EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH

CERN-EP/86-104
5 August 1986

Determination of the ratio $\sigma(\bar{p}n)/\sigma(\bar{p}p)$
from $\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ reaction data.

F.Balestra, S.Bossolasco, M.P.Bussa, L.Busso, L.Ferrero, D.Panzieri, G.Piragino, F.Tosello.
Istituto di Fisica Generale dell'Universita' di Torino and INFN-Sezione di Torino, Turin, Italy

G.Bendisoli, A.Rotondi, P.Salvini, A.Zenoni
Dipartimento di Fisica Nucleare e Teorica dell'Universita' di Pavia and INFN-Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

C.Guaraldo, A.Maggiora
Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, Frascati, Italy

Yu.A.Batusov, I.V.Falomkin, F.Nichitiu, G.B.Pontecorvo,
M.G.Sapozhnikov.
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, USSR

E.Lodi Rizzini
Dipartimento di Automazione Industriale dell'Universita' di Brescia and INFN-Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy.

Abstract - The ratio R^a_b between the cross sections for the annihilation of $\bar{p}$ on n and on p bound in the ^4He nucleus at four $\bar{p}$ momenta (at rest, 192.8, 306.2 and 607.7 MeV/c) has been obtained by the analysis of $\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ annihilation events detected with a self shunted streamer chamber exposed to the LEAR $\bar{p}$ beams. R^a_b increases from 0.42 ± 0.05 at rest up to 0.65 ± 0.09 at 607.7 MeV/c. The results are discussed in the light of Glauber theory analyses of $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ and $\bar{p}$ -nucleus data.

(Submitted to Nuclear Physics)

E

${}^4\text{He}$ ($\bar{p}, X$), $E=0, 19.6, 46.7, 179.6$ MeV; measured

σ annihilation annihilation
 ($\bar{p}-n$)/ σ ($\bar{p}-p$) ratio for bound nucleons.

Deduced $\sigma^{\text{total}}(\bar{p}-n)/\sigma^{\text{total}}(\bar{p}-p)$ ratio for free nucleons.

1. Introduction

While the interactions of antiprotons with free protons can be studied by using hydrogen targets, the interaction with free neutrons can be studied through the analysis of the $\bar{p}$ -nucleus interaction data. Below 600 MeV/c, recently many new results concerning scattering and annihilation of antiprotons on nuclei with $A=4-208$ (see Refs(1,2) and references quoted therein), have been added to the preceding data on deuterium (3,4,5) so giving new support to the investigation on the $\bar{p}n$ interaction.

In the case of deuterium targets annihilation events on n can be distinguished from those on p by the negative and positive pion numbers and by the presence of a recoil proton. Hence, assuming small charge exchange effects in the initial and in the final states, it is possible to evaluate the cross sections $\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)$ and $\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$ for annihilation on n and p bound in the deuteron structure. A surprising result is that $\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$ is equal to the cross section for annihilation on free proton within the limits of the experimental accuracy (3,4).

This result was interpreted as an indication of the absence of nuclear shadow corrections so that also $\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)$ could be considered to be the cross section for annihilation on free neutron. Successively, it was shown that these conjectures are, in principle, invalid (6). The absence of shadow correction for $\bar{p}p$ annihilation in deuterium means that this correction may be compensated by the contribution from rescattering of the pions in the final state; in particular, by the contribution from $\bar{p}n$ annihilations followed by charge exchange of negative pions on the spectator

proton. Consequently one should expect

$$\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)_{\text{bound}} \neq \sigma^a(\bar{p}n)_{\text{free}}$$

and also

$$R_b^a \equiv (\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)/\sigma^a(\bar{p}p))_{\text{bound}} \neq R_f^a \equiv (\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)/\sigma^a(\bar{p}p))_{\text{free}} \quad (1.1)$$

Another approach, which permits the study of the $\bar{p}n$ interaction, is based on the analysis of total $\bar{p}$ -nucleus cross sections with the Glauber theory. Indeed, due to the high annihilation probability and the consequent diffractive character of the elastic scattering, the Glauber theory has been shown to be suitable to describe the low energy $\bar{p}$ -nucleus interaction (1,2,7). If one assumes that the $\bar{p}p$ interaction parameters and the nuclear matter distribution are known, the Glauber theory allows us to calculate the ratio

$$R_f^T \equiv (\sigma^T(\bar{p}n)/\sigma^T(\bar{p}p))_{\text{free}} \quad (1.2)$$

between the total cross sections on free nucleons. Moreover, due to the diffractive nature of the $\bar{p}$ -nucleon interaction and following previous analyses concerning $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ data (7), it seems reasonable to assume

$$R_f^T = R_f^a \quad (1.3)$$

This equality is assumed to hold in what follows.

Hence, the measurements of prong multiplicity in $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ annihilation events and of total cross sections on light nuclei can give independent estimates of R_b^a and R_f^a (R_f^T).

Glauber theory analyses of deuterium data between 300 and 600 MeV/c led to different sets of R_f^T values vs $\bar{p}$ momentum in relation

to different sets of experimental total cross section values. Specifically, the data from Ref.(3,4) lead to $R_f^T > 1$ (increasing as the momentum decreases) and those from Ref.(5) lead to $R_f^T < 1$ (increasing with the momentum).

Analyses of $\bar{p}$ -nucleus data with $A \geq 4$ above 300 MeV/c agree with $R_f^T < 1$ (1,2,7,8).

It is worthwhile to stress that the R_b^a values obtained from ${}^2\text{H}$ data simply as ratios of the numbers of annihilation events on n and on p recognized by the prong multiplicity (3) fit very well the theoretical evaluations with $R_f^T < 1$. Hence, the results from $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ data seem confused and somewhat contradictory.

In this paper we intend to clarify in part this situation by means of measurements of $\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ annihilation events and of total reaction cross sections at 200, 300, 600 MeV/c (9,10) and at rest. The data at rest are presented here for the first time. The data were obtained with a streamer chamber in a magnetic field exposed to the LEAR antiproton beams (11).

The work is organized as follows. In Sect.2 and 3 the procedure to extract $\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)$, $\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$ and R_b^a from recognized events is explained. In Sect.4 this procedure is applied to the data at rest, at 200, 300 and 600 MeV/c. In Sect.5 Glauber theory calculations of R_f^T are performed. Finally, in Sect.6 our results are discussed and compared to those of other authors.

Our main results can be summarized as follows. The R_b^a values are 0.42 ± 0.05 at rest, 0.64 ± 0.07 at 192.8 MeV/c, 0.69 ± 0.06 at 306.2 MeV/c, and 0.65 ± 0.09 at 607.7 MeV/c; i.e., R_b^a for the $\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ interaction increases with the $\bar{p}$ momentum as in the $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ interaction (3,4). However, the ${}^4\text{He}$ values are somewhat smaller

than the ${}^2\text{H}$ ones. Moreover, our results, the previous $\bar{p}{}^2\text{H}$ annihilation data and some data from Glauber theory analyses of $\bar{p}{}^2\text{H}$ and $\bar{p}$ -nucleus total cross sections (this work and Ref.(1,2,12)) show an overall agreement within the experimental uncertainties on the condition

$$R^a_b = R^T_f < 1$$

with R increasing with the $\bar{p}$ momentum.

2. $\bar{p}{}^4\text{He}$ annihilation

2.1 Introduction

The $\bar{p}{}^4\text{He}$ annihilation process may consist of the following reaction sequence:

- a) inelastic scattering (charge exchange, knock-out, break-up); we will call it initial state interaction (ISI);
- b) antinucleon-nucleon annihilation;
- c) interaction between the residual nucleons and the annihilation mesons (mostly pions); we will call it final state interaction (FSI).

If only annihilation is effective and ISI and FSI are not, $\bar{p}p$ annihilation produces an odd number of charged prongs (1 heavy prong, i.e. a ${}^3\text{H}$ nucleus, and an even number of charged pions) and $\bar{p}n$ annihilation produces an even number of charged prongs (1 heavy prong, i.e. a ${}^3\text{He}$ nucleus, and an odd number of charged pions). Hence, the two types of annihilation processes are distinguishable

by the numbers of charged prongs.

2.2 ISI effects on the number of the charged prongs.

Let us consider the occurrence of the reactions a) and b). In this case a number of different processes may occur, such as those sketched in fig.1.

The knock-out and break-up processes may prevent the presence of ${}^3\text{H}$ and ${}^3\text{He}$ among the final products of the annihilation processes, so favouring the increase of the number of events with an odd number of prongs in respect of that of the even prong ones. Nevertheless, $\bar{p}p$ and $\bar{p}n$ annihilation events are in principle still distinguishable. Indeed, the $\bar{p}p$ annihilation events have among the final products one heavy prong and a number of negative pions equal to that of the positive pions. Instead, the $\bar{p}n$ annihilation events produce odd prong events with two heavy prongs and a number of negative pions greater than that of the positive pions (+1).

The charge exchange process changes $\bar{p}$ into $\bar{n}$; due to the isospin states, the $\bar{n}n$ annihilation is identical to the $\bar{p}p$ one (i.e. they have the same cross section) and the $\bar{n}p$ process is equal to the $\bar{p}n$ one.

The occurrence of charge exchange could have the main consequence that the R^b_a ratio for bound nucleons is lower than the like ratio for free nucleons, because the produced $\bar{n}$ may interact further with two neutrons and one proton, so that the $\bar{n}n$ annihilation is favoured statistically 2:1 in respect of the $\bar{n}p$ one. We can estimate the depression of R^b_a as follows. If we indicate with

R' the undepressed quantity, we have $R = aR' + bR'/2$, where a is the percentage of annihilation events without charge exchange and b is the percentage with charge exchange. Assuming for b the values for free protons (3.6%, 6.5% and 7% at 200, 300 and 600 MeV/c, respectively; see (14,15,16)), we obtain $(R'-R)/R' = 1.8\%$, 3.2% and 3.8%, respectively.

2.3 FSI effects on the number of the charged prongs.

Now let us consider annihilations followed by FSI, neglecting ISI. FSI may break the ${}^3\text{He}$ and ${}^3\text{H}$ nuclei increasing the number of events with an odd total number of charged prongs; moreover it may change the primary numbers of heavy prongs and charged pions through the pion-nucleon charge exchange interaction. The possible reactions are listed in Tab.1. An important consequence of the charge exchange, due to the $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ and $\pi^0 p \rightarrow \pi^+ n$ reactions, is that the $\bar{p}p$ annihilation events assume the features of events due to $\bar{p}n$ annihilation and viceversa, as it concerns the relative numbers of heavy and light particles emitted. For instance, reaction (A) in Tab.1 may be due to a direct $\bar{p}p$ annihilation or to a $\bar{p}n$ annihilation followed by the $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ reaction; reaction (B) may be due to a direct $\bar{p}n$ annihilation or to a $\bar{p}p$ annihilation followed by the $\pi^+ n \rightarrow \pi^0 p$ reaction. Therefore, the distinction between events due to $\bar{p}n$ and $\bar{p}p$ annihilation is not possible, in general, on the basis of the numbers of heavy and light particles.

However, one has to notice that πN charge exchange is less probable than πN scattering as the respective cross sections are

approximately in the ratio

$$\sigma(\pi^+p): \sigma(\pi^0p): \sigma(\pi^-p): \sigma_{ce} = 9:4:1:2$$

the annihilation pion momenta being close to the baryonic resonance momentum (~ 300 MeV/c).

2.4 Conclusions

The same conclusions hold also for the case where ISI is taken into account. The possible final state configurations are the same as reported in Tab.1. Processes including $\bar{n}n$ annihilation develop as those including $\bar{p}p$ annihilation.

Therefore we summarize the above analysis as follows:

- i) $\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ annihilation events may have an even or an odd number of charged prongs.
- ii) Even prong events are due to $\bar{p}n$ annihilation only; among their final products there are 1 heavy prong (^3He) and an odd number of charged pions.
- iii) Odd prong events arise both from direct $\bar{p}p$ annihilation and from $\bar{p}p$ or $\bar{p}n$ annihilation followed by FSI or preceded by ISI.
- iv) Due to final πN charge exchange, $\bar{p}p$ and $\bar{p}n$ annihilation events with an odd total number of charged prongs are in general not distinguishable.

In spite of point iv), it is possible to extract information from the odd prong events which allows us to evaluate the ratio between the cross sections for the $\bar{p}n$ and $\bar{p}p$ annihilations, as we

will show in the next section.

3. $\bar{p}n$ and $\bar{p}p$ annihilation cross sections.

3.1 Odd prong events analysis.

Odd prong events may be shared into two sets (a) and (b):

(a) includes (i) direct $\bar{p}p$ annihilations;

(ii) $\bar{p}p$ annihilations plus FSI without final charge exchange on n ($\pi^0 n$, $\pi^+ n$);

(iii) $\bar{p}n$ annihilations plus final charge exchange on p ($\pi^0 p$, $\pi^- p$).

Set (a) includes mostly $\bar{p}p$ annihilations and $\bar{p}n$ annihilations which look like $\bar{p}p$ annihilations owing to pion charge exchange.

(b) includes (i) $\bar{p}n$ annihilations plus FSI without final charge exchange on p ($\pi^0 p$, $\pi^- p$).

(ii) $\bar{p}p$ annihilations plus final charge exchange on n ($\pi^+ n$, $\pi^0 n$).

Set (b) includes mostly $\bar{p}n$ annihilations and $\bar{p}p$ annihilations which look like $\bar{p}n$ annihilations owing to pion charge exchange.

The events belonging to the two sets can be recognized through the numbers of heavy prongs and the equality between the numbers of π^+ and π^- , as it is summarized in Tab.2. Of course, all the events with one prong belong to the set (a), while the events with a higher multiplicity may belong both to the set (a) and to the set (b).

3.2 Evaluation of $\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)$, $\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$ and R_b^a .

We define:

$\sigma_m(\bar{p}p)$ = cross section for (a) event production;

$\sigma_m(\bar{p}n)$ = cross section for (b) event production;

$\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$ = cross section for annihilation on p;

$\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)$ = cross section for annihilation on n;

$\sigma_{ce}^p(\bar{p}n)$ = cross section for annihilation on n plus final charge exchange on p;

$\sigma_{ce}^n(\bar{p}p)$ = cross section for annihilation on p plus final charge exchange on n;

σ_e^a = cross section for even prong event production (^3He production);

σ_o^a = cross section for odd prong event production.

σ_e^a and σ_o^a are known from published data (9). $\sigma_m(\bar{p}p)$ and $\sigma_m(\bar{p}n)$ are measured in the present analysis. $\sigma_{ce}^p(\bar{p}n)$ and $\sigma_{ce}^n(\bar{p}p)$ are unknown and should be obtained from the event analysis, which is not easy. However their contribution is negligible (see later on). $\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$ and $\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)$ are annihilation cross sections on nucleons bound in ^4He and include the direct $\bar{p}$ -nucleon annihilation cross sections and all the interference terms due to ISI and FSI; $\sigma_{ce}^p(\bar{p}n)$ and $\sigma_{ce}^n(\bar{p}p)$ have a like meaning.

By definition, the following relations hold:

$$(3.1) \quad \sigma^a(\bar{p}p) = \sigma_m(\bar{p}p) - \sigma_{ce}^p(\bar{p}n) + \sigma_{ce}^n(\bar{p}p) = \sigma_m(\bar{p}p) - \sigma_{ce}$$

$$(3.2) \quad \sigma^a(\bar{p}n) = \sigma_m(\bar{p}n) + \sigma_e^a + \sigma_{ce}^p(\bar{p}n) - \sigma_{ce}^n(\bar{p}p) = \sigma_m(\bar{p}n) + \sigma_e^a + \sigma_{ce}$$

$$(3.3) \quad \sigma^a(\bar{p}p) + \sigma^a(\bar{p}n) = \sigma_e^a + \sigma_o^a$$

where

$$(3.4) \quad \sigma_{ce} = \sigma_{ce}^p(\bar{p}n) - \sigma_{ce}^n(\bar{p}p)$$

contains terms which tend to cancel each other ($\pi^0 p \rightleftharpoons \pi^+ n$; etc)(3).

Having set

$$(3.5) \quad r = \frac{\sigma_m(\bar{p}n)}{\sigma_m(\bar{p}p)}$$

from eqs. (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) one obtains

$$(3.6) \quad \sigma_o^a(\bar{p}p) = \sigma_o^a \frac{1 - (1+r) \sigma_{ce}/\sigma_o^a}{1+r}$$

$$(3.7) \quad \sigma_o^a(\bar{p}n) = \sigma_o^a \frac{(1+r) \sigma_e^a/\sigma_o^a + r + (1+r) \sigma_{ce}/\sigma_o^a}{1+r}$$

$$(3.8) \quad R^a = \frac{\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)}{\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)} = \frac{(1+r) \frac{\sigma_e^a}{\sigma_o^a} + r + (1+r) \frac{\sigma_{ce}^a}{\sigma_o^a}}{1 - (1+r) \frac{\sigma_{ce}^a}{\sigma_o^a}}$$

By assuming

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{\sigma_{ce}^a}{\sigma_o^a} \ll 1$$

one obtains the simplified formulas:

$$(3.10) \quad \sigma^a(\bar{p}p) = \frac{\sigma_o^a}{1+r}$$

$$(3.11) \quad \sigma^a(\bar{p}n) = \sigma_e^a + \frac{r}{1+r} \sigma_o^a$$

$$(3.12) \quad R^a = \frac{\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)}{\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)} = (1+r) \frac{\sigma_e^a}{\sigma_o^a} + r$$

4. Experimental data analysis.

4.1 Data at 19.6 MeV and at rest.

We have measured non elastic events at 19.6 MeV (198.8 MeV/c), an energy where inelastic processes are forbidden and only annihilation is possible. Cross sections and charged prong multiplicity distributions are given in Ref.(9) and the data useful in

the present work are reported in the tables 3 and 4b. We recall that the production of ^3He is evidenced simply by an even number of charged prongs.

Also we have performed measurements of momenta and angles and mass identification on which we will refer in detail elsewhere (10). Here we limit ourselves to say that we were able to recognize the mass of the particles (or, at least, to distinguish between pions and heavy particles) in 77% of the tracks on the basis of the following information: (i) the geometrical characteristics of the tracks given by the Hydra Geometry Program for different mass hypotheses; (ii) the relative ionizations of the tracks on the same picture; (iii) the electric charge conservation and (iv) the barionic number conservation. This information allowed us to identify 286 events with 3, 5 and 7 prongs as belonging to the set (a) or to the set (b). We recall that all the one prong events belong to the set (a) and are the 4.7% of the odd prong events (see Tab.4b).

Mass identification is prevented mainly in the cases of tracks at small angles in respect of the magnetic field direction or with very low ionization (very fast particles). These limitations might introduce a systematic error into the ratio r between the numbers of events of type (b) and type (a).

However we notice that the relative percentages of the recognized events with 3, 5 and 7 prongs are equal, within the statistical errors, to the correspondent percentages for all the events (44.8 ± 3.8 , 47.7 ± 4.1 , 7.8 ± 1.6 to be compared to 43.0 ± 3.1 , 50.8 ± 3.3 and 6.1 ± 1.1 , respectively) and the mean numbers of negative pions associated to the (a) type events and to the (b) type

ones plus the even prong ones are equal, respectively, to the values expected for $\bar{p}p$ and $\bar{p}n$ annihilations (1.38 ± 0.10 and 1.95 ± 0.12 to be compared to 1.49 ± 0.02 and 2.08 ± 0.04 , respectively (3,4,13)). Hence we conclude that possible systematic errors in the identification of the two types of events are within the statistical errors.

In order to evaluate the quantities defined by formulas (3.6-8) or (3.10-12), we calculated the ratio σ_{ce}/σ_o^a in an approximated way as follows. In the $\bar{p}p$ annihilation the residual nucleons are $(p+2n)$ and, on the average, the number of the produced pions is $(1.5 \pi^+ + 1.5 \pi^- + 2 \pi^0)$ (3,4,13). In the $\bar{p}n$ annihilation the residual nucleons are $(n+2p)$ and the pions are $(1\pi^+ + 2\pi^- + 2\pi^0)$. Considering the possible π -nucleon pairs and the ratios between the correspondent cross-sections (see sect.2.3), one obtains

$$\sigma_{ce}^n(\bar{p}p)/\sigma_{FSI}(\bar{p}p) \approx 0.15$$

$$\sigma_{ce}^p(\bar{p}n)/\sigma_{FSI}(\bar{p}n) \approx 0.18$$

where $\sigma_{FSI}(\bar{p}p)$ indicates the total cross section for the interaction of the pions and the residual nucleons after the $\bar{p}p$ annihilation; a similar meaning holds for $\sigma_{FSI}(\bar{p}n)$. Assuming $\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)/\sigma^a(\bar{p}p) = 0.7-1$ (1) and considering that FSI occurs in at most 44% of the annihilation events (9), the values of σ_{ce}/σ_o^a are between -0.009 and 0.017, that is

$$\frac{\sigma_{ce}}{\sigma_a} \ll 1$$

so that the simplified formulas (3.10-12) may be used.

For the effective evaluation of r , we calculated for each multiplicity i the fractions of the (0,1) heavy prong events and of the (≥ 2) heavy prong events (the numbers of the events are given in column 2 of Tab.4b) and multiplied them by the multiplicity percentage P_i (column 3), so obtaining the values reported in the column 4 and 5 of the same table. In this way we normalized the fractions of the events of column 2 to the multiplicity percentages concerning all the measured events so compensating for possible systematic errors made in the identification of the events of type (a) or (b).

The results are given in Tab.5 and Fig.2.

A similar procedure was applied to a sample of at rest events. The measured quantities are given in Tab.3 and 4a and the calculated quantities are reported in Tab.5 and Fig.2.

4.2 Data at 48.7 and 179.6 MeV.

These energies are higher than the energy threshold for charge exchange ($\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$) and for break-up and knock-out reactions. The charge exchange (not followed by annihilation) contributes to one prong events only and the other processes contribute to 1, 2 and 3 charged prong events (9).

Between 300 and 600 MeV/c the charge exchange cross section

is 10-12% of the annihilation cross section on free protons (14,15,17); in deuterium the same percentage is 1.5-2% (3); in carbon at 600 MeV/c it is 2.14% (18,19). We assumed the last value to be hold also for ${}^4\text{He}$ at 300 and 600 MeV/c and corrected consequently the cross section values reported in Ref.(9). The corrected values are reported in Tab.3. In Tab.4c,d the corrected charged prong multiplicity distributions are listed.

No correction has been introduced to eliminate possible break-up and knock-out events which were estimated less than 3% of all non elastic events (9).

We analyzed the 300 and 600 MeV/c events with the same procedure followed for those at 200 MeV/c. All data are reported in Tab.4c,d and their quality is like that of the 200 MeV/c data. The values of r , R_b^a , $\sigma_b^a(\bar{p}p)$ and $\sigma_b^a(\bar{p}n)$ are shown in Tab.5, Figs.2 and 3.

In Fig.3 the $\sigma_b^a(\bar{p}p)$ values are compared with the values of $\sigma_f^a(\bar{p}p)$ for free protons. One sees that $\sigma_b^a(\bar{p}p) \approx \sigma_f^a(\bar{p}p)$, so that the cross section per proton for $\bar{p}$ annihilation on p bound in ${}^4\text{He}$ is only $(1/2) \sigma_f^a$. Evidently, the compact structure of ${}^4\text{He}$ produces a strong shadow effect, a situation quite different from the annihilation on ${}^2\text{H}$, where, due to the soft structure, one finds $\sigma_b^a(\bar{p}p) = \sigma_f^a(\bar{p}p)$ (6,7).

5. Glauber theory calculation of R_f^T

As it is known, the Glauber approximation of the hadron-nucleus scattering is based on the projectile-free nucleon ampli-

tudes and neglects off-shell and rescattering (i.e. multiple scattering on the same nucleon) effects.

The limits of validity of this approach have been a long standing problem of nuclear reaction theory (20). Now it is definitely established that, when the eikonal propagator is employed in the Watson multiple scattering expansion of the on-shell transition amplitude, for commuting interactions there is a complete cancellation between off-shell and rescattering effects, and one obtains the Glauber multiple scattering series (21). This means that the off-shell effects are present only on the longitudinal part of the transferred momentum and they are negligible when the diffractive nature of the interaction permits the use of the eikonal (Glauber) approximation.

Since the $\bar{p}$ -nucleon interaction is commutative when spin effects are neglected and is diffractive even at low energy, one concludes that the Glauber approximation is applicable, (and in effect it has been successfully applied (1,2,7)), in the analysis of low energy $\bar{p}$ -nucleus scattering.

From the above discussion it results also that the relative accuracy of this approximation in calculating total cross sections is given by the weight of the noneikonal effects on the eikonal ones in the Watson multiple scattering expansion of the transition amplitude (20,21). This weight amounts (7,22) to $(kR_0)^{-1} \text{Re} f(0)/\text{Im} f(0)$, where $f(0)$ is the $\bar{p}$ -nucleon scattering amplitude at 0° , k is the projectile momentum and R_0 the nuclear radius. Since in the low energy $\bar{p}p$ scattering $\text{Re} f(0)/\text{Im} f(0) \lesssim 0.2$ for $200 < k < 600$ MeV/c, we estimated that the inaccuracy of our Glauber approach in what follows is $< 5\%$ (from Tab.6).

We define, as usually, the $\bar{p}$ -free nucleon scattering amplitude in the form

$$f(q) = (k/4\pi) \sigma_j (1 + \rho_j) e^{-\beta_j^2 q^2/2} \quad (5.1)$$

where q is the transferred momentum, $\rho_j = \text{Re } f(0)/\text{Im } f(0)$, β_j^2 is the slope parameter and σ_j the $\bar{p}$ -nucleon total cross section. The index j defines the target nucleon ($j=p$ and $j=n$ for protons and neutrons, respectively). With these definitions, the $\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ scattering amplitude in the Glauber approximation is (23)

$$F(\Delta) = ik e^{R_0^2 \Delta^2/16} \int J_0(\Delta b) \{ 1 - (1 - (1 - i\rho_p) G_p(b))^2 \times \\ \times (1 - (1 - i\rho_n) G_n(b))^2 \} b db \quad (5.2)$$

where Δ and Δ^2 are the laboratory transferred 3-momentum and 4-momentum, respectively; J_0 is the Bessel function and

$$G_j(b) = (\sigma_j/8\pi\gamma_j^2) e^{-b^2/4\gamma_j^2}$$

$$\gamma_j = \beta_j^2/2 + R_0^2/4$$

$$j = n, p$$

In eq.(5.2) we assume for ^4He an independent particle model with point like nuclear densities given by harmonic oscillator wave functions (23,25).

In this treatment Pauli, spin and nucleon-nucleon correlations are neglected. However, the first effect is absent from ^4He because of the charge and spin variables of the four nucleons. The

remaining ones affect by few percent the large angle behaviour of the elastic scattering distribution (26), so that they have a negligible influence on total cross section calculations.

The input parameters of the model are $R_0, \sigma_p, \beta_p^2, \rho_p, \sigma_n, \beta_n^2, \rho_n$. We fix for ${}^4\text{He}$ $R_0=1.37$ fm (25,26) and take σ_p, β_p^2 and ρ_p from low energy $\bar{p}p$ scattering experiments (27,28). Moreover, from eq.(1.3) we have

$$R_f^T = R_f^a = \sigma(\bar{p}n)/\sigma(\bar{p}p) = \sigma^a(\bar{p}n)/\sigma^a(\bar{p}p) = \sigma^{el}(\bar{p}n)/\sigma^{el}(\bar{p}p) \quad (5.3)$$

where a means annihilation and el elastic. Thus from eq.(5.1) and (5.3) we obtain for $\rho_p, \rho_n \ll 1$

$$R_f^T = R_f^a = \sigma_n/\sigma_p = \beta_n^2/\beta_p^2 \quad (5.4)$$

and, since ρ_p and ρ_n are small and have practically no influence on the total cross sections, we set (7)

$$\rho_n = \rho_p \quad (5.5)$$

In this way only R_f^T is a free parameter and we can fit our ${}^4\text{He}$ total reaction cross section experimental values by the equation

$$\sigma_R = (4\pi/k) \text{Im } F(0) - \int |F|^2 d\Omega \quad (5.6)$$

where $F(\Delta)$ is given by eq.(5.2).

Now we discuss the values of σ_p, β_p^2 and ρ_p obtained in recent $\bar{p}p$ scattering experiments. The world data up to 1984 ($k > 250$ MeV/c), which are summarized in Ref.(28), are in partial disagreement with those from a LEAR experiment (27) ($181 < k < 590$ MeV/c). One finds that it is possible to fit with an overall interpolation formula the ρ_p values (k in GeV/c):

$$\rho_p = \rho_n = 1.33 - 10.34 k + 22.78 k^2 - 13.63 k^3 \quad (5.7)$$

whereas the same thing is not true for σ_p and β_p^2 . Hence, we adopt two sets of values for σ_p and β_p^2 and perform a grid procedure with R_f^T as a free parameter, minimizing the difference between our experimental values of σ_R and those calculated by means of eq.(5.6).

The results are reported in Tab.5 and in Fig.2, where the error associated to R_f^T defines the interval where the calculated σ_R reproduce the experimental value within one standard deviation. This procedure determines, at each momentum, two theoretical estimations of R_f^T to be compared with the values obtained in the preceding section. The results are statistically compatible at 300 and 600 MeV/c, whereas there is a large discrepancy at 200 MeV/c, which reflects the uncertainty on the $\bar{p}p$ parameters at this momentum.

6. Discussion

6.1 Comparison with $\bar{p}^2H$ and $\bar{p}$ -nucleus results.

The R_b^a values we have found are reported on Fig.4 together with R_b^a values obtained from $\bar{p}^2H$ annihilation data following a similar procedure and with R_f^T values obtained from some analyses of experimental data performed in the frame of the Glauber theory. The latter ones concern both $\bar{p}^2H$ (6, 7, 12) and $\bar{p}$ -nucleus data with mass number A ranging from 4 to 63 (1,2,8).

The theoretical values obtained for the $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ interaction show two distinct behaviours depending on the different sets of experimental data analyzed. The black points and the dashed line on the figure were obtained from the total $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ cross section values reported in Ref.(3,4) and the open points were obtained from the total cross section values of Ref.(5). The latter cross section values are systematically lower than the former ones (see Fig.5a) and the difference is due to lower total elastic cross section values (see Fig.5c), while the annihilation cross section values agree each others (see Fig.5b). Also, the elastic cross section values of Ref.(4) show a an unexpected decrease at the lower momenta. We note that there is a substantial agreement between the R_f^T values obtained through the Glauber theory analysis of the ^2H data of Ref.(5) and the R_b^a values of Ref.(3,4).

For the annihilation of $\bar{p}$ at rest, Ref.(4) gives $R_b^a = 0.749 \pm 0.018$ and Ref.(3) 0.815 ± 0.0034 , but in the first experiment at rest means $\bar{p}$ momentum less than 260 MeV/c and in the latter one $\bar{p}$ momentum less than about 300 MeV/c. Summarizing, the R_b^a values are on the average 0.8 with a small decrease from 600 MeV/c down to 0.

Our R_b^a values are little smaller than those obtained for ^2H between 300 and 600 MeV/c and decrease more and more as the $\bar{p}$ momentum goes down to zero (here, zero energy means $\bar{p}$ captured on atomic orbits). At 300 MeV/c the R_b^a value is equal to the R_f^T value obtained by the Glauber theory calculation. At 200 MeV/c the R_b^a value falls between the two calculated R_f^T values and at 600 MeV/c is little smaller than the calculated R_f^T value.

Finally, we notice that very preliminary results (30) from an

experiment on antineutron-proton annihilation in the momentum range between 100 and 500 MeV/c show that $\sigma^a(\bar{n}p)$ is about $(2/3) \sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$, i.e. $R_f^T = 0.66$.

As a concluding remark, we recall also that values of R_f^T smaller than 1 are predicted by antinucleon-nucleon potential model calculations (31) independently from the different forms assumed for the potentials.

6.2 Conclusions

Our main results are summarized in Tab.4, 5 and 6 and Fig.2.

They agree with $\bar{p}^2H$ annihilation data and some Glauber theory analyses of $\bar{p}^2H$ and $\bar{p}$ -nucleus total cross sections and show that, within the experimental uncertainties,

$$R_b^a \approx R_f^T < 1$$

with R increasing with the $\bar{p}$ momentum. Values of R_b^a smaller than 1 are supported also by preliminary results of an experiment on the $\bar{n}p$ interaction (30).

Our Glauber theory analysis of the $\bar{p}^4He$ reaction cross section puts in evidence some discrepancies between experimental $\bar{p}p$ data at low energy (27,28). Similarly, a comparison of some Glauber theory calculations of R_f^T performed by using different sets of $\bar{p}^2H$ total cross sections shows some discrepancies among these experimental data (6,12,29).

Thanks are due to Dr.L.A.Kondratyuk, who discussed with us many aspects of our work and, very kindly, informed us in advance of some results of his analyses.

Table Captions

- Tab.1 Examples of reactions due to annihilation plus FSI as the number of annihilation $\pi\pm$ increases from 0 to 3. πN scattering and charge exchange effects are shown separately. In square parenthesis the different charge exchange reactions are indicated. Deuterons are omitted among the final products for the sake of simplicity. a, b, etc. indicate reactions with different types of charged particles in the final state. N_T is the total number of charged particles, N_H is the number of heavy particles and $E\pm$ is the equality (=) or the inequality ($\neq$) of the numbers of charged pions.
- Tab.2 Features of the charged prongs of the events of type (a) and (b) (See text). N_H = number of heavy prongs; $E\pm$ = equality (=) or inequality ($\neq$) of the numbers of π^- and π^+ .
- Tab.3 Annihilation cross sections: (t) total, (e) even prong event production, (o) odd prong event production (values from Ref.(9) minus charge exchange cross sections).
- Tab.4a,b,c,d Observed events of type (a) and type (b) and related multiplicity distributions at four $\bar{p}$ energies: n_c = charged prong multiplicity; n_{π^-} = negative pion multiplicity; N_{ev} = number of events of type (a) or (b) and (a) + (b); P_i = charged prong multiplicity distributions from Ref.(9), charge exchange contributions having been subtracted (we notice that the multiplicity distribution at

600 MeV/c refers to a two time higher statistics than in Ref.(9));

% (a) = normalized percentages of events of type (a);

% (b) = as above for the type (b) ones;

% ($\bar{p}p$) = multiplicity distribution for $\bar{p}p$ annihilations
(from column 4);

% ($\bar{p}n$) = multiplicity distribution for $\bar{p}n$ annihilations
(from columns 3 and 5: $8.39=6.7+1.69$, etc.).

Tab.5 Cross sections for annihilation on p and on n and their ratios (see text); the cross section values are in mb for annihilation in flight and % at rest.

Tab.6 Determination of ratio $R_f^T = \sigma_n / \sigma_p = \beta_n^2 / \beta_p^2$ using Glauber theory and $\bar{p}p$ scattering amplitude parameters interpolated from Ref.(27,28). $\sigma_R^{\text{exp}} = \bar{p}^4\text{He}$ total reaction cross section (Ref.9);

$\rho_p = \text{Re } f(0) / \text{Im}(0)$ for $\bar{p}p$ interaction (see eq.5.7);

σ_p = Total $\bar{p}p$ cross section; β_p^2 = slope parameter of the $\bar{p}p$ amplitude (see eq.5.1);

R_f^T = Total $\bar{p}n$ cross section over total $\bar{p}p$ cross section.

Figure Captions

- Fig.1 Different reaction schemes of annihilation preceded by ISI.
 N_H = Number of heavy prongs after the processes a) and b).
 $N_{\pi^{\pm}}$ = Number of charged pions.
- Fig.2 (▲) R_b^a values obtained in Sect.4;
(O) R_f^T values calculated by means of the Glauber theory with the $\bar{p}p$ data of Ref.(28);
(●) R_f^T values calculated with the $\bar{p}p$ data of Ref.(27).
- Fig.3 $\bar{p}p$ annihilation cross section: (●) Ref.(16), (□) Ref.(27);
cross section for annihilation of $\bar{p}$ on p bound in ${}^4\text{He}$: (○).
- Fig.4 Ratio between the $\bar{p}n$ and the $\bar{p}p$ cross sections vs $\bar{p}$ momentum. R_b^a values: (□) from $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ annihilation data of Ref.(3); (○) from $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ annihilation data of Ref.(4); (▲) from $\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ data (this work).
 R_f^T values from Glauber theory analyses: (■) Ref.(6) concerning $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ total cross sections of Ref.(3); (●) Ref.(29) concerning $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ total cross sections of Ref.(4); (x) Ref.(8,2) with regard to $\bar{p}$ -nucleus elastic scattering data; (+) from Ref.(1) with regard to $\bar{p}$ -nucleus annihilation cross section data; broken line: analysis of the $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ total cross sections of Ref.(4); full line: analysis of $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ total cross section of Ref.(5) (Both lines from Ref.(12)).

Fig.5 Total, annihilation and elastic $\bar{p}^2\text{H}$ cross sections vs $\bar{p}$ momentum. Comparison among the data of Ref.(3)(x), Ref.(4)(o) and Ref.(5)(●).

REFERENCES

- (1) F.Balestra et al.: Nucl.Phys. A452 (1986) 573
- (2) O.D.Dalkarov and V.A.Karmanov: Nucl.Phys. A445(1985)579 and Report n.87, Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow (1986)
- (3) R.Bizzarri et al.: Nuovo Cimento 22A (1974) 225
- (4) T.Kalogeropoulos, G.S.Tzanakos: Phys.Rev. D22 (1980) 2585
- (5) R.P.Hamilton et al.: Phys.Rev.Lett. 44 (1980) 1182
- (6) L.A.Kondratyuk: Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 24 (1976) 247
- (7) L.A.Kondratyuk et al.: Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 33 (1981) 413
- (8) O.D.Dalkarov, V.A.Karmanov: Phys.Lett. 147B (1984) 1
- (9) F.Balestra et al.: Phys.Lett. 165B (1985) 265
- (10) F.Balestra et al.: to be published
- (11) F.Balestra et al: Nucl.Instr.and Meth.A234 (1985) 30
- (12) L.A.Kondratyuk: Private communication
- (13) U.Amaldi et al.: Nuovo Cimento 46A (1966) 171
- (14) R.P.Hamilton et al.: Phys.Rev.Lett. 44 (1980) 1179
- (15) K.Nakamura et al.: Phys.Rev.Lett. 53 (1984) 885
- (16) W.Brückner et al.: CERN-EP/85-202
- (17) V.Flaminio et al.: Report CERN-HERA/84-01, Geneva, (1984)
- (18) K.Nakamura et al.: Phys.Rev.Lett. 52 (1984) 731
- (19) K.Nakamura et al.: Phys.Rev. C31 (1985) 1853
- (20) D.R.Harrington: Phys.Rev. 184 (1969) 1745;
V.M. Eisenberg: Ann.of Phys. 71 (1972) 542
S.J.Wallace: Adv.Nucl.Phys. 12 (1981) 135;
- (21) V.B.Mandelzweig and S.J.Wallace: Phys.Rev. C25 (1982) 61
- (22) V.M.Kolybasov and L.A.Kondratyuk: Phys.Lett. 39B (1972) 439

- (23) R.Glauber and G.Matthiae: Nucl.Phys. B21 (1970) 135
- (24) G.D.Alkhazov, S.L.Belostotsky, A.A.Vorobyov:
Phys.Rep. 42 (1978) 89
- (25) L.R.B.Elton: "Nuclear Sizes"(Oxford University, 1961)
- (26) R.H.Bassel and C.Wilkin: Phys.Rev. 174 (1968) 1179
- (27) W.Brückner et al.: Phys.Lett. 166B (1986) 113
: Phys.Lett. 158B (1985) 180
- (28) H.Iwasaki et al.: Nucl.Phys. A433 (1985) 580
- (29) L.A.Kondratyuk and M.Zh.Shmatikov: Phys.Lett. 117B (1982) 38.
- (30) D.L.Lowenstein et al.: VII Symp. Antiproton Interaction,
Durham 1984. Inst.Phys.Conf.Ser.N.73: Section 5, pag.323
L.S.Pinsky: Physics with antiprotons at LEAR in the ACOL era.
Third LEAR Workshop, Tignes (1985), pag.275
- (31) R.A.Bryan and R.J.Phillips: Nucl.Phys. B5 (1968) 201
T.Ueda: Progr. Theor. Phys. 62 (1979) 1670
J.M.Richard and M.E.Sanio: Phys.lett. B110 (1980) 349.

$\bar{p}^4\text{He}$ annihilation type	FSI effect	reaction Set type	N_T	N_H	$E_{\pm}$
$(\bar{p}p)^* \rightarrow t + M\pi^0 \rightarrow p + 2n + M\pi^0$		a A	1	1	=
$[\pi^0 n \rightarrow \pi^- p] \rightarrow 2p + n + \pi^- + M\pi^0$		b B	3	2	≠
$[\pi^0 p \rightarrow \pi^+ n] \rightarrow 3n + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		a C	1	0	≠
$(\bar{p}n)^* \rightarrow {}^3\text{He} + \pi^- + M\pi^0 \rightarrow 2p + n + \pi^- + M\pi^0$		b B	3	2	≠
$[\pi^0 p \rightarrow \pi^+ n] \rightarrow p + 2n + \pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		a D	3	1	=
$[\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n] \rightarrow p + 2n + M\pi^0$		a A	1	1	=
$[\pi^0 n \rightarrow \pi^- p] \rightarrow 3p + 2\pi^- + M\pi^0$		b E	5	3	≠
$(\bar{p}p)^* \rightarrow t + \pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0 \rightarrow p + 2n + \pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		a D	3	1	=
$[\pi^0 n \rightarrow \pi^- p] \rightarrow 2p + n + 2\pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		b F	5	2	≠
$[\pi^0 p \rightarrow \pi^+ n] \rightarrow 3n + \pi^- + 2\pi^+ + M\pi^0$		a G	3	0	≠
$[\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n] \rightarrow 3n + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		a C	1	0	≠
$[\pi^+ n \rightarrow \pi^0 p] \rightarrow 2p + n + \pi^- + M\pi^0$		b B	3	2	≠
$(\bar{p}n)^* \rightarrow {}^3\text{He} + 2\pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0 \rightarrow 2p + n + 2\pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		b I	5	2	≠
$[\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n] \rightarrow p + 2n + \pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		a G	3	1	=
$[\pi^0 n \rightarrow \pi^- p] \rightarrow 3p + 3\pi^- + \pi^+ + M\pi^0$		b L	7	3	≠
$[\pi^0 p \rightarrow \pi^+ n] \rightarrow p + 2n + 2\pi^- + 2\pi^+ + M\pi^0$		a N	5	1	=
$[\pi^+ n \rightarrow \pi^0 p] \rightarrow 3p + 2\pi^- + M\pi^0$		b F	5	3	≠

Tab. 1

	N_H	$E_{\pm}$
(a) events	0	$\neq$
	1	$=$
(b) events	≥ 2	$\neq$

Tab. 2

E(MeV)	at rest	19.6	48.7	179.6
σ_e^a	$(21.26 \pm 1.15)\%$	93.2 ± 7.9	58.6 ± 4.1	33.0 ± 1.7
σ_o^a	$(78.73 \pm 2.21)\%$	312.4 ± 14.3	229.0 ± 8.1	194.9 ± 4.2
σ_t^a	-	405.6 ± 16.4	287.6 ± 9.1	228.0 ± 4.6
$\frac{\sigma_e^a}{\sigma_o^a}$	0.270 ± 0.016	0.298 ± 0.029	0.255 ± 0.021	0.169 ± 0.0096

Tab. 3

at rest									
1		2			3	4	5	6	7
n_c	n_{π^-}	N_{ev}			P_i	$\%$ (a)	$\%$ (b)	$\%$ $\bar{p}p$	$\%$ $\bar{p}n$
		(a)	(b)	(a)+(b)					
1	0				3.9 ± 0.5	3.9 ± 0.5		3.9 ± 0.5	
2	1				6.8 ± 0.6				8.9 ± 1.3
3	1	43	3	46	34.9 ± 1.5	32.9 ± 1.8	2.0 ± 1.1	32.9 ± 1.8	
4	2				11.3 ± 0.8				16.04 ± 2.0
5	2	30	5	35	34.1 ± 1.5	29.0 ± 2.2	5.1 ± 1.8	29.0 ± 2.2	
6	3				3.1 ± 0.4				4.4 ± 1.2
7	3	2	1	3	5.5 ± 0.6	4.1 ± 1.3	1.4 ± 1.2	4.1 ± 1.3	
8	4				0.06 ± 0.06				0.06 ± 0.06
9	4				0.19 ± 0.11			0.19 ± 0.11	
$\langle n_{\pi^-} \rangle$								1.48 ± 0.07	1.84 ± 0.19

Tab. 4a

192.8 MeV/c (19.6 MeV)									
1		2			3	4	5	6	7
$n_c \quad n_{\pi^-}$		N_{ev} (a) (b) (a)+(b)			P_f	% (a)	% (b)	% $\bar{p}p$	% $\bar{p}n$
1	0				4.7 ± 0.9	4.7 ± 0.9		4.7 ± 0.9	
2	1				6.7 ± 1.0				8.4 ± 1.2
3	1	121	7	128	31.0 ± 2.2	29.3 ± 2.1	1.7 ± 0.6	29.3 ± 2.1	
4	2				13.1 ± 1.5				24.7 ± 2.2
5	2	93	43	136	36.6 ± 2.4	25.0 ± 2.1	11.6 ± 1.6	25.0 ± 2.1	
6	3				2.9 ± 0.7				5.5 ± 0.8
7	3	9	13	22	4.4 ± 0.8	1.8 ± 0.5	2.6 ± 0.5	1.8 ± 0.5	
8	4				0.16 ± 0.16				0.16 ± 0.16
9	4				0.16 ± 0.16			0.16 ± 0.16	
$\langle n_{\pi^-} \rangle$								1.40 ± 0.08	1.93 ± 0.10

Tab. 4b

306.2 MeV/c (47.9 MeV)									
1		2			3	4	5	6	7
$n_c \quad n_{\pi^-}$		N_{ev} (a) (b) (a)+(b)			P_1	% (a)	% (b)	% $\bar{p}p$	% $\bar{p}n$
1	0				3.3±0.4	3.3±0.4		3.3±0.4	
2	0,1				5.3±0.7				6.7±1.6
3	0,1	45	2	47	32.9±1.8	31.5±2.0	1.4±1.0	31.2±2.0	
4	2				11.1±1.0				24.1±2.7
5	2	32	18	50	36.0±1.9	23.0±2.7	13.0±2.5	23.0±2.7	
6	3				3.7±0.6				9.8±1.4
7	3	1	5	6	7.3±0.8	1.2±1.1	6.1±1.3	1.2±1.1	
8	4				0.19±0.14				0.19±0.14
9	4				0.10±0.10			0.10±0.10	
$\langle n_{\pi^-} \rangle$								1.38±0.11	2.08±0.17

Tab. 4c

607.7 MeV/c (199.6 MeV)									
1		2			3	4	5	6	7
$n_c \quad n_{\pi^-}$		N_{ev} (a) (b) (a)+(b)			P_1	% (a)	% (b)	% $\bar{p}p$	% $\bar{p}n$
1	0				5.3±0.6	5.3±0.6		5.3±0.6	
2	0,1				4.0±0.4				10.2±2.0
3	0,1	35	8	43	33.0±1.1	26.8±2.0	6.1±1.9	26.8±2.0	
4	2				7.6±0.6				22.7±3.1
5	2	24	15	39	39.9±1.3	24.6±3.2	15.1±3.1	24.6±3.2	
6	3				2.6±0.3				6.2±1.9
7	3	2	2	4	7.1±1.2	3.6±1.9	3.6±1.9	3.6±1.9	
8	4				0.13±0.08				0.24±0.14
9	4	-	1	1	0.11±0.11		0.11±0.11		
$\langle n_{\pi^-} \rangle$								1.44±0.14	1.91±0.22

Tab. 4d

MeV/c		192.8	306.2	607.7	
MeV	at rest	19.6	48.7	179.6	
r		0.12 ± 0.04	0.26 ± 0.05	0.35 ± 0.04	0.41 ± 0.07
$R = \frac{\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)}{\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)}$		0.42 ± 0.05	0.64 ± 0.07	0.69 ± 0.06	0.65 ± 0.09
$\sigma^a(\bar{p}p)$		$(70.4 \pm 2.5)\%$	247.8 ± 14.6	170.1 ± 8.2	137.9 ± 7.8
$\sigma^a(\bar{p}n)$		$(29.6 \pm 2.5)\%$	157.8 ± 21.9	117.5 ± 12.2	90.1 ± 9.1

Tab. 5

			Ref. (28)			Ref. (27)		
Momentum	σ_R^{exp}	ρ_p	σ_p	β_p^2	R_f^T	σ_p	β_p^2	R_f^T
MeV/c	mb		mb	GeV ⁻²		mb	GeV ⁻²	
200	406±2	0.05	328	44	0.88±0.09	309	71	0.40±0.12
300	298±9	-0.13	240	32	0.67±0.08	225	32	0.71±0.07
600	233±7	0.20	150	21	0.90±0.06	143	21	0.94±0.06

Tab. 6

N_H $N_{\pi^\pm}$	$\bar{n}$ n annihilation	$\bar{n}$ p annihilation	N_H $N_{\pi^\pm}$
1 even			0 odd
1 even			2 odd
1 even			2 odd
1 even			2 odd

Fig.1

Fig.2

Fig.3

Fig.4

Fig.5