Backward meson production at high energies: Connection with baryon stopping, and experimental prospects Spencer Klein, LBNL

Presented at the CFNS Workshop on Baryon Dynamics Jan. 22-24, 2024, Stony Brook NY

- Backward meson production
- Connection with baryon stopping
- Observability in ultra-peripheral collisions
- Observability at the EIC
- Conclusions

*Work done in collaboration with Zach Sweger



Conventional (forward) production

- In conventional (forward) meson a photon fluctuates to a q-qbar dipole (virtual vector meson), which scatters from a target, emerging as a real meson
 - Strong force, without color exchange
 - Pomeron or Reggeon exchange
- The Pomeron dominates at high energies
 - To lowest order, 2 gluons
 - LO may be inadequate here



- Reggeon (mesonic) trajectories dominate at low energies
- Describes light meson production well:
 - $\sigma(W) = XW^{\epsilon} + YW^{-\eta}$
 - + ε~ 0.22 for the Pomeron trajectory
 - + $\eta \sim 1.5$ for Reggeon (summed meson)trajectories
 - $d\sigma/dt \sim exp(-bt)$, where b depends on the size of the target
 - t is generally small (p_T<hbar/R_A)

Pomerons, Reggeons and kinematics HERA + fixed target data



Backward (u-channel) production

- t is large and u is small
 - In γp center-of-mass frame, meson and proton switch places
 - The meson is far-forward, while the proton is at mid-rapidity
 - ♦ u replaces t: dσ/du ~exp(-Cu)
- Studied at fixed target accelerators
 - Generally only light mesons*
 - Proton and meson share quark flavors
- Baryon is shifted by multiple units in rapidity
 - In one picture, the baryon and meson both recoil backwards after the collision (ala Rutherford)
 - Alternately, the baryon number is transferred to the photon
- Two models:
 - Transition Distribution Amplitudes (TDA, like GPDs)
 - Regge trajectories involving baryons
 - C. Ayerbe Gayoso et al., arXiv:2107.06748; D. Cebra et al. Phys. Rev. C 106, 015204 (2022)



Backward π^+ production

• $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^0 p$ and $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^+ n$

Charged & neutral baryon trajectories



R. L. Anderson et al., Phys. Rev. D **14**, 679 (1976)



4 6

111

2

 $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^{\circ} p$

Er=4 GeV

tmax

Ey=5GeV

tmax

8 10

(GeV/c)2

104

103

102

101

100

103

10²

101

100

0

[nb/(GeV/c)²]

₫ŧ

γ***p ->** ω**p**

- Electroproduction data from Clas 6 at Jlab
- Forward & backward interactions are soft; intermediate is hard

 $\gamma^* + p \rightarrow p + \omega, W = 2.47 \text{ GeV}, Q^2 = 2.35 \text{ GeV}^2$



Plot from Bill Li (Stony Brook); data from W. B. Li et al. (Jlab F π) PRL **123**, 182501 (2019). ⁶

Backward J/ ψ production?

- Intriguing near-threshold J/ψ data from Glue-X @ Jlab
- At the lowest photon energy, $d\sigma/dt$ turns upward at large t
 - Small-u region
- As the photon energy rises, u->0 corresponds to larger t
- The J/ψ shares no quarks with the incident baryon



Backward $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ data for fit

• The ω is one of the better studied mesons for backward production. There is more data available than for the ρ .

Reasonable lever arm for photon energy.



TABLE I. The compiled data. Errors on original data were around 25% of the listed value. Error due to transcription from figure is estimated to be less than 5%.

E_{γ}	$d\sigma/du(u \approx 0)$	Source
GeV	nb/GeV^2	
2.9	200	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 1
3.0	300	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.0	200	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.2	240	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.3	110	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.5	170	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 2
3.5	170	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 1
3.5	100	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.6	210	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.6	100	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.8	90	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.9	60	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.0	150	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
4.1	70	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.2	160	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
4.3	40	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.4	120	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
4.4	30	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.5	50	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.6	30	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.7	75	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 2
4.7	80	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 1
4.8	100	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3

⁴R. Clifft *et al.*, Physics Letters **72B**, 144 (1977).
⁵B.-G. Yu and K.-J. Kong, Physical Review D **99** (2019).
⁶R. Sibirtsev *et al.*, arXiv:nucl-th/0202083v1 (2002).

Transition Distribution Amplitude Approach

GPD-like model

 Functions - Transition Distribution Amplitudes quantify baryon trajectories.



Diagram from K. Park et al., Phys. Lett. B780, 340 (2018)

Regge parameterization of backward γp -> ωp

- Fit to data from two experiments after selection
- Follow approach used for vector meson dominance production:
 - $d\sigma/dt|_{t=0} \sim A (s/1GeV)^B$ embodies physics of reaction
 - $d\sigma/dt \sim exp(-Ct)$ accounts for form factor (size) of target
 - Swap u for t, to match behavior of backward kinematics
- $d\sigma/du|_{u\sim 0} = A (s/1GeV)^B$
 - A = 4.4 μb/GeV²
 - A=180 μb/GeV² for forward ω photoproduction
 - ◆ B = -2.7
 - + B=-1.92 for forward ω photoproduction
 - Falls off faster with increasing energy.
- dσ/du ~ exp(-Cu), with C= 21 GeV⁻²
 - Compared with b ~~ 10 GeV⁻² for forward $\gamma p \rightarrow \omega p^{-1}$
 - Object larger than a baryon???
- Rate is few ‰ of the forward rate for k~ GeV
 - Cross-sections are large enough to be easily accessible.

D. Cebra et al., Phys. Rev. C 106, 015204 (2022)

Zach's

Talk

Energy dependence: a more detailed view

Need to account for threshold region

♦ Linear cutoff below W_{max}

W_{max} for forward production

$$T(W) = \operatorname{Min}\left(\frac{W - W_T}{W_{\max} - W_T}, 1.0\right)$$

$$\left. \frac{d\sigma}{du} \right|_{u=0} = A \left(\frac{k}{1 \text{ GeV}} \right)^{-\eta} = A \left(\frac{W^2 - m_p^2}{2m_p(1 \text{ GeV})} \right)^{-\eta}$$



Faster falloff than for forward Regge trajectories

Electroproduction

- Data from Jefferson lab at Q²=2.21 GeV² and 2.45 GeV²
 - $\sigma_{\text{Longitudinal}} \sim 1/Q^{10.22}$
 - Small lever arm
 - Transition Distribution Amplitude (GPD-like) predicts 1/Q⁸
 - Divergent as Q²->0
 - σ_{Transverse} ~ 1/Q^{1.08}
 - Very slow Q dependence
- Probably not a single power law
 - For now, assume same Q² dependence as forward production

$$\sigma(Q^2, W) = \sigma(0, W) \left(\frac{M_{\omega}^2}{M_{\omega}^2 + Q^2}\right)^{2.09 + 0.73(M_{\omega}^2 + Q^2)/\text{GeV}^2}$$

From fits to ρ⁰ data done for eSTARlight

W. B. Li et al. (Jlab Fπ) PRL **123**, 182501 (2019); M. Lomnitz and SK, Phys. Rev. C **99**, 015203)2019)

Backward production and baryon stopping

- Baryon stopping can be explained in baryon-junction models using Regge trajectories that can shift baryon number by many units of rapidity.
- This is very similar to backward production
 - Regge trajectories seem comparable
 - Baryon stopping in ion collisions is via hadron-hadron (or partonparton) interactions, while backward production involves dipolehadron interactions
 - In hadron-hadron collisions, usually only one baryon is stopped
 - Small difference factor of 2/3 in coupling to dipole vs. hadron?
- Both seem to be non-perturbative processes
 - Backward production is very simple, and can be a useful test laboratory for these phenomena.

D. Cebra *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **106**, 015204 (2022); D. Kharzeev, Phys. Lett. B **378**, 238 (1996)

Implications for baryon stopping

- Conventional wisdom: Regge phenomenology only matters at low energy
 - But... the relevant energy is the dipole-baryon CM energy.
 - soft dipole -> small CM energy.
 - Low-energy UPC photon
 - + A soft virtual π

- A low-x q-qbar dipole
- Other configuration within an incident nucleus
- The baryon recoils but remains intact
 - Transport over multiple units in rapidity.
 - Like baryon stopping.
 - Phenomenology is very reminiscent of the baryon junction model.

Vance, Gyulassy and Wang, Phys. Lett. B443, 45 (1998)

Tests for backward production models

- New kinematic regimes
 - High energies
 - Wide range of Q² (preferably in a single experiment)
- Differences between mesons that share a quark with the baryon (ρ, ω) and those that do not (φ, J/ψ)
- Systematic measurements of a variety of charged and uncharged vector and non-vector mesons
 - π^0 , η , η' , ϕ , $a_2(1320)^+$ J/ ψ and γ (Virtual Compton Scattering)
 - Can we fit all of the data into a neat Regge model with a small-ish number of parmeters?
 - N. b. Here, I am thinking only of data above the resonance region

W_{γp} > ~ 2 GeV

- Nuclear targets (to measure neutron cross-sections and look at nuclear modifications)
- Final state meson polarization, if any

High energies with UPCs and the EIC

- UPCs: ultra-peripheral collisions in relativistic heavy ion collisions
 - Heavy ions carry strong EM fields which act as fields of nearly-real photons
 - + Flux ~ Z^2
 - Maximum photon energy ~ γ hbar c/R_A in lab frame
 - Maximum $W_{\gamma p} \sim 2$ TeV at the LHC
- Rates/cross-sections are high
 - σ (PbPb -> PbPb ρ^0) ~ 7 barns at the LHC
- Poorly exploited due to problems triggering
 - LHC Run 3 detectors have generally moved to continuous readout DAQ systems
 - Increases UPC event collection by orders of magnitude
 - Sensitivity to processes with relatively small cross sections

Rapidity distributions for UPCs and an EIC

- Model as forward production, except:
 - In γp CM frame, swap ω and p rapidity
 - Photon is soft
 - ω is in far-forward region (near beam rapidity)
 - Proton is at mid-rapidity
 - Use backward Regge trajectories, discussed earlier
 - Different W_{γp} dependence
 - dσ/du ~ exp(-Cu)



Production with UPCs

- UPCs create ω near-beam rapidity, with a mid-rapidity proton
- ω is outside the range of existing/planned future detectors
 - Lower beam energies would shift it to smaller rapidity, but this will not lead to practical detection
- π⁰ and photons (virtual Compton scattering) should be produced at higher rapidity, and could be visible in zero degree calorimeters
 - Some ZDCs are segmented, so can separate γ/π^0 from neutrons
 - + At the LHC, γ and π^0 should hit ZDC
 - More investigation needed!

<mark>UPC Au</mark> p->Au p ω at RHIC

C. Ayerbe Gayoso, Eur. Phys. J. A**57**, 342 (2021)



EIC studies

The backward Regge model was implemented in eSTARlight

• ρ^0 , ω , π^0 and Compton scattering

Mesons are assumed unpolarized

I will discuss ρ^0 , ω ; Zach will cover the π^0 and γ

- Acceptance was studied in ePIC-like detector
 - ♦ 5X41 GeV², 10X100 GeV² and 18X275 GeV²

Detector	Capabilities	Pseudorapidity Coverage
Central	charged-particle tracking	$-3.5 < \eta < 3.5$
	electromagnetic calorimetry	
B0	charged-particle tracking	$4.6 < \eta < 5.9$
	potential electromagnetic calorimetry	
ZDC	electromagnetic calorimetry	$\eta > \sim 6.1$



D. Cebra et al., Phys. Rev. C **106**, 015204 (2022); Z. Sweger et al., Phys. Rev. C **108**, 055205 (2023)

Proton and meson rapidities

- Proton is mostly visible in central detector
- Meson is mostly at rapidity 4-7, increasing with beam energy



Proton p_T

- Proton p_T is moderate, well within detection and particle identification limits
- Proton p_T increases with photon Q²



ω acceptance in $\gamma p \rightarrow \omega p \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \rightarrow (\gamma \gamma) \gamma$

- Photons from π^0 are equivalent.
- A good fraction of the photons end up in the B0 detector or ZDC
- B0 is critical at medium energies, ZDC for 18X275 GeV²



ρ acceptance in γp->ρp-> p $\pi^+\pi^-$

- ZDC cannot measure charged particle momentum
- Pions miss the central detector
- Only visible in B0 detector
 - Efficiency good for 10X100 GeV² beams



Rates and efficiencies

- $\sim \omega$ rates are high ~ 10M events/10 fb ⁻¹
 - Little dependence on beam energy
 - ♦ Q² lever arm depends on Q² distribution
 - $\blacklozenge\ \rho$ rates are likely similar to or higher than ω

Collider	t-channel	u-channel	u-channel events
energy	$\sigma_{ m Tot}~(m nb)$	$\sigma_{ m Tot}~({ m nb})$	$per 10 fb^{-1}$
$5 \times 41 \text{ GeV}$	501	1.8	1.8×10^{7}
$5 \times 100 \text{ GeV}$	583	1.9	$1.9{ imes}10^7$
$10 \times 100 \text{ GeV}$	651	2.0	$2.0{ imes}10^7$
$10 \times 275 \text{ GeV}$	758	2.2	$2.2{ imes}10^7$
$18{\times}275~{\rm GeV}$	825	3.2	$3.2{ imes}10^7$

- Efficiency for ω good with B0 magnet
- Efficiency for ρ is only good with B0 detector
 - B0 tracking is difficult, due to tough geometry

Proton	ω eff.	$\omega { m eff.}$	ho eff.
beam energy	$\operatorname{cent.+ZDC}$	cent.+B0+ZDC	$\operatorname{cent.}+\operatorname{B0}$
$41 { m GeV}$	1.4%	18%	13%
$100 \mathrm{GeV}$	1.3%	41%	49%
$275~{ m GeV}$	6%	63%	0.7%

Extension to other mesons

Meson mass and proton energy are the key variables

$$y_{\rm V} pprox 0.7 - \ln\left(rac{m_V}{E_p}
ight)$$

Should work for UPCs also

At the EIC	C: Meson	5x41 GeV ²	10X100 GeV ²	18X275 GeV ²
	φ	6.3	5.3	4.4
	J/ψ	5.2	4.2	3.3

- $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^-$ may be tough because of the soft kaons
- J/ψ-> ee, μμ should be geometrically accessible in a combination of the central tracker + B0 detector.
 - PID requirements do not seem stringent.
- For UPC π⁰ at the LHC (7 TeV protons), y=11.5, which should be within the ZDC acceptance

Conclusions

- Backward (u channel) production can produce mesons with large t exchange, but small u
- The struck baryons are shifted by many units in rapidity. This shift is very similar to baryon stopping.
 - Backward production and baryon stopping can be described by similar Regge models. It would be interesting to explore if a single set of parameters can explain both.
- Systematic measurements are needed of backward production of a large number of mesons, under varied kinematic conditions.
- It may be possible to explore backward π⁰ and γ production at high energies using ultra-peripheral collisions.
- Looking further ahead, the EIC and ePIC detector are quite well suited to making systematic measurements of backward production at high energies, over a range of Q².



γ**p->**ω**p** data

TABLE I. The compiled data. Errors on original data were around 25% of the listed value. Error due to transcription from figure is estimated to be less than 5%.

E_{γ}	$d\sigma/du(u \approx 0)$	Source
GeV	nb/GeV^2	
2.9	200	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 1
3.0	300	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.0	200	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.2	240	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.3	110	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.5	170	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 2
3.5	170	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 1
3.5	100	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.6	210	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.6	100	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
3.8	90	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
3.9	60	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.0	150	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
4.1	70	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.2	160	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
4.3	40	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.4	120	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3
4.4	30	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.5	50	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.6	30	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 7
4.7	75	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 2
4.7	80	Sibirtsev et al. ⁶ Figure 1
4.8	100	Clifft et al. ⁴ Figure 3

 ${}^{4}\text{R.}$ Clifft *et al.*, Physics Letters **72B**, 144 (1977). ${}^{5}\text{B.-G.}$ Yu and K.-J. Kong, Physical Review D **99** (2019). ${}^{6}\text{R.}$ Sibirtsev *et al.*, arXiv:nucl-th/0202083v1 (2002).