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#### Abstract

Assuming the minimal requirements necessary to derive the Froissart bound, the number of subtractions for the fixed-momentum-transfer dispersion relation in the unphysical region $0<t<4 \mu^{2}$ turns out to be 2 . In the proof, the positiveness of all the derivatives of absorptive part with respect to $t$ at $t=0$ is used. Physical implications and applications of this result are briefly discussed.


IT has been shown by Froissart, ${ }^{1}$ some time ago, that if a scattering amplitude satisfies Mandelstam representation, then the forward scattering amplitude (with relativistic normalization) is bounded by $C s \ln ^{2}$ $\left(s / s_{0}\right)$ at high energies, where $s$ is the square of the center-of-mass energy. Further, one of $\mathrm{us}^{2,3}$ showed that the only necessary assumptions to get the Froissart result were:
(a) At fixed energy the scattering amplitude is analytic with respect to $t=-2 k^{2}(1-\cos \theta)$, (where $\theta$ is the c.m. scattering angle and $k$ the c.m. momentum) in some neighborhood $\mathfrak{D}$ of the segment $t=0 \rightarrow t=4 \mu^{2}$. Then it follows that the absorptive part of the amplitude is analytic inside an ellipse with foci $t=0, t=-4 k^{2}$ and semimajor axis $t=2 k^{2}+4 \mu^{2}$. This may be shown because from the result of Lehmann ${ }^{4}$ we know that the partial-wave expansion of the absorptive part converges in some ellipse, and due to the positiveness of the expansion coefficients, as a consequence of unitarity, the largest ellipse in which the expansion converges has a singularity at the extreme right in the $t$ plane and therefore cannot intersect the segment $t=0, t=4 \mu^{2}$. Further, it follows that the amplitude is analytic inside an ellipse with foci $t=0, t=-4 k^{2}$ and semimajor axis

$$
2 k^{2}+\mu^{2}-\epsilon^{a}, \quad \text { where } \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text { as } s \rightarrow \infty .
$$

(b) The second assumption necessary for the proof is that for $0<t<4 \mu^{2}$ the absorptive part of the amplitude is bounded by $s^{N}$. This latter assumption is familiar but it seems very hard to justify. [If one replaces this assumption by the much weaker condition $A(s, t)<\exp s^{M}$ for $t<1 / s^{N}$ one still gets, adapting the argument of Refs. 2 and 3, that the forward scattering amplitude is polynomial bounded for real $s$.]

Here we want to maintain the minimal requirements necessary to derive the Froissart bound and take into account the further requirement that the scattering amplitude for fixed $t$, inside the region of analyticity in $t$ described above (D), is analytic with respect to $s$

[^0]in a twice-cut plane, with cuts from $s=\left(M_{A}+M_{B}\right)^{2}$ to $+\infty$ and from $s=-\infty-i \operatorname{Im} t$ to $s=\left(M_{A}-M_{B}\right)^{2}-t$, where $M_{A}$ and $M_{B}$ are the masses of the scattering particles.
Condition (b) enables us to write $N+1$ subtracted dispersion relations for the amplitude for $4 \mu^{2} \geq t \geq 0$
\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& F(s, t)=\sum_{n=0}^{N} C_{n}(t) s^{n}+\frac{s^{N+1}}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime N+1}\left(s^{\prime}-s\right)} \\
&+\frac{u^{N+1}}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime N+1}\left(u^{\prime}-u\right)} \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$
\]

where the familiar variable $u$ is defined by

$$
s+t+u=2\left(M_{A}{ }^{2}+M_{B}{ }^{2}\right)
$$

and from unitarity $A_{s}(s, t)$, absorptive part associated with the reaction $A+B \rightarrow A+B$, and $A_{u}(u, t)$ associated with $A+\bar{B} \rightarrow A+\bar{B}$, are positive. This will turn out to be the crucial point of the present work.
For $t$ inside $\mathscr{D}$ and $s$ complex, with say, Res big enough, the integrals appearing in the right-hand side of (1) are uniformly convergent with respect to $t$ and are therefore analytic functions of $t$, inside $\mathfrak{D}$ for fixed $s$. Therefore, the subtraction polynomial is itself analytic in $t$ inside $\mathfrak{D}$, and since this is certainly true for $N+1$ values of $s$, this is also true for the coefficients $C_{n}(t)$.

However, following the lines of Ref. 2 or 3, it is easy to see that in addition to the information

$$
\begin{equation*}
|F(s, 0)|<C s \ln ^{2} s, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

one can, given $\epsilon$ in advance, find a value $0<t_{0}<4 \mu^{2}$ such that for $0 \leq t \leq t_{0}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
|F(s, t)|<C s^{1+\epsilon} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall choose $\epsilon$ strictly less than unity.
Then in the interval $0 \leq t \leq t_{0}$ we can write dispersion relations with two subtractions only:

$$
\begin{align*}
& F(s, t)=\alpha(t)+s \beta(t)+\frac{s^{2}}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime 2}\left(s^{\prime}-s\right)} \\
&+\frac{u^{2}}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime 2}\left(u^{\prime}-u\right)} \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

Expressions (1) and (4) should coincide for $0 \leq t \leq t_{0}$.

Using the familiar identity

$$
\frac{X^{2}}{X^{\prime 2}} \frac{1}{X^{\prime}-X}=\frac{X^{2}}{X^{\prime 3}}+\cdots+\frac{X^{N}}{X^{N+1}}+\frac{X^{N+1}}{X^{\prime N+1}} \frac{1}{X^{\prime}-X}
$$

we get for $0 \leq t \leq t_{0}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \alpha(t)+s \beta(t)+\sum_{n=2}^{N}\left[\frac{s^{n}}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime n+1}}+\frac{u^{n}}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime n+1}}\right] \\
& \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{N} C_{n}(t) s^{n} . \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Now let us distinguish two cases:
(i) $N$ is even. Then clearly,

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{N}(t)=\frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime N+1}}+\frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime N+1}} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This equation holds only for $t \leq t_{0}$, though $C_{N}(t)$ is analytic up to $t=4 \mu^{2}$. However, from unitarity, we know that

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) & =\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_{s}^{(n)}\left(s^{\prime}\right) t^{n} \\
A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) & =\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_{u}^{(n)}\left(u^{\prime}\right) t^{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $A_{s}{ }^{(n)}\left(s^{\prime}\right)$ and $A_{u}{ }^{(n)}\left(s^{\prime}\right) \geq 0$.
Then, since the right-hand side of (6) converges for $t \leq t_{0}$, we conclude, according to a theorem on the exchange of summation and integration that for $t \leq t_{0}$

$$
C_{N}(t)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} t^{n}\left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{s}^{(n)}\left(s^{\prime}\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime N+1}}+\frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}^{(n)}\left(s^{\prime}\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime N+1}}\right]
$$

However, this is the power-series expansion of $C_{N}(t)$, with positive coefficients. $C_{N}(t)$ being analytic up to $t=4 \mu^{2}$, this expansion converges up to $|t|=4 \mu^{2}$. Then reversing the argument, the convergence of the series guarantees the convergence of the two integrals in (6) from $t=0$ to $t=4 \mu^{2}$. This means that we can undo one subtraction in integral representation (1).
(ii) $N$ odd $\geq 3$. Then from (5), using

$$
u=2\left(M_{A}^{2}+M_{B}^{2}\right)-s-t
$$

we get

$$
\begin{align*}
C_{N}(t)= & \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime N+1}}-\frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime N+1}}  \tag{7}\\
C_{N-1}(t)= & \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime N}}+\frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime N}} \\
& +N\left[2\left(M_{A^{2}}+M_{B}^{2}\right)-t\right] \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime N+1}} \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

We notice that we have necessarily

$$
2\left(M_{A}^{2}+M_{B}^{2}\right) \geq 4 \mu^{2},
$$

otherwise we would have a singularity in $t$ either at $t=4 M_{A}{ }^{2}$ or $t=4 M_{B}{ }^{2}$ due to the exchange of the $A \bar{A}$ or $B \bar{B}$ system and we would have to redefine $\mu$. Then, noticing that the expansion coefficients of $\left[2\left(M_{A}{ }^{2}+M_{B}{ }^{2}\right)-t\right]^{-1}$ are all positive, we first prove that

$$
C_{N-1}(t)\left[2\left(M_{A}{ }^{2}+M_{B}{ }^{2}\right)-t\right]^{-1}
$$

has positive expansion coefficients in $t$. Then generalizing somewhat the argument of case (i), we deduce again that the three integrals in the right-hand side of (8) are convergent for $0 \leq t<4 \mu^{2}$. From this it follows immediately that

$$
\int \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime N}}
$$

also converges for $0 \leq t>4 \mu^{2}$. Hence, we can undo two subtractions.

Carrying again the process as many times as necessary, we conclude that representation (4), with only two subtractions holds not only for $t \leq t_{0}$ but on the whole segment $0 \leq t<4 \mu^{2}$, and the integrals

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\left(M_{A+} M_{B}\right)^{2}}^{\infty} \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime 3}}, \quad \int_{\left(M_{A+}+M_{B}\right)^{2}}^{\infty} \frac{A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right) d u^{\prime}}{u^{\prime 3}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

are absolutely convergent for $t<4 \mu^{2}$.
If we make the further assumption that the subtraction coefficients $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$, which are already known to be analytic in $|t|<\mu^{2}$ are in fact analytic in $|t|<4 \mu^{2}$, we can extend the validity of representation (4) to the whole region $|t|<4 \mu^{2} .{ }^{5}$ Indeed it is easy to see from unitarity that the expansions of $A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right)$ and $A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right)$ in power series around $t=0$ have positive coefficients, therefore, for $|t|<4 \mu^{2}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, t\right)\right| \leq A_{s}\left(s^{\prime},|t|\right) \\
& \left|A_{u}\left(u^{\prime}, t\right)\right| \leq A_{u}\left(s^{\prime},|t|\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

And hence in region $|t|<4 \mu^{2}$ only two subtractions are necessary.
Let us now list some of the consequences:
(a) From the assumptions made at the beginning of this paper the previous expression for the Froissart bound was, in the total cross section

$$
\sigma_{t}(s)<C(N) \ln ^{2}\left(s / s_{0}\right),
$$

where $C(N)$ depends on the number of subtraction in the following way ${ }^{2}$ :

$$
C(N)=N^{2}\left(\pi / \mu^{2}\right)
$$

However, from the convergence of integrals (9) we

[^1]now know that there is at least a sequence of increasing energies for which
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{t}(s)<\left(4 \pi / \mu^{2}\right) \ln ^{2}\left(s / s_{0}\right) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

so that we have removed the major arbitrariness in the Froissart bound. In fact, a stronger condition can be obtained:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int s^{-3} \exp \left[2 \ln s\left(\frac{\mu^{2}}{4 \pi} \frac{\sigma_{t}}{\ln ^{2} s}\right)^{1 / 2}-1\right] d s \text { must converge. } \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means that if on a segment $s_{1}-s_{2} \sigma_{t}$ exceeds (10) by a factor $1+\epsilon$ this segment must go to zero as $s_{1}$ goes to infinity.
(b) In the symmetric case where the scattering amplitude is invariant in the exchange of $s$ and $u$ (example $\pi^{+} \pi^{0}$ scattering) (4) can be rewritten in terms of the symmetrical variable $z=\left(s-2 \mu^{2}+t / 2\right)^{2}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z, t)=f(t)+\frac{z}{\pi} \int_{\left(2 \mu^{2}+t / 2\right)^{2}}^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{Im} F\left(z^{\prime}, t\right) d z^{\prime}}{z^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}-z\right)} . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

From Eq. (12) we deduce the property $\operatorname{Im} F(z, t) / \operatorname{Im} z>0$ which is the definition of a "Herglotz" function. ${ }^{6}$ Therefore, $F(z, t)$ has no complex zeros. We also notice that for $z$ real $<\left[2 \mu^{2}+(t / 2)\right]^{2}, \quad(d / d z) F(z, t)>0$ and thence $F(z, t)$ has at most one real zero (which corresponds to two complex conjugate zeros in the $s$ plane). So the property $\operatorname{Im} F(s, t)>0$ for $4 \mu^{2} \geq t \geq 0$ is also valid in the whole quadrant of the $s$ plane $\operatorname{Im} s>0$, $\operatorname{Re} s>2 \mu^{2}-t / 2$ (with the corresponding symmetries). In addition, for $t \geq 0 F(s, t)$ cannot decrease faster than $1 / s^{2}$ as $s$ goes to infinity. ${ }^{7}$
(c) If analytic continuation to the third channel is possible, which is the case if Mandelstam representation is valid, one can investigate what happens for $t \rightarrow 4 \mu^{2}$. Let us take the completely symmetric case in stu. Then the subtraction polynomial, taken at $t=4 \mu^{2}$ gives us essentially the $N$ first zero-energy scattering lengths in the $t$ channel. These, if normal threshold behavior is assumed, are finite. Therefore the integrals

$$
\int_{4 M^{2}}^{\infty} \frac{A_{s}\left(s^{\prime} t\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime 3}} \text { etc. }
$$

have a finite limit for $t=4 \mu^{2}$. They represent a particular case of the Froissart representation ${ }^{8}$ of partial-wave amplitude in the $t$ channel. Hence, from our result we deduce that the scattering lengths at $t=4 \mu^{2}$ are analytic

[^2]in the angular momentum $l$ for $\operatorname{Re} l \geq 2$. More specifically if we define the scattering lengths as
$$
a_{l}=\lim _{q \rightarrow 0} \frac{e^{i \delta_{l}(q)} \sin \delta_{l}(q)}{q^{2 l+1}}
$$
where $q$ is the c.m. momentum in the $t$ channel, and $\delta_{l}$ the phase shift in the $t$ channel, the representation
$$
a_{l}=\frac{1}{2 M} \frac{\Gamma(l+1)}{\Gamma(l+3 / 2) \sqrt{ } \pi} \int_{4 M^{2}}^{\infty} \frac{A_{8}\left(s^{\prime}, 4 \mu^{2}\right) d s^{\prime}}{s^{\prime l+1}}
$$
is valid for $l=2,4$, etc. $\cdots$, and since $A_{s}\left(s^{\prime}, 4 \mu^{2}\right)$ is positive we conclude that the scattering lengths are positive for $l \geqslant 2$. This could be extended to more realistic cases with sufficient care.
(d) More generally for $|t|<4 \mu^{2}$ the holomorphy domain of the partial wave in the $t$ channel certainly contains $\operatorname{Rel} \geq 2$, and, if sufficient analyticity is assumed this can be extended to the interior of the parabola
$$
t=(2 \mu-i \lambda)^{2} \quad \lambda \text { real }
$$
by using the Legendre polynomial expansion of $A_{s}(s, t)$ instead of the power-series expansion. This should allow one to improve the holomorphy domain previously obtained by Bardakci. ${ }^{9}$
(e) If, in the $t$ channel, poles with angular momentum 0 or 1 occur for $t<4 \mu^{2}$, the conclusions are unchanged because one can merely subtract them. Poles with higher angular momentum will be considered in a separate publication by MacDowell. ${ }^{10}$

Finally, we should mention that we are aware of the fact that the main result of this paper, the number of subtractions for $t<4 \mu^{2}$ is at most two, comes out very naturally in the Regge pole dominance hypothesis, because then, for $0<t<4 \mu^{2}$ the even signature poles should dominate and hence the dominant Regge trajectory cannot cross $l=2$ for $t<4 \mu^{2}$ without producing a pole which was not present by assumption. However, the whole point of our paper is to show that this is true with much more generality.
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