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The measurement of exclusive $\rho \rho$ production in two-photon interactions at LEP, $\gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow \rho \rho$, was studied at two-photon center-of-mass energies of $1.1 \mathrm{GeV} \leq \mathrm{W}_{\gamma \gamma} \leq 3 \mathrm{GeV}$ and photon virtualities of $\mathrm{Q}^{2}<0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ and $0.2 \leq \mathrm{Q}^{2} \leq 30 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. These data allow on the one hand a comparison to QCD and the generalised vector dominance model (GVDM). On the other hand, the large kinematical range permits to check models with exotic mesons.
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## 1. Introduction

The two-photon process

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow e^{+} e^{-} \gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow e^{+} e^{-} \rho \rho \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

has already been measured at lower $e^{+} e^{-}$c.m. energies [1] but mostly without tagging. The data presented here were obtained with tagging, thus allowing to cover a larger range in the virtuality of one of the interacting photons, i.e. $0.2 \leq \mathrm{Q}^{2} \leq 30 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. For comparison, also preliminary untagged data at $\mathrm{Q}^{2}<0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ will be shown. Both $\rho^{0} \rho^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$and $\rho^{+} \rho^{-} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{0} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$ channels are studied. The large range in the two-photon c.m. energy, $1.1 \mathrm{GeV} \leq \mathrm{W}_{\gamma \gamma} \leq 3 \mathrm{GeV}$ allows to study resonance production in t-channel exchange as well as to search for exotic mesons.

## 2. Data

The data were taken with the L3 detector [2] at LEP (Fig. 1).


Figure 1: Sketch (sideview) of the L3 detectors used in this analysis.

The L3 detector was well suited for this search because there was only a small amount of material in front of the electromagnetic BGO calorimeter ( 0.2 of a radiation length). This yielded a low threshold in photon energies $(\geq 60 \mathrm{MeV})$ and in momentum measurements of charged tracks $\left(\mathrm{p}_{T} \geq 100 \mathrm{MeV}\right)$. Two detectors were used for tagging: a) The so called very small angle tagger (VSAT) detectors, situated on either side of the interaction point (IP) at a distance of 8.17 m , behind the first quadrupole. It consisted of 4 BGO crystal calorimeters. b) The luminosity monitors situated at either side of the IP at a distance of 2.73 m , each consisting of 2 detectors with 304 BGO crystals per detector.

In the following, the data will be divided into four intervals in $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ :

1. $\mathrm{Q}^{2}<0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$, no electron tag, $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ calculation from the $4 \pi$ state,
2. $0.2 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}<\mathrm{Q}^{2}<0.85 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$, electron tag from the VSAT, $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ calculation from the $4 \pi$ state,
3. $1.2 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}<\mathrm{Q}^{2}<8.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ electron tag and $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ calculation from the luminosity monitor,
4. $8.8 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}<\mathrm{Q}^{2}<30 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$, electron tag and $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ calculation from the luminosity monitor.

The tagged data were taken at $91 \mathrm{GeV} \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 209 \mathrm{GeV}$ with an integrated luminosity of $854.7 \mathrm{pb}^{-1}$ [3]. The untagged data were taken at $161 \mathrm{GeV} \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 209 \mathrm{GeV}$ with an integrated luminosity of $697.7 \mathrm{pb}^{-1}$ [4].

Fig. 2 shows the four-pion mass distribution $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\gamma \gamma}\right)$ and the 4 possible mass combinations $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}\right)$ (within 1.1 GeV $\leq W_{\gamma \gamma} \leq 3 \mathrm{GeV}$ ) for the reaction $e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow e^{+} e_{\text {tag }}^{-} \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0} \pi^{0}$ for 0.2 $\mathrm{GeV}^{2}<\mathrm{Q}^{2}<0.85 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. A clear $\rho^{ \pm}$signal is observed in $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}\right)$.


Figure 2: $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0} \pi^{0}\right)$ (left) and $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}\right), 4$ entries per event (right).

Fig. 3 shows the 4 pion invariant mass distribution $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\gamma \gamma}\right)$ and the 4 possible mass combinations $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)$(within $1.1 \mathrm{GeV} \leq W_{\gamma \gamma} \leq 3 \mathrm{GeV}$ ) for the reaction $e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow e^{+} e_{\text {tag }}^{-} \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$for 0.2 $\mathrm{GeV}^{2}<\mathrm{Q}^{2}<0.85 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. A strong $\rho^{0}$ signal is observed in $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)$.


Figure 3: $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)$(left) and $\mathrm{M}\left(\pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right), 4$ entries per event (right).

The fraction of $\rho \rho$ events was determined by a maximum likelihood fit in intervals of $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ and $\mathrm{W}_{\gamma \gamma}$. For the background, the following processes were considered: $\gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow \rho \pi \pi, \gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow$ $a_{2}^{ \pm}(1320) \pi^{\mp}, \gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow f_{2} \pi \pi$ and nonresonant $\gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow \pi \pi \pi \pi$.

The cross section $\sigma_{\gamma \gamma}\left(\gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow \rho \rho\right)$ was obtained from the the $\sigma_{e e}\left(e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow e^{+} e^{-} \rho \rho\right)$ cross section via $\sigma_{e e}=L_{T T} \cdot \sigma_{\gamma \gamma}$ where $L_{T T}$ is the two-photon luminosity function which is calculated using the program GALUGA [5].

## 3. Results

Fig. 4 shows the $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \rho^{0} \rho^{0}$ and $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \rho^{+} \rho^{-}$cross sections as a function of the four-pion masses in the four $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ intervals mentioned above.


Figure 4: The $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \rho^{0} \rho^{0}$ and $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \rho^{+} \rho^{-}$cross sections as a function of the four-pion mass a) at $Q^{2} \leq$ $0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$, b) $0.20 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \leq Q^{2} \leq 0.85 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$, c) $1.2 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \leq Q^{2} \leq 8.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ and d) $8.8 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \leq Q^{2} \leq 30 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$.

For an isospin $\mathrm{I}=0$ state the ratio R of $\sigma\left(\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \rho^{+} \rho^{-}\right) / \sigma\left(\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \rho^{0} \rho^{0}\right)$ is equal two. We observe this for $\mathrm{Q}^{2}>1.2 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. At low $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$, however, this ratio is reversed to $\mathrm{R}=0.42 \pm 0.05 \pm$ 0.09 for $\mathrm{Q}^{2}<0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. This strong enhancement of $\rho^{0} \rho^{0}$ with respect to $\rho^{+} \rho^{-}$at the lowest $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ value was interpreted as evidence for an isospin 2 resonance [6].

In Fig. 5 the cross section $d \sigma_{e e} / d Q^{2}$ is compared to a QCD-based calculation [7] and the $\sigma_{\gamma \gamma}$ cross section is compared to a parametrisation based on the GVDM model [8]. The QCD parametrisation fits both $\sigma\left(\rho^{+} \rho^{-}\right)$and $\sigma\left(\rho^{0} \rho^{0}\right)$ well over four orders of magnitude. There is a crossover of the cross sections at a $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ of around $1 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ suggesting a different production mechanism at low and high $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$. The GVDM parametrisation reproduces only $\sigma\left(\rho^{0} \rho^{0}\right)$ well. The $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ evolution of $\sigma\left(\rho^{+} \rho^{-}\right)$cannot be described by this parametrisation. A $\rho$-pole fit to the data fails for both the $\rho^{0} \rho^{0}$ and the $\rho^{+} \rho^{-}$cross sections.


Figure 5: $\frac{d \sigma_{e e}}{d Q^{2}}($ left $)$ and $\sigma_{\gamma \gamma}$ (right) as a function of $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$.
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