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A covariant formulation of the multiple scattering series for the optical potential is presented. We consider the case of a scalar "nucleon" interacting with a spin zero isospin zero \( A \)-body target through meson exchange. We show that a covariant equation for the projectile-target \( t \) matrix can be obtained that sums the ladder and crossed ladder diagrams efficiently. From this equation, a multiple scattering series for the optical potential is derived, and we show that in the impulse approximation, the two-body \( t \) matrix associated with the first-order optical potential is the one in which one particle is kept on mass shell. The meaning of various terms in the multiple scattering series is given and we describe how to construct the first-order optical potential for elastic scattering calculations.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the relativistic (Dirac equation) calculations give superior results to the nonrelativistic (NR) calculations in the case of \( p \)-nucleus elastic scattering and have been widely used in recent calculations.\(^1\) The first-order optical potential used in these calculations is the relativistic impulse approximation (RIA) which is a relativistic generalization of the nonrelativistic \( t \) approximation. In the NR theory the elastic scattering of the projectile from the target nucleus is described by an effective interaction (optical potential) which is to be used in the Schrödinger equation, and the scattering observables are then obtained. The optical potential itself can be expressed as an infinite series of scattering terms, single, double, etc., scatterings (the name multiple scattering series) in which there are no two successive scatterings from the same target particle. By keeping only the first term of the infinite series of the optical potential we obtain the first-order optical potential. The \( t \) approximation is achieved only after two more approximations, namely the impulse approximation which treats the struck target nucleon as though it were free, and the factorization approximation which assumes that the range of the interaction is small compared to the size of the nucleus. The last approximation is usually applied in order to avoid the complexities of performing the folding integral to obtain the optical potential. The existence of a multiple scattering series for the optical potential (in fact there are several in the literature) provides us with a means to calculate systematic corrections to the first-order results.

In the relativistic \( p \)-nucleus scattering calculations the effective one-body equation is taken to be the fixed energy Dirac equation. This choice is intuitively appealing as long as one considers the proton as an elementary fermion, but the actual validity of this assumption is still in question. This type of question will be answered only when one has the nonperturbative aspects of QCD under the same degree of control as in NR theories. Now the question arises as to what effective interaction (optical potential) should be used in the Dirac equation to describe \( p \)-nucleus scattering. As mentioned above, in all the relativistic calculations, the optical potential used has been the RIA.\(^1\) The RIA optical potential is obtained by simply folding a relativistic \( NN \) amplitude with the nuclear density matrix. Strictly speaking, use of the RIA is an intuitive guess guided by the nonrelativistic multiple scattering formalism, since a relativistic multiple scattering theory (RMST) has not been available.

It is important to realize that without a multiple scattering theory the \( t \) matrix associated with the first-order optical potential cannot be unambiguously determined and consequently the characters of the corrections to be made to the first-order optical potential are not well defined. The absence of such a theory prevents us from making systematic corrections, such as Pauli blocking, in a consistent manner. Therefore it is highly desirable to have an RMST. Probably the most appropriate approach might be to apply the methods of field theory to the problem. But the development of the RMST in this direction has been hampered by the problems arising in the treatment of the interacting many-body ground state, description of the residual interaction between the projectile particle and the target constituents, and many other obstacles not encountered in the NR theory.

In this work we take a less formal but more intuitive approach and describe the projectile-nucleus scattering problem in a meson exchange model. A brief account of this work has already been given.\(^4\) In this paper we will develop the ideas reported there in more detail.

From the beginning, we would like to make it clear
that our aim is to derive a multiple scattering theory for the projectile-nucleus scattering in the context of meson exchange. We will not consider the full implication of the formal field theoretical treatment of the interacting many-body problem, which is admittedly very difficult. We develop an approach which permits the standard multiple scattering techniques of NR theory to be applied with slight modification. We ignore the full complications of antisymmetry required by the Pauli principle and also ignore the spin part of the problem. We do not assume any particular form of equation for the projectile-nucleus $t$ matrix, but begin with the most obvious fact that the $t$ matrix is obtained by summing an infinite set of diagrams in which the projectile is interacting with the target particles through meson exchange. Although the approach we take in this work seems much less complicated than the formal field theoretical approach, it has its share of problems, such as the appearance of spurious singularities and the necessity for judicious treatment of the crossed meson diagrams. In this work we show how an RMST can be formulated within the context of meson exchange, unambiguously determine the $t$ matrix associated with the optical potential, and show that under the impulse approximation the $t$ matrix to be used in the first-order optical potential is the solution of a relativistic two-body equation in which one particle is kept on its mass shell.

This paper is arranged as follows. In Sec. II the derivation of a multiple scattering series of the optical potential is reviewed, following the approach of Watson. In Sec. III A it is shown how the crossed meson diagrams should be treated together with the box diagram for the case where the intermediate state target is in the ground state. In Sec. III B the complications that arise in the case of intermediate target excited states are discussed, and it is shown how to handle the box and crossed box diagrams in this case. In Sec. III C a covariant equation for the projectile-target $t$ matrix is presented and it is shown how a multiple scattering series for the optical potential can be derived. The meaning of various terms in the multiple scattering series are discussed, and it is shown that the most appropriate two-body $t$ matrix to be used in the first-order optical potential under the impulse approximation is the one calculated from a covariant equation in which one particle is kept on the mass shell. A general discussion and conclusion follows.

41. NONRELATIVISTIC FORMALISM

In this section the nonrelativistic multiple scattering formalism is reviewed. The approach of Watson is followed, since it is more closely related to our relativistic formalism than the more commonly used Keran-Klein-Antons-Thaler (KMT) method. Since we are interested in deriving a relativistic multiple scattering series for the optical potential, we will bypass the multiple scattering treatment of the $t$ matrix and will concentrate, in the present section, on the multiple scattering analysis of the nonrelativistic optical potential.

We begin with a total Hamiltonian $H$ for the projectile-nucleus system given by

$$ H = H_0 + V, \quad (2.1) $$

with

$$ H_0 = H_A + h_n \quad (2.2) $$

and

$$ H = \sum_{a=1}^A h_a + \sum_{i,j=1}^A \phi_{ij}, \quad (2.3) $$

$$ \phi = \sum_{i} \phi_i. \quad (2.4) $$

Notice that the total Hamiltonian $H$ is separated into two parts, the unperturbed Hamiltonian $H_0$ and the residual interaction $V$. It is the separability of $H$ into $H_0$ and $V$, which permits the derivation of a multiple scattering formalism. The residual interaction $V$ is taken to be the sum of the two-body interactions between the projectile particle "0" and the target particle "i." The unperturbed Hamiltonian $H_0$ is written as the sum of the target Hamiltonian $H_A$ and $h_n$, the kinetic energy operator for the projectile. In NR formalism, the target Hamiltonian is just the kinetic energy operators of the target particles plus the sum of their pair interactions.

The separation of the total Hamiltonian in Eq. (2.1) implies that we have some means in finding the solution to the target Hamiltonian $H_A$. Therefore in NR theory the complexities of the $A$-body problem are separated from the rest at the very beginning. Now write the Lippmann-Schwinger equation for the projectile-nucleus $t$ matrix in operator form as

$$ T = V + G_0T \quad (2.5) $$

with

$$ G_0 = \left( E - H_0 + i\eta \right)^{-1}. \quad (2.6) $$

Here $G_0$ is the unperturbed Green's function and the $i\eta$ prescription has been used to incorporate the outgoing boundary condition. The many-body nature of Eq. (2.5) is apparent since the propagator $G_0$ involves the target Hamiltonian $H_A$.

For elastic scattering problems it is useful to introduce an effective one-body potential (optical potential). The optical potential is defined as the potential that describes the passage of a projectile through the nucleus with the nucleus treated as a passive medium, i.e., the nucleus is treated as though it cannot be excited. To accomplish this, first define a projection operator $P$ which projects onto the ground state of the target and $Q$ which projects onto the excited states of the target including the breakup states. Therefore,

$$ P + Q = 1, \quad (2.7) $$

where

$$ P = |\phi_0 \rangle \langle \phi_0| \quad (2.8) $$

and $|\phi_0 \rangle$ is the target ground state. Now Eq. (2.5) can be rewritten as

$$ T = U + UPG_0TP \quad (2.9) $$
\[ U = U' + \nu Q Q Q U \]  
\[ (2.10) \]

The \( U \) appearing in these equations is the optical potential operator and Eq. (2.9) together with Eq. (2.10) are equivalent to Eq. (2.5).

Since we are dealing with strong interactions, it is impractical to solve Eq. (2.10) for \( U \) as it stands. It is at this point that the multiple scattering approach provides us with a big advantage. We may express \( U \) as \( \sum_{\ell} U'_{\ell} \) and rewrite Eq. (2.10) as

\[ U = r' + r' Q Q Q U'_{\ell} \]  
\[ (2.11) \]

Now define the Watson \( r \) operator as

\[ r = r' + r' Q Q Q r' \]  
\[ (2.12) \]

and observe that Eq. (2.11) can be written in terms of \( r \),

\[ U = r + r' Q Q Q U'_{\ell} \]  
\[ (2.13) \]

Summing over the index \( \ell \) in the last equation gives the Watson multiple scattering series for the optical potential operator,

\[ U = \sum_{\ell} r' + \sum_{\ell} r' Q Q Q U'_{\ell} \]  
\[ (2.14) \]

Notice that Eq. (2.14) is an infinite series in \( r \) instead of the two-body interactions \( r' \) as in Eq. (2.10). Each term of Eq. (2.14) can be interpreted as a single scattering, double scattering, and so on, hence the name multiple scattering series. By keeping only the first term of the series we obtain the first-order Watson optical potential

\[ U^{\text{1st}} = \sum_{\ell} r' \]  
\[ (2.15) \]

The operator \( r \) is not the free two-body \( t \) matrix because of the many-body propagator in Eq. (2.12), but related to it by

\[ r = r' + \nu Q Q Q r' \]  
\[ (2.16) \]

where the free two-body \( t \)-matrix is defined as

\[ t = t + \nu g \]  
\[ (2.17) \]

with \( g \) the free two-body propagator. For high projectile incident energies one usually approximates \( t \) by its impulse approximation \( t' \) and obtains for the first-order Watson impulse approximation optical potential

\[ U^{\text{1st}} = \sum_{\ell} t' \]  
\[ (2.18) \]

We can also rewrite Eq. (2.14) in terms of the free two-body \( t \)-matrix, \( t' \)

\[ U = \sum_{\ell} t' + \sum_{\ell} \nu Q Q Q t' + \nu Q Q Q U'_{\ell} \]  
\[ (2.19) \]

As we have mentioned above the first term in Eq. (2.19) gives the first-order impulse approximation optical potential. The second term can be interpreted as the propagator correction term. This term originates from the fact that we have written the optical potential in terms of the free \( t \) matrix \( t' \) instead of \( t \). For high projectile energies the differences between \( t' \) and \( t \) become negligible and the impulse approximation should give good results. The last term represents the multiple scattering terms. For NR scattering calculations the \( t \) matrix appearing in Eq. (2.14) can be obtained from Eq. (2.17) by employing a choice of \( \nu \), for example the Reid potential, or by fitting the NN experimental data directly by using an appropriate functional form. After the choice for the \( t \) matrix is made, solving Eq. (2.17) together with Eq. (2.9) is just a technicality.

III. RELATIVISTIC FORMALISM

In the last section we reviewed the nonrelativistic multiple scattering formalism and outlined how a multiple scattering series for the optical potential can be obtained. We pointed out that the key feature that enables us to construct a multiple scattering series is the separability of the total Hamiltonian into an unperturbed Hamiltonian describing the free projectile-target system and the residual interaction which is the sum of the two-body interactions between the projectile and the target particles. Unfortunately, there is no analogous procedure in the relativistic case. First of all, one cannot naively write the target Hamiltonian as the sum of the Dirac Hamiltonians plus the sum of two-body interactions, since the Hamiltonian written in this manner does not have a lower bound. In order to treat the projectile-target scattering consistently in a relativistic formalism one needs to resort to a field theoretical approach.

In this work we take a less ambitious route and show that a relativistic multiple scattering series can be formulated in the context of a relativistic meson exchange model. In the following we will consider a scalar "nucleon" interacting with an \( A \)-body spin zero isospin zero target where the interaction between the projectile and the target is described by meson exchange. Since we do not assume any particular form of equation for the projectile target \( t \) matrix, we will start from the most obvious fact that it can be obtained by summing all possible meson exchange diagrams for the projectile target system. A minimal set of meson exchange diagrams required for any such theory is the set of ladder and crossed ladder diagrams. In the limit when the heavy target becomes infinitely massive, this set reduces to a one-body equation for the lighter particle moving in an instantaneous potential produced by the heavier particle (the one-body limit), and at high energies gives the eikonal approximation to scattering. In this work we seek a theory in which these relativistic ladder and crossed ladder diagrams are summed efficiently.

In Fig. 1 the target is represented by a double line, the dashed lines represent the exchange particle (meson), and the solid line represents the projectile. For the intermediate states the target can be in its ground state, denoted by \( n = 0 \), or in excited states, \( n > 0 \), which includes the breakup states. The notation is very compact; each diagram in Fig. 1 actually represents a set of diagrams which can be obtained by opening up the bubbles at the meson-
FIG. 1. The projectile-target $t$ matrix is shown as the sum of all meson exchange processes up to the sixth order diagrams. The single line represents the projectile and the double line represents the target. The dashed lines are the exchanged meson. (a) is the one meson exchange term, (b) is the box, and (c) the crossed box. In the fourth and higher order diagrams, all possible intermediate target states are summed.

target vertices. For example, the set of diagrams contained in the box, Fig. 1(b), and crossed-box, Fig. 1(c), are shown explicitly in Figs. 2 and 3.

In our view, the solution of the relativistic problem in the meson exchange approximation is equivalent to finding an integral equation which sums all of the diagrams shown in Fig. 1. The construction of such an equation confronts us with three problems. The first problem, which does not occur in the nonrelativistic case, is the appearance of the crossed meson diagrams. These and all other irreducible diagrams (i.e., those which cannot be separated into two pieces by a line which intersects only the projectile and the target) will be included in the kernel of the integral equation. The second problem concerns the treatment of excited states. All diagrams, except for the one meson exchange term, include terms in which the target propagates in an excited state. A third problem is that each diagram includes terms in which the projectile may interact with two or more different target particles (multiple scattering). In this section, we will first discuss how the crossed diagrams are handled, and then discuss the complications arising from the occurrence of excited states.

A. Cancellation between the box and crossed-box diagrams

We know from the two-body problem that the ladder sum does not give a good approximation to the true solution of the Bethe-Salpeter equation. There is no reason to believe that it would be otherwise here. In fact, in the

FIG. 2. Figure 1(b) is redrawn by opening up the bubbles at the meson-target vertices. The sum is over the target particles.
two-body problem the box diagram and the crossed-box diagram tend to cancel, showing that it is unjustified to neglect crossed meson diagrams.

In this section we show that the cancellations between the box diagram and the crossed-box diagram still occur in the case of projectile nucleus scattering. In order to demonstrate this cancellation, we perform the integration over the relative energy for the intermediate states:

\[
M^{\pi j}_{n \rightarrow 1} = ig^4 \int \frac{d^4 k' dp_n}{(2\pi)^4} e^{i k' \cdot p_n} \left[ E_n(k') - W - p_n \right] v - i\eta
\]

\[
M^{\pi j}_{n \rightarrow 1} = ig^4 \int \frac{d^4 k' dp_n}{(2\pi)^4} e^{i k' \cdot p_n} \left[ E_n(k') - W - p_n \right] v - i\eta
\]

where the total four momenta in the c.m. is

\[ p + P = (W, 0) \quad p'^{\prime} + P = p'' + P'' \]

and the three momenta and the on-shell energies are defined as

\[ p = -P' - k' + q \quad p = p' + p'' \quad p = P' + k' \]

\[ \omega = [E_n + E_n(k') + i\eta]^2 \quad E_n(k') = m + k'^2 \]

We assume forward scattering, i.e., \( k' \rightarrow k'' \), so that the meson poles become double poles. The external particles are taken to be on their mass shell.

Figures 3a) and 5b) show the locations of the poles (when \( k' \) and \( k'' \) are small) for the box diagram and crossed-box diagram, respectively. We will evaluate the box and crossed-box diagrams by using the residue theorem. In the following expressions the superscript on \( M \) distinguishes between the box and the crossed-box diagrams, the subscript is for the type of pole under consideration, and the letters \( U' \) (upper half plane) and \( L \) (lower half plane) are used to remind us how the contour is closed. For example \( M^{\pi j}_{U,n \rightarrow 0} \) means the negative energy projectile pole \( (-p) \) contribution from the fourth-order box diagram \( (4.4) \) for \( n = 0 \), and the integration contour is closed in the upper half plane.

Evaluate the box diagram for \( n = 0 \). Close the contour in the upper half plane and pick up the target positive energy pole, double meson pole, and the projectile negative pole:

\[
M^{\pi j}_{U,n \rightarrow 0} M^{\pi j}_{U,n \rightarrow 0} M^{\pi j}_{L,n \rightarrow 0} M^{\pi j}_{U,n \rightarrow 0}
\]

where we have used the subscript \( \pi \) suggestively for the meson double pole contribution. These contributions are

\[
M^{\pi j}_{U,n \rightarrow 0} \int \frac{d^4 k'}{(2\pi)^4} e^{i k' \cdot (-E_n(k') + E_n (k)))} [E_n^2(k') + P + E_n^2(k')]
\]

\[
M^{\pi j}_{U,n \rightarrow 0} \int \frac{d^4 k'}{(2\pi)^4} e^{i k' \cdot (-E_n(k') + E_n (k)))} [E_n^2(k') + P + E_n^2(k')]
\]

\[
M^{\pi j}_{U,n \rightarrow 0} \int \frac{d^4 k'}{(2\pi)^4} e^{i k' \cdot (-E_n(k') + E_n (k)))} [E_n^2(k') + P + E_n^2(k')]
\]
where

\[ A = [E_2^0(k') - (E_0(k) + \omega)] [c^2(k') - c(k) - \omega] + 2\omega(c(k) - \omega) \],

\[ B = 2\omega E_0(k) [c^2(k') - c(k) - \omega^2] \].

For the crossed-box diagram we close the contour in the lower half plane for all \( n \) and pick up the double meson poles and negative energy projectile and target poles:

\[ M_{\text{4H}}(L, n) = M_{\text{4H}}^\rho(L, n) + M_{\text{4H}}^\pi(L, n) \].

The individual pole contributions are

\[ M_{\text{4H}}^\rho(L, n) = -\frac{g^4}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^4k}{[\omega^2 - c^2(k + q^2)]^2} \frac{d^4k}{[c^2(k) - c(k') - \omega^2]} [E_0^2(k') - (E_0(k) - c(k') - \omega)^2] \],

\[ M_{\text{4H}}^\pi(L, n) = -\frac{g^4}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^4k}{[\omega^2 - c^2(k + q^2)]^2} \frac{d^4k}{[c^2(k) - c(k') - \omega^2]} [E_0^2(k') - (E_0(k) - c(k') - \omega)^2] \],

\[ M_{\text{4H}}^\pi(L, n) = -\frac{g^4}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^4k}{[\omega^2 - c^2(k + q^2)]^2} \frac{d^4k}{[c^2(k) - c(k') - \omega^2]} [E_0^2(k') - (E_0(k) - c(k') - \omega)^2] \]

where

\[ F = [E_2^0(k') - (E_0(k) + \omega)] [c^2(k') - c(k) - \omega] + 2\omega(c(k) - \omega) \],

\[ G = 2\omega E_0(k) [c^2(k') - c(k) - \omega^2] \].

At this stage one could show that, at threshold, the dominant contribution of the box diagram for \( n = 0 \) comes from the positive energy target pole and the meson poles give the second largest contribution. For the crossed-box diagram, the meson pole contribution is the dominant one and is nearly equal to the meson pole contribution from the box diagram but with a relative negative sign. Since we are interested in other energies beside

FIG. 4. Figures 4(b) and 4(c) are redrawn with explicit labels for the projectile and the target momenta.

FIG. 5. The pole structures of the box diagram [Fig. 4(a)] and the crossed-box diagram [Fig. 4(b)] are shown in the complex \( p_\rho \) plane. The circled dots represent the double meson poles.
threshold, we evaluate the various pole contributions without any further approximations. The only restriction is forward scattering.

Figure 6 demonstrates the cancellation between the box diagram and the crossed-box diagram. The dashed line is \( |M_{21}^{sp}| / M_{11}^{sp} | \), the absolute magnitude of the ratio of the sum of negative energy projectile pole and meson pole contribution to the positive energy target pole contribution for \( n = 0 \). The dotted line is the ratio of all the pole contributions from the crossed box to the positive energy target pole of the box diagram. These two lines lie practically on top of each other. Finally, the solid line is \( |M_{21}^{pp} + M_{11}^{pp} + M_{11}^{ap} / M_{11}^{pp}| \) which is the ratio of the sum of the full crossed box and negative energy projectile pole plus the meson poles of the box diagram to the positive energy pole of the box diagram. These calculations, the target mass is taken to be \( M_{0} = 16m \), where \( m \) is the mass of the projectile particle and the meson mass is taken to be \( m = m / 2 \). This figure shows that, when the target is in the ground state \( (n > 0) \), the poles of the box diagram, which remain after the target is put on-shell, and the crossed-full box diagrams, are each of the order of 10\(^{-3}\) of the leading \( M_{11}^{pp} \) term, and hence are far from negligible. However, when the box and crossed box are taken together, an excellent cancellation occurs, as shown by the solid line for the energy range shown. After the cancellation, the positive energy target pole clearly dominates, and whatever is left over is less than 0.3\% of this dominant contribution.

If the projectile is put on mass shell, instead of the target, the ratio of the correction from the box and the crossed box to the leading term would be 
\( \frac{|M_{21}^{sp}| + |M_{11}^{pp} + M_{11}^{ap}|}{M_{11}^{pp}} \), and this is the dot-dashed line shown in Fig. 6. This result shows that the cancellation between the box and crossed-box diagrams is not as complete when the projectile is on-shell, but still quite good. The terms which remain are now between 1.4\% of the leading term, an order of magnitude larger than when the target is on-shell.

Figure 7 shows the \( A \) dependence of these cancellations. The legend of the curves mean the same as in Fig. 6, but they are shown as functions of the target mass \( M_{0} \), where the binding energy is neglected. The projectile laboratory kinetic energy is fixed at 1 GeV. As can be seen from the solid line, if the target is on-shell, the cancellations become better as \( A \) increases, and exact cancellation occurs when \( A \rightarrow \infty \). As shown by the solid line, this is an excellent approximation even for light nuclei. If the projectile is on-shell the cancellation does not improve as \( A \rightarrow \infty \), shown by the dot-dashed line, reflecting the fact that, in this case, the cancellation depends on the properties of the projectile and not on the target.

The above results suggest that, when the target is in the ground state, it is an excellent approximation to keep only the positive energy target pole for the intermediate states, which is equivalent to keeping the ground state target on its mass shell in all intermediate states. The cancellation is less complete and the approximation less accurate for realistic cases with spin and charge exchange, so that it is desirable, in the general case, to include (at least in principle) these extra terms as higher order corrections to the kernel [they become part of \( V^{\prime} \) in Eq. (3.51) as described below].

The alternative approach of putting the projectile on-shell has been seen to be less well justified; the additional correction terms are larger and do not decrease as \( A \rightarrow \infty \). We believe that this analysis provides a satisfactory motivation for using a fixed energy Dirac equation, in which the projectile is off-shell and the target is on-shell, to describe elastic nucleon-nucleus scattering.

II. Treatment of the excited states

In this subsection we will consider how to treat the intermediate target excited states. It would be tempting to

---

**FIG. 6** The cancellations between the box diagram and the crossed-box diagram are shown for \( n = 0 \). The target mass is taken to be \( M_{0} \). Here \( m \) is the mass of the projectile. See the discussion in the text.

**FIG. 7** The target mass dependence of the cancellation is shown for \( n = 0 \). The projectile laboratory kinetic energy is taken to be 1 GeV. See the discussion in the text.
say that the same approximation that we have advocated in the case of $n \geq 0$ should work here also, and that the excited state of the target should be put on mass shell. But for $n \leq 0$, further complications may arise because of the so-called dissolution singularities. 10

The dissolution singularities are spurious singularities which arise when a highly excited heavy target is put on its mass shell. To see how they come about, consider putting the excited target on its mass shell in the expression for the box diagram, i.e.,

$$[E_2(k') - (W - p_n^2 - i\gamma) = 2\pi i \frac{\delta(p_n^2 - e(k'))}{2E_n(k')}] .$$

The projectile propagator in (3.1) can be factorized into

$$[e^{i(k') - p_n^2}]^{-1} = \frac{[e(k) + (W - E_n(k'))]}{2}$$

In the last expression we see that there are two singularities, one at $W = E_n(k')$ which is the usual elastic cut and the other one at $W = E_n(k') - e(k')$ which is the dissolution singularity. This second singularity is spurious because it does not occur when the diagram is calculated exactly. (It can be shown that it is cancelled by a similar singularity in the $M^4_4$ term.) When $n = 0$, this singularity occurs at $W = E_n - e$, which is below threshold and hence not of importance. However, when the intermediate state is highly excited ($n \neq 0$), the singularity can move into the physical region and is a cause for concern. It has been an obstacle in developing an RMST.

To see when this singularity becomes potentially dangerous, study the locations of the poles in the box diagram, Fig. 5a). By approximating $W = M_n^2 + m$ (threshold) and taking $|k'|$ to be small so that $e(k') = m$ and $E_n(k') = M_n$, we see that the negative energy projectile pole and the positive energy target pole are separated by an amount $M_n - M_n + 2m$ in the upper half plane. As $M_n$ increases, the positive energy target pole moves towards the negative energy projectile pole and when the excitation energy of the target reaches $2m$ the poles touch and a singularity arises. In this situation it is clearly not a good approximation to take one of these poles and "neglect" the other. In addition to these spurious singularities in the projectile propagator, there are other spurious singularities arising from the meson propagators when the excited state target is put on its mass shell. For calculational purposes these meson singularities are even worse than the ones from the projectile propagator since they can arise for relatively low excitation energies. At threshold they will appear when the excitation energy reaches the meson mass.

The situation in the lower half plane [Fig. 5a)] is different. As $E_n$ increases the negative energy target pole moves away from the positive energy projectile pole. To see this explicitly we put the projectile on its mass shell in Eq. (3.1):

$$[e^{i(k') - p_n^2}]^{-1} \rightarrow \frac{\delta(p_n^2 - e(k'))}{2e(k')} .$$

and the target propagator is now

$$[E_2(k') - (W - p_n^2)]^{-1} = \frac{[E_n(k') - (W - e(k'))]}{2}$$

and exhibits no spurious singularities in the physical region. It can easily be seen that meson propagators do not have any such singularities either.

The above analysis suggests that, when we evaluate the expression (3.1) for $n = 0$, we should close the contour in the upper half plane to obtain the best approximation, but for $n \neq 0$ we should close the contour in the lower half plane to eliminate the problem of spurious singularities.

We now study the accuracy of this prescription by evaluating the box diagram for $n = 0$ by closing the contour in the lower half plane. The contributions come from the positive energy projectile pole, double meson pole, and negative energy target pole:

$$M^4_4(L, n \neq 0) = M^4_4(p, L, n / 0) + M^4_4(L, n / 0) + M^4_4(U, n / 0) .$$

The contribution from these poles is

$$M^4_4(p, L, n / 0) = -\frac{K^4}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^4k'}{[\omega^2 - (e(k') - e(k'))^2][2e(k')(E_2(k') - (W - e(k'))^2]} ,$$

$$M^4_4(L, n / 0) = -\frac{K^4}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^4k'}{[\omega^2 - (E_n(k') + E_n(k'))^2][e(k') - (W + E_n(k'))^2][2E_n(k')]},$$

$$M^4_4(U, n / 0) = -\frac{K^4}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^4k'}{4\omega^2[e(k') - (e(k') + \omega)^2][E_n(k') - (E_n(k') - \omega)]} ,$$

where

$$C = [E_2(k') - (E_n(k') - \omega^2)][e(k') - (e(k') + \omega)^2] - 2\omega(e(k') + \omega) ,$$

$$D = 2\omega(E_n(k') - \omega)(e(k') - (e(k') + \omega)^2) .$$
In Fig. 8 calculations of the \( n \neq 0 \) cases are shown. The dashed line is the ratio of the sum of the meson poles (box) and target negative energy pole (box) to the positive energy projectile pole (box), i.e., \( [(M^{10}_{m} + M^{10}_{s})/M^{10}_{p}] \). The dotted line shows the ratio of the crossed-box diagram to the positive energy pole of the box diagram. The solid line is \( [(M^{10}_{m} + M^{10}_{s})/M^{10}_{p}] \), which is the ratio of the sum of the full crossed box and the negative target pole (box) plus meson poles (box) to the positive energy projectile pole. For this calculation the target mass and the meson mass are the same as the \( n = 0 \) case, and the excitation energy of the target is taken to be \( \Delta m = m/100 \). As in the \( n = 0 \) case, the cancellations between the box and the crossed box still occur to a very large extent, although the cancellation is not as good as in the previous case. It can be seen that, after the cancellation, the lower terms in the energy range shown are less than 4% of the dominant projectile positive energy pole contribution.

In Fig. 9 the curves mean the same as in Fig. 8, but are shown as the function of target excitation energy with the projectile laboratory kinetic energy fixed at 1 GeV. As before the solid line shows the net result and it is seen that the cancellation becomes better as the excitation energy increases. This is a good signature, since as the excitation energy becomes higher, the one particle knock-out term, which is the dominant inelastic contribution at medium energies, will become more important, and it is advantageous to have the cancellations improve as these contributions become larger.

The preceding analysis suggests that for the intermediate target excited states, keeping the positive energy projectile pole of the box diagram provides us with a very good approximation and at the same time avoids the spurious singularities that would arise by putting the excited target on the mass shell.

In the preceding subsections, we have discussed the cancellations between the box and the crossed-box diagrams for both \( n = 0 \) and \( n \neq 0 \). We have concluded that, because of the excellent cancellations between these diagrams, we should keep the target on the mass shell for \( n = 0 \), and that for \( n \neq 0 \) we can avoid spurious singularities and still have a very good approximation if the projectile is kept on mass shell. Note that these approximations are obtained by considering the box and crossed box together. If one considered the box diagram only, these approximations would not be as good, as can be seen by the dashed curves of Figs. 6 and 8.

We now follow the suggestion provided by the last two subsections and write an integral equation for the projectile-target \( t \) matrix in the following form:

\[
\hat{t} = \hat{P} + \hat{V}_{PG} \hat{t} + \hat{V}_{m} \hat{t} + \hat{V}_{Q} \hat{t},
\]

where \( G_{t}^{n} \) is the propagator for the target in its ground state and on its mass shell, \( G_{m}^{n} \) is the propagator for the target in its excited states with the projectile on mass shell, and \( P \) and \( Q \) are target ground state and excited state projection operators, respectively. The three-dimensional propagators appearing in Eq. (3.3) can be written in a manifestly covariant form as

\[
G_{t}^{n} = \frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{4}} \delta^{4}[(W - p + i\varepsilon - m_{n})] \tag{3.3a}
\]

which in c.m. frame is

\[
G_{t}^{n} = \frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{4} 2E_{0}(k')} \{ \delta^{4}(W - E_{0}(k') + i\varepsilon - m_{n}) \} \tag{3.3b}
\]

and

\[
G_{m}^{n} = \frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{4} [M_{n} - (W - p + i\varepsilon)]} \tag{3.3c}
\]

FIG. 8. The cancellations between the box diagram and the crossed-box diagram are shown for \( n \neq 0 \). \( M_{n} \) is the same as in Fig. 6 and the excitation energy \( \Delta m = m/100 \). See the discussion in the text.

FIG. 9. Cancellations for \( n \neq 0 \) shown as a function of excitation energy. See the discussion in the text.

C. Multiple scattering series for the optical potential
which in c.m. frame is

$$G^e_{\nu} = \frac{i}{2(2\pi)^3} \frac{\langle k^* | e(k') \rangle}{e(k') - e(k)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.3b)

Equation (3.3) is the first major result of this paper. It is a three-meson exchange equation for the projectile-target $t$ matrix. If the three-meson exchange irreducible diagrams (to be described below) are neglected the driving term of this equation, $\hat{V}$, becomes a very simple form. It is the sum of one meson exchanges between the projectile and the target particles. The special feature of this equation is that it has two three-dimensional propagators in which the target is on mass shell when the target is in the ground state and the projectile is on mass shell when the target is in an excited state.

In Eq. (3.3), $\hat{V}$ is the sum of all irreducible meson exchange contributions. In order to derive a multiple scattering series for the optical potential in a fashion similar to NR theory we write

$$\hat{V} = \sum \hat{v} + \hat{V}_t,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.4)

where the first term is the one meson exchange diagrams summed over the target particle index. The second term $\hat{V}_t$ includes the contributions from the irreducible diagrams involving multimeson exchange. To be explicit, the fourth-order contributions to $\hat{V}_t$ would be the parts of the box diagram, which do not have the target on mass shell when $n = 0$ and the projectile on mass shell when $n > 0$, and the crossed-box diagram. These are illustrated in Fig. 10. Higher order diagrams with similar qualifications constitute the rest of $\hat{V}_t$. It is now clear that $\hat{V}$ through $\hat{V}_t$ can include diagrams in which the projectile particle interacts with more than one target particle through meson exchange. We therefore separate out the processes in which only one target particle is involved and write

$$\hat{V}_t = \sum \hat{K}_n + \sum \hat{K}_m + \cdots + \sum A_n,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

$$A_n = \sum \hat{K}_n + \sum \hat{K}_m + \cdots,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

where $\hat{K}_n$, $\hat{K}_m$, etc., are the contributions from the multimeson exchange irreducible diagrams in which only one target particle is involved. $A$ are the multimeson exchange irreducible diagrams with more than one target particle interacting with the projectile. We have demonstrated, to the fourth order, that these terms are $K_n$ and $K_m$ are very small compared to $\hat{V}_t$. It was shown in Refs. 12 and 13 that higher order terms such as $\hat{K}_m$ are also small when the scattering takes place at threshold. We believe that the higher order $K's$ will also be small above threshold.

We note that it is possible to define separate $t$ matrices with deriving terms $\hat{K}_n$, $\hat{K}_m$, etc., and derive a multiple scattering series. In the approach the resultant multiple scattering series will have a whole set of $t$ matrices. We want to formulate our multiple scattering series in terms of a new $t$ matrix whose kernel is the sum of irreducible diagrams involving only one target particle, i.e., $\hat{v}_1 K_n 1 \cdots$. As pointed out above, the terms $\hat{K}_n$, etc., are small compared to $\hat{V}_t$, but we will include these terms in the kernel of the new $t$ matrix for the sake of completeness. The terms given by $A_n$ involve more than one target particle and they will be treated in such a manner that they would appear as higher order corrections in the resultant multiple scattering series.

In the following we will show how a multiple scattering series for the optical potential that corresponds to Eq. (3.3) can be obtained. By employing the projection operator method, we can rewrite Eq. (3.3) as coupled equations:

$$\hat{U} = \hat{V} + \hat{T} \hat{P} \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{P} \hat{T} = \hat{U} + \hat{T} \hat{P} \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{P} \hat{U},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.7a)

$$\hat{U} = \hat{V} + \hat{T} \hat{Q} \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{Q} \hat{T} = \hat{U} + \hat{T} \hat{Q} \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{Q} \hat{U}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.7b)

Here $\hat{T}$ is our optical potential operator and we seek a multiple scattering series expression for this operator. It should be noted that Eqs. (3.7a) are three-dimensional equations. The first one, Eq. (3.7a), is the effective one-body equation for the projectile, and for a fermion projectile it becomes the fixed energy Dirac equation.

Next, as in the NR theory, we write $\hat{U} = \sum \hat{U}_i$, and obtain

$$\sum \hat{U}_i = \sum \hat{U}_i + \sum \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{U}_i + \sum \hat{A}_n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

In the above equation, $\hat{U}_i$ in the following, the projection operators $P$ and $Q$ are approved. It is to be understood that $P$ goes with $G^e_{\nu}$ and $Q$ goes with $G^e_{\nu}$. Adding and subtracting the quantity $\sum \hat{U}_i$ and dropping the sum over $i$ gives

$$\hat{U} + \sum \hat{K}_n 1 K_n 1 \cdots 1 \hat{A}_n + \sum \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{U},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.9a)

$$\sum \hat{A}_n = \sum \hat{A}_n + \sum \hat{A}_n G^e_{\nu} \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{A}_n + \hat{A}_n \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{G}^e_{\nu} \hat{A}_n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.9b)

\[ \text{FIG. 10. Diagrams which contribute to } \hat{V} \text{ are shown to fourth order. The first term is the one meson exchange term. The rest of the diagrams are the irreducible diagrams as defined in the text. The dotted circle on a line indicates that the diagram is to be calculated without the on-shell contribution for the projectile target. These irreducible diagrams as a whole are defined as } \hat{V}_t \text{ in Eq. (3.4).} \]
where we have introduced a new variable $g$ whose properties are not specified at this stage. Taking the second term on the right-hand side (RHS) of Eq. (3.9) to the left-hand side (LHS) and operating from the left with the inverse of $[1 - (\tilde{g}_i + \tilde{\Lambda}_i + \cdots)]$ gives

$$
\tilde{t}_i = \tilde{t}_i + \sum_j \tilde{t}_j (G^*_j G_j - g_{ij}) \tilde{t}_j + \tilde{t}_i \left[ 1 + \sum_j G^*_j G_j \right] \tilde{t}_j,
$$

where we have defined $\tilde{t}_i$ and $\tilde{t}_j$ as

$$
\tilde{t}_i = \tilde{t}_i + \tilde{\Lambda}_i + \cdots + (\tilde{g}_i + \tilde{\Lambda}_i + \cdots) \tilde{t}_i
$$

and

$$
\tilde{t}_j = \tilde{t}_j + \tilde{\Lambda}_j + \cdots + (\tilde{g}_j + \tilde{\Lambda}_j + \cdots) \tilde{t}_j.
$$

(3.10)

Resumming over the index $i$ gives

$$
\tilde{t} = \sum_i \tilde{t}_i + \sum_i \tilde{t}_i (G^*_j G_j - g_{ij}) \tilde{t}_j + \sum_i \tilde{t}_i (G^*_j G_j) \tilde{t}_j
$$

$$
+ \sum_i \tilde{t}_i \left[ 1 + \sum_j G^*_j G_j \right] \tilde{t}_j.
$$

(3.11)

Equation (3.12) is our multiple scattering series for the optical potential, and it is the second major result of this paper. It should be compared with the NR analogue Eq. (2.19).

The first term of this series can be interpreted as the single scattering term for the optical potential and it is given by a $t$ matrix driven by a kernel which is the sum of all irreducible diagrams involving only one target particle. The second term is the propagator correction term which obviously depends on our choice of the propagator $g$ and its NR analog is the second term of Eq. (2.19). The third term on the RHS of (3.12) is the relativistic analog of the third term of Eq. (2.19) and corresponds to multiple scattering corrections and they are directly related to two, three, etc., particle correlations and can be assumed to be small in the first approximation.

The last term includes iterations with the irreducible diagrams which have more than one target particle involved in the definition of $\tilde{t}_i$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_i$ and it does not concern itself in the single scattering processes. These terms have no NR analog and they originate from the multimers exchange irreducible diagrams. We note that it is also possible to recombine this last term with the third term by separating the pieces according to the number of target particles involved. For example the first contribution to the double scattering would be $\sum_i \tilde{\Lambda}_i \tilde{\Lambda}_i$. It should be noted that because of the conspiracy among the diagrams, these terms are quite small and will not carry the same weight as the true double scattering term such as $\tilde{t}_i G^*_j \tilde{t}_j$, but they would constitute an interesting correction to the double scattering term.

Keeping the first term only gives a single scattering approximation for the optical potential. The propagator $g$ has not yet been specified. In principle, one could use any convenient $t$ matrix for the $t$ operator in Eq. (3.12) as long as we are willing to incorporate the corrections represented by the rest of the terms in Eq. (3.12). In practice one usually keeps only the first term of the series and the judicious choice of $g$ is then essential.

Under normal conditions, the second term gives the largest correction to the single scattering approximation, and we therefore should pay the greatest attention to this term. We would like to choose our propagator $g$ so that this correction is minimal. This can be accomplished by choosing the propagator $g$ as shown in Fig. 11. In this figure, both the heavy $A - 1$ cluster and the projectile are kept on their mass shells. In the medium energy range the terms represented by the sum $\sum_i \tilde{t}_i G^*_j \tilde{t}_j$ are dominated by the one nucleon knockout term and our choice of $g$ described above would exactly cancel these dominant inelastic contributions and ensure that they are exactly accounted for in the $m$ matrix itself given by Eq. (3.10). Restricting the $A - 1$ cluster to the mass shell ensures cluster separability of the remaining two-nucleon system.

With this choice of $g$, Eq. (3.10) for $\tilde{t}_i$ in the NN subspace reduces to the one particle on mass shell (spectator) equation previously introduced by one of us. A feature of this equation, discussed in Refs. 8 and 13, is that the multi-cluster irreducible diagrams $\tilde{\Lambda}_i$, $\tilde{\Lambda}_j$, etc., are expected to be small compared to $\tilde{t}_i$, and can be neglected. To be specific, after neglecting these terms the $\tilde{t}_i$ of Eq. (3.10) becomes

$$
\tilde{t}_i = \tilde{t}_i + \tilde{\Lambda}_i \tilde{t}_i.
$$

(3.10a)

The projection $\tilde{t}_i$ onto this subspace will be denoted by $\tilde{t}_i$. The only difference between $\tilde{t}_i$ and the free two-body $t$ matrix is the shift in the total energy of the two-body subspace due to the motion of the free $A - 1$ cluster. In analogy with the NR theory, this choice of $g$ can be viewed as the "impulse approximation" choice of $g$ in our theory. The spectator Eq. (3.10a) is shown diagrammatically in Fig. 12.

We conclude that the most appropriate $t$ matrix to be used in the optical potential should be calculated from a covariant three-dimensional equation for two particles in which one particle is kept on its mass shell. This choice will minimize the leading correction to the multiple scattering series Eq. (3.12).

The last step is to carry out the necessary projections.
FIG. 12. The spectator force particle on-shell equation is shown diagrammatically. The crosses on a line mean that the particle is on the mass shell.

to obtain final equations for elastic scattering in the impulse approximation. The elastic scattering amplitude is $T = P^I P^I$, which satisfies the equation

$$T = U + UG^I \overline{\Phi} T,$$

(3.13)

where $U = P^I P^I$. Equation (3.13) is just the projection of Eq. (3.2a). In the single scattering approximation,

$$\overline{\Phi} = \sum \Phi_0,$$

(3.14)

where $U = P^I P^I$. Equation (3.13) is just the projection of Eq. (3.2a). In the single scattering approximation,

$$\overline{\Phi} = \Phi_0 + \Phi_0 \overline{\Phi}.$$

(3.10b)

Using both (3.10a) and (3.10b) we obtain an alternative equation for $\overline{\Phi}$,

$$\overline{\Phi} = \Phi_0 + \Phi_0 \overline{\Phi} + \Phi_0 \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi} + \Phi_0 \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi}.$$

(3.15)

If we define $\overline{\Phi}(i)$ to be the projection of $\overline{\Phi}(i)$ onto the subspace of states connected to the first-order optical potential in the impulse approximation (3.2a) is finally obtained as

$$U^I = \sum P^I P^I$$

$$= \sum (P^I P^I + P^I \overline{\Phi} P^I + P^I \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi} P^I + P^I \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi} P^I),$$

(3.14a)

where

$$P^I = \Phi_0 + \Phi_0 \overline{\Phi} + \Phi_0 \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi} + \Phi_0 \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi} \overline{\Phi}.$$

(3.16b)

Note that Eq. (3.16b) is equivalent to the two-body equation with the projectile on-shell, as described above and illustrated in Fig. 12 and (3.15) tells how all four legs of this two-body t matrix are extrapolated off-shell for use in the optical potential. Note that $\overline{\Phi}$ has all four legs off-shell and includes a delta function in the t = 1 spectator coordinate, but is identical to $\overline{\Phi}$ if one particle is on-shell in the initial and final state (and the delta function in the $t = 1$ coordinates is dropped). Furthermore, no further equation must be solved to obtain it; it is obtained directly from $\overline{\Phi}$ by quadrature, Eq. (3.16a).

Equation (3.16a) is illustrated in Fig. 13; its fourth-order contribution was already encountered in one of the terms in Fig. 2.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The idea that the projectile-target scattering amplitude is given by a relativistic equation where the kernel of the equation is the sum of certain diagrams was previously introduced in Ref. 17. However, these authors did not discuss meson exchange, nor did they derive any details about the multiple scattering series or the appropriate choice of relativistic equation and two-body amplitude.

In this paper we have considered a covariant formalism for projectile-target scattering in the context of meson exchange, and have shown that a multiple scattering series for the optical potential can be derived. We do not claim that we have derived an RMTF starting from a field theoretical Lagrangian, but we do claim that we have derived a multiple scattering theory in a covariant manner. Every step of our derivation is manifestly covariant and the end result, the t matrix associated with the impulse approximation optical potential, must also be calculated from a relativistically covariant equation.

In conclusion, we will restate what we have accomplished in this paper. In the context of meson exchange we have derived a covariant equation for the projectile-nucleus t matrix Eq. (3.3). This equation was derived by considering the cancellations between the box and crossed-box diagrams and we have also shown how the spurious singularities can be avoided. We then derived a multiple scattering series for the optical potential and showed, in the impulse approximation, that the t matrix associated with the optical potential is to be calculated from a relativistic three-dimensional equation in which the t matrix is kept on its mass shell. We also described how the fully off-shell extension of this t matrix Eq. (3.16a) can be calculated from a quadrature, Eq. (3.16a).

We emphasize that our development leads to a precise definition of the t matrix to be used in the impulse approximation of the first-order optical potential. This is the principal difference between our result and the RIA as commonly used. The t matrix is to be obtained from a one particle on mass shell equation. Hence intermediate states with both nucleons in negative energy states cannot occur, except at the "end points," as illustrated in Fig. 13. This result is obtained from a careful analysis of meson exchange diagrams, and seems to be the most appropriate for the problem of elastic nucleon-nucleon scattering. Numerical tests support this approach. It has been found that the contributions from channels in which both nucleons are in negative energy states are negligible.14 The amplitude predicted from Eq. (3.16b) have been used in an analysis of $p - Ca$ elastic scattering.14 This agreement with experimental data has been obtained. Differences between time and that of Efimov and

FIG. 13. This figure represents the quadrature equation

(3.10a). The fully off-shell t matrix is shown by an open oval. The shaded oval is the spectator t matrix of Eq. (3.10b). The first term on the RHS is the fully off-shell version of one meson exchange contribution used in Fig. 3.10a.
Wallace were visible, but not large.

Since our first-order impulse approximation optical potential is derived from a multiple scattering theory, it is possible to make systematic corrections to the first-order calculation. We first intend to calculate the four leg off-shell $t$ matrix from the quadrature equation (3.16a) and then evaluate other corrections. For example the double scattering correction term can be calculated in a straightforward manner as in the NR theory. Calculation of two-particle correlation functions, in a relativistically consistent manner, will be an obstacle. In the first approximation, one could treat the excited state target as a nonrelativistic object and neglect the small contributions from the negative energy propagation. In this approximation the second order (double scattering terms) in the expansion of the optical potential can be calculated in a standard manner by employing the $t$ matrix obtained from the spectator equation.

Finally we point out that we have not considered the problem of antisymmetry between the projectile and the target particles, nor the self-consistent treatment of the $A$-body target state. We have also ignored the complications due to spin. It is very likely that the projectile-target antisymmetry can be closely approximated by the Takeda-Watson prescription used in NR calculations.
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7Good accounts on the NR multiple scattering theories can be found in J. M. Einsberg and D. S. Koltun, Theory of Mean Interactions with Nuclei (Wiley Interscience, New York, 1980); P. C. Tandy, in Relativistic Dynamics and Quark-Nucleus Physics, edited by M. B. Johnson and A. Picklesimer (Wiley Interscience, New York, 1980).
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Relativistic $p^{-4}Ca$ elastic scattering observables are calculated using relativistic $NN$ amplitudes obtained from the solution of a two-body relativistic equation. Results at 200 MeV are presented for three sets of $NN$ amplitudes, two with pure pseudovector coupling for the pion and one with a 25% admixture of pseudoscalar coupling. Differences between the predictions of these three models provide a measure of the uncertainty in constructing Dirac optical potentials from $NN$ amplitudes.

It is well known that the relativistic impulse approximation (RIA) gives a good description of medium energy $p$-nucleus scattering observables.\textsuperscript{1} In this approach the scattering of the proton is described by a Dirac equation with an optical potential $U$ of the form

$$U_{H}(x) = \sum_{p} \gamma^{\mu} \eta^{\nu} \langle \rho | 0 \rangle \langle 0 | \gamma^{\nu} \rho | \eta \rangle \rho^{\mu} \eta^{\nu},$$

where the $\rho$ superscripts (known as $\rho$ spin) are positive (negative) for nucleons in a positive (negative) energy state. This equation therefore expresses the optical potential as a folding of the $NN$ $T$ matrix describing scattering of two initial nucleons in $p$-spin states ($\rho, p_s$) to two final nucleons in $p$-spin states ($\rho', p_s'$) by a nucleon density distribution $p$ which depends on the $\rho$ spin of the initial and the final bound nucleon.

Previous work\textsuperscript{2} has clearly established that the success of the RIA depends strongly on the $U^{(++,+)}$ and $U^{(++,+)}$ amplitudes, which in turn depend on knowledge of $T$-matrix elements in which at least one particle in the initial or final state is in the negative energy state. (In this paper these amplitudes will be referred to collectively as "negative $p$-spin amplitudes."\textsuperscript{3}) Furthermore, the size of these negative $p$-spin amplitudes at low energy has been found to be very sensitive to the amount of $\gamma^4$ coupling used for the pion. It has come to be accepted that pure $\gamma^4$ coupling is required to give a satisfactory description of $p$-nucleus scattering at low energies. In this paper we report results which show that a surprisingly sizable admixture (25%) of $\gamma^4$ coupling will still give good agreement with $p^{-4}Ca$ data at 200 MeV, provided the $NN$ $T$ matrix has been obtained from a relativistic meson exchange calculation which fits the observed $NN$ data. This 25% admixture seems to us quite large; in the recent fit to the $NN$ $T$ matrix used in this paper and reported in Ref. 4, no larger value could be found, and Fleischer and Tjon\textsuperscript{4} found some time ago that it was impossible to fit $NN$ data with pure (100%) $\gamma^4$ coupling.

Before describing our calculation in detail, we briefly review previous work, focusing on results which depend on the form of the off-shell pion coupling. In the original calculations,\textsuperscript{1} the values of the negative $p$-spin amplitudes were inferred by expanding $T$ in terms of five Fermi covariants,\textsuperscript{5} and fitting these to the on-shell $T^{(++,++)}$ data.\textsuperscript{6} It was found that this procedure is ambiguous and sensitive to the choice of the five covariants.\textsuperscript{6} For example, using the covariant $\gamma_{12}$ [which corresponds to assuming the pion coupling is pseudoscalar (PS)] or $-(\gamma_{1} \gamma_{2})_{P}$ results in the ($++$, $++$) sector, but their extrapolations to the negative $p$-spin sectors are very different, resulting in generally poor fits at low energy (200 MeV) when the $\gamma_{1} \gamma_{2}$ covariant is used. One finds divergent energy dependence of scalar and vector potentials as energy decreases and consequently divergent virtual pair contributions to proton scattering when the $\gamma_{1} \gamma_{2}$ covariant is used. To overcome this problem Tjon and Wallace\textsuperscript{7} adopted a meson exchange model of the $NN$ interaction with pure PV coupling for the pion as a basis for predicting all...
The $\tau^{\omega\pi\pi\pi}$ matrix elements in Eq. (1). Use of a dynamical model which describes the $nn$ observables in a qualitative way over the 0–1000 MeV range was thought to be the best way to minimize the ambiguity in prediction of the optical potential. The optical potential based on a complete set of amplitudes (referred to as IA2) produces good agreement with experimental results over a wide range of projectile energies from 200 to 800 MeV. The divergent behavior of the potentials at lower energies is absent in this case.

In this paper, we study the sensitivities of the $p$-nucleus scattering observables to realistic variations in the amount of $\tau\tau^{\omega\pi\pi\pi}$ coupling of the pion. We continue to demand that our $NN$ $T$ matrix be the solution of a relativistic equation with a meson exchange kernel which has been adjusted to give the quantitatively accurate fit to the $NN$ data. Two new sets of relativistic $NN$ amplitudes are obtained from the solution of the relativistic equation in which one particle is on shell. To ensure that the resulting amplitudes satisfy the Pauli principle, the one-boson exchange (OBE) kernels used in this calculation were explicitly antisymmetrized. Hence the four classes of amplitudes $T^{(+,+,+)}$, $T^{(+,+,-)}$, $T^{(+,-,+)}$, and $T^{(+,-,-)}$ can all be obtained through antisymmetry, or time reversal invariance, from $T^{(+,-,+)}$ which we will refer to simply as $T^{(+,+,-)}$, and the amplitudes $T^{(+,-,+)}$, $T^{(+,-,-)}$, $T^{(+,+,-)}$ and $T^{(+,-,-)}$ can similarly be obtained from $T^{(+,+,-)}$, referred to as $T^{(+,-,-)}$. The amplitudes $T^{(+,-,+)}$ and $T^{(+,+,-)}$ are all taken to be zero. Finally, the $\sigma N$ coupling used in these new solutions is a mixed coupling of the form

$$\lambda^*\phi^2 + (1 - \lambda)^*\frac{\sigma^2}{2m}.$$  

The parameter $\lambda$ varies the mix of pseudoscalar and pseudovector coupling, and is defined so that the on-shell amplitude is independent of $\lambda$. When $\lambda$ is unity the coupling is purely pseudoscalar and when it is zero the coupling becomes pure pseudovector.

Two OBE models have been found which fit the $NN$ data equally well, but which have significantly different $\tau^{\omega\pi\pi\pi}$ amplitudes. In model 1, only the four mesons $\pi$, $\sigma$, $\omega$, and $\rho$ are used. This is the minimal number needed to represent the long-, medium- and short-range nuclear forces, and a very good fit to the positive energy $NN$ amplitudes is obtained when the parameter $\lambda$ has the value 0.25, which is 25% pseudoscalar and 75% pseudovector (the $\omega$ meson provides the essential large value of $\lambda$). In another OBE model, model 2, the $\sigma N$ coupling is constrained to be pure pseudovector ($\lambda = 0$) consistent with pair suppression and chiral symmetry. In order to fit the $NN$ data equally well, two extra mesons, $\delta$ and $\eta$, must be included. (The $\delta$ meson is needed to get the correct splitting between $1S_0$ and $1^1S_0$ central terms, which emerges automatically when $\lambda = 0.25$.) These two models allow us to explore the sensitivity to the amount of pseudoscalar coupling one may use and still obtain a good fit to the $NN$ observables. They both differ significantly from the model used by Tjon and Wallace.

The results for the polarized $p^{40}\text{Ca}$ elastic scattering at 200 MeV obtained from the two models are shown in Fig. 1. Calculations are based on the IA2 formalism of Ref. 8, and we used the relativistic $^{40}\text{Ca}$ densities supplied by Horowitz and Serot.12 Surprisingly, both models give a reasonable description for the $p$-nucleus observables, and it can be seen that the mixed coupling model gives superior results over the pure pseudovector coupling case. However, since the integral in (1) has only been evaluated in the $tt$ approximation (in which the $T$ matrix is evaluated on shell and factored out of the integral) and other effects such as Pauli blocking and vacuum polarization have not been included, it cannot be concluded that the mixed coupling case will continue to give the best results after these effects are taken into account.

We would like to emphasize that the relativistic $NN$ amplitudes used were the results of dynamical calculations based on a relativistic equation, in which all parameters were fixed by the $NN$ data. No further adjustments in any parameter were made in calculating the $p^{40}\text{Ca}$ observables. Calculations have also been performed at 300 and 500 MeV and the predictions agree with the data as well as for the case of 200 MeV.

In order to isolate other possible model dependence arising from negative-energy components of $T$, we compare models 1 and 2 above with a calculation of Tjon and Wallace13 in Fig. 2. In this case we standardize the comparisons by replacing the $T^{(+,+,+)}$ amplitudes in each case by the on-shell amplitudes determined by Aarts et al.12 First note that the two pseudovector models (model 2 and Tjon-Wallace) are in close agreement in spite of the

---

**Fig. 1.** Predictions for $p^{40}\text{Ca}$ observables for the $\lambda = 0.25$ model 1 (solid line) and $\lambda = 0$ model 2 (dashed line) described in the text. The stars are data from Ref. 11.
fact that the Tjon-Wallace model uses a Blankenbecler-Sugar reduction of the Bethe-Salpeter equation which includes (---) channels (in which both of the initial or final particles have negative p spin) in the \(N\bar{N} \) sector, and additional \(N\Delta\) channels,\(^4\) both of which were neglected in model 2. We have checked that the differences shown in

Fig. 2 are not due to the additional (---) channels. Thus the sensitivity of Dirac results to the heavy mesons and the presence or absence of \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\bar{\Delta}\) channels or the

(---) states of the \(N\bar{N}\) channel seems to be minimal. Next, note that the larger differences between models 1 and 2 attributable to the form of pion coupling are substantially unchanged, in this standardized comparison, even though the depth of the oscillation in \(\Delta\) has increased somewhat for both models. This shows that the \(p\)

nucleus results are sensitive to fine details in the \(\gamma^{(+,+)}\) amplitude, but that the differences between models 1 and 2 cannot be attributed to these sensitivities.

In summary, we have shown that the differences in the predictions of models 1 and 2, both of which fit the on-shell \(N\bar{N}\) data very well, are due to the differences in their admixture of \(\gamma^p\) coupling, which cannot be uniquely determined by the on-shell data. While this model dependence is significant it is surprisingly small considering the large admixture (25\%) of \(\gamma^p\) coupling required by model 1.

Finally, it is amusing that the simpler model 1, with the exchange of only four mesons and a 25\% admixture of \(\gamma^p\) coupling for the pion, fits the observables as well as it does. This result suggests either that some degree of pair non-suppression on the Born level may be allowed, or that the \(\sigma\) counter terms required to control the \(\gamma^p\) part of the pion coupling may already be included as part of the phenomenological \(\sigma\) exchange potential used in the \(N\bar{N}\) models. In view of the success here, it may be worth examining the results of such mixed coupling models, both at lower energies where the sensitivity to \(n\bar{N}\) coupling is larger, and in other reactions, such as electromagnetic processes or processes involving pion production or absorption.

Two of us (F.G. and S.J.W.) gratefully acknowledge the support of the U.S. Department of Energy. One of us (K.M.M.) gratefully acknowledges the support of NASA, Grant No. NCCI-42. K.M.M. and J.A.T. would like to acknowledge the hospitality of the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, where this work was discussed and carried out.
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12. The relativistic \(^{46}\text{Ca}\) wave functions used in this calculation were obtained from C. Horowitz and B. Serot, Nucl. Phys. A368, 503 (1981).
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For the first time, we have calculated theoretical angular distributions for exclusive \(\pi^0\) production in C+C collisions at 84 MeV/nucleon using a quantum-coherent, microscopic, many-body formalism. We use a model spin, transition-spin, \(\Delta\)-isobar-formation interaction that is expanded in angular momentum multipoles and we now have the results from a complete code that includes these multipoles to all orders which couple to shell-model information. Also the first time, we calculate pion contributions coming from both the target and projectile and find that these contributions are important in determining the shape of the theoretical angular distributions. We compare the theoretical calculations to \(\pi^0\) data and find that our results are similar to the shape of the data at higher pion energies and bear some similarity in trend to the pion bremsstrahlung model. We also find that the shape of the theoretical angular distribution is sensitive to shell-model information.

There continues to be interest in finding a sensitivity to collective or coherent mechanisms in subthreshold heavy-ion pion production. The interest is enhanced by the experimental ability to measure neutral pions \(^{1,2}\) which leads to data that are not complicated by final-state Coulomb effects on the outgoing pions. The present model interaction has been described briefly in previous works\(^3,4\) where pion spectra were calculated over a range of incident energies from subthreshold to relativistic values for \(^{16}\)O on \(^{12}\)C; however, those calculations used only the lowest-order \((k=0)\) angular momentum multipole. We have now included all orders and discovered that the multipole expansion is highly convergent in the subthreshold region. For the first time with this model we calculate the angular distributions for coherent \(\pi^0\) production in C+C collisions at 85 MeV/nucleon at three different energy cuts.

The Lorentz-invariant differential cross section calculated in the projectile rest frame for a given target isospin \(M(T)\) is given by

\[
\frac{d^3\sigma}{d^3p/E_\pi} = \frac{2\pi}{(2\pi)^6} \frac{E_\pi V^3}{h \nu} \int \frac{d^3p_\pi}{E_\pi} |C_{\pi}|^2 , \tag{1}
\]

where \(\nu\) is the incident speed of the target as seen in the projectile rest frame, \(E_\pi\) is the total pion energy, and \(V\) is the quantization volume which cancels an identical term coming from the second-order amplitude \(C_{\pi}\). The total energy of the final state \(E_{\pi}\) is the sum of energies from the pion, recoil projectile, and excited target of momentum \(p_\pi\). Making the high momentum, forward scattering approximation that \(p_\pi \gg p_{NR}\) where \(p_{NR}\) is the momentum of the recoil projectile plus pion as seen from the projectile rest frame, then \(d\sigma/dE_{\pi} = (E_{\pi}/p_{NR})^{-3}d\sigma/dp_{\pi}\). Furthermore, the scattering amplitude is assumed to be approximately independent of the target solid angle. These assumptions are consistent with peripheral collisions of low recoil and simplify the integrations over the target momentum \(p_{\pi}\). The sums over all target isospins \(M(T)\) of the differential cross section are then taken. The second-order amplitude

\[
C_{\pi} = \sum (F | V_{\pi} | N)(N | V_{\pi} | I) \frac{E_\pi + M_{\pi}c^2 - M_{\pi}c^2 + iE_\pi c^2/2}{E_\pi + M_{\pi}c^2 - M_{\pi}c^2 + iE_\pi c^2/2} , \tag{2}
\]

where \(|I\) refers to the initial state of target, projectile, and the kinetic energy of the target, \(|N\) is the intermediate state where the target is excited to a \(J^* = 1^+, T = 1\) spin, isospin, coherent, isobar-analog, nuclear state, and the projectile is excited to a similar state except that a nucleon has been excited to a \(\Delta(3,3)\) isobar of mass \(M_{\pi}c^2 = 1232 \text{ MeV}\) and width \(\Gamma_{\pi} = 115 \text{ MeV}\). The final state \(|F\) contains the pion that decays from the \(\Delta\) and it is assumed that the decay of the \(\Delta\) from the projectile does not influence the target after the \(\Delta\) is created so that the center-of-mass plane waves and the internal target wave functions between the intermediate and final states are orthogonal. A nonrelativistic Breit-Wigner propagator for the \(\Delta\) resonance is used where the energy dependence of the width\(^5\) has been neglected since we are concerned here mainly with angular distributions.

The matrix elements for \(\Delta\) formation and decay in Eq. (2) are evaluated using the techniques of second quantization and involves a great deal of Racah algebra. The formation matrix \(\langle N | V_{\pi} | I\rangle\) which excites a particle-hole state in the target and creates a \(\Delta\)-hole state in the projectile is reduced by Wick's theorem to matrix elements of an interaction between particle hole and scattering states. In order to do an estimate calculation, a separable model \(\Delta\)-formation interaction was chosen to be

\[
v_{\pi} = 2\eta g(r)g_G^G(q_\pi)g_K(q_\pi)(S_{\pi} \cdot \sigma_i)(T_{\pi} \cdot r_i)
\]

\[
\times \sum_\Delta C_4(n_\pi) \cdot C_4(n_p) , \tag{3}
\]
where $g(r)$, $g'(r)$, and $g''(r)$ are Gaussian shapes which are functions of the coordinate magnitudes of the nucleus-nucleus center of mass, projectile nucleon, and target nucleon, respectively. This form was motivated by the work of Gaarde, Kampuri, and Osterfeld,9 but simplified to take into account target Lorentz contraction. The main features of this model interaction are the spin and isospin flip where the target is excited to a giant resonance as well as the projectile with the added feature that a $\Delta$ is created in the projectile through the transition spin and isospin. The scalar product of spherical tensors of rank $k$ allows for an exchange of orbital angular momentum $\hbar k$ between the projectile nucleon and target center of mass. The target nucleons, although spin flipped, are left in their spatial ground state so that the matrix element in the target can be approximated by a Lorentz-contracted form factor. This model represents a compromise where orbital angular momentum changes are neglected in the target single-particle states, but allows for a simple handling of the target Lorentz contraction as described previously.9 The strength of the interaction is given by $v_0$ which is initially determined from two-body scattering and the factor 2 has been included since

$$
\sum_{\ell} \int_0^\infty j_\ell(Kr)g(r)r^2dr \int_0^\infty R_\ell'((\xi)j_\ell(k,\xi)R_\ell''((\xi)k^2d\xi

(\ell_0 k \ell_0)

|P_{\lambda}(\cos \theta_{\Delta \Delta})|

$$

(4)

where the first integral is in the Born approximation with respect to the target momentum transfer $\hbar K$, and the second integral comes from the projectile $\Delta$-hole decay matrix element with respect to the outgoing pion momentum $\hbar K_\Delta$. The properties of the 3j symbol

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\ell_0 & k & \ell_0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
$$

restricts $k$ to even/odd values if $\ell_0 + \ell_0 = \text{even/odd values}$ and severely truncates the sum through the triangular condition $|\ell_0 - \ell_0| \leq k \leq \ell_0 + \ell_0$. The pion angular distribution is contained in the Legendre polynomial of order $k$ with respect to the correlation angle $\Theta_{\Delta \Delta}$ which is the angle between the pion and target momentum transfer. In previous work,6 we only hand calculated the differential cross section for the $k=0$ term and only calculated the square of Eq. (4) for $k=0$ plus $k=2$ to determine the relative effect of the higher-order multipole. Presently, we have a complete code which includes all $k$ multipoles and have calculated the differential cross section as a function of the correlation angle. After including higher $\Delta$-hole states, we discovered that the main contributions to the cross section come from the $1p_{1/2,3/2}^{\Delta \Delta}$ and states and the $1p_{3/2}$-hole state in $^{12}\text{C}$ ($\Delta$) for $k=0$ and $2$ multipole values. For example, when we included the $\Delta$ states for the $1d-2s$ shell which corresponds to $k=1,3$ and $k=1$, respectively with the $1p_{3/2}$-hole state, we found these contributions to be negligible. This occurs because the overlap between the functions in the first and second integral in Eq. (4) diminishes considerably and the value of the 3j symbol drops. It appears that the $k$ sum in Eq. (4) is highly convergent. Also, since we included assumed equal weight particle-hole coefficients $X_{\mu}(\ell)$, they become smaller when more shell-model states are included. If these coefficients were calculated in the schematic model,12 we would find that they are inversely proportional to the particle-hole energy difference which cuts down the contributions from higher shell-model states and justifies our truncation to lowest states. We also included the $1f$ shell and found that these results were also negligible. Therefore, the main contributor to the nonisotropic shape of the differential cross sections comes from $P_2$ although the actual shape is determined by the relative weighting between $P_0$ and $P_2$ in the multipole sum.

For the first time, we compared the results of this model to $\pi^0$ angular distributions in $^{12}\text{C}+^{12}\text{C}$ collisions at 84 MeV/nucleon transformed to the nucleon-nucleon, center-of-mass system.13 Since we are considering small momentum transfers in the forward direction, we assume that the correlation angle $\Theta_{\Delta \Delta}$ is approximately the pion angle measured from the forward direction $\Theta_\mu$. For fixed values of the pion kinetic energy and angle $(T^\mu_{\ell K},\Theta^\mu_{\ell K})$ in the nucleon-nucleon center of mass, we calculate the relativistically transformed set $(T^\mu_{\ell K},\Theta^\mu_{\ell K})$ for pions produced by the projectile in its own frame to obtain the Lorentz-invariant differential cross section which is further
transformed to the noninvariant cross section in the center-of-mass system. A similar procedure is applied to contributions coming from the target. These two cross sections are then added so that our results contain the incoherent addition of pions coming from projectile and target; however, the A's are produced coherently in each nucleus. The results are shown in Figs. 1-3 for three different energy cuts. Since we are concerned primarily with shape fits, the calculations have been normalized to the data at \( \cos \theta = 0.025 \) since that data point has an error bar shown in Fig. 3. We do not expect to fit the data in absolute value since the calculation is exclusive whereas the data is inclusive. It is interesting to note that the theoretical shape improves at the highest-energy bin from 100-150 MeV where the peak-to-valley ratio moves towards the data. This trend is compatible with the conclusions of Braun-Munzinger and Stachel\(^1\) where they point out that the low-energy pions are probably emitted from a local hot spot, whereas the pions produced approximately above 100 MeV cannot be fully understood by thermal models alone and may suggest the presence of a coherent mechanism in the production process. It is also interesting that our normalization factor drops by a factor of 10 from the lowest-energy cut to the highest perhaps indicating a convergence at the higher pion energies. It is also intriguing that for the lowest-energy cut, the results from the bremsstrahlung model compared to similar data\(^4\) shows a convex trend as do our results under the condition of incoherent \( \Delta \) production of projectile and target pions, whereas the bremsstrahlung calculations and our results improve at the higher-energy cuts.

In conclusion, for the first time, we include pion contributions coming from the target and projectile and find that these contributions are important in determining the theoretical shape of the \( \Delta^0 \) angular distributions. We compare the present model with experimental \( \Delta^0 \) angular distributions but do not expect to obtain absolute-value fits to the data because our calculation is exclusive whereas the data to which we compare are inclusive; however, we wanted to find out if the qualitative shape and energy trend of the theory bears some resemblance to existing experimental angular distributions before embarking on the more complicated phase of this calculation which is to include the tensor term. We find that the theoretical shape displays a forward-backward peaking similar to the shape of the data at the higher pion energies. The forward peaking in our model is due to pions coming predominantly from the projectile whereas the target predominantly contributes to the backward peaking as seen in the nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass system. We expect this qualitative result would also obtain when the tensor interaction is included. The calculations is also very sensitive to the shell-model information since the multipole sum is very convergent and not much of a washing out of the shell-model signature occurs. This was not obvious from previous work\(^5\) where hard calculations were done and it was not known if a washout of the angular distribution would occur with the inclusion of higher-order multipole values. We again expect a similar result with inclusion of the tensor term and now have a tentative explanation for the forward-backward peaking seen in the data.

FIG. 2. Same as Fig. 1 except for the 50 to 100 MeV cut.

FIG. 3. Same as Fig. 1 except for the 100 to 150 MeV cut.
The model isobar-formation interaction, even though incomplete, leads to a complicated, microscopic, quantum-mechanical, many-body, angular momentum formalism. Our approach was to start with the simplest spin-spin term but include orbital-angular momentum exchanges between projectile and target nucleons as well as the scattering of the relative nucleus-nucleus system and calculate angular distributions to discover the nature of the signature for coherent production. From Ref. 8, in an examination of the momentum transfer dependence $q$ of the central and tensor interactions, it is seen that for low momentum transfers of $q \leq 0.5 \text{fm}^{-1}$, the central term dominates over the tensor term. In fact, at $q = 0$, the tensor term is zero. At increasing values of $q$, the central term drops and the tensor term rises until at the critical value of $q = 3 \text{fm}^{-1}$, the tensor term dominates the cross section because the central term goes to zero. However, for peripheral collisions at subthreshold energies, it is likely that the lowest values of momentum transfer will be favored and that the central term might dominate these reactions. With this work, we are encouraged to include the more complicated tensor interaction and compare the roles of the central to the tensor term. In Ref. 2, where the tensor term was included, only total cross sections have been calculated for the subthreshold process using the impulsive Feshbach-Zabek approach. In our work, we are attempting a more fundamental, microscopic, quantum-mechanical approach. We are presently developing a heavy-ion calculation with a more realistic interaction model that includes the tensor term.
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Relativistic $p^{40}$Ca elastic scattering observables are calculated using four sets of relativistic $N\bar{N}$ amplitudes obtained from different one-boson-exchange (OBE) models. The first two sets are based upon a relativistic equation in which one particle is on mass shell and the other two sets are obtained from a quasipotential reduction of the Bethe-Salpeter equation. Results at 200, 300, and 500 MeV are presented for these amplitudes. Differences between the predictions of these models provide a study of the uncertainty in constructing Dirac optical potentials from OBE-based $N\bar{N}$ amplitudes.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work relativistic $p$-nucleus calculations based on four different sets of $NN$ amplitudes obtained from relativistic meson-exchange models are presented. The comparison of the results based upon these different relativistic $NN$ amplitudes is motivated by the fact that the main ingredient in the success of the Dirac approach to $p$-nucleus scattering is the virtual $NN$ effects which are implicit in the solution of the Dirac equation. For the positive energy component of the wave function we can write

$$(E \cdot p - U^{+} - U_{\text{pot}}) \psi^+ = 0,$$

where

$$U_{\text{pot}} = U^+ \cdot (E + F^0 - U^{-})^{-1} U^{-}.$$  

To a good approximation $U^+$ is the nonrelativistic potential and it is essentially determined by the $NN$ on-shell data and the density profile of the target nucleus. When one uses meson-exchange models to calculate the relativistic $NN$ amplitudes the pure positive energy amplitudes are fitted to the on-shell data and the amplitudes which belong to the pure relativistic sectors are determined dynamically. In principle all meson-exchange model calculations should provide the same positive energy amplitudes (since they are fitted to the on-shell data) but the amplitudes in the other sectors would be different depending on the dynamical model used. Therefore the ambiguity in the Dirac optical potential lies in the $U_{\text{pot}}$ term, which is determined by amplitudes other than the on-shell one. Since different dynamical models will give different amplitudes, except in the pure positive energy sector, it is important to study these differences and possible effects on the $p$-nucleus scattering observables which may arise because of these differences.

In previous work, preliminary analyses of relativistic $p^{40}$Ca elastic scattering at 200 MeV, using relativistic nucleon-nucleon ($NN$) amplitudes obtained from the solutions of two-body relativistic equations, were reported. In the present work the calculational methods are described and an extensive array of results for 200, 300, and 500 MeV protons incident upon a $^{40}$Ca target are presented. Calculations are preformed with two sets of $NN$ amplitudes obtained from a relativistic wave equation in which one particle is on positive energy mass shell and also with third and fourth sets of $NN$ amplitudes based upon a quasipotential method for solving the Bethe-Salpeter equation. The use of the relativistic $NN$ amplitudes obtained from one particle on mass shell equation is motivated by a recently formulated covariant multiple scattering theory. In this formalism the authors argued that the $NN$ amplitudes associated with the relativistic impulse approximation optical potential should be the one obtained from a one particle on-mass shell equation.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II we present an overview of the optical potential methods used...
to compute the elastic scattering observables. A brief discussion of the Tjon and Wallace method\(^1\) for obtaining the invariant \(NN\) amplitudes is also included for completeness and further discussions. In Sec. III the meson-exchange models used are described together with the associated relativistic equations and the one-boson-exchange (OBE) parameters are tabulated. In Sec. IV results for elastic scattering observables are presented for all four sets of \(NN\) amplitudes. To test these results for possible model dependencies arising from the differing negative energy components of the \(t\) matrix, the on-shell amplitudes are replaced by the ones determined by Arndt et al.\(^2\) and the resultant scattering observables computed and discussed. Finally, Sec. V summarizes our major results and conclusions.

II. THE DIRAC OPTICAL POTENTIAL

It is well known that the relativistic impact approximation (RIA) is a useful method for predicting intermediate energy \(p\)-nucleus scattering observables.\(^9\) In this approach one begins with the fixed energy Dirac equation

\[
\gamma \cdot p - m - \hat{U}(r)\psi(r) = 0,
\]

where the energy \(E = (p^2 + m^2)^{1/2}\), \(p\) is the on-shell momentum, \(\gamma \cdot p = \gamma_\alpha p^\alpha = (E, \mathbf{p})\), and the repeated indices are summed over. The optical potential \(\hat{U}\), obtained from the RIA, is written in momentum space as\(^10\)

\[
\hat{U}(p'j, p) = -\frac{i}{4} \text{Tr}_2 \left( \int d^3k \hat{M}(p, k - \frac{1}{2}q \rightarrow q', \frac{1}{2}q \rightarrow q', \frac{1}{2}q \rightarrow q') \right),
\]

where \(\hat{M}\) is the Feynman \(NN\) amplitude and \(\mathbf{p}\) is the relativistic nuclear density matrix for the target. In Eq. (2) particle 2 is the target nucleon and the trace is taken over its Dirac indices. Using the factorization approximation Eq. (2) yields

\[
\hat{U}(p'j, p) = -\frac{i}{4} \text{Tr}_1 \left( \hat{M}(p, -\frac{1}{2}q \rightarrow p', \frac{1}{2}q \rightarrow p') \right).
\]

Therefore to construct \(\hat{U}\) we require \(\hat{M}\) and \(\mathbf{p}\). For this work involving \(^{40}\)Ca target, the relativistic densities of Horowitz and Serot\(^11\) are used for \(\mathbf{p}\). The remaining problem is then to specify \(\hat{M}\).

It is customary to separate the full \(NN\) amplitudes into a sum of 16 terms each representing a particular \(p\)-spin sector. They are labeled by indices \((\rho, \mu, \nu, \rho', \mu', \nu')\) where each \(\rho\) is either + or -, and primed (unprimed) quantities denote final (initial) nucleon states. Tjon and Wallace have determined \(\hat{M}\) for all 16 \(\rho\)-spin sectors by solving the Bethe-Salpeter equation using a quasipotential method\(^13,5\) with pure pseudovector coupling for the pion. In that particular formalism, the invariant \(NN\) amplitude is expanded as

\[
\hat{F} = -\frac{\hbar}{2} \sum_{\rho, \mu, \nu, \rho', \mu', \nu'} \Lambda_0^{\rho \mu} \Lambda_0^{\rho' \mu'} e^{i \rho \mu \rho' \mu'} \Lambda_1^{\rho \mu} \Lambda_1^{\rho' \mu'},
\]

where each \(\rho\) is summed over + and -, and \(\kappa\) is a kinematic factor [see Eq. (2.10) of Ref. 8]. In Eq. (4) the \(F^{\rho \mu \rho' \mu'}\) are amplitudes restricted to act only within one \(p\)-spin sector (hence there are 16 different sets of them) and the \(\Lambda_0\)'s are covariant projection operators given by

\[
\Lambda_0^\rho(p) = \frac{\rho(E_p - \gamma \cdot p) + m}{2m},
\]

where \(\rho\) is + or -. Details for determining the various \(p\)-spin sector amplitudes \(F^{\rho \mu \rho' \mu'}\) are found in Refs. 7 and 10. This complete calculational program is referred to as the 1A2 formalism.\(^10,12\)

III. RELATIVISTIC MESON-EXCHANGE MODELS

In this section we briefly describe the relativistic meson-exchange models used in this work. In operator form the relativistic two-body equation can generically be written as

\[
M = V + VGM,
\]

where \(M\) is the invariant amplitude for the two nucleons scattering process, \(V\) is the interaction determined by the OBE model, and \(G\) is the relativistic two-body propagator. \(M\) satisfies the Pauli principle provided that \(V\) is suitably antisymmetrized.

The first two OBE model amplitudes\(^13\) used in this work are calculated from a one particle on-mass shell equation and in this case the propagator \(G\) in Eq. (6) is the propagator with one particle on the mass shell. Figure 1 depicts Eq. (6) for this case diagrammatically. The open boxes represent the combined OBE terms, properly antisymmetrized, for the mesons used. The horizontal lines represent the nucleons and a cross on a nucleon line indicates it is on the positive energy mass shell. Explicit antisymmetrization of the OBE kernel insures that the \(M\) matrix is correctly antisymmetrized under particle interchange. The first OBE model uses four mesons \((\sigma, \rho, \omega, \omega')\). This is the minimal number needed to represent the long, medium, and short range nuclear forces. The \(\pi\) \(N\) coupling used is a mixed coupling of the form

\[
\hat{F}^{\pi \rho \rho' \rho'} = \sum_{\rho, \mu, \nu, \rho', \mu', \nu'} \Lambda_0^{\rho \mu} \Lambda_0^{\rho' \mu'} e^{i \rho \mu \rho' \mu'} \Lambda_1^{\rho \mu} \Lambda_1^{\rho' \mu'},
\]

where each \(\rho\) is summed over + and -, and \(\kappa\) is a kinematic factor [see Eq. (2.10) of Ref. 8]. In Eq. (4) the
The parameter $\lambda$ varies the mix of the pseudoscalar and pseudovector coupling, and is defined so that the on-shell amplitude is independent of $\lambda$. When $\lambda$ is unity the coupling is purely pseudoscalar and when it is zero the coupling becomes pure pseudovector. Use of this coupling permits us to study the sensitivities of the scattering observables to relative variations in the amount of $\gamma^3$ vs $\gamma^1\gamma^0$ coupling of the pion. The best value of the mixing parameter $\lambda$ to fit the data was found to be 0.22 which corresponds to a 22% $\gamma^3$ coupling admixture.

In the second model, the $\pi N$ coupling is constrained to be pure pseudovector ($\lambda = 0$) consistent with pair suppression and chiral symmetry. In order to fit the $NN$ data equally well with this constraint, two additional mesons $\eta$ and $\sigma$ were added. The $\alpha_i$ meson, a phenomenological spin zero isospin 1 meson, is needed to obtain the correct splitting between the $^{13}S_0$ and $^{13}S_1$ central potentials when $\lambda = 0$. Note that neither of these OBE models contain $N\Delta$ or $\Delta\Delta$ channels but both models are able to fit the $NN$ phase shifts very well up to 300 MeV.

Since in these models (1 and 2) we require that one particle is on the positive energy mass shell $\rho$-spin amplitudes labeled by $(-, -)$, $p_2$, and $(\rho_1, \rho_2, -)$ are zero by

### Table 1. Meson masses (MeV), cutoff masses (MeV), and coupling constants for OBE models 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\pi g_{\pi}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>13.56403</td>
<td>13.35757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\pi}$</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>0.22557</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma g_{\sigma}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>5.51522</td>
<td>5.04720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\sigma}$</td>
<td>516.0</td>
<td>514.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho g_{\rho}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>0.38291</td>
<td>0.58686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_{\rho}$</td>
<td>7.52525</td>
<td>6.14920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_{\rho}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.75218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\rho}$</td>
<td>760.0</td>
<td>760.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega g_{\omega}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>9.85196</td>
<td>9.83064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_{\omega}$</td>
<td>0.14259</td>
<td>0.15090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\omega}$</td>
<td>782.8</td>
<td>782.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma g_{\sigma}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>0.32593</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\sigma}$</td>
<td>573.0</td>
<td>573.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta g_{\eta}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>6.40798</td>
<td>6.40798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\eta}$</td>
<td>548.8</td>
<td>548.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda_N$</td>
<td>1610.0</td>
<td>1685.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda_{\omega}$</td>
<td>2135.0</td>
<td>1830.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Meson masses (MeV), cutoff masses (MeV), and coupling constants for OBE models 3 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\pi g_{\pi}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\pi}$</td>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>138.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b g_{\pi}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\rho}$</td>
<td>960.0</td>
<td>960.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta g_{\pi}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\eta}$</td>
<td>548.0</td>
<td>548.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho g_{\rho}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\rho}$</td>
<td>763.0</td>
<td>763.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho g_{\rho}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\rho}$</td>
<td>763.0</td>
<td>763.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega g_{\omega}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\omega}$</td>
<td>783.0</td>
<td>783.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e g_{\rho}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\rho}$</td>
<td>570.0</td>
<td>570.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{\rho}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{\rho}^2/4\pi$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda_N$</td>
<td>1150.0</td>
<td>1150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda_{\omega}$</td>
<td>1670.0</td>
<td>1670.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 3. (a)–(d) The Wolfenstein amplitudes $A$ and $C$ at 200 MeV are presented for models 1, 2, and 3. The mixed coupling case (model 1) is shown by a dot-dashed line, pure pseudovector case (model 2) is shown by a dot-dashed line, and model 3 is shown by a dotted line. For comparison, the empirical Amundt amplitudes are shown by a solid line.
FIG. 4. |a|-(d) The Wolfenstein amplitudes $A$ and $C$ at 300 MeV are presented for models 1, 2, and 4. The mixed-coupling case (model 1) is shown by a dashed line, pure pseudovector case (model 2) is shown by a dot-dashed line, and model 4 is shown by a dotted line. For comparison, the empirical Arndt amplitudes are shown by a solid line.
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FIG. 5. (a)–(d) The Wolfenstein amplitudes $A$ and $C$ at 500 MeV are presented for models 1, 2, and 4. The mixed coupling case (model 1) is shown by a dashed line, pure pseudovector case (model 2) is shown by a dot-dashed line, and model 4 is shown by a dotted line. For comparison, the empirical Arndt amplitudes are shown by a solid line.
definition. In addition, the \((++, +), (++++), (++, --), \) and \((++, -)\) amplitudes, which we will label simply as \((-+, +)\), are obtained from the \((++, +)\) amplitudes using antisymmetry or time reversal properties. Similarly, the amplitudes \((++, +), (++, --), (-+, +), \) and \((-+, -)\), labeled as \((-\), \) are obtained from \((++, +)\) amplitudes.

The third and fourth OBE model amplitudes that we employ in this work are calculated from a quasipotential equation based upon the Bethe-Salpeter equation. In this case the propagator \(G\) of Eq. (6) is the quasipotential Blankenbecler-Sugar propagator. The third model includes only the \(NN\) channels. In our calculations, the \(g\) coupling constant of model 3 has been increased slightly as compared to Ref. 4, in order to improve on the fits of the \(S\)-wave phases. It is needed because of the inclusion of the negative energy spinor state channels, which has a repulsive nature in the \(S\)-wave channels. In addition to the \(NN\) channel the fourth model also includes the \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) channels. The scattering equations for these models are shown diagrammatically in Fig. 2. The equation for the case where there are no \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) channels can be obtained by leaving out the diagrams with the \(\Delta\) lines.

The meson masses, coupling constants, and cutoff masses for these models are given in Tables I and II. To see the goodness of fit to the on-shell \(NN\) data, the Wolfenstein \(A\) and \(C\) amplitudes at 200 MeV are shown in Fig. 3 for the first three OBE models together with the empirical Arndt amplitudes. It is to be noted that while the first two models resulted in reasonably close fits to each other, the third model differs quite visibly from the first two and also from the Arndt amplitudes. This goodness of fit to the on-shell data is also one of the possible ambiguities that can arise in the optical potential when the \(NN\) amplitudes obtained from OBE models are used. At 300 and 500 MeV, models 1, 2, and 4 give reasonable fits to the Arndt \(A\) and \(C\) amplitudes and they are shown in Figs. 4 and 5. The fits of models 1 and 2 are generally less good than at 200 MeV, but it turns out that the fits to the \(NN\) amplitudes at 300 and 500 MeV are not as crucial to the success of the \(p\)-nucleus prediction.

IV. RESULTS

Elastic scattering observables.

The results for \(p^\text{10}Ca\) elastic scattering observables are presented in this section. Calculations are based on the IA2 formalism of Refs. 7 and 10 and use the relativistic nuclear densities supplied by Horowitz and Serel. Figures 6–8 display results for elastic scattering observables, obtained with the OBE models discussed above, for proton energies 200, 300, and 500 MeV. In all three figures, results from the mixed coupling model are shown by a solid line, results from the pure pseudovector model are shown by a dashed line, and one of the two models of Ref. 4 is shown by a dotted line. In Figs. 6–8 \(p\)-nucleus calculations are done by using the theoretical amplitudes. For comparison purposes experimental data from Refs. 14, 15, and 16 are included for 200, 300, and 500 MeV, respectively. At 200 MeV, \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) channels are omitted in all three models. At this energy, model 4, which is designed to study the effects of coupling to the \(\Delta\) states at higher projectile energies, is not used in the calculation. All models give a reasonable description of the scattering observables, although model 3 (Ref. 4; with no \(N\Delta\) or \(\Delta\Delta\) channels) seems to describe the \(A\) better in the forward angle region. Note that, although model 3 seems to describe the 200 MeV \(p\)-nucleus data, it does not reproduce the Wolfenstein \(A\) and \(C\) very well as can be seen from Fig. 3. At this stage our conclusion is somewhat uncertain. It would be an interesting study in the future to compare the \(p\)-nucleus results of these models with the same quality of fit to the \(NN\) on-shell amplitudes. These results also show that the two OBE models of Ref. 13 \((\lambda = 0.1, \lambda = 0.22)\) give similar results although model 1 \((\lambda = 0.22)\) seems to describe the experimental data somewhat better.

For 300 and 500 MeV, the dotted lines are the results of model 4, which includes \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) channels, while the other two models (1 and 2) remain unchanged. At

![FIG. 6. \(p^\text{10}Ca\) scattering observables at 200 MeV. Model 1 results are shown by a solid line, model 2 results by a dashed line, and model 3 results by a dotted line. Note that in all three calculations \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) channels are omitted. Data are from Ref. 14.](image-url)
these energies, all three models give reasonably good fits to the on-shell Arndt \(NN\) amplitudes, although there are some differences. From the 300 and 500 MeV results, it seems that the experimental data do not appear to favor any one of the \(NN\) amplitudes over the other, although the polarization observables at 500 MeV seem to be somewhat better fit by models 1 and 2 in the region of the first minimum. We also notice that at these energies the differences between the \(\lambda = 0.22\) (model 1) and \(\lambda = 0\) (model 2) appear to be very small suggesting that the \(p\)-nucleus scattering observables are not very sensitive to the relative admixture of \(\gamma^3\) coupling at these energies.

As mentioned above, the best way to compare the \(p\)-nucleus results of these different models would be to have the same goodness of fit to the \(NN\) on-shell data. Since it is impractical to do this at the current stage of development we proceed as follows. In order to separate the effects of the negative energy components from differences which may arise from the goodness of fit, we standardize the comparisons by replacing the \(t+, +, +\) amplitudes in each model with the on-shell amplitudes determined by Arndt \(et\ al.\). The results are displayed in Fig. 9-11. First note that all three models are in reasonably close agreement with the experimental data although the previous agreement with data and model 3 at 200 MeV seems to be destroyed somewhat. This shows that at this energy (200 MeV) \(p\)-nucleus results are very sensitive to the positive energy sector of the \(NN\) amplitudes. Standardized calculations based on model 4 at 200 MeV (\(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) states included) have been shown in Ref. 12 to give a very good description of the data.

At 300 and 500 MeV, the mixed coupling model (model 1) and model 4 are in very close agreement in spite of the fact that model 4 uses a Blankenbecler-Sugar reduction of the Bethe-Salpeter equation which includes \((-,-)\) channels for which both of the initial and final particles have negative \(p\) spin, and additional \(N\Delta\) channels, both of which are absent in models 1 and 2. Therefore the sensitivity of the results to the presence or absence of \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) channels or \((-,-)\) states appears to be minimal at best, indicating that the \(p\)-nucleus theory at high energy (at least up to 500 MeV) is not critically sensitive to the goodness of the fit to the \(NN\) system. Comparing Figs. 6-8 with Figs. 9-11, we also note that the difference between models 1 and 2, attributable to the form of the pion coupling, are substantially unchanged in the standardized comparison.

For models 1 and 2 at 200 MeV, use of the Arndt amplitudes appears to give a slight improvement in the agreement with the experimental data. In addition the

![FIG. 7. \(p\)^5\(Ca\) scattering observables at 300 MeV. Models 1 and 2 results are shown by solid and dashed lines, respectively. Model 4 (which contains \(N\Delta\) and \(\Delta\Delta\) channels) results are shown by a dotted line. Data are from Ref. 15.](image1)

![FIG. 8. \(p\)^5\(Ca\) scattering observables at 500 MeV. The meaning of the curves is the same as in Fig. 5. Data are from Ref. 16.](image2)
minima in $A_r$ appear deeper and the minima in $Q$ appear shallower with the use of the Arndt amplitudes thereby demonstrating that the $p$-nucleus scattering observables are sensitive to the details of the $\{+,+,+\}$ amplitudes, at this energy, even though differences between model 1 and model 2 are not attributable to these sensitivities.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this work we have presented $p$-nucleus scattering calculations based on four different sets of relativistic $NN$ amplitudes. The first two sets of amplitudes are obtained from a three dimensional relativistic two-body equation in which one particle is kept on the positive energy mass shell. The difference between these two models is that one uses a pure pseudovector $wN$ coupling and the other uses a mixed coupling (22% pseudoscalar). The results for 200, 300, and 500 MeV proton energies are presented. For all three energies both models include only the $NN$ channels. Comparisons of the results of these two models show that, although both models give reasonable agreement with the experimental data, there are some definite model dependencies. This model dependency seems to lessen at higher proton energies. Since these two models reproduce the on-shell $NN$ data equally well, as shown in Fig. 3, we cannot attribute these differences in $p$-nucleus observables to the ambiguity in fitting the on-shell data. This statement is also supported by the fact that the differences in $p$-nucleus results seem relatively unchanged when the Arndt amplitudes are used to standardize comparisons.

The third and fourth set of $NN$ amplitudes are based on the quasipotential reduction of the Bethe-Salpeter equation. The third model includes only the $NN$ channels while the fourth one includes both the $N\Delta$ and $\Delta\Delta$ channels. Both models use pure pseudovector $wN$ coupling. The $p$-nucleus calculation at 200 MeV was done with amplitudes obtained from model 3 (see Ref. 12 for one based on model 4) and at 300 and 500 MeV model 4 amplitudes were used. Since model 3 does not reproduce the $NN$ on-shell data at 200 MeV very well, there is some ambiguity in comparing its results to models 1 and 2 at this energy. When Arndt amplitudes are used for standardized comparison, the results of models 1 and 2 change in a minimal way while the model 3 results change quite visibly. This observation shows that $p$-nucleus observables are very sensitive to the positive energy $NN$ amplitudes at this energy. This in turn suggests that in order

FIG. 9. $p^{35}$Ca scattering observables at 200 MeV. The meaning of the curves is the same as in Fig. 4, but the positive energy amplitudes in all three models are standardized to the Arndt amplitudes.

FIG. 10. $p^{35}$Ca scattering observables at 300 MeV. The meaning of the curves is the same as in Fig. 5, but the positive energy amplitudes in all three models are standardized to the Arndt amplitudes.
to use relativistic NN amplitudes obtained from OBE models without ambiguity, it is essential to have a good quality fit to the on-shell data. Although this statement is quite obvious and seems unnecessary, it is important to note that p-nucleus scattering is one of the areas in which the pure relativistic amplitudes can be tested and these amplitudes are determined only dynamically (through fitting the on-shell amplitudes) once an OBE model is chosen.

At 300 and 500 MeV, model 4, which includes the delta isobar channels, and models 1 and 2 are compared. They all describe the experimental data very well. In particular, the results for models 1 and 2 are very close and there are no obvious model dependencies. Except for the fact that model 4 seems to give a very deep first minima for $A_y$ and $Q$ at 500 MeV, all three models give very similar predictions for the p-nucleus scattering observables. When the standardized comparison is made, the differences in the models disappear almost totally. These results suggest that at high energies (up to 500 MeV), p-nucleus theory is insensitive to the quality of fit to the NN amplitudes, including the presence or absence of $N\Delta$ and $\Delta\Delta$ channels, and the $(-, -)$ channels in the NN sector. Most of the effects of the $\Delta$'s in elastic p-nucleus scattering may be described as giving rise to an attraction in the NN channels at medium range and which are effectively simulated by a stronger epsilon coupling constant in the other model.

In summary, we conclude that OBE models provide an unambiguous way of determining the relativistic NN amplitudes provided that a good quality fit to the on-shell data is achieved. There is a definite model dependency in p-nucleus results depending on the choice of $nn$ coupling but this dependency seems to disappear as the incident proton energy becomes higher. It is well known that the original RIA, which uses the five Fermi covariants, gave unreasonable large scalar and vector components at low energies. This has been attributed to the large pair contributions which result from pseudoscalar $nn$ coupling. Since one of the OBE models (model 1) studied in this work contains 72% pseudoscalar coupling, it seems to suggest that this amount of pseudoscalar admixture is tolerable at this energy. Whether the same amount of admixture is allowable at lower energies and/or is consistent with the nuclear matter results is still an open question at this time. Up to 500 MeV the effects of $N\Delta$ and $\Delta\Delta$ channels in p-nucleus results seem to be minimal and the specific choice of relativistic equation used to determine the relativistic amplitudes does not appear to matter as long as the on-shell NN amplitudes can be reproduced with reasonable accuracy.
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17In the previous work, Ref. 2, we have concluded that the mixed coupling model, model 1, was superior to model 2 which uses pure pseudovector uN coupling. Recently we have discovered an error in the treatment of the correction for the high partial waves in the p-nucleus calculations with the two OBE models 1 and 2. This error has been corrected in this work and model 1 results still seem to be better than model 2 and the conclusions are not affected although the differences are not as substantial as before.
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A relativistic multiple scattering theory is formulated in the context of meson exchange. The elastic scattering amplitude for a fermion projectile satisfies a Dirac equation with an optical potential derived from a relativistic multiple scattering series. It is shown that the two-body t-matrix associated with the optical potential is the one with one particle on its mass shell in all intermediate states.

In almost all the relativistic (Dirac) projectile–nucleus scattering calculations done in the past few years, the optical potential used has been the relativistic impulse approximation (RIA) [1] which is the relativistic analogue of the non-relativistic first-order impulse approximation optical potential. The tacit assumption behind the use of RIA, together with the Dirac equation, in which the heavy target is taken to be on its mass shell, is that there exists a multiple scattering series for the optical potential (in which the RIA is an approximation to the first term). However, neither the existence of the relativistic multiple scattering theory (RMST) nor the relation of it to the RIA has been consistently derived. The lack of a RMST not only prevents us from performing a systematic study of the higher-order multiple scattering terms, but also from making other corrections, such as off-shell effects and Pauli blocking, in a consistent manner. Therefore it is highly desirable to have a RMST.

In this work we show that a RMST can be formulated in the context of a relativistic meson exchange model. In the following we will consider a scalar “nucleon” interacting with a spin, isospin zero A-body target through meson exchange. A minimal set of meson exchange diagrams required for any such theory is the set of ladder and crossed ladder diagrams. In the limit when the heavy target becomes infinitely massive, this set reduces to a one-body equation for the lighter particle moving in an instantaneous potential produced by the heavier particle (the one-body limit [2]), and at high energies gives the eikonal approximation to scattering [3]. We will assume that the theory we seek is one in which these relativistic ladder and crossed ladders are summed efficiently.

The contributions to second order in the projectile–meson interaction are box and crossed box diagrams, shown in fig. 1. Since the target is a complex system with (in general) many closely spaced energy levels and continuum states with different combinations of clusters, we assume that all of these states can contribute, at least in principle, to the intermediate states. These states will be labelled by the index n, with n=0 referring to the ground state. Included in this sum are states where one, two, and possibly many nucleons are knocked out of the target. The elastic scattering matrix for the two diagrams in fig. 1 is, for spin zero particles,

1 Present address: Department of Physics, Hampton University, Hampton, VA 23668, USA.
The total four momentum in the current of mass is 

\[ P = \left( \begin{array}{c} \not{p} \not{q} \not{p'} \not{q'} \end{array} \right) \]

and the meson propagators are

\[ d(k-p) = \frac{1}{\mu^2 - (k-p)^2 - i\epsilon} = \frac{1}{\omega_{\mu} - (k_0 - \not{p})^2 - i\epsilon} \]

where the total four momentum in the center of mass is \( P = (W, 0) \), \( q = p' + p - k \), and \( p' \) and \( p \) are the momenta of the mesons.

The meson–projectile vertices which couple the ground state to the \( n \)th excited state are \( g_{mn} \) and \( g_{nm} \), and

\[ e_n = (m^2 + k^2)^{1/2}, \quad E_n(k) = (M_n^2 + k^2)^{1/2} \]

where \( m \) is the projectile mass and \( M_n = M_0 + \Delta_n \) is the mass of the \( n \)th excited state of the \( A \) nucleon system with excitation energy \( \Delta_n \), with \( \Delta_0 = 0 \).

The key to our derivation is the analysis of the singularities of the box and the crossed box diagrams in the complex \( k_0 \) plane. For this purpose we work at threshold where \( p = p' = 0 \) and \( W = M_0 + m \). The singularities are shown in Fig. 2.

(i) If the \( k_0 \) contour for the box diagram is closed in the upper half plane, the pole at \( E_n - E_0(k) + m \) dominates. This pole corresponds to restricting the target ground state to its positive energy mass shell.

(ii) The next largest contributions to the box diagram, and the leading contributions to the crossed box diagram, come from the meson poles. Furthermore, if the \( k_0 \) contour for the box diagram and the crossed box diagrams are closed in the upper half plane, these double meson poles at \( k_0 = m - \omega \) nearly cancel. The sum of these two terms is proportional to

\[ \frac{1}{E_n - E_0 - \omega} - \frac{1}{M_0 - E_n + \omega} = \frac{2(M_0 - E_n)}{\omega^2 - (M_0 - E_n)^2} \]

so that when \( n = 0 \) and \( M_0 = \infty \), the pole calculated in (i) above gives the exact answer (the negative energy poles are also negligible in this case). If \( M_0 = \infty \), an estimate of the ratio of the meson pole contribution to the
dominant target pole contribution, (i) above, is \( \mu'(m+M_\text{n})/4mM_\text{n} \).

(iii) For excited states of the target nucleus, the pole in the box diagram at \( M_\text{n} - E_\text{x}(k) + m \) may overlap the double meson pole or even the negative energy nucleon pole at \(-\epsilon_1\). (This happens when \( A_\text{n} \approx 0 \) or \( 2m \).) Such overlaps, which seem to be a manifestation of dissolution singularities [4], introduce spurious singularities into the equation. However, all of these spurious singularities are eliminated if the contour is closed in the lower half plane. Keeping the pole at \( k_0 = \epsilon_1 \) still permits us to separate out the leading term from the box, but in this case the cancellations in (ii) will go like \((m-\epsilon_1)/\omega^2\), which does not approach zero as \( A \to \infty \). However, this loss of convergence can be accepted since the contributions from excited states are generally smaller anyway.

These observations lead us to write the equation for the projectile target \( t \)-matrix in the following operator form:

\[
T = V + V G^0_t T + V G^0_{e,n} T.
\]  

(6)

where \( G^0_t \) is the propagator for the projectile and the target in its ground state, with the target on its mass shell, and \( G^0_{e,n} \) is the propagator for projectile and excited states of the target, with the projectile on the mass shell. In this equation

\[
1' = \sum \nu' + 1''\,.
\]  

(7)

where \( \nu' \) are the OBE diagrams describing the interaction of the projectile with the \( i \)th nucleon in the target and \( 1'' \) is the sum of all irreducible terms remaining from the full ladder and crossed ladder sum. Points (i)-(iii) imply that \( 1'' \) is very small, and if \( A \) and \( m \) both approach infinity the leading OBE terms are exact [2]. In general eq. (6) sums ladders and crossed ladders exactly if \( 1'' \) is included.

While eq. (6) is an exact formulation of the problem, it is too complicated to be useful. We need a philosophy for identifying leading contributions which will be summed exactly and others which will be treated perturbatively. The philosophy we use is familiar from non-relativistic multiple scattering theories [5]. The leading effects are assumed to arise from multiple scattering through the intermediate states in which the projectile interacts repeatedly with the same target nucleon. This is important compared to the terms where the projectile is interacting with two or more different target particles since the matrix elements of the latter are proportional to (small) correlation functions involving two or more particles. It is not our intention to improve on these basic assumptions, but rather to describe how they can be implemented in a relativistically covariant manner.

For elastic scattering, a convenient first step is to introduce an effective potential \( U \) (the optical potential). In operator form, the \( t \)-matrix in terms of the potential \( U \) is

\[
T = U + U G^0 \, T.
\]  

(8)

where the equation for the optical potential follows from eq. (6):

\[
U = V + V G^0_{e,n} U = V + U G^0_{e,n} V.
\]  

(9a)

\[
U = V + V G^0_{e,n} V + V G^0_{e,n} U G^0_{e,n} V.
\]  

(9b)

Eq. (9a) sums all inelastic contributions; (9b) is convenient for projecting the result onto the elastic subspace needed in eq. (8). For large \( A \), eq. (8) is an effective one-particle equation for the projectile moving in a fixed, instantaneous field generated by the target. If the projectile has spin \( j \), eq. (8) is a Dirac equation.

To take into account all the leading effects from rescattering from the same nucleon, which controls the strong short range NN interaction, we introduce the multiple scattering series as discussed above. To this end, separate \( 1'' \) from \( V \), introduce a new propagator \( g \), such that

\[
i'' = i'' + i'' g i''\,.
\]  

(10)

\[
\nu'' = \nu'' + \nu'' g \nu''\,.
\]  

(11)
where \( V'' = \frac{V'}{A} \). Note that \( g, \) describes the propagation of the \( i \)th nucleon in the nucleus, but is otherwise unspecified. With these definitions, eq. (9a) becomes

\[
U' = i' + \sum_i i'(G^*_{i,s} - G_{i,s})U' + \nu' \left( 1 + G^*_{i,s} \sum_j U' \right).
\]

(12a)

where

\[
U = \sum U'.
\]

(12b)

Eq. (12) is our final result for the optical potential. It gives the exact result for the sum of all ladders and crossed ladder diagrams, and in the nonrelativistic limit \((m \rightarrow 0)\), \( \nu' \rightarrow 0 \).

The propagator \( g, \) should be chosen to minimize the contribution from inelastic channels, so that the second term on the right hand side of eq. (12a) can be treated perturbatively. If these contributions are dominated by one nucleon knockout processes as discussed above and illustrated in fig. 3, choosing \( g, \) to be the propagator with both the heavy \( A-1 \) cluster and the projectile on mass shell will exactly cancel the dominant inelastic contributions from the second term in eq. (12a) and ensure that they are exactly accounted for in the summation of eq. (10) which produces \( i', \) Restricting the \( A-1 \) cluster to its mass shell \( ^4 \) ensures cluster separability of the remaining two nucleon system \([7]\). Eq. (10) for \( i' \) then reduces, in the NN subspace, to the one particle on-shell (spectator) equation previously introduced by one of us \([8]\), the only change being the shift in the total energy of the two-body subspace due to the motion of the \( A-1 \) cluster.

Finally \( U \) can be projected onto the elastic subspace using eq. (9b). This leads to an effective two-body \( t \)-matrix for the first term on the right hand side of eq. (12a) \( (\text{denoted by } \tilde{t}) \) which has both nucleons in the initial and final states off shell and is obtained by quadrature from the spectator amplitude \( t \)

\[
\tilde{t} = \nu_0 + \nu'g, \nu + \nu'g', \nu'.
\]

(13)

Here \( \nu_0 \) is the OBE potential with all four legs off shell (unless one of the legs is projected on-shell by \( g, \)). In applications the first term in eq. (12a) is usually simplified by using the \( t_0 \) approximation and is referred to as the RIA. Our derivation suggests that the full first term of eq. (12a) with \( g, \) defined as in fig. 3 is a more precise definition.

This prescription, with some approximations, is precisely the one recently used to calculate p-\( ^{40}\)Ca scattering at 200 MeV \([9]\). This calculation gives very good results, showing that calculations based on the theory presented here can work very well in practice.

In conclusion, we would like to emphasize that, in the context of the meson exchange model, the projectile-nucleus \( t \)-matrix does not readily assume the form convenient for multiple scattering analysis. In order to obtain a more manageable kernel and the corresponding \( t \)-matrix, we need to consider the explicit cancellations of

\[ \text{Note that the prescription that the } A-1 \text{ cluster be on mass shell has been given in ref. [6].} \]

\[ \sum_i \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Fig. 3. Diagrammatic representation of second order rescattering of the projectile with the same target nucleon through intermediate states in which one nucleon is knocked out and the remaining } A-1 \text{ system is in some excited state } n_{<0} \text{. Choosing } g, \text{ as shown ensures that these leading terms are exactly included in the first term of eq. (12a), and that the other terms are small.}
\end{array} \]
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meson poles between the box diagram and the crossed-box diagram. Once the integral equation for the ℏ-matrix
is obtained, the optical potential can be derived in a straightforward manner. The optical potential can then be
expressed as a multiple scattering series, eq. (12), and in the impulse approximation the ℏ-matrix associated
with the optical potential is found to be the one with one particle on its mass shell.
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and by NASA grant NCCI-42.
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Antideuteron-nucleus absorptive cross sections for intermediate to high energies are calculated using an ion-ion optical model. Good agreement with experiment (within 15 percent) is obtained in this same model for β-nucleus cross sections at laboratory energies up to 15 GeV. We describe a technique for estimating antinucleus-nucleus cross sections from N scientists and suggest that further cosmic ray studies to search for antideuterons and other antinuclei be undertaken.

The search for antimatter in the form of cosmic ray antinuclei is an intriguing and speculative endeavor. Certainly, with present experimental capabilities, producing particles heavier than antiprotons in the laboratory is difficult at best. Indeed, the question as to whether or not one should even search for antinuclei in cosmic rays has been addressed from several different perspectives. One point of view, for example, argues that theoretical abundances, estimated from empirical observations, of antinuclei with \( Z \geq 3 \) are negligible. Although the extreme rarity of antinuclei events may reflect nonconservation of baryon number in our universe, the purpose of this paper is not to address these issues but, rather, to provide a calculational procedure for determining whether or not an antinucleus has interacted with a nucleus. To do this we calculate antinucleus-nucleus total and absorptive cross sections utilizing an optical potential model of antinucleus scattering as described below. Numerical results for a nucleus are presented to illustrate the predictions. Since experimental data for antinucleus-nucleus collisions are nonexistent, predictions for β-nucleus cross sections are made, compared to available experimental data, and are found to be in good agreement (within 15 percent). Comprehensive tabulations of the predicted antinucleus-nucleus cross sections are published elsewhere.

For the scattering of composite nuclei, a general multiple-scattering theory (neglecting three-body interactions) has been developed by Wilson. The series reduces to the usual Watson form when the projectile is elementary. Through the use of the impulse and closure approximations, a simple, folded, optical model potential \( V_{\text{opt}} \) derived as

\[
W(z) = A_x A_T \int d^2 z \rho_T(z) \times \int d^3 y \rho_T(x + v + z) \tau(x, y),
\]

where \( \tau \) is the \( NN \) kinetic energy in the c.m. frame, \( y \) is the \( NN \) relative separation, \( \rho_T \) and \( \rho_x \) are the target and projectile density distributions normalized to unity, \( \tau(x, y) \) is the energy-dependent constituent-averaged two-nucleon transition amplitude obtained from scattering experiments, and \( A_x \) and \( A_T \) are the projectile and target atomic numbers, respectively. With no renormalization of parameter adjustments, this optical potential has previously been used in a Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB) formulation to obtain excellent agreement with experimental elastic scattering differential, reaction, and total cross section data at energies lower than 25 MeV/nucleon. More often, however, this optical potential approximation is used within the context of an eikonal formalism to predict nucleon-nucleus, deuterium-nucleus, and nucleus absorption (inelastic) cross sections to within 3% for energies higher than 80 MeV/particle and to within 10% for lower energies. From eikonal scattering theory, the absorption (reaction) cross section is

\[
\sigma_{\text{abs}} = 2 \pi \int_0^\infty [1 - \exp(-2 \Im X(b))] \, \frac{db}{b},
\]

where the complex phase function is (with \( \delta = 1 \))

\[
X(b) = -(2k)^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} U(b, x) dx,
\]

with \( k \) the projectile momentum wave number and \( b \) denoting the impact parameter. The reduced potential is then obtained from the optical potential as

\[
U(x) = \frac{2m A_x A_T (A_x + A_T)}{W(x)},
\]

where \( m \) is the nucleon mass. Within the eikonal context, this model is similar to the comparable, but alternative, Glauber theory formalism which has been extensively developed by Franco and collaborators. Aside from the improved convergence to the exact multiple-scattering series by the Wilson approximation (due to differences in higher order terms), the Wilson propagator also includes target recoil and terms to order \( k^2 \).

In order to apply Eqs. (1)–(4) to antinucleus-nucleus collisions, several assumptions, other than the applicability of the underlying composite-particle multiple-scattering formalism, are necessary. First, we assume that the num-
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Density distribution for an antinucleus is identical to that of its "normal" nucleon counterpart. Hence, aside from the overall sign of the charge distribution, the antinuclei charge distribution parameters and functional forms are assumed to be identical to those of the corresponding nuclear species. We then extract the number densities \( \rho_4 \) from the corresponding charge densities \( \rho_c \) obtained from electron scattering experiments, by assuming that

\[
\rho_c(r) = \int_0^R \rho_4(r') y_4(r + r') dr',
\]

(5)

where the nucleon charge distribution is taken to be the usual Gaussian form

\[
\rho_4(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_4^2} e^{-r^2/2\sigma_4^2},
\]

(6)

with a nucleon mean-square charge radius set equal to the proton value \( \sigma_4 \) of 0.87 fm.

For elementary projectiles, substitution of (6) into (5) yields a delta function for \( \rho_4 \). For nuclei or antinuclei with \( A < 20 \) we use an harmonic oscillator form for \( \rho_c \) as

\[
\rho_c(r) = \rho_0 \left[ 1 + \frac{r}{a} \right] e^{-r^2/a^2},
\]

(7)

where the charge distribution parameters \( \gamma \) and \( \alpha \) are listed in Table I. Inserting (6) and (7) into (5) yields

\[
\rho_4(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_4^2} \left\{ \left[ 1 + \frac{3\gamma/2}{1.5} \right] - \frac{3\gamma y^3/8a^4}{} \right\} e^{-r^2/2a^2},
\]

(8)

where

\[ a^2 = (\alpha/4) - (r_0^2/6). \]

(9)

For nuclei or antinuclei with \( A \geq 20 \) we choose a Woods-Saxon form

\[
\rho_c(r) = \rho_0 \left[ 1 + \frac{r}{a} \right] e^{-r^2/a^2},
\]

(5)

where \( R \) is the half-density radius, and the surface diffuseness \( \epsilon \) is related to the charge skin thickness \( t_e \) through

\[
t_e = 4.4 \epsilon.
\]

(11)

Values for \( R \) and \( t_e \) are also listed in Table I. Inserting (6) and (10) into (5) yields, after some simplification, a number density \( \rho_4 \) that is of the Woods-Saxon form with the same \( R \), but different overall normalization \( \rho_0 \) and surface thickness. The latter is given (in fm) by

\[
\rho_0 = 5.0 \rho(\beta = 11/13 \beta) \left( 3 \gamma - 11/13 \beta \right)^{-1},
\]

(12)

where

\[
\beta = c_\pi p/(2.54 \sigma_4 t_e).
\]

(13)

In all cases the densities are normalized to unity.

For the antinucleon-nucleon (NN) transition amplitude, \( \tilde{t} \), we assume a form

\[
\tilde{t}(x,y) = \frac{x}{\alpha^2} \sigma_{\text{tot}}(\epsilon) + i \frac{1}{2} \frac{2\pi B(\epsilon)}{a^2},
\]

(14)

which is obtained by taking the Fourier transform of the usual nuclear amplitude. In Eq. (14) \( \sigma_{\text{tot}} \) is the NN total cross section, \( \alpha(x) \) is the real-to-imaginary ratio of the forward amplitude, and \( B(\epsilon) \) is the NN slope parameter.

With this choice for the two-body amplitude we effectively treat antinucleons-nucleus scattering as a purely complementary system to nucleus-nucleus scattering. Values for \( \sigma_{\text{tot}} \) are parametrized in terms of the incident particle momentum \( P \) by

\[
\sigma_{\text{tot}} = (61.2 \text{ mb}) + (53.4 \text{ mb GeV/c}) / P
\]

(15)

which is a modification of the expression given in Ashford et al. to extend the cross sections to 15 GeV. Values for the slope parameter, displayed in Fig. 1, were taken from the Paris NN potential and from Block and Cahm. Values of the parameter \( \alpha \) are not presented for these results since only the imaginary part of the transition amplitude is used to calculate absorption cross sections. Details of the values used for the total cross section estimates are found in Ref. 4.

Predictions for \( p \)-nucleus and \( d \)-nucleus absorption cross sections are displayed in Figs. 2–4. Also plotted in Figs. 2 and 3, for comparison, are data from various experimental measurements. Clearly the agreement between theory and experiment is good since the maximum cross section difference for any of these results is less than 15 percent. Typical differences between theory and experiment are 5 percent. Figure 4 displays predicted \( d \)-nucleus absorptive cross sections for the range from 50 MeV/nucleon to 15 GeV/nucleon. These are provided in the event that techniques for producing antideuterons in the laboratory may become available in the future. Simi-
larly, the possibility of observing antinuclei in cosmic rays may also contribute to the usefulness of this collision model. Indeed a primary cosmic antitrion event was reported at the 18th International Cosmic Ray Conference. Cross sections for antinucleus-nucleus collisions up to Fe-Pb are tabulated in Ref. 4. For all collision pairs, the cross sections, as in Fig. 4, are smooth curves displaying no complicated structure. For optical model calculations, however, this is not entirely unexpected since it merely reflects the averaging nature of the calculation and the smooth functional dependencies of the input NN data.

FIG. 1. N$\bar{N}$ slope parameter values used in the present work. The crosses are our interpolation.

FIG. 2. Theoretical $p$-nucleus absorption cross sections as a function of incident kinetic energy. Experimental values were obtained from Refs. 14–16.

FIG. 3. Theoretical $p$-Pb absorption cross sections as a function of incident kinetic energy. Experimental values are taken from Refs. 15 and 16.
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We have also performed an analysis to investigate the sensitivity of our predictions to the magnitude of the slope parameter. This was done by recalculating antiproton- and Fe-nucleus cross sections for the cases where the NN slope parameters are taken in a rather ad hoc fashion as $2B(e)$ and $B(e)/2$. These slope parameter ranges are displayed in Fig. 5 along with the Brookhaven measurements.\(^{11}\) As anticipated, we found that collisions involving light nuclei are far more sensitive to changes in the slope parameter than collisions involving heavy nuclei, especially at lower energies. For instance, with an assumed slope parameter of 2.8, we find that $\sigma_{abs}$ at 100 MeV/nucleon, increases by 21% for $\bar{p}$-C (629 mb vs 520 mb), but only by 10% for $\bar{p}$-Pb (2528 mb vs 2303 mb). For Fe-Pb at 100 MeV/nucleon, the increase is 6% (5886 mb vs 5542 mb). At 15 GeV/nucleon, the increases for these same collision pairs are 13%, 7%, and 4%, respectively. If the slope parameter is halved (to 0.8), we find that $\sigma_{abs}$ for the same three collision pairs decreases by 13%, 6%, and 4% at 100 MeV/nucleon, and by 9%, 4%, and 3% at 15 GeV/nucleon. Clearly these absorption cross sections are not very sensitive to large changes in the slope parameter.

In summary, we have employed a simple optical model\(^2\) from nucleus-nucleus scattering theory to intermediate energy antinucleon-nucleus collisions. The only new inputs required to complete the calculations are the experimental NN elastic scattering parameters (total cross section, elastic slope parameters, and real-to-imaginary ratio of the forward scattering amplitudes). For the energy range considered here: (100 MeV/nucleon to 15 GeV/nucleon), the eikonal formalism is certainly adequate. Although these methods could be extended to even lower energies,\(^3\) other more suitable methods\(^{19}\) are currently being implemented elsewhere. We have included charge exchange only as it is included in the determination of the Paris NN slope parameters. We have not considered pion propagation effects in the target nucleus, two-body correlation functions, and have ignored possibly important spin and isospin excitations of the target.\(^{17}\) Nevertheless, we find that the model gives rather good agreement with available $\bar{p}$-nucleus data at intermediate energies and expect that the predicted d-nucleus absorption cross sections are reasonably accurate (certainly within 15 percent). While we realize that the production of enough antideuterons in the laboratory (LEAR for example) to produce a beam is in the distant future, the production of such a beam could open up new areas of research since, for example, high temperatures in nuclear matter, may be achievable\(^{20}\) with antideuterons of momentum greater than 2 GeV/c. For now, cosmic ray studies appear to offer the best chance for detecting and studying d and antinuclei interactions such as the reported antitriton event.\(^{17}\)
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Abstract

Results are presented of an analytic relativistic calculation of a OBE nucleon-nucleon (NN) interaction employing the Gross equation. The calculation consists of a non-relativistic reduction that keeps the negative energy states. The result is compared to purely non-relativistic OBEP results and the relativistic effects are separated out. One finds that the resulting relativistic effects are expressible as a power series in $r_1 \cdot r_2$ that agrees, qualitatively, with NN scattering. Upon G-parity transforming this NN potential, one obtains, qualitatively, a short range $\bar{N}N$ spectroscopy in which the S-states are the lowest states.
In the quest to understand short range nuclear forces, many nuclear theorists have embraced QCD and have made progress toward extracting the roles that quarks play. This approach is further fed by the observation that traditional non-relativistic meson exchange models have difficulty providing any new information on these short range forces. In this paper, new results for the short range interactions are presented that arise from a relativistic view of the N-N interaction that contains negative energy states. Preliminary and partial results were presented earlier.\(^{[1]}\)

This relativistic approach is not new; it was introduced by Gross in 1974.\(^{[2]}\) In this present work, that pioneering work is revisited and expanded upon in such a way as to provide further insight into the nature of the short range forces harbored in the relativistic wave equation. It will be shown that, for the One Boson Exchange Potential considered, the short range contribution can be expressed as a power series in \(r_1 - r_2\), the Nucleon-Nucleon isospin operator. This short range contribution is interpreted as a relativistic effect and is a direct result of coupling to negative energy states. It will further be shown that, as a consequence of this relativistic effect, the G-parity transformation of the elastic NN potential\(^{[3]}\) gives rise to a new level ordering prediction, at short ranges, for the Antinucleon-Nucleon (\(\bar{NN}\)) interaction. The final result of the analytic work presented below is a qualitative description of the (NN and \(\bar{NN}\)) interactions, as no numerical values for the exchanged mesons' masses or coupling constants are employed. A word of caution is needed, however; the \(\bar{NN}\) interaction as presented in this paper is not antisymmetrized. The impact that this may have on the short range NN contributions presented here is uncertain; however, it is assumed that antisymmetrization does not apply to \(\bar{NN}\).

The starting point is the Gross equation\(^{[2]}\) for the NN system written as:

\[
(\hat{I}C)_{\mu_\nu}(\vec{p}) = -\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} Y_{\mu',\nu',\mu,\nu}(\vec{p}, \vec{k}, W) G_{\mu',\nu',\mu,\nu}(\vec{k}, W)(\hat{I}C)_{\mu',\nu'}(\vec{k})
\]  

(1)

where

\[
\text{total 4-momentum} = P = (W, \vec{0}); \quad W = \text{total rest mass}
\]

\[
G_{\mu',\nu',\mu,\nu}(\vec{k}, W) = \frac{[M + \frac{W}{2} + \vec{k}]\mu'\nu' [M + \frac{W}{2} - \vec{k}]\nu\mu}{2E_k W (2E_k - W)}
\]

\[
\vec{k} = (k_0, \vec{k}); \vec{p} = (p_0, \vec{p})
\]

\[
\vec{k}_o = E_k - \frac{W}{2}; \quad \vec{p}_o = E_p - \frac{W}{2}
\]

\[
E_k^2 = M^2 + \vec{k}^2, M = \text{nucleon mass}
\]  

(2)

\(\hat{I}\) is the covariant two body vertex function that is state dependent, and \(C\) is the charge conjugation matrix. To facilitate making a non-relativistic reduction in order to expose the analytic structure of the interaction, it is useful to write
\[
\left[ m + \frac{p^2}{2} + k \right]_{\mu'\nu'} = 2M \left( \frac{W}{2E_k} \right) U_{\mu}(\vec{k}) \bar{u}_{\mu'}(\vec{k}) - 2M \left( \frac{2E_k - W}{2E_k} \right) \\
\times u_{\mu'}(-\vec{k}) \bar{u}_{\mu}(\vec{k})
\]

By introducing

\[
\psi^{+}_{rs}(\vec{p}) = \frac{M}{[2W(2\pi)^3]^{1/2}} \frac{\bar{u}_{\mu}(\vec{p}) U_{\mu'}(-\vec{p}) \bar{u}_{\mu'}(\vec{p})}{E_p (2E_p - W)}
\]

\[
\psi^{-}_{rs}(\vec{p}) = \frac{-M}{[2W(2\pi)^3]^{1/2}} \frac{\bar{u}_{\mu}(\vec{p}) U_{\mu'}(\vec{p}) \bar{u}_{\mu'}(\vec{p})}{E_p W}
\]

where \( \psi^{+} \) and \( \psi^{-} \) are the positive and negative energy momentum space wave functions respectively, the following set of coupled equations can be extracted:

\[
(2E_p - W)\psi^{+}_{rs}(\vec{p}) = -\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ V^{++}\psi^{+}_{r's'}(\vec{k}) + V^{+-}\psi^{-}_{r's'}(\vec{k}) \right\}
\]

\[
-W\psi^{-}_{rs}(\vec{p}) = -\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ V^{-+}\psi^{+}_{r's'}(\vec{k}) + V^{-}\psi^{-}_{r's'}(\vec{k}) \right\}
\]

The \( V^{++}, V^{+-}, V^{-+}, \) and \( V^{-} \) are related to the one particle on the mass shell interaction kernels \( V_{\mu'\nu'} \) by:

\[
V^{++} = \frac{M^2}{E_k E_p} \bar{u}_{\mu}(\vec{p}) \bar{u}_{\nu}(\vec{k}) V_{\mu'\nu', \mu'\nu'} u_{\mu'}(\vec{k}) u_{\nu'}(-\vec{k})
\]

\[
V^{+-} = \frac{M^2}{E_k E_p} \bar{u}_{\mu}(\vec{p}) \bar{u}_{\nu}(\vec{k}) V_{\mu'\nu', \mu'\nu'} u_{\mu'}(\vec{k}) u_{\nu'}(-\vec{k})
\]

\[
V^{-+} = \frac{M^2}{E_k E_p} \bar{u}_{\mu}(\vec{p}) \bar{u}_{\nu}(\vec{k}) V_{\mu'\nu', \mu'\nu'} u_{\mu'}(\vec{k}) u_{\nu'}(\vec{k})
\]

\[
V^{-} = \frac{M^2}{E_k E_p} \bar{u}_{\mu}(\vec{p}) \bar{u}_{\nu}(\vec{k}) V_{\mu'\nu', \mu'\nu'} u_{\mu'}(\vec{k}) u_{\nu'}(\vec{k})
\]

Of course, the non-antisymmetrized \( V_{\mu'\nu', \mu'\nu'} \) represent meson exchanges and, as is customary, these interactions will be approximated by single boson exchanges; namely, \( \pi, \sigma, \rho, \) and \( \omega. \) One notes that there is no concern at present for the numerical values of the masses and coupling constants of these bosons. Thus there is no concern that the interaction not reproduce the NN phases, effective ranges, etc. One quite simply want to compare qualitative features of the relativistic interaction to that of the non-relativistic interaction. This is performed by, essentially, subtracting the non-relativistic interaction from the relativistic interaction presented here. That is, the limit as \( r \to 0 \) is taken. What remains from this procedure is what one considers the relativistic effect or simply, the interaction difference. To arrive at results that can be treated analytically, a non-
relativistic reduction is performed that keeps the negative energy states. Having stated this, one continues with the calculation.

Employing expansion approximations such as \( \frac{(E_p + M)(E_k + M)}{E_k} \approx 4 \) and \( \frac{(E_p + M)(E_k + M)}{M^2} \approx 4 \) with \( (E_p + M)^{-1}(E_k + M)^{-1} = \frac{1}{4M^2}(1 - \frac{p^2}{4M^2} - \frac{k^2}{4M^2} + \cdots) \). After quite a bit of algebra, equation 5 is reduced to

\[
\left[ \frac{p^2}{M} - \frac{p^4}{4M^3} - \epsilon \right] \psi^+\bar{\psi} - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{m^2 + q^2} \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{4M^2} \left[ 2i\mathbf{q} \cdot (2\mathbf{q} \times \mathbf{k}) + 2\mathbf{k}^2 \right] \psi^+\bar{\psi} \mathbf{q} + \frac{\mathbf{q}^2}{2M} \cdot (2\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}) \psi^+\bar{\psi} \mathbf{q} \right \}
\]

for the sigma exchange only. Equation 11 is the result of keeping the lowest order of \( \frac{p}{M} \) or \( \frac{q}{M} \) compared to the leading term. Equation 11 as well as the other boson exchange contributions can now be Fourier Transformed to configuration space. (Similarly treated is equation 6.) The motivation for going to configuration space is the ease in which non-relativistic and relativistic contributions can be compared. Traditionally, non-relativistic potentials are always presented in position space. Keeping in mind that we seek only qualitative comparisons, we then transform our momentum space reduction into position space.

The resulting configuration space coupled equations are written:

\[
- \left( \frac{\nabla^2}{M} + \frac{\nabla^4}{4M^3} + \epsilon \right) \psi^+\bar{\psi} = -V^{++}(\mathbf{r}) \psi^+\bar{\psi} - V^{+-}(\mathbf{r}) \psi^-\bar{\psi}
\]

\[
-2M \psi^-\bar{\psi} = -V^{-+}(\mathbf{r}) \psi^+\bar{\psi} - V^{--}(\mathbf{r}) \psi^-\bar{\psi}
\]

The results of Equation 12 and 13 are not new. Gross presented these equations(2) without the quartic derivative operator.

The potentials \( V^{++}, V^{+-}, V^{-+}, \) and \( V^{--} \) are:

\[
V^{++} = u_e + \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \psi_{ss} + \tilde{S}_{12} \psi_T + \mathbf{L} \cdot \tilde{S}_{LS}
\]

\[
V^{+-} = \frac{i\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \psi_T - \frac{i\sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_T + \frac{\mathbf{r} \cdot \tilde{S} \cdot \mathbf{v}_T}{2\mathbf{r}} - \frac{i\tilde{S} \cdot \mathbf{v}_T}{2\mathbf{r}}
\]

\[
V^{-+} = (\psi^{-+})^\dagger
\]

\[
V^{--} = V_{\sigma}^\sigma \frac{\mathbf{L} \cdot \tilde{S}}{Mr} \cdot \mathbf{v}_T + \frac{\mathbf{v}_T}{Mr} + \frac{(\frac{3}{2} + 2k\omega)}{Mr} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot \tilde{S} \mathbf{v}_T^\sigma
\]

\[
+ \frac{2\mathbf{r}_L \cdot \left[ \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \psi_{e}^T + \tilde{S}_{12} \mathbf{v}_T + \mathbf{v}_T - \frac{(\frac{3}{2} + 2k\omega)}{Mr} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot \tilde{S} \mathbf{v}_T^\sigma \right] + \text{higher order terms}
\]
where

\[ u_c = V_o^\sigma + V_o^\omega + \tilde{r}_2 V_o^\rho \]

\[ u_{ss} = \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \left[ V_2^\sigma \frac{m^2}{6M^2} (1 + k_\rho)^2 V_o^\rho \right] + \frac{m^2}{6M^2} (1 + k_\omega)^2 V_o^\omega \]

\[ u_T = \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \left[ V_2^\sigma - (1 + R_\rho)^2 \right] - (1 + k_\omega)^2 V_2^\omega \]

\[ u_{LS} = -\frac{m_\pi}{M} \left[ V_1^\sigma + (1.5 + 2k_\omega) V_1^\omega + \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 ((1.5 + 2k_\rho) V_1^\rho) \right] \quad (18) \]

and

\[ x = rm_x \]

\[ V_1^- = -\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 V_1^\rho \]

\[ V_2^- = V_1^\sigma - \frac{1}{2} k_\omega V_1^\omega - \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \frac{k_\rho}{2} V_1^\rho \]

\[ V_3^- = -(1 + k_\omega) V_1^\omega - \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 (1 + k_\rho) V_1^\rho \]

\[ v_\eta = \frac{1}{M} \left[ V_o^\sigma + V_o^\omega + \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 V_o^\rho \right] \]

\[ V_o^\sigma (r) = \frac{g_2^2}{4\pi} m_\pi \frac{e^{-\nu x}}{x}; \quad \text{where } \alpha = \frac{m_\pi}{m_x} \]

\[ V_1^\sigma (r) = \frac{g_2^2}{4\pi} \frac{m_x^2}{2M} \frac{e^{-\nu x}}{x} \left( \alpha + \frac{1}{x} \right) \]

\[ V_o^\omega (r) = \frac{g_2^2}{4\pi} \frac{m_x^3}{12M^2} \frac{e^{-\nu x}}{x} \]

\[ V_1^\omega (r) = \frac{\lambda g_2^2}{4\pi} \frac{m_x^2}{2M} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{x} \right) \frac{e^{-\nu x}}{x} \]

\[ V_2^\omega (r) = \frac{g_2^2}{4\pi} \frac{m_x^3}{12M^2} \left( 1 + \frac{3}{x} + \frac{3}{x^2} \right) \frac{e^{-\nu x}}{x} \]

\[ V_o^{\rho,\omega} (r) = \frac{g_2^2}{4\pi} m_\pi \frac{e^{-\rho x,\omega x}}{x}; \quad \rho = \frac{m_\rho}{m_x}; \quad \omega = \frac{m_\omega}{m_x} \]

\[ V_1^{\rho,\omega} (r) = \frac{g_2^2}{4\pi} \frac{m_x^3}{M} \frac{e^{-\rho x}}{x} \left( \rho + \frac{1}{x} \right); \quad \rho' = \rho \text{ or } \omega \]

\[ V_2^{\rho,\omega} (r) = \frac{g_2^2}{4\pi} \frac{m_x^3}{12M^2} \frac{e^{-\rho x}}{x} \left( \rho^2 + \frac{3\rho x}{x} + \frac{3}{x^2} \right) \quad (19) \]

These relations are well known\(^{(2)}\) and one can verify them. The next step is to uncouple Equations 12 and 13 to obtain a single Schroedinger like equation. One finds that

\[ -\left( \frac{\nabla^2}{M} + \epsilon \right) \psi^+ (r) = - (V^{++} - V_R) \psi^+ (r) \quad (20) \]
where

\[ V_R = \frac{\nabla^4}{4M^2} + V^{++} - \frac{1}{2M} \left( 1 - \frac{V^{--}}{2M} \right) V^{--} \]  \hspace{1cm} (21)

This is the non-relativistic reduction to be examined. In all of the work that follows, \( V^{--} \) has been neglected. Thus

\[ V_R = \frac{\nabla^4}{4M^2} + \frac{|V^{++}|^2}{2M} \]  \hspace{1cm} (22)

One can show, through the employment of spin and angular momentum "aerobics" that equation 20 is equivalent to

\[ -\left( \frac{\nabla^2}{M} + \epsilon \right) \Phi = -\left( V_T - \frac{\nabla^4}{4M^2} \right) \Phi \]  \hspace{1cm} (23)

where

\[ \Phi = \left( 1 + \frac{v^2}{2} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (24)

and

\[ V_T = V_c + \partial_1 \cdot \partial_2 V_{ss} + \hat{S}_{12} V_{S12} + \hat{L} \cdot \hat{S} V_{LS} + \hat{L} \cdot \hat{D} V_{LD} \]  \hspace{1cm} (25)

The V's are the same as those described in reference 2 and are a convoluted arrangement of \( \pi \), \( \rho \), \( \sigma \), and \( \omega \) potentials.

For the next phase of the calculation, one can proceed either from Equation 25 or from the potential found in Equation 21. Proceeding from the former choice, one finds after performing some algebra and keeping only the largest contributions as \( r \to 0 \):

\[ V_C = a_c + b_c \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 + c_c (\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)^2 - a'_c - b'_c \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 - c'_c (\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)^2 \]
\[ V_{LS} = -a_{LS} - b_{LS} \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 - c_{LS} (\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)^2 \]
\[ V_{S12} = -a_{S12} - b_{S12} \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 + c_{S12} (\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)^2 \]
\[ V_{ss} = a_{ss} + b_{ss} \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 + c_{ss} (\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)^2 \]
\[ V_{LD} = a_{LD} + b_{LD} \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 + c_{LD} (\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (26)

where the a's, b's and c's are positive definite and, to the leading term, are given by

\[ a_c = \frac{\xi}{3} F V_o^{\omega^2} \quad ; \quad b_c = \frac{(12 + 3k_p)}{8p} V_o^{\rho V_o^{\omega^2}} \quad ; \quad c_c = (4 + 3k_p + 3k_p^2) \frac{\xi}{3} V_o^{\rho^2} \]
\[ a'_c = G V_o^{\omega^2} \quad ; \quad b'_c = 3G V_o^{\rho V_o^{\omega^2}} \quad ; \quad c'_c = 3G V_o^{\rho^2} \]
\[ a_{ss} = \frac{\xi}{3} V_o^{\omega^2} \quad ; \quad b_{ss} = \frac{\xi}{3} (1 + 3k_p) V_o^{\rho V_o^{\omega^2}} \quad ; \quad c_{ss} = \frac{\xi}{3} V_o^{\rho^2} \]
\[ a_{LD} = 2F V_o^{\rho V_o^{\omega^2}} \quad ; \quad b_{LD} = F V_o^{\rho V_o^{\omega}} \quad ; \quad c_{LD} = F V_o^{\rho^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (27)
\[ a_{S12} = \frac{\xi}{3} V_o^{\omega^2} \quad ; \quad b_{S12} = \frac{\xi}{3} (1 + 3k_p) V_o^{\rho V_o^{\omega^2}} \quad ; \quad c_{S12} = \frac{k_p}{12} (3 + 2k_p) V_o^{\rho^2} \]
\[ a_{LS} = F V_o^{\omega^2} \quad ; \quad b_{LS} = 3F V_o^{\rho V_o^{\omega}} \quad ; \quad c_{LS} = \frac{\xi}{3} V_o^{\rho^2} \]

and

\[ \textit{ORIGI\textsc{NAL} CASES IS}\]

\[ \textit{OF POOR QUALITY} \]
One notes that in this limit the pion contributions can be neglected compared to the other terms. To obtain the $\vec{NN}$ potentials for small distances, one G-parity transforms the NN potentials of Equation 26. This effectively changes the sign of the omega coupling constant and, thus, changes the sign of the corresponding coefficients.

The final ingredients that we need before making concluding remarks are the spin matrix elements; all but $L \cdot \vec{D}$ can be found elsewhere and the $L \cdot \vec{D}$ matrix elements are found in reference 2. For $^{33}P_0$ $\vec{NN}$, one finds $L = -2$, $S_{12} = -4$, $\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 = 1$, and $\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 = 1$. For $^{13}P_0$ $\vec{NN}$, one finds that only $\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$ changes; $\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 = -3$. Both of these $\vec{NN}^3P_0$ states have the same $L \cdot \vec{D}$. Making the substitutions into Equation 25 gives the qualitative result that the $^{13}P_0$ potential lies higher than the $^{33}P_0$; a result in agreement with the numerical work of other researchers. Furthermore, through similar arguments, one finds that the $^{11}S_0$ $\vec{NN}$ states are more repulsive than their isovector counterparts. Hence, $^{11}S_0 > ^{31}S_0$, $^{11}P_1 > ^{31}P_1$, $^{11}D_2 > ^{31}D_2$, etc.

These qualitative results should be unaffected by a more complete interaction since it is well known that the omega meson exchange dominates the short range interaction. The omega meson exchange is included explicitly here. More complete interaction models should vary only in their quantitative results such as the amount of energy level shift. It is not clear if the results presented here will affect the $\vec{pp}$ Coulombic state widths. Although, theoretical approaches generally "cut-off" the $\vec{pp}$ interaction inside 1 fm, investigating how relativistic effects affect Coulombic state widths is worth pursuing.

In conclusion, to obtain analytic results, the Gross equation was examined in a non-relativistic reduction of the NN interaction that keeps the negative energy states. The NN interaction was chosen to be a one boson exchange consisting of $\pi, \sigma, \rho, \omega$. The reduction was then applied to the real part of the $\vec{NN}$ interaction via G-parity. To get a qualitative feeling for what coupling to the negative energy states provides, a short distance limit was taken. One might expect that the difference between relativistic and non-relativistic theoretical descriptions would show up at short distance. This work finds that indeed that is the case; for the $^{11}S_0$ has a real $\vec{NN}$ potential that is more attractive than that of the $^{13}P_0$; a result rather different from reference 3. The fact that this is the case at very short distance for this work or any other work may be worrisome since annihilation was not taken into account. On the other hand, there is no conclusive evidence that annihilation contributes any more than giving the states widths. Furthermore, this "relativistic effect" may start to be evident at ranges as long as 0.4 fm in some channels. An effort is already underway to include annihilation in order to calculate cross sections and other effects. One final note is that the level orderings are directly related to the isospin coherences of Equations 26 and

\[ F = \frac{m^2}{M^2 + \left(1 + \frac{r^2}{4}ight)} \quad ; \quad G = \frac{m^2 \pi^2}{4m^2} \quad ; \quad D_T = 1 + \frac{r^2}{4} \]

One notes that in this limit the pion contributions can be neglected compared to the other terms. To obtain the $\vec{NN}$ potentials for small distances, one G-parity transforms the NN potentials of Equation 26. This effectively changes the sign of the omega coupling constant and, thus, changes the sign of the corresponding coefficients.
from a purely non-relativistic viewpoint this can be thought of as a result, in part, of adding the contribution of a $Z$ graph.\footnote{\textsuperscript{5}}
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Lattice gauge calculations (1) for static (heavy) quarks support the notion that the interquark potential in quantum chromodynamics (QCD) behaves as \( V(r) \sim \lambda r \) for large \( r \). Indeed, the linear potential has long been used in phenomenological nonrelativistic quark models of baryons and mesons (2, 3). Meson spectroscopy in particular is successfully described by a linear potential at large \( r \), modified by spin- and colour-dependent Coulomb forces at small \( r \). Most calculations with the linear potential are carried out in coordinate space. This is the simplest procedure for heavy-quark systems, which can perhaps be considered as nonrelativistic; however for light-quark systems it would be desirable to have a relativistic treatment. Bound-state equations in relativistic systems (4) are generally much easier to solve than in space, and thus we are led to consider, as a starting point for the relativistic case, the Schrödinger equation for two scalar particles interacting by a linear potential. The methods developed will generalize relatively straightforwardly to relativistic treatments.

To summarize: here, we treat the Schrödinger equation for a linear \( r \)-space potential. The method is for the most part straightforward, the only difficulty arising from the singularity of the kernel at the origin of momentum space. Previous treatments (5) have been limited in the sense that the singularity was handled by screening the \( r \)-space potential:

\[
V(r) = \lambda r e^{-\nu}
\]

What has perhaps not been generally appreciated is that the limit \( \eta \to 0 \) can be taken analytically. Previous treatments keep the parameter \( \eta \) finite, leading to some uncertainty as to the nature of the calculated eigenvalues and wave functions. In this connection, recall that the screened linear potential does not, strictly speaking, possess true bound states, instead it has scattering resonances, which for low energy approximate the bound states of the unscreened potential. We will extract the limit of zero screening analytically, using a subtraction technique. The resulting subtracted integral equation is relatively easy to handle numerically. An alternative procedure, not employing any subtraction, and leading to a different integrodifferential equation is presented in ref. 6. Our approach is easy to implement and generalizes without difficulty to higher partial waves. The Schrödinger equation for the \( \lambda \)th partial wave is (with the inhomogeneous term already omitted, as it will not contribute to the bound states in the limit of zero screening):

\[
\frac{L^2}{2\mu} \phi_\lambda(p) + \int V(p,p') \phi_\lambda(p') p'^2 dp' = E \phi_\lambda(p)
\]

Here \( \mu = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2) \) is the reduced mass and \( V_\mu \) given by

\[
V(p,p') = \frac{\lambda}{\pi} \left[ \frac{Q^2(p) + \eta^2}{(pp')^2} \right]^{1/2}
\]

is the \( \lambda \)th partial-wave component of the Fourier transform of \( V \):

\[
\hat{V}(p,p') = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi^2} \left[ \frac{2}{((p' - p)^2 + \eta^2)^2} - \frac{8 \eta^2}{((p' - p)^2 + \eta^2)^3} \right]
\]

The variable \( y \) is given by:

\[
y = \frac{p'^2 + \eta^2}{2pp'}
\]
$Q'(y)$ and $Q''(y)$ are the first and second derivatives (with respect to $y$) of the Legendre function of the second kind. To illustrate the method we specialize to $s$-waves, where we find by contour integration

$$[6] \quad \int V(p,p') p'^2 \, dp' = \frac{\lambda}{\pi} \int dp' \left[ Q'_d(y) + \frac{\eta^2}{pp'} Q''_d(y) \right]$$

$$= \frac{\lambda}{\pi} \left[ \frac{-\eta p^2}{\eta} + \frac{\eta p^2}{\eta} \right] = 0$$

Note that when $\eta = 0$, $Q'_d(y)$ and $Q''_d(y)$ have double and quadruple poles, respectively, at $p' = p$, so that their integrals do not exist separately. Nevertheless, the two terms added together produce a function with an integrable singularity. This is illustrated in Fig. 1, which shows the kernel as a function of $p'$ for fixed $p$. One observes that there is a central maximum at $p' = p$ with height scaling as $1/\eta^2$. Rankeled by two minima at $p' = \pm 2$, where heights also scale with $1/\eta^2$. The integral vanishes [6] and this allows us to rewrite the Schrödinger equation in subtracted form

$$[7] \quad \frac{\mu p^2}{2} \phi(p) + \frac{\lambda}{\pi} \int \left[ \frac{Q'_d(y)}{(pp')^2 + \eta^2} + \frac{Q''_d(y)}{(pp')^2} \right]$$

$$\times \left[ \phi(p') - \phi(p) \right] p'^2 \, dp' = E \phi(p) \quad \text{for } \eta = 0.075 \text{ with fixed } p = 2.$$

The limit $\eta \to 0$ now exists, and may be extracted by splitting the region of integration to isolate the singularity. We write

$$[8] \quad \int dp' \left[ Q'_d(y) + \frac{\eta^2}{pp'} Q''_d(y) \right] \left[ \phi(p') - \phi(p) \right]$$

$$= \int_0^{-\eta} + \int_0^{\eta} + \int_0^\infty$$

$$= A + B + C$$

The limits $p \pm \eta$ are chosen so that all three extrema of the kernel lie in the middle region $B$. The explicit forms of the Legendre functions are

$$Q'_d(y) = \frac{1}{1 - y^2}$$

$$Q''_d(y) = \frac{1}{(1 - y^2)^2}$$

$$\lim_{\eta \to 0} B = \lim_{\eta \to 0} \int_0^{-\eta} \int_0^{p + x} \left[ \left( \frac{p + x}{p + y} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{(p + 2p')^2 + \eta^2} \right] \left\{ \frac{x^3 + x^2}{2} \phi'' + \frac{x^3}{2} \phi' \right\}$$

$$= \left[ \eta^2(1 + p^2)^2 + p' + \eta^2 \right] \left[ \left( \frac{-1}{\eta^2 + \eta^2} + \frac{1}{(x + 2p')^2 + \eta^2} \right] \left\{ \frac{x^3}{2} \phi'' + \frac{x^3}{2} \phi' \right\} = \lim_{\eta \to 0} B_1 + \lim_{\eta \to 0} B_2$$

Scaling out $4\eta$ then results in

$$[11] \quad \lim_{\eta \to 0} B_1 = \lim_{\eta \to 0} \int_0^{\eta} \left[ (4\eta) \, dy \, \left( \frac{p}{4\eta} + y \right) \left( \frac{-16v}{y + 16y^2} \right) \right] \left( 4\eta \right) \phi'(p') + \frac{(4\eta)^3}{2} \phi'' + \ldots$$

$$= \int_0^{\eta} \left. \left( \frac{-16v}{y + 16y^2} \right) \right|_1 = 0$$

FIG. 1. The singularity structure of the kernel is shown for finite $\eta = 0.075$ with fixed $p = 2$. It is clear that for $p' \neq p$, as is the case in the integrals $A$ and $C$, the limit $\eta \to 0$ is innocuous, and may be taken immediately. Indeed one has

$$\lim_{\eta \to 0} \left[ A + C \right]$$

where $P$ denotes as usual, the Cauchy principal value of the integral, which has been made well defined by the subtraction. The term $B$ must be handled with care, however, since $p' = p$ inside the region of integration. Assuming $\phi(p')$ is analytic in the neighborhood of $p$, and making an obvious change of variable, we find
The contribution of the second term in B1 clearly vanishes since it is not singular at \( \rho^* = \rho \), the analysis of B2 is similar, and we conclude that B tends to zero. Therefore the limiting form of the equation is

\[
\frac{\rho^2}{2\mu} \phi_{\rho}(\rho) - \frac{\lambda}{\rho^2} \int_0^{\rho^*} \frac{4 p^2 p'^2}{(p^2 - p'^2)^2} \left[ \phi_{\rho}(p') - \phi_{\rho}(\rho) \right] = E \phi_{\rho}(\rho)
\]

We now discuss the numerical solution of (12), which is not yet a completely trivial matter, since care must be taken to obtain the Cauchy principal value. In this respect there is a difference between the linear potential and the Coulomb potential, the latter giving rise to a logarithmic singularity. For the Coulomb potential, the method used in the literature (7) is to write the Coulomb analog of (12) directly, for example, using Gaussian quadrature, as a matrix equation. Since the singularity is only logarithmic this method is successful for the Coulomb potential. Here, such an approach is not feasible. Instead, we expand \( \phi_\omega \) in a suitable set of basis functions.

\[
\phi_{\rho}(\rho) = \sum_{\omega} \phi_{\rho,\omega}(\rho)
\]

Inserting this expansion in (12), multiplying by \( p^2 g_{\rho,\omega}(p) \) and integrating over \( p \), we obtain

\[
\sum_{\omega} \phi_{\rho,\omega}(\rho) = E \sum_{\omega} C_{\omega} \int p^2 g_{\rho,\omega}(p) \phi_{\rho}(p) \, dp + \frac{\lambda}{\rho^2} \int \frac{4 p^2 p'^2}{(p^2 - p'^2)^2} g_{\rho,\omega}(p) \right] \phi_{\rho}(p') - \phi_{\rho}(\rho) \right) \, dp' \, dp = E \sum_{\omega} C_{\omega} \int p^2 g_{\rho,\omega}(p) \phi_{\rho}(p) \, dp
\]

which is just the matrix equation

\[
\sum_{\omega} A_{\omega,\omega} C_{\omega} = E \sum_{\omega} G_{\omega,\omega} C_{\omega}
\]

The double integral over \( p \) and \( p' \) is performed by changing to variables \( (p^* + p) \) and \( (p^* - p) \). The singularity is in the integral over \( (p^* - p) \), so this is carried out first using Gaussian quadrature with an even number of points. This type of integration yields the Cauchy principal value automatically (8). A convenient set of functions \( g(p) \) is

\[
g_{\rho}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\left( n(N)^2 + \rho^2 \right)}
\]

where \( N \) is the maximum number of functions used in expansion [13]. Figure 2 is a 3D plot of the kernel of [14], showing clearly the cancellation that leads to the principal value. Using the above method, we have calculated both eigenvalues and eigenvectors. In Table 1 the first 12 eigenvalues are listed. We used \( m_u = m_d = 1.5 \text{ GeV} \) and the string tension \( \lambda = 5 \text{ GeV}^2 \). One can see that the lower eigenvalues converge nicely as the number of functions is increased. We compare these with the eigenvalues obtained from a coordinate space calculation (integrating the equation out from \( r = 0 \) and in from large \( r \), and matching the logarithmic derivatives at the classical turning point), in Table 1. The calculated eigenfunctions also agree with the coordinate space calculation.
In conclusion, we have treated the problem of two nonrelativistic, scalar particles interacting via a linear potential in momentum space. The relevant Schrödinger equation has a singular kernel. We have shown how after regulating the singularity by exponentially screening the r-space potential, the severity of the singularity can be reduced by a suitable subtraction, and the limit of zero screening extracted analytically. To the best of our knowledge, this point has not been generally understood in the literature. The limiting form of the equation has been treated numerically, and the results are in good agreement with more straightforward coordinate space calculations. Relativistic equations involving linear potentials involve similar singularities, so that the methods developed here will be applicable. We intend to study the relativistic quark-antiquark problem in the future. The method presented here can be generalized to higher partial waves without undue difficulty.
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