

η -nucleon scattering length and effective range

A. M. Green*

*Department of Physics, University of Helsinki and Helsinki Institute of Physics, P.O. Box 9, FIN-00014, Finland*S. Wycech[†]*Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland*

(Received 28 February 1997)

The coupled $\eta N, \pi N$ system is described by a K -matrix method. The parameters in this model are adjusted to get an optimal fit to $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$, $\pi N \rightarrow \eta N$, and $\gamma N \rightarrow \eta N$ data in an energy range of about 100 MeV each side of the η threshold. In the notation $T^{-1} + iq_\eta = 1/a + (r_0/2)q_\eta^2 + sq_\eta^4$, q_η being the momentum in the ηN center of mass, the resulting effective range parameters for ηN scattering are found to be a (fm) = 0.75(4) + i 0.27(3), r_0 (fm) = -1.50(13) - i 0.24(4), and s (fm³) = -0.10(2) - i 0.01(1). [S0556-2813(97)50705-9]

PACS number(s): 13.75.Gx, 25.80.-e, 25.40.Ve

The pion-nucleon and pion-nucleus interactions have been much studied, both theoretically and experimentally, for many years. However, the corresponding interactions of the η meson, mainly because of the lack of η -beams, have—by comparison—been neglected. The main interest in η 's has been the possibility of η -nuclear quasibound states. Such states were first predicted by Haider and Liu [1] and Li *et al.* [2], when it was realized that the η -nucleon interaction was attractive. Calculations by Ueda indicated [3] that this may happen already in the η -deuteron system. If these states exist, then one may expect them to be narrow in few-nucleon systems, and so be easier to detect there. The first verification of this hypothesis was made by Wilkin [4], who has suggested that an indirect effect of such a state is seen in the rapid slope of the $pd \rightarrow {}^3\text{He} \eta$ amplitude detected just above the η production threshold [5]. Also an indication of strong three-body ηpp correlations follows from the measurement of the $pp \rightarrow pp \eta$ cross sections in the threshold region [6].

It has been shown in Ref. [7] that the strengths of ηd interactions, in particular the magnitude of the scattering length in this system and the position of quasibound or virtual state are very sensitive to the value of the ηN scattering length. Moreover, the behavior of the ηN scattering matrix off the energy shell was found to be important. In order that these η -nucleus studies can be put on a firmer foundation, it is, therefore, necessary that a better parametrization of the basic η -nucleon interaction be available. With this in mind, a three channel analysis of the η -nucleon (ηN), pion-nucleon (πN), and the two-pion-nucleon ($\pi \pi N$) three-body system is carried out. This is done in terms of a K matrix based on pion-nucleon amplitudes and η -production cross sections—the actual data being the πN amplitudes of Arndt *et al.* [8], the $\pi N \rightarrow \eta N$ cross sections reviewed by Nefkens [9], and the $\gamma p \rightarrow \eta p$ data of Krusche *et al.* [10]. In Ref. [11] it is shown that the photoproduction cross section runs essentially parallel to the electroproduction cross section in the region some 100 MeV above threshold. Therefore, including elec-

troproduction data into the following analysis is not expected to lead to a different conclusion.

This analysis is now carried out and, we believe, it improves analyses done directly in terms of resonant T matrices. The main motivation for this study is to extract the η -nucleon scattering length *and* effective range and to determine in these quantities the uncertainties allowed by the existing data. The next check and refinement is expected to follow from the few-body η physics.

For s -wave scattering in a system consisting of the two channels πN and ηN —here denoted simply by the indices π and η —the K matrix, which is essentially a generalization of the scattering length, and the T matrix that follows from it, can be written as

$$\hat{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K_{\pi\pi} & K_{\eta\pi} \\ K_{\pi\eta} & K_{\eta\eta} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{A_{\pi\pi}}{1 - iq_\pi A_{\pi\pi}} & \frac{A_{\eta\pi}}{1 - iq_\eta A_{\eta\eta}} \\ \frac{A_{\pi\eta}}{1 - iq_\eta A_{\eta\eta}} & \frac{A_{\eta\eta}}{1 - iq_\eta A_{\eta\eta}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where $q_{\pi,\eta}$ are the center-of-mass momenta of the two mesons in the two channels π, η . The channel scattering lengths A_{ij} are expressed in terms of the K -matrix elements, via the solution of $T = K + iKQT$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\pi\pi} &= K_{\pi\pi} + iK_{\pi\eta}^2 q_\eta / (1 - iq_\eta K_{\eta\eta}), \\ A_{\eta\pi} &= K_{\eta\pi} / (1 - iq_\pi K_{\pi\pi}), \\ A_{\eta\eta} &= K_{\eta\eta} + iK_{\eta\pi}^2 q_\pi / (1 - iq_\pi K_{\pi\pi}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

These equations form a basis in which to describe two channel scattering in terms of the parameters of the K matrix. These K matrices must account for several observed features of the experimental data—in particular:

(a) The S -wave πN resonances $S(1535)$ and $S(1650)$. The effect of these is inserted as poles at $E = E_0$ and E_1 ,

*Electronic mail: green@phcu.helsinki.fi

[†]Electronic mail: wycech@fuw.edu.pl

which are treated as free parameters. However, their values are expected to be near 1535 MeV and 1650 MeV. Differences arise, since $E_{0,1}$ are renormalized by the presence of two background terms $K_{\pi\eta}$ and $K_{\eta\eta}$, which describe other forms of the interactions and channel couplings not included explicitly.

(b) Experimentally, the η does not appear to couple to the $S(1650)$ resonance, and so this coupling is not included in the model.

(c) There is a small correction for inelasticities of the $S(1535)$ and $S(1650)$ due to couplings to the two-pion nucleon channel. This is treated in an ‘‘optical potential manner,’’ which means the introduction of the two-pion channel K matrix and its subsequent elimination. This leads to a complex correction to the two channel K matrix. For example, the $S(1535)$ has a coupling to the three-body channel described by a singular K matrix $K_{3,3} = \gamma_3/(E_0 - E)$ and its coupling to the two-body channels by $K_{3,i} = \sqrt{\gamma_3}\sqrt{\gamma_i}/(E_0 - E)$, where $i = \pi, \eta$. In the three-body channel, there is a relative momentum equivalent to the above q_i . This is a three-body phase space element q_3 . It may be included together with the coupling parameter γ_3 into a small contribution to the width of the $S(1535)$ width $\Gamma_{\pi\pi}/2 = \sqrt{\gamma_3}q_3\sqrt{\gamma_3}$. Only this combination of the two-pion parameters enters the correction to the K matrix of the two channel problem. In principle, it should be proportional to the three-body phase space, and this energy dependence has been accounted for. Now, the correction to the basic two channel K matrix, which stems from the three-body channel is readily obtained to be

$$\delta K_{i,j}^0 = i \frac{K_{i,3}q_3K_{3,j}}{1 - iq_3K_{3,3}}. \quad (3)$$

A similar procedure is applied to describe the slightly higher inelasticity of the $S(1650)$ resonance.

These features are included in the K matrices as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\pi\pi} &\rightarrow \frac{\gamma_\pi(0)}{E_0 - E} + \frac{\gamma_\pi(1)}{E_1 - E} + i \frac{K_{\pi 3}q_3K_{3\pi}}{1 - iq_3K_{33}}, \\ K_{\pi\eta} &\rightarrow K_{\pi\eta} + \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_\pi(0)\gamma_\eta}}{E_0 - E} + i \frac{K_{\pi 3}q_3K_{3\eta}}{1 - iq_3K_{33}}, \\ K_{\eta\eta} &\rightarrow K_{\eta\eta} + \frac{\gamma_\eta}{E_0 - E} + i \frac{K_{\eta 3}q_3K_{3\eta}}{1 - iq_3K_{33}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_{33} &= \frac{\gamma_3(0)}{E_0 - E} + \frac{\gamma_3(1)}{E_1 - E}, \\ K_{\pi 3} &= \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_\pi(0)\gamma_3(0)}}{E_0 - E} + \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_\pi(1)\gamma_3(1)}}{E_1 - E}, \\ K_{\eta 3} &= \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_\eta\gamma_3(0)}}{E_0 - E}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In the above model, there are 10 parameters that are determined by a Minuit fit to 110 pieces of data—23 are πN




FIG. 1. The K matrix fit to experimental data as a function of the center-of-mass energy $E_{c.m.}$: (a) The $\pi N \rightarrow \eta N$ data of Ref. [9]—the reduced cross section in mb containing the factor q_π/q_η , (b) $\tau(\gamma\eta)_r$ the reduced cross section of Ref. [10] in units of $10^{-3}/m_{\pi^+}$, (c) the real part of the πN amplitudes ($q_\pi \text{Re} T$) [8], and (d) the imaginary part of the πN amplitudes ($q_\pi \text{Im} T$) [8].

amplitudes (real and imaginary) [8], 11 are $\pi N \rightarrow \eta N$ cross sections [$\sigma(\pi\eta)$] [9], and 53 are $\gamma N \rightarrow \eta N$ cross sections [$\sigma(\gamma\eta)$] [10]. In practice, the actual cross-section data was used in a reduced form, from which threshold factors have been removed—namely

$$\sigma(\pi\eta)_r = \sigma(\pi\eta) \frac{q_\pi}{q_\eta} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(\gamma\eta)_r = \sqrt{\sigma(\gamma\eta) \frac{E_\gamma}{4\pi q_\eta}}. \quad (6)$$

The values of $\tau(\gamma\eta)_r$ given in Ref. [10] are used here directly, even though the mass of the η there is 547.12 MeV, compared with the present value of 547.45 MeV in Ref. [12]. Such small differences are unimportant here, since the main threshold effect is removed by considering the combination σ/q_η . In terms of the scattering amplitudes (T) of Eq. (1), the corresponding model expressions are

$$\sigma(\pi\eta)_r = 4\pi [(\text{Re} T_{\pi\eta})^2 + (\text{Im} T_{\pi\eta})^2] \frac{2q_\pi}{3q_\eta}$$

and

$$\tau(\gamma\eta)_r = A(\text{Phot}) \sqrt{(\text{Re} T_{\eta\eta})^2 + (\text{Im} T_{\eta\eta})^2},$$

where $A(\text{Phot})$ is a normalization parameter that simulates the actual production amplitude. This parameter is assumed to be energy independent and is treated as a free parameter in the Minuit minimization. The resulting fit had a χ^2 of 0.83/dof and the outcome is seen in Fig. 1. Since it is not clear that the four sets of data in Fig. 1 have equal weight, it is of interest to also look at the separate χ^2/dpt —(a) 0.73, (b) 0.75, (c) 0.94, and (d) 0.60. This shows that, indeed, good fits are achieved in all four sets of data and that the overall χ^2/dof is not dominated by any particular set.

TABLE I. The optimized parameters from Minuit defining the K matrices and the corresponding values from the Particle Data Tables (PDT) [12].

	$K_{\eta\eta}$	$K_{\pi\eta}$	E_0 (MeV)	E_1 (MeV)	Γ (Total) (MeV)
Minuit	0.177(33)	0.022(13)	1541.0(1.6)	1681.6(1.6)	148.2(8.1)
PDT	–	–	1535(20)	1650(30)	150(50)
	η (br)	π (br)	Γ (Total,1) (MeV)	π (br,1)	A (Phot)
Minuit	0.568(11)	0.394(9)	167.9(9.4)	0.735(11)	19.74(36)
PDT	0.30–0.55	0.35–0.50	145–190	0.55–0.90	–

From Table I it is seen that those parameters that can be compared with numbers in the Particle Data Tables [12] fall into three classes:

(a) Γ (Total), η (br), π (br), Γ (Total,1), and π (br,1) can be compared directly and are seen to be consistent with the experimental uncertainties. The relationship between the above Γ 's and the γ 's is determined by the T matrix, which—close to the resonance—should be of a Breit-Wigner form with an energy dependent width. This relates the channel parameters γ to the total width Γ , with elasticities and the channel momenta calculated at the resonance energy q (PDT). Thus, for example $\gamma_\pi = 0.5\pi$ (br) Γ/q (PDT). Similarly, since γ_3 and q_3 never occur separately, the combination that enters can be expressed as $\gamma_3 q_3 = 0.5[1 - \pi$ (br) $-\eta$ (br)] $\Gamma F[E_{c.m.}]/F[E_i$ (PDT)]. Here the function $F[E]$ is approximated by a nonrelativistic form of the two pion phase space $\sqrt{(E - M_N - 2m_\pi)m_\pi}$. This is found to be adequate over the present range of energies.

(b) E_0 and E_1 are the positions of the bare poles in the K matrices. As mentioned earlier, these get slightly renormalized in going from K matrices to T matrices to give the numbers in the Particle Data Tables [12].

(c) The seven parameters in (a) and (b) are essentially obtained by fine tuning the corresponding experimental

TABLE II. Results compared with earlier works. The numbers in [...] are the values of a and r_0 , when the exact scattering amplitudes are fitted with $s=0$.

Reference	Scattering length (fm)
Bhalerao and Liu [14]	0.27+ i 0.22 0.28+ i 0.19
Benhold and Tanabe [15]	0.25+ i 0.16
Arima, Shimizu, and Yazaki [16]	0.980+ i 0.37
Batinić, Šlaus, and Švarc [17]	0.886+ i 0.274
Wilkin [4]	0.55(20)+ i 0.30
Sauermann <i>et al.</i> [13]	0.51+ i 0.21
Abaev and Nefkens [19]	0.621(40)+ i 0.306(34)
This paper	
Scattering length (a)	0.751(43)+ i 0.274(28) [0.751(43)+ i 0.274(28)]
Effective range (r_0)	−1.496(134)− i 0.237(37) [−1.497(134)− i 0.237(38)]
Shape parameter (s)	−0.102(15)− i 0.008(10)

numbers—as is seen by the close agreement between the two. However, the remaining three parameters $K_{\eta\eta}$, $K_{\pi\eta}$, and A (Phot) are completely free. In principle, the first two could be related to some more fundamental model based on some underlying Lagrangian as in Ref. [13]. The third parameter could also be calculated, if a mechanism for η photoproduction were used.

The values of the branching ratios η (br), π (br) for the $S(1535)$ resonance also give a prediction for the two-pion ratio to be $1 - \eta$ (br) $-\pi$ (br) = 0.038—a number in line with experimental estimates of 0.05–0.20. If in the Minuit fit this ratio is constrained to be 0.1, then the main effect is to decrease Rea to 0.688 fm and Imr_0 to −0.295 fm with Ima and $Re r_0$ being virtually unchanged at 0.276 and −1.502 fm, respectively.

The errors on a , r_0 , and s were obtained by repeating the calculation for a random selection of the nine parameters defining the K matrices of Eq. (1). This selection was chosen to ensure the distribution of each parameter was a Gaussian centered on the values in Table I and with the same standard deviation. Several tests were made to determine the dependence of these errors on the number of runs and on the size of the region each side of the Gaussian maximum over which the random points were chosen. The errors shown are for 1000 runs using regions that were 3 standard deviations.

The negative sign of the effective range is expected, since it arises quite naturally due to the proximity of the $S(1535)$. For the single η channel case dominated by the resonance, one would have $r_0 q_\eta^2/2 = (E_{\text{threshold}} - E)/\gamma_\eta$. This is a fairly large negative effective range of about −3 fm [18]. The presence of other channels and background terms reduce it to about half of this value. The shape parameter appears to




FIG. 2. The quality of the effective range expression versus the exact values. The solid line shows the exact results, the dashed line the effective range expansion with the values of a, r_0, s from Table II and the dotted line the effective range expansion with only a, r_0 . (a) Shows the real parts and (b) the imaginary parts. All amplitudes are in fm.

be small. In fact the imaginary part is consistent with zero.

In Table II a comparison is made with earlier determinations of the scattering length. There it is seen that the present result supports, in particular, the estimates of Refs. [4] and [19]. It is difficult to compare with the other references, since they do not give any error estimates.

Figure 2 shows that, within 30 MeV of the η threshold, the effective range expansion is very good. For a parametrization up to 100 MeV from the threshold, the effect of the shape parameter(s) plays an increasingly important role. Also it is seen that the effective range must be included, if the ηN scattering is needed 10–20 MeV away from the η threshold at 1485.7 MeV. Such excursions from the threshold are needed, for example, when extrapolating below the threshold in η -bound state situations. In the present case, the threshold value of the ηN amplitude ($0.75+i0.27$) becomes $0.49+i0.10$ fm at 1468.4 MeV and $0.51+i0.51$ fm at 1500.0

MeV. Such differences could be crucial in discussions concerning the existence, or not, of η -bound states in few nucleon systems.

Since submitting this communication Ref. [20] has appeared. It essentially corrects an error in the latest publication of Ref. [17] and gives results very close to those in Table II. However, it should be pointed out that the methods used here and in Refs. [17] and [20] are quite different. Furthermore, the present calculation also includes photoproduction data in the analysis.

One of the authors (S.W.) wishes to acknowledge the hospitality of the Research Institute for Theoretical Physics, Helsinki, where part of this work was carried out. The authors also thank Dr. R. Arndt and Dr. B. Krusche for useful correspondence and Dr. J. Niskanen and Dr. M. Sainio for several discussions.

-
- [1] Q. Haider and L. C. Liu, Phys. Lett. B **172**, 257 (1986); Phys. Rev. C **34**, 1845 (1986).
- [2] G. L. Li, W. K. Cheung, and T. T. Kuo, Phys. Lett. B **195**, 515 (1987).
- [3] T. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 297 (1991).
- [4] C. Wilkin, Phys. Rev. C **47**, R938 (1993).
- [5] B. Mayer *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **53**, 2068 (1996).
- [6] H. Calén *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **366**, 39 (1996).
- [7] A. M. Green, J. A. Niskanen, and S. Wycech, Phys. Rev. C **54**, 1970 (1996).
- [8] R. Arndt, J. M. Ford, and L. D. Roper, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 1085 (1985); Solution SM95 obtained from SAID via internet in November, 1996.
- [9] M. Clajus and B. M. K. Nefkens, πN Newsletter **7**, 76, (1992).
- [10] B. Krusche *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 3736 (1995).
- [11] B. H. Schoch, *BARYONS 95*, edited by B. F. Gibson, P. D. Barnes, J. B. McClelland, and W. Weise (World Scientific, Singapore, 1996), p. 17.
- [12] R. M. Barnett *et al.*, Particle Data Group Phys. Rev. D **54**, 1 (1996).
- [13] Ch. Sauermaun, B. L. Friman, and W. Nörenberg, Phys. Lett. B **341**, 261 (1995); Ch. Deutsch-Sauermaun, B. L. Friman, and W. Nörenberg, “ ν -meson photoproduction off protons and deuterons,” Report nucl-th/9701022.
- [14] R. S. Bhalerao and L. C. Liu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 865 (1985).
- [15] C. Benhold and H. Tanabe, Nucl. Phys. **A350**, 625 (1991).
- [16] M. Arima, K. Shimizu, and K. Yazaki, Nucl. Phys. **A543**, 613 (1992).
- [17] M. Batinić, I. Šlaus, A. Švarc, and B. M. K. Nefkens, Phys. Rev. C **51**, 2310 (1995); M. Batinić, I. Šlaus, and A. Švarc, Phys. Rev. C **52**, 2188 (1995); M. Batinić and A. Švarc, Few-Body Syst. **20**, 69 (1996).
- [18] G. Fäldt and C. Wilkin, Nucl. Phys. **A587**, 769 (1995).
- [19] V. V. Abaev and B. M. K. Nefkens, Phys. Rev. C **53**, 385 (1996).
- [20] M. Batinić, I. Dadić, I. Šlaus, A. Švarc, B. M. K. Nefkens, and T.-S. H. Lee, “Update of the $\pi N \rightarrow \nu N$ and $\nu N \rightarrow \nu N$ partial-wave amplitudes,” Report nucl-th/970323.