

Comment on "Three-Body Forces and Neutron-Neutron Effective Range Parameters"

Šlaus, Akaishi, and Tanaka¹ have suggested a reconciliation of the neutron-neutron scattering parameters extracted from the neutron-induced deuteron breakup reaction $D(n, 2n)p$ with those obtained from the reaction $D(\pi^-, \gamma)2n$ on the basis of three-body forces present in the final state of the former.

Unquestionably, three-body forces exist. There is also some evidence of effects in the nucleon-nucleon correlation from the reaction $D(p, 2p)n$ which may be due to the two-pion exchange three-body force,^{2,3} pions being exchanged between two pairs of nucleons. Such effects are seen far from the nucleon-nucleon pole final-state enhancements in the correlation spectra and they would indeed, as they propagate into the pole-dominated kinematic regions, change the value of the scattering length. However, it is also well known that reactions involving the deuteron, with its long-tailed wave function, are complex and may involve charge-exchange processes that are difficult to differentiate from three-body force effects.³ Such charge exchange is, of course, a genuine three-body effect, but it originates in the well-known n - p charge exchange described many years ago by the Serber force and potential.⁴ The usual "exact" treatments of the deuteron breakup via Faddeev equations do not consider the charge-exchange processes *in a three-body system*, as usual input is simply two-body amplitudes (on- and off-shell). To summarize, there is real difficulty in disentangling charge-exchange processes in a three-nucleon system from genuine three-body forces. A definite test concerning the actual accuracy of "exact" treatments of the nucleon-induced deuteron breakup reaction may be forthcoming in the future, once the reaction $D(p, 2p)n$ is calculated incorporating the full electromagnetic dynamics,³ as in this case the nucleon-nucleon interactions are known from *independent scattering experiments*. This brings once more into focus a basic criterion necessary

to give confidence in any attempt to extract the neutron-neutron interaction from reactions involving three (or more) bodies: a test using pairs of charge-symmetric reactions, where in one all interactions are known and, in the other, the neutron-neutron interaction is the "unknown." Such a test has been known as "comparison procedure."⁵ Just to show how uncertain the situation is concerning the origin of present-day discrepancies, it is worthwhile to mention the results of Gross *et al.*⁶ using such a method in the reactions ${}^3\text{He}({}^3\text{He}, {}^4\text{He})2p$ and ${}^3\text{H}({}^3\text{H}, {}^4\text{He})2n$ which are, incidentally, far superior to the deuteron breakup reactions: $a_{nn} = -18.11 \pm 0.75$ fm, a value which is in excellent agreement with the $(\pi^-, \gamma)2n$ results cited in Ref. 1, -18.45 ± 0.46 fm. Here it may be argued that charge exchange is forbidden to reach the final state, and hence that the failure of the deuteron breakup reaction stems from charge exchange.⁷ Perhaps the time is now ripe for a final attack via colliding neutron beams in order to provide totally unambiguous information. The effort seems worthwhile.

R. J. Slobodrian

Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire
Département de Physique
Université Laval
Ste.-Foy, Québec G1K 7P4, Canada

Received 11 May 1982

PACS numbers: 21.30.+y, 25.10.+s

¹I. Šlaus, Y. Akaishi, and H. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 993 (1982).

²R. J. Slobodrian, S. S. Dasgupta, C. Rioux, F. Lahlou, and R. Roy, *J. Phys. (Paris)* **42**, 13 (1981).

³R. J. Slobodrian and P. Doleschall, *Phys. Lett.* **101B**, 1 (1981).

⁴R. Serber, *Phys. Rev.* **72**, 1114 (1947).

⁵W. T. H. van Oers and I. Šlaus, *Phys. Rev.* **160**, 853 (1967); V. Hungerford, *Nucl. Phys.* **A163**, 523 (1971); R. J. Slobodrian, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **34**, 175 (1971), and references therein.

⁶E. E. Gross, E. V. Hungerford, J. J. Malanify, and R. W. Woods, *Phys. Rev. C* **1**, 1365 (1970).

⁷The comparison procedure applied to $D(n, p)2n$ produced $a_{nn} = -16.7$ fm. R. J. Slobodrian, H. E. Conzett, and F. Resmini, *Phys. Lett.* **27B**, 405 (1968).