

A COVARIANT AND UNITARY EQUATION FOR  
SINGLE QUANTUM EXCHANGE\*

H. Pierre Noyes  
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center  
Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

and

James V. Lindesay  
Physics Department, University of California,  
Berkeley, California 94720

ABSTRACT

By requiring the "bound state" of particle and quantum to have the mass of the particle and be physically indistinguishable from the particle we derive fully covariant and unitary equations for particle particle scattering; these reduce to the Lippmann-Schwinger equation for Yukawa potential scattering in the nonrelativistic kinematic region and provide a new definition of the "nuclear potential."

Submitted to Australian Journal of Physics

---

\* Work supported by the Department of Energy, contract DE-AC03-76SF00515.

In quantum electrodynamics the nonrelativistic limit to lowest order taken in the Coulomb gauge leads to the nonrelativistic Schroedinger equation with a Coulomb potential. For a scalar meson theory the corresponding reduction to the Schroedinger equation with a Yukawa potential has never been accomplished by a generally accepted procedure (Moravcsik and Noyes 1961). We believe the difference is due to the fact that for QED the nonrelativistic limit leads to a potential defined in classical physics, which is scale invariant, whereas the range  $\hbar/mc$  of the Yukawa potential is not scale invariant and hence intrinsically nonclassical. This fact has frustrated attempts to construct generally accepted unique models for nonrelativistic nuclear physics. In this communication we demonstrate that by starting from covariant Faddeev equations for two particles and one massive quantum we can derive integral equations defining covariant, unitary amplitudes describing single quantum exchange and production. The production channel can be closed without destroying unitarity, leading to fully covariant equations for elastic scattering which reduce to the Lippmann-Schwinger for the scattering by a Yukawa potential in the nonrelativistic kinematic region, but which are valid at any energy. The extension to sectors with higher particle and quantum number, the connection to field theory, and some possible applications are briefly discussed.

Fully covariant Faddeev equations driven by separable two-particle amplitudes define unitary and time-reversal invariant three particle amplitudes (Freedman et al. 1966; Brayshaw 1978). For the minimal case discussed by Lindesay (1981), they reproduce the Efimov effect in the appropriate limit in quantitative agreement with nonrelativistic calculations. For this communication we restrict ourselves to two scalar particles of

mass  $m_1$ ,  $m_2$  and a scalar quantum of mass  $m_Q$ . The quantum is distinguished from the particles by our postulate that there is no direct particle-particle scattering, which reduces the number of Faddeev amplitudes from 9 to 4.

Our second assumption is that the quantum-particle scattering input amplitudes describing  $m_i + m_Q \rightarrow m_i + m_Q$  are a single s-channel bound state of mass  $m_i$  which is physically indistinguishable from the particle  $m_i$  ( $i \in 1,2$ ).

Following the usual convention of labeling this amplitude by the spectator index  $j$  ( $\neq i$ ) and writing it as a function of the initial and final specta-

tor momenta  $\underline{k}_j^{(0)}$ ,  $\underline{k}_j$  in the three particle zero momentum system and the

invariant four momentum  $M$  this invariant amplitude  $t_j(\underline{k}_j, \underline{k}_j^{(0)}; M) =$

$s^{\frac{1}{2}}(2\pi)^{-2} \epsilon_j \delta^3(\underline{k}_j - \underline{k}_j^{(0)}) [(-q^2(m_i^2))^{\frac{1}{2}} - (-q^2(s))^{\frac{1}{2}}]^{-1}$ . If in the coordinate

system in which  $m_i$  and  $m_Q$  have zero total momentum we allow the spectator

$m_j$  to have any momentum between zero and infinity, these limits in the

three-particle zero momentum system transform covariantly to (Brayshaw 1978)

$0 \leq k_j \leq (M^2 - m_j^2)/2M$  where  $M$  is the invariant four momentum. Consequently

in this system we have that  $s = M^2 + m_j^2 - 2M\epsilon_j$  with  $\epsilon_j = (m_j^2 + k_j^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ;

further,  $q^2(s) = [s - (m_i + m_Q)^2] |s - (m_i - m_Q)^2| / 4s$ . This model differs from

the minimal model previously discussed in that (a) the 3(i.e., Q)-channel

is closed and (b) we have taken  $\mu_j \equiv \mu_{iQ} \equiv m_i$ .

By inserting this driving term in the relativistic Faddeev equation

(Freedman et al. 1966; Brayshaw 1978; Lindesay 1981) for the three particle

amplitudes  $M_{ij}$ , defining  $t_j = \tau_j \epsilon_j \delta^3$  and  $M_{ij} = t_i \delta_{ij} + \tau_i Z_{ij} \tau_j$ , and iterating

once we find that the  $Z_{ij}$  satisfy the coupled equations  $Z_{ij} = -\bar{\delta}_{ij} R -$

$\int \bar{\delta}_{ik} R \tau_k Z_{kj} = -\bar{\delta}_{ij} R - \int Z_{ik} \tau_k R \bar{\delta}_{kj}$  where  $\bar{\delta}_{ij} = 1 - \delta_{ij}$ ,  $R$  is the three parti-

cle propagator and the variable content is defined below. To isolate the

elastic scattering and rearrangement amplitudes we rationalize the denomi-

nator in  $\tau_j$  and separate the pole by defining  $\tau_j = \Gamma_i^2 (s_j - m_i^2)^{-1} + \hat{\tau}_j$ . Following Osborn and Bollé (1973, Eq. (IV.7)) we isolate the primary singularities in  $M_{ij}$  and define the physical amplitudes whose squares are directly related to cross sections by

$$M_{ij} = t_i \delta_{ij} + F_{ij} + G_{ij} \Gamma_j (s_j - m_i^2)^{-1} + \Gamma_j (s_i - m_j^2)^{-1} \tilde{G}_{ij} \\ + \Gamma_i (s_i - m_j^2)^{-1} K_{ij} (s_j - m_i^2)^{-1} \Gamma_j \quad . \quad (1)$$

From this definition it follows immediately that  $F_{ij}$  (the 3-3 amplitude) is equal to  $\hat{\tau}_i Z_{ij} \hat{\tau}_j$ , that the amplitudes needed to compute breakup and coalescence (cf., OB Eq. (I.2)) are  $G_{ij} = \hat{\tau}_i Z_{ij} \Gamma_j$  and  $\tilde{G}_{ij} = \Gamma_i Z_{ij} \hat{\tau}_j$ , while the elastic scattering and rearrangement amplitudes are  $K_{ij} = \Gamma_i Z_{ij} \Gamma_j$ .

Since we are primarily concerned here with two particle elastic scattering, we note that we can close the quantum production channel simply by taking  $\hat{\tau} = 0$ . Noting that the three particle propagator  $R(\underline{k}_i, \underline{k}_j; M) = \epsilon_{ij}^{-1} (\epsilon_{ij} + \epsilon_i + \epsilon_j - M - i0^+)^{-1}$  with  $\epsilon_{ij} = [m_Q^2 + (\underline{k}_i + \underline{k}_j)^2]^{1/2}$  and that since  $M = \epsilon_i^{(0)} + \epsilon_j^{(0)}$  when we start from a two body channel,  $s_j - m_i^2 = -2M(\epsilon_j - \epsilon_j^{(0)} - i0^+) \equiv -P(\underline{k}_j, \underline{k}_j^{(0)})^{-1}$ , we find that the equations for the physical amplitudes are

$$K_{ij}(\underline{k}_i, \underline{k}_j^{(0)}; M) + \bar{\delta}_{ij} \Gamma_i R(\underline{k}_i, \underline{k}_j^{(0)}; M) \Gamma_j \\ = \bar{\delta}_{ik} \int_0^{(M^2 - m_k^2)/2M} d^3 k_k \epsilon_k^{-1} \Gamma_i R(\underline{k}_i, \underline{k}_k; M) \Gamma_k P(\underline{k}_k, \underline{k}_k^{(0)}) K_{kj}(\underline{k}_k, \underline{k}_j^{(0)}; M) \\ = \int K_{ik} P_k \Gamma_k R \Gamma_j \bar{\delta}_{kj} \quad . \quad (2)$$

If the bound states  $m_{iQ}$  were physically distinguishable from the particles  $m_i$  all four of these amplitudes would describe different observable

processes. Actually, so far as observation goes we have only elastic scattering, and since we are in the zero momentum system  $\underline{k}_j = -\underline{k}_i$  and we can describe everything in terms of one vector variable. Taking this vector to be  $\underline{k}$  the momentum of  $m_1$  as a spectator, and noting that we can tell, relative to this direction, whether it is  $m_1$  or  $m_2$  that had initial momentum  $\underline{k}'$ , the physical amplitude whose square gives the elastic scattering cross section is  $T(\underline{k}, \underline{k}'; M) = K_{11}(\underline{k}, \underline{k}'; M) + K_{21}(-\underline{k}, \underline{k}'; M) = K_{22}(-\underline{k}, -\underline{k}'; M) + K_{12}(\underline{k}, -\underline{k}'; M)$ ; the second form expresses the time reversal invariance guaranteed by the two forms of Eq. (2).

We note that Eq. (2) is a coupled channel relativistic Lippmann-Schwinger equation with the exchange potential  $V_{ij} = -\bar{\delta}_{ij} \Gamma_i R \Gamma_j$ . Since the form of the equation automatically guarantees two particle unitarity independent of the (finite) value of the product  $\Gamma_i \Gamma_j$  we can treat the strength of this potential as arbitrary and call it  $g_i g_j$ . Since the  $\Gamma$ 's are the asymptotic normalization of the "bound state" wave function, this amounts to saying that the "zero range" or pole form of the wave function does not hold down to infinitesimal distance, but other than the reflection of this fact in the "reduced width"  $g_i^2 \neq \Gamma_i^2$ , we need not specify this behavior, a point we will return to below. Further, since on shell where in the zero momentum system ( $\underline{k}_i + \underline{k}_j = 0 = \underline{k}'_i + \underline{k}'_j$ ) we have that  $t = (\epsilon_i - \epsilon_i')^2 - (\underline{k}_i - \underline{k}'_i)^2 = -(\underline{k}_i + \underline{k}'_i)^2$  and  $M = \epsilon_i + \epsilon_j$ , or in the nonrelativistic kinematic region, our "potential" is  $-g_1 g_2 [m_Q^2 + (\underline{k} - \underline{k}')^2]^{-1} = g_1 g_2 / (t - m_Q^2)$  and hence can be interpreted as either a nonrelativistic Yukawa potential or as the lowest order field theory result for single quantum exchange. Further, in the non-relativistic kinematic region  $P_k^{-1}$  reduces to the nonrelativistic propagator  $(k^2 - k'^2 - i0^+)^{-1}$  and we can add the two equations to obtain the usual Lippmann-Schwinger equation for  $T$  due to a Yukawa potential. Thus our

equation' for single quantum exchange, although fully unitary and covariant, has an unambiguous nonrelativistic limit.

The generalization of our treatment to a first approximation for the nuclear force problem is immediate. Instead of scalar particle functions we can use spinors, and since our driving term in the three particle space with which we start is, kinematically, simply the s-channel absorption and re-emission of the quantum, we know how to put in the vertex operators for pseudoscalar, vector, or pseudovector quanta; they are the same as lowest order field theory. Thus we can write three-particle coupled channel equations, and by isolating the pole terms as before obtain a fully covariant and unitary "one-boson-exchange" model for nucleon nucleon scattering. Solving these equations then gives us directly the fully off shell  $T_{NN}(\underline{k}, \underline{k}'; M)$  which could be used directly to compute three nucleon observables from relativistic Faddeev equations, or N-nucleon observables from relativistic Faddeev-Yakubovsky equations. Noyes (1982) has shown that the Faddeev-Yakubovsky equations for  $N=4$  can easily be derived using our "zero range" approach. Simply by comparing the results with the same equations using nonrelativistic kinematics we can find out quantitatively how important relativistic "recoil corrections" are for nuclear physics. But we can go further; by using Faddeev-Yakubovsky equations for N nucleons plus one meson and comparing them with the (relativistic) equations for N nucleons, we can isolate (within our model) the effect of "three body forces" from the effect of "two body off shell" behavior. A still simpler way to test the adequacy of the static potential concept for nuclear physics is to use our fully off shell  $T_{NN}$  to compute the potential, starting from the Low equation (Noyes 1968). Explicitly,

since the nonrelativistic energy parameter  $z$  is related to  $M$  by

$$M = z + m_1 + m_2,$$

$$V(\underline{k}, \underline{k}') = T(\underline{k}, \underline{k}'; z + m_1 + m_2) - \int_0^{\infty} \frac{q^2 dq T(\underline{k}, \underline{q}; \tilde{q}^2 + m_1 + m_2) T^*(\underline{q}, \underline{k}'; \tilde{q}^2 + m_1 + m_2)}{\tilde{q}^2 - z}$$

(3)

where  $\tilde{q}^2 = q^2/2\mu$ ,  $\mu = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2)$ , and the  $\int$  is included with the integral to remind us to include any bound state pole terms predicted by our interaction. Thus we can determine up to what energy and to what accuracy the  $V$  so computed is indeed independent of  $z$ , and hence can be used in a nonrelativistic Schroedinger equation for nuclear physics.

Returning to our covariant equation, we note that it is not the ladder approximation to the Salpeter-Bethe equation (1951), because it is a single time equation, and it is not the Blankenbecler-Sugar equation (1966) because it has no spurious singularities. Since we have shown above that it has an unambiguous and reasonable limit in nonrelativistic scattering theory, we claim to have obtained the correct equation for single quantum exchange. Note that if we make one of the particles a spinor, let  $m_Q \rightarrow 0$  and the mass of the second particle go to infinity, we obtain the momentum space Dirac equation for a Coulomb potential. Clearly if we do not take these limits we have a correct relativistic equation with full "recoil" and as noted above can introduce spin for the quantum (or quanta) as easily as for the particles. If we have  $m_1 = m_2$  and treat the two particles as identical, then we must, as usual, symmetrize or antisymmetrize the amplitude depending on whether the particles are bosons or fermions. As can be seen from the expressions discussed above, this will give us t-u

"crossing." Clearly we cannot have s-t or s-u "crossing" in a finite particle number theory since our ladder would imply an infinite number of particles in the intermediate states when crossed. We can, however, introduce antiparticles in a straightforward way, and compute unitary amplitudes for particle-antiparticle processes with appropriate symmetries, as we will discuss elsewhere.

To extend our theory to higher particle number is, as already noted, straightforward. Since our equations will always give finite results, the test of whether our theory can be generalized in a way consistent with known physics will come when we compute four particle (or more specifically two particle and two quantum) processes and compare to renormalized perturbation theory in the weak coupling limit. So far as we can see, we are including the same physics as quantum field theories with Yukawa-type couplings at that level, and should anticipate the same results. If we fail, this will show that even though, once renormalized, perturbation theory to order  $g^4$  seems only to refer to a finite number of real particles, some trace of the infinite renormalization was left behind; this would also be interesting.

It remains to extend our three particle theory to quantum production, by restoring the elastic scattering amplitude  $\hat{t}$  to our two particle input. This leads to coupled equations for the  $K_{ij}$  and  $G_{ij}$  which are easy to write down. The three particle amplitudes calculated from them are clearly unitary so long as we retain the residues  $\Gamma_i^2$ ,  $\Gamma_j^2$  at the poles which come from a unitarity two particle amplitude, since it is easy to show (Freedman et al. 1966 and Noyes 1982) that this plus the Faddeev form of the equations guarantees this. Whether we can in this case take  $g_i^2$  arbitrary depends to some extent on interpretation.



Again, if we introduce a "form factor" so that the normalization of the bound state wave function corresponds to precisely two particles, we have simply gone back to the more general model discussed by Freedman et al. (1966) and Brayshaw (1978), and there is no problem with unitarity; however the form factors then enter the equations and change our fundamental theory to a phenomenology, which we wish to avoid doing. But if we retain the simple pole form for the bound state wave function with an arbitrary residue, we in some sense saying that the bound state is partly elementary and partly composite. With this interpretation flux conservation is preserved, as can be seen from the way it is achieved in OB. In their "nonrelativistic field theory" for n-d scattering, Aaron et al. (1965) have used a similar argument in treating the n-d vertex constant as a free parameter, and we do not see why we do not have the same freedom in our context. A fuller discussion of this point, and an approach in which we use the density matrix to describe physical states which are partly "bare" and partly "composite" will be presented elsewhere.

We conclude that we have achieved a unitary and covariant description of single quantum exchange with immediate application in nuclear physics, and with possible interesting extensions to a much broader class of problems.

DEDICATION

This article is dedicated to the memory of Stewart Butler, who was the office mate of one of us (HPN) in Birmingham at the time when Stewart was completing his thesis on deuteron stripping reactions. As is well known, Stewart's fundamental contribution became one of the primary tools for making progress in the analysis of nuclear reactions and nuclear structure, neatly avoiding the ambiguities discussed in this paper. At the time HPN was struggling with the problems discussed here, but in contrast to Stewart's success, it has taken until now to achieve what might be a satisfactory resolution of them. We can only wish that we could still profit from his comments on this work.

REFERENCES

- Aaron, R., Amado, R.D., and Yam, Y.Y. (1965). Phys. Rev. 140, B1291.
- Blankenbecler, R., and Sugar, R (1966). Phys. Rev. 142, 1051.
- Brayshaw, D.D. (1978). Phys. Rev. D 18, 2638.
- Freedman, D.Z., Lovelace, C., and Namyslowski, J.M. (1966). Nuovo Cimento 43A, 258.
- Lindesay, J.V. (1981). "Minimal Relativistic Three Particle Equations,"  
Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford, available as SLAC Report 243.
- Moravcsik, M.J., and Noyes, H.P. (1961). Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. 11, 95.
- Noyes, H.P. (1968). Prog. in Nucl. Phys. 10, 335.
- Noyes, H.P. (1982). Phys. Rev. C 26, 1858.
- Osborn, T.A., and Bollé, D. (1973). Phys. Rev. C 8, 1198, hereinafter OB.
- Salpeter, E., and Bethe, H.A. (1951). Phys. Rev. 84, 1232.