

Effect of the spin-dependent electromagnetic forces on low-energy proton-proton scattering

L. D. Knutson* and D. Chiang

University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

(Received 31 May 1978)

The effects of electromagnetically induced spin-dependent potentials on the analyzing power for low-energy proton-proton scattering are calculated using the Coulomb-distorted-wave Born approximation. The amplitudes which arise from these potentials are nearly in phase with the usual Coulomb amplitude and as a result the potentials have virtually no effect on the analyzing power.

[NUCLEAR REACTIONS polarized p - p scattering, electromagnetic effects.]

In the scattering of particles with spin, polarization effects can arise from purely electromagnetic interactions. For example, the interaction of the magnetic moment of a projectile with the Coulomb field of the target produces a spin-dependent force which can result in a nonzero polarization or analyzing power. In proton-proton scattering at energies of a few hundred MeV these effects are significant. Thus if one wishes to isolate the nuclear effects, it is necessary to correct for the electromagnetic processes. At lower energies ($E_p < 50$ MeV) corrections have been unnecessary since the errors in the measured analyzing powers were much larger than the predicted electromagnetic effects. However, recent polarized beam experiments^{1,2} have produced highly accurate analyzing power data at 10 and 16 MeV. These new measurements make it necessary to reconsider the importance of the spin-dependent electromagnetic potentials. In this paper we calculate the effects of these potentials using approximations which are valid at low energies.

From relativistic theories of the proton-proton interaction (see Ref. 3) one finds that, to first order in the fine-structure constant, the proton-proton potential contains two spin-dependent terms of electromagnetic origin: a spin-orbit potential,

$$V_{ls} = -8\mu_0(\mu_T - \frac{1}{4}\mu_0)r^{-3}\hat{\mathbf{T}} \cdot \vec{\mathbf{S}}, \tag{1}$$

and a tensor potential,

$$V_T = -\mu_T r^{-3}S_{12}, \tag{2}$$

where

$$\mu_0 = e\hbar/2mc, \tag{3}$$

$$\mu_T = 2.79276\mu_0, \tag{4}$$

$$\vec{\mathbf{S}} = \frac{1}{2}(\vec{\sigma}_1 + \vec{\sigma}_2), \tag{5}$$

$$S_{12} = 3(\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \hat{r})(\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \hat{r}) - \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2, \tag{6}$$

and where m is the proton mass. The spin-orbit potential describes the interaction of the magnetic moment of each proton with the Coulomb field of the other and includes a correction for the Thomas

precession, while the tensor potential corresponds to the moment-moment interaction.

In order to calculate the effect of these spin-dependent potentials we make use of the distorted-wave Born approximation for the scattering from two potentials. For a potential of the form

$$U = V + V' \tag{7}$$

the elastic scattering wave function, $\psi^{(*)}$, satisfies an integral equation

$$\psi^{(*)}(\vec{\mathbf{k}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}) = \phi^{(*)}(\vec{\mathbf{k}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}) - \int G^{(*)}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}')V'(\vec{\mathbf{r}}')\psi^{(*)}(\vec{\mathbf{k}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}')d^3r'. \tag{8}$$

Here $\phi^{(*)}$ is a wave function for scattering from V alone, and G is a Green's function corresponding to V . The distorted-wave Born approximation is obtained by replacing ψ on the right-hand side of Eq. (8) by ϕ .

We take V to be the sum of the Coulomb and nuclear potentials and treat the potentials of Eqs. (1) and (2) as perturbations. Now for low energies the nuclear potential has a large effect only in the $l=0$ partial wave. Since the Pauli principle restricts the $l=0$ scattering to the singlet spin state (where the spin-dependent forces vanish), it is reasonable to neglect the effect of the nuclear forces when evaluating the integral in Eq. (8). We therefore replace $\psi^{(*)}$ in the integral by a pure Coulomb wave function, $\phi_C^{(*)}$, and take $G^{(*)}$ to be the usual Coulomb Green's function. For large r , $G^{(*)}$ becomes

$$G^{(*)}(\vec{\mathbf{r}}, \vec{\mathbf{r}}') \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m}{4\pi\hbar^2} \frac{1}{r} \exp\{i[k'r - \eta \ln(2k'r)]\} \times \phi_C^{(*)*}(\vec{\mathbf{k}}', \vec{\mathbf{r}}'), \tag{9}$$

where η is the Coulomb parameter

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2}me^2/\hbar^2k. \tag{10}$$

In order to describe the scattering of identical particles, we must ensure that $\psi^{(*)}$ is properly antisymmetrized. This is done by simply choos-

ing $\phi_C^{(\pm)}$ to be an antisymmetric wave function with the correct boundary conditions. On the other hand, the Green's function [i. e., the wave function $\phi_C^{(\pm)}$ in Eq. (9)] should not be antisymmetrized. Thus we find that the scattering amplitude is given by

$$f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = f_C(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') + f_N(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') - \frac{m}{4\pi\hbar^2} \int \phi_C^{(\pm)*}(\vec{k}', \vec{r}') V'(\vec{r}') \phi_C^{(\pm)}(\vec{k}, \vec{r}') d^3r', \quad (11)$$

where f_C and f_N are the Coulomb and nuclear scattering amplitudes, respectively, and where it is understood that $\phi_C^{(\pm)}$ is to be antisymmetrized but that $\phi_C^{(\pm)}$ is not.

Since the matrix elements of $\vec{l} \cdot \vec{s}$ and S_{12} between singlet spin states are zero we consider only the triplet states. In this case the appropriate Coulomb amplitude is

$$f_C(k, k') = -\frac{\eta}{k} \left\{ \frac{1}{1-\mu} \exp[-i\eta \ln \frac{1}{2}(1-\mu)] - \frac{1}{1+\mu} \exp[-i\eta \ln \frac{1}{2}(1+\mu)] \right\} e^{2i\alpha_0}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\mu = \hat{k} \cdot \hat{k}'. \quad (13)$$

For the Coulomb wave functions we write

$$\phi_C^{(+)}(\vec{k}, \vec{r}) = (8\pi/kr) \sum_{\text{odd } l} \sum_m i^l e^{i\alpha_l} F_l(kr) Y_l^m(\hat{r}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{k}), \quad (14)$$

$$\phi_C^{(-)}(\vec{k}, \vec{r}) = (4\pi/kr) \sum_{\text{all } l} \sum_m i^{-l} e^{i\alpha_l} F_l(kr) Y_l^m(\hat{r}) Y_l^m(\hat{k}). \quad (15)$$

Here α_l is the usual Coulomb phase shift, and F_l is the regular solution to the Coulomb radial wave equation.

We now consider the spin-orbit potential in Eq. (1). We must evaluate the matrix element

$$\langle \sigma' | f_{1s} | \sigma \rangle = C_{1s} \int \phi_C^{(-)*}(\vec{k}', \vec{r}) r^{-3} \times \langle \chi_1^{\sigma'} | \vec{l} \cdot \vec{s} | \chi_1^{\sigma} \rangle \phi_C^{(+)}(\vec{k}, \vec{r}) d^3r, \quad (16)$$

where $|\chi_1^{\sigma}\rangle$ is a triplet spin function and where

$$C_{1s} = 2m\mu_0(\mu_T - \frac{1}{4}\mu_0)/\pi\hbar^2. \quad (17)$$

We choose a coordinate system which has its z axis along \vec{k} and its y axis along $\vec{k} \times \vec{k}'$. It is then straightforward to show that

$$\langle \sigma' | f_{1s} | \sigma \rangle = 8\pi C_{1s} \langle \chi_1^{\sigma'} | iS_y | \chi_1^{\sigma} \rangle \times \sum_{\text{odd } l} e^{i\alpha_l} (2l+1) M^{-3} P^{-1}(l), \quad (18)$$

where

$$M_{1l}^{-3} = k^{-2} \int_0^{\infty} r^{-3} F_l(kr) F_l'(kr) dr \quad (19)$$

and

$$P_l^{\lambda} = (1-\mu^2)^{\lambda/2} \frac{d^{\lambda}}{d\mu^{\lambda}} P_l(\mu). \quad (20)$$

From Ref. 4 we find

$$M_{1l}^{-3} = [2l(l+1)(2l+1)]^{-1} \times \left(2l+1 - \eta\pi + 1 + \eta\pi \coth\eta\pi - 2\eta^2 \sum_{p=0}^l \frac{1}{p^2 + \eta^2} \right). \quad (21)$$

In principle, one could evaluate f_{1s} by summing Eq. (18) term by term with a computer. However, the sum converges too slowly for this to be a practical method. Instead we split f_{1s} into two pieces,

$$\langle \sigma' | f_{1s} | \sigma \rangle = [f_1(\mu) + f_2(\mu)] \times \langle \chi_1^{\sigma'} | iS_y | \chi_1^{\sigma} \rangle, \quad (22)$$

where f_1 is defined as

$$f_1(\mu) = 4\pi C_{1s} \sum_{\text{odd } l} e^{2i\alpha_l} (2l+1) [l(l+1)]^{-1} P_l^{-1}(\mu). \quad (23)$$

This separation is convenient because f_2 converges rapidly enough to be summed term by term, while f_1 can be summed analytically:

$$f_1 = 4\pi C_{1s} e^{2i\alpha_0} (1-\mu^2)^{-1/2} \times \{ \exp[-i\eta \ln \frac{1}{2}(1-\mu)] + \exp[-i\eta \ln \frac{1}{2}(1+\mu)] - 1 \}. \quad (24)$$

If one were to use the plane-wave Born approximation to calculate the scattering amplitude these results would be somewhat modified. The plane-wave result is obtained by setting $f_2=0$ and setting $\alpha_0 = \eta = 0$ in Eq. (24). This has little effect on the magnitude of f_{1s} , but does change the phase (see below). Ebel and Hull⁵ have used the plane-wave Born approximation to calculate the phase shifts resulting from the spin-orbit potential, but have included the effect of the Coulomb potential by including factors $\exp(2i\alpha_l)$ in the partial wave expansion for f_{1s} . Using this approach they obtain precisely the result in Eq. (24); however, the term f_2 is missing. At energies near 10 MeV, this is not serious since $|f_2|$ is about an order of magnitude smaller than $|f_1|$.

We now consider the tensor potential defined in Eq. (2). Using an approach similar to that de-

$$\langle \sigma' | f_T | \sigma \rangle = (4\sqrt{10} m \mu_T^2 / \hbar^2) \sum_{\text{odd } l} \sum_{l', \lambda} (2l+1) i^{l-l'} [(l'-\lambda)! / (l'+\lambda)!]^{1/2} e^{i(\alpha_{l'} + \alpha_{l'})} M_{ll'}^{-3} \langle l0, 2\lambda | l'\lambda \rangle \langle l0, 20 | l'0 \rangle P_l^\lambda(\mu), \quad (25)$$

where M_{ll}^{-3} is given in Eq. (19) and⁴

$$M_{l, l+2}^{-3} = M_{l+2, l}^{-3} = (6 |l+1+i\eta| |l+2+i\eta|)^{-1}. \quad (26)$$

$$A = \text{Im}(f_1^* f_c) / (\frac{3}{4} |f_c|^2 + \frac{1}{4} |f_{ss}|^2). \quad (27)$$

Here f_{ss} is the scattering amplitude for the singlet state. At $\theta_{c.m.} = 30^\circ$, for example, $|f_1| \approx 0.02 |f_c|$ and $|f_{ss}| \approx 4 |f_c|$. Thus one might expect A to

*Present address: Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

¹J. D. Hutton, W. Haerberli, L. D. Knutson, and P. Signell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 429 (1975).

²P. A. Lovoi, G. G. Ohlsen, N. Jarmie, C. E. Moss, and D. M. Stupin, in *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Polarization Phenomena in Nuclear Reactions*, edited by W. Gruebler and V. König (Birkhäuser, Berlin, 1975), p. 450.

³W. A. Barker and F. N. Glover, *Phys. Rev.* **99**, 317

(1955).

⁴L. C. Biedenharn and C. M. Class, *Phys. Rev.* **98**, 691 (1955).

⁵M. E. Ebel and M. H. Hull, *Phys. Rev.* **99**, 1596 (1955).

⁶H. P. Stapp, T. J. Ypsilantis, and N. Metropolis, *Phys. Rev.* **105**, 302 (1957).

⁷K. Imai, K. Nisimura, N. Tamura, and H. Sato, *Nucl. Phys. A* **246**, 76 (1975).

⁸J. S. C. McKee and T. Osborn, *Phys. Lett.* **28B**, 7 (1968).