UCRL 3192

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Radiation Laboratory

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

This is a Library Circulating Copy which may be borrowed for two weeks. For a personal retention copy, call Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 5545

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

UCRL-3192

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California

Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

ON NUCLEON SCATTERING AND THE FESHBACH-LOMON MODEL

Robert B. Raphael

November 9, 1955

Printed for the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

ON NUCLEON SCATTERING AND THE FESHBACH-LOMAN MODEL*

Robert B. Raphael

Radiation Laboratory, University of California
Berkeley, California

November 9, 1955

ABSTRACT

A method, based upon the results of the preceding paper, is established whereby a given potential may be simply tested for its capability of providing an adequate charge-independent description of nucleon-nucleon scattering to 300 Mev. The view is taken that the scattering is better represented by replacing the (in general) strongly energy-dependent scattering phase shifts with a set of suitably defined logarithmic derivatives Γ_{JL}. These when evaluated at 'characteristic interaction distances' $\bar{r}$, will depend at most weakly upon energy. The success of the Feshbach-Loman (FL) model in the interval 0 to 300 Mev is here regarded more generally as establishing this view in the above energy range. These ideas are given their mathematical formulation through a generalization of effective range methods familiar in low-energy scattering. Here $\bar{r}$, which plays the role of an effective range, is shown by means of stationary expressions for Γ_{JL} to attain a state-independent value equal to the FL 'core' radius, provided that Γ_{JL} has the desired weak energy dependence. It is then only necessary to find the behavior with energy of the parameters Γ_{JL}, as determined by a given potential, in order to test whether or not the latter is capable of giving a charge-independent description of the scattering. The method is illustrated in S-states with two parameter monotonic static potentials. It is found that Gaussian, exponential, and Yukawa potentials are not consistent with the analysis unless these potentials also contain a repulsive core whose radius is suitably restricted. A rectangular potential is barely possible because of the uncertainties in the FL fit arising from insufficient experimental data. An Appendix is devoted to a discussion of the variational principle used in the text.

---

* A portion of this material may be found in the author's Thesis, Harvard 1954.

ON NUCLEON SCATTERING AND THE FESHBACH-LOMON MODEL

Robert B. Raphael

I. INTRODUCTION

In the preceding paper,[1] an explicitly charge-independent fit of the nucleon-nucleon bound state, and scattering data has been obtained. A model was used which confines the nuclear forces within a radius r_o which depends upon the state and which, for all but one state, the ^1S_o, was taken to be energy independent. In this region the forces are assumed to be sufficiently strong to be essentially independent of the relative energy of the colliding particles, and may thus be represented by an energy-independent boundary condition applied to the set of logarithmic derivatives $f_{JL}(r_o)$ of the interaction wave function. We wish to point out that the success of this specific model may be more generally regarded as establishing, within the above energy range, an alternative and highly compact representation of experimental results. This representation embodies an extension to higher energies of the effective range methods[2] familiar in the analysis of low-energy nucleon scattering. It will be shown in this paper that such a viewpoint results in a simple procedure for determining whether a given potential is capable of giving a charge-independent description of the scattering.

The success of FL in fitting data in the range 0 to 300 Mev suggests that, from a formal standpoint, the scattering may be more appropriately represented in each state by two parameters, $\Gamma_{JL}(\bar{r})$ and $\bar{r}$, which depend only weakly upon the energy, than by the phase shift δ_{JL}, which is in general strongly energy-dependent.[3] ($\Gamma_{JL} = f_{JL}+1$) In II, we shall make use of a procedure due to Schwinger[4] to define an appropriate set of generalized logarithmic derivatives Γ on the surface of a sphere of radius $\bar{r}$, which we then show to be Hermitian. A stationary expression for Γ is then invoked, by means of which $\bar{r}$ is so chosen that Γ has the desired weak energy dependence. The resulting condition for $\bar{r}$ is manifestly a generalization of that used to define the effective range in low-energy scattering theory. This connection is made explicit by consideration of the $^1S_0$ and $^3S_1 + {}^3D_1$ states of the two-nucleon system. The "effective interaction distances" $\bar{r}$ in these states are shown to be equal to each other within experimental

error and to have the value r_o found by FL to yield the best overall agreement with the scattering data. Thus, only a single range parameter is needed to describe the low-energy scattering in singlet and triplet states. In III, we investigate the energy dependence of the logarithmic derivative in the $^1S_0$ state and compare with the FL fit. It is demonstrated that with sufficiently complete and accurate data for energies less than 50 Mev that it would be possible to determine the character of the interaction potential. For example, if it is assumed that Γ does not vary more than 20 per cent in energy from 0 to 50 Mev that the rectangular, Gaussian, exponential and Yukawa wells would fail to fit the data. However, a potential consisting of a repulsive core together with an exterior well of rectangular or Yukawa shape could satisfy the above criterion. In the former case a repulsive core radius r_c less than 0.4×10^{-13} cm, and in the latter r_c less than 0.7×10^{-13} cm would be required. A brief discussion of the variational principle used in the text, together with its explicit realization for higher angular momenta and tensor forces, is included in the Appendix.

II. THE EXTENDED EFFECTIVE RANGE DESCRIPTION

Consider the Schroedinger equation for the interaction of two nucleons,

$$(k^2 - H)\psi = 0 ; \qquad (r\psi) = 0 , \quad r = 0 , \tag{1a}$$

and its adjoint,

$$\psi^{\dagger}(k^2 - H)^{\dagger} = 0 , \tag{1b}$$

where $k^2 = ME/\hbar^2$, $H = -\nabla^2 + H'$, and H' is the interaction Hamiltonian, which we shall assume to be energy-independent and of short range. Let us also introduce a comparison wave function Ψ, satisfying

$$(k^2 + \nabla^2)\Psi = 0 . \tag{2}$$

Inside the interaction volume, Ψ is then an extrapolation of ψ. By elementary manipulation one obtains the relations

$$\nabla \cdot (\psi^{\dagger}\nabla\psi - (\nabla\psi)^{\dagger}\psi) = 0 , \tag{3}$$

$$\nabla \cdot (\Psi^{\dagger}\nabla\Psi - (\nabla\Psi)^{\dagger}\Psi) = 0 . \tag{4}$$

Let us integrate Eq. (3) over all space, but Eq. (4) only outside a sphere of radius $r = \bar{r}$. Then in view of the identity of ψ, Ψ at large distances, we must have

$$\int dS \cdot \left[\Psi^{\dagger}\nabla\Psi - (\nabla\Psi)^{\dagger}\Psi\right]_{r=\bar{r}} = 0 \tag{5}$$

Observing that only the radial part of the gradient operator contributes to this integral, we define a generalized logarithmic derivative Γ on the sphere $r = \bar{r}$ by the expressions

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r\Psi)\right]_{r=\bar{r}} = \Gamma\,\bar{r}\Psi(\bar{r}) \;,$$
$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r\Psi^{\dagger})\right]_{r=\bar{r}} = \bar{r}\Psi^{\dagger}(\bar{r})\Gamma^{\dagger} . \tag{6}$$

The condition in Eq. (5) thus expresses the hermiticity of Γ :

$$\int d\omega \left[r\Psi^{\dagger}(\Gamma - \Gamma^{\dagger})\, r\Psi\right]_{r=\bar{r}} = 0 \;. \tag{7}$$

It is proven in the Appendix that

$$\int_{r=\bar{r}} d\omega\, r\Psi^{\dagger}\Gamma r\Psi = \int_{\text{all space}} (dr)\left[r^{-2}(\nabla r\psi)^{\dagger}\cdot\nabla(r\psi) - \psi^{\dagger}(k^2 - H')\psi\right]$$
$$- \int_{r\geq\bar{r}} (dr)\left[r^{-2}\nabla(r\Psi)^{\dagger}\cdot\nabla(r\Psi) - \Psi^{\dagger}k^2\Psi\right] \tag{8}$$

is a stationary expression for Γ under independent variation of ψ , Ψ or their adjoints. It is convenient to use Eq. (8) as a means of specifying the energy dependence of Γ . Under variation with respect to the energy, the wave functions in their dependence on energy do not contribute in virtue of the stationary property, and one obtains the rigorous expression

$$\int_{r=\bar{r}} d\omega\, r\Psi^{\dagger}\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial k^2}\, r\Psi = \int_{r\geq\bar{r}} (dr)\,\Psi^{\dagger}\Psi - \int_{\text{all space}} (dr)\,\psi^{\dagger}\psi . \tag{9}$$

Let us now view the wave functions ψ , Ψ as being decomposed into mutually orthogonal parts, each part corresponding to a constant of the motion.

Equation (9) is then to be regarded as a set of independent equations corresponding, for example, to possible values of the total angular momentum J, spin S, and charge state τ. Thus with central forces Eq. (9) assumes the form

$$U_L^{\,2}(\bar{r}_L)\,\frac{\partial \Gamma_{LL}}{\partial k^2} = \int_{\bar{r}_L}^{\infty} dr\, U_L^{\,2} - \int_0^{\infty} dr\, u_L^{\,2} \quad , \tag{10}$$

as shown in the Appendix. Here u_L, U_L are the radial parts of ψ, Ψ corresponding to angular momentum L. The orthogonality of these partial waves requires Γ to be a diagonal matrix, whose elements are Γ_{LL}. For the coupled waves present in triplet scattering with tensor forces, we find in the Appendix that

$$\left[U_J^{\,2}(r)\,\frac{\partial \Gamma_{u_J}}{\partial k^2} + W_J^{\,2}(r)\,\frac{\partial \Gamma_{W_J}}{\partial k^2} \right]_{r=\bar{r}_J}$$

$$= \int_{\bar{r}_J}^{\infty} dr \left[U_J^{\,2}(r) + W_J^{\,2}(r) \right] - \int_0^{\infty} dr \left[u_J^{\,2}(r) + w_J^{\,2}(r) \right] . \tag{11}$$

Here u_J, w_J are the radial wave functions for $L = J - 1, J+1$ respectively, and U_J, W_J are the corresponding comparison functions. These wave functions, together with $\bar{r}_J$ and the logarithmic derivatives, may refer to either of the mutually orthogonal eigenwave mixtures which, in virtue of the tensor coupling, remain unchanged during the scattering process.

In each scattering state ξ , we now require $\bar{r}_\xi$ to be energy independent, and of value such that the left-hand side of Eq. (9) vanishes when evaluated at some specified energy $\bar{E}$,

$$\left[\frac{\partial \Gamma_\xi}{\partial k^2}\right]_{r=\bar{r}_\xi} = 0 \quad , \qquad E = \bar{E} \ . \tag{12}$$

The logarithmic derivatives Γ_ξ , which in the vicinity of $\bar{E}$ depend at most weakly upon energy, together with the (by choice) energy-independent characteristic distances $\bar{r}_\xi$, completely specify the scattering. Indeed the Γ's are <u>formally</u> identical with the logarithmic derivatives $f_i + 1$ assumed energy-independent by F.L. in their fit of the scattering data. However, while the latter incorporate the effect of a very strong nuclear force confined within a region $r \leq r_0$, the former embody no assumptions whatever about the force except its static nature and short range. The increased generality of description is reflected in the correspondingly weaker statement that Γ_ξ is no more than locally energy-independent.

The form of the stationary expression in Eq. (9) suggests that the above description is closely analogous to the effective range representation of low-energy scattering. In the $^1S_0$ state, Eq. (9) reduces to

$$U^2(\bar{r}_0)\,\Gamma_0(\bar{r}_0) = \int_0^\infty dr \left[\left(\frac{du}{dr}\right)^2 - (k^2 - \lambda f(r))u^2\right] - \int_{\bar{r}_0}^\infty dr \left[\left(\frac{dU}{dr}\right)^2 - k^2 U^2\right], \tag{13}$$

where u, U satisfy the equations

$$\left[\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + k^2 - \lambda f(r)\right] u = 0 , \tag{14}$$

$$\left[\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + k^2\right] U = 0 , \tag{15}$$

in which $\lambda = MV_o/\hbar^2$ and $V_o f(r)$ is the $^1S_0$ potential. Let us set $\bar{r}_o = 0$ momentarily, and follow Schwinger[5] in introducing energy expansions:

$$\begin{aligned} u(r) &= u_o(r) + k^2 u_1(r) + \ldots , \qquad u_1(0) = 0 , \\ U(r) &= U_o(r) + k^2 U_1(r) + \ldots , \qquad U_1(0) = 0 , \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

and

$$\Gamma_o(0) = k \cot \delta_o = a_o^{-1} + \tfrac{1}{2} r_{eo} k^2 - P r_{eo}^3 k^4 + \ldots . \tag{17}$$

Equation (13) then yields the customary definitions of the singlet scattering length a_o, effective range r_{eo}, and shape-dependent parameter P:

$$a_o^{-1} = U_o^{-2}(0) \left[\int_0^\infty \left[\left(\frac{du_o}{dr}\right)^2 - \lambda f(r) u_o^2 \right] dr - \int_0^\infty dr \left(\frac{dU_o}{dr}\right)^2 \right] , \tag{18}$$

$$\tfrac{1}{2} r_{eo} = U_o^{-2}(0) \int_0^\infty (U_o^2 - u_o^2) dr , \tag{19}$$

$$P r_{eo}^3 = U_o^{-2}(0) \int_0^\infty (U_o U_1 - u_o u_1) dr . \tag{20}$$

It is thus appropriate to apply the condition of Eq. (12) at $\bar{E} = 0$, which then gives the defining equation for $\bar{r}_o$:

$$\int_{\bar{r}_o}^{\infty} dr\, U_o^{\,2} - \int_0^{\infty} u_o^{\,2}\, dr = 0 \quad . \tag{21}$$

Using Eq. (19) and the zero-energy solution of Eq. (15),

$$U_o(r) = 1 + a_o^{-1}\, r \quad , \tag{22}$$

we obtain an expression for $\bar{r}_o$ independent of the details of the force,

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\, r_{eo} = \bar{r}_o + a_o^{-1}\, \bar{r}_o^{\,2} + \tfrac{1}{3}\, a_o^{-2}\, \bar{r}_o^{\,3} \quad . \tag{23}$$

From the experimental values[6]

$$r_{eo} = (2.52 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm},$$

$$a_o^{-1} = (0.422 \pm 0.001) \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1},$$

we have

$$\bar{r}_o = (1.20 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}. \tag{24}$$

This value is in good agreement with the 'core' radius $\bar{r}_o \sim 1.32 \times 10^{-13}$ cm found empirically by LF to yield the best over-all fit of nucleon-nucleon scattering data; and of course also agrees with the boundary radius of $0.47\ e^2/mc^2$ found by Breit,[3] using the same criterion (i.e., weak energy dependence) but rather different methods.

Turning now to the coupled $^3S_1 + {}^3D_1$ mixture, we apply Condition (12) to Eq. (11) at $E = -\epsilon$, the binding energy of the deuteron. In virtue of

the normalization

$$\int_0^\infty dr(u_1^2 + w_1^2) = 1 , \tag{25}$$

we have

$$\int_{\bar{r}_1}^\infty dr\,(U_1^2 + W_1^2) = 1 , \qquad E = -\epsilon , \tag{26}$$

in which the S, D comparison functions U_1, W_1 refer to the S-dominant eigenwave mixture. Equation (26) is now to be compared with the 'bound state' definition of the effective range,

$$\bar{U}_1^2(0)\left(\tfrac{1}{2} r_{e1}\right) \equiv \int_0^\infty dr\, \bar{U}_1^2 - 1 \tag{27}$$

where $\bar{U}(r)$ is the solution of (15) at $E = -\epsilon$,

$$\bar{U}_1(r) = \bar{U}_1(0)\exp(-\eta r) , \qquad \eta = (M\epsilon/\hbar^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} , \tag{28}$$

and thus corresponds to neglect of the small D-state admixture in $U_1(r)$. The latter and $W_1(r)$ are the solutions of the radial equations, uncoupled in the absence of interaction,

$$\left(d^2/dr^2 - \eta^2\right) U_1(r) = 0 \tag{29}$$

$$\left(d^2/dr^2 - 6/r^2 - \eta^2\right) W_1(r) = 0 \tag{30}$$

which we write as

$$U_1(r) = \bar{U}_1(0)\,(1-\zeta^2)^{1/2}\exp(-\eta r) \tag{31}$$

$$W_1(r) = \bar{U}_1(0)\,\zeta\,[1+3(\eta r)^{-1}+3(\eta r)^{-2}]\exp(-\eta r) \tag{32}$$

In this way $\bar{U}(0)$ measures the total amplitude at large distances,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\left[U_1^2+W_1^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sim \bar{U}_1(0)\exp(-\eta r)\ , \tag{33}$$

while ζ similarly measures the relative amplitude of D state,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} W_1\Big/\left(U_1^2+W_1^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sim \zeta\ . \tag{34}$$

The quantity $\bar{U}(0)$ is determined from Eq. (27) to be

$$\bar{U}_1(0) = 2\eta/(1-\eta r_{el})^{\frac{1}{2}}\ , \tag{35}$$

while ζ is fixed by reference to the quadrupole moment,

$$Q = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{10}\int_0^\infty dr\, r^2(u_1 w_1 - 2^{-3/2} w_1^2) \simeq 2.77\times 10^{-27}\ \mathrm{cm}^2. \tag{36}$$

The error incurred in Eq. (36) by replacing the interaction wave functions by their corresponding comparison functions is small, in virtue of the insensitivity of Q to changes in the former at small distances. The quantity ζ thus determined is ~ 0.02, although this value could fluctuate by perhaps 50% without destroying agreement with the observed value of Q and the asymmetry of the low-energy n-p angular distribution.

The Condition (26) then yields the following expression for $\bar{r}_1$:

$$1-\eta r_{e1}=\left[1+6\zeta^2(\eta\bar{r}_1)^{-3}(1+\eta\bar{r}_1)^2\right]\exp(-2\eta\bar{r}_1) \qquad (37)$$

In Fig. 1 we have plotted $\bar{r}_1$ in its dependence upon the admixture ζ, using the experimental values[7]

$$\epsilon = 2.226 \pm 0.003 \text{ Mev},$$

$$r_{e1} = (1.720 \pm 0.035)10^{-13} \text{ cm},$$

and have also indicated the permitted range of values of $\bar{r}_o$. We may evidently consider the characteristic distances $\bar{r}_1$, $\bar{r}_o$ to be the same within experimental uncertainties. Thus even at low energies the compactness of this "extended effective range" description is manifest, in that only one characteristic distance need be used to describe the ground states of the two-nucleon system as opposed to the two range corrections r_{eo}, r_{e1} in the usual treatment.

It is clear from the above development that $\bar{r}$ has no more significance than the effective range itself. In the $^1S_0$ state, it is closely equal to half the effective range, and therefore may be thought of as a mean interaction distance. In general, however, it is simply to be viewed as one of two parameters that have been chosen to represent a single strongly energy-dependent quantity, the phase shift, in such a way as to make it an explicit function of energy, rather than an implicit one, over a certain energy range. To the extent that an energy-independent core region is actually a true representation of the nuclear force, these parameters have physical significance.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NUCLEAR FORCE

Since the value of $\bar{r}$ agrees well with the core radius of the preceding paper, we may apply FL's results directly to our own work. Regarding the logarithmic derivative Γ as energy-independent results in a quantitative fit of all nucleon scattering data to 200 Mev. In virtue of our more general description, this fit is no longer to be regarded solely as a consequence of a specific model of nuclear forces, but rather as constituting a strong condition which any proposed nuclear potential must satisfy if it is to yield a charge-independent representation of the data. More specifically, the energy-independent character of Γ in S states is maintained only within an energy region corresponding to the shape-independent approximation where all short-range potentials are equivalent; i.e., 0 to 15 Mev. The further energy dependence required by the FL fit must therefore be determined by the details of the potential. Thus what has been established in the above simple fashion is a means of testing potentials for their agreement with experiment without recourse to a phase-shift analysis. One need only determine the behavior with energy of the Γ_ξ corresponding to the potential in question.

In order to illustrate this procedure, we turn our attention to $^1S_0$ scattering from a number of potentials in the limit of zero binding (infinite scattering length). Let us first consider the rectangular well, for which an exact expression for Γ can be obtained.[8] The functions u, U are given by

$$\begin{aligned} u &\sim \sin \alpha x, & x &\leq 1, \\ u = U &\sim \sin kx \cot\delta + \cos kx, & x &\geq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where we now use the dimensionless notation $x = r/R$, $K = kR$, $\alpha^2 = K^2 + \pi^2/4$, and R is the range of the force. Matching logarithmic derivatives at $x = 1$ yields the desired expression for

$$\Gamma(K) = K \cot(K\bar{x} + \delta) = K \frac{(\alpha \cot\alpha)\cot K(\bar{x}-1) - K}{\alpha \cot\alpha + K \cot K(\bar{x}-1)} \tag{39}$$

where according to Eq. (21) $\bar{x} = \bar{r}/R = 1/2$.

An estimate of the energy dependence of $\Gamma(\kappa)$ is to be made by comparing its value at a given energy with its correct zero-energy value,[9]

$$\Gamma(0) = a^{-1}R/(1 + a^{-1}r) \tag{40}$$

$$= 0.0965 \pm 0.0077 \text{ (Rect.)}.$$

The expression

$$\varepsilon(\kappa) = (\Gamma(\kappa) - \Gamma(0))/\Gamma(0) \tag{41}$$

is shown in Fig. 2.

It is of interest to use the rectangular well as a means of testing the accuracy of results obtained through the use of variational principle, Eq. (13). Consider the approximate expression

$$\Gamma'(\kappa) = \Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1 \kappa^2 + \Gamma_2 \kappa^4 \tag{42}$$

The coefficient Γ_1 is required to vanish by our choice of $\bar{r}$; then Γ_2 is primarily responsible for the energy dependence of Γ over an interval whose extent we now determine. By differentiating Eq. (13) twice with respect to energy, making use of its stationary character in the manner already described, and evaluating the result at E = 0, we obtain

$$\Gamma_2 = U_o^{-2}(\bar{x}) \left[\int_{\bar{x}}^{\infty} dx\, U_o U_1 - \int_0^{\infty} dx\, u_o u_1 \right], \tag{43}$$

which may be re-expressed in terms of the shape-dependent parameter P, using Eq. (20):

$$\Gamma_2 = -\bar{x}^3 (8P + 1/3). \tag{44}$$

A simple calculation yields the value $\Gamma_2(\text{rect.}) = -0.0096$, consistent with $P(\text{rect.}) = -0.032$ as given in Blatt-Jackson.[2] The expression

$$\varepsilon'(\kappa) = \Gamma_2 \Gamma_o^{-1} \kappa^4 \quad , \tag{45}$$

where Γ_o is given by Eq. (40), is seen from Fig. 2 to be accurate within 10% for energies less than 50 Mev.

We now assume that Eq. (42) gives an equally adequate representation of the Gaussian, exponential and Yukawa potentials. The corresponding $\epsilon'(\kappa)$ are also plotted in Fig. 2. We now compare this energy dependence with that determined by the FL fit for the ^1S_o state, restricting our discussion to energies below 50 Mev. In this energy region p-p scattering is determined mostly by the ^1S_o state, although at the higher energies there is a small contribution coming from the ^3P_o state. The uncertainty in the change in Γ over this range, $\Delta\Gamma$, arises mostly from the incomplete determination of the contribution of the latter state. From the FL analysis, it is reasonable to assume that $\Delta\Gamma$ varies between zero and the change which FL obtain in their fit B. (Fit A seems to be eliminated by recent experimental data.) The corresponding condition on P is

$$-0.0416 < P < -.0367 \tag{46}$$

This condition clearly eliminates the Yukawa, exponential and Gaussian potentials. The square well potential is still possible but only barely so. It is clear that it would be worth while to make a more thorough experimental investigation of this energy region.

To demonstrate what information such research might yield, suppose that Γ only changes by 20 per cent in going from 0 to 50 Mev. Then

$$-0.0416 < P < -0.0402 \tag{47}$$

We shall now show that such a limitation on the permitted values of P would require the use of core type potentials, as is already indicated by intermediate energy scattering experiments. We shall also see that the FL fit as given by Eq. (46) if applied rigorously would require a core. As a first orientation, it may be noted that as P changes from positive to negative values, the potential becomes progressively shorter-tailed and less attractive at the origin. Since P for a rectangular well is -0.032, the requirement (47) as well as (46) of the FL fit suggests a core without adducing further evidence.

Consider then the potential

$$V_{(x)} = \begin{cases} V_1 & x < x_c \\ -V_o & x_c < x < 1 \\ 0 & x > 1 \end{cases} \tag{48}$$

for which exact solutions may be obtained. The calculation, which is perfectly straightforward, will not be discussed except to observe that Γ in its dependence on energy is most easily found by using an obvious modification of Eq. (13):

$$U^2(\bar{x})\,\Gamma(\bar{x}) - u^2(x_c)\,\gamma_c = \int_{x_c}^{1} dx\left[\left(\frac{du}{dx}\right)^2 - \frac{MR^2}{\hbar^2}\,(E + V_o)\,u^2\right] - \int_{1}^{\bar{x}} dx\left[\left(\frac{dU}{dx}\right)^2 - \frac{MR^2}{\hbar^2}\,U^2\right] ,$$

where $\gamma_c = \left[u^{-1}\,du/dx\right]_{x=x_c}$, and the other symbols have their usual significance. In the limit of zero binding, V_1 is shown in Fig. 3 as a function of P for several values of x_c. The value of the core radius r_c changes by no more than $\pm\,0.03\,r$ for a given value of $x_c = r_c/R$, so that each of the curves in Fig. 3 also represents a characteristic core size. The matching conditions at $x = x_c$ cannot be maintained for $V_1 < \sim 25$ Mev; for large V_1 the curves approach asymptotic values of P. In the limit of small r_c and large V_1, this asymptotic value approaches $P = -0.032$, i.e., a pure rectangular well. The effect upon the scattering of an increase in core size is evidently just the reverse of that produced by going to longer-tailed attractive wells, which implies the existence of many tail-core combinations for a given value of P. We note that, in order for Eq. (47) to hold, r_c is confined to the approximate region

$$0.1 \times 10^{-13}\ \text{cm} < r_c < 0.4 \times 10^{-13}\ \text{cm} , \qquad \underline{\text{Rect.}} \qquad (49)$$

for reasonably hard cores.[13] This is to be compared with $r_c = 0.5 - 0.6 \times 10^{-13}$ cm, the value used by Jastrow[11] in his phenomenological fit of p-p scattering, as well as by Levy[12] in conjunction with a meson-theoretical potential. The small discrepancy is due to their use of a fairly long-tailed attractive well, which in our calculations has the effect of increasing somewhat the permissible core size. A numerical analysis making use of an exterior Yukawa well yields the approximate limiting value

$$r_c < 0.7 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}, \qquad \underline{\text{Yukawa.}} \tag{50}$$

In summary, we have seen that the local energy independence of Γ in S-states is valid over an energy range corresponding to the shape-independent approximation. The additional energy independence required by the FL analysis prohibits the use of simple two-parameter potentials except possibly the rectangular well but does permit core-type configurations. Such potentials will yield the correct $^1S_0$ phase shift up to energies of at least 50 to 60 Mev. It has been noted that there is still considerable freedom in the choice of potential. $^1S_0$ scattering to 50 Mev implies no restriction on the form of the attractive well, although once a well shape is chosen the core size is limited.[14] A further (weak) restriction may be obtained by invoking charge independence in S states,[5] which tends to exclude cores greater than $\sim 0.3 \times 10^{-13}$ cm.[15] Such small cores are not necessarily in conflict with meson theory.[16]

While all our examples have been concerned with static potentials, the methods may be easily extended to treat velocity-dependent forces. These can be reconciled with the FL analysis provided they are at most

weakly energy dependent. Calculations, to be reported more fully at a later date, reveal that such forces are capable of reducing ϵ (Eq. (41)) in S states considerably below its corresponding static force value. We point out that the virtual excitation, in close collisions, of nucleonic isobaric states produces an S-state force having this behavior in the energy range considered above.[17]

The fit of the two-nucleon scattering data obtained from the constancy of Γ in all states is quantitative to energies as high as 200 Mev, so that the testing procedures may be extended. Uncertainties in the FL analysis due to causes already mentioned will of course increase, so that limitations on the energy variation of Γ will become less severe.

The methods we have presented are of course not restricted to S states. The forces obtaining in higher angular momentum states with tensor interactions may be analyzed with the aid of the development in the Appendix. It is hoped that these methods may be of use in treating the consequences of specific models of the two-body force without the necessity of direct comparison with experiment at a variety of energies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The use of the FL empirical fit as a means of facilitating the comparison of potential models was first suggested to the author by Professor Julian Schwinger, whom he wishes to thank for encouragement and many helpful conversations. He has also enjoyed many talks with Professor Herman Feshbach and Dr. Earle Lomon on the relation of their work to his research. Finally he wishes to acknowledge the help of the computing staff of the Radiation Laboratory, in particular Messrs. Eldon Hansen and Charles Stableford, in finding the characteristics of core-type potentials.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

APPENDIX

We shall verify that Eq. (9) in the text is a stationary expression for the generalized logarithmic derivative $\Gamma(\bar{r})$ with respect to independent variations of ψ, Ψ or their adjoints, subject only to the restriction

$$(r\psi)(0) = 0 ; \qquad \psi(r) \to \Psi(r) , \qquad r \to \infty . \tag{A1}$$

The stationary value is attained for functions ψ, Ψ satisfying Eq. (1), (2) in the text. Variation with respect to $\psi^{\dagger}$, $\Psi^{\dagger}$ for example gives

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \left\{ \int d\omega \left[r\,\delta\psi^{\dagger} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r\psi) \right]_{r=0}^{r=R} - \int d\omega \left[r\,\delta\Psi^{\dagger} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r\Psi) \right]_{r=\bar{r}}^{r=R} \right\}$$

$$+ \int_{r\geq\bar{r}} (dr)\,\delta\Psi^{\dagger}(k^2+\nabla^2)\Psi - \int_{\text{all space}} (dr)\,\delta\psi^{\dagger}(k^2-H)\psi$$

$$= \int d\omega \left[r\,\delta\Psi^{\dagger}\Gamma(r\Psi) + r\Psi^{\dagger}\delta\Gamma(r\Psi) \right]_{r=\bar{r}} \tag{A2}$$

In virtue of the condition in Eq. (A1), the surface integrals on the left-hand side becomes

$$\int d\omega \left[r\,\delta\Psi^{\dagger}\,\partial(r\Psi)/\partial r \right]_{r=\bar{r}} ;$$

hence the condition that Γ be stationary under this type of variation is expressed by the differential equations (1), (2) of the text and the requirement of Eq. (7).

By insertion of the appropriate partial-wave expansions into the stationary expression Eq. (9), we may easily obtain the variational principles appropriate to the different scattering states, together with the differential equations obeyed by the radial functions in these states. For example let us assume

$$H' = -\lambda\left[F(r) + \gamma G(r) S_{12}\right] , \tag{A3}$$

where S_{12} is the tensor operator

$$S_{12} = (3/r^2)(\underset{\sim}{\sigma}_1 \cdot \underset{\sim}{r})(\underset{\sim}{\sigma}_2 \cdot \underset{\sim}{r}) - \underset{\sim}{\sigma}_1 \cdot \underset{\sim}{\sigma}_2 , \tag{A4}$$

$\lambda = MV_o/\hbar^2$, and γ is the ratio of the tensor strength V_1 to the central strength V_o. We make use of

$$r\Psi_{\text{singlet}} = \sum_L c_L P_L(\cos\theta)\, U_L(r) . \tag{A5}$$

with a similar expression for ψ_{singlet}; and, after performing the angular integrations, obtain the form of Eq. (9) appropriate to singlet states of scattering:

$$U_L^2(\bar{r})\,\Gamma_{LL}(\bar{r}) = \int_0^\infty dr\left[(du_L/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 + \lambda F(r) - \frac{L(L+1)}{r^2}\right) u_L^2\right]$$

$$- \int_{r_L}^\infty dr\left[(dU_L/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 - \frac{L(L+1)}{r^2}\right) U_L^2\right] . \tag{A6}$$

Equation (A6) is a stationary expression for $\Gamma_{LL}(\bar{r})$ when the radial functions u_L, U_L satisfy

$$\left[d^2/dr^2 + \left(k^2 + \lambda F(r) - L(L+1)/r^2\right)\right] u_L(r) = 0$$

$$\left[d^2/dr^2 + \left(k^2 - L(L+1)/r^2\right)\right] U_L(r) = 0 \tag{A7}$$

and provided we make the identification

$$\Gamma_{LL}(\bar{r}_L) = U_L^{-1}(\bar{r}_L)\,(dU_L/dr)_{r=\bar{r}_L} \quad . \tag{A8}$$

Thus, in singlet states, Γ is a diagonal matrix with elements Γ_{LL}. In virtue of the stationary property of Eq. (A6), expansion of the radial functions u_L, U_L in the manner of Eq. (18) of the text gives rise to the rigorous expression Eq. (12).

Turning now to triplet states, we note that $\Gamma_{triplet}$ is in general not diagonal, owing to mixing of states induced by the tensor coupling. We may, however, go to a representation in which $\Gamma_{triplet}$ is diagonal by taking linear combinations of states with the same parity. In this "eigenstate representation" the scattering matrix is diagonal. We follow Rohrlich and Eisenstein[18] in introducing the partial wave expansion

$$\underset{\sim}{\Psi}_{triplet} = \sum_{J,m} c_J^m \left[c_\alpha \underset{\sim}{\Psi}_\alpha^{J,m} + c_\beta \underset{\sim}{\Psi}_\beta^{J,m} + c_\gamma \underset{\sim}{\Psi}_\gamma^{J,m}\right] \tag{A9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r\,\underset{\sim}{\Psi}_\alpha^{J,m} &= \underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{U_J} U_J^{(\alpha)} - \underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{W_J} W_J^{(\alpha)} \\ r\,\underset{\sim}{\Psi}_\beta^{J,m} &= \underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{V_J} V_J^{(\beta)} \\ r\,\underset{\sim}{\Psi}_\gamma^{J,m} &= \underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{U_J} U_J^{(\gamma)} + \underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{W_J} W_J^{(\gamma)} \end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

are a set of mutually orthogonal "parity" wave functions, the eigenfunctions of the tensor Hamiltonian. Here the Φ's are the orthonormal spin-angle vectors introduced by Corben and Schwinger,[19] while U_J, V_J, W_J represent the comparison radial functions for the states $L = J - 1, J, J+1$ respectively. An analogous expansion is introduced for the interaction wave function Ψ_{triplet}. The effect of S_{12} operating on Φ, as given in RE, is

$$S_{12}\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{U_J} = -2\,\frac{J-1}{2J+1}\,\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{U_J} + 6\,\frac{[J(J+1)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2J+1}\,\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{W_J}\,,$$

$$S_{12}\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{W_J} = 6\,\frac{[J(J+1)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2J+1}\,\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{U_J} - 2\,\frac{J+2}{2J+1}\,\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{W_J}\,, \tag{A11}$$

$$S_{12}\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{V_J} = 2\,\underset{\sim}{\Phi}_{V_J}\,.$$

We are now in a position to carry out the angular integrations in Eq. (9). The orthogonality of the wave functions, Eq. (A10), results in three separate expressions corresponding to the eigenstates (α, β, γ),[20]

$$\left[U_J^{\,2}(\bar{r}_J)\,\Gamma_{U_J}(\bar{r}_J)\right]^{(\alpha,\gamma)} + \left[W_J^{\,2}(\bar{r}_J)\,\Gamma_{W_J}(\bar{r}_J)\right]^{(\alpha,\gamma)}$$

$$= \int_0^\infty dr\left\{\left[(du_J/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 + \lambda f_J(r) - \frac{J(J-1)}{r^2}\right)u_J^{\,2}\right] + \left[(dw_J/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 + \lambda h_J(r) - \frac{(J+1)(J+2)}{r^2}\right)w_J^{\,2}\right] - 2\lambda g_J(r)u_J\,w_J\right\}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}$$

$$- \int_{\bar{r}_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)}}^\infty dr\left\{\left[(dU_J/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 - \frac{J(J-1)}{r^2}\right)U_J^{\,2}\right] + \left[(dW_J/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 - \frac{(J+1)(J+2)}{r^2}\right)W_J^{\,2}\right]\right\}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}$$

$$\left[V_J^{\,2}(\bar{r}_J)\, \Gamma_{V_J}(\bar{r}_J) \right]^{(\mathcal{B})} = \int_0^\infty dr \left[(dv_J/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 - \frac{J(J+1)}{r^2} + \lambda\, \mathcal{L}(r) \right) v_J^{\,2} \right]^{(\mathcal{B})}$$

$$- \int_{\bar{r}_J^{(\mathcal{B})}}^\infty dr \left[(dV_J/dr)^2 - \left(k^2 - \frac{J(J+1)}{r^2} \right) V_J^{\,2} \right]^{(\mathcal{B})} . \tag{A13}$$

Here we use the notation of RB,

$$\begin{aligned} f_J(r) &= F(r) - 2\, \frac{J-1}{2J+1}\, G(r) , \\ g_J(r) &= 6\, \frac{[J(J+1)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2J+1}\, \gamma\, G(r) , \\ h_J(r) &= F(r) - 2\, \frac{J+2}{2J+1}\, \gamma\, G(r) , \\ \mathcal{L}_J(r) &= F(r) + 2\, \gamma\, G(r) . \end{aligned} \tag{A14}$$

Again we obtain the differential equations satisfied by the various radial functions in the form of conditions such that Eqs. (A12), (A13) are stationary expressions for the Γ's. They are

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + k^2 - \frac{J(J-1)}{r^2} \right) u_J(r) &= \lambda \left(f_J(r)\, u_J(r) + g_J(r)\, w_J(r) \right) , \\ \left(\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + k^2 - \frac{(J+1)(J+2)}{r^2} \right) w_J(r) &= \lambda \left(g_J(r)\, u_J(r) + h_J(r)\, w_J(r) \right) , \\ \left(\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + k^2 - \frac{J(J+1)}{r^2} \right) v_J(r) &= \lambda\, \mathcal{L}(r)\, v_J(r) . \end{aligned} \tag{A15}$$

The corresponding comparison functions satisfy the set of Eq. (A15) with $\lambda = 0$. Then by virtue of Eq. (A1), a variation of this type applied to Eq. (A12) results in

$$U_J^2(\bar{r}_J)\,\delta\Gamma_{U_J}(\bar{r}_J) + W_J^2(\bar{r}_J)\,\delta\Gamma_{W_J}(\bar{r}_J)$$

$$= 2\left((dU_J/dr) - U_J\,\Gamma_{U_J}\right)_{\bar{r}_J}\delta U_J(\bar{r}_J) + 2\left((dW_J/dr) - W_J\,\Gamma_{W_J}\right)_{\bar{r}_J}\delta W_J(\bar{r}_J) \tag{A16}$$

for either of the mixtures (α, γ). The variations of U_J, W_J at $r = \bar{r}_J$ are unrelated, and hence Eq. (A12) is indeed stationary provided we define

$$\Gamma_{U_J}(\bar{r}_J) = U_J^{-1}(\bar{r}_J)\left[(d/dr)\ U_J\right]_{\bar{r}_J} ; \tag{A17}$$

$$\Gamma_{W_J}(\bar{r}_J) = W_J^{-1}(\bar{r}_J)\left[(d/dr)\ W_J\ (r)\right]_{\bar{r}_J} . \qquad ($$

The stationary nature of Eq. (A13) follows analogously.

It is a consequence of describing the scattering in terms of the eigenstates of the tensor Hamiltonian that the variations δU_J, δW_J are asymptotically related. Thus asymptotically, U_J, W_J are given by

$$U_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} \sim A_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)}\left[\sin\left(kr - \frac{\pi}{2}(J-1) + \delta_{U_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}\right)\Big/\cos\delta_{U_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}\right],$$

$$W_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} \sim C_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)}\left[\sin\left(kr - \frac{\pi}{2}(J+1) + \delta_{W_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}\right)\Big/\cos\delta_{W_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}\right]. \tag{A18}$$

We must choose $\delta_{U_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)} = \delta_{W_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}$ in order to uniquely fix the pairs of linearly independent radial functions $(u_J, w_J)^{\alpha}$, $(u_J, \omega_J)^{\gamma}$ so that the coupled wave mixture remains unchanged before and after the scattering. We may then define admixture parameters $\eta_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} = -(C_J/A_J)^{(\alpha,\gamma)}$ giving the asymptotic mixing of the $L = J \pm 1$ waves. Thus we have at large distances the relation

$$\delta_{W_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}(r) = \eta_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} \delta_{U_J}^{(\alpha,\gamma)}(\bar{r}), \qquad r \to \infty. \tag{A19}$$

The reciprocal relationship between η_J^{α}, η_J^{γ}, which follows from the unitarity of the S-matrix and the reciprocity of scattering, may also be obtained from the variational principle of Eq. (A12) in a particularly simple fashion. We introduce the scale transformation

$$\begin{aligned} w_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} &\to \eta_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} w_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)}, \\ W_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} &\to \eta_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)} W_J^{(\alpha,\gamma)}. \end{aligned} \tag{A20}$$

Equation (A12) may then be written as

$$\left[U_J^2 \Gamma_{u_J} + \eta_J^2 W_J^2 \Gamma_{W_J} \right]_{r=\bar{r}_J} = a_J - 2b_J \eta_J + c_J \eta_J^2 . \tag{A21}$$

Variation with respect to η_J yields, by virtue of the stationary property,

$$\eta_J = b_J / \left(c_J - W_J^2(r_J) \Gamma_{W_J}(r_J) \right). \tag{A22}$$

Introducing Eq. (A22) into Eq. (A21), one obtains a quadratic equation in $W_J^2 \Gamma_{W_J}$, whose solutions are the eigensolutions of the scattering problem. The well-known relation

$$\eta_J^{(\alpha)} \eta_J^{(\gamma)} = -1 \tag{A23}$$

then follows immediately from Eq. (A22).

Finally, it may be noted that the D-wave admixture for the deuteron ground state may be written

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_D^2 &= \zeta^2/(1+\zeta^2) \\ &= -\left[U^2 (\partial/\partial E)\Gamma_U / W^2 (\partial/\partial E)\Gamma_W\right]_{r=\bar{r}}, \quad E = -\epsilon , \end{aligned} \tag{A24}$$

as follows from the stationary character of Eq. (A21). This then implies the more explicit Expression (39) of the text.

REFERENCES

1. H. Feshbach and E. L. Lomon, referred to as FL

2. J. Schwinger, unpublished lectures on nuclear physics, Harvard 1947; Phys. Rev. 72, 724 (1947). J. M. Blatt, Phys. Rev. 74, 92 (1948). J. M. Blatt and J. D. Jackson, Phys. Rev. 76, 18 (1949).

3. G. Breit and W. G. Bouricius, Phys. Rev. 79, 1029 (1949) have discussed this point of view most thoroughly for low-energy S-wave scattering.

4. J. Schwinger, unpublished lectures on nuclear physics, Harvard, 1955.

5. J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 78, 135 (1950).

6. Recent data summarized by H. S. W. Massey, Proceedings, International Conference on Nuclear and Meson Physics, Glasgow 1954.

7. For r_{el}, cf. D. J. Hughes, M. T. Burgy and G. R. Ringo, Phys. Rev. 79, 227 (1950); for ϵ, cf. E. Melkonian, Phys. Rev. 76, 1744 (1949).

8. Henceforth, all quantities refer to the $^1S_0$ state.

9. LF obtain 0.08 for this quantity by analysis of low-energy n-p data. A similar analysis by G. Breit and W. G. Bouricius (op. cit.) gives the same value.

10. J. M. Blatt and J. D. Jackson, Revs. Modern Phys. 22, 77 (1950).

11. R. Jastrow, Phys. Rev. 81, 165 (1951).

12. M. Levy, Phys. Rev. 88, 725 (1952).

13. A pathological case not included in this range consists of an infinitely strong repulsive core surrounded by a δ-function attractive shell.

14. It proves possible to establish the necessity of a core-type potential in S states under some fairly general assumptions. The force characteristics thus deduced accurately confirm those obtained here. For a preliminary report, see R. B. Raphael, Phys. Rev. 99, 619(A), 1955.

15. E. Salpeter, Phys. Rev. 91, 994 (1953).

16. K. A. Brueckner and K. M. Watson, Phys. Rev. 92, 1023 (1953).

17. R. B. Raphael and J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 90, 373(A) (1953).

18. F. Rohrlich and J. Eisenstein, Phys. Rev. 75, 705 (1949), referred to as RE.

19. H. C. Corben and J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 58, 953 (1940).

20. In these expressions the superscripts designating the parity eigenstates are meant to apply to all the wave functions, logarithmic derivatives, and characteristic distances $\bar{r}$ occurring within the brackets.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: The variation of the triplet characteristic interaction distance $\bar{r}_1$ with the admixture parameter ζ (Eq. (37). The vertical lines indicate the error associated with the triplet effective range r_{e1}. The shaded region indicates possible values of the corresponding singlet quantity r_o. The distances $\bar{r}_1$, $\bar{r}_o$ may consistent with experiment, be taken as equal.

Figure 2: The dependence of the $^1S_0$ logarithmic derivative on energy, as measured approximately by the parameter $\mathcal{E}'$ (Eq. (45)), for four well shapes. The accuracy of this measure is indicated for the rectangular well by plotting the exact dependence $\mathcal{E}$ (Eq. (41)) using Eq. (39). Since the LF fit excludes $\mathcal{E}'$ values greater than 0.1, the potentials are valid only within the shape independent region.

Figure 3: The dependence of the core height V_1 on the shape dependent parameter P for various core radii r_c, using an exterior rectangular well (Eq. (47)) to achieve proper (zero) binding. Permissible core parameters must yield a value of P in the neighborhood of $P = -0.04$ (constant logarithmic derivative).



Fig. 1

24202-1


10.
1.0
0.1
.01
ε'
1.0
10.
100.
E (Mev)
YUKAWA
P = +0.066
EXPONENTIAL
P = +0.012
GAUSSIAN
P = -0.018
RECTANGULAR
P = -0.032
ε
ε'

Fig 2

24201-1


1,000
800
600
400
200
0
V_1 (Mev)
-.02
-.04
-.06
-.08
P
$x_c = 0.05$
$x_c = 0.1$
$x_c = 0.15$
$x_c = 0.3$
$r_c \cong 0.1\bar{r}$
$r_c \cong 0.2\bar{r}$
$r_c \cong 0.3\bar{r}$
$r_c \cong 0.5\bar{r}$

Fig 3

24203-1