# Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
**Recent Work**

**Title**
COULOMB-NUCLEAR INTERFERENCE

**Permalink**
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2d75t2nm

**Author**
Franco, Victor.

**Publication Date**
1972-08-01

# COULOMB-NUCLEAR INTERFERENCE

Victor Franco

August 22, 1972

# DISCLAIMER

# COULOMB-NUCLEAR INTERFERENCE*

Victor Franco

Physics Department
Brooklyn College of the City University of New York
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11210†

and

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

August 22, 1972

## ABSTRACT

The phase difference between strong and electro-
magnetic contributions to the scattering amplitude is
derived from diffraction theory. The results are consist-
ent with relativistic calculations. Bethe's phase is
shown also to be consistent with relativistic calcula-
tions. New expressions for the amplitude are obtained
to all orders in $Z_1 Z_2 e^2/\hbar v$ for the point charge and
extended charge cases. Cross sections calculated from
the original expression and from the point charge solution
are compared with those of the extended charge solution.

When charged strongly-interacting systems collide, both strong
and electromagnetic interactions contribute to the scattering amplitude.
Bethe[1] showed that with certain assumptions the modulus of the
amplitude $F(q)$ for elastic scattering of a point unit charge by a
nucleus of charge $Z$ may be approximated by

$$|F(q)| = |f_s(q) + f_e(q)e^{in\phi}| \tag{1}$$

where $f_s$ is the strong interaction amplitude, $f_e$ is the electro-
magnetic amplitude apart from its phase, $n = Ze^2/\hbar v$, $\hbar\vec{q}$ is the

momentum transfer, and the phase $\phi$ is given by

$$\phi \approx -2 \ln(aq/1.06). \tag{2}$$

Both $f_s$ and the form factor for the charge distribution were taken to
be proportional to $\exp(-\frac{1}{4} a^2 q^2)$.

Subsequently, West and Yennie[2,3] using relativistic methods,
derived for the phase $\phi$ the expression

$$\phi \approx -2 \ln(a'q) - \gamma \tag{3}$$

where $\gamma = 0.577\cdots$ is Euler's constant and

$$a' = \frac{1}{2}(a^2 + c^2 + d^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4}$$

It was assumed that the charge form factors of the target and incident
particles are $\exp(-\frac{1}{4} c^2 q^2)$ and $\exp(-\frac{1}{4} d^2 q^2)$, respectively, and
that $f_s$ is proportional to $\exp(-\frac{1}{4} a^2 q^2)$.

We point out that no reinterpretation of $a$ in Eq. (2) is
needed in order that Eq. (2) be consistent with Eq. (3). Bethe assumed
$d = 0$ (point charge for the incident particle) and $c = a$. Therefore
from Eq. (4) $a' = a/\sqrt{2}$ and from Eq. (3)

$$\phi \approx -2 \ln(aq/\sqrt{2}) - \gamma$$
$$\approx -2 \ln(aq/1.06)$$

which is Bethe's formula Eq. (2).[4]

Using relativistic methods West and Yennie also showed[2] that
for point charges and arbitrary $f_s$, $\phi$ is given by

$$\phi = -2 \ln \sin \frac{1}{2}\theta - 2 \int_0^{2k} [1 - f_s(q')/f_s(q)] \, q' \, dq'/|q^2 - q'^2|. \tag{5}$$

Equation (5) can be derived from diffraction theory. We use
techniques similar to those of the Glauber approximation.[5] The
scattering amplitude is given by[5]

$$F(\vec{q}) = (ik/2\pi) \int e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{b}} \left[1 - e^{iX(\vec{b})}\right] d^2b, \tag{6}$$

where $\hbar\vec{k}$ is the incident momentum and $\vec{b}$ is an impact parameter vector. To exhibit the effects of the Coulomb interaction we write[6]

$$X(\vec{b}) = X_c(b) + X_s(b) \tag{7}$$

where $X_c(b)$ is due to the Coulomb interaction alone and $X_s(b)$ is due to the strong interaction alone. The purely strong and purely Coulombic amplitudes $f_s$ and $f_c$ are given by expressions similar to Eq. (6),

$$f_j(q) = (ik/2\pi) \int e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{b}} \left[1 - e^{iX_j(b)}\right] d^2b, \qquad j = s,c. \tag{8}$$

Using Eqs. (6 - 8) together with the identity

$$1 - e^{i(X_c+X_s)} = (1 - e^{iX_c}) + (1 - e^{iX_s}) - (1 - e^{iX_c})(1 - e^{iX_s}) \tag{9}$$

we obtain

$$F(q) = f_c(q) + f_s(q) - (ik/2\pi) \int e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{b}} \left[1 - e^{iX_c(b)}\right]\left[1 - e^{iX_s(b)}\right] d^2b. \tag{10}$$

If we invert Eq. (8) with $j = s$, we obtain

$$1 - e^{iX_s(b)} = (2\pi ik)^{-1} \int e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{b}} f_s(q) d^2q, \tag{11}$$

and the amplitude $F$ becomes

$$F(q) = f_c(q) + f_s(q) + (2\pi)^{-1} \int f_s(q') J_0(b|\vec{q} - \vec{q}'|) \times \left[e^{iX_c(b)} - 1\right] b\, db\, d^2q'. \tag{12}$$

For a screened Coulomb field with screening radius $R$ and for $q \gg R^{-1}$, we may write[5]

$$X_c(b) = 2 n \ln(b/2R) , \qquad b < R$$
$$= 0 , \qquad b > R. \tag{13}$$

Since $R$ is of atomic dimensions, Eq. (13) will be valid for $\hbar^2 q^2 \gg 10^{-11}$ (GeV/c)$^2$. Furthermore,[5]

$$f_c(q) = -2 n k q^{-2} \exp\left\{-2i[n \ln(qR) - \arg \Gamma(1 + in)]\right\}. \tag{14}$$

For $n \ll 1$, Eq. (12) with Eq. (13) becomes[7]

$$F(q) \approx \lim_{R \to \infty} \left[ f_c(q) + f_s(q) + in\pi^{-1} \int f_s(q') d^2q' \right.$$
$$\left. \times \int_0^R J_0(|\vec{q} - \vec{q}'|b) \ln(b/2R) b\, db \right] \tag{15}$$

$$\approx \lim_{R \to \infty} \left( f_c(q) + f_s(q) \exp\left\{-in\pi^{-1} \int \left[f_s(q')/f_s(q)\right] \right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. \times \left[1 - J_0(R|\vec{q}-\vec{q}'|)\right]\Big/|\vec{q}-\vec{q}'|^2 \, d^2q' - 2 in \ln 2 \right\} \right). \tag{16}$$

Therefore the phase difference $\phi$ is

$$\phi = -2 \ln \sin \tfrac{1}{2}\theta - 2\gamma - \lim_{R \to \infty} \left( 2 \ln kR + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{q'=0}^{q'=2k} \frac{d^2q'}{|\vec{q}-\vec{q}'|^2} \right.$$
$$\left. \times \left\{ \left[1 - \frac{f_s(q')}{f_s(q)}\right] + \left[J_0(R|\vec{q} - \vec{q}'|) \frac{f_s(q')}{f_s(q)} - 1\right] \right\} \right). \tag{17}$$

We have assumed, as is usual in high energy diffraction theory,[5] that $f_s(q)$ is strongly peaked in the forward direction and that the $q'$ integration is taken over the physical region $q' \le 2k$. For $(q/2k)^2 \ll 1$, we obtain[7]

$$\lim_{R \to \infty} \pi^{-1} \int_0^{2k} [1 - J_0(R|\vec{q} - \vec{q}'|)]f_s(q')/f_s(q)]/|\vec{q} - \vec{q}'|^2 \, d^2q'$$

$$\approx \lim_{R \to \infty} \pi^{-1} \int_0^{2kR} [1 - J_0(q')]/q'^2 \, d^2q' \qquad (18)$$

$$= \lim_{R \to \infty} [2 \ln(kR) + 2\gamma]. \qquad (19)$$

If we perform the angular integration on the remaining integral in Eq. (17) we obtain Eq. (5).

We have thus demonstrated that the results obtained by relativistic methods (which are calculated to $O(n)$) and the results of diffraction theory (which are calculated to all orders in $n$) agree to $O(n)$. For scattering of hadrons by heavy nuclei, or for high-energy heavy-ion experiments being performed,[8] the parameter $n = Z_1 Z_2 e^2/\hbar v$ is not small (even at high energies) and calculations good to first order in $n$ will be inaccurate. Let us therefore use diffraction theory to calculate the complete amplitude in such cases. We shall assume that the charge form factors of the target and incident nuclei are $\exp(-\frac{1}{4} c^2 q^2)$ and $\exp(-\frac{1}{4} d^2 q^2)$, respectively, and that the incident-nucleus-target strong interaction amplitude is[9] $f_s(q) = f_0 \exp(-\frac{1}{4} a^2 q^2)$. We find that

$$\chi_c(b) = \chi_c^{pt}(b) + n E_1(b^2/r^2), \qquad (20)$$

where $r^2 = c^2 + d^2$, $\chi_c^{pt}(b)$ is the Coulomb phase shift function for a point charge, and $E_1(x) = -Ei(-x)$, where $Ei$ is the exponential integral. There are many ways of separating the Coulomb and nuclear effects and of separating the point-charge and charge-distribution effects. The final result may be written, for example, as

$$|F(q)| = \left| F^{pt}(q) + ikr^2 e^{2in \, \ln(r/a)} \int_0^\infty J_0(rqx)x^{2in+1}\left[1 - e^{inE_1(x^2)}\right]dx \right.$$

$$+ (2r^2 f_0/a^2) e^{2in\ln(r/a)} \int_0^\infty J_0(rqx)\left[e^{inE_1(x^2)} - 1\right] x^{2in+1}$$

$$\left. \times \, e^{-r^2 x^2/a^2} \, dx \right|, \qquad (21)$$

where $F^{pt}(q)$ is the point-charge solution[10]

$$F^{pt}(q) = -2n k q^{-2} \exp\left\{-2i\left[n \, \ln(\tfrac{1}{2} aq) - \arg \Gamma(1 + in)\right]\right\}$$

$$+ f_s(q) \, \Gamma(1 + in) \, {}_1F_1(-in; 1; \tfrac{1}{4} a^2 q^2) \qquad (22)$$

in which ${}_1F_1$ is the confluent hypergeometric function.

As an illustration, we consider the case $d = 0$, $c = a$ (so that Eqs. (2) and (3) are identical). We compare in Fig. 1 cross sections near the Coulomb interference region obtained from (i) Eq. (1) with $\phi$ given by Eqs. (2) or (3), and (ii) $F(q) = F^{pt}(q)$, with those obtained from the "exact" solution Eq. (21). The parameters $a$ and $f_0$ were chosen to correspond approximately to appropriate strong interaction data. Their precise values are unimportant since we are comparing theoretical expressions.

We see from Fig. 1 that with Eq. (2) or (3) errors in the cross sections of $\sim 20\%$ occur for p-Pb scattering, $\sim 10\%$ for C-C scattering, $\sim 1\%$ for p-C and $\pi^-$-C scattering, $\sim 0.2\%$ for $\alpha$-$\alpha$ scattering, and $\sim 0.03\%$ for p-p scattering.

It is interesting to note that the point-charge solution Eq. (22) is generally no more accurate (and often less accurate) than Eq. (2) or (3), even at very small angles.

In obtaining his result, Bethe made the approximations that the average Coulomb phase shift of the nuclear scattering be evaluated at $q = 0$ and that the calculation neglect terms of $O(n^2)$. The remarkable accuracy of Bethe's result for p-p, $\alpha$-$\alpha$, $\pi$-C, and p-C scattering stems in part from the compensating effects of these two approximations. Figure 1 shows that neglecting the q-dependence of the phase generally induces an error opposite in sign to that induced by neglecting terms which are of higher order in n. (The dotted and solid curves generally lie on opposite sides of the -t axis.) We also see that for p-C, $\pi$-C, $\alpha$-$\alpha$, and p-p scattering, retention of the q-dependence of the phase (dotted curve) generally increases the accuracy of the results significantly. It is straightforward to modify Eq. (2) to take the q-dependence into account by means of a simple rapidly converging power series in $q^2$. However, for $n \gtrsim 0.1$, the q-dependence modification still yields inaccurate results. It is clear from our calculations that for collisions in which $n \gtrsim 0.1$, Eq. (21) should be used in analyses of data in the Coulomb-nuclear interference region.

We wish to thank Professor Geoffrey F. Chew for his hospitality at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

## FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

\* Work supported in part by the National Science Foundation, by the CUNY Faculty Research Award Program, and by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

† Permanent address.

1. H. A. Bethe, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) 3, 190 (1958).

2. G. B. West and D. R. Yennie, Phys. Rev. 172, 1413 (1968).

3. See also M. P. Locher, Nucl. Phys. B2, 525 (1967).

4. The generalization of Bethe's calculation for the case $d \neq 0$ and $c \neq a$ is also consistent with Eq. (3).

5. R. J. Glauber, in Lectures in Theoretical Physics (Interscience, New York, 1959), Vol. I.

6. V. Franco, Phys. Rev. Lett. 16, 944 (1966).

7. Tables of Integral Transforms, edited by A. Erdelyi (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960), Vol. II, Chap. 8.

8. H. M. Steiner, private communication.

9. For arbitrary $f_s$ and form factors, numerical evaluation of Eq. (6) could be performed.

10. V. Franco, Phys. Rev. Lett. 27, 1541 (1971).

FIGURE CAPTION

Fig. 1. Percentage error in calculated cross sections when compared with the "exact" solution Eq. (21), as a function of the squared momentum transfer. The solid curves compare cross sections calculated using the phase given by Bethe and by West and Yennie, Eqs. (2) and (3), with cross sections obtained from Eq. (21). The dashed curves compare the point charge solution, Eq. (22), with Eq. (21). The dotted curves are obtained by modifying Bethe's calculation to take into account the q-dependence of the average Coulomb phase shift of the nuclear scattering. The arrows indicate the $t$ values for which Coulomb and strong interaction contributions to the cross section are approximately equal.

Fig. 1

XBL 728 - 3822