

Asymmetry in $\vec{n} + p \rightarrow d + \gamma$

Chang Ho Hyun^{a,#1#2}, Tae-Sun Park^{b,c,#3} and Dong-Pil Min^{a,#4}

^a*Department of Physics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea*

^b*Theory Group, TRIUMF, 4004 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 2A3*

^c*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of South Carolina, Columbia SC29208, USA*

Abstract

Heavy-baryon chiral perturbation theory (HBChPT) is applied to the asymmetry A_γ in $\vec{n} + p \rightarrow d + \gamma$ at threshold, which arises due to the weak parity non-conserving interactions. Instead of appealing to Siegert's theorem, transition operators up to next-to-leading chiral order are derived and the corresponding amplitudes are evaluated with the Argonne v_{18} wavefunctions. In addition to the impulse contribution, both parity-conserving and parity-non-conserving two-body one-pion-exchange diagrams appear up to this order. Our prediction for the asymmetry is $A_\gamma = -0.10 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$, which is close to the Siegert's theorem based result, $A_\gamma \simeq -0.11 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$. This illustrates that HBChPT is effectively applied to the parity-non-conserving physics.

PACS : 12.15; 13.75.G; 11.15.Bt

Keywords : Weak interaction; pion-nucleon coupling; Effective field theory

^{#1} e-mail: hch@zoo.snu.ac.kr

^{#2} Present address: Department of Physics, Sung Kyun Kwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea

^{#3} e-mail: tspark@nuc003.psc.sc.edu

^{#4} e-mail: dpmin@phy.snu.ac.kr

There are still large discrepancies in the value of the $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$, where $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ is the leading order weak πNN coupling constant. For example, detection of the circular polarization of 1081 keV gamma rays from ^{18}F transition predicts $|h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}| \leq 1.43 \times 10^{-7}$ [1]. Measurement of anapole moment of ^{133}Cs predicts, on the other hand, much larger value, $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} = (9.5 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.34) \times 10^{-7}$ [2]. The process

$$\vec{n} + p \rightarrow d + \gamma \quad (1)$$

at threshold is free from the uncertainties of many-body ($A \geq 3$) systems, and thus a suitable source for the study of the parity non-conserving (PNC) effects in nuclear reactions. As a relevant observable for this purpose the asymmetry A_γ is investigated, which is defined by the dependence of the cross section on the angle θ defined by the directions of the photon emission and the neutron polarization, $W(\theta) \propto 1 + A_\gamma \cos \theta$. The first calculation of the A_γ was performed by Danilov [3] obtaining $A_\gamma = -0.08 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$. More elaborate attempts were made with realistic wavefunctions [4, 5, 6],

$$A_\gamma = -0.11 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}. \quad (2)$$

In more detail, Hamada-Johnston, Reid-soft-core and Turreil-Sprung potentials are adopted to yield $A_\gamma = -0.109 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$, $-0.114 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ and $-0.107 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$, respectively [4]. The available data are from the ILL experiment [7], $A_\gamma^{\text{ILL}} = -(1.5 \pm 4.8) \times 10^{-8}$. This data with the eq.(2) then imposes $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} = (1.4 \pm 4.4) \times 10^{-7}$. At LANSCE [8], an experiment that aims at having 10^{-9} accuracy in A_γ is under progress, which will sharpen the determination of $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ greatly.

The good convergence among the above various calculations is mostly due to Siegert's theorem [9, 10]. It relates the major part of the E1 amplitude at low-energy to the one-body charge density whose amplitude can be estimated reliably without detailed informations of the nucleon-nucleon reactions. This indicates that a substantial departure from eq.(2) is unlikely. In the meantime, effective field theories (EFTs) have recently gained great successes in low-energy two-nucleon systems, which include the Solar proton fusion [11], the total radiative np capture cross section [12] and its spin observables [13, 14], the deuteron properties and low-energy nucleon-nucleon phase shifts [15, 16, 17, 18]. Kaplan, Savage, Springer and Wise [19] (KSSW) performed an EFT calculation of the process (1), using the so-called power-divergence subtraction scheme. They found rather surprising result, $A_\gamma = 0.17 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$, where the difference in overall sign is simply due to a mismatch in conventions (see Ref. [20, 21]). Desplanques [20] has analyzed KSSW's result in great detail. He showed that KSSW's result is – apart from the overall sign – exactly equivalent to the conventional result but with the zero-range approximation (ZRA) for the wavefunctions. The ZRA is responsible for the KSSW's overestimation of the asymmetry.

In this paper, we will show that the asymmetry can be understood accurately by HBChPT, an EFT that has been thoroughly tested in low-energy nuclear physics. For this purpose we will go to next-to-leading-order (NLO) in Weinberg's power counting [22], with the wavefunctions obtained by the Argonne v_{18} potential [23]. So far this *hybrid* method has been found to be quite powerful. For example, the total cross section of the neutron thermal capture was found to agree to the experimental data perfectly with the theoretical error bar about 1% [12].

The leading-order PNC Lagrangian takes the form [6, 24, 19]

$$\mathcal{L}_{pnc} = -\frac{h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{3ab} N^\dagger \tau^a \pi^b N, \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: Generic diagrams that contribute to the asymmetry. The solid, dashed and curly lines are nucleons, pions and photons; and the “ \times ” marks denote the insertion of the PNC vertex. Empty blobs stand for the sum of arbitrary number of iterations of the parity-conserving strong interactions, while the shaded blobs with (without) the “ \times ” mark do the PNC (PC) two-nucleon irreducible currents. None of the crossing diagrams have been drawn. The shaded blob in (a) will be denoted as \vec{J} , while that in (b) will be denoted by $\delta\vec{J}$.

where $\epsilon^{123} = +1$ and $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ is the weak coupling constant that should be determined from the experimental value of the asymmetry. There are other PNC interactions at higher order, but our current poor understanding of the nuclear PNC effects does not make much sense to include them. Thus we will limit ourselves to the above leading order PNC term. Due to the smallness of $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ ($\sim 10^{-7}$), it is sufficient to consider only the contributions linear in $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ for the PNC amplitude. The factor $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ appears either in the wavefunctions or in the currents,

$$\delta\langle\Psi_f|\vec{J}|\Psi_i\rangle = \langle\delta\Psi_f|\vec{J}|\Psi_i\rangle + \langle\Psi_f|\vec{J}|\delta\Psi_i\rangle + \langle\Psi_f|\delta\vec{J}|\Psi_i\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where Ψ_i (Ψ_f) and \vec{J} are the initial (final) wavefunctions and the electromagnetic currents, respectively. The “ δ ” marks stand for the first order perturbation with respect to the $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$. Generic diagrams for the asymmetry are drawn in Fig. 1, where the first and the last terms in eq.(4) correspond to Fig. (a) and Fig. (b), respectively. The second term, being symmetric to the first, is not shown in the figure. Note that the final state wavefunction in Fig. (a) has a parity-violating vertex.

As mentioned, we follow Weinberg’s power counting [22], where an irreducible diagram is counted as of order $(Q/\Lambda_\chi)^\nu$, Q is the typical momentum scale and/or pion mass and $\Lambda_\chi \sim 4\pi f_\pi \sim m_N$ is the chiral scale. The chiral index ν is given as

$$\nu = 2L - 2(C - 1) - 1 + \sum_i \nu_i,$$

where C and L are the numbers of the separate pieces and loops, respectively. A vertex indexed by the subscript i is characterized by $\nu_i \equiv d_i + \frac{n_i}{2} + e_i - 2$, where d_i , n_i and e_i are the number of derivatives/ m_π ’s, nucleon lines and the external fields, respectively. For PC interactions, chiral

symmetry guarantees $\nu_i \geq 0$ [25]. Fig. (a1) is LO with $C = 2$, while Fig. (a2, b) are NLO with $C = 1$. However, the counting rules for the process at hand is tricky. For example, the PNC amplitudes due to Fig. (a) contain the two-nucleon reducible part, while the above counting rule is for irreducible diagrams. The unnatural smallness of the binding energy of the deuteron, B_d , can also contaminate the counting rule, in the sense that a quantity proportional to positive powers of B_d becomes much smaller than what the counting rule implies. We find that the convergence of the chiral expansion is rather poor and we should go to at least up to NLO to have accurate results.

To be specific in convention, we also write down the parity-conserving (PC) strong lagrangian explicitly,

$$\mathcal{L}_{pc} = -\frac{g_A}{2f_\pi} \bar{N} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \pi^i \tau^i N + \dots, \quad (5)$$

with $g_A \simeq +1.26$, $f_\pi \simeq +93$ MeV and the ellipsis denotes terms not relevant in the discussion. Eqs.(3, 5) then lead to the PNC one-pion-exchange (OPE) potential that is identical to the one given in [4, 5, 6],

$$V_{pnc}(\vec{r}) = \frac{h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} g_A}{2\sqrt{2} f_\pi} (\vec{\tau}_1 \times \vec{\tau}_2)^z (\vec{\sigma}_1 + \vec{\sigma}_2) \cdot \hat{r} \frac{d}{dr} \left(\frac{e^{-m_\pi r}}{4\pi r} \right), \quad (6)$$

where $\vec{r} \equiv \vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2$, $r \equiv |\vec{r}|$ and $\hat{r} \equiv \vec{r}/r$. Note that when Siegert's theorem is used, the sign of the asymmetry is determined by the PNC potential. Thus the consistency of our convention to the conventional studies are guaranteed by the above PNC potential. ^{#5}

The one-body currents (Fig. (a1)) read

$$\vec{J}_{1B} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[\frac{1 + \tau_i^z}{4} \frac{\vec{p}_i}{m_N} - i \frac{\mu_S + \mu_V \tau_i^z}{4m_N} \vec{\sigma}_i \times \vec{k}_\gamma + \dots \right], \quad (7)$$

where $\mu_S = \mu_p + \mu_n \simeq 0.880$, $\mu_V = \mu_p - \mu_n \simeq 4.706$ and the ellipsis denotes higher order terms. The two-body PC (Fig. (a2)) and PNC (Fig. (b)) currents read

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{J}_{2B} &= \int \frac{d^3 \vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}} i (\vec{\tau}_1 \times \vec{\tau}_2)^z \frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{q}} \frac{\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{q} \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{q}}{m_\pi^2 + \vec{q}^2} \\ &= -\vec{r} \frac{g_A^2}{12f_\pi^2} (\vec{\tau}_1 \times \vec{\tau}_2)^z \left[\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 \left(m_\pi^2 y_0(r) - \delta^{(3)}(\vec{r}) \right) + S_{12}(\hat{r}) y_2(r) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \vec{J}_{2B} &= -\int \frac{d^3 \vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}} [\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 - \tau_1^z \tau_2^z] \frac{h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} g_A}{2\sqrt{2} f_\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{q}} \frac{(\vec{\sigma}_1 + \vec{\sigma}_2) \cdot \vec{q}}{m_\pi^2 + \vec{q}^2} \\ &= -\hat{r} \frac{h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} g_A}{2\sqrt{2} f_\pi} [\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \vec{\tau}_2 - \tau_1^z \tau_2^z] (1 + m_\pi r) y_0(r) \hat{r} \cdot (\vec{\sigma}_1 + \vec{\sigma}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$y_2(r) \equiv r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} y_0(r), \quad y_0(r) \equiv \frac{e^{-m_\pi r}}{4\pi r} \quad (10)$$

and

$$S_{12}(\hat{r}) \equiv 3\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \hat{r} \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \hat{r} - \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2.$$

^{#5}KSSW [19] used PC Lagrangian with different sign, which causes different sign in the PNC potential and the asymmetry.

The PC currents, \vec{J}_{1B} and \vec{J}_{2B} , contribute to the asymmetry through the small parity-odd components of the wavefunctions induced by the PNC potential, as drawn Fig. (a). Here we recall that the PNC potential eq.(6) does not commute with either isospin or orbital angular momentum and induces parity-odd components (which are linearly proportional to $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$) in the spin-triplet wavefunctions. On the other hand, the PNC currents, $\delta\vec{J}_{2B}$, contribute to the asymmetry by connecting the parity-even components.

At threshold, there are only S -waves in the initial np states, Ψ_0^{000} (1S_0) and $\Psi_{J_z}^{011}$ (3S_1), where $\Psi_{J_z}^{LSJ}$ are the partial waves. We write the wavefunctions as

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_0^{000}(\vec{r}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi r}} u_s(r) \zeta_{10} \chi_{00}, \\ \Psi_{J_z}^{011}(\vec{r}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi r}} \left(u_t(r) + \frac{S_{12}(\hat{r})}{\sqrt{8}} w_t(r) \right) \zeta_{00} \chi_{1J_z}, \\ \delta\Psi_{J_z}^{011}(\vec{r}) &= -i\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi r}} (\vec{\sigma}_1 + \vec{\sigma}_2) \cdot \hat{r} v_t(r) \zeta_{10} \chi_{1J_z},\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

where $\chi(\zeta)$ represents spinor(isospinor). We multiplied “ i ” in front of the P -wavefunction to make $v_t(r)$ real at threshold. The deuteron wavefunction is the same with Ψ^{011} but with the subscript “ d ”, instead of “ t ”. The radial functions are normalized as $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u_s(r) = r - a_s$, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u_t(r) = r - a_t$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} u_d(r) = e^{-\gamma_d r}$, where $a_s \simeq -23.7$ fm ($a_t \simeq 5.42$ fm) is the spin-singlet (spin-triplet) np scattering length and $\gamma_d = \sqrt{B_d m_N}$. The boundary conditions for the 3P_1 radial wavefunctions are $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v_t(r) \propto h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} \frac{1}{r^2}$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} v_d(r) \propto h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma_d r}\right) e^{-\gamma_d r}$.

It is well-known (see, for example, [12]) that the total cross section near threshold is predominated by the isovector M1 transition, $^1S_0 \rightarrow d$,

$$\langle \Psi_d | \vec{J} | \Psi_0^{000} \rangle = \chi_{1M_d}^\dagger \left[-i(\vec{\sigma}_p - \vec{\sigma}_n) \times \hat{k} M(^1S_0) \right] \chi_{00} \quad (12)$$

with

$$M(^1S_0) = \frac{\omega \mu_V}{4m_N} \int_0^\infty dr u_d(r) u_s(r) + \dots = (1 + \delta_{2B}) (0.263 \text{ fm}^2) \quad (13)$$

where $\vec{k} = \omega \hat{k}$ is the momentum carried out by the photon, the ellipsis denotes the two-body-current contributions and $\delta_{2B} = (4.6 \pm 0.3) \%$ denotes the ratio of the two-body currents compared to the one-body contribution. For the transition from the spin-triplet np state, there are both PC isoscalar M1 and PNC E1 contributions,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Psi_d | \vec{J} | \Psi_{J_z}^{011} \rangle &= \chi_{1M_d}^\dagger \left[-i(\vec{\sigma}_p + \vec{\sigma}_n) \times \hat{k} M(^3S_1) \right] \chi_{1J_z}, \\ \delta \langle \Psi_d | \vec{J} | \Psi_{J_z}^{011} \rangle &= \chi_{1M_d}^\dagger \left[(\vec{\sigma}_p + \vec{\sigma}_n) E(^3S_1) \right] \chi_{1J_z}.\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

The isoscalar M1 transition is tiny (less than 0.1 %) in the total cross section and does not contribute to the asymmetry. Detailed analysis can be found in [13, 14] and we will neglect this isoscalar contribution hereafter.

The asymmetry reads

$$A_\gamma = -2 \frac{E(^3S_1)}{M(^1S_0)}, \quad (15)$$

where the $E(^3S_1)$ is the consequence of the PNC interaction and proportional to $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$. The LO $E(^3S_1)$ comes from the one-body (1B) contribution (Fig. (a1)), while the two-body contributions

(Fig. (a2)) and (b)) are NLO,

$$E(^3S_1) = h_{\pi NN}^{(1)} \tilde{E}, \quad \tilde{E} = \tilde{E}_{1B} + \tilde{E}_{2B} \quad (16)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{1B} &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}m_N} \int_0^\infty dr \left[\tilde{v}'_d(r) \left(u_t(r) + \frac{w_t(r)}{\sqrt{2}} \right) + \frac{\tilde{v}_d(r)}{r} \left(u_t(r) - \sqrt{2}w_t(r) \right) + (d \leftrightarrow t) \right], \\ \tilde{E}_{2B} &= -\frac{g_A^2}{12\sqrt{6}f_\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dr r \left[m_\pi^2 y_0(r) - \delta^{(3)}(\vec{r}) + 2y_2(r) \right] \left[\left(u_d(r) + \frac{w_d(r)}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \tilde{v}_t(r) + (d \leftrightarrow t) \right] \\ &+ \frac{g_A}{3\sqrt{2}f_\pi} \int_0^\infty dr y_0(r) (1 + m_\pi r) \left(u_d(r) + \frac{w_d(r)}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \left(u_t(r) + \frac{w_t(r)}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{v}_{d,t}(r)$ is defined by $\tilde{v}_{d,t}(r) \equiv v_{d,t}(r)/h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ and the “ $(d \leftrightarrow t)$ ” denotes the permutation between the subscript “ d ” and “ t ”. With Argonne v_{18} wavefunctions we have $\tilde{E} = (0.0428 - 0.0302) \text{ fm}^2 = 0.0136 \text{ fm}^2$ and consequently

$$A_\gamma^{\text{ChPT}} = -0.10 h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}. \quad (18)$$

It might be worthwhile making a comparison of our result eq.(18) with the Siegert’s theorem prediction,

$$\tilde{E}^{\text{Siegert}} = \frac{\omega}{4\sqrt{6}} \int_0^\infty dr r \left[\tilde{v}_d(r) \left(u_t(r) + \frac{w_t(r)}{\sqrt{2}} \right) - (d \leftrightarrow t) \right] = 0.0148 \text{ fm}^2, \quad (19)$$

where the numerical value is obtained with Argonne v_{18} wavefunctions. Our result is close to the Siegert’s theorem prediction, but the chiral convergence is rather slow,

$$\frac{\tilde{E}_{1B} + \tilde{E}_{2B}}{\tilde{E}^{\text{Siegert}}} = 2.89 - 1.97 = 0.92. \quad (20)$$

While a more study is needed to be definite, here let us present a plausible scenario for the bad convergence. One can see that the Siegert’s theorem prediction, eq.(19), is suppressed by the smallness of $\omega \simeq B_d$, which is smaller than its *natural* size, $Q^2/\Lambda_\chi \sim m_\pi^2/m_N \sim 21 \text{ MeV}$, by about 10 times. The suppression mechanism is, however, not manifest in our HBChPT results, eq.(17). To understand the consequences of this, let us expand \tilde{E}_{1B} and \tilde{E}_{2B} with respect to B_d at threshold,

$$\tilde{E}_{nB} = A_{nB}^{(0)} + B_d A_{nB}^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(B_d^2), \quad (n = 1, 2). \quad (21)$$

Then what Siegert’s theorem tells us is that

$$A_{1B}^{(0)} + A_{2B}^{(0)} = 0. \quad (22)$$

In case both $A_{1B}^{(0)}$ and $A_{2B}^{(0)}$ are not zero, the above equation indicates that the ratio $\tilde{E}_{2B}/\tilde{E}_{1B}$ becomes -1 at $B_d \rightarrow 0$ limit, which is not much far from our result, $\tilde{E}_{2B}/\tilde{E}_{1B} \simeq -2/3$. In this respect the net result eq.(20) is the result of strong cancellation between the B_d -independent terms, $A_{nB}^{(0)}$. By the same token, the above scenario says that our PNC E1 amplitudes can be contaminated by a small deviation from eq.(22), when B_d is quite small. However it should be understood clearly that the HBChPT results are to be improved systematically by taking the higher order. Thus, for

example, to include the two-body vector charge contributions which have been neglected in Siegert's theorem, we should rely on a systematic EFT like HBChPT. It is quite promising to observe that HBChPT up to NLO could already explain the $A_\gamma/h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ ratio within 10 % (compared to the Siegert's theorem prediction). We would like to make it clear that the situation is completely different in, for example, M1 transition amplitude, where the suppression factor $\omega \simeq B_d$ can be factored out and we are left with the quantity which is non-zero even at $B_d = 0$ limit. In this case, a beautiful chiral convergence has been observed [12].

So far, we have limited ourselves to the threshold limit, where only S np states are relevant. At thermal energy, there is tiny but non-zero contribution from the np Ψ^{111} state. This 3P_1 state gives non-zero E1 transition amplitude that is independent of the $h_{\pi NN}^{(1)}$ and dependent on \hat{p} , the direction of the relative np momentum. This small P -component gives rise to PC asymmetry and its magnitude was calculated in [26]. The PC asymmetry arises from the PC scalar $\hat{n} \cdot (\hat{p} \times \vec{k}_\gamma)$. While PNC asymmetry measures up-down asymmetry, PC asymmetry is the left-right asymmetry. The amount of the PC asymmetry is reported to be $\sim 7 \times 10^{-9}$ which can contaminate the exact measurement of A_γ . This corresponds to the accuracy goal of the LANSCE of the order 10^{-9} . Experimental considerations to discriminate these false signals were illustrated in [8].

We thank B. Desplanques for his valuable discussions during this work. TSP is grateful to S.-i. Ando for his comments. Work of DPM and CHH is partially supported by the KOSEF grant No. 1999-2-111-005-5, KRF grant 1999-015-DI0023, 2000-015-DP0072 and BK21 program.

References

- [1] E. G. Adelberger and W. C. Haxton, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **35** (1985) 501.
- [2] V. V. Flambaum and D. W. Murray, *Phys. Rev.* **C 57** (1997) 1641.
- [3] G. S. Danilov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **14** (1972) 443.
- [4] B. Desplanques, *Nucl. Phys.* **A 242** (1975) 423.
- [5] B. Desplanques and J. Missimer, *Nucl. Phys.* **A 300** (1978) 286.
- [6] B. Desplanques, J. F. Donoghue, B. R. Holstein, *Ann. Phys.* **124**(1980) 449.
- [7] J. Alberi *et al.*, *Can. J. Phys.* **66** (1988) 542.
- [8] W. M. Snow *et al.*, nucl-ex/9804001; *Nucl. Inst. and Meth.* **440** (2000) 729.
- [9] A. J. F. Siegert, *Phys. Rev.* **81** (1937) 787.
- [10] N. Austern, R. G. Sach, *Phys. Rev.* **81** (1951) 710.
- [11] T.-S. Park, K. Kubodera, D.-P. Min, M. Rho, *Astrophys. J.* **507** (1998) 443.
- [12] T.-S. Park, D.-P. Min, M. Rho, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995) 4153; *Nucl. Phys.* **A 596** (1996) 515.

- [13] T.-S. Park, K. Kubodera, D.-P. Min, M. Rho, Phys. Lett. **B 472** (2000) 232.
- [14] J.-W. Chen, G. Rupak, M. J. Savage, Phys. Lett. **B 464** (1999) 1.
- [15] T.-S. Park, K. Kubodera, D.-P. Min, M. Rho, Phys. Rev. **C 58** (1998) R637; Nucl. Phys. **A 646** (1999) 83.
- [16] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage, M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B 424** (1998) 390.
- [17] E. Epelbaum, W. Glöckle, Ulf-G. Meißner, nucl-th/9910064.
- [18] C. Ordóñez, L. Ray and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. **C53** (1996) 2086.
- [19] D.B. Kaplan, M.J. Savage, R.P. Springer and M.B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B 449** (1999) 1.
- [20] B. Desplanques, nucl-th/0006065.
- [21] M. J. Savage, nucl-th/0012043.
- [22] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. **B 251** (1990) 288.
- [23] R.B. Wiringa, V.G.J. Stoks and R. Schiavilla, Phys. Rev. **C 51** (1995) 38.
- [24] D. B. Kaplan and M. J. Savage, Nucl. Phys. **A 556** (1993) 653.
- [25] M. Rho, Phys. Lett. Rev. **66** (1991) 1275.
- [26] A. Csótó, B. F. Gibson and G. L. Payne, Phys. Rev. **C 57** (1997) 631.