

## In-Medium Effective Pion Mass from Heavy-Baryon Chiral Perturbation Theory

Tae-Sun Park<sup>a,b,\*</sup> Hong Jung<sup>c,†</sup> and Dong-Pil Min<sup>d,‡</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Theory group, TRIUMF, Vancouver, B. C., Canada V6T 2A3*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of South Carolina,  
Columbia SC 29208, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics, Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul 140-742, Korea*

<sup>d</sup>*Department of Physics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea*

Using heavy-baryon chiral perturbation theory, we have calculated all the diagrams up to two-loop order which contribute to the  $S$ -wave pion self-energy in symmetric nuclear matter. Some subtleties related to the definition of pion fields are discussed. The in-medium pion mass turns out to increase by only (5 ~ 6) per cents at normal nuclear matter density, and this result is model independent.

---

\*E-mail: park@nuc003.psc.sc.edu.

†E-mail: jung@sookmyung.ac.kr

‡E-mail: dpmin@phya.snu.ac.kr

The role of pionic interactions in nuclear medium has long been an important issue in nuclear physics. Recently, the interest in the  $S$ -wave pionic interaction in nuclear medium has reemerged due to the experimental observation of deeply bound pionic states in Pb at GSI [1, 2, 3]. It is to be noted that there is a wide variance among the theoretically deduced values of the effective pion mass  $m_\pi^*$ ; for symmetric nuclear matter,  $m_\pi^*$  is found to increase by 7 % in Ref.[2], but by 20 % in Ref.[3]. These results are obtained relying on the phenomenology related to the  $S$ -wave pion-nucleus optical potential. It is well-known that threshold isoscalar  $S$ -wave pion-nucleon interaction in nuclear medium, though very weak, is more repulsive than in vacuum [3, 4]. Noting that the leading Weinberg-Tomozawa term vanishes and the pion-nucleon sigma term is partly canceled by the effective range term, higher order corrections to the one-body contribution is substantial [5], and also the two-body contribution is expected to play a significant role; this latter aspect has been considered in explaining the threshold  $S$ -wave pion-nucleus interaction [3, 6, 7].

There are approaches for the effective pion masses based on chiral symmetry [2, 8]. In this letter we reexamine the problem in symmetric nuclear matter in the framework of heavy baryon chiral perturbation theory. All the contributions up to  $\mathcal{O}(Q^7)$  and the one-body  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$  contribution in the pion self-energy will be calculated. In addition, we will discuss some subtleties of the problem related to the definition of the pion fields.

The relevant quantity for the effective pion mass  $m_\pi^*$  in nuclear matter we are interested in is the in-medium self-energy of pion,  $\Pi(\omega^2)$ , which is defined with the pion momentum  $q^\mu = (\omega, \vec{0})$ . To evaluate the self-energy systematically, we employ Weinberg's formalism [9] of heavy baryon chiral perturbation theory (HBChPT), which has been quite successful in understanding threshold pion-nuclear interactions [9, 10, 11, 12]. In Weinberg's scheme, Feynman diagrams are characterized by the order  $Q^\nu$ , where  $Q$  is the typical size of the momenta involved and/or pion mass, which is regarded as small compared to the chiral scale  $\Lambda \sim 1$  GeV. In this scheme, the Fermi momentum  $k_F$  is thus counted as of order  $Q$ . For diagrams for the pion self-energy, the chiral index  $\nu$  is given as

$$\nu = 2 + 2L + \sum_i \nu_i, \quad \nu_i \equiv d_i + \frac{n_i}{2} - 2 \quad (1)$$

where  $L$  is the number of the loop,  $d_i$  is the the number of derivatives and/or pion masses, and  $n_i$  is the number of nucleon fields attached to the  $i$ -th vertex. In HBChPT, the Lagrangian consists of pions and nucleons, while all other degrees of freedom are integrated out,

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 + \dots, \quad (2)$$

where the subscripts are the chiral index  $\nu_i$ . Terms relevant to computing the  $S$ -wave pion self-energy are

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \bar{B} [i v \cdot D + 2i g_A S \cdot \Delta] B - \frac{1}{2} \sum_A C_A (\bar{B} \Gamma_A B)^2 + f_\pi^2 \text{Tr} \left( i \Delta^\mu i \Delta_\mu + \frac{\chi_+}{4} \right), \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_1 = & \bar{B} \left[ \frac{v^\mu v^\nu - g^{\mu\nu}}{2m_N} D_\mu D_\nu + \frac{g_A}{m_N} \{S \cdot D, v \cdot \Delta\} \right. \\
& \left. + c_1 \text{Tr} \chi_+ + 4 \left( c_2 - \frac{g_A^2}{8m_N} \right) (v \cdot i\Delta)^2 + 4c_3 i\Delta \cdot i\Delta \right] B
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with  $D_\mu = \frac{1}{2} (\xi_R^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi_R + \xi_L^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi_L)$ ,  $\Delta_\mu = \frac{1}{2} (\xi_R^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi_R - \xi_L^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi_L)$ ,  $\chi_+ = \xi_R^\dagger \chi \xi_L + \xi_L^\dagger \chi \xi_R$ ,  $\chi = m_\pi^2$ , and

$$\xi_R = \xi_L^\dagger = \exp \left( i \frac{\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi}}{2f_\pi} \right). \tag{5}$$

The low-energy constants  $c_1$ ,  $c_2$  and  $c_3$  are to be fixed from experimental data; at present there are several sets of values for the parameters determined by fitting low-energy pion-nucleon data[5]:

$$\begin{aligned}
(c_1, c_2, c_3) &= (-1.27 \pm 0.12, 3.23 \pm 0.19, -5.93 \pm 0.08) \text{ GeV}^{-1} \text{ (Fit1)}, \\
(c_1, c_2, c_3) &= (-1.47 \pm 0.09, 3.21 \pm 0.11, -6.00 \pm 0.03) \text{ GeV}^{-1} \text{ (Fit2)}, \\
(c_1, c_2, c_3) &= (-1.53 \pm 0.18, 3.22 \pm 0.25, -6.19 \pm 0.09) \text{ GeV}^{-1} \text{ (Fit3)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Figure 1 shows the nuclear diagrams we compute for the pion self-energy. Note that




Figure 1: Feynman diagrams that contribute to the pion self-energy. Solid lines are nucleons, and dashed lines are pions. The rectangle in (a) denotes the whole set of diagrams (including loop corrections) that contribute to the  $\pi N$  scattering amplitude.

nucleon loops in *free* space are forbidden in HBChPT, and all the nucleon lines (in solid line) drawn in Fig. 1 run only up to  $k_F$ , the Fermi momentum. Throughout this work, we employ the Fermi gas approximation for the wavefunction of nuclear matter. We acknowledge that the diagrams in Fig. 1 have been studied in chiral models since long time ago, see, for example, Ref. [13].

The leading order (LO) contribution to the  $S$ -wave pion self-energy is from the one-loop graph with the Weinberg-Tomozawa term coming from  $\mathcal{L}_0$ , which vanishes for symmetric nuclear matter. If such a term survives, it would be  $\mathcal{O}(Q^4)$ . The next-to-leading order (NLO) contribution comes from the one-loop graph with the  $\pi\pi NN$  vertices from  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , which is nothing but the pion-nucleon sigma term. Before going further, we note that all the diagrams with a one-nucleon-loop only, called one-body contributions, are related to the pion-nucleon scattering amplitude. Particularly, all the contributions at  $\omega = m_\pi$  can

be replaced by the isoscalar  $\pi N$  scattering length,  $a_{\pi N}$ :

$$\Pi_{1\text{-body}}(\omega^2 = m_\pi^2) = -4\pi(1 + \mu)a_{\pi N} \frac{2k_F^3}{3\pi^2} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mu \equiv \frac{m_\pi}{m_N}$ . Note that the above equation is correct to all order, as far as the one-body contributions are concerned. The scattering length has been calculated within HBChPT [15],

$$4\pi(1 + \mu)a_{\pi N} = -\frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi^2}(4c_1 - 4c_{23}) + \frac{3g_A^2 m_\pi^3}{64\pi f_\pi^4} + \dots \quad (8)$$

with  $c_{23} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( c_2 + c_3 - \frac{g_A^2}{8m_N} \right)$ . In the *r.h.s.* of the above equation, the first term is from NLO, the second from the next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO), and the ellipsis denotes higher-order contributions. At NNLO, we also have genuine two-body contributions which are drawn in Fig. 1(b-d). Including all of them, the pion self-energy up to NNLO or up to  $\mathcal{O}(Q^6)$  reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\omega^2) &= - \left[ 4\pi(1 + \mu)a_{\pi N} - \frac{\omega^2}{8\pi f_\pi^4} \sqrt{m_\pi^2 - \omega^2} + (\omega^2 - m_\pi^2) \left( \frac{4c_{23}}{f_\pi^2} + \zeta \frac{3g_A^2 m_\pi}{64\pi f_\pi^4} \right) \right] \frac{2k_F^3}{3\pi^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{16\pi^4 f_\pi^4} \left[ 2\omega^2 I_F(\sqrt{m_\pi^2 - \omega^2}) - \frac{g_A^2}{2} (m_\pi^2 + \zeta(\omega^2 - m_\pi^2)) J_F(m_\pi) \right], \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_F(m) &\equiv k_F^4 - \frac{k_F^2 m^2}{6} + \left( \frac{k_F^2 m^2}{2} + \frac{m^4}{24} \right) \log \frac{4k_F^2 + m^2}{m^2} - \frac{4}{3} m k_F^3 \tan^{-1} \frac{2k_F}{m}, \\ J_F(m) &\equiv k_F^4 - \frac{k_F^2 m^2}{2} + \left( k_F^2 m^2 + \frac{m^4}{8} \right) \log \frac{4k_F^2 + m^2}{m^2} - 2m k_F^3 \tan^{-1} \frac{2k_F}{m}, \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

and  $\zeta = \frac{4}{3}$  for the pion field defined by eq.(5). Here,  $\zeta$  is an off-shell parameter (that is effective only when the pion is off-shell), which depends on the definition of the pion field. For example, the canonical pion field introduced by Weinberg [9, 14]<sup>#1</sup> corresponds to  $\zeta = 3$ . In fact, the value of  $\zeta$  is not fixed by chiral symmetry and can be any arbitrary number [14]. As another interesting definition of the pion field, we discuss here the background field method (BFM) [16]. In BFM, the covariant quantities are defined as

$$\xi_R = \exp \left( i \frac{\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi}_{\text{cl}}}{2f_\pi} \right) \exp \left( i \frac{\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi}_{\text{fl}}}{2f_\pi} \right), \quad \xi_L = \exp \left( -i \frac{\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi}_{\text{cl}}}{2f_\pi} \right) \exp \left( -i \frac{\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi}_{\text{fl}}}{2f_\pi} \right), \quad (11)$$

where  $\vec{\pi}_{\text{cl}}$  is the pion field that appears as external legs, while the  $\vec{\pi}_{\text{fl}}$  is for the internal pion lines. Often the BFM removes some of artificial contributions and simplifies the calculation. In our case, the contribution of Fig. (1c) vanishes with BFM; with the canonical pion field of eq.(5), Fig. (1c) is not zero but canceled out by a part of the contribution of Fig. (1d). For physical observables where all the external particles are on mass shell, however, BFM gives exactly the same results as any other definition of pion field does. The value of  $\zeta$  obtained by using BFM is  $\zeta = 4$ .

<sup>#1</sup>The covariant derivative of the pion field we are referring to has the form  $\partial_\mu \vec{\pi} / (1 + \vec{\pi}^2 / (4f_\pi^2))$ .




Figure 2: The ratio  $m_\pi^*/m_\pi$  as a function of  $\rho/\rho_0$ . The upper shade is obtained with the canonical  $U$ -field ( $\zeta = \frac{4}{3}$ ), while the lower shade with the BFM ( $\zeta = 4$ ). In each shade, the upper (lower) bound corresponds to Fit 1 (Fit 3). Fit 2 gives almost the same results as Fit 3.

Now we are in a position to discuss the in-medium pion mass  $m_\pi^*$ . The conventional way of determining the in-medium mass is to find the zero of the inverse of the pion propagator,  $w^2 - m_\pi^2 - \Pi(w^2)$ , or

$$m_\pi^{*2} = m_\pi^2 + \Pi(m_\pi^{*2}). \quad (12)$$

But since  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2})$  with  $m_\pi^* \neq m_\pi$  depends on  $\zeta$ , the resulting  $m_\pi^*$  also depends on the off-shell parameter  $\zeta$ . The results are depicted in Fig. 2 with two popular choices of  $\zeta$ ; the upper shade is for the case with  $\zeta = 4/3$  (the canonical field of eq.(5)), and the lower shade is for  $\zeta = 4$  (BFM). The results with  $\zeta = 3$  lie in between the two. In each case, the parameter set Fit 1 gives the biggest  $m_\pi^*$ , and Fit 3 results in the lowest value. At normal nuclear matter density, the ratio  $m_\pi^*/m_\pi$  is  $1.20 - 1.32$  with  $\zeta = 4/3$ , and  $1.12 - 1.15$  with  $\zeta = 4$ . Thus, apart from the non-trivial dependence on the parameter set of low-energy constants, there is quite substantial  $\zeta$ -dependence. We note that in the chiral limit  $m_\pi = 0$ , however,  $m_\pi^*$  remains zero in all the cases.

An interesting observation is that, when the nuclear density reaches around  $\rho = (1.3 \sim 1.7) \rho_0$  with  $\zeta = (4/3 \sim 4)$ , where  $\rho_0$  is the normal nuclear matter density, the in-medium pion mass decreases abruptly below the pion mass in the vacuum. This is caused by the fact that when the density increases, the value of the  $\Pi'(\omega^2) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega^2} \Pi(\omega^2)$  is close to one and makes the solution of eq.(12) unstable at the density mentioned above.

The off-shell ambiguity may indicate that the effective pion mass defined by eq.(12) is not a physical observable, which should be independent of the definition of the pion field. Indeed the effective pion mass is measured only indirectly in experiments with the help of optical potentials. A thorough study on this subject, which should be quite important, has not been done in this work and will appear in a separate work.

In this letter, however, we introduce a new way to extract the effective pion mass unambiguously. So far the pion self energy has been obtained to a certain order  $\nu$ , and

then treated non-perturbatively in obtaining the effective mass through eq.(12). To avoid the above mentioned ambiguities, we propose to get the effective mass itself up to order  $\nu$ . The new procedure gives us exactly the same results as the previous method up to  $\nu$ , all the differences residing in higher orders. Particularly if the gap  $(m_\pi^{*2} - m_\pi^2)$  is of order of  $Q^2$  as the naive counting indicates, there is absolutely no difference. In actual cases, the gap is much smaller than in the naive counting,

$$m_\pi^{*2} - m_\pi^2 = \mathcal{O}(Q^5), \quad (13)$$

since the non-vanishing-leading-order (or NLO) of the pion self-energy is  $\mathcal{O}(Q^5)$ . Inserting this into eq.(9) with  $\omega^2 = m_\pi^{*2}$ , we see that *all the  $\zeta$ -dependent terms in  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2})$  are of  $\mathcal{O}(Q^9)$* , which is beyond the scope of this work and will be neglected. In other words, there is no off-shell ambiguity in  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2})$  up to  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$ . Furthermore,  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2})$  is the same as  $\Pi(m_\pi^2)$  up to  $\mathcal{O}(Q^7)$ , that is,  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2}) = \Pi(m_\pi^2) + \mathcal{O}(Q^8)$ . Expanding  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2})$  based on our “detailed” power counting rule,

$$\Pi(m_\pi^{*2}) = \sum_{\nu=5}^{\infty} \Pi^{(\nu)}(m_\pi^{*2}), \quad (14)$$

our two-loop order calculation determines the first two leading order contributions unambiguously:

$$\Pi^{(5)}(m_\pi^{*2}) = -4\pi(1 + \mu)a_{\pi N} \frac{2k_F^3}{3\pi^2}, \quad (15)$$

$$\Pi^{(6)}(m_\pi^{*2}) = \frac{m_\pi^2}{16\pi^4 f_\pi^4} \left[ 2k_F^4 - \frac{g_A^2}{2} J_F(m_\pi) \right]. \quad (16)$$

We remark that  $\Pi^{(5)}(m_\pi^{*2})$  in eq.(15) includes all the one-body contributions at  $\omega^2 = m_\pi^2$  up to infinite order, since the experimental scattering length  $a_{\pi N}$  contains all the higher order contributions as well as the leading  $\mathcal{O}(Q^2)$  contribution. We can also show that there is no  $\mathcal{O}(Q^7)$  contribution,

$$\Pi^{(7)}(m_\pi^{*2}) = 0, \quad (17)$$

by the following arguments. All the one-body contributions are already absorbed into  $\Pi^{(5)}$  at  $\omega^2 = m_\pi^2$ , and the difference  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2}) - \Pi(m_\pi^2)$  is  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$ , which can be read from eq.(9). The two-body contributions at  $\mathcal{O}(Q^7)$  are two-loop diagrams which contain one vertex from  $\mathcal{L}_1$ ; however, they are all isovector and therefore cannot contribute to the pion self-energy in symmetric nuclear matter. Contributions involving three or more nucleons begin to appear only at  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$ .

At  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$  there are one-, two- and three-body contributions,

$$\Pi^{(8)}(m_\pi^{*2}) = \Pi_{1\text{-body}}^{(8)}(m_\pi^{*2}) + \Pi_{2\text{-body}}^{(8)}(m_\pi^{*2}) + \Pi_{3\text{-body}}^{(8)}(m_\pi^{*2}). \quad (18)$$

The one-body contribution at this order comes from the  $\omega$ -dependence in  $\Pi(\omega^2)$ ,

$$\Pi_{1\text{-body}}^{(8)}(m_\pi^{*2}) = 4\pi(1 + \mu)a_{\pi N} \frac{4c_{23}}{f_\pi^2} \left( \frac{2k_F^3}{3\pi^2} \right)^2. \quad (19)$$

The two- and three-body contributions at this order are not discussed in this work.




Figure 3: The cumulative graphs for  $m_\pi^*/m_\pi$  vs.  $\rho/\rho_0$ . The dotted, dotted-dashed and solid lines stand for the results up to  $\mathcal{O}(Q^5)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(Q^6)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$ . The result up to  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$  does not contain the two- and three-body contributions at this order, see the explanation in the text.

The numerical results are given in Fig. 3. The  $\mathcal{O}(Q^5)$  (dotted line) contribution is tiny because of the smallness of the  $\pi - N$  scattering length. The two-body contribution embodied in  $\mathcal{O}(Q^6)$  (dotted-dashed line) gives the main contribution, about 6 % increase of the in-medium pion mass at normal nuclear matter density. As mentioned above, there is no  $\mathcal{O}(Q^7)$  contribution. Just for discussion, we have drawn  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$  results (solid line) without the two- and three-body contributions. This (partial)  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$  contribution at this order is not significant, which is again due to the smallness of the  $\pi - N$  scattering length. For the same reason, the dependence on the parameter set up to this order is tiny and invisible in the figure.

By expanding  $\Pi(m_\pi^{*2})$  with the *detailed* power counting rule which considers the gap  $(m_\pi^{*2} - m_\pi^2)$  to be of order  $Q^5$ , we find that the in-medium pion mass increases only very mildly as the nuclear matter density increases. At normal nuclear density,  $m_\pi^*$  is larger than  $m_\pi$  only by (5 ~ 6) %. This result has little dependence on the parameter set used, and is independent of the off-shell parameter  $\zeta$ . Our results support the phenomenological study given in Ref.[2]. The complete calculation up to  $\mathcal{O}(Q^8)$  is feasible and involves computing three-body contributions as well as one- and two-body contributions, and it would play more important roles in higher density regions.

Let us make concluding remarks. We have considered two schemes for computing the effective pion mass in symmetric nuclear matter based on chiral perturbation theory: a naive power counting scheme (eqs.(7-10, 12), Fig. 2) and a more detailed power counting scheme (eqs.(15-19), Fig. 3). The discrepancies in  $m_\pi^{*2}$  are of order of  $\mathcal{O}(Q^9)$  or higher order. We believe the latter is more meaningful than the former, because the latter is independent of

the offshell parameter  $\zeta$ . While of higher order than considered, the possible dependence on the off-shell parameter at  $\mathcal{O}(Q^9)$  remains to be addressed. Especially the radical differences between the two schemes (Fig. 2 and Fig. 3) are quite alarming. Thus our results up to NNLO should be taken with caution. To be more definite, a calculation up-to- $\mathcal{O}(Q^9)$  would be required.

In overcoming the problem caused by the off-shell ambiguity, the idea of Brown-Rho (BR) scaling [17] may shed some light on this problem. If we follow the BR scaling, the parameters of the pion self-energy should be replaced by the in-medium effective values. Let  $\Pi^*(w^2)$  be the BR scaled pion self-energy. Then the equation for the  $m_\pi^*$  reads

$$m_\pi^{*2} = m_\pi^2 + \Pi^*(m_\pi^{*2}). \quad (20)$$

with

$$\Pi^*(m_\pi^{*2}) = -4\pi(1 + \mu)a_{\pi N}^* \frac{2k_F^3}{3\pi^2} + \frac{m_\pi^{*2}}{16\pi^4 f_\pi^{*4}} \left[ 2k_F^4 - \frac{g_A^{*2}}{2} J_F(m_\pi^*) \right]. \quad (21)$$

We note that there is no  $\zeta$ -dependence, and these equations are essentially the same as eqs.(15-19) except that all the parameters are replaced by their in-medium counterparts. This is because in nuclear medium the effective on-shell condition is  $\omega = m_\pi^*$  and  $\Pi^*(m_\pi^{*2})$  is effectively an on-shell quantity. However, in order to perform a numerical analysis, we need the value of  $a_{\pi N}^*$  as well as other effective parameters, which requires more studies.

On finalizing this work, we have learned of the existence of a similar work by Kaiser and Weise[18]. Their work is more extensive than ours in that it includes pions and kaons in isospin asymmetric nuclear matter but the effective pion mass is simply assumed to be  $m_\pi^{*2} = m_\pi^2 + \Pi(m_\pi^2)$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Jerry Miller and Mannque Rho for valuable comments. We thank E. Oset and N. Kaiser for comments. TSP is indebted to S.-i. Ando, F. Myhrer and K. Kubodera for discussions. H. J. acknowledges the hospitality of the nuclear theory group of University of Washington. This work was supported in part by Korea Research Foundation (KRF-grant-1999-015-DI0023) and in part by Korea Science and Engineering Foundation (1999-2-111-005-5). The work of H. J. was also supported in part by Korea Ministry of Science and Technology (99-B-WB-07-A-03).

## References

- [1] T. Yamazaki *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 418** (1998) 246.
- [2] T. Waas, R. Brockmann, and W. Weise, Phys. Lett. **B 405** (1997) 215.
- [3] E. Friedman and A. Gal, Phys. Lett. **B 432** (1998) 235.
- [4] D. Sigg *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A 609** (1996) 269, Erratum Nucl. Phys. **A 617** (1977) 526.
- [5] N. Fettes, Ulf-G. Meissner, S. Steininger, Nucl. Phys. **A 640** (1998) 199.
- [6] T. Ericson and W. Weise, “Pions and Nuclei” (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988).
- [7] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and Ulf-G. Meissner. Phys. Lett. **B 309** (1993) 421, Phys. Rev. **C 52** (1995) 2185.
- [8] V. Thorsson and A. Wirzba, Nucl. Phys. **A589** (1995) 633.
- [9] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. **B251**, 288 (1990); Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 3 (1991); Phys. Lett. **B295**, 114 (1992).
- [10] C. Ordonez, L. Ray, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1982 (1994); Phys. Rev. **C53**, 2086 (1996).
- [11] T-S. Park, D.-P. Min and M. Rho, Phys. Rep. **233** (1993) 341.
- [12] T.-S. Park, H. Jung and D.-P. Min, Phys. Lett. **B409**, 26 (1997).
- [13] M.R. Robilotta and C. Wilkin, J. Phys. G **4** (1978) L115; G.A. Miller and J.V. Noble, Phys. Rev. C **22** (1980) 1211; C. Garcia Recio, E. Oset and L L. Salcedo, Phys. Rev. **37** (1988) 194; E. Oset, C. Garcia Recio and J. Nieves, Nucl. Phys. A **584** (1995) 653.
- [14] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **166** (1968) 1568.
- [15] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and Ulf-G. Meissner, Phys. Lett. **B 309** (1993) 421; S.R. Beane, V. Bernard, T.S.H. Lee and Ulf-G. Meissner, Phys. Rev. **C 57** (1998) 424.
- [16] G. Ecker, Phys. Lett. **B 336** (1994) 508.
- [17] G.E. Brown and M. Rho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 2720; M. Rho, J. Korean Phys. Soc. **29** (1996) S337; B. Friman and M. Rho, Nucl. Phys. **A606** (1996) 303.
- [18] N. Kaiser and W. Weise, “Systematic calculation of *s*-wave pion and kaon self-energies in asymmetric nuclear matter”, nucl-th/0102062.