

NT@UW-01-17

## Light Front Nuclear Theory

Gerald A. Miller <sup>a</sup> \*<sup>a</sup>Department of Physics, University of Washington,  
Seattle, Washington 98195-1560 USA

High energy scattering experiments involving nuclei are typically analyzed in terms of light front variables. The desire to provide realistic, relativistic wave functions expressed in terms of these variables led me to try to use light front dynamics to compute nuclear wave functions. Here calculations of infinite nuclear matter in the mean field approximation and also in a light front version of Bruckner theory which includes NN correlations are reviewed. Applications of these wave functions to nuclear deep inelastic scattering and Drell-Yan processes are discussed. We find that relativistic mean field theory produces no EMC binding effect.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The goal of our approach[1–3] is to test the assumption that the nucleus is made of nucleons and mesons. Thus we attempt to compute the full Fock state wave function of such a system using light front dynamics.

We shall follow the following outline, beginning with trying to answer the questions “What is light front nuclear theory?” and more importantly, “Why do it”? I will keep the discussion of the formalism to a minimum, as the details have been published. Then we proceed to examples and results. First, the properties of infinite nuclear matter, obtained using the mean field approximation will be discussed. The application of this theory to finite nuclei has been made[4],[5], but will not be discussed here. Then nucleon-nucleon correlations are included by implementing a light front version of Bruckner theory.

A general result of these considerations is that vector and scalar mesons are prominent components of nuclear wave functions. This is important in trying to explain the HERMES effect[6,7]. We also find that pionic effects are small, but testable. This talk is based on work with collaborators P. Blunden, M.Burkardt, J. Cooke, R. Machleidt, J. Smith and B. Tiburzi.

**2. WHAT IS LIGHT FRONT DYNAMICS?**

This is a relativistic many-body dynamics in which fields are quantized at a “time”  $=t+z = x^0 + x^3 \equiv x^+$ . The canonical energy is then given by  $P^0 - P^3 \equiv P^-$ . These equations

---

\*This work is partially supported by the USDOE.

show the notation that a four-vector  $A^\mu$  is expressed in terms of its  $\pm$  components

$$A^\pm \equiv A^0 \pm A^3. \quad (1)$$

The operator  $P^-$  acts as an  $x^+$  evolution operator. One quantizes at  $x^+ = 0$  which is a light-front, hence the name ‘‘light front dynamics’’.

The canonical spatial variable must be orthogonal to the time variable, and this is given by  $x^- = x^0 - x^3$ . The canonical momentum is then  $P^+ = P^0 + P^3$ . The other coordinates are as usual  $\mathbf{x}_\perp$  and  $\mathbf{P}_\perp$ .

A consequence of our notation is that dot products are written as

$$A \cdot b = A^\mu B_\mu = \frac{1}{2}(A^+ B^- + A^- B^+) - \mathbf{A}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{B}_\perp. \quad (2)$$

The most important result is the relation between energy and momentum:

$$p_\mu p^\mu = m^2 = p^+ p^- - p_\perp^2, \quad (3)$$

which means

$$p^- = \frac{p_\perp^2 + m^2}{p^+}. \quad (4)$$

This is a relativistic formula for the kinetic energy which does not contain a square root operator. This is very useful in separating the center of mass and relative coordinates, so that the computed wave functions are frame independent. To a first approximation one may say that doing light front dynamics is doing ordinary quantum mechanics, but with energy denominators obtained using  $p^-$ .

### 3. MOTIVATION FOR LIGHT FRONT NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Much of this work is motivated by the desire to understand nuclear deep inelastic scattering and related experiments, so it is worthwhile to review some of the features of the EMC effect [8–10]. One central experimental result is the suppression of the structure function for  $x \sim 0.5$ . The immediate parton model interpretation is that the valence quarks of bound nucleons carry less plus-momentum than those of free nucleons. Some other degrees of freedom are therefore needed to maintain to total plus-momentum, and some authors therefore postulate that mesons carry a larger fraction of the plus-momentum in the nucleus than in free space[11,12]. While such a model explains the shift in the valence distribution, any meson contains valence anti-quarks and that distribution is enhanced compared to free nucleons. This should be observable in Drell-Yan experiments [13], but no such enhancement has been observed experimentally [14], and this has been termed as a severe crisis for nuclear theory in Ref. [15].

The EMC effect is rather small, so that one may begin by regarding the nucleus as being made of nucleons. In this case, we say that deep inelastic scattering proceeds when a virtual photon is absorbed by a quark carrying plus-momentum  $p^+$ , which came from a nucleon carrying a plus-momentum  $k^+$ . In the parton model, the kinematic variable  $x_{Bj} = Q^2/2M_N\nu$  is given by

$$x_{Bj} = \frac{p^+}{P^+} = \frac{p^+ k^+}{k^+ P^+}, \quad (5)$$

where  $P^+$  is the momentum of the nucleus  $P^+ = M_A$  in the target rest frame. Thus one needs to know the probability  $f_N(k^+/P^+)$  that a nucleon has a momentum fraction  $k^+/P^+$ . One also wants to know the related probability for a meson, for example:  $f_\pi(k^+/P^+)$ .

The essential technical advantage of using light cone variables is that the light cone energy  $P^-$  of a given final state does not appear in the delta function which expresses the conservation of energy and momentum. Thus one may use closure to perform the sum over final states which appears in the calculation of an exclusive nuclear cross section. The result is that the conventional lore is that cross sections may be expressed in terms of the probabilities:

$$\sigma \propto f_N\left(\frac{k^+}{P^+}\right) \sim \int d^2k_\perp \cdots \left| \Psi_A\left(\frac{k^+}{P^+}, \mathbf{k}_\perp, \cdots\right) \right|^2, \quad (6)$$

where  $\Psi_A$  represents the ground state wave function. Another less formal way of saying the same thing is that two events at  $(z_1, t_1)$  and  $(z_2, t_2)$  which have a light-like separation occur at different times, but at the same value of  $x^+ = z_1 + t_1 = z_2 + t_2$ . Thus one avoids the need to use a time development operator which would lead to summing over an infinite number of excited states. Such a light-like separation occurs often when one considers high energy scattering processes.

For these reasons we are concerned with calculating the distribution function  $f_N(k^+/P^+)$ . Since usual nuclear dynamics is done within the equal-time formulation, the  $k^+$  variable is not readily available. Thus we need realistic calculations, with real dynamics and symmetries. This brings me to the conclusion that it is necessary to redo nuclear physics on the light front. The main motivation here is to do a good calculation of conventional dynamics. If the calculations are good enough and fail to reproduce data then one may be able to reach an interesting conclusion that interesting non-standard dynamics are involved.

#### 4. LIGHT FRONT QUANTIZATION LITE

You have to have a Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}$  no matter how bad! This is because, in contrast with approaches based on symmetries, we try to obtain all of the necessary operators from a given Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}$ . We use ones in which the degrees of freedom are nucleons, vector and scalar mesons and pions. The existence of  $\mathcal{L}$  allows the derivation of the canonical, symmetric energy momentum tensor  $T^{\mu\nu}$ . In light front dynamics the momentum is  $P^+ = P^0 + P^3$  where  $P^\mu$  is the total momentum operator:  $P^\mu = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2x_\perp dx^- T^{+\mu}$ . One necessary detail is that that  $T^{+-}$  must be expressed in terms of independent degrees of freedom. One uses the equations of motion to express the dependent degrees of freedom in terms of the independent ones, and uses these constraint equations in the expression for  $T^{+-}$ .

We use two Lagrangians. The first is that of the Walecka model[16]:  $\mathcal{L}(\phi, V^\mu, N)$  which contains the fields: nucleon  $N$ , neutral vector meson  $V^\mu$ , neutral scalar meson  $\phi$ . This is the simplest model which provides a reasonable caricature of the nucleus. The binding is caused by the attractive effects occurring at relatively long range when nucleons exchange scalar mesons. The nucleus is prevented from collapsing by the short distance repulsion arising from the exchange of vector mesons.

We also shall show results obtained using a more complicated chiral Lagrangian: in which the fields are  $N, \pi, \sigma, \omega, \rho, \eta, \delta$ . Our plan is to first use the Walecka model in the mean field approximation, and then to employ a chiral Lagrangian and include nucleon-nucleon correlations in a formalism which yields a non-zero pionic content.

## 5. INFINITE NUCLEAR MATTER IN MEAN FIELD APPROXIMATION–WALECKA MODEL

In this approach one assumes that the strong baryon sources produce sufficiently many mesons to justify a classical treatment. In infinite nuclear matter, one works in a limit in which the nuclear volume  $\Omega$  is considered to be infinite, so that all positions, and directions equivalent in the nuclear rest frame. Then the fields  $\phi$  and  $V^\pm$  are constant, with  $\mathbf{V}_\perp = 0$ . These features simplify the solution of the field equations. One easily obtains the operators  $T^\pm$ , and the light front “momentum” and “energy” are given by

$$\frac{P^\pm}{\Omega} = \langle T^\pm \rangle, \quad (7)$$

in which the expectation value is over the nuclear ground state.

The nuclear momentum content is the essential feature we wish to understand here. The results are that

$$\frac{P^-}{\Omega} = m_s^2 \phi^2 + \frac{4}{(2\pi)^3} \int_F d^2 k_\perp dk^+ \frac{k_\perp^2 + (M + g_s \phi)^2}{k^+}, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{P^+}{\Omega} = m_v^2 (V^-)^2 + \frac{4}{(2\pi)^3} \int_F d^2 k_\perp dk^+ k^+. \quad (9)$$

The first term of  $P^+$  is the plus momentum carried by vector mesons, and the second term is the plus momenta carried by the nucleons. Here  $g_s$  is the scalar-meson-nucleon coupling constant, and the vector meson-nucleon coupling constant  $g_v$  enters in the expression for  $V^-$ . The interpretation of these results is aided by a change of variables:

$$k^+ \equiv \sqrt{(M + g_s \phi)^2 + \vec{k}^2} + k^3, \quad (10)$$

which defines defines the variable  $k^3$ . Using this variable one can show that rotational invariance is respected and obtain a spherical Fermi surface. The Fermi sphere is defined via Eq. (10) by the relation

$$k_\perp^2 + (k^+ - E_F^*)^2 \leq k_F^2, \quad E_F^* \equiv \sqrt{k_F^2 + M^{*2}}. \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, one may show that  $E \equiv \frac{1}{2}(P^- + P^+)$  is the same as the usual expression obtained in the Walecka model.

For nuclear matter in its rest frame we need to obtain  $P^+ = P^- = M_A$ . This is the light front expression of the statement that the pressure on the system must vanish[19,20]. Indeed the minimization

$$\left( \frac{\partial(E/A)}{\partial k_F} \right)_\Omega = 0, \quad (12)$$

determines the value of the Fermi momentum and is an expression that gives  $P^+ = P^- = M_A$ .

We can quickly obtain the relevant numerical results using the 1974 parameters of Chin & Walecka. These are

$$g_v^2 M_N^2 / m_v^2 = 195.9 \quad g_s^2 M_N^2 / m_s^2 = 267.1. \quad (13)$$

With these parameters  $M_N + g_s \phi = 0.56 M_N$  and  $g_v V^- = 270$  MeV. These are the HUGE scalar and vector potentials which are characteristic of the Walecka model. The interesting variables are those associated with the total nuclear plus momentum  $\frac{P^+}{\Omega}$ . With the above parameters, the vector meson contribution to this quantity:  $m_v^2 (V^-)^2$  is a monumental  $0.35 \frac{P^+}{\Omega}$ , while the nucleon contribution  $\frac{4}{(2\pi)^3} \int_F d^2 k_\perp dk^+ k^+$  is only  $0.65 \frac{P^+}{\Omega}$ . Only 65% of  $P^+$  carried by nucleons, but 90% is needed to understand the EMC effect in infinite nuclear matter[21].

## 6. PLUS-MOMENTUM DISTRIBUTIONS

The nucleonic contribution to the nuclear plus momentum is given by the relation (9), so the probability  $f(k^+)$  that a nucleon carries a plus momentum  $k^+$  may be defined by:  $P_N^+ / A \equiv \int dk^+ k^+ f(k^+)$ , with

$$f(k^+) = \frac{4}{\rho_B (2\pi)^3} \int_F d^2 k_\perp = \frac{4}{\rho_B (2\pi)^3} \int_F d^2 k_\perp dp^+ \delta(k^+ - p^+), \quad (14)$$

where the subscript  $F$  denotes integration over the Fermi sea according to Eq. (11). It is useful to obtain a dimensionless distribution function  $f(y)$  by replacing  $k^+$  by the dimensionless variable  $y$  using  $y \equiv \frac{k^+}{M}$ ,  $f(y) \equiv \overline{M} f(y \overline{M})$ , with  $\overline{M} \equiv P_A^+ / A = M_A / M$ . Then using Eq.(11) leads to the result

$$f(y) = \frac{3 \overline{M}^3}{4 k_F^3} \theta(y^+ - y) \theta(y - y^-) \left[ \frac{k_F^2}{\overline{M}^2} - \left( \frac{E_F^*}{\overline{M}} - y \right)^2 \right], \quad (15)$$

where  $y^\pm \equiv \frac{E_F^* \pm k_F}{\overline{M}}$  and  $E_F^* \equiv \sqrt{k_F^2 + M^{*2}}$ . This function peaks narrowly at the value  $y = 0.65$ , which causes a disaster if the conventional lore is used to compute the nuclear structure function  $F_{2A}$ :

$$\frac{F_{2A}^{\text{lore}}(x)}{A} = \int dy f(y) F_{2N}(x/y). \quad (16)$$

There is far, far too large a depletion of  $F_{2A}$  because here the nucleons carry only 65% of the plus-momentum. One can't plot the results of the theory in comparison with the experimental results using pages of ordinary size.

However, Eq. (16) is obtained without having made the connection between the nucleon momentum distribution computed using light front dynamics and that used in computing the deep inelastic structure function. Recently, the authors of Ref. [22] have claimed that quark distribution functions are not parton probabilities. The key point is that one needs to derive the connection between the constituent distribution function and the observed data. That work stimulated us to undertake an investigation[23] in which this connection

is derived. That investigation uses a manifestly covariant formulation[24] and the result is a formula

$$\frac{F_{2A}^{\text{lore}}(x)}{A} = \int dy f(y - \frac{V^+}{M}) F_{2N}(x/y), \quad (17)$$

so that now one using a nucleon distribution function which has peak at unity. This leads to no depletion. There is only an enhancement due to Fermi motion. This result is obtained for any relativistic mean field theory. A very similar result was obtained by Birse some time ago[25]. A paper on this subject has recently been submitted for publication[23].

## 7. BEYOND MEAN FIELD THEORY

The interactions between nucleons are strong, and the mean field approximation is unlikely to provide a description of nuclear properties which involve high momentum observables. We developed [2,19,20] a version of light front theory in which the correlations between two nucleons are included. The theory was applied to infinite nuclear matter.

The calculation required three principal steps. (1) Light front quantization of chiral  $\mathcal{L}$ . (2) Derive Light Front version of the  $NN$  one boson exchange potential. This could be done exploiting the relationship between the Weinberg equation and the Blankenbecler-Sugar equation. Results for the phase shifts are shown in Fig. 1 of Ref. [20]. Generally good agreement with the measured data is obtained. The light front approach is no worse than any other.

The third step is to develop the many body theory. This turns out to be a long story[20]. The net result is that the light front theory looks like the usual relativistic Brueckner theory theory except that the Blankenbecler-Sugar equation is used, and the effects of retardation are kept. The resulting nuclear matter saturation curve is shown in Fig. 2 of Ref. [20]. Standard good results for nuclear saturation properties are obtained, with a possible improvement in the lowered value, 180 MeV, of the computed nuclear compressibility. One may compare the present calculations with those of earlier relativistic Bruckner theory calculations, e.g. that of Ref. [26], by comparing the light front equations with those of the usual equal time formulation. The differences reduce to the use of teh Blankenbecler-Sugar equation instead of the Thompson equation, and to the inclusion of retardation effects (necessary for Poincare invariance) in the light front approach.

The results for deep inelastic scattering and the related Drell-Yan process seem very promising. Our preliminary result[27] is that the nucleons carry about 93% of the nuclear plus momentum, which includes the effects of two-particle two-hole states. The calculation of lepton-nucleus deep inelastic scattering is not finished. We are working on it[27]

In these calculations the nucleus does have a pionic component, which arises as a result of going beyond the mean field approximation. The number of excess pions per nucleon was computed to be about 5%[20], which accounts for about 2% of the nuclear plus momentum[27], small enough to avoid a contradiction with the Drell-Yan data[24,30]. This 5% is smaller than the value of  $\sim 20\%$  found in Ref. [28], but is in accord with the more recent calculation of Ref. [29]. The difference between the calculations is related to the inclusion of the  $\Delta$  as an explicit degree of freedom. This was done in Ref. [28], but not in our or the more recent Illinois calculations.

It may be possible to observe the pionic content by measuring an enhancement of the cross sections  $\sigma_L$  for longitudinally polarized photons in electron nucleus scattering[30]. There are 15-30% enhancement effects at values of  $x \sim 0.2 - 0.3$  (shown in Fig. 4 of Ref. [30]) which present an excellent opportunity to unravel along-standing mystery about the presence or absence of pionic effects.

## 8. SUMMARY

The light front approach leads to boost-invariant wave functions of the form  $\Psi_A(\frac{k^+}{P^+})$ . Furthermore, formalisms to compute these wave functions do exist right now. Mesons are significant components of nuclei, and can be used to explain the HERMES effect. Relativistic mean field theory can not reproduce the EMC effect of nuclear depletion of the structure function for  $x \geq 0.4$ . One may go beyond mean field theory and include the correlations. This leads to a small pionic effect, which causes inconsistency with the nuclear Drell-Yan experiment, but which is testable by measuring  $\sigma_L$  in electron nucleus scattering.

## REFERENCES

1. G.A. Miller, Phys. Rev. **C56** (1997) R8.
2. G.A. Miller, Phys. Rev. **C56** (1997) 2789.
3. G. A. Miller, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, 83 (2000) [nucl-th/0002059].
4. P. G. Blunden, M. Burkardt and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C, Rapid Comm. **59**, 2998 (1999) [nucl-th/9901063].
5. P. G. Blunden, M. Burkardt and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C **60**, 055211 (1999) [nucl-th/9906012].
6. K. Ackerstaff *et al.* [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **475**, 386 (2000) [hep-ex/9910071].
7. G. A. Miller, S. J. Brodsky and M. Karliner, Phys. Lett. B **481**, 245 (2000) [hep-ph/0002156].
8. J. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **123B** (1982) 275; R.G. Arnold *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 727; A. Bodek *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 534.
9. G. Piller and W. Weise, Phys. Rept. **330**, 1 (2000) [hep-ph/9908230]. L.L. Frankfurt and M.I. Strikman, Phys. Rep. **160**(1988) 235; M. Arneodo, Phys. Rep. **240** (1994) 301; D.F. Geesaman, K. Saito, A.W. Thomas, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **45** (1995) 337.
10. L.L. Frankfurt and M.I. Strikman, Phys. Rep. **160** (1988) 235.
11. C.H. Llewellyn Smith **B128** (1983) 107.
12. M. Ericson and A.W. Thomas, Phys. Lett. **B128** (1983) 112.
13. R.P. Bickerstaff, M.C. Birse, and G.A. Miller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, (1984) 2532; M. Ericson and A.W. Thomas, Phys. Lett. **148B** (1984) 191.
14. D.M. Alde *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2479.
15. G.F. Bertsch, L. Frankfurt, and M. Strikman, Science **259** (1993) 773.
16. B.D. Serot and J.D. Walecka, Adv. Nucl. Phys. **16** (1986)
17. L.L. Frankfurt and M.I. Strikman, Phys. Rep. **76**, (1981) 215.
18. F. Gürsey, Nuovo Cimento **16**, (1960) 230

19. G.A. Miller and R. Machleidt, Phys. Lett. **B455** (1999) 19 nucl-th/9811050.
20. G.A. Miller and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. C **60**, 035202 (1999) [nucl-th/9903080].
21. I. Sick and D. Day, Phys. Lett. B **274**, 16 (1992).
22. S. J. Brodsky, P. Hoyer, N. Marchal, S. Peigne and F. Sannino, hep-ph/0104291.
23. G. A. Miller and J. R. Smith, "Return of the EMC Effect" NT@UW-01-14, nucl-th/0107026
24. H. Jung and G.A. Miller, Phys. Rev. **C41** (1990) 659.
25. M. C. Birse, Phys. Lett. B **299**, 186 (1993).
26. R. Brockmann and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. C **42**, 1965 (1990).
27. D.R. Entem, R. Machleidt, G. A. Miller in preparation.
28. B. Friman, V.R. Pandharipande and R.B. Wiringa, Phys. Rev. Lett **51** (1983) 763.
29. A. Akmal and V. R. Pandharipande, Phys. Rev. C **56**, 2261 (1997) [nucl-th/9705013].
30. G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C **64**, 022201 (2001) [nucl-th/0104025].