EPJ manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Forward analysis of πN scattering with an expansion method

P. Metsä

Department of Physical Sciences, P.O. Box 64, FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

Received: date / Revised version: date

Tiivistelmä The πN forward scattering data are analyzed using an expansion method, where the invariant amplitudes are represented by expansions satisfying the forward dispersion relations. The experimental errors of the data are taken into account through the covariance matrix of the coefficients of the expansions in a careful error analysis. From the results, some coefficients, $c^{\pm}_{n0}$, of the subthreshold expansions have been calculated with proper error bars.

PACS. 13.75.Gx Pion-baryon interactions

arXiv:0705.4528v3 [hep-ph] 13 Sep 2007

1 Introduction

Forward dispersion relations are a special case in πN scattering analysis, because in forward scattering the optical theorem provides a direct connection to total cross section data. An expansion method provides a tool for guaranteeing that the forward dispersion relations are satisfied. Since the last forward analysis with the expansion method [1], there has not been very much experimental activity in the forward πN scattering. In particular, there are no new total cross section data except the very high energy measurements of the SELEX collaboration [2]. However, there is new information at the physical threshold from the very precise pionic hydrogen experiments [3], and, at low energy, from some new integrated cross section measurements [4,5] which are filling the gap between the physical threshold and the first total cross section data points. Both of these have a direct impact on the subthreshold expansion.

The aim of the present article is to construct invariant amplitudes $C^{\pm}$ at $t = 0$ to constrain a phase shift analysis with fixed-t analyticity. Furthermore, information on $\mathrm{Im}\, C^{-}(\omega)$ can be used to study the Goldberger-Miyazawa-Oehme sum rule [6,7]. The expansion method is briefly explained in sect. 2, the experimental input is described in sect. 3, the minimizations are discussed in sect. 4 together with the evaluation of the subthreshold expansion coefficients. In sect. 5 the conclusions are drawn.

2 The expansion method

The isospin even pion-nucleon C-amplitude satisfies the forward dispersion relation [8]

$$\mathrm{Re}\, C^{+}(\nu, t=0) = -\frac{g^2}{m}\frac{\nu^2}{\nu^2-\nu_B^2} + \frac{2\nu^2}{\pi} \fint_{\nu_T}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}\nu'}{\nu'} \frac{\mathrm{Im}\, C^{+}(\nu', t=0)}{\nu'^2-\nu^2} + C^{+}(\nu=0, t=0). \quad (1)$$

Here ν is the crossing antisymmetric Mandelstam variable $\nu = (s-u)/4m = \omega + t/4m$ with ω denoting the pion total laboratory energy, g^2 is the πN coupling constant, $\nu_B = -\mu^2/2m$ and $C^{+}(\nu = 0, t = 0)$ is the subtraction constant. Everywhere we denote the proton mass by m and the charged pion mass by μ. In practice, equations like (1) are difficult to use as constraints, because the principal value integration is difficult to handle with experimental input. In particular, integrating over experimental data is unreliable and propagating the errors of the input to the error bars of the output is very difficult. Instead, we express the isospin even and odd amplitudes using Pietarinen's versions of the expansions [9,10] at $t = 0$

$$C^{\pm}(\nu) = C^{\pm}_{N}(\nu) + H^{\pm}(Z) \sum_{k=1}^{N} c^{\pm}_{k} [Z(\nu)]^{k-1}, \quad (2)$$

where the base function $Z(\nu)$ is a conformal mapping

$$Z(\nu) = \frac{\alpha - \sqrt{\nu_T^2 - \nu^2}}{\alpha + \sqrt{\nu_T^2 - \nu^2}}, \quad (3)$$

which maps the physical cut to the upper half of the unit circle in such a way, that the threshold is mapped to $(1, 0)$ and the infinity to $(-1, 0)$. The threshold of the cut in the forward direction is $\nu_T = \mu$ and the parameter α controls which energy is mapped to $(0, 1)$; there the pion laboratory momentum $p_{\mathrm{lab}} = \alpha$. The numerical value of α in (3) is not crucial, but it is fixed to $\alpha = 0.72$ GeV, which seems to give the most rapid convergence [10]. By using $Z(\nu)$ as the base function, the analyticity structure of the invariant amplitudes is a built-in feature and not only a

constraint, so the resulting amplitudes will satisfy the dispersion relations exactly. In the expansion method there is also the great advantage, that experimental input for both real and imaginary parts with their errors can be used simultaneously. The pole terms [9,11]

$$C_N^+(\nu) = -\frac{\mu^2 g^2}{2m}\left(\frac{1}{m^2-s}+\frac{1}{m^2-u}\right),$$
$$C_N^-(\nu) = \frac{(s-u)g^2}{4m}\left(\frac{1}{m^2-s}+\frac{1}{m^2-u}\right) \qquad (4)$$

are treated separately and the assumed high energy behaviour in the forward direction is taken care of by the functions $H^{\pm}(Z(\nu))$ [9]

$$H^+(Z) = \frac{1+\{r_1\log[r_2(1+Z)]\}^2}{1+Z},$$
$$H^-(Z) = 4m\nu(1+Z)^{1-\alpha_\rho}, \qquad (5)$$
$$\text{where } r_1 = 0.144,\ r_2 = 44.154\ ,\ \text{and } \alpha_\rho = 0.48.$$

The number of terms in eq. (2), *i.e.* N, was taken to be 40 in the earlier work [10,11], but here we take $N = 100$, which should fully guarantee that the truncation error is negligible.

An essential ingredient of the expansion technique is the convergence test function (CTF) [10,11,12]. It is not sufficient to fix the coefficients $c_k^{\pm}$ in the expansion at fixed-t by fitting to data, but, in addition, to guarantee the smoothness of the invariant amplitudes an additional term in the χ^2 sum is needed. The convergence test function part takes the form [10]

$$\chi^2_{\rm ctf} = W^+_{\rm ctf}\sum_{k=1}^{N}(c_k^+)^2k^3 + W^-_{\rm ctf}\sum_{k=1}^{N}(c_k^-)^2k^3, \qquad (6)$$


where the weights are

$$W^{\pm}_{\rm ctf} = \frac{N}{\sum_{k=1}^{N}k^3\left[(\bar{c}_k^{\pm})^2+(\Delta\bar{c}_k^{\pm})^2\right]}. \qquad (7)$$


Here $\bar{c}_k^{\pm}$ and $\Delta\bar{c}_k^{\pm}$ denote the expansion coefficients and their corresponding errors in the isospin even and odd C-amplitudes at the χ^2-minimum, *i.e.* at the best fit to the data and to the contraints. So, the minimum has to be roughly known before the final CTF weights can be calculated. This leads to an iterative minimization.

3 The input

As input for the fit, we used total cross section data [13, 14], integrated cross section measurements [4,5], real-to-imaginary ratios [13,14], real parts of the isoscalar D-amplitude [15,16,17], the s-wave scattering length a_{π^-p} from pionic hydrogen experiments [3,7] and the scattering length a_{π^+p} from discrete phase shift analysis [7]. To begin with, our full forward data base contains 1098 data points in 142 data sets covering the laboratory momenta from 0.077 GeV/c to 640 GeV/c in addition to the threshold values.



Kuva 1. Electromagnetic (solid line) and Δ-splitting corrections (dashed line) for $\sigma^{\rm Tot}_{\pi^-p}$.




Kuva 2. Electromagnetic correction for $\sigma^{\rm Tot}_{\pi^+p}$.

The electromagnetic effects were removed from the total cross sections and from the real parts of the D-amplitude by the Tromborg method [18] for the laboratory momenta $p_{\rm lab} < 725$ MeV/c. The corrections have been published only up to 655 MeV/c, but here we employ a smooth extrapolation up to 725 MeV/c. In order to apply the Tromborg method, an existing partial wave solution is needed. We used the KA84 solution [19], but the corrections are practically unchanged, if one chooses to take the KH80 [20] or the FA02 solution [21] instead. The Δ-splitting was treated by using the P_{33} phase shift differences from ref. [22], which are very similar to the earlier P_{33}-corrections of Bugg [23,24]. Bugg gives the corrections for a discrete set of momenta from $p_{\rm lab} = 183$ MeV/c to $p_{\rm lab} = 408$ MeV/c, while with ref. [22] it is possible to treat all data up to $p_{\rm lab} = 725$ MeV/c. The corrections


$\Delta\sigma^{\rm Tot}_{\pi^\pm p} = \sigma^{\rm Tot}_{\pi^\pm p} - \sigma^{\rm Tot,hadr}_{\pi^\pm p}$ applied to the measured total cross sections to obtain the isospin invariant hadronic ones are displayed in figs. 1 and 2. After applying these corrections, the data were assumed to be purely hadronic and isospin invariant. That is reasonable, because any remaining effects are expected to be considerably smaller than the experimental errors. Above $p_{\rm lab} = 725$ MeV/c the one photon exchange picture with the Coulomb phase and form factors was assumed to be applicable. For the pionic hydrogen results χPT-based electromagnetic corrections [25] were applied to extract the hadronic quantities. To make use of the integrated differential cross section data [4,5], they were corrected to hadronic cross sections integrated over the whole angular range by adding corrections calculated with the KA84 solution.

The error bars of the total cross sections of Carter *et al.* [26] were modified by adding the errors due to the 0.25% uncertainty in the beam momenta, as explained by Bugg [27]. Also, the corrections adopted by Giacomelli [28] were applied to the total cross sections of Citron *et al.* [29].

The forward data alone are not enough to stabilize the low energy behaviour, *i.e.* the energy range from the threshold up to the first total cross section data point. In order to stabilize it without introducing any bias from earlier solutions, we used our current partial wave solution to constrain the momentum range 20 MeV/c $\leq p_{\rm lab} \leq$ 155 MeV/c. The details of the partial wave solution will be published elsewhere [30].



Kuva 3. Difference plot of the total $\pi^- p$ cross section. The dashed lines give the error band of the fit. The Carter data [26] are marked with crosses, the Pedroni data [39] with bars and the Davidson data [38] with circles.



Kuva 4. Difference plot of the total $\pi^+ p$ cross section. For the explanation of the symbols for the data, see the caption of fig. 3.

4 Results

The coefficients $c_k^\pm$ of Pietarinen's expansions (2) were fixed in a χ^2-minimization using the program `MINUIT` [31, 32]. The actual minimization was carried out three times, because the convergence test function method depends on the previously determined minimum. The data were allowed to float inside the quoted systematic errors and the floating factors were searched simultaneously with the coefficients of Pietarinen's expansions. In the process of the minimization we had to discard six data sets, which were too discrepant even after the renormalization: the $\pi^\pm p$ total cross section sets of Devlin *et al.* [33], two $\pi^+ p$ total cross section sets of Brisson *et al.* [34,35], the $\pi^+ p$ total cross section set of Ignatenko *et al.* [36] and the $\pi^+ p$ total cross section set of Lindenbaum *et al.* [37]. In addition to these, we had to discard the three lowest data points of Davidson *et al.* [38]. After excluding these data, we were left with 967 data points in 136 sets and the average χ^2 per data point was 1.47. The differences between the data and the total cross sections calculated from the fit are plotted in figs. 3 and 4 for the laboratory momentum range $p_{\rm lab}$ =150 – 500 MeV/c. At higher energy the results are in good agreement with the earlier work of the Karlsruhe group [1].

Inside the Mandelstam triangle, it is useful to formulate the πN amplitudes in terms of the subthreshold expansion with the pseudovector Born terms subtracted, $\bar{C}^\pm = C^\pm - C^\pm_{N,pv}$. The subthreshold expansion coefficients are the coefficients in the expansions based on crossing [8]

$$\bar{C}^+(\nu,t) = \sum_{n,m} c^+_{nm} \nu^{2n} t^m$$
$$\bar{C}^-(\nu,t)/\nu = \sum_{n,m} c^-_{nm} \nu^{2n} t^m, \qquad (8)$$

where the isospin odd amplitude is divided by ν in order to get a crossing even quantity. One gets the subthreshold parameters $c^\pm_{n0}$ by Taylor expanding Pietarinen's representation (2) with the pseudovector Born term subtracted

Taulukko 1. The coefficients of the subthreshold expansion of $\bar{C}^+$ in natural units (powers of μ^{-1}). In the error estimate the first part is the statistical error, and the second part is the combination of the uncertainty in the coupling constant and the effect of conflicting data sets. They should be added linearly in order to get the total error. The Karlsruhe results are from table 2.4.7.1. of ref. [8] (N.B. $c^{\pm}_{n0} = d^{\pm}_{n0}$).

	Present analysis	Karlsruhe	SM99 [40]
c^+_{00}	$-1.20^{\dagger} \pm 0.004 \pm 0.03$	-1.46 ± 0.10	-1.26 ± 0.02
c^+_{10}	$1.119\pm0.001\pm0.002$	1.12 ± 0.02	1.11 ± 0.02
c^+_{20}	$0.2015\pm0.0005\pm0.0008$	0.200 ± 0.005	0.20 ± 0.01
c^+_{30}	$0.0568\pm0.0003\pm0.0001$	-	-

[†]The value resulting from a calculation with isospin invariance.

Taulukko 2. The coefficients of the subthreshold expansion of $\bar{C}^-/\nu$ in natural units (powers of μ^{-1}). The error estimates are displayed in the same manner as in table 1 except for c^-_{00}, where the g^2 dependence and the effect of conflicting data are separated.

	Present analysis	Karlsruhe	SM99 [40]
c^-_{00}	$1.41\pm0.002^{\mathrm{a}} \pm 0.05^{\mathrm{b}} \pm 0.01^{\mathrm{c}}$	1.53 ± 0.02	1.43 ± 0.01
c^-_{10}	$-0.167\pm0.001\pm0.001$	-0.167 ± 0.005	-0.16 ± 0.01
c^-_{20}	$-0.0388\pm0.0004\pm0.0005$	-0.039 ± 0.002	-0.04 ± 0.01
c^-_{30}	$-0.0092\pm0.0002\pm0.0001$	-	-

[a]The statistical error.
[b]The g^2 dependence, see sect. 4.
[c]Due to conflicting data.

around $\nu = t = 0$

$$c^+_{n0} = \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{k=1}^{N} c^+_k \left.\frac{\partial^n}{\partial(\nu^2)^n}\left[Z^{k-1}H^+(Z)\right]\right|_{\nu=t=0} \qquad (9)$$

$$c^-_{n0} = \frac{g^2\delta_{n0}}{2m^2} + \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{k=1}^{N} c^-_k \left.\frac{\partial^n}{\partial(\nu^2)^n}\left[Z^{k-1}H^-(Z)/\nu\right]\right|_{\nu=t=0}.$$

The numerical values of the lowest coefficients are given in tables 1 and 2 together with the Karlsruhe values [8] and the GWU/VPI SM99 values [40].

The statistical errors of the subthreshold expansion coefficients (9) are calculated by the standard way, *i.e.*

$$(\Delta c_{n0})^2 = \sum_{k,l} \frac{\partial c_{n0}}{\partial c_k}\frac{\partial c_{n0}}{\partial c_l} V_{kl}, \qquad (10)$$

where V_{kl} is the covariance matrix of the Pietarinen coefficients c_k, calculated by `MINUIT`. In Pietarinen's method, the minimized function is not a pure χ^2-distribution, but the combination of a χ^2-distribution and the convergence test function, which generally makes the minimum steeper and gives too optimistic error bars. In practice 9.5% of the probability distribution at the minimum is due to CTF. Therefore, in order to get the proper error bars, we increased the statistical errors of eq. (10) by 10%.

Two sources of systematic errors are studied explicitly. The effect of the uncertainty in the coupling constant was estimated by making calculations with various values[1] in the range $f^2 = 0.075 \pm 0.002$ [7]. The conflicting data sets are causing another systematic effect, which was estimated by making the analysis with different subsets of the data. The combinations of these effects are displayed in tables 1 and 2.

The coefficient c^+_{00} can be written as

$$c^+_{00} = 4\pi(1+x)a^+_{0+} + g^2\frac{x^3}{4-x^2}\frac{1}{\mu} - J^+, \qquad (11)$$

where $x = \mu/m$, a^+_{0+} is the isoscalar s-wave scattering length and J^+ is the integral

$$J^+ = \frac{2\mu^2}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{\sigma^+(k)\,\mathrm{d}k}{\omega^2}. \qquad (12)$$

Here σ^+ is the average $\sigma^+ = (\sigma^{\mathrm{Tot}}_{\pi^- p} + \sigma^{\mathrm{Tot}}_{\pi^+ p})/2$. The uncertainty in c^+_{00} is mainly due to the first term of eq. (11). The value of the integral J^+ is quite stable, we obtain $J^+ = 1.459 \pm 0.005\ \mu^{-1}$, if the integrations are performed as in ref. [7]. The result can be compared with the Karlsruhe value [41] $J^+ = 1.478 \pm 0.010\ \mu^{-1}$. If the values for $a_{\pi^\pm p}$ derived in ref. [7] are used and isospin invariance is assumed, we obtain $a^+_{0+} = 0.0085 \pm 0.0016\ \mu^{-1}$ which gives the value in table 1. However, employing the isovector scattering lengths a^-_{0+} derived from the width measurements of pionic hydrogen to fix the isoscalar scattering length from $a^+_{0+} = a_{\pi^- p} - a^-_{0+}$ would give a range of values for c^+_{00} extending from $-1.17\ \mu^{-1}$ to $-1.41\ \mu^{-1}$. The detailed value depends on which data one wants to fit, *e.g.*, the Denz *et al.* $\mathrm{Re}\,D^+$ data [17] favour a more negative c^+_{00}.

To fix a^+_{0+} it is also possible to make use of the measured level shift in pionic deuterium [42]. For recent evaluations of the $\pi^- d$ level shift, see *e.g.* ref. [43,44,45,46]. Meißner *et al.* [46] include isospin breaking corrections to $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ in chiral perturbation theory and give the result

[1] The pseudoscalar coupling constant g is related to the pseudovector coupling f by $g^2 = 4\pi f^2(2m/\mu)^2$.

$a^+_{0+} = 0.0015 \pm 0.0022\ \mu^{-1}$ which would lead to $c^+_{00} = -1.30\ \mu^{-1}$, a result well within the above range of values.

In table 2, the explicit g^2 dependence of the parameter c^-_{00} is given separately as well as the effects due to conflicting data sets. For all other parameter values the coupling constant dependence, the conflicting data effects and the statistical errors are added linearly. Beyond $c^\pm_{00}$ all the other parameters are very stable.

If one uses the value of the coupling constant from Ericson *et al.* [47,48], $g^2/4\pi = 14.07 \pm 0.17$ instead of the value of ref. [7], the value of the first coefficient of the isospin odd expansion will be $c^-_{00} = 1.49 \pm 0.03\ \mu^{-2}$. The changes in the other coefficients are small.

5 Conclusions

The resulting expansions give smooth forward isospin even and odd C-amplitudes, which can be used as a starting point for a phase shift analysis with fixed-t constraints as well as constraints for a discrete phase shift analysis [49]. Also, when the Δ-splitting corrections have been taken into account, the hadronic $\pi^\pm p$ total cross sections can be calculated and used to evaluate the Goldberger-Miyazawa-Oehme sum rule [7].

The resulting forward subthreshold expansion coefficients are in excellent agreement with the earlier evaluations of the Karlsruhe group except for $c^\pm_{00}$, where the effects due to the coupling constant and the threshold amplitudes, obtained from pionic hydrogen experiments, are important.

I wish to thank E. Pietarinen for useful exchanges in the early phase of the project, A.M. Green and M. Sainio for useful comments on the manuscript and V. Abaev for many fruitful discussions. Also, I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Magnus Ehrnrooth Foundation and the Waldemar von Frenckell Foundation. This work was supported in part by the EU Contract MRTN-CT-2006-035482, FLAVIAnet.

Viitteet

1. G. Höhler, F. Kaiser, *Review and Tables of Pion-Nucleon Forward Amplitudes*, (Kernforschungszentrum Karlsruhe, KfK 3027, Germany 1980).
2. U. Dersch *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **579**, 277 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ex/9910052].
3. H.-Ch. Schröder *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **21**, 473 (2001).
4. E. Friedman *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **514**, 601 (1990); E. Friedman, πN Newsletter **15**, 37 (1999).
5. B.J. Kriss *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 1480 (1999).
6. M.L. Goldberger, H. Miyazawa, R. Oehme, Phys. Rev. **99**, 986 (1955).
7. V.V. Abaev, P. Metsä, M.E. Sainio, Eur. Phys. J. A **32**, 321 (2007) [arXiv:0704.3167].
8. G. Höhler, *Pion-Nucleon Scattering*, Landolt-Börnstein, edited by H. Schopper, Vol.I/9b2 (Springer, Berlin 1983).
9. G. Höhler, F. Kaiser, R. Koch, E. Pietarinen, *Handbook of Pion-Nucleon Scattering*, (Institut für Theoretische Kernphysik der Universität Karlsruhe, Physics Data Nr. 12-1, ISSN 0344-8401, Germany 1979).
10. E. Pietarinen, Nuovo Cim. A **12**, 522 (1972).
11. E. Pietarinen, Nucl. Phys. B **107**, 21 (1976).
12. E. Pietarinen, Nucl. Phys. B **55**, 541 (1973).
13. W.-M. Yao *et al.*, J. of Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
14. `http://pdg.lbl.gov/2006/hadronic-xsections/hadron.html`
15. U. Wiedner *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 3568 (1989).
16. Ch. Joram *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **51**, 2144 (1995).
17. H. Denz *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **633**, 209 (2006) [arXiv:nucl-ex/0512006].
18. B. Tromborg, S. Waldenstrøm, I. Øverbø, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 725 (1977).
19. R. Koch, Z. Phys. C **29**, 597 (1985).
20. R. Koch, E. Pietarinen, Nucl. Phys. A **336**, 331 (1980).
21. R.A. Arndt, W.J. Briscoe, I.I. Strakovsky, R.L. Workman, M.M. Pavan, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 035213 (2004) [arXiv:nucl-th/0311089].
22. V.V. Abaev, S.P. Kruglov, Z. Phys. A **352**, 85 (1995).
23. D.V. Bugg, πN Newsletter **6**, 7 (1992).
24. D.V. Bugg *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **26**, 588 (1971).
25. J. Gasser, M.A. Ivanov, E. Lipartia, M. Mojžiš, A. Rusetsky, Eur. Phys. J. C **26**, 13 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0206068].
26. A.A. Carter, J.R. Williams, D.V. Bugg, P.J. Bussey, D.R. Dance, Nucl. Phys. B **26**, 445 (1971).
27. D.V. Bugg, Eur. Phys. J. C **33**, 505 (2004).
28. G. Giacomelli, Prog. in Nucl. Phys. **12/2**, 1 (1970).
29. A. Citron *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **144**, 1101 (1966).
30. P. Metsä *et al.*, work in progress.
31. F. James, M. Roos, Comp. Phys. Comm. **10**, 343 (1975).
32. F. James, *MINUIT Function Minimization and Error Analysis Reference Manual*, (Computing and Networks Division, CERN Geneva 1998).
33. T.J. Devlin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **14**, 1031 (1965).
34. J.C. Brisson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **3**, 561 (1959).
35. J.C. Brisson *et al.*, Nuovo Cim. **19**, 210 (1961).
36. A.E. Ignatenko, A.I. Mukhin, E.B. Ozerov, B. Pontecorvo, Soviet Physics JETP **3**, 10 (1956).
37. S.J. Lindenbaum, Luke C.L. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **111**, 1380 (1958).
38. D. Davidson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **6**, 1199 (1972).
39. E. Pedroni *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **300**, 321 (1978).
40. B.R. Martin, G.C Oades, πN Newsletter **16**, 133 (2002).
41. R. Koch, Karlsruhe TKP 85-5, 1985, unpublished.
42. P. Hauser *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **58**, 1869 (1998).
43. T.E.O. Ericson, B. Loiseau, A.W. Thomas, Phys. Rev. C **66**, 014005 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0009312].
44. S.R. Beane, V. Bernard, E. Epelbaum, U.-G. Meißner, D.R. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. A **720**, 399 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0206219].
45. M. Döring, E. Oset, M.J. Vicente Vacas, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 045203 (2004) [arXiv:nucl-th/0402086].
46. U.-G. Meißner, U. Raha, A. Rusetsky, Phys. Lett. B **639**, 478 (2006) [arXiv:nucl-th/0512035].
47. T.E.O. Ericson, A.N. Ivanov, Phys. Lett. B. **634**, 39 (2006).
48. T.E.O. Ericson, B. Loiseau, S. Wycech, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **20**, 1650 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0411230].
49. V.V. Abaev *et al.*, work in progress.