

Meson exchange effects in elastic ep scattering at loop level and the electromagnetic form factors of proton

December 25, 2021

Hong-Yu Chen¹, Hai-Qing Zhou^{1,2*}

¹ Department of Physics, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, P. R. China

² State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China

Abstract

A new form of two-photon exchange(TPE) effect is studied to explain the discrepancy between unpolarized and polarized experimental data in elastic ep scattering. The mechanism is based on a simple idea that besides the usual TPE effects from box and crossed-box diagrams, the mesons may also be exchanged in elastic ep scattering by two-photon coupling at loop level. The detailed study shows such contributions to unpolarized cross section ($\sigma_{r,un}$) and polarized observables (P_t, P_l) at fixed Q^2 are only dependent on proton's electromagnetic form factors $G_{E,M}$ and a new un-known parameter g . After combining this contribution with the usual TPE contributions from box and crossed-box diagrams, the ratio $\mu_p G_E/G_M$ extracted from the new precise unpolarized and polarized experimental data can be described consistently.

Key words: Two-Photon Exchange, Meson-Exchange, Form Factor

1 Introduction

As the basic constituent of our world and most elemental bound state of strong interaction, the proton plays important role in the physics. Up to now, our knowledge on the structure of proton is still poor, for example, how big is the proton[1], how large are the electromagnetic form factors $G_{E,M}$ of the proton[2, 3, 4, 5]. Since the first measurement of $R = \mu_p G_E/G_M$ by the polarization transfer(PT) method[2], it becomes a serious problem for theoretical physicists to explain the large discrepancy of extracted R between PT method and Rosenbluth or longitudinal-transverse (LT) method[4, 5].

In the Born approximation, the ep scattering is described by one-photon exchange(OPE) shown as Fig.1(a). By this approximation, the reduced unpolarized cross section is expressed as

$$\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma} \equiv \left. \frac{d\sigma^{(un)}}{d\Omega} \right|_{lab} \frac{\varepsilon\tau(1+\tau)}{\sigma_{Mott}} = G_M^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} G_E^2, \quad (1)$$

and the polarized observables P_t, P_l are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} P_t^{1\gamma} &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma}} \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)}{\tau}} G_M G_E, \\ P_l^{1\gamma} &= \frac{1}{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma}} \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)(1-\varepsilon)} G_M^2, \\ R_{PT}^{1\gamma} &\equiv -\mu_p \sqrt{\frac{\tau(1+\varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon}} \frac{P_t}{P_l} = \mu_p \frac{G_E}{G_M}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

*E-mail: zhouhq@seu.edu.cn

with $Q^2 = -q^2$, $q = p_1 - p_3$, $\tau = Q^2/4M_N^2$, $\epsilon = [1 - 2(1 + \tau \tan^2 \theta/2)]^{-1}$, M_N the mass of proton and θ the scattering angle of electron in the lab frame.

Experimentally, the LT method extracts R from the ϵ dependence of unpolarized cross section at fixed Q^2 by Eq.(1) and the PT method extracts R from the experimental ratio P_t/P_l at fixed Q^2 and ϵ by Eq.(2). We named such extracted R s as $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ and $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$, respectively. The current precise experimental measurements[2, 5] show that $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ are much larger than $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ at large Q^2 .

In the literature, two-photon-exchange(TPE) effects are suggested to explain such discrepancy[6]. Many model dependent methods are studied to estimate the TPE corrections such as hadronic model[7], GPDs method[8], dispersion relation method[9], pQCD[10] and SCET[11]. These model dependent calculations gave similar TPE corrections $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma}/R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ (where $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma}$ refers to extracted R_{LT} after considering the TPE corrections), and are usually concluded to be able to explain the discrepancy[7, 12]. But the recent polarized experimental data[3] shows very different properties of R_{PT} with that predicted by these models. For example, the experimental data showed that TPE corrections to R_{PT} are almost a constant at $\epsilon = (0.152, 0.635, 0.785)$ with $Q^2 = 2.49\text{GeV}^2$ [3], while the theoretical estimations of such corrections are large and positive at small ϵ by the hadronic model and the dispersion relation method[7, 9], and are large and negative at small ϵ by GPDs method and pQCD method[8, 10]. This situation shows that we are still far away from the accurate understanding of experimental data in elastic ep scattering. And a further careful study of TPE corrections or similar effects are strongly called for.

In this work, we consider a new form of TPE effect in ep scattering. The main idea is based on the theoretical estimations of photo-production of vector meson. For the photo-production of vector meson, there are contributions from s-channel, u-channel and t-channel shown as Fig.1(b,c,d), where only the main contributions from $0^{++}, 0^{-+}, 2^{++}$ resonances are included. By the vector meson dominance(VMD), these three channels also give contributions to virtual Compton scattering(VSC). When considering the radiative corrections in elastic ep scattering, it is natural that there are similar corresponding contributions shown as Fig.2(a,b,c). Fig.2(a,b) are just the usual box and crossed-box diagrams studied in [7], while the contribution from Fig.2(c) is usually ignored. In this work, we estimate such contribution and find the experimental behavior of $R_{LT}^{1\gamma}$ and $R_{PT}^{1\gamma}$ can be understood well after combining the contributions from Fig.2(a,b,c).




Figure 1: (a) the Born diagram in ep scattering and (b,c,d) the s,u,t-channels in photo-production of vector meson.

2 Basic Formula

Since the couplings of $M\gamma\gamma$ in Fig.2(c) depend on the four momentum of virtual photons and their expressions in the full integrated momentum region are un-known and difficult to be determined by the VSC, we re-write the contributions from Fig.2(c) by the effective direct meson-exchange interactions shown as Fig.2(d) and leave the new effective couplings as unknown parameters. The most general form




Figure 2: TPE contributions in ep scattering. (a) box diagram; (b) crossed-box diagram; (c) meson-exchange diagram by two-photon coupling; (d) effective direct meson-exchange diagram.

of the effective interactions can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{See} &= -ig_{See}, & \Gamma_{Spp} &= -ig_{Spp}, \\
\Gamma_{Aee} &= g_{Aee,1}\gamma_5 - ig_{Aee,2}\gamma_5(\not{p}_f - \not{p}_i), \\
\Gamma_{Tee,\mu\nu} &= g_{Tee,1}(p_f + p_i)_\mu\gamma_\nu - ig_{Tee,2}g_{\mu\nu}, \\
\Gamma_{App} &= g_{App,1}\gamma_5 - ig_{App,2}\gamma_5(\not{p}_f - \not{p}_i), \\
\Gamma_{Tpp,\mu\nu} &= g_{Tpp,1}(p_f + p_i)_\mu\gamma_\nu - ig_{Tpp,2}g_{\mu\nu},
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where S, A, T refer to the scalar, axial scalar and tensor meson, p_i, p_f refer to the initial and final momenta of electron and proton, and all the couplings g_i are only functions of Q^2 . The propagators of exchanged mesons are taken as the Regge form [13]

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{S,A}(q) &= \mathcal{P}_{S,A}(q), \\
S_T^{\mu\nu;\rho\omega}(q) &= \Pi^{\mu\nu;\rho\omega}(q)\mathcal{P}_T(q).
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\Pi^{\mu\nu;\rho\omega}(q) = \frac{1}{2}(\eta^{\mu\rho}\eta^{\nu\omega} + \eta^{\mu\omega}\eta^{\nu\rho}) - \frac{1}{3}\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\omega}$, $\eta^{\mu\nu} = -g^{\mu\nu} + q^\mu q^\nu/m_T^2$ and

$$\mathcal{P}_X = \frac{\pi\alpha'_X}{\Gamma[\alpha_X(t) - J_X + 1] \sin[\pi\alpha_X(t)]} \left(\frac{s}{s_0}\right)^{\bar{\alpha}_X}, \tag{5}$$

with $\bar{\alpha}_T = \alpha'_X(t - m_X^2)$, $\alpha_X(t) = J_X + \alpha'_X(t - m_X^2)$. Here α_X denotes the Regge trajectory for the meson X as a function of $t = -Q^2$ with the slope α'_X , J_X and m_X stand for the spin and mass of the meson, respectively. The phase factors of the propagators are taken as positive unity since it does not affect the results.

With Eq.(3-5), the contribution from interference of Fig.2(d) and Fig.1(a) can be calculated directly. And After combining it with the Born contribution, the reduced un-polarized cross section is expressed as

$$\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(M)} = \sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma} + gf_0 s^{\bar{\alpha}_T} (G_M(1 + \varepsilon)\tau + 2G_E\varepsilon), \tag{6}$$

and the polarized observables P_t, P_l are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
P_t^{1\gamma+2\gamma(M)} &= P_t^{1\gamma} \frac{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma}}{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(M)}} - \frac{gf_1 s^{\bar{\alpha}_T} (G_E + 2G_M)}{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(M)}}, \\
P_l^{1\gamma+2\gamma(M)} &= P_l^{1\gamma} \frac{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma}}{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(M)}} + \frac{gf_2 s^{\bar{\alpha}_T} G_M}{\sigma_{r,un}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(M)}},
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $f_0 = \tau\sqrt{\tau(1+\tau)(1+\varepsilon)/(1-\varepsilon)}$, $f_1 = \tau^2\sqrt{\varepsilon(1+\varepsilon)(1+\tau)/2}$, $f_2 = \tau^{5/2}\sqrt{(1+\tau)(2\varepsilon+1)}$, \sqrt{s} is the center mass of ep system and g is expressed as

$$g = Re\left[\frac{-16iM_N^4 g_{Te,1} g_{Tp,1} \pi \alpha'_T}{e^2 \Gamma[\alpha_T(t) - J_T + 1] \sin[\pi \alpha_X(t)]} \left(\frac{1}{s_0}\right)^{\bar{\alpha}_T}\right].$$

The important property of g is that it is a constant at fixed t and can be taken as a parameter just like $G_{E,M}$ in the analysis. In the practical calculation, we take $\bar{\alpha}_T = 0.8(t - 1.3 \text{ GeV}^2)$ [13] and the detailed analysis shows that the results are not sensitive to the slope of $\bar{\alpha}_T$ in the region $[0.7, 0.9]$. Eq.(6) and Eq.(7) show the following interesting properties: (1) only the 2^{++} meson-exchange gives contributions due to the zero mass of electron. This is very different with the VCS where the contributions from $0^{++}, 0^{-+}$ meson-exchange play more important role, (2) the corrections to σ_{un} , P_t and P_l are only dependent on one new unknown parameter g at fixed t , (3) all the three corrections are vanish when $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ due to the factor $s^{\bar{\alpha}_T}$ which is expected by unitarity.

To estimate the TPE contributions from Fig.2(a,b), we use the simple hadronic model and include N and Δ as the intermediate states. For the TPE contributions from N , we take the same parameters as [7]. For the TPE contribution from Δ , we improve the choice of the coupling parameters and form factors of $\Gamma_{\gamma N \Delta}$ used in [7] by taking $(g_1, g_2, g_3) = (6.59, 9.06, 7.16)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\Delta}^{(1)} &= F_{\Delta}^{(2)} = \left(\frac{\Lambda_1^2}{q^2 - \Lambda_1^2}\right)^2 \frac{-\Lambda_3^2}{q^2 - \Lambda_3^2}, \\ F_{\Delta}^{(3)} &= \left(\frac{\Lambda_1^2}{q^2 - \Lambda_1^2}\right)^2 \frac{\Lambda_3^2}{q^2 - \Lambda_3^2} \left[\frac{a\Lambda_2^2}{q^2 - \Lambda_2^2} + \frac{b\Lambda_4^2}{q^2 - \Lambda_4^2}\right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $\Lambda_{1,2,3,4} = (0.84, 2, \sqrt{2}, 0.2) \text{ GeV}$, $a = -0.3$ and $b = 1.3$. Such coupling parameters and form factors of $\gamma N \Delta$ are much closer to the physical results [14] than those used in [7]. With this input, the contribution from the interference of Fig.2(a,b) and Fig.1(a) can be calculated directly as [7].

3 Numerical results and discussion

To show how the meson-exchange contributions play their roles, we first apply the usual TPE corrections from Fig.2(a,b)[†] to the experimental data as done in [12], and then extract the corresponding R_{LT} from the TPE-corrected data using Eq.(1) and Eq.(6). We named such extracted R_{LT} as $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta)}$ and $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)}$, respectively. The results are presented in Fig.3 where only the recent precise experimental data [5] are taken and the error-bar of experimental data is taken as the weight in the fitting.

The results in Fig.3 clearly show that when no any TPE contributions considered, the extracted $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ [5] are totally inconsistent with that by polarized method $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ [2]. After considering the usual TPE contributions from Fig.2(a,b), the extracted $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta)}$ are much close to $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$, while obvious discrepancy still exists for $Q^2 = 3.2, 4.1 \text{ GeV}^2$. When the meson-exchange contribution is also considered, the extracted $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)}$ are naturally close to $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$. In the following, we will show that $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ are very close to $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)}$ when $\epsilon > 0.6$ where most of $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ are measured which means $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)}$ are consistent with $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)}$.

The extracted G_M , R , g are listed in Tab.1. With these parameters, the polarized observables $R_{PT,th}^{1\gamma, 1\gamma+2\gamma(N, \Delta, M)}$ and $P_l^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N, \Delta, M)}$ (the indexes 1γ and $2\gamma(N, \Delta, M)$ refer to theoretical estimations without and with corresponding TEP contributions) can be calculated directly and the corresponding corrections $\delta_R^{N, \Delta, M, N+\Delta+M} \equiv R_{PT,th}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N, \Delta, M)} / R_{PT,th}^{1\gamma}$ and $\delta_{P_l} \equiv P_l^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N, \Delta, M)} / P_l^{1\gamma}$ are presented in Fig.4 and Fig.5.

Fig.4(a) shows that at small ϵ the corrections from the usual TPE contributions $\delta_R^{N, \Delta}$ are large and positive while the corrections from meson-exchange δ_R^M are large and negative, and they are canceled to

[†] In this paper, all the TPE correction from N refers to the one that the soft part has been deducted as done in [7].




Figure 3: Extracted R by LT method and RT method. $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ refers to the direct fitting results by Eq.(1); $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta)}$ and $R_{LT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)}$ refer to the fitting results by Eq.(1) and Eq.(6) after applying the usual TPE corrections to experimental data. The experimental data in the fitting are taken from [5] and $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$ are taken from [2].

$Q^2(GeV^2)$	2.64	3.2	4.1
G_M	0.136	0.100	0.067
R	0.70	0.64	0.56
g	-0.461	-1.213	-8.59

Table 1: Extracted parameters G_M, R, g by Eq.(6) after applying the usual TPE corrections to experimental data[5].




Figure 4: Estimated TPE corrections to R_{PT} . $\delta_R^{N,\Delta,M,N+\Delta+M}$ refer to the theoretical estimations of TPE contributions from $N, \Delta, M, N + \Delta + M$ exchange, respectively. The experimental results are taken from [3] and normalized at $\epsilon = 0.785$.




Figure 5: Estimated TPE corrections to P_l . $\delta_{P_l}^{N,\Delta,M,N+\Delta+M}$ refer to the theoretical estimations of TPE corrections from $N, \Delta, M, N + \Delta + M$ exchange, respectively. The experimental results are taken from [3] and normalized at $\epsilon = 0.152$.

some degree which results in the small magnitude of the full TPE corrections $\delta_R^{N+\Delta+M}$. And at large ϵ all the three corrections are small. Since $\delta_R^{N+\Delta+M} = R_{PT,th}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)}/R_{PT,th}^{1\gamma} = R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}/R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N+\Delta+M)} \approx R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}/R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}|_{\epsilon \approx 1}$, the smallness of $\delta_R^{N+\Delta+M}$ means the small TPE corrections to $R_{PT,Ex}^{1\gamma}$.

Fig.4(b) shows when Q^2 decreases, the full TPE corrections $\delta_R^{N+\Delta+M}$ also decreases. The behavior of $\delta_R^{N+\Delta+M}$ at $Q^2 = 2.64, 3.2, 4.1 \text{ GeV}^2$ strongly suggests it may be close to 1 at $Q^2 = 2.49 \text{ GeV}^2$ and are consistent with the recent experimental results[3].

By the definition $\delta_{P_l} \equiv P_{l,th}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N,\Delta,M)}/P_{l,th}^{1\gamma} = P_{l,Ex}^{1\gamma}/P_{l,th}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N,\Delta,M)}$ and by the angular momentum conservation $P_{l,Ex}^{1\gamma}/P_{l,th}^{1\gamma+2\gamma(N,\Delta,M)} \approx P_{l,Ex}^{1\gamma}/P_{l,Ex}^{1\gamma}|_{\epsilon \approx 0}$, δ_{P_l} can be compared with the experimental data directly. Fig.5 shows the behavior of δ_{P_l} is much closer to the experiment results after including the contribution from meson exchange, while considerable discrepancy still exist at large ϵ . Since the experimental error bar of P_l and the error bar of extracted g are not small, it is difficult to give certain conclusion on such discrepancy at present and the further more precise experiments will be a good and interesting test.




Figure 6: The theoretical estimation of ratio R_{e^+/e^-} at $Q^2 = 2.64, 3.2, 4.1 \text{ GeV}^2$.

Using the parameters in Tab.1 and including the usual TPE corrections from N and Δ , the ratio $R_{e^+/e^-} \equiv \sigma_{un,e^+p \rightarrow e^+p}/\sigma_{un,e^-p \rightarrow e^-p}$ can be calculated directly and the corresponding numerical results

are presented in Fig.6 where N, Δ, M refer to the corresponding TPE corrections from N, Δ intermediate state and meson exchange. The numerical results at $Q^2 = 2.64, 3.2, 4.1 GeV^2$ show similar magnitude and properties with that predicted by [15] based on the direct data-extracting. Comparing with the smallness of $R_{e^+e^-}$ at $Q^2 < 2 GeV^2$ [16], the results suggests the measurement of $R_{e^+e^-}$ at $Q^2 = 2.5 GeV^2$ and small ϵ will be a good test of the theoretical study of TPE effects in ep scattering.

To summarize, we suggest a new dynamical form of TPE effect in elastic ep scattering and estimate its contributions to σ_{un}, P_t, P_l with one un-known coupling parameter g at fixed Q^2 . We find after combining such contributions with the usual TPE contributions from box and crossed-box diagrams, the extracted R by LT method from the recent precise experimental data[5] are natural close to those measured by PT method. And using such extracted $G_{E,M}$ and g , the ϵ dependence of measured R by PT method at $Q^2 = 2.49 GeV^2$ [3] can be described well and we also get similar $R_{e^+e^-}$ with that predicted by [15] where both the cross-section and polarization data are used for extracting. The full results suggest the meson-exchange mechanism may play important role in ep scattering and more precise experimental data at $Q^2 = 2.5$ will be a good test.

4 Acknowledgment

The author Hai-Qing Zhou thanks Shin Nan Yang for helpful discussions. This work is supported by the National Sciences Foundations of China under Grant No.11375044.

References

- [1] Randolph Pohl, *et al.*, Nature **466** (2010)213; Helen S. Margolis, Science **339**(2013)405 ; Aldo Antognini, *et al.*, Science **339** (2013) 417.
- [2] M.K. Jones *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**(2000) 1398 ; O. Gayou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002)092301; A.J.R. Puckett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104** (2010) 242301; A.J.R. Puckett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **85** (2012)045203 .
- [3] M. Meziane *et al.* (GEP2 γ Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**(2011) 132501.
- [4] R.C. Walker *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D**49**(1994)5671 ; L. Andivahis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **50**(1994) 5491 ; M. E. Christy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C**70**(2004)015206 .
- [5] I. A. Qattan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005)142301; I. A. Qattan, arXiv:nucl-ex/0610006.
- [6] Carl E. Carlson, Marc Vanderhaeghen, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **57** (2007) 171; J. Arrington, P. G. Blunden, W. Melnitchouk, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **66** (2011)782.
- [7] P.G. Blunden, W. Melnitchouk, J.A. Tjon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**(2003)142304 ; S. Kondratyuk, P.G. Blunden, W. Melnitchouk, J.A. Tjon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005)172503 ; P. G. Blunden, W. Melnitchouk, J. A. Tjon, Phys. Rev. C **72** (2005)034612.
- [8] Y.C. Chen, A.V. Afanasev, S.J. Brodsky, C.E. Carlson, M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**(2004) 122301; A. V. Afanasev, S. J. Brodsky, C. E. Carlson, Yu-Chun Chen, M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. D **72**(2005)013008.
- [9] Dmitry Borisjuk, Alexander Kobushkin, Phys. Rev. C **78**(2008)025208; D. Borisjuk, A. Kobushkin, Phys. Rev. C **86**(2012)055204.
- [10] Nikolai Kivel, Marc Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** (2009) 092004.
- [11] Kivel, M. Vanderhaeghen, JHEP **1304**,029(2013).
- [12] J. Arrington, W. Melnitchouk, J. A. Tjon, Phys. Rev. C **76** (2007) 035205.
- [13] Byung Geel Yu, Tae Keun Choi, W. Kim, Phys. Lett. B**701**(2011) 332; Phys. Rev. C**83** (2011)025208.

- [14] Vladimir Pascalutsa, Marc Vanderhaeghen, Shin Nan Yang, Phys.Rept **437**,125 (2007).
- [15] Julia Guttman, Nikolai Kivel, Mehdi Meiziane, Marc Vanderhaeghen, Eur.Phys.J. A **47**(2011) 77.
- [16] A.V. Gramolin, J. Arrington, L.M. Barkov, V.F. Dmitriev, V.V. Gauzshtein, R.A. Golovin, R.J. Holt, V.V. Kaminsky, B.A. Lazarenko, S.I. Mishnev Nucl.Phys.Proc.Suppl. **225**(2012) 216.