

Onset of η -nuclear binding in a pionless EFT approach

N. Barnea^a, B. Bazak^b, E. Friedman^a, A. Gal^{a,*}

^a*Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University, 91904 Jerusalem, Israel*

^b*IPNO, CNRS/IN2P3, Univ. Paris-Sud, Université Paris-Saclay, F-91406 Orsay, France*

Abstract

ηNNN and $\eta NNNN$ bound states are explored in stochastic variational method (SVM) calculations within a pionless effective field theory (EFT) approach at leading order. The theoretical input consists of regulated NN and NNN contact terms, a regulated *energy dependent* ηN contact term derived from coupled-channel models of the $N^*(1535)$ nucleon resonance plus a regulated ηNN contact term. A self consistency procedure is applied to deal with the energy dependence of the ηN subthreshold input, resulting in a weak dependence of the calculated η -nuclear binding energies on the EFT regulator. It is found, in terms of the ηN scattering length $a_{\eta N}$, that the onset of binding $\eta^3\text{He}$ requires a minimal value of $\text{Re } a_{\eta N}$ close to 1 fm, yielding then a few MeV η binding in $\eta^4\text{He}$. The onset of binding $\eta^4\text{He}$ requires a lower value of $\text{Re } a_{\eta N}$, but exceeding 0.7 fm.

Keywords: few-body systems, mesic nuclei, $\not\pi$ EFT calculations

1. Introduction

The ηN s -wave interaction near threshold, $E_{\text{th}}(\eta N) = 1487$ MeV, is attractive as realized first by coupling to the πN channel [1] and subsequently confirmed, e.g. [2], by coupling the ηN channel to the entire set of meson-baryon channels with 0^- octet mesons and $\frac{1}{2}^+$ octet baryons, thereby generating dynamically the $N^*(1535)$ S_{11} resonance. The size of the resulting ηN energy dependent s -wave attraction, however, is strongly model dependent with values of the real part of the ηN scattering length as low as 0.2 fm [2] and up to nearly 1 fm in the K -matrix model of Green and Wycech (GW) [3]

*corresponding author: Avraham Gal, avragal@savion.huji.ac.il

and in the recent Giessen coupled channels study [4]. Following the work of Ref. [1] it was soon realized that η -nuclear quasibound states might exist [5, 6] with widths determined by the scale of the imaginary part of the ηN scattering length. This imaginary part, due mostly to $\eta N \rightarrow \pi N$, is small in all models, between 0.2 to 0.3 fm. Nevertheless, no η -nuclear quasibound state has ever been established beyond doubt [7].

Recent optical-model calculations of such bound states [8, 9] using several energy-dependent ηN model amplitudes are summarized in Refs. [10, 11]. Whereas the appearance of η -nuclear bound states is robust in any of these ηN interaction models, the value of mass number A at which binding begins is model dependent. Thus, the relatively strong ηN attraction in model GW even admits in such calculations a $1s_\eta$ bound state in ${}^4\text{He}$, with as low binding energy as 1.2 MeV and width of 2.3 MeV [11] calculated using a static ${}^4\text{He}$ density. Unfortunately, the η -nucleus optical model approach is not trustable for as light nuclei as ${}^4\text{He}$, and genuine few-body calculations are required.

Photon- and hadron-induced reactions on nuclear targets provide useful constraints on possible η bound states in very light nuclei, where according to a recent review [12] the most straightforward interpretation of the data is that ηd is unbound, $\eta {}^3\text{He}$ is nearly or just bound, and $\eta {}^4\text{He}$ is bound. Our previous few-body ηNN and ηNNN calculations [13], using the Minnesota [14] and Argonne AV4' [15] NN potentials, agree with this conjecture as far as the ηd and $\eta {}^3\text{He}$ systems are concerned. A similar conclusion for $\eta {}^3\text{He}$ has been reached recently by evaluating the $pd \rightarrow \eta {}^3\text{He}$ near-threshold reaction [16]. And a recent WASA-at-COSY search for a possible $\eta {}^4\text{He}$ bound state in the $dd \rightarrow {}^3\text{He}N\pi$ reaction placed upper limits of a few nb on the production of a near-threshold bound state [17]. On the theoretical side, no precise few-body calculation of $\eta NNNN$ bound-state has ever been reported for $\eta {}^4\text{He}$.¹

The present work reports for the first time on precise few-body $\eta NNNN$ calculations in which the Stochastic Variational Method (SVM) is applied to η plus few-nucleon Hamiltonians constructed in Leading Order (LO) within a Pionless Effective Field Theory. While this $\not\pi$ EFT approach has been applied before to few-nucleon systems, e.g. [19, 20], and more recently in lattice-nuclei calculations [21, 22], it is extended here to include constituent pseudoscalar

¹A very recent preprint by Fix and Kolesnikov [18] reports on few-body calculations of the $\eta {}^3\text{He}$ and $\eta {}^4\text{He}$ scattering lengths, concluding that these systems are unbound.

mesons for which pion exchange with nucleons is forbidden by parity conservation of the strong interactions. In particular, the single ηN contact term required in LO is provided by the ηN s -wave scattering amplitude $F_{\eta N}(E_{\text{sc}})$ at a subthreshold energy E_{sc} derived self consistently within the few-body calculation, as practised in our previous work [13]. This is demonstrated in two ηN interaction models, GW [3] and CS (Cieplý–Smejkal [23]), which exhibit strong energy dependence of $F_{\eta N}(E)$ arising from the proximity of the $N^*(1535)$ resonance. The results of the few-body calculations reported in the present work suggest that the onset of binding $\eta^3\text{He}$ requires a value of $\text{Re } a_{\eta N}$ close to 1 fm, whereas the onset of binding $\eta^4\text{He}$ requires a somewhat weaker ηN interaction with $\text{Re } a_{\eta N}$ exceeding 0.7 fm.

2. Methodology

Here we outline the methodology of the present work, including the few-body SVM used, the choice of NN , NNN , ηN and ηNN $\not\equiv$ EFT regulated contact terms, and the self consistent treatment of the energy-dependent ηN term.

2.1. SVM calculations

SVM calculations were introduced in the mid seventies to few-body nuclear problems [24], and used extensively with correlated Gaussian bases since the mid 1990s [25]. The SVM was benchmarked together with six other few-body methods in calculating the ^4He binding energy [26]. Correlated Gaussian trial wavefunctions in this method are written as

$$\Psi = \sum_k c_k \mathcal{A} \left([\mathcal{Y}_L^k(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\chi_S^k]_{JM} \xi_{TT_z}^k \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T A_k \mathbf{x}\right) \right) \quad (1)$$

where the summation index k runs with linear variational parameters c_k on all possible values of the total spin S and the total orbital angular momentum L , as well as on all possible intermediate coupling schemes, χ_S and ξ_T stand for spin and isospin functions of the N -particle system, respectively, \mathcal{Y}_L is the orbital part of Ψ formed by coupling successively spherical harmonics in the $(N - 1)$ relative coordinates of which the vector \mathbf{x} is made, and \mathcal{A} antisymmetrizes over nucleons. The matrix A_k introduces $N(N - 1)/2$ nonlinear variational parameters which are chosen stochastically. For a comprehensive review see Ref. [27].

2.2. Pionless EFT nuclear interactions

Here we follow a $\not\pi$ EFT approach at LO. To this order the nuclear interaction consists of two-body and three-body contact (zero-range) terms,

$$V_2(ij) = \left[c_S^\Lambda \frac{1}{4} (1 - \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j) + c_T^\Lambda \frac{1}{4} (3 + \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j) \right] \delta_\Lambda(r_{ij}), \quad (2)$$

$$V_3(ijk) = d_{NNN}^\Lambda \delta_\Lambda(r_{ij}, r_{ik}), \quad (3)$$

where these contact terms are smeared by using normalized-to-one Gaussians with a regulating momentum-space scale (cut-off) parameter Λ :

$$\delta_\Lambda(r_{ij}) = \left(\frac{\Lambda}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \right)^3 \exp\left(-\frac{\Lambda^2}{4} r_{ij}^2\right), \quad \delta_\Lambda(r_{ij}, r_{ik}) = \delta_\Lambda(r_{ij})\delta_\Lambda(r_{ik}), \quad (4)$$

with $\delta_\Lambda(r_{ij})$ in the zero-range limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ becoming a Dirac $\delta(\mathbf{r}_{ij})$ function. For a given value of the scale parameter Λ , two-body low-energy constants (LEC) c_S^Λ and c_T^Λ are fitted to the $S = 0$ pn scattering length and to the $S = 1$ deuteron binding energy $B(d)$, respectively, and a three-body LEC d_{NNN}^Λ is fitted to $B(^3\text{H})$. Following Ref. [28] a small corrective proton-proton contact term, with LEC c_{pp}^Λ , is introduced together with the Coulomb interaction between protons to reproduce the ^3He binding energy. These two-body and three-body LECs are listed in Ref. [28] where c_{pp}^Λ was found to effectively adjust c_S^Λ by less than 0.1% over the full Λ -range tested in the present work. The ^4He calculated binding energy $B(^4\text{He})$ provides then a check on how reasonable this LO $\not\pi$ EFT version is. This is demonstrated in Table 1 for four representative values of Λ . The calculated values of $B(^4\text{He})$ depend only moderately on the scale parameter Λ , exhibiting renormalization scale invariance by approaching in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ a finite value 27.8 ± 0.2 MeV which compares well with $B_{\text{exp}}(^4\text{He}) = 28.3$ MeV, despite the fact that only LO contributions are accounted for in this $\not\pi$ EFT version.

Table 1: ^4He binding energies $B(^4\text{He})$ (in MeV) in LO $\not\pi$ EFT SVM calculations, with LECs fitted to NN and NNN low-energy data [28]. The $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit of $B(^4\text{He})$ was evaluated by using higher values of the scale Λ than listed here.

Λ (fm $^{-1}$)	2	4	6	8	$\rightarrow \infty$	exp.
$B(^4\text{He})$	22.4	22.9	24.2	25.1	27.8 ± 0.2	28.3

2.3. Pionless EFT ηN interactions

Parity conservation forbids pion exchange in the ηN interaction, suggesting thereby that a $\not\pi$ EFT approach may be justified. With spin and isospin zero for the η meson, a single two-body ηN contact term is needed at LO. Below we derive the corresponding LEC from the ηN s -wave scattering amplitude $F_{\eta N}(E)$ calculated in two meson-baryon coupled-channel interaction models, GW [3] and CS [23], and shown in Fig. 1. Whereas the GW model used in our previous work [13] is an on-shell K -matrix model that considers $\eta N \leftrightarrow \pi N$ coupling, the CS model is a meson-baryon multi-channel chirally motivated model in which the ηN interaction is extremely short ranged and practically momentum independent below the momentum breakdown scale specified in the next paragraph. Both models capture the main features of the underlying $N^*(1535)$ resonance which peaks about 50 MeV above the ηN threshold energy $E_{\text{th}} = 1487$ MeV and generates considerable energy dependence of $F_{\eta N}$ near threshold. In particular, both $\text{Re } F_{\eta N}(E)$ and $\text{Im } F_{\eta N}(E)$, which at threshold are given by the scattering lengths (in fm)

$$a_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}} = 0.96 + i0.26 \quad a_{\eta N}^{\text{CS}} = 0.67 + i0.20, \quad (5)$$

decrease monotonically in these models upon going into the subthreshold region while displaying considerable model dependence.

The ηN scattering lengths listed above are of order 1 fm or less, much smaller than the NN scattering lengths whose large size justifies the use of $\not\pi$ EFT in light nuclei. For ηN interactions as weak as implied by this size of $a_{\eta N}$, and with no ηN bound or virtual state expected, the ηN scattering length alone does not provide a meaningful criterion of fitting into an EFT approach. Alternatively, we estimate $p_\eta R \lesssim \frac{\pi}{2}$ for the momentum p_η of a weakly bound η -nuclear state in a square well of radius R . With $R = 2$ fm or a bit larger for the He isotopes, we get $p_\eta \lesssim 150$ MeV/ c (≈ 0.76 fm $^{-1}$). Since the lowest-mass allowed meson exchange in pseudoscalar meson interaction with octet baryons is owing to vector mesons, with a typical mass of $m_\rho = 770$ MeV, this range of η -nuclear momenta can be accommodated comfortably within the nuclear LO $\not\pi$ EFT approach of the preceding subsection. The $\not\pi$ EFT small parameter associated with this momentum breakdown scale of $Q_{\text{high}}^\rho \approx m_\rho = 3.9$ fm $^{-1}$ is given by $(p_\eta/Q_{\text{high}}^\rho)^2 \approx 0.04$.

As in previous work [13], and in order to account for the energy dependence inherent in the meson-baryon coupled channel dynamical generation of the $N^*(1535)$ resonance, we construct energy-dependent local potentials




Figure 1: Real (left panel) and imaginary (right panel) parts of the ηN cm s -wave scattering amplitude $F_{\eta N}(E)$ as a function of $E - E_{\text{th}}$, with $E = \sqrt{s}$ the total ηN cm energy, in the GW [3] and CS [23] meson-baryon coupled-channel interaction models. The vertical line marks the ηN threshold energy E_{th} . Figure adapted from Ref. [11].

$v_{\eta N}(E)$ that produce the ηN energy dependent scattering amplitude $F_{\eta N}(E)$ below threshold in models GW and CS. For a given ηN interaction model, the on-shell scattering amplitude $F_{\eta N}(E)$ serves as a single datum to which LO $\not\propto$ EFT two-body regulated contact terms of the form

$$v_{\eta N}(E; r) = c_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E) \delta_{\Lambda}(r), \quad c_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E) = -\frac{4\pi}{2\mu_{\eta N}} b_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E), \quad (6)$$

are fitted. Here δ_{Λ} is a regulating normalized-to-one Gaussian with scale parameter Λ , as per Eq. (4), and $c_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E)$ is an energy dependent LEC conveniently related through the ηN reduced mass $\mu_{\eta N}$ to a strength function $b_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E)$ of length dimension. The specific value $c_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E_{\text{sc}})$ of this LEC for a given cut-off Λ is determined self consistently in the η -nuclear SVM calculation as detailed in the next subsection. By using the *same* value of Λ in all NN , NNN , ηN and ηNN regulating Gaussians we reach a consistent extension of the nuclear $\not\propto$ EFT to a combined η -nuclear $\not\propto$ EFT approach.²

²Along with the NNN LEC that averts a Thomas collapse of the NNN system, an ηNN LEC $d_{\eta NN}^{\Lambda}$ is needed to avert ηNN collapse. Given no ηNN datum, a rough estimate $d_{\eta NN}^{\Lambda} = d_{NNN}^{\Lambda}$ is made here; see Appendix A: Erratum to the PLB published version.

In order to study the renormalization scale invariance of our few-body η -nuclear results, as shown for the purely nuclear case of $B(^4\text{He})$ in Table 1, we discuss below $\not\epsilon$ EFT calculations done for several representative values of the scale parameter, $\Lambda = 2, 4, 6, 8 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. The last two values, clearly, exceed the momentum breakdown scale $Q_{\text{high}}^\rho \approx 3.9 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ of the underlying $N^*(1535)$ resonance model for the ηN interaction, or even more so the lower momentum breakdown scale $q_{\text{high}}^\rho \approx 3.0 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ set by excitation of vector meson degrees of freedom absent in the underlying $N^*(1535)$ dynamical models considered here, such as the ρ meson produced at threshold in the strong pion exchange reaction $\pi N \rightarrow \rho N$ with $p_{\text{th}}^\rho = 586 \text{ MeV}/c$. Finally, the model dependence of the LO ηN contact term introduced by studying two quite different ηN interaction models, GW and CS, leaves little motivation to go at present beyond LO. Hence, discussion of higher orders in $\not\epsilon$ EFT is left to future work.




Figure 2: Real (left panel) and imaginary (right panel) parts of the strength parameter $b_{\eta N}^\Lambda(E)$ of the ηN effective potential (6) at subthreshold energies $E < E_{\text{th}}$ for four values of the scale (cut-off) parameter Λ , all of which result in the same scattering amplitude $F_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}$ [3] shown in Fig. 1.

For a given value of Λ , the subthreshold values of the complex strength parameter $b_{\eta N}^\Lambda(E)$ in Eq. (6) were fitted to the complex phase shifts derived from the subthreshold scattering amplitudes $F_{\eta N}(E)$ in models GW and CS. The resulting values of the strength parameter $b_{\eta N}^\Lambda(E)$ for ηN subthreshold energies in model GW, shown in Fig. 2, fall off monotonically for both real and imaginary parts in going deeper below threshold, except for small

kinks near threshold that reflect the threshold cusp of $\text{Re } F_{\eta N}(E)$ at E_{th} in Fig. 1. Similar curves for $b_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E)$ are obtained in model CS, with values smaller uniformly for both real and imaginary parts than model GW yields, in accordance with the relative strength of the generating scattering amplitudes $F_{\eta N}(E)$ shown in Fig. 1. We note that increasing Λ leads to weaker strengths $b_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E)$ and also to a weaker energy dependence. Inspecting Fig. 2, one also notes that $\text{Im } b_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E) \ll \text{Re } b_{\eta N}^{\Lambda}(E)$, which justifies treating $\text{Im } v_{\eta N}$ perturbatively in the present calculations.

2.4. Energy dependence

To determine the ηN subthreshold energy at which $v_{\eta N}(E)$ is evaluated as input to the η -nuclear few-body calculations reported below, we denote the shift away from threshold by $\delta\sqrt{s} \equiv \sqrt{s} - \sqrt{s_{\text{th}}}$, expressing it in terms of output expectation values [13]:

$$\langle \delta\sqrt{s} \rangle = -\frac{B}{A} - \beta_N \frac{1}{A} \langle T_N \rangle + \frac{A-1}{A} E_{\eta} - \xi_A \beta_{\eta} \left(\frac{A-1}{A} \right)^2 \langle T_{\eta} \rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $\beta_{N(\eta)} \equiv m_{N(\eta)}/(m_N + m_{\eta})$, $\xi_A \equiv Am_N/(Am_N + m_{\eta})$, T_N and T_{η} are the nuclear and η kinetic energy operators evaluated in terms of internal Jacobi coordinates, with $T = T_N + T_{\eta}$ the total intrinsic kinetic energy of the system, B is the total binding energy of the η -nuclear few-body system and $E_{\eta} = \langle \Psi | (H - H_N) | \Psi \rangle$, where H_N is the Hamiltonian of the purely nuclear part in its own cm frame, and the total Hamiltonian H is evaluated in the overall cm frame. The imaginary, absorptive part of the ηN interaction is suppressed in this discussion. Noting that $(A-1)\langle T_{N:N} \rangle$ in Eq. (7) of Ref. [13] equals $\langle T_N \rangle$ here, Eq. (7) coincides with the former equation apart from a kinematical factor ξ_A introduced here to make correspondence with the η -nuclear, last Jacobi coordinate with which T_{η} is associated. Requiring that the expectation value $\langle \delta\sqrt{s} \rangle$ on the l.h.s. of Eq. (7), as derived from the solution of the Schroedinger equation, agrees with the input value $\delta\sqrt{s}$ for $v_{\eta N}(E)$, this equation defines a self-consistency cycle in our few-body η -nuclear calculations. Since each one of the four terms on the r.h.s. of Eq. (7) is negative, the self consistent energy shift $\delta\sqrt{s_{\text{sc}}}$ is also negative, with size exceeding a minimum nonzero value obtained from the first two terms in the limit of vanishing η binding. Eq. (7) in the limit $A \gg 1$ coincides with the nuclear-matter expression used in Refs. [8, 9] for calculating η -nuclear quasibound states.




Figure 3: Calculated η ^3He bound-state energies E (squares) and expectation values $\langle\delta\sqrt{s}\rangle$ (circles) from Eq. (7), using LO \not{r} EFT NN , NNN and ηNN regulated contact terms plus ηN potentials $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$ for two values of the scale parameter Λ , as a function of the input energy shift $\delta\sqrt{s}$ used for the energy argument of $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$. The dashed vertical line marks the self consistent values of E and $\langle\delta\sqrt{s}\rangle$. The dashed horizontal line marks the ^3He core g.s. energy serving as threshold for a bound η , and the curve above it shows the squeezed core energy $\langle H_N \rangle$.

Fig. 3 demonstrates how the self consistency requirement works in actual calculations. The three curves plotted in each panel are obtained by interpolating a sequence of calculated η ^3He bound-state energies (squares) and the corresponding expectation values $\langle\delta\sqrt{s}\rangle$ (circles) from Eq. (7) for $A = 3$, as a function of the input $\delta\sqrt{s}$ to the energy argument $E_{\text{th}} + \delta\sqrt{s}$ of $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}$, for two choices of the momentum scale parameter $\Lambda = 2, 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. The dashed vertical line marks the self consistent value of $\delta\sqrt{s}$ at which the outcome bound-state energy $E(\eta^3\text{He})$ is evaluated, and the dashed horizontal line marks the ^3He core energy $E(^3\text{He})$. Note that the self consistent value $E_{\text{sc}}(\eta^3\text{He})$ is *higher* than $E(^3\text{He})$ in the left panel for $\Lambda = 2 \text{ fm}^{-1}$, while it is *lower* than $E(^3\text{He})$ in the right panel for $\Lambda = 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. This means that, correspondingly, $\eta^3\text{He}$ is slightly unbound for $\Lambda = 2 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ while slightly bound for $\Lambda = 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. We note furthermore that for threshold values $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E_{\text{th}})$, i.e. $\delta\sqrt{s} = 0$, $\eta^3\text{He}$ is

bound in both cases (and also if the often used but unfortunately unfounded self consistency requirement [29] $\delta\sqrt{s} = E_\eta$ is imposed). Finally, the upper curve in Fig. 3 shows the expectation value $\langle H_N \rangle$ of the nuclear core energy, which is bounded from below by the ${}^3\text{He}$ core energy $E({}^3\text{He})$ marked by the dashed horizontal line.

3. Results and Discussion

Separation energies $B_\eta \equiv B(\eta^A\text{He}) - B({}^A\text{He})$ (often called η binding energies) of the $\eta^A\text{He}$ isotopes with $A = 3, 4$ were calculated self consistently in the SVM using LO $\not\kappa$ EFT NN , NNN and ηNN regulated contact terms introduced in Eqs. (2)–(4) and Footnote 2, and a regulated ηN energy dependent contact term specified by Eq. (6), with scale parameters $\Lambda = 2, 4, 6, 8 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. Two ηN coupled-channels models were used, GW [3] and CS [23]. The CS ηN interaction was found by far too weak to bind $\eta^3\text{He}$, and only by a fraction of MeV short of binding $\eta^4\text{He}$. The binding energies B_η were evaluated using real Hamiltonians in which $\text{Im } v_{\eta N}$ was disregarded. Restoring $\text{Im } v_{\eta N}$ in optical model calculations was found particularly important for near-threshold bound states, lowering their calculated B_η by $0.2 \pm 0.1 \text{ MeV}$. The η -nuclear widths Γ_η were calculated with wavefunctions $\Psi_{\text{g.s.}}$ generated by these real Hamiltonians:

$$\Gamma_\eta = -2 \langle \Psi_{\text{g.s.}} | \text{Im } V_\eta | \Psi_{\text{g.s.}} \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Here, V_η sums over all pairwise ηN interactions. Since $|\text{Im } V_\eta| \ll |\text{Re } V_\eta|$, this is a reasonable approximation.

Table 2: η binding energies and widths (MeV) in the He isotopes from SVM calculations using ηN potentials $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$ with scale parameters $\Lambda = 2, 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$, together with the corresponding self consistent values of the downward energy shift (in MeV) $\delta\sqrt{s_{\text{sc}}}$. The values of $\Gamma(\eta^3\text{He})$ shown here outdate the erroneous, too large widths listed in Ref. [13].

$\Lambda \text{ (fm}^{-1}\text{)}$	$\delta\sqrt{s_{\text{sc}}}$	$\eta^3\text{He}$		$\eta^4\text{He}$		
		B_η	Γ_η	$\delta\sqrt{s_{\text{sc}}}$	B_η	Γ_η
2	-11.2	-0.16	0.24	-16.5	-0.15	0.34
4	-21.1	+0.30	1.46	-32.2	+1.54	2.82

Binding energies B_η and widths Γ_η resulting from these self consistent calculations are listed in Table 2 for the ηN potentials $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$ with scale

parameters $\Lambda = 2, 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$, values for which our self consistency procedure was demonstrated in Fig. 3. Higher values of Λ exceed by far the momentum breakdown scale q_{high}^{ρ} introduced in our previous work [13] for $N^*(1535)$ resonance meson-baryon models in which the ηN scattering amplitude $F_{\eta N}$ is determined. Taken literally, this would mean that the GW ηN interaction hardly binds $\eta^3\text{He}$, if at all, and is likely to bind slightly $\eta^4\text{He}$, with B_{η} of order 1 MeV.




Figure 4: $B_{\eta}(\eta^3\text{He})$ as a function of Λ^{-1} , calculated using ηN potentials $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$ with scale parameters (from right to left) $\Lambda=2,4,6,8 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. Squares (red) denote self consistent calculations, circles (blue) denote calculations with threshold values of the ηN interaction. Linear extrapolation to a point-like interaction, $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, is marked by straight lines.

Sequences of calculated values of η binding energy B_{η} using ηN potentials $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$ are shown for $\eta^3\text{He}$ and $\eta^4\text{He}$ in Figs. 4 and 5, respectively, as a function of Λ^{-1} . The figures demonstrate that the larger Λ , the larger is the resulting η binding energy B_{η} in spite of a similar increase in the value of $-\delta\sqrt{s_{\text{sc}}}$ in self consistent calculations which implies a weaker ηN potential strength $b(E_{\text{sc}})$. The dependence of B_{η} on Λ is weak for $\eta^3\text{He}$ and moderate for $\eta^4\text{He}$ in these calculations. For $\Lambda \geq 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$, B_{η} varies linearly in Λ^{-1} , with an average error of 50 keV for $\eta^3\text{He}$ and 300 keV for $\eta^4\text{He}$, and with twice these errors upon extrapolating $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$. In contrast, for calculations done at the ηN threshold, i.e. $\delta\sqrt{s}=0$, the resulting values of B_{η} shown in the figures depend strongly on Λ with almost perfect linear dependence on Λ^{-1} for $\Lambda \geq 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$.




Figure 5: Same as in Fig. 4, but for $\eta^4\text{He}$ instead of $\eta^3\text{He}$.

Interestingly, Figs. 4 and 5 also suggest that B_η assumes a *finite* value $B_\eta^{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty}$ in the limit of point ηN interaction. This follows directly from the introduction of a stabilizing ηNN LEC $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda$ analogous to the NNN LEC d_{NNN}^Λ of Eq. (3). Here we used a value $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda = d_{NNN}^\Lambda$. The sensitivity of our results to this choice is studied in Appendix A. Generally, a Thomas collapse of three-body systems is averted in $\not\pi$ EFT by promoting a non-derivative three-body contact term from N²LO to LO.

4. Conclusion

To summarize, we have presented genuine few-body SVM calculations of ηNNN ($\eta^3\text{He}$) bound states and, for the first time, also $\eta NNNN$ ($\eta^4\text{He}$) bound states, using LO $\not\pi$ EFT interactions where the ηN interaction contact term was derived in coupled channels studies of the $N^*(1535)$ nucleon resonance. Special care was taken of the energy dependence of the input ηN subthreshold scattering amplitude by using a self consistency procedure. The present results exhibit renormalization scale invariance of the calculated η binding energies owing to the introduction of a repulsive ηNN contact interaction. For physically motivated values of Λ , the onset of $\eta^3\text{He}$ binding occurs for $\text{Re } a_{\eta N}$ close to 1 fm, as in model GW [3], consistently with our previous hyperspherical-basis ηNNN calculations [13]. The onset of $\eta^4\text{He}$ binding requires a lower value of $\text{Re } a_{\eta N}$, exceeding however 0.7 fm; it is com-

fortably satisfied in model GW but not in model CS [23]. Further dedicated experimental searches for η ^4He bound states are desirable in order to confirm the recent negative report from WASA-at-COSY [17] which, taken at face value, implies that $\text{Re } a_{\eta N} \lesssim 0.7$ fm. Similar results and conclusions hold valid in SVM calculations using non-EFT realistic nuclear models [14, 15] augmented by the same ηN interaction models used here, and will be reported elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

We thank Jiří Mareš and Martin Schaefer for useful discussions on related matters. This work was supported in part (NB) by the Israel Science Foundation grant 1308/16, in part (NB, BB) by Pazi Fund grants, and in part (EF, AG) by the EU initiative FP7, Hadron-Physics3, under the SPHERE and LEANNIS cooperation programs.

Appendix A: Erratum [30] to “Onset of η -nuclear binding in a pionless EFT approach” [31]

A three-body ηNN force was inadvertently overlooked in the potential model description and discussion in Ref. [31]. In the actual calculations, however, the LO interaction between the η and the nucleons was composed of the ηN term discussed here in Sect. 2.3, supplemented by an ηNN term

$$V_{\eta N_i N_j} = d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda \delta_\Lambda(r_{\eta N_i}, r_{\eta N_j}). \quad (9)$$

In this expression, $\delta_\Lambda(r_{\eta N_i}, r_{\eta N_j})$ is a product of normalized pairwise Gaussians $\delta_\Lambda(r_{\eta N_i})$ and $\delta_\Lambda(r_{\eta N_j})$, with range parameter inversely proportional to the momentum-scale parameter Λ , as defined by Eq. (4) here. For the results presented in this paper, the low energy constant (LEC) $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda$ was set equal to the nuclear NNN LEC d_{NNN}^Λ . Setting $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda = 0$, the η -deuteron (ηd) system, and therefore any η -nucleus system, would collapse as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$.

The parameter $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda$ is a free parameter to be fixed by experimental data. In the absence of such data one may estimate its value using the nuclear NNN LEC, $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda = d_{NNN}^\Lambda$, as done here [31], or to set a bound on its value accepting that ηd is unbound [12], i.e. set $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda$ so that $B_\eta(\eta d) = 0$. To check the sensitivity of the present results [31] to these distinct choices of $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda$, we show in Figs. 6 and 7 η separation energies B_η in η ^3He and η ^4He ,




Figure 6: $B_\eta(\eta^3\text{He})$ as a function of $1/\Lambda$, calculated using ηN potentials $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$ for two choices of the ηNN LEC. Solid lines: $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda = d_{NNN}^\Lambda$ [31], dashed lines: $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda$ fitted to produce $B_\eta(\eta d) = 0$. Self consistent calculations are marked by squares (red); calculations using threshold values $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E_{\text{th}})$ are marked by spheres (blue). Linear extrapolations to a point-like interaction, $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, are marked by straight lines.




Figure 7: Same as in Fig. 6, but for $\eta^4\text{He}$ instead of $\eta^3\text{He}$.

respectively, calculated using ηN potentials $v_{\eta N}^{\text{GW}}(E)$ under these two choices of $d_{\eta NN}^\Lambda$. Figs. 6 and 7 update the original Figs. 4 and 5 here [31].

Figures 6 and 7 demonstrate that the two choices made for the three-body

ηNN LEC yield practically identical values of B_η in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$. For values of Λ near the physical breakdown scale $\Lambda \approx 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$, however, B_η differs by about 0.7 MeV for $\eta^3\text{He}$ and 2 MeV for $\eta^4\text{He}$ between the two choices applied in self consistent calculations (lower group of curves). Since ηd is unbound [12], the choice marked in dashed lines in both figures is likely to somewhat overestimate B_η . Nevertheless, these η separation energies are in good agreement with the non-EFT B_η values calculated recently using the same two-body energy dependent ηN interaction [32].

References

- [1] R.S. Bhalerao, L.C. Liu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 865.
- [2] T. Waas, N. Kaiser, W. Weise, Phys. Lett. B 379 (1996) 34.
- [3] A.M. Green, S. Wycech, Phys. Rev. C 71 (2005) 014001.
- [4] V. Shklyar, H. Lenske, U. Mosel, Phys. Rev. C 87 (2013) 015201.
- [5] Q. Haider, L.C. Liu, Phys. Lett. B 172 (1986) 257.
- [6] L.C. Liu, Q. Haider, Phys. Rev. C 34 (1986) 1845.
- [7] C. Wilkin, EPJ Web of Conf. 130 (2016) 01007.
- [8] E. Friedman, A. Gal, J. Mareš, Phys. Lett. B 725 (2013) 334.
- [9] A. Cieplý, E. Friedman, A. Gal, J. Mareš, Nucl. Phys. A 925 (2014) 126.
- [10] A. Gal, E. Friedman, N. Barnea, A. Cieplý, J. Mareš, D. Gazda, Acta Phys. Polon. B 45 (2014) 673.
- [11] J. Mareš, N. Barnea, A. Cieplý, E. Friedman, A. Gal, EPJ Web of Conf. 130 (2016) 03006.
- [12] B. Krusche, C. Wilkin, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 80 (2015) 43.
- [13] N. Barnea, E. Friedman, A. Gal, Phys. Lett. B 747 (2015) 345.
- [14] D.R. Thompson, M. LeMere, Y.C. Tang, Nucl. Phys. A 286 (1977) 53.
- [15] R.B. Wiringa, S.C. Pieper, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 182501.

- [16] J.J. Xie, W.H. Liang, E. Oset, P. Moskal, M. Skurzok, C. Wilkin, Phys. Rev. C 95 (2017) 015202.
- [17] P. Adlarson, et al. (WASA-at-COSY Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. A 959 (2017) 102.
- [18] A. Fix, O. Kolesnikov, Phys. Lett. B 772 (2017) 663.
- [19] U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. A 645 (1999) 273.
- [20] P.F. Bedaque, H.-W. Hammer, U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. A 676 (2000) 357.
- [21] N. Barnea, L. Contessi, D. Gazit, F. Pederiva, U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114 (2015) 052501.
- [22] J. Kirscher, N. Barnea, D. Gazit, F. Pederiva, U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. C 92 (2015) 054002.
- [23] A. Cieplý, J. Smejkal, Nucl. Phys. A 919 (2013) 46.
- [24] V.I. Kukulin, V.M. Krasnopol'sky, J. Phys. G 3 (1977) 795.
- [25] K. Varga, Y. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. C 52 (1995) 2885.
- [26] H. Kamada, et al., Phys. Rev. C 64 (2001) 044001.
- [27] Y. Suzuki, K. Varga, *Stochastic Variational Approach to Quantum Mechanical Few-Body Problems* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998).
- [28] J. Kirscher, E. Pazy, J. Drachman, N. Barnea, Phys. Rev. C 96 (2017) 024001.
- [29] C. García-Recio, T. Inoue, J. Nieves, E. Oset, Phys. Lett. B 550 (2002) 47.
- [30] N. Barnea, B. Bazak, E. Friedman, A. Gal, Phys. Lett. B 775 (2017) 364 (Erratum to [31]).
- [31] N. Barnea, B. Bazak, E. Friedman, A. Gal, Phys. Lett. B 771 (2017) 297 (published version of the present paper).
- [32] N. Barnea, E. Friedman, A. Gal, Nucl. Phys. A 968 (2017) 35.