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The relativistic impulse approximation has been widely used in atomic, condensed matter, nuclear and elementary particle physics. In this paper, we investigate the relativistic impulse approximation to Compton scattering of atomic systems described using Dirac-Fock wave functions. An “exact” numerical method is developed in the integration without invoking any further simplified approximations or factorization treatments used in former researches. Calculations of C, Cu, Ge, and Xe atoms have been carried out. Quantitative comparisons on the differential cross sections and Compton profiles between this work and former treatments of relativistic impulse approximations are also illustrated and discussed. Consistent results are obtained in the Compton peak region, and notable discrepancies only arise away from the Compton peaks. For Compton profiles, a non-negligible 20% change outside the palm of the momentum greater than 10 a.u. is obtained.

PACS numbers: 34.50.-s, 78.70.-g, 78.70.Ck, 31.15.xr, 32.90.+a, 95.35.+d

I. INTRODUCTION

Atomic Compton Scatterings have been widely investigated over the past few decades,

\[ h\omega_i + A \rightarrow h\omega_f + e^- + A^+ \]  

through which many aspects of physics, e.g., electron correlations [1, 2], electron momentum distributions [3–5], Fermi surfaces [6], X-ray as well as gamma-ray radiations [7–9], are revealed. Moreover, Compton Scatterings have also been utilized in the development of modern gamma-ray spectrometer and imaging devices [10, 11].

For convenience, Compton scattering is conventional approached using Klein-Nishina formula from the free electron approximation (FEA) [13, 14]. In FEA, electron interactions with atomic ions are neglected, and electrons are also assumed to be rest prior to photon scatterings in the laboratory frame. In Klein-Nishina formula, the energy of the scattered photon \( \omega_C \) is totally determined by its scattering angle \( \theta \) via

\[ \omega_C = \frac{\omega_i}{1 + \omega_i (1 - \cos \theta)/mc^2} \]  

The Klein-Nishina formula works perfectly in the high-energy region, in which cases electrons are asymptotical free. However, in the low-energy region when the atomic binding effects come into play, the FEA becomes inappropriate and Klein-Nishina formula fails to explain the experiments [7].

\*Electronic address: stlin@scu.edu.cn
†Electronic address: knhuang1206@gmail.com

FIG. 1: Compton Spectrum in the IA model at a particular scattering angle \( \theta \).

Atomic binding effects are treated systematically in the impulse approximation (IA) [15–20], in which formulation, electrons in an atom have a momentum distribution. The motion of atomic electrons gives rise to a Doppler broadened Compton spectrum, as shown schematically in Fig. 1. In the former treatment of IA models, the doubly-differential cross section (DDCS) of Compton scatterings can be factorized into two parts,

\[ \left( \frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} \right)_{IA} = Y \cdot J \]  

where \( Y \) is a factor depend on kinematical and dynamical properties of Compton scatterings, irrelevant to the electronic structure of target materials. The correction factor \( J \), called Compton profile, is related to the momentum distributions of electrons in the atomic or molecular...
ground state.

The former IA treatment incorporated the factorization in Eq. [3] has been widely applied to interdisciplinary studies in the current years, especially in condensed matter physics, nuclear physics and elementary particle physics. With the help of Compton profiles, the explorations of the sophisticated electronic structures [21, 22], electron correlations [1, 2], band structures and Fermi surfaces [6, 23] in condensed matter physics are studied. The current Geant4 and other Monte Carlo simulation packages in nuclear and particle physics is also adopted the IA formulation as well as Compton profiles [24, 25]. The conclusions of these interdisciplinary researches depend strictly on the validity of factorization in Eq. [3]. It was anticipated in the early years that this factorization adopted in the former RIA treatments do not change the physical results essentially [17]. However, this point has not been quantitatively analyzed in the past years. Throughout this paper, we try to clarify that there are essential differences in IA treatments with and without these simplified factorization approximations.

Therefore, for a comprehensive study of atomic Compton Scattering processes, in this article we develop an “exact” numerical treatment of relativistic impulse approximation (RIA) without invoking the factorization in Eq. [3]. Then we apply the present approach to Compton scattering with several atomic systems, and results are compared with former treatments of RIA. A carefully analysis on the adequacy of the former RIA treatments is provided in this work. In a recent paper, LaJohn have compared various treatments of RIA formulation in a similar way, and the nonrelativistic limit of RIA is achieved in the low-momentum-transfer cases [27]. However, LaJohn’s work only limited to the hydrogen-like systems. In this work, more complicated atomic systems are taken into consideration. We apply the present scheme to atoms C, Cu, Ge, and Xe, which are chosen to represent elements in the small-Z, middle-Z, and large-Z regimes, respectively. Moreover, effective Compton profiles are proposed and analyzed to quantify the deviations between our results and those from former RIA treatments.

Recently, there are great interests in experimental detections of dark matter particles [28, 29] and neutrinoless double beta decays [30, 31]. These experiments, which utilizing high-purity Germanium and Xenon detectors, need a sufficient low radiation background. Compton scattering is one of the most dominant radiation backgrounds for X-ray and gamma rays that must be suppressed and subtracted. Therefore studying the atomic Compton scattering effects in detectors shall have great impacts on these elementary particle experiments. Recent researches using former treatments of RIA have shown that low momentum transfer Compton scattering plays a remarkable role in dark matter direct detections [40, 41]. Our method discussed here can be easily applied to this area and could have impacts and guidance on analyzing and subtraction of Compton scattering backgrounds in particle physics experiments.

This paper is organized as follows. Sec. II is devoted to introduce the RIA formulation and is divided into two subsections. In Sec. II A we briefly review the former treatments of Compton Scattering in the RIA formulation. In Sec. II B we describe our present numerical treatment of RIA for applications to atomic Compton scatterings. Results and comparisons of our approach with former RIA treatments are presented in Sec. III. Conclusions and future perspectives are given in Sec. IV.

II. RELATIVISTIC IMPULSE APPROXIMATION

A. Former Treatments

In this section, we give a description on former theoretical treatments of Compton Scatterings in the RIA formulation. The nonrelativistic impulse approximation approach can be derived similar to the relativistic case.

In the framework of RIA, consider an incident photon with energy \( \omega_i \) and momentum \( k_i \), scattering with an electron which has energy \( E_i \) and momentum \( \mathbf{p}_i \). After scattering, the energy and momentum of emitted photon are \( \omega_f \) and \( \mathbf{k}_f \), and energy and momentum of final state electron are \( E_f \) and \( \mathbf{p}_f \). Then the DDCS of Compton scattering in RIA formulation is given by [17, 19]

\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} = \frac{r_0^2 m^2 c^4 \omega_f}{2 \omega_i} \int \int \int d^3p_i \rho(\mathbf{p}_i) \frac{X(K_i, K_f)}{E_i E_f} \delta(E_i + \omega_i - E_f - \omega_f) \tag{4}
\]

where \( r_0 \) is the electron classical charge radius, functions \( K_i, K_f \) are defined as

\[
K_i = k_i^0 \cdot \mathbf{p}_i = \frac{E_i \cdot \omega_i}{c^2} - \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{k}_i \tag{5}
\]

\[
K_f = k_f^0 \cdot \mathbf{p}_i = \frac{E_i \cdot \omega_f}{c^2} - \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{k}_f = K_i - \frac{\omega_i \omega_f (1 - \cos \theta)}{c^2} \tag{6}
\]

and the kernel function \( X(K_i, K_f) \) is defined as

\[
X(K_i, K_f) = \frac{K_i}{K_f} + \frac{K_f}{K_i} + 2 m^2 c^2 \left( \frac{1}{K_i} - \frac{1}{K_f} \right) + m^4 c^4 \left( \frac{1}{K_i} - \frac{1}{K_f} \right)^2 \tag{7}
\]

Here \( \rho(\mathbf{p}_i) \) denotes the momentum distribution of electrons, which is related to the charge density \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \) through Fourier transformation

\[
\rho(\mathbf{p}_i) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int \int \int d^3r \rho(\mathbf{r}) e^{i \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}} \tag{8}
\]

The electron’s charge density is obtained by solving a manybody wavefunction of the atomic or molecular
In the earlier studies, Ribberfors et al. have found that the kernel function \( X(K_i, K_f) \) in Eq. (4) is a slowly-varying function and therefore can be pulled out of the integration \[17\] \[19\] \[24\]. Successively, this kernel is furthermore approximated by

\[
X(K_i, K_f) \approx \overline{X}(p_z) = \frac{K_i(p_z)}{K_f(p_z)} + \frac{K_f(p_z)}{K_i(p_z)} + 2m^2c^2\left(\frac{1}{K_i(p_z)} - \frac{1}{K_f(p_z)}\right) + m^4c^4\left(\frac{1}{K_i(p_z)} - \frac{1}{K_f(p_z)}\right)^2
\]

where

\[
K_i(p_z) = \frac{\omega_i E(p_z)}{c^2} + \frac{\omega_i(\omega_i - \omega_f \cos \theta)p_z}{c^2q}
\]

\[
K_f(p_z) = K_i(p_z) - \frac{\omega_i \omega_f (1 - \cos \theta)}{c^2}
\]

with \( E(p_z) = \sqrt{m^2c^4 + p_z^2c^2} \) and \( q \) is the modulus of the momentum transfer vector \( q \equiv k_i - k_f \), and \( p_z \) is the projection of the electron’s initial momentum on the momentum transfer direction

\[
p_z = -\frac{p \cdot q}{q} = \frac{\omega_i \omega_f (1 - \cos \theta) - E(p_z)(\omega_i - \omega_f)}{c^2q}
\]

see Fig. 2 for more explanations. A good approximation to \( p_z \) can be made by

\[
p_z \approx \frac{\omega_i \omega_f (1 - \cos \theta) - mc^2(\omega_i - \omega_f)}{c^2}
\]

Moreover, \( p_z \) and \( E(p_z) \) are exactly the minimal energy and momentum values of the initial electron allowed in energy and momentum conservations

\[
p_z^{\text{min}} = |p_z|; \quad E_z^{\text{min}} = E(p_z)
\]

Through the above assumptions, the DDCS of Compton scatterings in the former RIA treatments is given by

\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega d\Omega_f}(\text{RIA}) = \frac{r_0^2 m \omega_f}{2q} \frac{\omega_f}{\omega_i} \overline{X}(p_z) J(p_z)
\]

\[
= Y^{\text{RIA}} \cdot J(p_z)
\]

The same results can be derived from Eq. (4) through integration by part \[17\].

An alternative and more simpler approximation of kernel function \( X(K_i, K_f) \) can be made by taking the \( p_z \to 0 \) limit of \( \overline{X}(p_z) \), which gives its Klein-Nishina value exactly \[19\] \[20\]

\[
X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN} = \frac{\omega_i}{\omega_f} + \frac{\omega_f}{\omega_i} - \sin^2 \theta
\]

Therefore the simplified results of DDCS for Compton scatterings in former RIA treatments can be expressed as

\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega d\Omega_f}(\text{RIA}) = \frac{r_0^2 m \omega_f}{2q} \frac{\omega_f}{\omega_i} X_{KN} J(p_z) = Y^{\text{RIA}} \cdot J(p_z)
\]

From Eqs. (16) and (18), it is obvious that the DDCS of Compton scattering in former RIA treatments just factorize into two parts as in Eq. (4).

\[
\left(\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega d\Omega_f}\right)^{\text{RIA}} = Y^{\text{RIA}} \cdot J(p_z)
\]

The correction factor \( J(p_z) \), which incorporate ground state electron momentum distribution, is called atomic Compton profile

\[
J(p_z) = \int \rho(p) dp_z dp_y
\]

For most of the atomic systems, the momentum distribution is spherical symmetric, then atomic Compton profile reduces to

\[
J(p_z) = 2\pi \int_{|p_z|}^\infty pp(p) dp
\]

In this case, the Compton profile \( J(p_z) \) is bell-shaped and axisymmetric around the \( p_z = 0 \) axis. We will restrict ourselves to the spherical symmetric case in this paper.
our numerical treatment, Dirac-Fock ground state wavefunctions are employed to achieve electron’s momentum distribution. Assuming that the considered atomic systems are spherical symmetric, the electron’s momentum distribution then reduces to \(\rho(p_i) = \rho(p_f)\). Moreover, the wavefunction of a particular electron is given by Dirac orbital \(u_{nlj}(r)\), which is composed of a large component \(G_{nlj}\) and a small component \(F_{nlj}\). The Fourier transformation of large and small components give the momentum distributions:

\[
\phi_{nlj}^G(p_i) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^\infty G_{nlj}(r)j_l(pr)r^2dr
\]

\[
\phi_{nlj}^F(p_i) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^\infty F_{nlj}(r)j_{l+\frac{1}{2}}(pr)r^2dr & j = l + \frac{1}{2} \\ \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^\infty F_{nlj}(r)j_{l-\frac{1}{2}}(pr)r^2dr & j = l - \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}
\]

and the total momentum distribution can be calculated through

\[
\rho(p_i) = \sum_a |\phi_a(p_i)|^2
\]

\[
= \sum_{njl} N_{njl} \left( (\phi_{nlj}^G(p_i))^2 + (\phi_{nlj}^F(p_i))^2 \right)
\]

where \(N_{njl}\) is the number of electrons in each orbital \((njl)\).

Putting Eqs \((22), (23)\) and \((27)\) into the integration in Eq. \((3)\) and take atomic binding energies into account, we obtain the DDCS for Compton scattering processes

\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} = \sum_{njl} \frac{d^2\sigma_{njl}}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f}
\]

\[
= \sum_{njl} \frac{r_0^3}{2} \frac{\omega_i}{\omega_f} m^2 c^4 \Theta(\omega_i - E_{nlj}^B) N_{njl}
\]

\[
\times \int \int p_i^2 dp_i \sin \theta_i d\theta_i d\phi_i \delta(E_i + \omega_i - E_f - \omega_f)
\]

\[
\times \left( (\phi_{nlj}^G(p_i))^2 + (\phi_{nlj}^F(p_i))^2 \right)
\]

\[
\times \frac{X(K_i(p_i, \theta_1), K_f(p_i, \theta_1))}{E_i(p_i) E_f(p_i, \theta_1)}
\]

where \(E_{nlj}^B\) is the binding energy of orbital \((njl)\), and \(\Theta(\omega_i - E_{nlj}^B)\) is the Heaviside step function. When the incident photon energy \(\omega_i\) is less than atomic binding energy \(E_{nlj}^B\), the Heaviside step function vanishes cross section from this orbital \((njl)\). In other words, electron in this orbital is inactive in atomic Compton scattering process \(h\omega_i + A \rightarrow h\omega_f + e^- + A^+\).

In order to reach the final results of DDCS numerically, one point should be mentioned. In Eq. \((28)\), when integrating one of the there variables \(p_i, \theta_1\) and \(\phi_1\), the Dirac delta function \(\delta(E_i + \omega_i - E_f - \omega_f)\) in the integrand will restricts this variable to a fixed value. These fixed
values $\overline{p}_i$, $\overline{\theta}_1$ and $\overline{\phi}_1$ can be solved by finding the zeros of function

$$f(p_i, \theta_1, \phi_1) = E_f(p_i) + \omega_i - E_f(p_i, \theta_1, \phi_1) - \omega_f$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

where $E_f(p_i) = \sqrt{p_i^2c^2 + m^2c^4}$ and $E_f(p_i, \theta_1, \phi_1)$ is calculated in Eq. 24.

To evaluate the integral in Eq. 28, we first integrate over the azimuthal angle $\phi_1$. After some redundant calculations routinely, we get the DDCS for Compton scatterings:

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} = \sum_{n,j,l} \frac{r_0^2}{2\omega_i \sin \theta} m^2c^4 \Theta(\omega_i - E_{njl}^H) N_{njl} \times \frac{\int \int p_i d\theta_1 d\phi_1 \left( (\phi_{njl}^G(p_i))^2 + (\phi_{njl}^F(p_i))^2 \right)}{E_i(p_i) \times c \sqrt{1 - \cos^2(\phi - \phi_1)}}$$

(30)

where the fixed azimuthal angle $\overline{\phi}_1$ satisfies

$$\cos(\phi - \overline{\phi}_1) = \frac{\omega_f^2 + \omega_f^2 - 2\omega_i \omega_f \cos \theta}{2p_c \omega_f \sin \theta \sin \theta_1} - \frac{(\omega_i - \omega_f)^2}{2p_c \omega_f \sin \theta \sin \theta_1} - \frac{(\omega_i - \omega_f)E_f(p_i)}{p_c \omega_f \sin \theta \sin \theta_1} + \frac{\cos \theta_1 (\omega_i - \omega_f \cos \theta)}{\omega_f \sin \theta \sin \theta_1}$$

(31)

Moreover, it is worth noting that, only those which satisfied Eq. 31 and inequality $-1 \leq \overline{\phi}_1 \leq 1$ simultaneously can be regarded as physical allowed value of $\overline{\phi}_1$.

In this work, we adopt the above order of integration in the numerical evaluation of Eq. 28. However, equivalent results can be achieved by exchanging the order of integration. Results from alternative order of integration are given in the Appendix A.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, we provide results on atomic Compton scattering using our "exact" numerical method of RIA described in Sec. IIIB. For a complementary study, we choose four neutral atoms C, Cu, Ge, and Xe to represent the small-Z, middle-Z, and large-Z regimes, respectively. Sec. IIIA is focused on differential cross sections, where detailed comparisons between our results and those from former treatments of RIA are presented. The validity of the factorization in Eq. 23 and available ranges of former RIA treatments are discussed through these comparisons. In Sec. IIIB effective Compton profiles are extracted from our results to quantitatively illustrate the corrections of our method to the atomic Compton profile defined in Eq. 21. Furthermore, we give an uncertainty estimate for numerical scheme in Sec. IIIC.

A. Differential Cross Sections

In this subsection, we focus on the differential cross sections in atomic Compton scatterings. The DDCS of Compton Scatterings for C, Cu, Ge, and Xe at photon energy $\omega_i = 662$ KeV and scattering angle $\theta = 120^\circ$ are given as representative examples in Fig. 4. Comparative results between our “exact” numerical treatment of RIA and several former treatments of RIA have been displayed in this figure. The former RIA results are obtained through Eqs. (16) and (18), where the DDCS of Compton scatterings factorized into factor $Y$ times atomic Compton profiles $J$ as in Eq. 23. Moreover, when computing atomic Compton profiles, the projected momentum $p_z$ can be adopted through its exact or approximate values calculated in Eqs. (13) and (14). Our exact RIA results are acquired by evaluating the numerical integral in Eq. 23 directly.

From this figure, numerical results indicate that our “exact” RIA treatment successfully reproduces the former RIA results near the Compton peak region $\omega_f \approx \omega_C$. However, when the energy of scattered photon goes far away from the Compton peak region, discrepancies between our “exact” RIA treatment and former RIA treatments become notable. Therefore, the available range for former RIA treatments is just near the Compton peak region. Moreover, when $\omega_f < \omega_C$, the several former RIA treatments overestimate the DDCS of Compton scattering, while in the region $\omega_f > \omega_C$, our results acquire larger cross sections than the former RIA results. For several former RIA treatments, both the approximations of kernel function $X(K_i, K_f)$ and the values of projected momentum $p_z$ have great impacts on DDCS of Compton scattering. Among these former treatments of RIA, only one utilized more accurate kernel function approximation $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X(p_z)$ and employed exact projected momentum $p_z$ values, which correspond to dashed curves in Fig. 4 agrees well with our approach in the whole energy spectrum.

In order to check the validity of former RIA treatments through kernel function $X(K_i, K_f)$ directly, we explore the function $X(K_i, K_f)$ in Eq. 7 numerically, and the results are given in the Appendix B. Detailed analysis shows that the approximation $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN}$ in former RIA treatments only works well in the Compton peak region $\omega_f \approx \omega_C$. When final photon energy goes far away from the Compton peak region, the approximation $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN}$ becomes inappropriate. This is consistent with our conclusions obtained from DDCS of Compton scattering in Fig. 4 where former RIA results based on the approximation $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN}$ through Eq. 18 have notable discrepancies away from the Compton peak region, regardless of whether exact or approximate $p_z$ values are employed. As an comparison, in the Appendix B, we will demonstrate that $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X(p_z)$ is a more accurate kernel function approximation than $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN}$ when $\omega_f$ goes far away from the Compton peak region. This conclusion
can define the effective Compton profiles as

In order to further compare the results between our method and former RIA treatments quantitatively, we employ using Eq. (16) with approximate value computed in Eq. (14); 4) short-dashed lines correspond to the former RIA results using Eq. (18) with exact values; 5) short-dotted curves display the former RIA results calculated through Eq. (18) with approximate values.

can also be revealed from DDCS of Compton scattering displayed in Fig. 4 where former RIA results depending on $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X(p_z)$ through Eq. (16) have less discrepancies with our “exact” RIA results than those employing $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN}$ through Eq. (18).

B. Effective Compton Profiles

In order to further compare the results between our method and former RIA treatments quantitatively, we can define the effective Compton profiles as

$$J_{eff}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) = \frac{1}{V_{RIA}} \frac{d^2 \sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f}$$

$$= \frac{2}{r_0^3} \frac{E(p_z)}{m} \frac{q}{m c^2} \omega_i \frac{d^2 \sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} X(p_z)$$

and

$$J_{eff}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) = \frac{1}{V_{RIA}} \frac{d^2 \sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f}$$

$$= \frac{2}{r_0^3} \frac{q}{m} \frac{d^2 \sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} \frac{\omega_i}{X_{KN}}$$

where $p_z$ is projection of the electron’s initial momentum on the momentum transfer direction, which is defined in Eq. (13). Differential cross section $d^2 \sigma/d\omega_f d\Omega_f$ is obtained using our “exact” RIA treatment numerically. If former RIA treatments were adopted in calculating differential cross sections, the effective Compton profiles automatically reduce to the usual atomic Compton profile defined in Eq. (20). Therefore effective Compton profiles, when comparing with the atomic Compton profile, give the corrections of our method to the former RIA treatments. Furthermore, the effective Compton profiles
also presented. The HF results are given by Biggs et al. profiles computed using Eq. (20) from nonrelativistic Hatree-Fock (HF) theory and relativistic Dirac-Fock (DF) theory are \( J(\omega) \) with approximate \( p_z \) value with \( \omega = 662 \) KeV and scattering angle \( \theta = 120^\circ \). The solid lines correspond to the effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) with exact \( p_z \) values calculated in Eq. (13). The dashed lines correspond to the effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) with approximate \( p_z \) values computed in Eq. (14). The dashed-dotted lines represent the effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (33) with exact \( p_z \) values calculated in Eq. (13). The short-dotted lines represent the effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (33) with approximate \( p_z \) values computed in Eq. (14). The atomic Compton profiles computed using Eq. (20) from nonrelativistic Hatree-Fock (HF) theory and relativistic Dirac-Fock (DF) theory are also presented. The HF results are given by Biggs et al. for \( Z \leq 36 \). DF results are computed using our program. Moreover, the relative discrepancies, which are defined as \( D \equiv (J_{\text{eff}} - J)/J \) with \( J \) and \( J_{\text{eff}} \) to be the atomic and effective Compton profiles, are superimposed in the figure for various kinds of effective Compton profiles.
given in Eqs. (32) and (33) contain more dynamical information for Compton scattering process, and they depend on three variables: projected momentum $p_z$, initial photon energy $\omega_i$, and scattering angle $\theta$. While the atomic Compton profile, which is a single variable function of $p_z$, is totally determined by momentum distributions of atomic systems, regardless of dynamical properties in Compton scattering.

Although in the present work we have used effective Compton profiles to quantitatively describe the corrections of our “exact” RIA treatments to former RIA treatments. However, it is worth noting that, the effective Compton profiles defined in the above expressions not only act as an theoretically subject but also can be measured from experiments directly. To experimentally determine these effective Compton profiles, we should first obtain differential cross section values in real Compton scattering measurements, and then plug them into Eqs. (32) and (33).

Before going to any detailed analysis of effective Compton profiles, we should talk a little more about the variable $p_z$. As discussed in Sec. IIA, the projected momentum $p_z$ can be calculated through its exact form in Eq. (13) or its approximate form in Eq. (14). The projected momentum $p_z$, when combined with two effective Compton profiles $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ and $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ defined in Eqs. (32) and (33), shall give rise to four kinds of effective Compton profiles.

These four kinds of effective Compton profiles for C, Cu, Ge, and Xe atoms at initial photon energy $\omega_i = 662$ KeV and scattering angle $\theta = 120^\circ$ are plotted in Fig. 6. The atomic Compton profiles computed using Eq. (20) from nonrelativistic Hartree-Fock theory and relativistic Dirac-Fock theory are also presented as comparisons. In the early years, Biggs et al. have calculated the atomic Compton profile through nonrelativistic Hartree-Fock theory for light elements $Z < 36$ and relativistic Dirac-Fock theory for heavy elements $Z > 36$. In order to compare the nonrelativistic and relativistic results, we have recalculated the atomic Compton profiles for C, Cu, and Ge atoms in relativistic Dirac-Fock theory. We have found that, for small-Z element C with weak relativistic effects, there are no much differences between nonrelativistic and relativistic results. While for middle-Z elements Cu and Ge, the relativistic effects become stronger and there are obvious differences between nonrelativistic and relativistic results for large value of $|p_z|$. Moreover, to quantitatively analyze the discrepancies between effective Compton profiles and atomic Compton profiles, we define the relative discrepancy as $D \equiv |J_{\text{eff}} - J|/J$, where $J$ is atomic Compton profile and $J_{\text{eff}}$ to be the effective Compton profile defined in Eqs. (32) or (33). In order to consider relativistic effects on equal footing, we only mark the relative discrepancies between our RIA effective Compton profiles and relativistic atomic Compton profiles calculated within Dirac-Fock method. However, the relative discrepancies between RIA effective Compton profiles and nonrelativistic atomic Compton profiles, which are given by Biggs et al. in reference [42], are at the same order of magnitude.

One observation from this figure that has significantly importance to interdisciplinary studies is that, when the projected momentum $|p_z|$ is less than 10 a.u., all kinds of effective Compton profiles converge to the atomic Compton profiles with relative discrepancies $|D| < 20\%$. A non-negligible 20% change on the $D$ variable only arise outside the palm of the projected momentum $|p_z|$ greater than 10 a.u.. Therefore previous researches in condensed matter physics, which studied electron correlations, electron momentum distributions and Fermi surfaces with the help of Compton profiles and Compton scattering experiments [16, 21], are still valid at a high level of accuracy, because researches in these areas mainly focus on the region $|p_z| \sim a.u.$ However, in the large $|p_z|$ regions, except for the effective Compton profiles $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ defined in Eq. (32) employing exact $p_z$ values, other effective Compton profiles all have large discrepancies with atomic Compton profiles at large momentum $|p_z|$, especially in the negative axis of $p_z$. This is consistent with our conclusions obtained from DDCS in Sec. IIA where large $|p_z|$ values correspond to cases where final photon energy $\omega_f$ moves far away from the Compton peak region. In these cases, our results on DDCS have notable differences with former RIA treatments. Another interesting phenomenon revealed in Fig. 5 is that, unlike the atomic Compton profiles, effective Compton profiles generally are not axisymmetric around the $p_z = 0$ axis.

Furthermore, in the present work, we have calculated all kinds of effective Compton profiles at different initial photon energies $\omega_i$ and scattering angles $\theta$, and the results are presented in the Appendix C. We will see that the effective Compton profiles $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ defined in Eq. (33) are more sensitive to the scattering angle $\theta$ than the incoming photon energy $\omega_i$. Moreover, effective Compton profiles $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ acquired from smaller scattering angle $\theta$ are more approaching to the usual atomic Compton profiles, see Appendix C for more discussions.

C. Numerical Uncertainty Estimate

To give an uncertainty estimate for different numerical schemes, we have recalculated the atomic Compton profiles employing exactly the same Hartree-Fock method as Biggs et al. in reference [42]. The comparative results for Ge and Xe atoms are shown in Table I for selected $p_z$ momenta. The relative difference between our results and those in reference [42] can give us an uncertainty estimate for different numerical schemes, and it is parameterized by a deviation parameter $R \equiv |(J_0 - J)/J_0|$, where $J$ and $J_0$ correspond to the nonrelativistic atomic Compton profiles from our calculations and from Biggs et al. in reference [42] respectively. From this table, it is obvious that the uncertainties for different numerical schemes are at the order of $10^{-4}$ to $10^{-2}$, which is much less than the relative discrepancies $D$ between the atomic Comp-
ton profiles and effective Compton profiles obtained in Sec. 3 Therefore, uncertainties for different numerical schemes are negligible in this work.

IV. SUMMARY

Throughout this paper, we have developed an “exact” numerical scheme to evaluate the integral in RIA formulation. Our method does not invoke any further simplified approximations or factorization treatments used in former RIA studies. Compton scatterings for atomic systems are carefully analyzed in this work, and our results are compared with former treatments of RIA effectively. We have chosen four typical elements C, Cu, Ge and Xe to represent the small-$Z$, middle-$Z$ and large-$Z$ regimes respectively. For DDCS of Compton scatterings, our results agree with the former RIA treatments in the Compton peak region $\omega_f \approx \omega_C$. However, when the scattered photon energy $\omega_f$ moves far away from the Compton peak region, notable discrepancies are obtained.

In order to further compare the corrections from our “exact” RIA results to those from former RIA treatments quantitatively, several kinds of effective Compton profiles are defined and calculated in this work. Detailed results shown that except for the effective Compton profile $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ defined in Eq. (32) employing exact $p_z$ values acquired from Eq. (13), other kinds of effective Compton profiles all have large discrepancies with atomic Compton profiles at large projected momentum $|p_z|$, especially in the negative axis of $p_z$. Furthermore, according to the analysis of effective Compton profiles for various incident photon energies $\omega_i$ and scattering angles $\theta$, we can draw the following conclusions:

(i). The effective Compton profiles do not shown any notable differences with atomic Compton profiles for small momentum value $|p_z| < 10$ a.u. A non-negligible 20% change on relative discrepancy $D$ only arise in the large momentum cases with $|p_z| > 10$ a.u.. Therefore researches in condensed matter physics studying electron correlations, electron momentum distributions and Fermi surfaces with the help of Compton profiles and Compton scattering experiments, which correspond to $|p_z| \sim a.u.$, are still valid with sufficient high precision.

(ii). Different from the atomic Compton profiles, effective Compton profiles generally are not axisymmetric around the $p_z = 0$ axis.

(iii). The effective Compton profile $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ defined in Eq. (33) are more sensitive to the scattering angle $\theta$ than the incoming photon energy $\omega_i$. Moreover, effective Compton profile $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ acquired from smaller scattering angle $\theta$ are more approaching to the usual atomic Compton profiles.

In the present work, we have carried out a complementary study of atomic Compton scatterings through our “exact” numerical treatment in the RIA formulation. However, in the past few years, several approaches beyond IA framework have already been investigated recently [43–51]. These researches, mainly employing low-energy theorems and S-matrix formulation, have revealed many remarkable and nontrivial aspects of Compton scatterings and have attracted lots of interests in inter-disciplinary studies. We shall study atomic Compton Scatterings beyond IA formulation in the future.
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Appendix A: Equivalent Results for Numerical Integration

In Sec. 3B we have mentioned that equivalent results for DDCS can be achieved by exchanging the order of integration in Eq. (28). In this Appendix, we will give results on differential cross sections calculated through alternative order of integration.

When we first integrate over momentum $p_i$ or polar angle $\theta_1$ in Eq. (28), the DDCS for Compton scattering...
becomes
\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} = \sum_{njl} \frac{r_0^2}{2\omega_i} m^2 c^4 \Theta(\omega_i - E_{njl}^B) N_{njl}
\]
\[
\int \tilde{p}_i^2 \sin \theta_1 d\theta_1 d\phi_1 \left( (\phi_{njl}(\tilde{p}_i))^2 + (\phi_{njl}^*(\tilde{p}_i))^2 \right)
\]
\[
\times X(K_i(\tilde{p}_i, \theta_1), K_f(\tilde{p}_i, \phi_1)) \frac{E_i(\tilde{p}_i) E_f(\tilde{p}_i)}{E_i(\tilde{p}_i) - \tilde{p}_i c^2 + (A \sin \theta_1 - B \cos \theta_1)c} \left| 1\right. \]
\[
(A1)
\]
\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\omega_f d\Omega_f} = \sum_{njl} \frac{r_0^2}{2\omega_i} m^2 c^4 \Theta(\omega_i - E_{njl}^B) N_{njl}
\]
\[
\int \int p_i dp_i d\phi_1 \left( (\phi_{njl}(p_i))^2 + (\phi_{njl}^*(p_i))^2 \right)
\]
\[
\times \left| X(K_i(p_i, \tilde{\theta}_1), K_f(p_i, \tilde{\phi}_1, \phi_1)) \times \sin \tilde{\theta}_1 \right| \frac{E_i(p_i) \times (A \sin \tilde{\theta}_1 + B \cos \tilde{\theta}_1)c}{E_i(p_i) - \tilde{p}_i c^2 + (A \sin \theta_1 - B \cos \theta_1)c} \right| \]
\[
(A2)
\]

where
\[
A \equiv \omega_i - \omega_f \cos \theta
(A3)
\]
\[
B \equiv \omega_f \sin \theta \cos(\phi - \phi_1)
(A4)
\]

The fixed momentum \(\tilde{p}_i\) and polar angle \(\tilde{\theta}_1\) are calculated by solving the zeros of function \(f\) in Eq. (29) respectively. After tedious calculations, \(\tilde{p}_i\) can be expressed as:
\[
\tilde{p}_i = \frac{-MN \pm \sqrt{N^2 + (M^2 - 1)N^2c^4}}{c(M^2 - 1)}
(A5)
\]

where
\[
M \equiv \frac{A \cos \theta - B \sin \theta}{\omega_i - \omega_f}
(A6)
\]
\[
N \equiv \frac{\omega_i \omega_f (1 - \cos \theta)}{\omega_i - \omega_f}
(A7)
\]

Similar to the cases of \(\tilde{\phi}_1\) discussed in Sec. II B, only those which satisfied Eq. (A5) and inequality \(p_i \geq 0\) simultaneously can be regarded as physical allowed values of \(\tilde{p}_i\).

The fixed polar angle \(\tilde{\theta}_1\) can be expressed through \(\sin \tilde{\theta}_1\) or \(\cos \tilde{\theta}_1\). The expression for \(\sin \tilde{\theta}_1\) and \(\cos \tilde{\theta}_1\) are:
\[
\sin \tilde{\theta}_1 = \frac{-BC \pm \sqrt{A^2(A^2 + B^2 - C^2)}}{A^2 + B^2}
(A8)
\]
\[
\cos \tilde{\theta}_1 = \frac{B}{A} \sin \tilde{\theta}_1 + \frac{C}{A}
(A9)
\]

where \(C\) is defined as
\[
C = \frac{E_i(p_i)(\omega_i - \omega_f) - \omega_i \omega_f (1 - \cos \theta)}{p_i c}
(A10)
\]

FIG. 6: Electron momentum distributions \(\rho(p_i)/Z\) for C, Ge, Cu and Xe atoms in the atomic units. It is worthy noting that we have normalized the momentum distribution into the contribution from one electron.

Furthermore, only those which satisfied the above expressions (A8)-(A9) and inequality \(-1 \leq \tilde{p}_i \leq 1\) simultaneously are physically reasonable values of \(\tilde{\theta}_1\).

Appendix B: Validity of Approximation
\(X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN}\) and \(X(K_i, K_f) \approx \bar{X}(p_z)\)

In this Appendix, we will discuss the kernel function \(X(K_i, K_f)\) in the integrand of Eq. (4), testing the validity of the approximations
\[
X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN} = \frac{\omega_i}{\omega_f} - \sin^2 \theta
(B1)
\]
and
\[
X(K_i, K_f) \approx \bar{X}(p_z)
(B2)
\]
in former treatments of RIA discussed in Sec. II In order to quantitatively describe the discrepancies between kernel function \(X(K_i, K_f)\) and its Klein-Nishina value \(X_{KN}\) or its “averaged” value \(\bar{X}(p_z)\), we define the relative factors \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) to be
\[
\alpha \equiv \frac{X(K_i, K_f)}{X_{KN}}
(B3)
\]
\[
\beta \equiv \frac{X(K_i, K_f)}{\bar{X}(p_z)}
(B4)\]
tron momentum distributions are at rest in the target. Contributions in the small momentum region are forbidden in the energy and large momentum region become notable only when the tiny contributions in the integration. Contributions from the Klein-Nishina in Eq. (28), while large momentum region have a dominant role in the DDCS of Compton scattering. This indicates that small momentum region momentum distributions, compared with small momentum values, give negligible contributions on the energy and momentum. Therefore in this figure we only plot the contributions from small momentum values $p_i$ to $25$ a.u., where the momentum density is sufficient large and can give notable contributions in the integration of Eq. (10). From this figure, we can observe that the relative factor $\alpha$ varies from $0.90 - 1.10$, which demonstrate the validity of approximation $X(K_i, K_f) \approx X_{KN}$ and $X(K_i, K_f) \approx \chi(p_z)$ in the Compton peak region. This is consistent with our DDCS results presented in Fig. 4 where our method successfully reproduces the former RIA results in the Compton peak region $\omega_f \approx \omega_C$.

On the other hand, we choose $\omega_f = 500$ KeV as an example to illustrate the cases when final photon energy goes far away from the Compton peak region. The results of relative factors $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are given in Figs. 8 and 9. A crucial fact different from the previous case is that small momentum values $p_i < 100$ a.u. are not kinematically al-
The cases for C, Cu, and Xe atoms are similar to those of Ge atom.

The effective Compton profiles for Ge atom at scattering angle \( \theta = 120^\circ \) with various incident photon energy are given in Fig. [10]. In this work, we pick several characteristic energies for gamma ray sources: 320, 356, 511, and 662 KeV. The effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) with approximate or exact \( p_z \) values are superimposed in Fig. [10]. From this figure, we can observe that, only effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) employing exact \( p_z \) values fit well with atomic Compton profiles at all \( p_z \) values. While other kinds of effective Compton profiles are not axisymmetric around the \( p_z = 0 \) axis and have large discrepancies at large \( |p_z| \) values, especially in the negative axis of \( p_z \). It worth noting that, for various kinds of effective Compton profiles, the projected momentum \( p_z \) has maximum and minimum values due to the energy and momentum conservations in Compton scatterings. Moreover, for the same angle \( \theta \), when the incident photon energy \( \omega_i \) is lower, the maximal kinematically allowed value of \( p_z \) becomes smaller. In all situations, the minimum values of \( p_z \) are less than \(-100 \) a.u., which is not shown in this figure. The same as in Sec. [III B] when \( |p_z| < 10 \) a.u., various kinds of effective Compton profiles are consistent with the atomic Compton profiles within the \( 20\% \) uncertainty of the \( D \) variable. Deviations only pronounce when \( |p_z| > 10 \) a.u., which correspond to the cases where final photon energy \( \omega_f \) goes far away from the Compton peak region in the DDCS spectrum. Another interesting phenomenon is that all kinds of effective Compton profiles at different energies \( \omega_i \) almost converge with each other at a fixed scattering angle \( \theta = 120^\circ \).

The effective Compton profiles for Ge atom at photon energy \( \omega_i = 662 \) KeV with various scattering angle \( \theta \) are displayed in Fig. [11]. We have chosen the scattering angle to be \( \theta = 10^\circ \), \( 30^\circ \), \( 60^\circ \), \( 90^\circ \), \( 120^\circ \) and \( 150^\circ \) in this figure. Effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) and \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eqs. (32) and (33) with approximate or exact \( p_z \) values computed in Eqs. (14) and (13) are plotted the same as in Fig. [10]. The nonrelativistic and relativistic atomic Compton profiles have been compared in the figure. The relative discrepancies \( D \equiv (J_{\text{eff}} - J)/J \) are also superimposed the same as in Figs. [4] and [10]. In these cases, momentum \( p_z \) has maximum and minimum values constrained by energy and momentum conservations, and the maximal kinematically allowed value of \( p_z \) increases when scattering angle \( \theta \) becomes larger. Again in these cases, only effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) was calculated.

Appendix C: More Results on Effective Compton Profiles

In this Appendix, we will display more detailed numerical results on effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) and \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Sec. [III B]. These results will reveal some intrinsic properties of effective Compton profiles. For simplicity, we only list our results for Ge atom.

FIG. 9: Counterplot of relative factor \( \beta \) when final photon energy \( \omega_f \) goes far away from the Compton peak region. We have chosen the energies to be \( \omega_i = 662 \) KeV, \( \omega_f = 500 \) KeV and scattering angle \( \theta = 120^\circ \). The horizontal and vertical axes label the electron momentum \( p_z \) and polar angle \( \theta_i \) as in Fig. [7]. The regions which are not kinematically allowed in the energy and momentum conservations are left with white as in Fig. [7].

The effective Compton profiles for Ge atom at scattering angle \( \theta = 120^\circ \) with various incident photon energy are given in Fig. [10]. In this work, we pick several characteristic energies for gamma ray sources: 320, 356, 511, and 662 KeV. The effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) with approximate or exact \( p_z \) values computed in Eq. (14) and Eq. (13) are shown in the upper panels. While the lower panels plotted the effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (33) with approximate or exact \( p_z \) values. The atomic Compton profiles computed using Eq. (20) from nonrelativistic Hartree-Fock theory and relativistic Dirac-Fock theory are also presented as comparisons. The relative discrepancies defined as \( D \equiv (J_{\text{eff}} - J)/J \) in Sec. [III B] are superimposed in Fig. [10]. From this figure, we can observe that, only effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) employing exact \( p_z \) values fit well with atomic Compton profiles at all \( p_z \) values. While other kinds of effective Compton profiles are not axisymmetric around the \( p_z = 0 \) axis and have large discrepancies at large \( |p_z| \) values, especially in the negative axis of \( p_z \). It worth noting that, for various kinds of effective Compton profiles, the projected momentum \( p_z \) has maximum and minimum values due to the energy and momentum conservations in Compton scatterings. Moreover, for the same angle \( \theta \), when the incident photon energy \( \omega_i \) is lower, the maximal kinematically allowed value of \( p_z \) becomes smaller. In all situations, the minimum values of \( p_z \) are less than \(-100 \) a.u., which is not shown in this figure. The same as in Sec. [III B] when \( |p_z| < 10 \) a.u., various kinds of effective Compton profiles are consistent with the atomic Compton profiles within the \( 20\% \) uncertainty of the \( D \) variable. Deviations only pronounce when \( |p_z| > 10 \) a.u., which correspond to the cases where final photon energy \( \omega_f \) goes far away from the Compton peak region in the DDCS spectrum. Another interesting phenomenon is that all kinds of effective Compton profiles at different energies \( \omega_i \) almost converge with each other at a fixed scattering angle \( \theta = 120^\circ \).

The effective Compton profiles for Ge atom at photon energy \( \omega_i = 662 \) KeV with various scattering angle \( \theta \) are displayed in Fig. [11]. We have chosen the scattering angle to be \( \theta = 10^\circ \), \( 30^\circ \), \( 60^\circ \), \( 90^\circ \), \( 120^\circ \) and \( 150^\circ \) in this figure. Effective Compton profiles \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) and \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eqs. (32) and (33) with approximate or exact \( p_z \) values computed in Eqs. (14) and (13) are plotted the same as in Fig. [10]. The nonrelativistic and relativistic atomic Compton profiles have been compared in the figure. The relative discrepancies \( D \equiv (J_{\text{eff}} - J)/J \) are also superimposed the same as in Figs. [4] and [10]. In these cases, momentum \( p_z \) has maximum and minimum values constrained by energy and momentum conservations, and the maximal kinematically allowed value of \( p_z \) increases when scattering angle \( \theta \) becomes larger. Again in these cases, only effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) was calculated.
FIG. 10: Effective Compton profiles (ECP) for Ge atom at scattering angle \( \theta = 120^\circ \) with various incident photon energy \( \omega_i = 662, 511, 356 \) and 320 KeV. Upper left panel: effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) with approximate \( p_z \) values computed in Eq. (14). Upper right panel: effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (32) with exact \( p_z \) values calculated in Eq. (13). Lower left panel: effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (33) employing approximate \( p_z \) values. Lower right panel: effective Compton profile \( J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega, \theta) \) defined in Eq. (33) employing exact \( p_z \) values. Atomic Compton profiles \( J(p_z) \) computed using Eq. (20) from nonrelativistic Hatree-Fock (HF) theory and relativistic Dirac-Fock (DF) theory are also plotted as in Fig. 5. Moreover, the relative discrepancies defined as \( D \equiv (J_{\text{eff}} - J)/J \) are superimposed the same as in Fig. 5. It should be mention that for various effective Compton profiles, the projected momentum \( p_z \) has a maximal cutoff due to the energy and momentum conservations.
Relative discrepancies defined as $D$ computed using Eq. (20) from nonrelativistic and relativistic theories are also plotted as in the figure. Moreover, the relative discrepancies defined as $D = (J_{\text{eff}} - J)/J$ are superimposed the same as in Figs. 5 and 10. It should be mentioned that for various effective Compton profiles, the projected momentum $p_z$ has a maximal cutoff due to the energy and momentum conservations.
adopting exact $p_z$ values fit well with the atomic Compton profiles for all $p_z$ values. While other kinds of effective Compton profiles are not axisymmetric around the $p_z = 0$ axis and have large discrepancies at large $|p_z|$ values. From Fig. [11] it is obvious that effective Compton profiles $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ defined in Eq. (33) for different scattering angles $\theta$ do not converge with each other at a fixed incident photon energy $\omega_i = 662$ KeV. However, we have learned in Fig. [10] that the effective Compton profiles $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ for different photon energies $\omega_i$ converge with each other at a fixed scattering angle $\theta = 120^\circ$. Therefore we can draw the conclusion that the effective Compton profile $J_{\text{eff}}(p_z, \omega_i, \theta)$ are more sensitive to the scattering $\theta$ than the incident photon energy $\omega_i$. Moreover, the curves which correspond to smaller scattering angles are more approaching to the usual atomic Compton profiles. Furthermore, when $|p_z|$ is less than 10 a.u., all kinds of effective Compton profiles are consistent with atomic Compton profiles within the 20% uncertainty of the $D$ variable, which is the same as in Figs. [3] and [10].

Therefore previous condensed matter researches relating electron correlations, electron momentum distributions and Fermi surfaces with Compton profiles are still valid at a high level of accuracy [1–6, 21].
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