

Lambda-nucleon scattering in baryon chiral perturbation theory

X.-L. Ren,¹ E. Epelbaum,¹ and J. Gegelia^{1,2}

¹*Ruhr University Bochum, Faculty of Physics and Astronomy,
Institute for Theoretical Physics II, D-44870 Bochum, Germany*

²*Tbilisi State University, 0186 Tbilisi, Georgia*

(Dated: 14 November, 2019)

Abstract

We calculate the lambda-nucleon scattering phase shifts and mixing angles by applying time-ordered perturbation theory to the manifestly Lorentz-invariant formulation of SU(3) baryon chiral perturbation theory. Scattering amplitudes are obtained by solving the corresponding coupled-channel integral equations that have a milder ultraviolet behavior compared to their non-relativistic analogs. This allows us to consider the removed cutoff limit in our leading-order calculations also in the 3P_0 and 3P_1 partial waves. We find that, in the framework we are using, at least some part of the higher-order contributions to the baryon-baryon potential in these channels needs to be treated nonperturbatively and demonstrate how this can be achieved in a way consistent with quantum field theoretical renormalization for the leading contact interactions. We compare our results with the ones of the non-relativistic approach and lattice QCD phase shifts obtained for non-physical pion masses.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Gh,12.39.Fe,13.75.Cs

I. INTRODUCTION

Nuclear systems with non-vanishing strangeness play an important role in the study of nuclear, particle and astrophysics. Hyperon-nucleon (YN) interactions are crucial for understanding hypernuclear binding. Experiments investigating the YN, hyperon-hyperon (YY) and cascade-nucleon (Ξ N) interactions are carried out at various laboratories such as CERN, DAΦNE, GSI, JLab, J-PARC, KEK, MAMI, RHIC and will also be performed at the future FAIR facility. For reviews on the subject of hypernuclear physics see Refs. [1–4].

Lattice QCD is another valuable source of information on YN and YY interactions [5–17]. While some lattice simulations are approaching the physical values of the light quark masses, most of the available lattice QCD calculations still correspond to unphysically large values and, therefore, require extrapolations to their physical values.

Chiral effective field theory (ChEFT) is a natural framework for analyzing low-energy properties of (hyper)nuclei and performing chiral extrapolations. Chiral perturbation theory for systems involving two and more nucleons has been initiated in Refs. [18, 19]. In that formulation, power counting rules are applied to the effective potentials, and the scattering amplitude is then obtained by solving the Lippmann-Schwinger (LS) or Schrödinger equations. Reviews of ChEFT in the few-body sector can be found in Refs. [20–24].

Chiral EFT for baryon-baryon (BB) interactions in the strange sector has been formulated in Refs. [25–38] using the non-relativistic framework. In these studies, the standard Weinberg power counting for nucleon-nucleon (NN) interactions is extended to the non-zero strangeness sectors of the baryon-baryon interaction. Ultraviolet divergences of the LS equation have been taken care of by applying finite-cutoff regularization using exponential cutoffs in the range of 500 . . . 700 MeV.

For nucleon-nucleon scattering, a modified Weinberg approach with an improved ultraviolet behavior has been proposed in Ref. [39]. This novel framework uses time-ordered perturbation theory (TOPT) applied to the manifestly Lorentz-invariant effective Lagrangian and leads to the Kadyshevsky equation for the scattering amplitude [40]. It has been explored in the non-strange sector [41–43], also with a different treatment of Dirac spinors and using an alternative power counting [44]. First applications of a similar formalism to baryon-baryon systems with non-zero strangeness can be found in Refs. [45–49].¹

Recently, we have worked out in details the diagrammatic rules of TOPT for particles with non-zero spin and for interactions involving time derivatives [51]. In this paper, we apply the resulting framework to the strangeness $S = -1$ sector of baryon-baryon scattering and focus, in particular, on lambda-nucleon and sigma-nucleon scatterings.

Our paper is organized as follows: in section II we specify the effective Lagrangian required for our calculations. In section III, we consider the system of integral equations for baryon-baryon scattering and present the lambda-nucleon and sigma-nucleon scattering phase shifts. Next, in section IV, we discuss the renormalization of the scattering amplitudes with the next-to-leading order (NLO) contact interaction potentials treated nonperturbatively. The

¹ For an application of the modified Weinberg approach to hadronic molecules see Ref. [50].

results of our work are summarized in section V.

II. EFFECTIVE LAGRANGIAN

The starting point of our analysis is the manifestly Lorentz-invariant effective Lagrangian of baryon chiral perturbation theory consisting of the purely mesonic, single-baryon and two-baryon parts,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_\phi + \mathcal{L}_{\phi\text{B}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{BB}}. \quad (1)$$

From the purely mesonic sector, we only need the lowest-order Lagrangian [52]

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi^{(2)} = \frac{F_0^2}{4} \text{Tr} \{u_\mu u^\mu + \chi_+\}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$u_\mu = iu^\dagger \partial_\mu U u^\dagger, \quad u^2 = U = \exp\left(\sqrt{2}i\phi/F_0\right), \quad \chi_\pm = u^\dagger \chi u^\dagger \pm u \chi^\dagger u, \quad \chi = 2B_0 s, \quad (3)$$

and ϕ is the irreducible octet representation of $\text{SU}(3)_f$ for the Goldstone bosons,

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & \frac{-\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & -\frac{2\eta}{\sqrt{6}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Here F_0 stands for the meson decay constant in the chiral limit while s is the external scalar source that gives rise to the quark (and Goldstone-boson) masses. For the purposes of the current work we switch off all other external sources and consider the isospin-symmetric case of $m_u = m_d \neq m_s$. The constant B_0 in Eq. (3) is related to the quark condensate.

The leading-order (LO) Lagrangian of the single-baryon sector is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\phi\text{B}}^{(1)} = \text{Tr} \{ \bar{\text{B}} (i\gamma_\mu D^\mu - m) \text{B} \} + \frac{D/F}{2} \text{Tr} \{ \bar{\text{B}} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 [u^\mu, \text{B}]_\pm \}, \quad (5)$$

where B is the irreducible octet representation of $\text{SU}(3)_f$ involving baryon fields,

$$\text{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\Sigma^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{6}} & \Sigma^+ & p \\ \Sigma^- & \frac{-\Sigma^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{6}} & n \\ \Xi^- & \Xi^0 & -\frac{2\Lambda}{\sqrt{6}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

D and F are coupling constants corresponding to $[\dots]_+$ and $[\dots]_-$, respectively, and $D_\mu \text{B} = \partial_\mu \text{B} + [[u^\dagger, \partial_\mu u], \text{B}]$ is the covariant derivative.

The effective baryon-baryon Lagrangian contributing to the LO BB potential consists of the following terms [27]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{BB}} &= C_i^1 \text{Tr} \left\{ \bar{\text{B}}_\alpha \bar{\text{B}}_\beta (\Gamma_i \text{B})_\beta (\Gamma_i \text{B})_\alpha \right\} + C_i^2 \text{Tr} \left\{ \bar{\text{B}}_\alpha (\Gamma_i \text{B})_\alpha \bar{\text{B}}_\beta (\Gamma_i \text{B})_\beta \right\} \\ &+ C_i^3 \text{Tr} \left\{ \bar{\text{B}}_\alpha (\Gamma_i \text{B})_\alpha \right\} \text{Tr} \left\{ \bar{\text{B}}_\beta (\Gamma_i \text{B})_\beta \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where C_i^1 , C_i^2 and C_i^3 are the coupling constants, α and β are the Dirac spinor indices and

$$\Gamma_1 = 1, \quad \Gamma_2 = \gamma^\mu, \quad \Gamma_3 = \sigma^{\mu\nu}, \quad \Gamma_4 = \gamma^\mu \gamma_5. \quad (8)$$

Notice that the $\Gamma_5 = \gamma_5$ -term starts contributing at NLO.

III. INTEGRAL EQUATIONS FOR BARYON-BARYON SCATTERING

The off-shell baryon-baryon scattering amplitude T satisfies the integral equation, which can symbolically be written as [51]:

$$T = V + VGT, \quad (9)$$

where V is the effective potential and G is the two-baryon Green function. To obtain the scattering amplitudes of processes with strangeness $S = -1$ in the isospin limit, Eq. (9) is understood as a 2×2 matrix equation, where

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_{\Lambda N, \Lambda N} & T_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N} \\ T_{\Sigma N, \Lambda N} & T_{\Sigma N, \Sigma N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{pmatrix} V_{\Lambda N, \Lambda N} & V_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N} \\ V_{\Sigma N, \Lambda N} & V_{\Sigma N, \Sigma N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} G^{\Lambda N} & 0 \\ 0 & G^{\Sigma N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

and the two-body Green functions read

$$G^{IJ}(E) = \frac{1}{\omega(p_I, m_I)\omega(p_J, m_J)} \frac{m_I m_J}{E - \omega(p_I, m_I) - \omega(p_J, m_J) + i\epsilon}, \quad (11)$$

with m_I and $\omega(p_I, m_I) = (\vec{p}_I^2 + m_I^2)^{1/2}$ being the mass and the energy of the I -th baryon with four-momentum p_I . In the partial wave basis, Eq. (9) leads to the following coupled-channel equations with the partial wave projected potentials $V_{l'l',s's',j}^{IJ,KL}(E; p', p)$,

$$T_{l'l',s's',j}^{IJ,KL}(E; p', p) = V_{l'l',s's',j}^{IJ,KL}(E; p', p) + \sum_{l'',s'',P,Q} \int_0^\infty \frac{dk k^2}{2\pi^2} V_{l'l'',s''s'',j}^{IJ,PQ}(E; p', k) G^{PQ}(E) T_{l''l',s''s',j}^{PQ,KL}(E; k, p), \quad (12)$$

where IJ, KL and PQ label the initial, final and intermediate particles, respectively, and $p \equiv |\vec{p}|$, $p' \equiv |\vec{p}'|$ and $k \equiv |\vec{k}|$. The indices l, l'', l' and s, s'', s' stand for their orbital angular momentum and spin, respectively, while j denotes the total angular momentum of the BB states. Compared to the corresponding Lippmann-Schwinger equation for the same potential, Eq. (12) with the Green functions of Eq. (11) has a milder UV behaviour. Therefore, its solutions show less sensitivity to the variation of the cutoff parameter [51].

We organize the BB potential by applying the standard Weinberg power counting to two-baryon irreducible TOPT diagrams. The LO potential consists of the short-range contact interaction part $V_{LO,C}^{IJ,KL}$ and the one-meson exchange (OME) contribution [51]

$$V_{LO,M_P}^{IJ,KL} = -\frac{f_{IKP}f_{JLP}\mathcal{I}_{IJ,KL}}{2\omega(q, M_P)} \left[\frac{1}{\omega(q, M_P) + \omega(p_K, m_K) + \omega(p_J, m_J) - E - i\epsilon} + \frac{1}{\omega(q, M_P) + \omega(p_L, m_L) + \omega(p_I, m_I) - E - i\epsilon} \right] \frac{(m_I + m_K)(m_J + m_L)}{\sqrt{m_I m_J m_K m_L}} \quad (13)$$

$$\times \frac{(m_K \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{p}_I - m_I \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{p}_K)(m_L \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{p}_J - m_J \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{p}_L)}{\sqrt{\omega(p_I, m_I) + m_I} \sqrt{\omega(p_J, m_J) + m_J} \sqrt{\omega(p_K, m_K) + m_K} \sqrt{\omega(p_L, m_L) + m_L}},$$




FIG. 1: Phase shifts of ΛN scattering. Red lines represent our LO results with the cutoff $\Lambda = 20$ GeV, green dashed lines and blue dot-dashed lines denote the non-relativistic results (obtained with $\Lambda = 0.6$ GeV) at LO [25] and NLO [53], respectively.

where $q = p_I - p_K = p_L - p_J$ is the four-momentum transfer. The isospin factors $\mathcal{I}_{IJ,KL}$ and the values of f_{IKP} can be found in Refs. [26, 29].

It is straightforward to obtain from the Lagrangian of Eq. (7) the expressions for the contact interactions, which we include at LO according to Ref. [51]. They are identical to those of the non-relativistic approach and can be found in Refs. [25, 27, 44, 45, 48].

Due to the SU(3) flavour symmetry assumed in Ref. [25], there are two LECs in the contact terms of 1S_0 and 3S_1 partial waves for the ΛN - ΣN coupled channels, respectively. However, as argued in Ref. [53], the SU(3) symmetry is always broken by the one-meson-exchange potential in calculations using the actual meson and baryon masses. Therefore, we have to introduce an extra contact term in each of the 1S_0 and 3S_1 partial waves in order to be able to carry out renormalization. Specifically, we consider the contact interactions of the following form

$$V_{\text{LO},C}^{1S_0} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\Lambda N, \Lambda N}^{1S_0} & C_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N}^{1S_0} \\ C_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N}^{1S_0} & C_{\Sigma N, \Sigma N}^{1S_0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{\text{LO},C}^{3S_1} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\Lambda N, \Lambda N}^{3S_1} & C_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N}^{3S_1} \\ C_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N}^{3S_1} & C_{\Sigma N, \Sigma N}^{3S_1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

To determine these LECs we fit them to the low-energy phase shifts quoted in Ref. [53], where non-relativistic chiral EFT potentials up to NLO were employed to describe the scattering observables.

Our results for the baryon-baryon scattering phase shifts in strangeness $S = -1$ sector with isospin 1/2 are plotted in Figs. 1 and 2.² The obtained phase shifts for partial waves

² In all figures in this paper, p_{lab} is defined as the momentum of the incoming Λ -particle in the laboratory




FIG. 2: Phase shifts of ΣN scattering. Same description of curves as in Fig. 1.

TABLE I: The scattering lengths and effective ranges in the ΛN scattering for the 1S_0 and 3S_1 partial waves. The non-relativistic results from LO and NLO studies are also listed.

	Rel.-LO, $\Lambda = 20$ GeV	NR-LO [25], $\Lambda = 0.6$ GeV	NR-NLO [53], $\Lambda = 0.6$ GeV
a_{1S_0} [fm]	-2.94	-1.91	-2.91
r_{1S_0} [fm]	-1.44	1.40	2.78
a_{3S_1} [fm]	-1.41	-1.23	-1.41
r_{3S_1} [fm]	1.61	2.13	2.53

without contact interactions at LO are similar to those of the non-relativistic approach except for the 3P_0 partial wave in the ΛN channel and the 3P_1 partial wave in the ΛN and ΣN channels, which strongly deviate from the phase shifts of Ref. [53]. The phase shifts and mixing angles for the 3S_1 - 3D_1 coupled channels are consistent with the NLO results of Ref. [53]. The observed large differences between our LO results and the phase shifts in the 1S_0 , 3P_0 and 3P_1 channels as well as the large NLO corrections in these partial waves found in Ref. [53] suggest that certain contributions to the potential beyond LO in these channels need to be treated nonperturbatively. In the next section, we will show how the contributions of the P-wave contact interactions can be resummed nonperturbatively in the way compatible with EFT. As for the 1S_0 partial wave, a more involved treatment similar to that of Ref. [43] in the nonstrange sector is needed. This case will be treated in a separate publication.

We also calculated the scattering lengths and the effective range parameters of the ΛN scattering for the 1S_0 and 3S_1 partial waves. Our results, given in Table I, agree reasonably

system with the nucleon at rest.




FIG. 3: 1S_0 and 3S_1 phase shifts of the ΛN scattering for various values of the pion mass.

well with those of the non-relativistic approach except the effective range of the 1S_0 partial wave, which has different sign, as already visible from the corresponding phase shifts shown in Fig. 1.

Since we employ here an explicitly renormalizable formalism, there is no implicit quark-mass dependence of the renormalized LECs, see Ref. [41] for more details. This allows us to calculate the phase shifts of various processes for unphysical values of the quark masses and to confront them with the results of lattice QCD calculations. The 1S_0 and 3S_1 phase shifts of the ΛN scattering for various values of the pion mass are shown in Fig. 3 together with the results of the NPLQCD [13] and HAL QCD collaborations [5].³ For 1S_0 partial wave, our results for large values of the pion mass are in good agreement with those found by the HAL QCD collaboration,⁴ and the ones for 3S_1 partial wave agree, within errors, with the prediction of the NPLQCD collaboration.

³ Note that the values of masses of pseudoscalar mesons and octet baryons are taken from the LHPC [54] and PACS-CS [55] collaborations, because the NPLQCD and HAL QCD employ the lattice configurations of LHPC and PACS-CS, respectively.

⁴ Notice, however, that the applicability of chiral EFT for such large values of the pion mass is rather questionable.

IV. NONPERTURBATIVE INCLUSION OF HIGHER-ORDER CONTACT INTERACTION POTENTIALS IN P-WAVES

As already pointed out above, our results indicate that at least some parts of subleading contributions to the potential will have to be treated nonperturbatively. This then raises the question of whether the scattering amplitude can still be renormalized, and the infinite-cutoff limit can be taken. Fortunately, at least for the case of nonperturbatively treated short-range interactions, the renormalization program can still be carried out as will be demonstrated below. We start by considering the case of the 3P_0 partial waves and treat non-perturbatively the following potential

$$V(p'_1, p'_2; p_1, p_2) = V_C(p'_1, p'_2; p_1, p_2) + V_{LO,MP}^{JJ,KL}, \quad (15)$$

where $V_{LO,MP}^{JJ,KL}$ stands for the OME projected onto the 3P_0 partial wave and the contact interaction potential is given by

$$V_C = \xi(p'_1, p'_2) \mathcal{C} \xi(p_1, p_2), \quad \mathcal{C} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\Lambda N, \Lambda N} & C_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N} \\ C_{\Lambda N, \Sigma N} & C_{\Sigma N, \Sigma N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \xi(p_1, p_2) = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 & 0 \\ 0 & p_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

Using the results of Ref. [56] we write the solution to the system of integral equations for the potential of Eq. (15) in the form, which allows one to carry out the subtractive renormalization. We start by writing the integral equations (12) symbolically as

$$T = V + V G T, \quad (17)$$

and rewrite it in the form [43]

$$T = T_M + (1 + T_M G) T_C (1 + G T_M), \quad (18)$$

where the amplitude T_M satisfies the equation

$$T_M = V_{LO,MP} + V_{LO,MP} G T_M. \quad (19)$$

For the contact interaction potential of Eq. (16) the amplitude T_C is given as

$$T_C(p'_1, p'_2; p_1, p_2) = \xi(p'_1, p'_2) \mathcal{X} \xi(p_1, p_2), \quad (20)$$

where

$$\mathcal{X} = [\mathcal{C}^{-1} - \xi G \xi - \xi G T_M G \xi]^{-1}. \quad (21)$$

Thus, the final expression for the amplitude T has the form

$$T = T_M + (1 + T_M G) \xi \mathcal{X} \xi (1 + G T_M). \quad (22)$$

Analogously to Refs. [43] and [51] we apply the subtractive (BPHZ-type) renormalization, i.e. we subtract *all* divergences in *all* loop diagrams and regard the coupling constants as renormalized (i.e. cutoff-independent but renormalization scheme dependent) finite quantities, see e.g. Ref. [57] for details of the BPHZ renormalization. Subtractive renormalization of the amplitude in Eq. (22) corresponds to the inclusion of contributions of an infinite

number of counter terms generated by an infinite number of bare parameters of the effective Lagrangian [58].

To apply subtractive renormalization to Eq. (22) we notice that the amplitude T_M and expressions $\bar{\Xi}(p'_1, p'_2) = (1 + T_M G) \xi$ and $\Xi(p_1, p_2) = \xi(1 + G T_M)$ are finite. Therefore we need to apply subtractions only to the quantity \mathcal{X} . While the $\xi G T_M G \xi$ -term in Eq. (21) contains only the overall logarithmic divergences, the term $\xi G \xi$ is quadratically divergent and, therefore, requires two additional BPHZ subtractions.

After carrying out the subtractions, the final expression of the amplitude reads

$$T(p'_1, p'_2; p_1, p_2) = T_M(p'_1, p'_2; p_1, p_2) + \bar{\Xi}(p'_1, p'_2) \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}_R^{-1} - (\xi G \xi)^R - (\xi G T_M G \xi - \alpha)} \Xi(p_1, p_2), \quad (23)$$

where the counter term matrix α subtracts the overall divergences of $\xi G T_M G \xi$. The subtracted expression of $(\xi G \xi)^R$ is given by

$$(\xi G \xi)^R = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\Lambda N}, & 0 \\ 0, & I_{\Sigma N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

where the integrals I_{IJ} , subtracted at $E = E_0 < m_I + m_J$, are given by

$$I_{IJ} = \int \frac{dk k^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{k^2 (E_0 - E)^3 m_I m_J}{\sqrt{m_i^2 + k^2} \sqrt{m_j^2 + k^2} \left(E_0 - \sqrt{m_I^2 + k^2} - \sqrt{m_J^2 + k^2} \right)^3} \times \frac{1}{\left(E - \sqrt{m_I^2 + k^2} - \sqrt{m_J^2 + k^2} - i\epsilon \right)}. \quad (25)$$

The imaginary part of this integral has the form

$$\text{Im}(I_{IJ}) = -\frac{m_I m_J [m_I^4 - 2m_I^2 (E^2 + m_J^2) + (E^2 - m_J^2)^2]^{3/2}}{16\pi E^4}. \quad (26)$$

In practice, we fix the bare constant matrix $1/C = 1/C_R + \alpha$ as a function of the cutoff numerically in such a way that it cancels the divergent part of $\xi G T_M G \xi$ and the resulting cutoff-independent coupled-channel scattering amplitudes describe the phase shifts for a fixed value of the energy. The three renormalized LECs are fixed by the low-energy 3P_0 phase shifts of the ΛN and ΣN scatterings and the inelasticity parameters of Ref. [53]. The results are shown in Fig. 4. The description of the ΛN 3P_0 phase shifts is satisfactory while the results of ΣN 3P_0 phase shifts are similar to the ones of the OME potential.

We also extended the renormalization procedure to the 1P_1 - 3P_1 coupled channels. We treat nonperturbatively three contact interactions for the coupled particle channels in 3P_1 partial wave and fix the corresponding renormalized LECs via the description of the low-energy 3P_1 phase shifts of Ref. [53]. As seen from the results in Fig. 5, a rather good description of 3P_1 partial wave phase shifts is achieved. One should also notice that there is small effect on the 1P_1 partial wave phase shifts.




FIG. 4: 3P_0 phase shifts of ΛN and ΣN scatterings with the subtractive renormalization.




FIG. 5: 3P_1 phase shifts of ΛN and ΣN scatterings with the subtractive renormalization.

V. SUMMARY

In this paper we calculated the lambda-nucleon scattering amplitude of the strangeness $S = -1$ sector in the framework of manifestly Lorentz-invariant formulation of SU(3) BChPT by applying time-ordered perturbation theory [51].

For the case of baryon-baryon scattering, the relative importance of time-ordered diagrams can be determined using the Weinberg's power counting rules [18, 19]. To sum up the relevant contributions it is convenient to define the effective potential as a sum of all two-baryon irreducible contributions to the scattering amplitude within TOPT. The scattering amplitudes are obtained as solutions of a system of the coupled-channel integral equations with the potentials at the corresponding order. These equations represent a coupled-channel generalization of the Kadyshevsky equation [40] and feature a milder ultraviolet behaviour as compared to their non-relativistic analogs. By solving the integral equations for the LO amplitudes and including corrections perturbatively one can remove cutoff-dependence from the physical amplitudes. Also for higher-order contact interactions included nonperturbatively one can remove all divergences by performing BPHZ type subtractions. This corresponds to taking into account an infinite number of counter terms of higher orders.

The large discrepancy between the results of our LO calculations and the phase shifts

from Ref. [53] suggest that certain contributions to the BB potential beyond LO must be treated nonperturbatively in the 3P_0 and the 3P_1 partial waves. Thus, we have extended our calculations to include the NLO short-range interactions in these partial waves and carried out subtractive renormalization in a way consistent with EFT. The resulting phase shifts are found to be in a good agreement with the corresponding ones from the non-relativistic approach of Ref. [53]. We also studied the quark mass dependence of the 1S_0 and 3S_1 phase shifts and compared the resulting LO predictions with the available results from the lattice QCD simulations.

Acknowledgments

We thank Johann Haidenbauer for providing the non-relativistic chiral potentials from Refs. [25, 31, 53] and for numerous fruitful discussions. We are also grateful to Ulf-G. Meißner and Johann Haidenbauer for their insightful and helpful comments on the manuscript. This work was supported in part by the BMBF (Grant No. 05P18PCFP1), by the DFG and NSFC through funds provided to the Sino-German CRC 110 “Symmetries and the Emergence of Structure in QCD” (NSFC Grant No. 11621131001, DFG Grant No. TRR110) and by the Georgian Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation (Grant No. FR17-354).

-
- [1] J. Pochodzalla, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **42**, 833 (2011).
 - [2] A. Esser, S. Nagao, F. Schulz, S. Bleser, M. Steinen, P. Achenbach, C. Ayerbe Gayoso and R. Böhm *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. A* **914**, 519 (2013).
 - [3] A. Feliciello and T. Nagae, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **78**, 096301 (2015).
 - [4] A. Gal, E. V. Hungerford and D. J. Millener, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88**, 035004 (2016).
 - [5] T. Miyamoto [HAL QCD Collaboration], *PoS LATTICE* **2015**, 090 (2016).
 - [6] T. Doi *et al.*, *EPJ Web Conf.* **175**, 05009 (2018).
 - [7] H. Nemura *et al.*, *EPJ Web Conf.* **175**, 05030 (2018).
 - [8] K. Sasaki *et al.* [HAL QCD Collaboration], *EPJ Web Conf.* **175**, 05010 (2018).
 - [9] S. R. Beane, E. Chang, S. D. Cohen, W. Detmold, P. Junnarkar, H. W. Lin, T. C. Luu and K. Orginos *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **88**, 024003 (2013).
 - [10] S. R. Beane, E. Chang, S. D. Cohen, W. Detmold, H. -W. Lin, T. C. Luu, K. Orginos and A. Parreno *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 172001 (2012).
 - [11] S. R. Beane, E. Chang, S. D. Cohen, W. Detmold, H. W. Lin, T. C. Luu, K. Orginos and A. Parreno *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 034506 (2013).
 - [12] S. R. Beane, W. Detmold, K. Orginos and M. J. Savage, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **66**, 1 (2011).
 - [13] S. R. Beane *et al.* [NPLQCD Collaboration], *Nucl. Phys. A* **794**, 62 (2007).
 - [14] S. R. Beane, K. Orginos and M. J. Savage, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **17**, 1157 (2008).
 - [15] T. Yamazaki, K. i. Ishikawa, Y. Kuramashi and A. Ukawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 074514 (2012).
 - [16] T. Yamazaki, K. i. Ishikawa, Y. Kuramashi and A. Ukawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 014501 (2015).
 - [17] A. Hanlon, A. Francis, J. Green, P. Junnarkar and H. Wittig, *PoS LATTICE* **2018**, 081 (2018).
 - [18] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Lett. B* **251**, 288 (1990).

- [19] S. Weinberg, Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 3 (1991).
- [20] P. F. Bedaque, U. van Kolck, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **52**, 339 (2002).
- [21] E. Epelbaum, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **57**, 654 (2006).
- [22] E. Epelbaum, H. W. Hammer and U.-G. Meißner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1773 (2009).
- [23] R. Machleidt and D. R. Entem, Phys. Rept. **503**, 1 (2011).
- [24] E. Epelbaum and U.-G. Meißner, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **62**, 159 (2012).
- [25] H. Polinder, J. Haidenbauer and U.-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. A **779**, 244 (2006).
- [26] J. Haidenbauer, U.-G. Meißner, A. Nogga, H. Polinder, Lect. Notes Phys. **724**, 113 (2007).
- [27] H. Polinder, J. Haidenbauer and U.-G. Meißner, Phys. Lett. B **653**, 29 (2007).
- [28] J. Haidenbauer and U.-G. Meißner, Phys. Lett. B **684**, 275 (2010).
- [29] J. Haidenbauer and U.-G. Meißner, Phys. Lett. B **706**, 100 (2011).
- [30] J. Haidenbauer and U.-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. A **881**, 44 (2012).
- [31] J. Haidenbauer, S. Petschauer, N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner, A. Nogga and W. Weise, Nucl. Phys. A **915**, 24 (2013).
- [32] J. Haidenbauer, U.-G. Meißner and S. Petschauer, Eur. Phys. J. A **51**, 17 (2015).
- [33] J. Haidenbauer and U.-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. A **936**, 29 (2015).
- [34] S. Petschauer, J. Haidenbauer, N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner and W. Weise, Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 15 (2016).
- [35] J. Haidenbauer, U.-G. Meißner and S. Petschauer, Nucl. Phys. A **954**, 273 (2016).
- [36] J. Haidenbauer, S. Petschauer, N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner and W. Weise, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 11, 760 (2017).
- [37] U.-G. Meißner and J. Haidenbauer, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **26**, 1740019 (2017).
- [38] J. Haidenbauer and U.-G. Meißner, Eur. Phys. J. A **55**, 23 (2019).
- [39] E. Epelbaum and J. Gegelia, Phys. Lett. B **716**, 338 (2012).
- [40] V. G. Kadyshevsky, Nucl. Phys. B **6**, 125 (1968).
- [41] E. Epelbaum and J. Gegelia, PoS CD **12**, 090 (2013).
- [42] E. Epelbaum, A. M. Gasparyan, J. Gegelia and M. R. Schindler, Eur. Phys. J. A **50**, 51 (2014).
- [43] E. Epelbaum, A. M. Gasparyan, J. Gegelia and H. Krebs, Eur. Phys. J. A **51**, 71 (2015).
- [44] X. L. Ren, K. W. Li, L. S. Geng, B. W. Long, P. Ring and J. Meng, Chin. Phys. C **42**, 014103 (2018).
- [45] K. W. Li, X. L. Ren, L. S. Geng and B. W. Long, Chin. Phys. C **42**, 014105 (2018).
- [46] X. L. Ren, K. W. Li and L. S. Geng, Nucl. Phys. Rev. **34**, 392 (2017).
- [47] K. W. Li, X. L. Ren, L. S. Geng and B. Long, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 014029 (2016).
- [48] K. W. Li, T. Hyodo and L. S. Geng, Phys. Rev. C **98**, 065203 (2018).
- [49] J. Song, K. W. Li and L. S. Geng, Phys. Rev. C **97**, 065201 (2018).
- [50] V. Baru, E. Epelbaum, A. A. Filin, J. Gegelia and A. V. Nefediev, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 114016 (2015).
- [51] V. Baru, E. Epelbaum, J. Gegelia and X.-L. Ren, Phys. Lett. B **798**, 134987 (2019).
- [52] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **158**, 142 (1984).
- [53] J. Haidenbauer, U.-G. Meißner and A. Nogga, arXiv:1906.11681 [nucl-th].
- [54] A. Walker-Loud *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 054502 (2009).
- [55] S. Aoki *et al.* [PACS-CS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **79**, 034503 (2009).
- [56] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **478**, 629 (1996).
- [57] J. C. Collins, “Renormalization: An Introduction to Renormalization, The Renormalization Group, and the Operator Product Expansion,” (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

1984).

[58] E. Epelbaum, A. M. Gasparyan, J. Gegelia and U.-G. Meißner, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **54**, 186 (2018).