

Renormalizability of leading order covariant chiral nucleon-nucleon interaction

Chun-Xuan Wang,¹ Li-Sheng Geng,^{1,2,3,4,*} and Bingwei Long^{5,†}

¹*School of Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 102206, China*

²*Beijing Key Laboratory of Advanced Nuclear Materials and Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

³*Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Big Data-based Precision Medicine, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

⁴*School of Physics and Microelectronics, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, Henan 450001, China*

⁵*Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, Sichuan University, Sichuan 610064, China*

Abstract

In this work, we study the renormalization group invariance (RGI) of the recently proposed covariant power counting (PC) scheme in the case of nucleon-nucleon scattering [Chin.Phys. C42 (2018) 014103] at leading order (LO). We show that unlike the LO Weinberg case, RGI is satisfied in the 3P_0 channel, because a term of pp' appears naturally in the covariant PC scheme at LO. Another interesting feature is that the 1S_0 and 3P_1 channels are correlated. Fixing the two relevant low energy constants by fitting to the 1S_0 phase shifts at $T_{\text{lab.}} = 10$ and 25 MeV with a cutoff Λ of 400 – 650 MeV, the 3P_1 phase shifts can be described relatively well. In the limit of $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the 1S_0 channel becomes cutoff independent, while RGI is lost in the 3P_1 channel, consistent with the Wigner bound and the previous observation that the 3P_1 channel better be treated perturbatively. As for the 1P_1 and 3S_1 - 3D_1 channels, RGI is satisfied, similar to the Weinberg approach.

* E-mail: lisheng.geng@buaa.edu.cn

† bingwei@scu.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the pioneering works of Weinberg [1, 2], chiral effective field theory (ChEFT) has been successfully applied to describe the nucleon-nucleon interaction. Today, high precision chiral nuclear forces have become the de facto standard in ab initio nuclear structure and reaction studies [3–5]. Nevertheless, there are still a few outstanding issues in current chiral nuclear forces. One hotly discussed issue is their renormalizability, see, e.g., Refs. [6, 7].

ChEFT is based on the chiral symmetry of QCD and its explicit and spontaneous breaking [8–13]. In ChEFT, the long range interaction is provided by the exchange of the Goldstone bosons (pions in the u and d two flavor sector and the pseudoscalar nonet in the u , d , and s three flavor sector), and the short range interaction is described by the so-called low-energy constants (LECs) that encode the effects of degrees of freedom with energies larger than the chiral symmetry breaking scale, $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$. In principle, these LECs can be calculated in the underlying theory, QCD, but in practice they can only be determined by fitting either to experimental or lattice QCD data, because of the non-perturbative nature of low energy strong interactions. As a result, the predictive power of ChEFT relies on the fact that at a certain order and to a specific observable only a finite number of LECs contribute.

For an EFT, a proper power-counting (PC) scheme is the most important ingredient in order to perform any calculation. Current high precision chiral nuclear forces are based on the Weinberg PC (WPC), or the so-called naive dimensional analysis (NDA) [1, 2]. However, in the past two decades, one realized that the WPC is inconsistent in the sense that the so-constructed chiral nuclear force is not renormalization group invariant (RGI), or naively, is not cutoff independent. Since in any EFT, a separation (cutoff) between high- and low-energy physics should be offset with the LECs once one refits them for each new cutoff. In the WPC, the inconsistency problem already appears at leading order [14, 15].

The pursuit of a consistent PC has continued for almost two decades. Using RGI as a guideline, it has been proposed that one can promote some of the high-order terms in the WPC to make the chiral nuclear force renormalization group invariant at a specific order [16–19]. In principle, one can count how many counter terms are needed before calculations are done by solving the Wilson RG-equation [20–22]. A modified Weinberg approach with Lorentz invariant contact interactions was proposed for nucleon-nucleon scattering in Ref. [23] and later applied to study hyperon-nucleon scattering in Ref. [24]. The modified Weinberg approach was further re-

fined and applied to study baryon-baryon scattering [25, 26] with a different treatment of the one-pion(meson) exchange.

Recently, a covariant power-counting approach for NN scattering was proposed in Ref. [27] with the full structure of the Dirac spinor retained. At leading order, it already provided a reasonably good description of the phase shifts of angular momentum $J = 0$ and 1 by solving the Kadyshevsky equation [28].¹ This framework has also been successfully applied to study hyperon-nucleon interactions [30–32]. In Ref. [33], it was shown that this formulation also provides a good description of the unique features of the 1S_0 channel at leading order, in particular the pole position of the virtual bound state and the zero amplitude at the scattering momentum–340 MeV. According to Ref. [34], a proper description of the unique features of the 1S_0 channel at leading order can serve as a nontrivial check on the self-consistency of any EFT for the NN interaction. In the present work, in the spirit of Ref. [15], we study the cutoff dependence of the leading order covariant chiral nucleon-nucleon interaction.

This article is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly introduce the covariant nucleon-nucleon potential. In Sec. III, we study the cutoff dependence of the partial wave phase shifts of $J = 0$ and 1, followed by a short summary in Sec. IV.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In Refs. [27, 30], similar to the extended-on-mass-shell scheme in the one-baryon sector [35–37], a covariant power counting scheme for the two-baryon sector was introduced. For the nucleon-nucleon interaction, at leading order it contains five covariant four-fermion contact terms without derivatives and the one-pion-exchange (OPE) term [27],

$$V_{\text{LO}} = V_{\text{CTP}} + V_{\text{OPE}}. \quad (1)$$

The contact potential in momentum space reads

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{CTP}} = & C_S (\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', s'_1) u(\mathbf{p}, s_1)) (\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', s'_2) u(-\mathbf{p}, s_2)) \\ & + C_A (\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', s'_1) \gamma_5 u(\mathbf{p}, s_1)) (\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', s'_2) \gamma_5 u(-\mathbf{p}, s_2)) \\ & + C_V (\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', s'_1) \gamma_\mu u(\mathbf{p}, s_1)) (\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', s'_2) \gamma_\mu u(-\mathbf{p}, s_2)) \\ & + C_{AV} (\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', s'_1) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 u(\mathbf{p}, s_1)) (\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', s'_2) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 u(-\mathbf{p}, s_2)) \\ & + C_T (\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', s'_1) \sigma_{\mu\nu} u(\mathbf{p}, s_1)) (\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', s'_2) \sigma^{\mu\nu} u(-\mathbf{p}, s_2)), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

¹ The numerical results remain almost the same if the Blankenbecler-Sugar [29] equation was used instead.

where $C_{S,A,V,AV,T}$ are the LECs and $u(\bar{u})$ are the Dirac spinors,

$$u(\mathbf{p}, s) = N_p \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{E_p + M} \end{pmatrix} \chi_s, \quad N_p = \sqrt{\frac{E_p + M}{2M}} \quad (3)$$

with the Pauli spinor χ_s and E_p (M) the nucleon energy (mass). The one-pion-exchange potential in momentum space is

$$V_{\text{OPE}}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = -\frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2} \frac{(\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', s'_1) \boldsymbol{\tau}_1 \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q_\mu u(\mathbf{p}, s_1)) (\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', s'_2) \boldsymbol{\tau}_2 \gamma^\nu \gamma_5 q_\nu u(-\mathbf{p}, s_2))}{(E_{p'} - E_p)^2 - (\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p})^2 - m_\pi^2} \quad (4)$$

where m_π is the pion mass, \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' are initial and final three momentum, $g_A = 1.267$, and $f_\pi = 92.4 \text{ MeV}$. Note that the leading order relativistic potentials already contain all the six spin operators needed to describe nucleon-nucleon scattering.

The contact potentials can be projected into different partial waves in the $|LSJ\rangle$ basis, which read

$$\begin{aligned} V_{1S0} &= \xi_N [C_{1S0}(1 + R_p^2 R_{p'}^2) + \hat{C}_{1S0}(R_p^2 + R_{p'}^2)] \\ &= 4\pi C_{1S0} + \pi(C_{1S0} + \hat{C}_{1S0}) \left(\frac{p^2}{M^2} + \frac{p'^2}{M^2} \right) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{3S1} &= \frac{\xi_N}{9} [C_{3S1}(9 + R_p^2 R_{p'}^2) + \hat{C}_{3S1}(R_p^2 + R_{p'}^2)] \\ &= 4\pi C_{3S1} + \pi \left(C_{3S1} + \frac{\hat{C}_{1P1}}{9} \right) \left(\frac{p^2}{M^2} + \frac{p'^2}{M^2} \right) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$V_{3D1} = \frac{8\xi_N}{9} C_{3D1} R_p^2 R_{p'}^2 = \frac{2\pi C_{3D1}}{9M^2} pp', \quad (7)$$

$$V_{3S1-3D1} = \frac{2\sqrt{2}\xi_N}{9} (C_{3S1} R_p^2 R_{p'}^2 + \hat{C}_{3S1} R_p^2) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{9} \pi \hat{C}_{3S1} \frac{p^2}{M^2} + \dots, \quad (8)$$

$$V_{3D1-3S1} = \frac{2\sqrt{2}\xi_N}{9} (C_{3S1} R_p^2 R_{p'}^2 + \hat{C}_{3S1} R_{p'}^2) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{9} \pi \hat{C}_{3S1} \frac{p'^2}{M^2} + \dots, \quad (9)$$

$$V_{3P0} = -2\xi_N C_{3P0} R_p R_{p'} = \frac{-2\pi C_{3P0}}{M^2} pp', \quad (10)$$

$$V_{1P1} = -\frac{2\xi_N}{3} C_{1P1} R_p R_{p'} = \frac{-2\pi C_{1P1}}{3M^2} pp', \quad (11)$$

$$V_{3P1} = -\frac{4\xi_N}{3} C_{3P1} R_p R_{p'} = \frac{-4\pi C_{3P1}}{3M^2} pp', \quad (12)$$

where $\xi_N = 4\pi N_p^2 N_{p'}^2$, $R_p = |\mathbf{p}|/(E_p + M)$, $R_{p'} = |\mathbf{p}'|/(E_{p'} + M)$, p and p' are absolute value of \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{p}' , and “...” denote higher order chiral terms in the WPC. Note that the expansion in $1/M$ shown for V_{1S0} , V_{3S1} , $V_{3S1-3D1}$, and $V_{3D1-3S1}$ are only done to guide the comparison with the Weinberg approach. In our study, we use the full potential without any approximations. The

coefficients in the partial waves are linear combination of the LECs appearing in the Lagrangian,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{1S_0} &= (C_S + C_V + 3C_{AV} - 6C_T), \\
\hat{C}_{1S_0} &= (3C_V + C_A + C_{AV} - 6C_T), \\
C_{3P_0} &= (C_S - 4C_V + C_A - 4C_{AV} - 12C_T), \\
C_{1P_1} &= (C_S + C_A + 4C_T), \\
C_{3P_1} &= (C_S - 2C_V - C_A + 2C_{AV}), \\
C_{3S_1} &= (C_S + C_V - C_{AV} + 2C_T), \\
\hat{C}_{3S_1} &= 3(C_V - C_A - C_{AV} - 2C_T), \\
C_{3D_1} &= (C_S + C_V - C_{AV} + 2C_T).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We note that three of the eight partial wave coefficients are correlated, namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{3S_1} &= C_{3D_1}, \\
\hat{C}_{1S_0} &= C_{1S_0} - C_{3P_1}, \\
\hat{C}_{3S_1} &= 3C_{3S_1} - 3C_{1P_1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

A few remarks are in order. First, it is clear that in the limit of $M \rightarrow \infty$, only two LECs in the 1S_0 and 3S_1 channels remain, in agreement with the WPC. Second, the retainment of the full Dirac spinors in the Lagrangian not only leads to additional terms in the 1S_0 and 3S_1 partial waves², but also provides contributions to other channels which are counted as of higher (than LO) order in the WPC. These new contributions will not only affect the description of the covariant nucleon-nucleon phase shifts but also the renormalizability of the chiral nuclear force. The latter is the main focus of the present work. Third, in the covariant PC, some of the LECs contribute to different partial waves, which is different from the WPC, where a LEC only contributes to a particular partial wave. It should be noted that the above correlations are only valid at leading order, as can be explicitly checked using the higher order Lagrangians constructed in Ref. [40].

To take into account the non-perturbative nature of the nucleon-nucleon interaction, we solve the following Kadyshevsky equation with the above-obtained kernel potential, $V_{\text{LO}}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})$,

$$T(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) + \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{k}) \frac{M^2}{2E_k^2} \frac{1}{E_p - E_k + i\varepsilon} T(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}) \tag{15}$$

² A large contribution of the correction terms is known to be essential to describe the 1S_0 phase shifts [38, 39]

To avoid ultraviolet divergence, we need to introduce a regulator $f(p, p')$. In principle, physical observables should be independent of the choice of the regulator if the EFT is properly formulated, i.e., the EFT is RGI. Here we choose the commonly used separable cutoff function in momentum space, $f(p, p') = \exp\left[\frac{-p^{2n}-p'^{2n}}{\Lambda^{2n}}\right]$ with $n = 2$. The convenience of such a regulator lies in that it only depends on initial and final momenta so that it does not mix partial wave decomposition.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present the fitting strategy and results of the RG-analysis in all the $J = 0, 1$ partial waves.

A. Fitting strategy

Numerically, we fit the Nijmegen partial wave phase shifts of the np channel [41]. At LO, there are five linear independent LECs and they can be divided into three groups according to Eq.(14): 1) C_{3P_0} , 2) $C_{1S_0}, \hat{C}_{1S_0}, C_{3P_1}$, and 3) $C_{3S_1}, \hat{C}_{3S_1}, C_{1P_1}$. In groups 2 and 3, only two of the three LECs are linear independent.

Since our aim is to study the dependence of observables, here phase shifts, on the chosen value of the cutoff, we fit the coefficients of the partial wave potentials rather than the LECs of the Lagrangian. First, we fit C_{3P_0} to the 3P_0 phase shift at $T_{\text{lab.}} = 10$ MeV. Then we fit C_{3P_1} and C_{1S_0} to two 1S_0 phase shifts at $T_{\text{lab.}} = 10$ and 25 MeV. Last, we fit C_{1P_1} and C_{3S_1} to the 1P_1 and 3S_1 phase shifts at $T_{\text{lab.}} = 10$ MeV. In the fitting, we take into account that $\hat{C}_{1S_0} = C_{1S_0} - C_{3P_1}$ and $\hat{C}_{3S_1} = 3C_{3S_1} - 3C_{1P_1}$.

The reason why we adopt such a fitting strategy is that 3P_1 is not renormalization group invariant with a potential of the form $V_{3P_1} = \text{OPE} + C_{3P_1}pp'$, as shown in Ref. [42]. Therefore, we better use the two 1S_0 constants to predict the 3P_1 phase shifts since they are coupled in the covariant PC scheme. There will be more discussions in Sec. III D.

In the fitting, we define $\tilde{\chi}^2$ as $\tilde{\chi}^2 = (\delta_{\text{LO}} - \delta_{\text{PWA}})^2$, namely we neglect the uncertainties of the data as they are much smaller compared to higher chiral order contributions. In our study the momentum cutoff Λ is varied from 0.4 GeV to 10 GeV except for the 1S_0 and 3P_1 channels, due to the reasons explained below.




FIG. 1. Comparison of the 3P_0 , 1P_1 , and 3P_1 phase shifts (as functions of the Λ) for laboratory energies of 10 MeV (black solid lines), 50 MeV (red dashed lines), 100 MeV (green dotted lines), 190 MeV (blue dash-dotted lines), 300 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dotted lines). Phase shifts in the upper row are obtained in the covariant scheme, while those in the lower row are obtained in the Weinberg scheme. Note that only the OPE contribution is considered.

B. One-pion exchange in the covariant approach

It is instructive to compare at LO the covariant framework with the non-relativistic one, on which Weinberg counting is based, when only the long-range force present — OPE—is present. The phase shifts for different laboratory energies as a function of the cutoff are shown in Fig. 1. It is clear that the OPE is cutoff independent for the 1P_1 and 3P_1 channels, while it is not for the 3P_0 channel, where a limit-cycle-like behavior appears in both approaches. However, as already noticed in Ref. [24], the interval between adjacent cycles is bigger in the Kadyshevsky equation (used in the covariant scheme) than in the Lippmann-Schwinger approach (used in the Weinberg approach). In the present case, the second cycle appears at $\Lambda = 10.6$ GeV in the covariant scheme.

We note by passing that although the OPE in 3P_1 is cutoff independent, once a contact term is added and fixed by fitting to the corresponding phase shift, this channel becomes cutoff dependent, both in the present case and in Ref. [42].




FIG. 2. Phase shifts as functions of the cutoff Λ for laboratory energies of 10 MeV (black solid line), 50 MeV (red dashed line), 100 MeV (green dotted line), 190 MeV (blue dash-dotted line), 300 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dotted line) and as functions of laboratory energies with Λ of 600 MeV (red dashed line), 1000 MeV (green dotted line), 2000 MeV (blue dash-dotted line), 5000 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dotted line), 10000 MeV (magenta short dashed line). The black diamonds are the Nijmegen phase shifts [41].

C. Nucleon-nucleon phase shifts for 3P_0

We first discuss the much debate 3P_0 channel, where in the Weinberg scheme RGI is lost. In our covariant scheme, the 3P_0 channel is not coupled to any other channel and the corresponding contact potential is given in Eq.(13). The phase shifts as functions of Λ and laboratory energies are shown in Fig. 2. Clearly, the dependence on Λ becomes weaker and weaker with increasing Λ even for $T_{\text{lab.}}$ up to 300 MeV. Form the perspective of RGI, the covariant PC is consistent in this channel. The agreement is good up to $T_{\text{lab.}} = 200$ MeV. One should note that in Ref. [23], such a term was promoted to leading order in order to have RGI in this channel.

D. Nucleon-nucleon phase shifts for 1S_0 and 3P_1

In non-relativistic pion-less EFT, the Wigner bound [43] constrains more strongly the value taken by the effective range at higher cutoffs [44, 45]. We have observed numerically a similar bound in 1S_0 with the covariant integral equation (15): for cutoff values higher than ~ 650 MeV, the 1S_0 scattering length and effective range can not be fitted simultaneously to their empirical values. Regarding the previously stated fitting strategy, this means that, for high enough cutoff values, we can no longer make predictions on 3P_1 from 1S_0 inputs. With C_{3P_1} to be fitted to 3P_1 phase shifts, RGI is lost because OPE is singularly repulsive in this partial wave [42]. We note




FIG. 3. Cutoff dependence of the 1S_0 and 3P_1 phase shifts for laboratory energies of 10 MeV (black solid lines), 25 MeV (red dashed lines), 50 MeV (green dotted lines), 100 MeV (blue dash-dotted lines), 190 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dotted lines), and 300 MeV (magenta short dashed lines).

that one solution is suggested by recent works: perturbation theory in all partial waves except for 1S_0 , 3S_1 - 3D_1 , and 3P_0 [46, 47].

It is still worth studying these softer cutoffs, so we focus in the following on the region of $\Lambda = 400 - 650$ MeV. From Eq. (5), it is clear that the nominally higher order contributions can simulate the finite nature of the 1S_0 potential. With two LECS, we can reproduce the scattering length and effective range simultaneously. This implies that one can describe the corresponding phase shifts better than the LO Weinberg approach, as verified numerically in Ref. [33]. The phase shifts as functions of the cutoff Λ for 1S_0 and 3P_1 are shown in Fig. 3. One can see that the dependence on the cutoff in the limited cutoff region is rather weak for both 1S_0 and 3P_1 . Keep in mind that the later is predicted using $C_{3P_1} = C_{1S_0} - \hat{C}_{1S_0}$. In Fig. 4, we see that as the cutoff increases from 450 to 650 MeV, the description of the two phase shifts become better.

E. Nucleon-nucleon phase shifts for 3S_1 , 3D_1 , E_1 and 1P_1

The 3S_1 , 3D_1 , E_1 , and 1P_1 phase shifts as functions of Λ are shown in Fig. 5. It is seen that the dependence on Λ becomes weaker for larger Λ , indicating that in all these channels RGI is satisfied.

The phase shifts of these four channels are compared with those of the Nijmegen phase shifts in Fig. 6. For 3S_1 , the agreement is pretty good when the phase shifts converge. For 1P_1 , the agreement is good below $T_{\text{lab.}} = 70$ MeV. With the cutoff increasing, the deviation becomes larger at high laboratory energies and therefore higher chiral order contributions are needed. For E_1 ,




FIG. 4. Comparison of the 1S_0 and 3P_1 phase shifts (as functions of the laboratory energy) with Λ at 450 MeV (red dashed lines), 550 MeV (green dotted lines), 650 MeV (blue dash-dotted lines) with the Nijmegen phase shifts (black diamonds) [41].

the agreement with the Nijmegen analysis is quite good even up to $T_{\text{lab.}} = 300$ MeV when it converges. For 3D_1 , the agreement is good up to $T_{\text{lab.}} < 100$ MeV.

IV. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

In this work, we have analyzed renormalization group invariance of the leading order covariant chiral nucleon-nucleon force. There are five LECS in all the $J = 0, 1$ channels. We identified the relations among them and checked the consistency of power counting from the perspective of renormalization group invariance in the 3S_1 , 3D_1 , E_1 , 3P_0 , and 1P_1 channels. In the much discussed 3P_0 channel, renormalization group invariance is automatically satisfied in the covariant power counting as well. On the other hand, the 1S_0 and 3P_1 channels are correlated. Therefore, we fix the LECS C_{1S_0} and \hat{C}_{1S_0} by fitting to the 1S_0 phase shifts and use the relation $\hat{C}_{1S_0} = C_{1S_0} - C_{3P_1}$ to predict C_{3P_1} . Since the Wigner bound restricts the maximum cutoff allowed in this channel, we only varied the cutoff in a limited region of 400-650 MeV. The resulting phase shifts in the two channels turn out to be reasonable. Similar to the Weinberg power counting, the 3S_1 , 3D_1 , E_1 and 1P_1 channels are renormalization group invariant.

It must be noted that after many years of extensive studies, there is yet no consensus on the meaning of and no universally accepted solutions to the non-perturbative renormalization of the pionful chiral nuclear force. The present work should only be viewed a new attempt at tackling this long-standing problem from a different perspective. The results shown in the present work indicate that we are still far away from providing a solution and therefore more works are needed,




FIG. 5. The 3S_1 , 3D_1 , E_1 , and 1P_1 phase shifts for laboratory energies of 10 MeV (black solid lines), 50 MeV (red dashed lines), 100 MeV (green dotted lines), 190 MeV (blue dash-dot line), 300 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dotted lines) as functions of the cutoff Λ .

for instance, a detailed study along the same line at higher chiral orders.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CXW thanks Xiu-Lei Ren for useful discussions at the early stage of the present work. We would like to thank Manuel Pavon Valderrama and Bira van Kolck for stimulating discussions and comments in various occasions. This work is partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos.11735003, 11975041, 11775148, and 11961141004.

VI. APPENDIX

Here, we show the result of 3P_1 with C_{3P_1} fixed by fitting to the phase shift at 50 MeV in Fig. 7. It is clear that 3P_1 is not renormalization group invariant. This conclusion is similar to Ref. [48] where it is shown that contact interactions in 3P_1 , if treated non-perturbatively, destroy




FIG. 6. Comparison of the 3S_1 , 3D_1 , E_1 , and 1P_1 phase shifts (as function of the laboratory energy) with Λ at 600 MeV (red dashed lines), 1000 MeV (green dotted lines), 2000 MeV (blue dash-dotted lines), 5000 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dotted lines), 10000 MeV (magenta short dashed lines) with the Nijmegen phase shifts (black diamonds) [41].

the renormalizability of this channel .

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. **B251**, 288 (1990).
 - [2] S. Weinberg, Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 3 (1991).
 - [3] E. Epelbaum, H.-W. Hammer, and U.-G. Meissner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1773 (2009), arXiv:0811.1338 [nucl-th].
 - [4] R. Machleidt and D. R. Entem, Phys. Rept. **503**, 1 (2011), arXiv:1105.2919 [nucl-th].
 - [5] H. W. Hammer, S. König, and U. van Kolck, arXiv:1906.12122 [nucl-th].
 - [6] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B424**, 390 (1998), arXiv:nucl-th/9801034 [nucl-th].




FIG. 7. Phase shifts as functions of Λ for laboratory energy of 10 MeV (black solid line), 50 MeV (red dashed line), 100 MeV (green dotted line), 190 MeV (blue dash-dot line), 300 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dot line) and as functions of laboratory energies with Λ fixed at 600 MeV (red dash line), 1000 MeV (green dot line), 2000 MeV (blue dash-dot line), 5000 MeV (cyan dash-dot-dot line), 10000 MeV (magenta short dashed line). The black diamonds are the Nijmegen phase shifts [41].

- [7] C. J. Yang, arXiv:1905.12510 [nucl-th].
- [8] S. Weinberg, *Physica* **A96**, 327 (1979).
- [9] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Annals Phys.* **158**, 142 (1984).
- [10] G. Ecker, J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler, A. Pich, and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett.* **B223**, 425 (1989).
- [11] G. Ecker, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **35**, 1 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9501357 [hep-ph].
- [12] A. Pich, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **58**, 563 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9502366 [hep-ph].
- [13] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser, and U.-G. Meissner, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **E4**, 193 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9501384 [hep-ph].
- [14] S. R. Beane, P. F. Bedaque, L. Childress, A. Kryjevski, J. McGuire, and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev.* **A64**, 042103 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0010073 [quant-ph].
- [15] A. Nogga, R. G. E. Timmermans, and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev.* **C72**, 054006 (2005), arXiv:nucl-th/0506005 [nucl-th].
- [16] B. Long and U. van Kolck, *Annals Phys.* **323**, 1304 (2008), arXiv:0707.4325 [quant-ph].
- [17] B. Long and C. J. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **C84**, 057001 (2011), arXiv:1108.0985 [nucl-th].
- [18] B. Long and C. J. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **C85**, 034002 (2012), arXiv:1111.3993 [nucl-th].
- [19] B. Long and C. J. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **C86**, 024001 (2012), arXiv:1202.4053 [nucl-th].
- [20] M. C. Birse, *Phys. Rev.* **C74**, 014003 (2006), arXiv:nucl-th/0507077 [nucl-th].
- [21] T. Barford and M. C. Birse, *Phys. Rev.* **C67**, 064006 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0206146 [hep-ph].

- [22] M. Pavón Valderrama and D. R. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 082502 (2015), arXiv:1407.0437 [nucl-th].
- [23] E. Epelbaum and J. Gegelia, Phys. Lett. **B716**, 338 (2012), arXiv:1207.2420 [nucl-th].
- [24] K.-W. Li, X.-L. Ren, L.-S. Geng, and B. Long, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 014029 (2016), arXiv:1603.07802 [hep-ph].
- [25] V. Baru, E. Epelbaum, J. Gegelia, and X. L. Ren, Phys. Lett. **B798**, 134987 (2019), arXiv:1905.02116 [nucl-th].
- [26] X. L. Ren, E. Epelbaum, and J. Gegelia, (), arXiv:1911.05616 [nucl-th].
- [27] X.-L. Ren, K.-W. Li, L.-S. Geng, B.-W. Long, P. Ring, and J. Meng, Chin. Phys. **C42**, 014103 (2018), arXiv:1611.08475 [nucl-th].
- [28] V. G. Kadyshevsky, Nucl. Phys. **B6**, 125 (1968).
- [29] R. Blankenbecler and R. Sugar, Phys. Rev. **142**, 1051 (1966).
- [30] K.-W. Li, X.-L. Ren, L.-S. Geng, and B.-W. Long, Chin. Phys. **C42**, 014105 (2018), arXiv:1612.08482 [nucl-th].
- [31] J. Song, K.-W. Li, and L.-S. Geng, Phys. Rev. **C97**, 065201 (2018), arXiv:1802.04433 [nucl-th].
- [32] K.-W. Li, T. Hyodo, and L.-S. Geng, Phys. Rev. **C98**, 065203 (2018), arXiv:1809.03199 [nucl-th].
- [33] X.-L. Ren, K.-W. Li, L.-S. Geng, and J. Meng, (), arXiv:1712.10083 [nucl-th].
- [34] M. Sánchez Sánchez, C. J. Yang, B. Long, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. **C97**, 024001 (2018), arXiv:1704.08524 [nucl-th].
- [35] J. Gegelia and G. Japaridze, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 114038 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9908377 [hep-ph].
- [36] T. Fuchs, J. Gegelia, G. Japaridze, and S. Scherer, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 056005 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0302117 [hep-ph].
- [37] L. Geng, Front. Phys.(Beijing) **8**, 328 (2013), arXiv:1301.6815 [nucl-th].
- [38] J. Soto and J. Tarrus, Phys. Rev. **C78**, 024003 (2008), arXiv:0712.3404 [nucl-th].
- [39] B. Long, Phys. Rev. **C88**, 014002 (2013), arXiv:1304.7382 [nucl-th].
- [40] Y. Xiao, L.-S. Geng, and X.-L. Ren, Phys. Rev. **C99**, 024004 (2019), arXiv:1812.03005 [nucl-th].
- [41] V. G. J. Stoks, R. A. M. Klomp, M. C. M. Rentmeester, and J. J. de Swart, Phys. Rev. **C48**, 792 (1993).
- [42] C. J. Yang, C. Elster, and D. R. Phillips, Phys. Rev. **C80**, 034002 (2009), arXiv:0901.2663 [nucl-th].
- [43] E. P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **98**, 145 (1955).
- [44] D. R. Phillips and T. D. Cohen, Phys. Lett. **B390**, 7 (1997), arXiv:nucl-th/9607048 [nucl-th].

- [45] D. R. Phillips, S. R. Beane, and T. D. Cohen, *Annals Phys.* **263**, 255 (1998), arXiv:hep-th/9706070 [hep-th].
- [46] S. Wu and B. Long, *Phys. Rev.* **C99**, 024003 (2019), arXiv:1807.04407 [nucl-th].
- [47] D. B. Kaplan, arXiv:1905.07485 [nucl-th].
- [48] C. J. Yang, C. Elster, and D. R. Phillips, *Phys. Rev.* **C80**, 044002 (2009), arXiv:0905.4943 [nucl-th].