

Sub-barrier $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$ scattering and sensitivity to nucleon-nucleon interactions

Peng Yin,^{1,2} Weijie Du*,² Wei Zuo,^{1,3} Xingbo Zhao,^{1,3} and James P. Vary²

¹*CAS Key Laboratory of High Precision Nuclear Spectroscopy,*

Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou 730000, China

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA*

³*School of Nuclear Science and Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

We employ the non-perturbative time-dependent basis function (tBF) approach to investigate in detail the sub-Coulomb barrier scattering of the deuteron projectile on the ^{208}Pb target. Specifically, we treat the target as a quiescent source of a strong external Coulomb field that induces higher-order effects in electric-dipole excitations of the deuteron projectile including the population of states not accessible through direct electric-dipole transitions from the ground state of the deuteron. We calculate the electric-dipole polarizability of the deuteron and elastic scattering observables for comparison with experimental data. With no adjustable parameters, the tBF approach provides good agreement with experimentally available differential cross-section ratios. The dependence of these measured quantities on nucleon-nucleon interactions is investigated. The effects of the polarization potential on the scattering observables are also presented in this work. We also investigate the detailed scattering dynamics and identify characteristics of coherent and incoherent processes.

PACS numbers: 13.75.Cs, 21.10.Ky, 21.60.De, 24.10.-i, 25.70.De.

I. INTRODUCTION

As the existing and upcoming radioactive ion beam facilities provide unique access to the exotic phenomena in nuclear physics, reliable reaction theory is crucial for establishing a substantial connection between the measured reaction observables and the underlying nuclear structure. While phenomenological reaction theories and standard approximation methods are playing a significant role in modeling nuclear reaction data, reaction approaches, that start from the *ab initio* calculations of nuclear structure, have been developed and turn out to be numerically tractable and successful in describing reactions involving light nuclei. For few-body systems with nucleon number $A \leq 4$, the Faddeev [1], Faddeev-Yakubovsky [2, 3], hyperspherical harmonics (HH) [4, 5], the Alt, Grassberger, and Sandhas (AGS) [6, 7], resonating group method (RGM) [8], etc., are applicable and successful. For systems with more than four nucleons, additional approaches, such as the Lorentz integral transform (LIT) methods [9–12], the Green's function Monte Carlo (GFMC) [13], the fermionic molecular dynamics (FMD) [14], no-core shell model (NCSM) with RGM [15–18] and the single-state harmonic oscillator representation of scattering equations (SS-HORSE) method [19] have been proposed and applied. However, these approaches may be challenged to retain the full, non-perturbative quantal coherence of all the potentially relevant intermediate and final states in nucleus-nucleus reactions, especially for reactions involving unstable rare isotopes.

In Refs. [20, 21], we proposed the theoretical framework of the non-perturbative time-dependent basis function (tBF) approach. The tBF method establishes a firm connection between *ab initio* nuclear structure approaches, e.g., the NCSM [22], and nuclear reaction theory. Its counterpart in relativistic quantum field theory, the time-dependent basis light front quantization approach, has been applied to investigate the non-linear Compton scattering [23, 24], the interaction of an electron with intense electromagnetic field [25] and the scattering of a quark on a heavy nucleus [26, 27] at high energies. The key point of the tBF method is the construction of the basis representation for the scattering problem, employing the eigenstates of the system being investigated (a rare isotope beam in future applications) that are obtained with *ab initio* nuclear structure approaches. Based on this basis representation, we solve the equation of motion (EOM) of the scattering process numerically as an initial value problem in a non-perturbative manner, where the quantal coherence is fully retained during the reaction process. It is noteworthy that the tBF approach appears to be well-suited as a forefront application of quantum computing in nuclear scattering dynamics [28].

In Ref. [29], we improved the tBF method and employed it to investigate the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb well below the Coulomb barrier of approximately 11 MeV. By considering all the possible electric-dipole ($E1$) transition paths among all the states in the deuteron projectile and the polarization potential, we successfully described the experimental data of elastic cross-section ratios with the tBF method employing a realistic nucleon-nucleon (NN) interaction from the chiral effective field theory (EFT). No adjustable parameters were introduced. In the present

* Corresponding author: duweigy@gmail.com

work, we study the detailed dynamics for the scattering of $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$ with the deuteron incident energy $E_d = 7$ MeV and the scattering angle $\theta = 150^\circ$ using the tBF method. We also calculate the angular distribution of the elastic differential cross-section at $E_d = 5 - 7$ MeV and investigate the effect of the polarization potential. In addition, we calculate the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron and ratios of elastic scattering cross sections (at $E_d = 3 - 7$ MeV) to compare with experimental data and present their dependence on NN interactions.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we present the theoretical framework of the tBF approach. We show the main results in Sec. III. Finally we give a summary of our conclusions and an outlook in Sec. IV.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE TBF APPROACH

In this work we investigate the scattering of the deuteron projectile on the ^{208}Pb target below the Coulomb barrier employing the tBF approach. When the Sommerfeld parameter

$$\eta = \frac{Ze^2}{v} \quad (1)$$

is much larger than unity, one may reasonably adopt a semi-classical approach for the scattering trajectory [30, 31]. Here Z represents the charge of our target ($Z = 82$ for Pb), e is the unit of electric charge and v represents the incident velocity of the deuteron. Note that we adopt the natural unit and set $\hbar = c = 1$ throughout the paper. The minimum value of the Sommerfeld parameter in this work is 6.93 (corresponding to the maximum incident deuteron energy 7 MeV). Therefore we assume, for the applications in the present work, that the center of mass (COM) of the deuteron projectile moves along a classical trajectory. We then construct the time-dependent Schrödinger equation of the scattering process describing how the external field provided by the ^{208}Pb target induces the internal transitions in the deuteron projectile during the scattering. The main idea of the tBF approach is to solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation within a basis representation determined from *ab initio* nuclear structure calculations.

We do not consider the excitation of ^{208}Pb since its spin-parity (3^-) requires a high multipole ($E3$) transition, its excitation energy (2.6 MeV) is also rather high [32] and the deuteron provides an external excitation potential acting on the lead target that is 82 times weaker than it experiences from the lead target. Hence, this 3^- excitation of ^{208}Pb is expected to be at least two orders of magnitude smaller than the Coulomb dissociation of the deuteron for $E_d = 3 - 7$ MeV, as previously noted [33]. The influence of vacuum polarization, atomic screening and relativistic corrections on the elastic cross-section ratios is found to be small [33, 34] and therefore these effects are also not taken into account in this work. We found the effects of the magnetic dipole ($M1$) transitions to be negligibly small compared to the effects of the $E1$ transitions below the Coulomb barrier and would not affect the conclusions of this paper so we omit the $M1$ transitions at the present time [29].

A. Determination of the trajectory

We show in Fig. 1 the sketch of the scattering setup. We set the scattering plane to be the xz plane. We assume that the ^{208}Pb target is infinitely massive and we then work in the lab frame. For the low incident energies considered, we assume that the ^{208}Pb target is a point-like nucleus located at the origin during the scattering. The initial velocity of the deuteron projectile is parallel to the z axis. E_d and b denote the bombarding energy of the deuteron and the impact parameter, respectively. θ represents the scattering angle. The time-dependent vector $\mathbf{R}_d(t)$ denotes the position of the COM of the neutron-proton (np) system with respect to the origin during the scattering. We calculate the trajectory assuming that the deuteron projectile is initially located at $(x, z) = (b, z_0)$ at $t = 0$ as shown in Fig. 1. Specifically, we adopt $z_0 = -300 \text{ MeV}^{-1}$ ($\approx -59200 \text{ fm}$) for which the scattering observables investigated in this work are converged to the order of 10^{-5} [29].

In the non-relativistic limit, the trajectory for the scattering of two electric point charges is given by the well known Rutherford trajectory. When two nuclei approach to distances comparable to the sum of their radii, they interact through the strong nuclear potential and the trajectory will deviate from the Rutherford trajectory. Even for scatterings well below the Coulomb barrier, where the nuclear effects become small, some other effects will also lead to deviations from the Rutherford trajectory. One of the most important effects is expected to arise from dipole polarization [34].

During the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb , the charge distribution in the projectile is distorted by the electric field of the target. Then the proton and the neutron in the deuteron are forced to larger amplitudes of relative motion with the proton repelled away from the Pb target relative to the neutron. This effect is usually referred to as the dipole polarization of the projectile. In this work, the effect of the dipole polarization will be represented by a polarization




FIG. 1: (Color online) A sketch for the scattering of the deuteron projectile on the ^{208}Pb target. See the text for details.

potential acting on the COM of the deuteron during the scattering process. Simultaneously, we will treat the effects of the external field on the relative motion inside the deuteron at the quantum amplitude level in tBF.

Taking into account the dipole polarization effect of the deuteron projectile, the trajectory of the projectile is determined by the following combined potential

$$V_{\text{pot}} = V_c + V_{\text{pol}}, \quad (2)$$

where V_c and V_{pol} denote the Coulomb potential and the polarization potential, respectively, acting on the projectile COM. Omitting the correction of the polarization potential, the trajectory takes the form of the conventional hyperbolic Rutherford trajectory.

Applying second-order perturbation theory [30, 33–35], the polarization potential is written as

$$V_{\text{pol}} = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha \frac{Z^2 e^2}{R_d^4(t)}. \quad (3)$$

α denotes the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron which is defined as [30]

$$\alpha = \frac{8\pi}{9} \sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{B(E1; 0 \rightarrow n)}{(E_n - E_0)}, \quad (4)$$

where the indexes 0 and n denote the ground state and the scattering states of the deuteron, respectively. $B(E1; 0 \rightarrow n)$ represents the $E1$ strength for the coupling between the deuteron ground state and the scattering state, which is calculated as follows

$$B(E1; 0 \rightarrow n) = \sum_{M_n, \mu} |\langle \beta_0, M_0 | \mathcal{M}(E1, \mu) | \beta_n, M_n \rangle|^2. \quad (5)$$

$|\beta_j\rangle$ denotes the wave function of the deuteron ground state ($j = 0$) or the scattering state ($j > 0$), which is calculated by solving the following eigenequation:

$$H_0 |\beta_j\rangle = E_j |\beta_j\rangle, \quad (6)$$

with E_j the eigenenergy of the state $|\beta_j\rangle$. H_0 represents the fully interacting Hamiltonian for the intrinsic motion of the np system in the absence of any external fields:

$$H_0 = T_{\text{rel}} + V_{\text{NN}}, \quad (7)$$

with T_{rel} and V_{NN} being the relative kinetic energy and the NN interaction, respectively. M_0 and M_n in Eq. (5) represent the total angular momentum projections of $|\beta_0\rangle$ and $|\beta_n\rangle$, respectively, while μ is the angular momentum

projection of the $E1$ operator so that $M_n + \mu = M_0$. In practice we obtain $|\beta_j\rangle$ by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian H_0 in the harmonic oscillator (HO) basis, which is characterized by the basis strength ω and the basis truncation parameter $N_{\max}$ (defined as the maximum of twice the radial quantum number plus the orbital angular momentum) [22, 36]. In the HO basis, the scattering states are discretized. In what follows, we therefore check for the convergence of the scattering observables with increasing basis space cutoff $N_{\max}$ for a range of values of ω . $\mathcal{M}(E1, \mu)$ in Eq. (5) is the $E1$ operator which is expressed in the internal coordinates of the deuteron as

$$\mathcal{M}(E1, \mu) = \sum_{k=n,p} e_k r_k Y_{1\mu}(\theta_k, \phi_k). \quad (8)$$

where $Y_{\lambda\mu}$ denotes the spherical harmonics ($\lambda = 1$ denotes the dipole component) in the Condon-Shortley convention. e_k and $\mathbf{r}_k = (r_k, \theta_k, \phi_k)$ are the charge and the position vector of the proton ($k = p$) or neutron ($k = n$) in the deuteron projectile.

In this work, we adopt five NN interactions for our investigations: the JISP16 [37, 38], Daejeon16 [39] NN interactions and three NN interactions from the chiral EFT. Specifically, we select the Low Energy Nuclear Physics International Collaboration (LENPIC) NN interactions [40–43] for the chiral EFT interactions, which have been developed for each chiral order up through $N^4\text{LO}$. These LENPIC interactions employ a semilocal coordinate-space regulator and we take the interactions with the regulator range of 1.0 fm. We take three LENPIC interactions at the chiral orders of $N^2\text{LO}$, $N^3\text{LO}$ and $N^4\text{LO}$, which we refer to as “LENPIC- $N^2\text{LO}$ ”, “LENPIC- $N^3\text{LO}$ ” and “LENPIC- $N^4\text{LO}$ ”, respectively.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Trajectory of the deuteron incident from the negative z direction and scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 7$ MeV to the final angle of $\theta = 150^\circ$. Distances are marked in units of MeV^{-1} . Inset: amplification of the trajectories near the closest approach. The dashed and solid lines denote the results with and without the polarization potential respectively.

As an example, we show in Fig. 2 the trajectories of the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb with the incident energy $E_d = 7$ MeV and the scattering angle $\theta = 150^\circ$, determined by V_c (solid line) or $V_c + V_{\text{pol}}$ [Eq. (2)] (dashed line). Note that the trajectory determined by V_c corresponds to the Rutherford trajectory. We adopt the polarization potential in Eq. (3) with $\alpha = 0.635 \text{ fm}^3$ which was determined in Ref. [29] for the LENPIC- $N^4\text{LO}$ interaction. We find that the effect of the polarization potential on the trajectory is almost invisible in the large scale. However, the difference between these two trajectories are visible near the closest approach (see the inset). In particular, the correction of the attractive polarization potential leads to a slightly smaller distance of closest approach for this scattering angle compared to the result of the Rutherford trajectory.

B. EOM for the scattering

The full Hamiltonian of the deuteron projectile moving in the time-dependent background field provided by the ^{208}Pb target can be written as

$$H_{\text{full}}(t) = H_0 + V_{\text{int}}(t), \quad (9)$$

where $V_{\text{int}}(t)$ denotes the time-dependent interaction between the projectile and the target during the scattering. The EOM of the projectile during the scattering, in the interaction picture, can be written as

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\psi; t\rangle_I = e^{iH_0 t} V_{\text{int}}(t) e^{-iH_0 t} |\psi; t\rangle_I \equiv V_I(t) |\psi; t\rangle_I, \quad (10)$$

where $V_I(t)$ denotes the time-dependent interaction between the projectile and the target in the interaction picture. The subscript ‘‘I’’ specifies the interaction picture. The wave function of the projectile at $t \geq t_0$ can be solved as

$$|\psi; t\rangle_I = U_I(t; t_0) |\psi; t_0\rangle_I, \quad (11)$$

where t_0 denotes the time when the deuteron projectile is in its initial state. $U_I(t; t_0)$ is the unitary operator for the time-evolution

$$U_I(t; t_0) = \hat{T} e^{-i \int_{t_0}^t V_I(t') dt'}, \quad (12)$$

with $\hat{T}$ the time-ordering operator towards the future.

C. Numerical solution of the EOM

The internal transitions in the deuteron projectile are negligible for large separation of the projectile and the target $R_d(t)$. To improve the computational efficiency, we do not consider the internal transitions in the deuteron projectile before $t = t_0$ where $R_d(t < t_0)$ is larger than R_d^c , which will be determined in the following. We initiate the internal transitions from the position $R_d(t_0) = R_d^c$.

To solve the EOM numerically, we divide the interval $[t_0, t]$ into n segments with the equal time step $\delta t = (t - t_0)/n$, which must be sufficiently small to attain numerically stable results. We then replace the integration in the time-evolution operator $U_I(t; t_0)$ by additive increments and keep only terms up to the order of δt in the following Taylor expansion:

$$U_I(t; t_0) \longrightarrow [1 - iV_I(t)\delta t][1 - iV_I(t_{n-1})\delta t] \cdots [1 - iV_I(t_1)\delta t]. \quad (13)$$

The numerical solution of the EOM according to Eq. (13) is called the Euler scheme, which was found numerically unstable during the time-evolution [44]. We therefore employ the non-perturbative multistep differencing scheme up to the second-order (MSD2 scheme) [45] to obtain the time-dependent wave function of the deuteron projectile in our tBF method. Using the MSD2 scheme, we evaluate the state vector at the first time step ($t_1 = t_0 + \delta t$) still via the Euler Scheme:

$$|\psi; t_1\rangle_I = [1 - iV_I(t_0)\delta t] |\psi; t_0\rangle_I. \quad (14)$$

However, we calculate the state vector at $t' = t_2, t_3, \dots, t_{n-1}$ with

$$|\psi; t' + \delta t\rangle_I = |\psi; t'\rangle_I - 2iV_I(t')\delta t |\psi; t'\rangle_I. \quad (15)$$

In this work, we take $R_d^c = 5 \text{ MeV}^{-1} (\approx 987 \text{ fm})$ and $\delta t = 0.0001 \text{ MeV}^{-1}$ under which the calculated observables are converged up to the fifth significant figure as illustrated in Ref. [29].

D. State vector and interaction in the basis representation

In the numerical implementation of the MSD2 scheme [Eq. (14) and Eq. (15)], we calculate the time-dependent state vector of the deuteron projectile in a basis representation formed by the deuteron bound and scattering states, i.e., $\{|\beta_j, M_j\rangle\}$. In this basis representation, the state vector of the deuteron projectile at any moment t is written as

$$|\psi; t\rangle_I = \sum_j A_j^I(t) |\beta_j, M_j\rangle, \quad (16)$$

where $A_j^I(t)$ is the amplitude corresponding to the basis $|\beta_j, M_j\rangle$. The time-dependent interaction $V_I(t)$ becomes a matrix in this basis representation. We consider only the $E1$ component of the Coulomb interaction between the projectile and the target since that is known to be the dominant deuteron excitation mode for sub-barrier scatterings [34]. We calculate the matrix elements of the $E1$ interaction as follows:

$$\langle \beta_j, M_j | V_I(t) | \beta_k, M_k \rangle = -\frac{4\pi}{3} Z e^2 e^{i(E_j - E_k)t} \sum_{\mu} \frac{Y_{1\mu}^*(\Omega_R)}{|R_d(t)|^2} \int d\mathbf{r} \langle \beta_j, M_j | \mathbf{r} \rangle \frac{r}{2} Y_{1\mu}(\Omega_r) \langle \mathbf{r} | \beta_k, M_k \rangle, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_p - \mathbf{r}_n$ denotes the relative coordinates of the deuteron projectile. After adopting an initial state $|\psi; t_0\rangle_I = \sum_j A_j^I(t_0) |\beta_j, M_j\rangle$ in the above basis representation, we can calculate the state vector of the deuteron projectile at $t > t_0$ with Eq. (14) and Eq. (15) straightforwardly. It is noteworthy that the time-varying $R_d(t)$ (separation between the COMs of the projectile and the target) in Eq. (17) provides the only source of the time-dependence in the present scattering problem.

E. Observables

In this work, we calculate the differential cross-section for elastic scattering by

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{el}} = P_{\text{el}} \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{class}}, \quad (18)$$

where the elastic scattering probability P_{el} is obtained by summing over the probabilities in the three orientations of the deuteron ground state after the time-evolution with the tBF method. That is, we take into account the spin flips of the deuteron ground state, a higher-order process, in the elastic channel which would be appropriate for experiments that do not measure the spin of the deuteron in the final state. $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{class}}$ denotes the classical differential cross-section, which is calculated using a trajectory determined by the adopted potential acting on the COM of the deuteron (either V_c or V_{pot}). Specifically, we calculate $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{class}}$ with

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{class}} = \frac{b}{\sin \theta} \left| \frac{db}{d\theta} \right|, \quad (19)$$

where b and θ denote the impact parameter and the scattering angle, respectively. For reference, in the case where V_c alone is used, the Rutherford cross-section would emerge since $b = \frac{Ze^2}{2E_d} \cot\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)$.

In order to compare with available experimental data [33], we calculate the following quantity

$$R(E_d) = \frac{\sigma(3 \text{ MeV}, \theta_1) \sigma(E_d, \theta_2)}{\sigma(3 \text{ MeV}, \theta_2) \sigma(E_d, \theta_1)}, \quad (20)$$

where $\sigma(E_d, \theta) = 2\pi \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{el}}$ denotes the differential cross-section of the elastically scattered deuterons at the angle θ with the bombarding energy E_d .

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this work we set the initial state of the deuteron projectile to be its ground state ($^3S_1 - ^3D_1$ channel). The polarization will be defined for each of the specific applications below. Since $E1$ transitions respect the conservation of the total spin S of the np system, we take only channels with $S = 1$ into account. We restrict the total angular momentum J to be $J \leq 2$ though higher angular momentum states could, in principle, be populated through higher-order transitions. We introduce a quantity E_{cut} to represent the upper energy limit of the retained scattering states of the np system. To be specific, we adopt the eigenstates of the np system with eigenenergies below E_{cut} in $^3S_1 - ^3D_1$, 3P_0 , 3P_1 , 3D_2 and $^3P_2 - ^3F_2$ channels to form the basis representation of the tBF approach in this work.

In Fig. 3, we show the spectra of the deuteron in five channels ($^3S_1 - ^3D_1$, 3P_0 , 3P_1 , $^3P_2 - ^3F_2$, and 3D_2) below 14 MeV calculated with $\omega = 20$ MeV and a sequence of N_{max} truncations by adopting the LENPIC-N⁴LO interaction. We also show the number of states in these five channels which takes into account the degeneracy with respect to the magnetic quantum number of each state. The set of states for a given truncation forms the basis representation of the tBF approach as in Eq. (16) which is used to solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. The deuteron bound state energy becomes well converged with increasing N_{max} and tends to the experimental value. As the basis




FIG. 3: (Color online) The deuteron spectrum, up to $E_{\text{cut}} = 14$ MeV for $S = 1$ and $J \leq 2$, as a function of N_{max} obtained with the LENPIC-N⁴LO interaction with $\omega = 20$ MeV. The horizontal dashed line denotes the boundary between the bound and scattering states. We indicate the energy of the deuteron ground state below the lowest level of each spectrum.

truncation N_{max} increases, we find that the discretized scattering states become increasingly dense and flow towards the breakup threshold as expected. The ultimate test of sufficiency of the continuum discretization will be the convergence rate of specific experimental observables with increasing N_{max} as we will address below.

In Fig. 4 (a), we show the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron, α , as a function of the truncation parameter of the HO basis, N_{max} , for the LENPIC (-N²LO, -N³LO, -N⁴LO), JISP16 and Daejeon16 NN interactions with the identical strength of the HO basis $\omega = 20$ MeV. We also show two sets of results extracted from experiments along with their quoted uncertainties for comparison. We find in Fig. 4 (a) that the $E1$ polarizabilities of the deuteron calculated with these five NN interactions converge to different values at sufficiently large N_{max} , which are all consistent with the experimental data.

The LENPIC-N³LO and LENPIC-N⁴LO interactions are known to provide challenges for obtaining converged spectra in *ab initio* calculations in light nuclei [43]. Since the HO basis space parameters can be characterized by an ultraviolet (UV) cutoff $\Lambda = \sqrt{m_N(N_{\text{max}} + 3/2)}\omega$ (m_N is the nucleon mass) [47, 48], we can deduce from Fig. 4 that the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron for fixed ω requires a sufficiently large N_{max} for these interactions to access their higher-momentum contributions. One may interpret the erratic oscillations at small N_{max} for these two interactions in Fig. 4 (a) as arising from basis spaces that are deficient in the needed high-momentum contributions. However, the results calculated with the LENPIC-N²LO, JISP16 and Daejeon16 show smooth trends at low to moderate N_{max} indicating that these three interactions are softer in the UV region than the LENPIC-N³LO and LENPIC-N⁴LO interactions. Above about $N_{\text{max}} = 40$ at $\omega = 20$ MeV, we observe that all these five NN interactions produce a similar trend reflecting similar accumulations of the long-range (infra-red region) components of the nuclear wave function that contribute to the $E1$ polarizability.

In Fig. 4 (b), we present the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron as a function of N_{max} , calculated with the LENPIC-N⁴LO interaction with various ω values. The results with different ω values converge to the same asymptotic value at sufficiently large N_{max} . However, different ω values result in different convergence patterns at small N_{max} . In particular, we observe erratic fluctuations at small N_{max} for small ω values. However, these fluctuations vanish at large ω since the UV cutoff Λ increases with ω and the physics at high-momentum is more adequately accommodated at larger ω and small to moderate N_{max} .

We summarize in Table I the $E1$ polarizabilities of the deuteron at $N_{\text{max}} = 240$ obtained with the LENPIC (-N²LO, -N³LO, -N⁴LO), JISP16 and Daejeon16 interactions with $\omega = 20$ MeV. The uncertainty for each interaction denotes the absolute difference between the result at $N_{\text{max}} = 240$ and the result at $N_{\text{max}} = 280$. The results calculated with the




FIG. 4: (Color online) The $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron as a function $N_{\max}$. The results in panel (a) are obtained using five different NN interactions with $\omega = 20$ MeV. The results in panel (b) are calculated employing the LENPIC- N^4 LO interaction with various ω values. Two experimental results and their uncertainty bands from Ref. [33] (blue region) and Ref. [46] (green region) are presented for comparison.

TABLE I: The $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron, α , for 11 NN interactions and two results extracted from experiments.

	α (fm ³)	Refs.
LENPIC- N^2 LO	0.6292(1)	this work
LENPIC- N^3 LO	0.6352(1)	this work
LENPIC- N^4 LO	0.6349(1)	this work
JISP16	0.6164(1)	this work
Daejeon16	0.6658(1)	this work
Reid soft core (68)	0.6237	[49]
Reid soft core (93)	0.6345	[49]
Argonne V ₁₄	0.6419	[49]
Argonne V ₁₈	0.6343	[49]
Bonn (CS)	0.6336	[49]
Paris	0.6352	[49]
Exp.	0.70(5)	[33]
Exp.	0.61(4)	[46]

three LENPIC interactions differ from each other by less than 1%. The JISP16 and Daejeon16 interactions predict the smallest and the largest $E1$ polarizabilities of the deuteron, respectively. The spread of the $E1$ polarizability, induced by these five interactions, is about 8%. For comparison, we also show in Table I the $E1$ polarizabilities of the deuteron extracted from experiments in Refs. [33, 46] and those obtained with the Reid soft core (68) [50], Reid soft core (93) [51], Argonne V₁₄ [52], Argonne V₁₈ [53] and Bonn (CS) [54] interactions in Ref. [49]. The results obtained in our work and prior theoretical results [49], all shown in Table I, are consistent with experiment [33, 46].




FIG. 5: (Color online) Probability of the initial state as a function of the evolution time at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$ for various $N_{\max}$ [panel (a)] and E_{cut} [panel (b)].

In Fig. 5, we display the probability of the deuteron remaining in its initial state, which we refer to as P_0 , as a function of the evolution time during the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$, calculated with the tBF method employing the LENPIC- $N^4\text{LO}$ interaction with $\omega = 20$ MeV at various $N_{\max}$ values [panel (a)] and various E_{cut} values [panel (b)]. We adopt the trajectory, determined by $V_c + V_{\text{pol}}$ [see Eq. (2)] with $\alpha = 0.635 \text{ fm}^3$, in the tBF method as in Fig. 2. In the following we will use the same NN interaction and the polarization potential as in Fig. 5 unless explicitly stated otherwise. We take a polarized deuteron with the total angular momentum projection $M_0 = -1$ in its ground state for the initial state. We show the results for different $N_{\max}$ and E_{cut} to investigate the convergence of P_0 with respect to these two truncation parameters.

In the early stage of the time-evolution, the probability P_0 decreases with time but is still very close to 1 since the interaction between the projectile and the target is very weak. This deviation from unity is not visible in Fig. 5. When the deuteron projectile is sufficiently close to the ^{208}Pb target, transitions become significant and therefore the probability P_0 drops sharply below unity before partially recovering, with an oscillatory fine structure, towards the final value at longer times.

Eventually the probability P_0 relaxes to its asymptotic value as the Coulomb field fades away. We notice in Fig. 5 that the asymptotic value of the probability P_0 is well converged with respect to the truncation parameters $N_{\max}$ and E_{cut} . The uncertainty of P_0 induced by $N_{\max}$ and E_{cut} is on the order of 10^{-4} . In all remaining calculations, we take $N_{\max} = 200$, $\omega = 20$ MeV and $E_{\text{cut}} = 14$ MeV, which provides 165 states of the np system. We deem this to be sufficient since we find the observables that we investigate are converged to the order of 10^{-4} under this choice.

In Fig. 6, we show the time-evolution of the probabilities of all the states, except for the initial state, for the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$, calculated by the tBF method. We take the same initial state (i.e., a polarized deuteron ground state with $M_0 = -1$) as in Fig. 5. We signify the states, allowed and forbidden by the $E1$ transition operator acting on our initial state in first-order perturbation theory, by the solid and the dashed curves in Fig. 6, respectively. For simplicity, we will refer to these states as “ $E1$ allowed” and “ $E1$ forbidden”, respectively.

In the early stage of the time-evolution in Fig. 6, only $E1$ allowed states populate significantly. We note that six of them (see the legend of Fig. 6) populate well above the others before reaching the crest. The wave functions of the first, third and fifth states in the $^3P_2 - ^3F_2$ channel are dominated by the 3P_2 component and therefore obtain significant populations from the 3S_1 component of the deuteron ground state in this stage, according to the $E1$ selection rules. However, the second and fourth states in the $^3P_2 - ^3F_2$ channel, which are dominated by the 3F_2 channel, are not able to populate via direct transitions from the 3S_1 component of the deuteron ground state and therefore are less populated than the first, third and fifth states in this channel. The populations of the $E1$ forbidden states are very small, but still non-zero, during this early stage. Of course, $E1$ forbidden states populate via transitions from the $E1$ allowed states according to the $E1$ selection rule. Therefore, as expected, the $E1$ forbidden states do not populate




FIG. 6: (Color online) Probabilities, on a semi-log scale, of the deuteron ground state with $M_0 = 0$ and $M_0 = 1$ and the deuteron scattering states as functions of the evolution time for the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$. The solid and the dashed curves represent the states allowed and forbidden respectively by the $E1$ transition operator acting on the initial state with $M_0 = -1$ in first-order perturbation theory. We show in the legend the six states (e.g., “1st, $^3\text{P}_2$ - $^3\text{F}_2$ ” denotes the lowest state in the $^3\text{P}_2$ - $^3\text{F}_2$ channel) with the largest probabilities before the crest. These states are labeled in ascending order of excitation energy in the spectrum of the deuteron.

significantly until the $E1$ allowed states accumulate appreciable populations. Note that the de-excitations among all the states are also taken into account in the tBF method. One may be able to visualize that an entire complex web of quantum excitations and de-excitations is evolving with time and Fig. 6 attempts to portray some aspects of the probability flow among these states.

We show in Fig. 7 the probability of the deuteron remaining in its initial state (the deuteron ground state with $M_0 = -1$) as a function of the evolution time during the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$ with three different sets of transition couplings. In other words, the deviation of the asymptotic value of P_0 from unity measures the inelastic effects. The black solid line denotes the tBF results with all the possible couplings among all the 165 states included. The red dashed line, signified as “Type I”, represents the case where we retain only the couplings between the initial state and its $E1$ allowed states (60 states in total). The blue dotted line, signified as “Type II”, represents the case where we retain the couplings between the initial state and the six states, highlighted in Fig. 6, as well as the couplings between these six states and their corresponding $E1$ allowed states (46 states in total).

The $E1$ transitions between the initial state and the six $E1$ allowed scattering states, which are highlighted in Fig. 6, are dominant in the early stage of the time-evolution and all the three curves in Fig. 7 take into account these transitions. Therefore these three curves in Fig. 7 are almost identical in the early stage of the time-evolution. As the projectile approaches the target and the Coulomb interaction between them increases accordingly, we notice that differences among these three curves emerge. After the virtual excitation denoted by the dip in the red dashed line, the de-excitation processes bring almost all the populations back to values near zero for the Type I coupling. This reflects an approximate time-reversal symmetry which is effectively achieved in this restricted inelastic scattering framework. However, the initial state retains appreciable transitions to the excited states later in the time-evolution with the Type II coupling (blue dotted line) and with all the couplings (black solid line). Comparing the asymptotic values of the black and the red lines (0.9784 and 0.9998, respectively), we find that retaining only the coupling to $E1$ allowed states (Type I coupling) dramatically underestimates the inelastic effects which clearly demonstrates that the higher-order effects play a major role in the scattering process. Comparing the asymptotic values of the black and the blue curves (0.9784 and 0.9823, respectively), we find that the Type II coupling accounts for about 82% of the inelastic effects. The remaining 18% represents additional transitions to $E1$ allowed states and additional




FIG. 7: (Color online) Time-evolution for the probability of the deuteron remaining in the initial state for three different sets of transition couplings. See the text for details.

non-linearities included coherently with the dominant processes.

In order to check our numerical accuracy, we can exploit the time-reversal symmetry of the tBF approach. We show in Fig. 8 the time-evolution of the probability of the deuteron remaining in its initial state (the deuteron ground state with $M_0 = -1$), predicted by the standard (forward time-propagation) tBF method (red solid curves) as well as the corresponding time-reversed calculations (blue dashed curves) considering two different couplings [Type I coupling in panel (a) and all the possible couplings in panel (b)], for the $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$ scattering at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$. We take the time step $\delta t = 0.0001$ MeV $^{-1}$ for the standard tBF calculations while $\delta t = -0.0001$ MeV $^{-1}$ for the time-reversed calculations. The time at which we switch to the time-reversed calculation corresponds to the closest approach of the projectile and the target, which is at about $t = 3476.12$ MeV $^{-1}$.

We find in Fig. 8 that the standard tBF result and its corresponding time-reversed result are coincident, to within five significant figures in these results, for both of the two choices of $E1$ couplings [panel (a) and panel (b)]. It is important to recall that the full wave function of the state (i.e., not the probabilities) is evolved first forward and then backwards in time so that the coherent complex amplitude is being verified. This reproduction of time-reversal symmetry to high accuracy supports the numerical precision of the tBF approach in the current application.

We note that the probabilities of all the states in Fig. 6 exhibit oscillations. To shed more light on these oscillating patterns, we show in Fig. 9 the probabilities of the six states, highlighted in Fig. 6, as an example. In panel (a) we show the results in the early stage of the time-evolution, which we refer to as the “incoming segment”, in an expanded view. In panel (b) we show the results after the closest approach, which we refer to as the “outgoing segment”, also in an expanded view. For both the incoming and outgoing segments, we present in Fig. 9 the results calculated by the tBF method with all the couplings and with Type I coupling. In the incoming segment, we notice that the results for both of the two sets of couplings are coincident since these are six states that populate dominantly in the incoming segment as shown in Fig. 6. As the deuteron projectile approaches the ^{208}Pb target, the higher-order effects become significant. As a consequence, the results from these two couplings become significantly different in the outgoing segment.

We find in Fig. 9 that the probabilities of all these six states oscillate in approximately periodic patterns in each segment for both of the two sets of couplings. In Fig. 9 we define a quantity Γ , for every state in a given segment, as the time difference between two adjacent troughs, within the time range of the same segment. We show in Table II




FIG. 8: (Color online) Probability of the initial state as a function of the evolution time evaluated by the tBF method (solid red lines) and the time-reversed calculations (dashed blue lines). Panels (a) and (b) denote the results with the Type I coupling and all the couplings, respectively.

the quantity Γ of these six states in both the incoming (Columns 3 and 4) and the outgoing segments (Columns 5 and 6). We also distinguish in Table II the quantity Γ calculated with the Type I coupling (Columns 3 and 5) from the one with all the couplings (Columns 4 and 6). We then calculate the products of the excitation energy E_x (Column 2) and Γ , denoted as κ , and present the results in Table II (Columns 7-10). We find in Table II that the κ values calculated with these two couplings (Columns 7 and 8) are the same up to the third significant figure for each state in the incoming segment. This is readily understood since the higher-order effects are negligible in this segment. We also notice in Table II that the κ values of these six states are all approximately 2π . We recognize this as a “phase coherence” representing periodicity in the entanglement of the ground state with these particular excited states induced by the $E1$ operator.

In the outgoing segment, we find that the κ values of these six states, calculated with the Type I coupling (Column 9), are also around 2π , which means the phase coherence phenomenon remains valid for this case. However, we observe noticeable differences for the κ values of these six states, calculated with all the couplings (Column 10), and most of the κ values deviate significantly from 2π . We refer to this as a “phase decoherence”. Thus, the maintenance of the phase coherence phenomenon depends on the absence of the couplings between the excited states. Such interference effect at the amplitude level due to the time-varying interaction between the particle and the external field is reminiscent of the Landau-Pomeranchuk-Migdal (LPM) effect known in relativistic inelastic collisions [55–57].

In panel (a) of Fig. 10, we show the angular distribution of the elastic differential cross-section $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\text{el}}$ divided by the Rutherford cross-section $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\text{R}}$ for the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 5, 6$ and 7 MeV calculated by the tBF method. We take the evenly weighted coherent sum of the magnetic substates of the deuteron ground state as




FIG. 9: (Color online) Time-evolution for the probabilities of six selected states in the incoming [panel (a)] and outgoing [panel (b)] segments of the $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$ scattering at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$, which are calculated with all the couplings (solid curves) or Type I coupling (solid squares). These states are labeled in ascending order of excitation energy in the spectrum of the deuteron. The horizontal arrows delimit a cycle that is discussed in the text.

the initial state. We denote the elastic differential cross-section calculated with and without the polarization potential by $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}}\right]_a$ and $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}}\right]_b$, respectively, for convenience.

Comparing the two results with and without the polarization potential at the same incident energy, we find that the polarization potential reduces the elastic cross-section for all the incident energies and scattering angles presented in Fig. 10 (a). The difference between $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}}\right]_a$ and $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}}\right]_b$ is rather small at small scattering angles since the polarization potential is very weak. As the scattering angle increases, the polarization effect grows in importance since the deuteron projectile approaches closer to the target. For similar reasons, we observe in Fig. 10 (a) that the difference between $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}}\right]_a$ and $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}}\right]_b$ at the same scattering angle increases with the deuteron incident energy.

We do not anticipate diffractive effects in our treatment since that would require a consideration of the strong interaction between the projectile and the target and a quantum treatment of the COM motion of the projectile during the scattering. Our approximations of an impact parameter treatment seem reasonable since the Sommerfeld parameter is larger than unity for our current application as discussed above. In addition, it has been noted that diffractive scattering effects are expected to be negligible below $E_d = 12$ MeV [34]. We therefore find in Fig. 10 (a) that the elastic cross-section predicted by the tBF method decreases monotonically with the scattering angle independent of whether the polarization potential is included or not.

For classical Rutherford scattering, we have $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\text{el}} = \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\text{R}}$ since $P_{\text{el}} = 1$ and $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\text{class}} = \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\text{R}}$ [Eq. (18)]. Therefore the deviation of the ratio of angular distributions from unity as measured by $1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}}\right]$, indicates the deviation of a scattering from the classical Rutherford scattering.

TABLE II: E_x , Γ and κ for the six scattering states of the deuteron which are shown in Fig. 9. Γ and κ in the incoming segment are distinguished from those in the outgoing segment for the tBF calculations with either the Type I coupling or all the couplings. See the text for additional details.

	E_x (MeV)	$\Gamma(\text{MeV}^{-1})$				κ			
		Incoming		Outgoing		Incoming		Outgoing	
		Type I	All	Type I	All	Type I	All	Type I	All
1 st $^3\text{P}_2$ - $^3\text{F}_2$	2.72	2.31	2.31	2.30	2.10	6.28	6.28	6.26	5.71
1 st $^3\text{P}_1$	2.72	2.31	2.31	2.30	2.13	6.28	6.28	6.26	5.79
3 rd $^3\text{P}_2$ - $^3\text{F}_2$	3.69	1.70	1.70	1.69	2.16	6.27	6.27	6.24	7.97
2 nd $^3\text{P}_1$	3.70	1.70	1.70	1.69	2.12	6.29	6.29	6.25	7.84
5 th $^3\text{P}_2$ - $^3\text{F}_2$	5.15	1.22	1.22	1.17	1.32	6.28	6.28	6.03	6.80
3 rd $^3\text{P}_1$	5.17	1.22	1.22	1.17	1.31	6.31	6.31	6.05	6.77




FIG. 10: (Color online) Angular distribution of the elastic differential cross-section (left panel) and the quantity T (right panel) after the deuteron scatterings on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 5, 6$ and 7 MeV. The solid and open symbols in panel (a) are calculated by employing the classical trajectories determined by the Coulomb potential with and without the inclusion of the polarization potential, respectively. See the text for the details.

For the tBF results with the correction of the polarization potential to the Rutherford trajectories, $1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}} \right]_a$ stems from the following two effects:

1. internal transitions of the projectile induced by the $E1$ interaction between the projectile and the target during the scattering which lead to $P_{\text{el}} < 1$, and
2. the correction of the polarization potential to the classical Rutherford trajectories which gives rise to $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{class}} < \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{R}}$.

We incorporate these two effects into the tBF method using the quantum and classical method, respectively, as mentioned in Sec. II. However, $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}} \right]_b$, calculated by the tBF method without the correction of the polarization potential, deviates from unity solely due to the internal $E1$ transitions in the projectile during the scattering. Therefore, we estimate the significance of the internal $E1$ transitions in generating $1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}} \right]_a$ with the following quantity

$$T(E_d, \theta) = \frac{1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}(E_d, \theta)}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}(E_d, \theta)} \right]_b}{1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}(E_d, \theta)}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}(E_d, \theta)} \right]_a}. \quad (21)$$

We show the corresponding results in Fig. 10 (b). The larger the quantity T is, the more the internal $E1$ transitions in the deuteron projectile contribute to $1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}} \right]_a$ compared to the polarization potential contributions. We find in Fig. 10 (b) that the effect of the internal $E1$ transitions in the deuteron projectile on $1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}} \right]_a$ increases monotonically with the scattering angle at $E_d = 5, 6$ and 7 MeV. The deviation of $\left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}} \right]_a$ from unity is always dominated by the polarization potential for all the scattering angles presented in Fig. 10 at $E_d = 5$ and 6 MeV. However, the contribution of the internal $E1$ transitions in the deuteron projectile to $1 - \left[\frac{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{el}}}{(d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{R}}} \right]_a$ is less significant than the polarization potential below 140° while it becomes dominant above 140° at $E_d = 7$ MeV.




FIG. 11: (Color online) $R(E_d)$ with $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (60^\circ, 150^\circ)$ as a function of the bombarding energy E_d for the scattering of $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$. The dashed lines denote the results calculated by the tBF method employing five NN interactions with no polarization potential. The solid lines represent the results calculated with the same NN interactions including the polarization potential. The experimental data (black solid squares with error bars) are also shown for comparison.

In Fig. 11 we show the quantity $R(E_d)$ with $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (60^\circ, 150^\circ)$ in Eq. (20) for the scattering of the deuteron on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 3 - 7$ MeV. We again adopt the initial state with equal amplitudes for the three magnetic substates as used for the results in Fig. 10. We also present the experimental data in Fig. 11 for comparison [33]. To investigate the sensitivity of $R(E_d)$ to the NN interactions, we show in Fig. 11 the tBF results calculated with the LENPIC ($-N^2\text{LO}$, $-N^3\text{LO}$, $-N^4\text{LO}$), JISP16 and Daejeon16 NN interactions. For pure Rutherford scattering $\sigma(E_d, \theta_1)/\sigma(E_d, \theta_2)$ in Eq. (20) is independent of E_d and therefore $R(E_d) = 1$ in this case [33, 34]. Therefore the deviation of the quantity $R(E_d)$ from unity, i.e., $1 - R(E_d)$, reveals the deviation of a scattering from the classical Rutherford scattering.

For the tBF results without the polarization potential (dashed lines) in Fig. 11, we use the Rutherford trajectories determined by the Coulomb potential. $1 - R(E_d)$ is entirely induced by the internal transitions in the deuteron projectile in this case as we pointed out in Ref. [29]. We notice in Fig. 11 that the tBF calculations with no polarization potential are not able to reproduce the experimental data. By taking the polarization potential into account (solid lines), our tBF approach reproduces the experimental data at $E_d = 3 - 6$ MeV while falling below experiment at $E_d = 7$ MeV for all the five adopted NN interactions, which indicates that the polarization potential is significant in the current application. In our calculations we take α from Table I and retain three significant figures. In Ref. [29], we have compared the tBF results of the LENPIC- $N^4\text{LO}$ interaction with the optical model calculations in Refs. [33, 34]. We will concentrate mainly on the sensitivity of $R(E_d)$ to the NN interactions in the following.

It is noteworthy that the semiclassical tBF approach neglects the effect of the energy loss on the center of mass motion of the projectile. The energy transferred to the intrinsic degree of freedom of the projectile, approximated by the average excitation energy of the projectile, should be compensated by a reduction of the energy in its COM degree of freedom. We have shown in Ref. [29] that the energy loss effect could enhance $R(E_d = 7 \text{ MeV})$ by about 1% using the LENPIC- $N^4\text{LO}$ interaction, which would lead to an improved tBF description of the experimental data at $E_d = 7$ MeV. The effect of the energy loss on $R(E_d)$ is insignificant at $E_d = 3 - 6$ MeV and therefore the current

calculation is able to reproduce those experimental data.




FIG. 12: (Color online) elastic cross section ratio $R(E_d)$ with both $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (60^\circ, 140^\circ)$ [panel (a)] and $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (60^\circ, 160^\circ)$ [panel (b)] as functions of the bombarding energy E_d for the scattering of $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$. The solid lines represent the tBF results employing five NN interactions including their associated polarization potentials. The experimental data (black solid squares with error bars) are also shown for comparison.

Similarly, in Fig. 12 we show the calculated $R(E_d)$ with both $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (60^\circ, 140^\circ)$ and $(60^\circ, 160^\circ)$ [see Eq. 20], and compare with experiment. In the tBF calculations we include the corrections from their associated polarization potentials to the Rutherford trajectory, where we use the same α values as in Fig. 11. We omit θ_1 in the following since we use the same $\theta_1 = 60^\circ$. In Fig. 12 we reproduce well the experimental $R(E_d)$ with $\theta_2 = 140^\circ$ and 160° at $E_d = 3 - 6$ MeV for all the five interactions. We find in panel (b) that the tBF calculations fall below the experimental data at $E_d = 7$ MeV for $\theta_2 = 160^\circ$ which we attribute to the omission of the correction of the energy loss to the COM motion of the projectile, as we observed in Fig. 11. However, the tBF calculation is close to the experimental data at $E_d = 7$ MeV for $\theta_2 = 140^\circ$ (see panel (a) of Fig. 12) where the energy loss is less significant compared to $\theta_2 = 150^\circ$ and $\theta_2 = 160^\circ$.

We find in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 that $R(E_d)$ calculated with the five interactions are almost indistinguishable at low incident energies and separate with increasing incident energy. For deeper insights into the sensitivity of $R(E_d)$ to NN interactions, we present in Fig. 13 the spread of $R(E_d)$, $\Delta R(E_d)$, evaluated by the absolute difference between the upper and lower edges of the solid lines in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12, as a function of the deuteron incident energy (denoted as “Total” in Fig. 13). We notice in Fig. 13 that the spread $\Delta R(E_d)$ increases with the deuteron incident energy as well as the scattering angle, indicating that $R(E_d)$ is more sensitive to NN interaction at higher incident energies and larger scattering angles.

In this work, $\Delta R(E_d)$ stems from the following two effects. The first effect is the dependence of the $E1$ transition matrix elements [Eq. (17)] on NN interactions, which contribute to $\Delta R(E_d)$ via the time-dependent Schrödinger equation [Eq. (10)]. The second effect is the dependence of the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron on the NN interactions, which contributes to $\Delta R(E_d)$ via the effect of the polarization potential on the scattering trajectory. Note that




FIG. 13: (Color online) Contributions to the spread of $R(E_d)$ arising from the different NN interactions employed in this work. The total spread (solid symbols and solid lines) is depicted for three scattering angles ($\theta_2 = 140^\circ, 150^\circ$ and 160°). In particular, we show the contributions to the total spread at each angle arising from the $E1$ transition matrix elements (dashed line+symbol embedded with '+') and from the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron (dotted line+open symbol). The black, red and blue colors represent the results for $\theta_2 = 140^\circ, 150^\circ$ and 160° , respectively. The green symbols '- | x' denote the addition of these two contributions for $\theta_2 = 140^\circ, 150^\circ$ and 160° , respectively. The deviation of the green symbols from their solid symbol counterparts is small and hardly visible on this scale (see the text for details).

$\Delta R(E_d)$ is not simply a linear superposition of the above two effects. We therefore perform the following two sets of independent tBF calculations to investigate their individual contributions to the total $\Delta R(E_d)$ in Fig. 13. To evaluate the contribution of the first effect, we solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation using different $E1$ transition matrix elements calculated with the five interactions, where the trajectories are determined by the Coulomb potential and the polarization potential with the same $E1$ polarizability $\alpha = 0.635 \text{ fm}^3$, for each θ_2 . We present in Fig. 13 the corresponding spread of $R(E_d)$, which is the absolute difference between the two extreme values of $R(E_d)$ obtained with these five interactions at each E_d and θ_2 , denoted as “1st-contr.”. To estimate the contribution of the second effect, we solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation using the same $E1$ transition matrix elements of the LENPIC- $N^4\text{LO}$ interaction, while we use the trajectories, determined by the Coulomb potential and the polarization potential with the two extreme values of the five $E1$ polarizabilities obtained in this work (Table I), i.e., $\alpha = 0.616 \text{ fm}^3$ and $\alpha = 0.666 \text{ fm}^3$, for each θ_2 . We show in Fig. 13 the corresponding spread of $R(E_d)$, which stems entirely from using these two extreme $E1$ polarizabilities, denoted as “2nd-contr.”. We find in Fig. 13 that the addition of these two contributions, denoted as “1st+2nd”, can almost reproduce the total $\Delta R(E_d)$, which indicates that the above evaluations to the individual contributions of these two effects appear to be reasonable.

At low incident energies, since the internal transitions in the deuteron projectile are insignificant and the polarization potential is weak, we find in Fig. 13 that both the total spread of $R(E_d)$ and its two contributions are negligibly small. Both of these two effects grow as the incident energy increases. Therefore the spreads of $R(E_d)$ induced by these two effects and the total spread become more noticeable at higher incident energies. We find the spread of $R(E_d)$ stems almost completely from the second effect at low incident energies. As the incident energy increases, the second effect remains dominant, though the first effect is growing in the direction of becoming comparable.

To quantify the deviation of our tBF results of $R(E_d)$ from the experimental data for $\theta_2 = 140^\circ, 150^\circ$ and 160° , we

TABLE III: $\chi^2/\text{data}(\theta_2)$ and χ_t^2/data for the five NN interactions presented in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12. See the text for details.

	$\chi^2/\text{data} (\theta_2 = 140^\circ)$	$\chi^2/\text{data} (\theta_2 = 150^\circ)$	$\chi^2/\text{data} (\theta_2 = 160^\circ)$	χ_t^2/data
LENPIC-N ² LO	2.703	3.105	1.602	2.470
LENPIC-N ³ LO	2.778	3.619	2.053	2.817
LENPIC-N ⁴ LO	2.789	3.593	2.036	2.806
JISP16	2.725	2.657	1.210	2.197
Daejeon16	2.837	4.517	2.829	3.395

present in Table III (Column 2 – 4) the quantity $\chi^2/\text{data}(\theta_2)$, which we define as follows

$$\chi^2/\text{data}(\theta_2) = \frac{1}{7} \sum_{i=1}^7 \left[\frac{R_i^{\text{tBF}}(E_d) - R_i^{\text{Exp}}(E_d)}{\delta R_i^{\text{Exp}}(E_d)} \right]^2, \quad (22)$$

where $R_i^{\text{Exp}}(E_d)$ denotes the central value of the experimental $R(E_d)$ in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12. $R_i^{\text{tBF}}(E_d)$ represents the tBF results for each interaction. $\delta R_i^{\text{Exp}}(E_d)$ corresponds to the experimental error in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12. The subscript i runs over the seven points experimentally available for each θ_2 in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12. To evaluate the entire deviation of our results from the experimental data, we also present in Table III the quantity χ_t^2/data (Column 5), defined by

$$\chi_t^2/\text{data} = \frac{1}{21} \sum_{j=1}^{21} \left[\frac{R_j^{\text{tBF}}(E_d) - R_j^{\text{Exp}}(E_d)}{\delta R_j^{\text{Exp}}(E_d)} \right]^2, \quad (23)$$

where the subscript j runs over all the 21 points experimentally available in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12.

We find in Table III that $\chi^2/\text{data}(\theta_2)$ becomes more sensitive to NN interaction as θ_2 increases, which is consistent with the results in Fig. 13. All the five interactions adopted in this work provide rather small χ_t^2/data , indicating that the tBF approach is able to describe reasonably the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 3 - 7$ MeV with these interactions. We expect to improve χ_t^2/data by taking into account the correction of the energy loss to the center of mass motion of the projectile in the future.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

In this work, we investigated the scattering of the deuteron projectile on the ^{208}Pb target below the Coulomb barrier with the non-perturbative time-dependent basis function (tBF) approach, employing the LENPIC (-N²LO, -N³LO, -N⁴LO), JISP16 and Daejeon16 nucleon-nucleon (NN) interactions. We constructed the basis representation of the tBF method with the deuteron ground and discretized scattering states, which are obtained by diagonalizing the realistic Hamiltonian based on these interactions in a large harmonic oscillator (HO) basis sufficient to obtain the observables presented here. We considered all the possible electric-dipole ($E1$) transitions among these states during the scattering. We employed the classical trajectory determined by either the Coulomb potential or the Coulomb potential supplemented with the polarization potential. For each NN interaction that we employed, we adopted the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron α (in the polarization potential) obtained with the same interaction. For each of our chosen NN interactions, the tBF calculations have no adjustable parameters.

Before performing the tBF calculations, we studied the spectra and $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron projectile, which are both time-independent. Taking the LENPIC-N⁴LO interaction with $\omega = 20$ MeV as an example, we found that the deuteron ground state becomes well converged and tends to the experimental value with increasing N_{max} . By comparing the $E1$ polarizabilities of the deuteron, calculated by the LENPIC (-N²LO, -N³LO, -N⁴LO), JISP16 and Daejeon16 interactions with $\omega = 20$ MeV, we found that all these five interactions produce converged results at sufficiently large N_{max} , which are all consistent with the data extracted from experiments. The spread in the theoretical $E1$ polarizabilities is about 8%. We also investigated the convergence pattern of the $E1$ polarizability of the deuteron with respect to ω for the LENPIC-N⁴LO interaction. We found that results are sensitive to ω at lower N_{max} though the converged values for different ω are the same at large N_{max} .

We then investigated the scattering dynamics during the scattering of $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$ at $E_d = 7$ MeV and $\theta = 150^\circ$ with the tBF method employing the LENPIC-N⁴LO interaction with $\omega = 20$ MeV. We found that the asymptotic

value of the probability for the deuteron remaining in its initial state is well converged for our chosen values of the two truncation parameters $N_{\max}$ and E_{cut} . We also found that the $E1$ allowed states, especially six of the scattering states, populates dominantly in the early stage of the scattering and the $E1$ forbidden states populates significantly in the later scattering process via the higher-order effects. By considering three different couplings (Type I, Type II and all the possible couplings in Fig. 7), we showed quantitatively that the Type I coupling, which includes only transitions between the initial state and its $E1$ allowed states with six of them found to dominate the early scattering, remarkably underestimates the inelastic effects when all couplings were included. On the other hand, the Type II coupling, which includes the $E1$ transitions between the initial state and these six states as well as transitions between these six states and their $E1$ allowed states (but none beyond), accounts for around 82% of the inelastic effects when all couplings are included.

Comparing the time-evolution of the initial state calculated by the standard tBF method with that of the time-reversed calculation, we illustrated that the time-reversal symmetry of the theoretical Hamiltonian dynamics in our semiclassical approximation is well respected in our numerical implementation of the tBF method. By investigating the oscillations of the probabilities of these six scattering states mentioned above with the Type I coupling as well as with all the possible couplings, we established a phase coherence in the incoming segment representing $E1$ -induced entanglement of each of these six states with the initial state along with probability oscillations commensurate with their energy differences. However, we observed phase decoherence for the results with all the possible couplings, due to the higher-order effects in the outgoing segment. This was confirmed by showing that phase coherence is retained in the outgoing segment with the Type I coupling.

Finally, we investigated two additional observables with the tBF method. We calculated the angular distribution of the elastic cross-section for the $d+^{208}\text{Pb}$ scattering at $E_d = 5, 6$ and 7 MeV with the LENPIC- $N^4\text{LO}$ interaction. We found that the elastic cross-section ratio to the Rutherford cross-section decreases with increasing incident energy and increasing scattering angle both with and without the polarization potential. The polarization potential reduces the elastic cross-section and this effect increases with the bombarding energy and scattering angle. The reduction of the elastic cross-section stems dominantly from the polarization potential at $E_d = 5$ and 6 MeV. However, at $E_d = 7$ MeV, the polarization potential contributes dominantly to the reduction of the elastic cross-section for scattering angles below 140° while the internal $E1$ transitions in the deuteron projectile become dominant above 140° .

We also calculated the elastic cross-section ratios $R(E_d)$ for $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (60^\circ, 140^\circ)$, $(60^\circ, 150^\circ)$ and $(60^\circ, 160^\circ)$ with the tBF method employing the LENPIC ($-N^2\text{LO}$, $-N^3\text{LO}$, $-N^4\text{LO}$), JISP16 and Daejeon16 interactions. By considering the internal $E1$ transitions in the deuteron projectile and the polarization potential during the scattering, each of these five interactions is able to reproduce the experimental $R(E_d)$ at $E_d = 3 - 6$ MeV. We found that $R(E_d)$ falls below the experimental data at $E_d = 7$ MeV for $\theta_2 = 150^\circ$ and 160° which we attributed to neglecting the effect of the energy loss (due to the internal excitations) of the projectile on its center of mass motion. The tBF calculation of $R(E_d)$ with $\theta_2 = 140^\circ$ at $E_d = 7$ MeV is close to experiment since the energy loss is less significant compared to $\theta_2 = 150^\circ$ and 160° . By analysing the spread of $R(E_d)$ induced by these five interactions, we found that $R(E_d)$ becomes more sensitive to NN interactions with increasing either the deuteron incident energy or the scattering angle θ_2 . In particular, the sensitivity of $R(E_d)$ to NN interactions stems almost completely from the dependence of the $E1$ polarizability on the NN interactions at low incident energies. Its contribution to the spread remains dominant in contrast to the contribution of the dependence of the $E1$ transition matrix elements on the NN interactions, though both of these two contributions grow with increasing incident energy.

By analysing $\chi^2/\text{data}(\theta_2)$ and χ_t^2/data , we found the interactions adopted in this work provide reasonable descriptions to the deuteron scattering on ^{208}Pb at $E_d = 3 - 7$ MeV without any adjustable parameters. We anticipate improving the χ_t^2/data by taking into account the correction of the energy loss to the center of mass motion of the projectile in future improvements to the tBF approach.

It should be noted that we adopted a semiclassical approximation in the current tBF method, where the center of mass motion of the projectile was calculated via classical mechanics. We considered the contributions of the $E1$ effects for the deuteron's internal and center of mass degrees of freedom separately. We took into account the $E1$ transitions in the internal degree of freedom of the deuteron projectile by solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. We approximated the effect of the $E1$ polarization on the center of mass motion of the projectile by a polarization potential.

In the future, we will improve the tBF method to extend the range of its applications. (1) We will extend the tBF method to a fully quantum mechanical framework, within which the center of mass motion and the internal motion of the projectile will be considered coherently. The energy loss omitted in this work will then be resolved naturally. (2) We are extending the tBF method to investigate nuclear reactions involving larger projectile nuclei, where we will obtain the nuclear structure information with *ab initio* approaches, e.g., no-core shell model. (3) We will take into account the vacuum polarization potential in the tBF method, which is expected to enhance the elastic cross-section [35] while it has no appreciable contribution to $R(E_d)$ [33, 34]. (4) In the tBF method we will introduce the chiral two-body charge operator, which first appears at $N^3\text{LO}$, as a higher-order correction to the present one-body

$E1$ operator [58]. We will also investigate the contribution of other electromagnetic transitions, such as $E2$ and $M1$, to scattering observables. (5) We will extend the tBF method to higher bombarding energies by considering the strong interaction between the projectile and the target [59, 60].

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge helpful discussions with Andrey Shirokov, Pieter Maris, Shiplu Sarker, Robert A. M. Basili, Antonio M. Moro, Gerhard Baur, Zhigang Xiao, Li Ou, William Lynch and Betty Tsang. This work is supported in part by the US Department of Energy (DOE) under Grant Nos. DE-FG02-87ER40371 and DE-SC00018223. A portion of the computational resources are provided by the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC), which is supported by the US DOE Office of Science. Xingbo Zhao is supported by new faculty startup funding by the Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, by Key Research Program of Frontier Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Grant No. ZDB-SLY-7020, by the Natural Science Foundation of Gansu Province, China, Grant No. 20JR10RA067, by the Foundation for Key Talents of Gansu Province and by the Central Funds Guiding the Local Science and Technology Development of Gansu Province. Peng Yin and Wei Zuo are supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 11975282, 11705240, 11435014), the Strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Grant No. XDB34000000 and the Key Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences under Grant No. XDPB15. This work is also partially supported by the CUSTIPEN (China-U.S. Theory Institute for Physics with Exotic Nuclei) funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, office of Science under Grant No. DE-SC0009971.

-
- [1] H. Witala, W. Gloeckle, J. Golak, H. Kamada, J. Kuros-Zolnierczuk, A. Nogga and R. Skibinski, Phys. Rev. C **63**, 024007 (2001).
 - [2] R. Lazauskas and J. Carbonell, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 044002 (2004).
 - [3] R. Lazauskas, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 054007 (2009).
 - [4] L. E. Marcucci, A. Kievsky, L. Girlanda, S. Rosati and M. Viviani, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 034003 (2009).
 - [5] L. E. Marcucci, J. Dohet-Eraly, L. Girlanda, A. Gnech, A. Kievsky and M. Viviani, Front. in Phys. **8**, 69 (2020).
 - [6] A. Deltuva and A. C. Fonseca, Phys. Rev. C **75**, 014005 (2007).
 - [7] A. Deltuva and A. C. Fonseca, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 162502 (2007).
 - [8] H. M. Hofmann and G. M. Hale, Phys. Rev. C **77**, 044002 (2008).
 - [9] D. Gazit, S. Bacca, N. Barnea, W. Leidemann and G. Orlandini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 112301 (2006).
 - [10] S. Quaglioni and P. Navratil, Phys. Lett. B **652**, 370 (2007).
 - [11] S. Bacca, N. Barnea, W. Leidemann and G. Orlandini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 162501 (2009).
 - [12] W. Leidemann and G. Orlandini, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **68**, 158-214 (2013).
 - [13] K. M. Nollett, S. C. Pieper, R. B. Wiringa, J. Carlson and G. M. Hale, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 022502 (2007).
 - [14] M. Chernykh, H. Feldmeier, T. Neff, P. von Neumann-Cosel and A. Richter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 032501 (2007).
 - [15] S. Quaglioni and P. Navratil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 092501 (2008).
 - [16] S. Quaglioni and P. Navratil, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 044606 (2009).
 - [17] P. Navratil, S. Quaglioni, I. Stetcu and B. R. Barrett, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **36**, 083101 (2009).
 - [18] P. Navratil and S. Quaglioni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 042503 (2012).
 - [19] A. M. Shirokov, A. I. Mazur, I. A. Mazur, E. A. Mazur, I. J. Shin, Y. Kim, L. D. Blokhintsev and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. C **98**, 044624 (2018), and references therein.
 - [20] W. Du, P. Yin, G. Chen, X. Zhao, and J. P. Vary, in *Proceedings of the International Conference "Nuclear Theory in the Supercomputing Era-2016" (NTSE-2016)*, Khabarovsk, Russia, September 19-23, 2016, edited by A. M. Shirokov and A. I. Mazur (Pacific National University, Khabarovsk, Russia, 2018), p. 102 [arXiv:1704.05520 [nucl-th]].
 - [21] Weijie Du, Peng Yin, Yang Li, Guangyao Chen, Wei Zuo, Xingbo Zhao, and James P. Vary, Phys. Rev. C **97**, 064620 (2018).
 - [22] B. R. Barrett, P. Navratil and J. P. Vary, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **69**, 131 (2013).
 - [23] X. Zhao, A. Ilderton, P. Maris and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 065014 (2013).
 - [24] B. Hu, A. Ilderton and X. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 016017 (2020).
 - [25] G. Chen, X. Zhao, Y. Li, K. Tuchin and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 096012 (2017).
 - [26] M. Li, X. Zhao, P. Maris, G. Chen, Y. Li, K. Tuchin and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 076016 (2020).
 - [27] M. Li, T. Lappi and X. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 056014 (2021).
 - [28] W. Du, J. P. Vary, X. Zhao and W. Zuo, Phys. Rev. A **104**, 012611 (2021).
 - [29] P. Yin, W. Du, W. Zuo, X. Zhao and J. P. Vary, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. (in press), [arXiv:1910.10586 [nucl-th]].
 - [30] K. Alder, A. Bohr, T. Huus, B. Mottelson and A. Winther, Rev. Mod. Phys. **28**, 432 (1956).
 - [31] K. Alder and A. Winther, *Electromagnetic Excitation*, (North-Holland, New York, 1975).

- [32] Y. Aoki, N. Okumura, T. Joh, N. Takahashi and Y. Honkyu, Nucl. Phys. A **673**, 189-206 (2000).
- [33] N. L. Rodning, L. D. Knutson, W. G. Lynch and M. B. Tsang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 909 (1982).
- [34] A. M. Moro and J. Gómez-Camacho, Nucl. Phys. A **648**, 141 (1999).
- [35] G. Baur, F. Rösler and D. Trautmann, Nucl. Phys. A **288**, 113 (1977).
- [36] J. P. Vary, R. Basili, W. Du, M. Lockner, P. Maris, S. Pal and S. Sarker, Phys. Rev. C **98**, 065502 (2018).
- [37] A. M. Shirokov, J. P. Vary, A. I. Mazur and T. A. Weber, Phys. Lett. B **644**, 33-37 (2007).
- [38] A. M. Shirokov, A. G. Negoita, J. P. Vary, S. K. Bogner, A. I. Mazur, E. A. Mazur and D. Gogny, Phys. Rev. C **90**, 024324 (2014).
- [39] A. M. Shirokov, I. J. Shin, Y. Kim, M. Sosonkina, P. Maris and J. P. Vary, Phys. Lett. B **761**, 87-91 (2016).
- [40] E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs and U. G. Meißner, Eur. Phys. J. A **51**, 53 (2015).
- [41] E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs and U. G. Meißner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 122301 (2015).
- [42] S. Binder, A. Calci, E. Epelbaum, R. J. Furnstahl, J. Golak, K. Hebeler, H. Kamada, H. Krebs, J. Langhammer, S. Liebig, P. Maris, U.-G. Meißner, D. Minossi, A. Nogga, H. Potter, R. Roth, R. Skibinski, K. Topolnicki, J. P. Vary, and H. Witala (LENPIC Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C **93**, 044002 (2016).
- [43] S. Binder, A. Calci, E. Epelbaum, R. J. Furnstahl, J. Golak, K. Hebeler, T. Hütther, H. Kamada, H. Krebs, P. Maris, U.-G. Meißner, A. Nogga, R. Roth, R. Skibinski, K. Topolnicki, J. P. Vary, K. Vobig, and H. Witala (LENPIC Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C **98**, 014002 (2018).
- [44] A. Askar and A. S. Cakmak, J. Chem. Phys. **68**, 2794 (1978).
- [45] Toshiaki Iitaka, Phys. Rev. E **49**, 4684 (1994).
- [46] J. L. Friar, S. Fallieros, E. L. Tomusiak, D. Skopik and E. G. Fuller, Phys. Rev. C **27**, 1364 (1983).
- [47] I. Stetcu, B. R. Barrett and U. van Kolck, Phys. Lett. B **653**, 358-362 (2007).
- [48] S. A. Coon, M. I. Avetian, M. K. G. Kruse, U. van Kolck, P. Maris and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 054002 (2012).
- [49] J. L. Friar and G. L. Payne, Phys. Rev. C **55**, 2764 (1997).
- [50] R. V. Reid, Jr., Annals Phys. **50**, 411-448 (1968).
- [51] V. G. J. Stoks, R. A. M. Klomp, C. P. F. Terheggen and J. J. de Swart, Phys. Rev. C **49**, 2950-2962 (1994).
- [52] R. B. Wiringa, R. A. Smith and T. L. Ainsworth, Phys. Rev. C **29**, 1207-1221 (1984).
- [53] R. B. Wiringa, V. G. J. Stoks and R. Schiavilla, Phys. Rev. C **51**, 38-51 (1995).
- [54] R. Machleidt, K. Holinde and C. Elster, Phys. Rept. **149**, 1-89 (1987).
- [55] L. D. Landau and I. Pomeranchuk, Dokl. Akad. Nauk Ser. Fiz. **92**, 535-536 (1953)
- [56] A. B. Migdal, Phys. Rev. **103**, 1811-1820 (1956) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.103.1811
- [57] X. Yao, [arXiv:2205.07902 [hep-ph]].
- [58] A. A. Filin, V. Baru, E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs, D. Möller and P. Reinert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 082501 (2020).
- [59] G. R. Satchler and W. G. Love, Phys. Rept. **55**, 183 (1979).
- [60] P. J. Moffa, C. B. Dover and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. C **16**, 1857 (1977).