Regularization, Renorm alization and Range: The Nucleon-Nucleon Interaction from E ective Field Theory

Thom as D.Cohen

Departm ent of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4111

R egularization and renorm alization is discussed in the context of low-energy e ective eld theory treatments of two or more heavy particles (such as nucleons). It is desirable to regulate the contact interactions from the outset by treating them as having a nite range. The low energy physical observables should be insensitive to this range provided that the range is of a similar or greater scale than that of the interaction. A litemative schemes, such as dimensional regularization, lead to paradoxical conclusions such as the impossibility of repulsive interactions for truly low energy e ective theories where all of the exchange particles are integrated out. This di culty arises because a nonrelativistic eld theory with repulsive contact interactions is trivial in the sense that the S m atrix is unity and the renorm alized coupling constant zero. Possible consequences of low energy attraction are also discussed. It is argued that in the case of large or sm all scattering lengths, the region of validity of e ective eld theory expansion is much larger if the contact interactions are given a nite range from the beginning.

I. IN TRODUCTION

O ne common issue in particle physics is the existence of phenomena on widely diering energy scales. In studying the low energy phenomenology in such situations, the techniques of e ective eld theory (EFT) have proven extremely useful [1]. They allow one to include systematically only those e ects of the short range physics which contribute to the long range phenomena up to some given level of accuracy. The philosophy underlying this is that one can integrate the short wavelength degrees of freedom, i.e. those degrees of freedom whose momenta are larger than some separation scale, , out of the functional integral. Of course, in doing this one obtains an elective action which is nonlocal. However, the nonlocality is on the scale of the degrees of freedom which have been integrated out. At scales far below this it is legitimate to expand this in the form of a derivative expansion. It is often the case that one cannot, in fact, carry out this partial functional integration of the underlying fundamental theory either because it is technically intractable or because one does not know the underlying theory in detail. In this case, one can use a know ledge of the form of the symmetries of the underlying theory to develop an elective eld theory with phenomenological coe cients which corresponds to the derivative expansion of the full theory. A classic example of this approach is chiral perturbation theory which has been used to describe the interactions of pseudo-G oldstone bosons with each other [2].

Several years ago, W einberg suggested that the technology of EFT | when properly m odi ed | could be used to describe low energy nuclear phenom ena such as nucleon-nucleon scattering and bound states and the interaction of nucleiw ith pions and photons [3]. The key to this approach was the developm ent of a form alism based on a system atic power counting scheme describing the interactions of heavy particles (where \heavy" m eans that the m ass is very large com pared to the m om entum scale being probed). The fundam ental insight is that the power counting should apply to n-particle irreducible graphs (i.e. potentials) and not to the full am plitudes. The full am plitudes are obtained by iteration of these potentials. The approach is im plem ented via an elective Lagrangian containing explicit light degrees of freedom (e.g. pions) along with contact interactions whose coupling constants serve to param eterize the elects of shorter range physics. W einberg's suggestion has inspired a considerable amount of research on elective eld theoretic approaches to low energy nuclear phenom ena [4[16].

In this paper it will be shown that great care must be exercised when renorm alizing this elective theory. A version of the form alism elucidated by W einberg has a rather perverse feature which can be traced to the renorm alization scheme: the approach is apparently incapable of describing systems whose low energy interactions are repulsive in the limit of very low energy scattering; i.e., the limit where the momenta are much less than all of the masses in the problem (so that in the nuclear case one could integrate out the pion). In such a case, as discussed in refs. [3] and [16] one can integrate out all of the light degrees of freedom to obtain an elective lagrangian with contact interactions only. To lowest order in the power counting, the T matrix for swave scattering of heavy fermions (e.g. nucleons) in W einberg's treatment [3] depends on only a single parameter which corresponds to a particular combination of spin-independent and spin-dependent contact interactions whose renorm alized value is xed by the scattering length, a:

$$T_{0}(p^{0};p) = \frac{4 = M}{1 = a + i M E + i} ;$$
(1)

where M is the mass of the particles and p is the magnitude of the momentum of the nucleon in the center of mass frame. The subscript, 0, indicates that this T matrix was derived from the contact interaction with no derivatives. The energy of the state, E, is $p^2 = M$ for scattering states and the i xes the boundary conditions in extrapolations to negative energies.

The di culty is easy to see from eq. (1). E ken entary considerations show that a negative value of a necessarily corresponds to attraction. On the other hand, a positive value of a can either correspond to repulsion or to attraction with at least one bound state. Bound states give rise to poles in the T matrix for negative energies. Purely repulsive interactions always correspond to a T matrix without negative energy poles. From the form of the T matrix in eq. (1), how ever, it is apparent that when a is positive, there is always a pole in the T matrix at $E = 1 = (M a^2)$. Thus, regardless of the sign of a, the T matrix in eq. (1) corresponds to an attractive interaction.

How serious a problem is this? One might argue that the problem is purely form all and is of no phenom enological concern. A fiter all, in nuclear physics the potential is attractive at low energies; the inability to describe repulsion may simply not be relevant. On the other hand, the EFT methods used to derive eq. (1) are not particular to nuclear physics and never explicitly use the fact the interaction is attractive | if the arguments are valid they ought to apply equally well to cases where the interaction is repulsive. Nothing in Weinberg's power counting scheme depends on the sign of the interaction. Thus, the inability to describe repulsion suggests that something is seriously wrong with the form alism. As will be seen in this paper the di culty can ultimately be traced to the fact that the interaction in the elective Lagrangian has zero range. The only way which an explicit range can enter into the dynam ics in this approach is through regulation and renorm alization prescriptions. The general issues of regulation and renorm alization are clearly in portant in the attractive case.

It will be shown here that the problem is technical and is related to the renorm alization scheme used in the derivation of eq. (1). It should be recalled that the contact terms in an elective Lagrangian do not, in fact, describe zero range physics. Rather, they serve to parameterize the elects of physics of shorter range than the separation scale. Ultimately, the contact terms lead to divergences which necessitate some regularization prescription and an associated renorm alization of the coelecters in the lagrangian. The regularization prescription should be consistent with the fact that the interactions are, in fact, of nite range. For example, one can introduce a regulator into the contact interaction, thus making it a nite range interaction. The range of this interaction should not be taken to be zero in any intermediate step of the calculation. At the end of the calculation, the regulator parameter should be well by the separation scale, . As will be discussed here, it must correspond to a larger range than the typical range of the potential (e.g. the elective range). If there is a true separation of scales in the problem, one will not the regulator.

In the derivation of Eq. (1), how ever, it was implicitly assumed that the range is, in fact, zero. That is, at various points in the calculation the contact interaction is treated literally, as opposed to merely serving to parameterize some short range physics. It has been known for some time that the repulsive function interaction in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics is trivial the renormalized coupling constant must be zero and the S matrix, unity [17]; this is a consequence of Friedman's theorem [18]. Thus, it is not surprising that Eq. (1) fails to describe repulsion. Treating the contact terms literally is incompatable with the derivation of the eld theories from an underlying theory since integrating out short range physics yields a nonlocal theory. O focurse, in most applications of EFT this inconsistency is innocuous in that errors induced by it are small and can be systematically corrected at higher orders. However, in the case of two heavy particles where one must iterate the potential to all orders the problem can be serious. The inability to describe repulsion should be viewed as an artifact of this inconsistent treatment.

It is important to use a consistent regularization scheme even in the case of attractive interactions. For example, as recently noted in Ref. [16], the convergence of W einberg's scheme is controlled by the scattering length; as the the scattering length diverges the region of validity of the expansion tends to zero. In nature the scattering length is quite large, implying a very limited regime of applicability of the approach. As will be discussed brie y in this paper and in more detail in a subsequent work this is also a consequence of a renorm alization scheme based on truly zero-ranged interactions. The central point of this paper is that if one wishes to use EFT m ethods in nuclear interactions it is essential to regulate the contact interactions from the outset by giving them nite range.

It is worth noting that excepting work based on a new expansion scheme proposed in Ref. [16], num erical studies of the N N force based on elective eld theories and chiral counting do not employ the renormalization prescription used in the derivation of Eq. (1). Rather, they cut on the integrals in the momentum space Schrödinger equation which electively gives a nite range to the interactions. Thus the problem s discussed here do not a lict the calculations in Refs. [4,7,13]

II. THE LOW ENERGY T MATRIX

Before discussing the problem of repulsion in any detail it is useful to review how the T m atrix in Eq. (1) emerges in an elective eld theory treatment. In order to use elective eld theories one needs a systematic power-counting scheme. Traditionally in elective eld theory treatments this power counting is for a Feynman amplitude. However, as pointed out in ref [3], such a scheme fails for the situation where two or more heavy particles interact strongly at low energy. The disculty is that if the particles typically have a momentum Q, the free propagator goes as $M = Q^{-2}$ and becomes large in the limit of small Q destroying simple power counting in Q =. The solution to this is quite simple instead of using power counting for the Feynman amplitude itself one develops a systematic power counting only for the n-particle irreducible graphs i.e. for potentials. The details of the power counting argument will not be given here as it is well described in Ref. [3].

To obtain scattering amplitudes, one can iterate these potentials to all orders which corresponds to solving the Schrodinger equation for these potentials. Recently K aplan, Savage and W ise (K SW) have proposed a di erent resum m ation [16], in which the lowest order potential is sum m ed to all orders as a Schroeinger equation and subsequently the inverse of the real part of the Feynm an amplitude is expanded system atically. This apparently greatly im proves the convergence of the expansion when the scattering length is large. How ever, the problem discussed here applies to the lowest order calculation of the scattering amplitude and it a ects both the W einberg and the K SW schemes.

In the case where all of the particles are treated as heavy, including all exchanged bosons, it is trivial to write down the potentials to some order. They are given in terms of an elective Lagrangian which consists entirely of contact interactions with various numbers of derivatives. This elective Lagrangian is:

$$L = N^{y} i \theta_{t} N \qquad N^{y} \frac{r^{2}}{2M} N \qquad \frac{1}{2} C_{s} (N^{y} N)^{2} \qquad \frac{1}{2} C_{T} (N^{y} \sim N)^{2} ::: ; \qquad (2)$$

where ::: indicates contact term s with two or more derivatives. Such term s are higher order in the power counting. Isoscalar s-wave scattering only depends on the combination C (C_S 3 C_T).

The next step is to solve the Schrödinger equation with appropriate boundary conditions for scattering and thus determ ine the T m atrix. This is done most naturally in the form of the Lippm ann-Schwinger equation: $T = V + V G_0 T$, where $G_0 = 1 = (E p^2 = M + i)$ and p is the relative m on entum operator. C learly, this corresponds to iterating the potential to all orders. As written above, the Lippm ann-Schwinger equation is an operator equation; in m om entum space it is an integral equation:

$$T (p;p^{0}) = V (p;p^{0}) + (2)^{3} d^{3}p^{0}V (p;p^{0}) G_{0} (p^{0};E) T (p^{0};p^{0}) ;$$
(3)

where G_0 (p; E) = 1 = (E $p^2 = M + i$). For an arbitrary V one must solve this equation via standard num ericalm eans.

For the present case the zeroth order potential is simply a delta function in conguration space and therefore a constant in momentum space; V_0 (k; k⁰) = C. Form ally, it is straightforward to solve the Lippm ann-Schwinger equation with this potential. Since V_0 is a constant the equation becomes algebraic; the solution is

$$T_{0}(p;p^{0}) = \frac{1}{1=C (2)^{3}} \frac{1}{d^{3}p^{0}G_{0}(p^{0};E)} :$$
(4)

Unfortunately, the solution is only form all since (2) 3 1 $d^{3}p^{00}G_{0}$ (p^{0} ;E) diverges, and so as written the solution is meaningless. This is hardly surprising | it is well known that in 3+1 dimensions, delta function potentials with nite strength are su ciently singular as to have no well-behaved solutions.

Thus, to make sense of eq. (4) one must renormalize. The bare parameter C must go to zero, but must do so in such a way that the T matrix remains nite. Weinberg introduces a renormalized coupling C_R given by

$$1=C_{\rm R} = 1=C \quad (2)^{3} d^{3}p^{00}G_{0}(p^{00};E=0) : \qquad (5)$$

In term s of C $_{\rm R}\,$ the T $\,$ m atrix is given by

$$T_{0}(p;p^{0}) = \frac{P}{1=C_{R}} \frac{1}{d^{3}p^{0}(G_{0}(p^{0};E) - G_{0}(p^{0};E=0))} = \frac{4}{4=C_{R} + iM} \frac{P}{ME + i}$$
(6)

The second equality is easily obtained since the integral is now convergent. Finally, identifying the zero energy T matrix as 4 a=M immediately gives a renormalization condition that $C_R = 4$ a=M and yields Eq. (1). It is also worth observing at this stage W einberg's renormalization scheme is completely equivalent to dimensional regularization with the \overline{MS} renormalization scheme as discussed in KSW.

This section addresses the question of why the calculation based on the renorm alization prescription discussed in Sec. II cannot describe repulsion. As mentioned in the Introduction, this occurs because the calculation implicitly assumes that the range of the interaction is zero and not simply shorter than some separation scale. One indication Eq. (1) is based on a true zero range interaction is the absence of any dependence on a regulator mass in the nal expression for the T matrix. Indeed, in W einberg's derivation no regularization scheme is explicitly introduced. In fact, the regulator mass has in plicitly been taken to in nity at two distinct places in this calculation. The rst is the derivation of Eq. (4); had a nite range been given to the interaction via any form of a regulator, one could not obtain the simple result of Eq. (4). Instead one would have had to solve an integral equation. The second place where the regulator mass was in plicitly taken to in nity is in the second equality in Eq. (6).

K SW reproduce W einberg's result using dimensional regularization. This, is to be expected, since by construction, dimensional regularization introduces no regulator mass. In principle, a scale can enter the problem through renorm alization but, as noted by K SW, at this order the renorm alization scale dependence is trivial:

$$(1=C_R) = 0 :$$
(7)

The KSW result is the same as W einberg's and suggests that the lack of a regulator in the derivation of Eq. (4) is su cient for the system to bee the information that the range of the interaction is nite.

To see that Eq. (1) does correspond to a truly zero-range interaction one should study nite ranged interactions and then show that Eq. (1) is the zero-range limit. Consider a regularization prescription where one replaces the function potential by a nite-ranged potential at the beginning of the problem. If one is in the regime in which the e ective eld theory is valid, then the results are insensitive to the precise form of the regulator and the precise value of the regulator m ass.

For sim plicity, consider a sim ple form for the regulated function a square well of radius 1= :

$$_{R}(\mathbf{x};) = \frac{3^{3} (1 = \dot{\mathbf{x}})}{4} ; \qquad (8)$$

where is the regulator mass. In coordinate space, the potential is just

$$V_0(x) = C()_R(x;)$$
 : (9)

The bare coe cient is written as C () to indicate that the value of the coupling depends on the regulator mass, , through a renorm alization condition.

It is an elementary exercise to nd the T matrix associated with this potential. The phase shifts satisfy

$$p \cot() = \frac{\cot(=) + p \tan(p=)}{1 = p \cot(=) \tan(p=)} ;$$
(10)

with

$$= p^{2} \frac{3C()M^{3}}{4} :$$
 (11)

This expression is valid for both attractive and repulsive interactions. For repulsive interactions and su ciently small p, becomes in aginary. The on shell T matrix is related to cot() by

$$T(p) = \frac{2}{M p(cot())}$$
 : (12)

The expression for the phase shift in Eqs. (10) and (11) depends on the bare coupling C (). It is useful to express this in terms of a physical observable. This amounts to picking a renormalization condition for C (). The most natural choice is to use the scattering length which is related to the phase shifts near p = 0:

$$\lim_{p \ge 0} p \cot() = 1 = a \tag{13}$$

to x C(). Using Eqs. (10), (11) and (13), one nds the following renorm alization condition for C():

$$\frac{3C()M}{4} \cot \frac{3C()M}{4} = \frac{1}{1 a} :$$
 (14)

I.

It is straightforward to demonstrate that for attractive interactions in the lim it of ! 1, one recovers Eq. (1). The key point is that in this lim it C()³! 1 and thus also diverges. Moreover, as C()³! 1, ! $(\frac{3C()^{3}}{4})^{1=2}$ which is independent of p. Although C()³ diverges, C() can remain nite. Moreover p= ! 0. Im posing the lim it, one nds that Eq. (10) becomes

$$\lim_{|1|_{C}(1)} p \cot(1) = \frac{\left(\frac{3C(1)M}{4}\right)^{1-2} \cot\left[\left(\frac{3C(1)M}{4}\right)^{1-2}\right]}{1 \left(\frac{3C(1)M}{4}\right)^{1-2} \cot\left[\left(\frac{3C(1)M}{4}\right)^{1-2}\right]}$$
(15)

where the right-hand side of Eq. (15) is independent of p. Im posing the renorm alization condition in eq. (14) on the expression in Eq. (15) one sees that $p \cot() = 1=a; Eq. (1)$ im mediately follows. The conclusion of this analysis is that, as expected, Eq. (1) corresponds to an interaction of literally zero range.

Now consider what happens for a repulsive potential with C () > 0. Form ally, Eq. (15) still applies. There is a di culty, however, in implementing the renormalization condition. For C () > 0, Eq. (14) becomes

$$\frac{3C()M}{4} \operatorname{coth}^{r} \frac{3C()M}{4} = \frac{1}{1 a} :$$
(16)

For repulsivive interactions, C() > 0 and the left-hand side of Eq. (16) is positive so that the renormalization condition can only be satis ed if

Thus, when describing repulsion, one cannot take the regulator mass to in nity while still describing the correct scattering length. Indeed, when one lets ! 1 one is forced to have a ! 0 which implies a zero cross section; as ! 0, all e ects of the repulsive interaction must vanish.

O fcourse, the preceding analysis is just an alternative dem onstration of the triviality of the repulsive delta function interaction discussed in the context of the nonrelativistic lim it of 4^{4} eld theories by B eg and Furlong [17]. A rigorous m athem atical proof of this was provided by Friedman [18].

There is no great mystery here. A regulated delta function of the form in Eq. (8), with an in nite strength repulsive interaction is simply a hard core interaction of radius 1 = . The scattering length for a hard core potential is just the radius of the hard core. Thus, no matter how strong the repulsion in the regulated function, one cannot get a scattering length greater than 1 = . It is very clear why this happens, as ! 1, C() gets large. The e ect of a potential which has a large positive value over some nite region is simply to exclude the wave function from that region. As ! 1, how ever, the size of the region over which the wave function is excluded goes to zero and the e ect of the repulsion vanishes.

It is worth stressing that Friedman's theorem guarantees that the inability to describe repulsion when one takes the regulatorm ass to in nity is a general feature and not simply a peculiar feature of the square-well regulator. This can be explicitly verified by choosing various alternative forms. For example, the regulated delta function can be chosen to be a surface delta function on a shell of radius 1= :

$$_{R}(\mathbf{x};) = \frac{2}{4}(jxj \ l=)$$
 (18)

Taking $V_0(\mathbf{x}) = C(\mathbf{x})_{R}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x})$, calculating the T m atrix and using the scattering length to $\mathbf{x} C(\mathbf{x})$ gives the following renorm alization condition:

$$C() = \frac{4 a}{M(1 a)}$$
 : (19)

As in the case of the square well regulator, one can satisfy the renorm alization condition for repulsive interactions (which of necessity have C () > 0 and a > 0) only for < 1=a.

IV .ATTRACTIVE IN TERACTIONS AND THE CONVERGENCE OF THE EFT EXPANSION

The preceding section showed that, in order to describe repulsion in an elective led theory with all exchanged particles integrated out, it was necessary to regulate the theory by giving the contact interactions a nite range. Moreover, it was seen that it was not possible to let the regulator parameter go to in nity. This section brie y

discusses possible consequences of taking the regulator mass to in nity for attractive interactions. It is easy to see that the problem s arise with such a scheme when the scattering length is either very large or very small. The case of large scattering length is of particular importance since in the nuclear physics case the scattering length in the singlet channel is very large. This situation was discussed by KSW who point out that W einberg's scheme, when implemented with dimensional regularization and MS renormalization, breaks down at a momentum scale set by the scattering length. As the scattering length goes to in nity, W einberg's approach breaks down for lower and lower momentum; if a were in nite W einberg's expansion would break down for arbitrarily smallp and thus be of no utility. KSW suggest that this breakdown is a consequence of strong correlations between the coe cients of contact term s

at di erent orders in the EFT expansion of the potential. They propose to avoid this di culty by expanding p ot rather than by expanding the potentials and iterating to all orders as proposed by W einberg. At rst glance the explanation for the breakdown of W einberg's scheme seem s quite unnatural; it depends on a conspiracy am ong the higher order term s. On the other hand, one m ight argue that generically the scattering length should be of order 1= and that having a very long scattering length | one m uch longer than 1= | is, in itself, unnatural. Thus, one m ight expect that to describe such a situation an a priori unlikely correlation am ong various terms s in the expansion is not absurd. However, even if there are correlations of the form postulated by K SW , there is still a problem . The conventional power counting scheme requires that the contribution of V₂, the two derivative contact interaction, to the T m atrix be down by a power of $p^2 = 2$, com pared to the e ect of V₀; this should hold up to m omenta of order . K SW show explicitly that this fails for large a when dimensional regularization and M S renorm alization is used. This raises a thormy question since there is no obvious aw with conventional power counting arguments and the power counting does not obviously depend on the scattering length being sm all.

In this section, an alternative explanation for the breakdown of W einberg's scheme at low p for large a will be explored. It will be argued that the breakdown is another consequence of taking the regulatorm ass to in nity and is not an intrinsic defect in the expansion.

In many ways, this problem is quite analogous to the di culty of describing repulsion. In the repulsion case, the range of the interaction was intrinsic to the description | the scattering length was always smaller than the range of the potential. Thus any scheme which treats the range as being zero is destined to fail. The elective range in the case of in nite scattering length is similar. Recall that the elective range, r_0 , is defined in terms of an expansion of pcot(),

$$p \cot() = 1 = a + \frac{1}{2}r_0p^2 + \dots$$
 (20)

Suppose for example that the underlying dynam ics were in fact a square well. Then it is trivial to show from Eqs. (10), (11) and (20) that when the scattering length is in nite, the elective range is just the radius of the well. Thus, the physical size of the well is an essential part of the physics of the elective range when a is in nite. It will hardly be supprising if it turns out not to be possible to describe this by a zero-range interaction.

Consider the treatment of the physics of the elective range in W einberg's scheme. Clearly it depends on V_2 , the two-derivative contact term in the elective Lagrangian. Formally, the elects of this are order $p^2 = 2$ suppressed relative to V_0 . A linear combination plays a role in the singlet swave channel and one can write V_2 as

$$V_2(\vec{p}^0; p) = \frac{C_2}{2}(p^2 + p^{02})$$
 : (21)

Iterating this potential, using dimensional regularization and M S renorm alization and using the scattering length r_0 to x the renorm alized C₂ gives the following T m atrix [16]:

$$T_{2}(p^{0};p) = \frac{4 = M}{a + \frac{1}{2}a^{2}r_{0}p^{2} + i\frac{p}{ME + i}} :$$
(22)

The subscript, 2, indicates that this T m atrix includes the e ects of contact interactions with up to two derivatives.

By conventional power counting one expects $T_2 = T_0 [1 + 0 (p^2 = 2)]$. How ever, expanding Eqs. (22) and comparing with eq. (1) one sees that

$$T_{2}(p^{0};p) = T_{0}(p^{0};p) [1 + \frac{1}{2}ar_{0}p^{2} + O(p^{3}a^{2}r_{0})] : \qquad (23)$$

Thus, for a >> r_0 , the e ects of V_2 becomes comparable to the the e ects V_0 when p (ar₀) ¹⁼². This is a signature of the breakdown of the power counting argument. If a ! 1, the momentum scale at which the power counting breaks down goes to zero.

This problem can be avoided quite simply if the function interactions are regulated from the beginning. The basic strategy is to exploit the freedom in choosing . If one begins with regulated functions, the strength of both C_0 and C_2 depend on both the renormalization conditions (xed by a and r_0) and the regulator mass . In principle, all physical results should be independent of since it is an artical parameter introduced only for convenience. However, the full theory is not being solved; within a given approximation scheme results do depend on , albeit only weakly. One can exploit the freedom in choosing to improve the convergence of the approximation scheme. An optimal choice of is one which minimizes the errors associated with truncating the expansion. Thus, for example, in perturbative QCD treatments of deep inelastic scattering one chooses the factorization scale to be of order Q^2 in order to avoid large logarithms in the higher order corrections. In an analogous fashion, for the present problem one can x so as to minimize the higher order corrections of the EFT expansion. In particular, one can chose so that $C_2 = 0$. This is possible for any reasonable regulator $T_2 = T_0$ for all p and the di culty of the expansion breaking down at low p is avoided. More generally, one expects that if a non-optimal regulator mass, , com parable to or less than $1=r_0$ were chosen then $T_2 = T_0 [1 + 0 (p=)]$. This will be studied in a subsequent publication.

There is also a problem with this treatment in the limit a ! 0. This corresponds to a zero T matrix at zero energy. This situation can occur in a nontrivial way if the underlying potential has both attraction and repulsion whose e ects cancel at zero energy; it can also occur in an attractive potential with a su ciently deeply bound state. In general, for scattering problem s with nonzero potentials and a = 0, the T matrix is zero only for zero energy. For a generic interaction tuned to give a = 0, norm alpower counting would lead one to expect that T $p^2 = {}^2$. In contrast, consider Eq. (22). As a goes to zero, T_2 goes to zero for all p violating the conventional power counting arguments. A gain this represents a serious di culty since nothing in the conventional power counting depends in an obvious way on a being nonzero. This problem is also an artifact of in posing an in nite cuto.

The author gratefully acknow ledges discussions with Daniel Phillips, Manoj Banerjee and Ubira jara van Kolck. This work was supported in part by the U.S.Department of Energy through grant no.DE+FG 02-93ER-40762.

- [2] J.G asser and H.Leutwyler, Ann. Phys. 158, 142 (1984); Nucl. Phys. B 250, 465 (1985).
- [3] S.W einberg, Phys. Lett. B 251, 288 (1990); Nucl. Phys. B 363, 3 (1991).
- [4] C.Ordonez and U. van Kolck, Phys. LettB 291, 459 (1992).
- [5] S.W einberg, Phys. Lett. B 295 114, (1992).
- [6] T-S Park, D.-P.M in and M. Rho, Phys. Rept. 233, 341 (1993).
- [7] C.Ordonez, L.Ray and U.van Kolck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1982 (1994).
- [8] T.-S. Park, I. Towner and K. Kubadera, Nucl. Phys. A 579, 381 (1994).
- [9] T.-S. Park, D.-P. M in and M. Rho, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 4143 (1995).
- [10] T.-S. Park, D.-P. M in and M. Rho, Nucl. Phys. A 596,515 (1996).
- [11] S.R. Beane, C.Y. Lee, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. C 52 2914 (1995).
- [12] C.Ordonez, L.Ray and U.van Kolck, Phys. Rev. C 53, 2086 (1996).
- [13] B.Y.Park, F.M yhrer, J.R.M orones, T.M eissner, K.Kubodera, University of South Carolina preprint USC-NT-95-6; e-Print Archive: nucl-th/9512023.
- [14] T.D.Cohen, J.L.Friar, G.A.M iller and U. van Kolck, University of Washington Preprint, DOE-ER-40427-26-N 95; e-Print Archive: nucl-th/9512036.
- [15] U. van Kolck, J. L. Friar and T. Goldman, Phys. Lett. B 371, 169 (1996).
- [16] D.B.Kaplan, M.J.Savage and M.W ise, University of W ashington preprint DOE-ER-40561-257-INT 96-00-125; e-Print Archive: nucl-th/9605002.
- [17] M.A.B.Beg and R.C.Furlong, Phys.Rev.D 31, 1370 (1984).
- [18] C.N. Friedman, Journ. of Functional Analysis, 10, 346 (1972).

^[1] For pedagogic reviews see D.B.Kaplan, \E ective Field Theories", Lectures given at 7th Summer School in Nuclear Physics Symmetries, Seattle, WA, June 18-30 1995; e-Print Archive: nucl-th/9506035; or A.V.Manohar, \E ective Field Theories", Lectures given at 35th International University School of Nuclear and Particle Physics: Perturbative and Nonperturbative A spects of Quantum Field Theory, Schladming, Austria, March 2-9 1996; e-Print Archive: hep-ph/9606222.