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The scattering of neutrons up to about 10 or 20 Mev by protons can be described by two parameters, the scattering length at zero energy, \( a \), and the effective range, \( r_0 \). A formula (16), expressing the phase shift in terms of \( a \) and \( r_0 \) is derived; it is identical with one previously derived by Schwinger but the derivation is very much simpler. Reasons are given why the deviations from the simple formula are very small, as shown by the explicit calculations by Blatt and Jackson.

The theory is then applied to proton-proton scattering, with a similarly simple result. Moreover, a method is developed to compare proton-proton and proton-neutron scattering without explicit calculation of a nuclear potential.

The most recent experimental results are evaluated on the basis of the theory, and accurate values for the effective ranges are obtained for the triplet scattering of neutrons, and for proton-proton scattering. The nuclear force between two protons is found to differ by a small amount, but beyond doubt, from that between neutron and proton in the singlet state. All actual results agree with those obtained by Breit and collaborators, and by Blatt and Jackson.

I. INTRODUCTION

Schwinger\(^1\) has shown that the phase shift \( \delta \) in the triplet neutron-proton scattering is related to the wave number \( k \) by the relation

\[
k \cot \delta = -\gamma + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^2 + k^2)r_0 + O(kr_0^2),
\]

where \( \gamma \) is related to the deuteron binding energy, \( \epsilon \), by

\[
\epsilon = (\hbar^2/M)\gamma^2,
\]

and \( r_0 \) is a constant of the dimension of a length, which is called the "effective range" of the nuclear forces. The term of order \( kr_0^2 \) is negligible at "classical" \(^2\) neutron energies. Therefore, if \( \delta \) is obtained from experiment and \( k \cot \delta \) plotted against the neutron energy (i.e., \( k^2 \)), a straight line will result. The slope of this line determines the effective range \( r_0 \); the intercept at \( k = 0 \) gives the scattering length\(^3\) at zero energy, \( a \), by means of the relation

\[
1/a = \gamma(1 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma r_0).
\]

The singlet scattering can be treated in an analogous way.

It has long been suspected that "classical" nuclear scattering experiments can only determine two parameters in the nuclear potential, let us say an effective range and an effective depth. This was demonstrated with the greatest thoroughness by Breit and his collaborators\(^4\) for proton-proton scattering. For any reasonable shape of the nuclear potential, they could choose two parameters (depth and range) in such a way as to fit the observed scattering essentially within experimental error. This showed that practically no information could be obtained, from classical scattering experiments, on the shape of the potential. Subsequently, Landau and Smorodinsky\(^5\) surmised the relations (12) and (51) which are similar to (1). However, Schwinger was the first to give a general proof of these relations.

Schwinger's proof is based on a variational principle and is quite complicated. It is the main purpose of this paper to give a greatly simplified derivation. Because of the simplicity, it is then easy to calculate higher terms in Eq. (1), and in particular to show generally that the neglected term is not only of order \( k^6 \) but in addition has a very small coefficient. For the proton-proton scattering, a similar equation (Eq. (51)) can be derived with very little trouble; moreover, the relation between proton-proton and proton-neutron force can be established without explicit calculation of the nuclear potential. In a subsequent paper, it will be shown that the photoelectric and the photomagnetic effects of the deuteron can be calculated in terms of the effective ranges, and that the theory can be generalized to the case of tensor forces.

Blatt\(^6\) has applied Schwinger's theory to an evaluation of the experiments on neutron-proton scattering. Blatt and Jackson\(^7\) have analyzed all the implications of the theory and have, in addition, given very useful curves and formulas showing the relation between the parameters of potentials of


\(^2\) J. M. Blatt and J. D. Jackson, Phys. Rev. this issue. Referred to as BJ. As far as possible, the same notation is used here as in BJ.

\(^3\) This work was done while the author was a Visiting Professor at Columbia University, New York, New York.


\(^5\) The expression "classical nuclear physics" was introduced by S. Allison to describe the energy region up to, say, 10 or 20 Mev.


\(^7\) Breit, Thaxton, and Eisenbud, Phys. Rev. 55, 1018 (1939); Holsington, Share, and Breit, Phys. Rev. 56, 884 (1939).
various shapes, and the effective range and scattering length. They have also evaluated the coefficient of $k^3r^3$ in (1) for various potential shapes. We shall therefore refer to their paper with regard to quantitative numerical results obtainable with the present theory.

II. NEUTRON-PROTON SCATTERING, EFFECTIVE RANGE

Consider a neutron of energy $E_1$ and wave number $k_1$. If $E_1$ is in the laboratory system,

$$ E_1 = 2\hbar^2k_1^2/M. $$

(4)

Let $u_1$ by the radial wave function multiplied by $r$, for an $S$ state; then $u_1$ satisfies the Shr"odinger equation

$$ d^2u_1/dr^2 + k_1^2u_1 - V(r)u_1 = 0, $$

(5)

where $V$ is the potential energy, multiplied by $M/k^2$. For another energy, we have

$$ d^2u_2/dr^2 + k_2^2u_2 - V(r)u_2 = 0. $$

(5a)

Multiply (5) by $u_2$ and (5a) by $u_1$, subtract and integrate; then we get

$$ u_2u_1' - u_1u_2' \bigg|_0^R = (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \int_0^R u_1u_2dr, $$

(6)

where the upper limit $R$ is arbitrary.

If $R$ is infinity, the orthogonality relation results. If $R$ is chosen equal to the range of the nuclear forces, one obtains the relation of Bethe and Peierls\(^4\) between scattering phase shift and $k$. We shall not use (6) directly, but first introduce a comparison function $\psi$ which represents the asymptotic behavior of $u$ for large distances, viz.

$$ \psi = A_1 \sin(k_1r + \delta_1), $$

(7a)

where $\delta_1$ is the phase shift\(^5\) for energy $E_1$. It is most convenient to choose the normalizing factor $A_1$ so as to make $\psi = 1$ at the origin, thus:

$$ \psi = \sin(k_1r + \delta_1)/\sin\delta_1. $$

(7)

This will at the same time determine the normalization of $u$ since $u$ is supposed to approach $\psi$ asymptotically for large $r$ including normalization.

For the $\psi$'s, a relation analogous to (6) will hold, viz.:

$$ \psi_1\psi_1' - \psi_2\psi_2' \bigg|_0^R = (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \int_0^R \psi_1\psi_2dr. $$

(8)

Now subtract (6) from (8). Then, if the upper limit $R$ is chosen large compared with the range of the nuclear forces, each function $u_i$ will be equal to its asymptotic form $\psi_i$ and there will therefore be no contribution to the integrated term (left-hand side) from the upper limit $R$. For the same reason, the integral on the right-hand side can now be extended to infinity. At the lower limit, $u_1 = u_2 = 0$ so that this term does not contribute. This leaves

$$ (\psi_1\psi_1' - \psi_2\psi_2')_{r=0} = (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \int_0^\infty (\psi_1\psi_2 - u_1u_2)dr. $$

(9)

Now we have normalized $\psi$ to unity at $r = 0$ (Eq. (7)), and the derivative of $\psi$ can easily be obtained from (7) so that we find

$$ k_2\cot\delta_2 - k_1\cot\delta_1 = (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \int_0^\infty (\psi_1\psi_2 - u_1u_2)dr. $$

(10)

This equation is exact and is the fundamental equation of our theory.

We can now apply (10) to the special case $k_1 = 0$. Then

$$ k_1\cot\delta_1 = -\alpha = -1/a, $$

(11)

where $a$ is the scattering length of Fermi and Marshall, for zero-energy neutrons, which can be determined with great accuracy. For the triplet state, $a$ is positive, for the singlet state, negative. We shall use subscripts zero for the wave functions referring to zero energy, and we may drop the subscripts for state 2. Then (10) becomes

$$ k\cot\delta = -a + 1/4k^2\rho(0, E) $$

(12)

with

$$ 1/4\rho(0, E) = \int_0^\infty (\psi_1\psi_2 - u_{1u_2})dr. $$

(13)

Clearly, $\rho$ has the dimension of a length. It can also be defined for two arbitrary energies,

$$ 1/4\rho(E_1, E_2) = \int_0^\infty (\psi_1\psi_2 - u_{1u_2})dr. $$

(13a)

The important point is now that $\psi$ and $u$ differ only inside the range of the nuclear forces. Therefore the integrands in (13) and (13a) will be different from zero only inside the force-range. However, in this region the wave functions $u$ and $\psi$ depend only very slightly on energy, because $kr$ is small and the potential energy is much larger than $k^2$. Therefore it will be a good approximation (indeed a very good one, as we shall show in the next section) to replace $u$ by $u_0$ and $\psi$ by $\psi_0$ and to write

$$ 1/4\rho(0, E) = 1/4\rho(0, 0) = 1/4r_0 = \int_0^\infty (\psi_0^2 - u_0^2)dr. $$

(14)

This quantity is now a constant, independent of energy, and we call it the effective range.\(^5\) It is


\(^{4}\) All considerations refer to $S$ waves; therefore we do not need to put the orbital momentum in evidence by writing $\delta_1$. The subscript in this paper will generally refer to the energy, not to $i$.

\(^{5}\) F. C. Barker and R. E. Peierls, Phys. Rev. 75, 312 (1949), have given a similar derivation for the effective range. Also similar are the calculations of G. F. Chew and M. L. Goldberger, Phys. Rev. 75, 1637 (1949).
identical with the effective range used and defined
by Blatt and Jackson. (For the shape of the func-
tions $\psi_0$ and $u_0$ see their Fig. 3.) Schwinger defined
$r_0$ by

$$\frac{1}{2}r_0 = \int_0^\infty (\psi_0^2 - u_0^2) dr, \quad (14a)$$

where $u_0$ and $\psi_0$ refer to the ground state of the
deuteron, and in particular $\psi_0$ is the asymptotic
solution

$$\psi_0 = e^{-r} \quad (15)$$

with $\gamma$ defined in (2). Since $\rho(E_1, E_2)$ is insensitive
to the energies $E_1$ and $E_2$, it makes little difference
if both of them are replaced by $-\epsilon$ where $\epsilon$ is the
binding energy of the deuteron; so Schwinger's effective
range is very close to ours. Blatt and Jackson have shown that (14) will give a somewhat
closer approximation to the scattering than (14a).

Using (14), then, the fundamental relation (12) reduces to

$$k \cot \delta = -\alpha + \frac{1}{2}k^2 r_0. \quad (16)$$

Schwinger's relation (1) is obtained from (10) if the
comparison state is taken to be the ground state.
As pointed out by Blatt, and mentioned in the
Introduction, these relations are both very
convenient for the analysis of neutron-proton
scattering data, although some complication is caused
by the mixture of triplet and singlet scattering. If these
two parts can be separated and $\delta$ determined for
triplet and singlet separately, a straight line is obtained when the empirically determined
quantity $k \cot \delta$ is plotted against the "energy" $k^2$.

Equation (16) may be inserted in the formula for the
cross section,

$$\sigma = \frac{\sin^2 \delta}{4\pi} \frac{1}{k^2} \frac{k^2 + k^2 \cot^2 \delta}{[k^2 + \alpha^2 - k^2 \alpha r_0}
+ \frac{1}{2} k^2 r_0^2 + O(k^4 \alpha r_0^3)]^{-1}. \quad (17)$$

Actually, the more complicated Schwinger
expression (1) gives a simpler result because several
terms combine, viz.

$$\sigma = \frac{4\pi}{(k^2 + \gamma^2) [1 - \gamma r_0 + \frac{1}{3}(k^2 + \gamma^2) r_0^2}
+ O(k^4 \gamma r_0^3)]^{-1}. \quad (18a)$$

Thus, in first approximation, the cross section is
multiplied by the constant factor $1/(1 - \gamma r_0)$ as
already pointed out by Bethe and Peierls. But the
following correction term, $\frac{1}{3}(k^2 + \gamma^2) r_0^2$, while in
general much smaller than the first, still is unaffected
by the omission of higher order corrections in (16) or (1): these neglected terms will only give
contributions of relative order $(kr_0)^3$. Schwinger
has pointed out that the term in $(kr_0)^2$ is required
in order to keep the cross section everywhere
below the permitted maximum, $4\pi/k^2$. This maxi-
mum is reached when $\cot \delta = 0$, i.e., $k^2 = 2\alpha r_0$. For
triplet scattering, with the numerical values given
in the next section, this corresponds to 20 Mev
neutron energy (laboratory system).

III. DETERMINATION OF RANGE FROM PARA-
HYDROGEN SCATTERING

If the state 2 in (10) is taken to be the ground
state, then from (15) we have $\psi_2'(0) = -\gamma$, and we find

$$\alpha = \gamma - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \rho(0, -\epsilon) \approx \gamma(1 - \frac{1}{2} \gamma r_0), \quad (19)$$

which is also contained in the Schwinger relation (1). This provides the most accurate way to deter-
dine $r_0$ for the triplet state because $\gamma$ is known
from the binding energy of the deuteron and $\alpha$ from
the parahydrogen scattering.

Since all the relevant experimental data are still
subject to correction, it is desirable to indicate the
change of the result which would be caused by a
given change of the experimental numbers. We put:

Binding energy of deuteron

$$\epsilon = 2.21(1 + \epsilon_1) \text{ Mev}. \quad (20a)$$

Scattering cross section of slow neutrons by free
protons \( \sigma_f = 20.36(1 + \epsilon_2) \) barns. \( (20b) \)

Scattering of parahydrogen

\( (3a_t + a_s)^2 = 0.624(1 + \epsilon_3) \) barns, \( (20c) \)

where $a_t$ and $a_s$ are the scattering lengths for triplet
and singlet, respectively, so that

$$\sigma_f = \pi(3a_t^2 + a_s^2). \quad (21)$$

The corrections $\epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_2$, $\epsilon_3$ may be just as easily posi-
tive as negative; the present indicated probable
errors are about

$$\epsilon_1 = \pm 0.009 \quad (\pm 0.2 \text{ kev}), \quad (22a)$$

$$\epsilon_2 = \pm 0.005 \quad (\pm 0.10 \text{ barn}), \quad (22b)$$

$$\epsilon_3 = \pm 0.08 \quad (\pm 0.050 \text{ barn}). \quad (22c)$$

The value for the binding energy of the deuteron
is taken mainly from the reaction

$$\text{C}^{14} + \text{H} = \text{N}^{14} + n, \quad (23)$$

whose threshold has been accurately determined by
Shoup and Jennings\footnote{I am indebted to Dr. K. Bainbridge for a discussion of the}
experimentation on the deuteron binding energy at
the Conference on Classical Nuclear Physics at Chicago,
December 1948. Dr. Bainbridge will publish a more detailed
discussion in the near future.

\footnote{Shoup, Jennings, and Sun, Phys. Rev. 75, 1 (1949).}
Cook, and Price, and is 156.3±1.0 kev. This gives for the difference

\[ n - H = 776 \pm 9 \text{ kev.} \quad (23a) \]

Combining this with the mass spectograph doublet

\[ H_2 - D = 1432 \pm 2 \text{ kev}, \quad (23b) \]

we get for the binding energy of the deuteron

\[ n + H - D = \epsilon = 2208 \pm 7 \text{ kev.} \quad (23c) \]

Probably the best direct measurement of the binding energy is the recent one by Bell and Elliot at Chalk River who measured the energy of the \( \gamma \)-rays from the capture reaction and found

\[ \epsilon = 2237 \pm 5 \text{ kev} \quad (24) \]

referred to the ThC" \( \gamma \)-ray which was taken as 2620 kev. Since this involves an absolute calibration of \( \gamma \)-ray energies and since (23a) involves only the measurement of small energies, we shall provisionally adopt (23c) until the small discrepancy between it and (24) is resolved. In any case, the lower values (2185 kev) found earlier seem to be discredited.

For the free proton cross section, we take the very accurate value obtained by Melkonian, Rainwater and Havens with the Columbia velocity selector. For the para-hydrogen scattering, the value of Sutton et al. observed at Los Alamos was taken; a relatively generous probable error seemed indicated (see the discussion in BJ, Section VI).

The values chosen in (20) give for the "radius of the deuteron"

\[ 1/\gamma = 4.332(1 + \frac{3}{2} \epsilon_0) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm} \quad (25) \]

for the two scattering lengths

\[ -a_\alpha = (2.375 + 1.11 \epsilon_2 + 0.072 \epsilon_3) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}, \quad (26a) \]

\[ a_\alpha = (0.528 + 0.37 \epsilon_2 - 0.108 \epsilon_3) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}, \quad (26b) \]

and, using (19), for the effective range

\[ r_0 = (1.56 + 2.7 \epsilon_1 + 5.0 \epsilon_2 - 1.5 \epsilon_3) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm.} \quad (27) \]

Inserting (22), we find for the contributions to the uncertainty of the effective range:

from the deuteron binding energy

\[ 0.024 \times 10^{-13}, \quad (27a) \]

from the free-proton scattering

\[ 0.025 \times 10^{-13}, \quad (27b) \]

from the parascattering

\[ 0.12 \times 10^{-13}. \quad (27c) \]

As is to be expected, the parascattering gives the greatest uncertainty and more precise experiments are very desirable. An additional uncertainty arises from the slight difference between \( \rho(0, -\epsilon) \) and \( \rho(0, 0) \) which depends on the shape of the potential; from Fig. 14 of BJ this effect may be estimated to be an increase of \( r_0 \) by about 0.01 for the square well, and a decrease of about 0.04 for the Yukawa potential, as compared with the value given in (27).

The singlet scattering range cannot be deduced with any certainty from existing neutron-proton experiments (BJ Fig. 8). The best procedure still seems to be to assume approximate equality of force in the singlet state for proton-proton and neutron-proton. The proton-proton data (Section 6) give \( r_0 = 2.7 \times 10^{-13} \) which we shall assume to be true also for neutron-proton singlet scattering. This means a large difference between the effective ranges for triplet and singlet states. Now for square wells the effective range is nearly equal to the actual width (intrinsic range) of the square well and therefore the intrinsic ranges come out very differently for triplet and singlet (1.85 and 2.55 \times 10^{-13}, respectively). But for long-tailed potentials, there is a large difference between intrinsic and effective range, especially for the triplet state which is relatively strongly bound. For such potentials, then, the same intrinsic range may easily be compatible with the observed large difference in effective ranges in singlet and triplet states. This is true, in particular, for a Yukawa potential if the intrinsic range is chosen to be

\[ b_s = b_t = 2.5 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm.} \quad (28) \]

That it is possible to use the same intrinsic potential for triplet and singlet, is due to the fact that the "Yukawa" curve for \( b/r_0 \) vs. \( \alpha r_0 \), Fig. 6 of BJ, is very steep when \( \alpha r_0 \) is large which it is for the triplet state, viz. about 0.3 from Eq. (26b) and (27). Therefore almost any value of \( b_t \) is compatible with a given \( r_0 \), and among them also \( b_s \). It is therefore better to turn the argument around and assume \( b_t = b_s \), to be given by (28), and \( r_t \) by (27), then we get \( b_t/r_t = 1.6 \); and from BJ Fig. 6 we find \( \alpha r_t = a_t = 0.28 \) in good agreement with (26b), (27). Thus, if we knew (a) that the potential had a Yukawa shape and (b) that \( ab \) is rather large, we could predict the effective triplet range quite accurately from the scattering length \( a_t \) alone,
without knowing the binding energy of the ground state; or we might even predict \( r_1 \) and \( a_t \) (and thus the parahydrogen scattering) directly from the binding energy of the deuteron, using \( a_t = 0.3 \) and Eq. (19).

The fact that the small effective triplet range is compatible with a large singlet range for a long-tailed potential, is the reason why Bohm and Richman\(^\text{18} \) found it possible to explain the observed neutron-proton scattering up to 6 Mev with the same well for singlet and triplet provided they took a long-tailed well.

**IV. ENERGY DEPENDENCE OF EFFECTIVE RANGE**

We shall now study the dependence on energy of \( \rho(0, E) \), as defined by Eq. (13). For this purpose we expand the comparison function \( \psi \) up to second order in \( k \); we get from (7)

\[
\psi = \cos kr + \cot \delta \sin k r = 1 - \frac{1}{2} k^2 r^2 + k \cot \delta r - \frac{1}{2} k^2 \cot \delta r^2 + O(k^4 r^4). \tag{29}\]

Now we insert for \( k \cot \delta \) the first approximation (16) which is also accurate including terms of order \( k^2 r \); then

\[
\psi = 1 - ar + \frac{1}{2} k^2 r (r_0 - r) - \frac{1}{2} k^2 ar^2. \tag{29a}\]

The first two terms are independent of energy, the other two are proportional to the energy. It is often convenient to write \( \psi \) in the form

\[
\psi = \psi_0 + k^2 x_1 + k^4 x_2 + \cdots. \tag{30}\]

Then, according to (29a),

\[
x_1 = \frac{1}{2} r (r_0 - r) - \frac{1}{2} ar^2. \tag{30a}\]

This function is zero at \( r = 0 \) because all \( \psi \)'s are normalized to unity at this point; then it becomes positive because \( k \cot \delta \) (the slope of \( \psi \)) increases with energy; \( x_1 \) has a negative curvature which arises from the term \( \cos kr \) in (29); therefore it becomes zero again, at

\[
r = r_1 = r_0 (1 - \frac{1}{2} ar_0) \tag{31}\]

which is rather close to \( r_0 \), and is negative thereafter. In this approximation, then, the functions \( \psi \) for all energies will intersect near the effective range. (See Fig. 1.)

The energy dependent term \( x_1 \) is obviously small for any value of \( r \) comparable with \( r_0 \), i.e., anywhere within the range of the nuclear forces, whatever their shape. This is because \( x_1 \) has two zeros, one at 0 and one at \( r_1 \), and is therefore a small fraction of \( r_0^2 \) in the interesting range. Therefore \( \psi - \psi_0 \) will be a small numerical coefficient multiplied by \( (kr_0)^2 \) which itself is small for energies up to 10 Mev or so. We shall see that this makes the simple theory of Section II such a good approximation.

The correction to the simple theory is given by

\[
\frac{1}{2} \rho (E, 0) - \frac{1}{2} \rho (0, 0) = \int [\psi_0 (\psi - \psi_0) - u_0 (u - u_0)] dr
\]

\[
= k^2 \int_0^\infty (\psi x_1 - u x_1) dr, \tag{32}\]

if we set, in analogy to (30),

\[
u = u_0 + k^2 v_1 + k^4 v_2 + \cdots. \tag{32a}\]

The first part of (32), the integral of \( \psi_0 x_1 \), is small because \( x_1 \) has been shown to be small (compared with \( r_0^2 \)) inside the range of the nuclear forces. The function \( v_1 \) must also be small in this region because it must approach \( x_1 \) as soon as the nuclear forces become negligible, and must be zero for \( r = 0 \). Therefore the factor of \( k^2 \) in (32) must be small compared with \( r_0^2 \).

BJ have written the phase shift formula in the form

\[
k \cot \delta = -\alpha + \frac{1}{2} k^2 r_0 - P k^4 r_0^2 + \cdots. \tag{33}\]

Our argument then shows that \( P \) must be a small numerical coefficient. This is indeed what BJ find by explicit calculation. According to their Fig. 10, \( P \) is in most cases less than 0.05 and never exceeds 0.14. It depends, of course, on the shape of the potential and on the quantity \( a r_0^2 \); see Eq. (11).

It is very easy to calculate \( P \) for a square well, especially if we assume the resonance level to lie exactly at zero energy, i.e., if \( \alpha = 0 \). Then \( \psi_0 \) is equal to unity, \( \alpha \) is zero, \( r_0 \) is equal to the actual width \( b \) of the well, and \( x_1 \) is positive throughout the region contributing to the integral in (32). The first term

\[^{18}\text{D. Bohm and C. Richman, Phys. Rev. 71, 567 (1947). This fact was pointed out to the author by Dr. Blatt.}\]
in this integral then gives
\[ \int_0^{r_0} \psi_0 \chi_0 dr = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{r_0} r(r_0-r) dr = \frac{1}{2} r_0^3. \]  
(34)

The factor here is indeed small. Moreover, the second term in the integral (32) has always the opposite sign and is in general smaller than the first (since \( u_0 \leq \psi_0 \) everywhere); so the actual result of (32) will be even smaller than that obtained from the first term alone. Explicitly, we have for the square well

\[ u_0 = \sin Kr, \quad K = \pi/2b, \]  
(35a)

\[ u = \sin [(K^2 + k^2) r], \]  
(35b)

\[ v_1 = (u - u_0)/k^2 = (r/2K) \cos Kr, \]  
(35c)

\[ \int_0^{r_0} u_0 v_1 dr = \frac{r_0^3}{2\pi^2}. \]  
(35)

This is indeed of the same sign, and smaller than, Eq. (34). Combining them we get

\[ \rho(0, k^2) = r_0 + 0.0654k^2r_0^3 \]  
(36)

\[ P = -0.0327. \]  
(36a)

The correction to the effective range is very small. For 10 Mev and the observed value of \( r_0 \), Eq. (27), we have \( kr_0 = 0.54 \) and the second term of (36) is 2 percent of the first. The effect on the phase shift is about 0.3°. This shows the excellence of the simple (Schwinger) approximation given by Eq. (16).

We have seen that the correction function \( \chi_1 \) is positive for \( r < r_1 = r_0 \), negative for \( r > r_1 \). Therefore the correction term (32) is positive for the square well where the entire contribution comes from \( r < r_1 \). On the other hand, for a long-tailed potential such as that of Yukawa, most of the contribution to (32) is likely to come from \( r > r_1 \), where \( \chi_1 \) is negative, especially because \( |\chi_1| \) is on the whole greater for \( r > r_1 \). Therefore we should expect that the correction term (32) is negative (\( P \) positive) for long-tailed potentials. BJ have shown that this is indeed the case for the Yukawa and the exponential potential.

Another factor which tends to make (32) negative is that in this case \( v_1 \) is algebraically larger than \( \chi_1 \), so that the second term in (32) gives an additional negative contribution. (For the square well, \( v_1 \) is algebraically smaller than \( \chi_1 \).) This is illustrated in Fig. 2. This argument, as well as the calculations for Fig. 2, are due to Dr. C. Longmire.

The coefficient \( P \) is the first parameter in the expansion (33) of \( k \cot \delta \) which depends on the shape of the potential. If the scattering experiments could be made accurate enough to deduce \( P \), information on the shape would be obtained. If the plot of \( k \cot \delta \) vs. \( k^2 \) deviates from a straight line upwards we have a concentrated potential (square well or Gaussian); if the deviation is downwards the potential has a long tail (exponential or Yukawa potential). For the present, the experimental accuracy is not sufficient to make any deviations from the straight line significant. The only arguments for the shape of the potential are then of the type presented in the last section, viz. that the Yukawa potential permits the intrinsic range to be the same for triplet and singlet, while the square well would require very different intrinsic ranges in the two cases. From the triplet or the singlet scattering separately, each as a function of energy, nothing could be said about the shape. Moreover, to predict the scattering at an energy where it has not been measured, the straight line relation (16) appears to be the simplest as well as a very accurate method.

V. PROTON-PROTON SCATTERING: THEORY

In the case of proton-proton scattering, the Coulomb potential is added to the nuclear interaction. If \( w_1 \) is the radial wave function multiplied by \( r \), for wave number \( k_1 \), then

\[ w''_1 + k^2 w_1 = Vw_1 + 2w_1/Dr. \]  
(37)

The last term represents the Coulomb potential, and \( D \) is the Bohr radius for two protons,

\[ D = 2h^2/Me^2 = 5.76 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm} \]  
(38)

(factor 2 because of reduced mass). Because of the relative smallness of the Coulomb potential, the
Bohr radius \( D \) is very large compared with nuclear dimensions. This will be useful in the analysis.

We use again a comparison function, \( \varphi \), which is the solution in the Coulomb field alone, viz.

\[
\varphi'(r) + k_r^2 \varphi = 2 \varphi / Dr.
\]  

(39)

It is so chosen that \( w \) becomes equal to \( \varphi \) asymptotically, i.e., outside the range of the nuclear forces.

The function \( \varphi \) itself is quite complicated but most of its relevant properties, as well as tables, have been given by Yost, Wheeler, and Breit.\(^{29}\) For \( kr \gg 1 \), \( \varphi \) has the asymptotic form

\[
\varphi = C \sin(kr - \eta \log 2kr + 2 \arg \Gamma(1+i\eta) + \delta),
\]  

(40)

where \( C \) is a normalizing constant,

\[
\eta = e^2/\hbar v = 1/kD = (25.0 \text{ kev} / E)^\frac{1}{2}
\]  

(41)

is a very useful parameter, and \( \arg \Gamma \) is the complex phase of the \( \Gamma \)-function,

\[
\Gamma(x) = |\Gamma(x)| \exp[i \arg \Gamma(x)].
\]  

(41a)

The phase shift relative to the regular Coulomb function is denoted by \( \delta \) (Breit's \( K_0 \)). The function \( \varphi \), like its counterpart \( \psi \) in Section II, shall be normalized to unity at \( r = 0 \). It can then be expressed, at any value of \( r \), by a combination of regular and irregular solutions in the Coulomb potential which are denoted by \( F \) and \( G \), respectively, by YWB, thus:

\[
\varphi = C_0(G + F \cot \delta),
\]  

(42)

where \( C_0 \) is the well-known normalizing constant for Coulomb wave functions,

\[
C_0 = \left( \frac{2 \pi \eta}{e^{2\pi \eta} - 1} \right)^\frac{1}{2}.
\]  

(43)

As before, the normalization of \( \varphi \) determines that of \( w \).

Then, using a proof entirely analogous to Section II, we get

\[
\varphi_2 \varphi_1' - \varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \omega_2 \omega_1' + \omega_1 \omega_2' \bigg|_r^R = (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \int_r^R (\varphi_1 \omega_2 - \omega_1 \varphi_2) dr.
\]  

(44)

The only difference as compared with Section II is that we now take a finite lower limit \( r \), which, however, we assume to be very small compared with \( r_0 \). The integrated term in (44) is again zero at the upper limit; at the lower limit, the functions \( w \) are zero and the \( \varphi 's \) are 1 (within corrections of order \( r \)). Then we get

\[
\varphi_2'(r) - \varphi_1'(r) = (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \int_r^\infty (\varphi_1 \varphi_2 - \omega_1 \omega_2) dr = \frac{1}{2} (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \rho(E_1, E_2)
\]  

(45)

in complete analogy with (10), (13a). Equation (45) defines the "effective range" \( \rho \).

We must now investigate the derivative \( \varphi'(r) \). For small but finite \( r \), YWB give for the irregular function

\[
C_0 G = 1 + \frac{2r}{D} \left( \ln \frac{2r}{D} \right) + \text{R.P.} \Psi(i\eta) + 2C - 1 + O(r^2),
\]  

(46)

where \( C \) is Euler's constant, 0.577\ldots and \( \Psi \) the logarithmic derivative of the \( \Gamma \)-function,

\[
\Psi(z) = \frac{\Gamma'(z)}{\Gamma(z)} = \sum_{\nu = 1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{\nu} - \frac{1}{z + \nu} \right) - C
\]  

(46a)

so that

\[
\text{R.P.} \Psi(i\eta) + C = \eta^2 \sum_{\nu = 1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\nu(\nu^2 + \eta^2)}.
\]  

(46b)

Further evaluations are given by YWB. For reasonably high energy (\( > 0.5 \text{ Mev} \)) it is sufficient to set

\[
\text{R.P.} \Psi(i\eta) + C = \eta^2 s_3, \quad s_3 = \sum_{\nu = 1}^{\infty} \nu^{-3} = 1.202.
\]  

(46c)

We abbreviate

\[
C_0 G = 1 + (2r/D) \left[ \ln(2r/D) + \frac{1}{2} g(\eta) + C - 1 \right],
\]  

(47)

where \( g \) is a known function of \( \eta \), viz.

\[
g = -2 \ln \eta + 2\eta^2 \sum_{\nu = 1}^{\infty} \nu^{-1}(\nu^2 + \eta^2)^{-1}.
\]  

(47a)

The regular function is, up to order \( r \), simply

\[
F = C_0 kr
\]  

(48)

and therefore

\[
\varphi = C_0(G + F \cot \delta) = 1 + (2r/D) \left[ \ln(2r/D) + \frac{1}{2} g(\eta) + C - 1 \right.
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{2} C_0 kD \cot \delta \right] = 1 + \frac{2r}{D} \ln \frac{2r}{D} + \frac{1}{2} g(\eta) + C - 1 + \frac{\pi \cot \delta}{e^{2\pi \eta} - 1}.
\]  

(49)

where the values of \( C_0 \), (42), and of \( \eta \), (41), have been inserted.

It is seen that \( \varphi' \) is logarithmically infinite for \( r = 0 \). Therefore the direct use of \( \varphi'(0) \) is impossible,
and it is for this reason that we had to use a finite lower limit \( r \) in (45). But if we take the difference of the values of \( \varphi' \) for two different energies, \( E_2 \) and \( E_1 \), and at the same \( r \), the troublesome term \( \log r \) cancels out since it is energy-independent. We get then from (45), (49):

\[
\varphi_1' - \varphi_2' = \frac{1}{D} \left[ g(n_2) - g(n_1) + \frac{2 \pi \cot \delta_1}{e^{2\pi n_1} - 1} - \frac{2 \pi \cot \delta_2}{e^{2\pi n_2} - 1} \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} (k_2^2 - k_1^2) \rho(E_1, E_2), \tag{50}
\]

or, putting \( k_1 = 0 \):

\[
f(\eta) = \frac{2 \pi \cot \delta}{e^{2\pi \eta} - 1} = D[-\alpha' + \frac{1}{2} k^2 \rho(0, E)], \tag{51}
\]

where \( \alpha' \) is a constant, independent of energy, and analogous to the reciprocal scattering length \( \alpha \) in (16).

Equation (51) is quite similar to (16). It also was obtained by Schwinger\(^1\) from a variational principle. Previously, the relation had been stated but not proved by Landau and Smorodinsky. The quantity \( f \) itself was already defined and found useful by Breit, Condon, and Present\(^2\) in their first theory of the proton-proton scattering. These authors pointed out that \( f \) should be independent of energy if the range of the nuclear forces were zero, and derived the consequences of such an assumption for the behavior of \( \delta \) as a function of energy.

The left-hand sides of (51) and (50) differ from (16) in two respects: first, the factor of \( \cot \delta \) is not simply \( k \) but (in (50))

\[
\frac{2 \pi}{D(e^{2\pi \eta} - 1)} = \frac{2 \pi \eta}{e^{2\pi \eta} - 1}. \tag{51a}
\]

For large energies, \( \eta \) becomes small and this expression goes over into \( k \), as it should. For small energies (large \( \eta \)), however, the denominator becomes very large and consequently \( \cot \delta \) approaches infinity \((\delta \rightarrow 0)\) much more rapidly than for neutron-proton scattering. Physically this means the elimination of nuclear scattering by the Coulomb potential barrier.

The second difference is the appearance of the given function \( g(\eta) \) on the left side of (50) and (51).

On the right-hand side, the definition of \( \rho \) is the same as for neutron-proton scattering. Therefore the same arguments hold as there: \( \rho \) is very nearly independent of the energy, and may therefore be replaced by \( \rho(0, 0) \) which may again be called the effective range. Moreover, the Coulomb potential also has very little influence on the wave functions inside the range of the nuclear forces; therefore we may in good approximation replace \( \varphi, \psi \) by the functions \( \varphi, \psi \) obtained in the same nuclear potential without Coulomb potential (see also Section VII). Then the effective range is defined by

\[
\frac{1}{2} r_0 = \int_0^\infty (\varphi_0^2 - \omega_0^2) dr = \int_0^\infty (\psi_0^2 - u_0^2) dr, \tag{52}
\]

where the subscript 0 again refers to zero energy, just as for neutron-proton scattering.

---


---

**Fig. 3.** Experiments on proton-proton scattering up to 4 Mev. The function \( f \), Eq. (51), is plotted vs. energy. The experimental points fall very accurately on a straight line, as the theory predicts.

- Ragan, Kanne, and Taschek; 
- Heydenburg, Hafstad, and Tuve; 
- Herb, Kerst, Parkinson, and Plain; 
- Blair, Freier, Lampi, Sleator, and Williams. 
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VI. ANALYSIS OF PROTON-PROTON SCATTERING EXPERIMENTS

To analyze the many accurate experiments on proton-proton scattering, we merely need to take the phase shifts of the s-wave from experiment, calculate the left-hand side of Eq. (51), and plot it against the energy. This has been done in Fig. 3.

It is seen that the experimental points fall very accurately on a straight line, as (51) demands. The line was actually drawn through the lowest energy points of Ragan, Kanne, and Taschek29 (at 176 and 200 kev) and through the highest energy points of Blair, Freier, Lampi, Sleator, and Williams30 (3.27 and 3.53 Mev). Then the points of Herb, Kerst, Parkinson, and Plain31 fall very beautifully on the straight line. Only those of Hafstad, Heydenburg, and Tuve32 are off the line, as was noticed before by Breit et al., and as is explainable from the early date at which this work was done, and from the fact that the electrostatic generator was pushed to the limit in energy.

For the two latter sets of experiments, I took the phase shifts from the work of Breit, Thaxter, and Eisenbud.4 For the former two, they were evaluated by Longmire, using only the absolute scattering cross section at 45°. We realize that this is not the most accurate method of evaluation but it is simple and quick. The phase shifts obtained by Longmire, and used in constructing Fig. 3, are given in Table I.

The slope of the line in Fig. 3 is

\[ E_{\text{Mev}} = 0.8304^2 \text{ (barn}^{-1}), \]

with an accuracy of 5 percent or better. Using \( D \) from (38), and (see 4))

\[ E_{\text{Mev}} = 0.8304^2 \text{ (barn}^{-1}), \]

we get the effective range

\[ (2.71 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm.} \] (53)

This is in complete agreement with the analysis by Breit and collaborators. The limits on \( r_s \) can now be set considerably lower than by Breit, Thaxter, and Eisenbud, primarily because of the extension of the experiments to lower and higher energies, and to some extent because the very simple linear relation used here permits a very easy estimate of error by inspection.

The intrinsic range is slightly smaller than the effective range since the "level" of the proton-proton system is virtual. Using the scattering lengths given in Section VII, Eqs. (65) and (70), together with Fig. 6 of BJ, one obtains

\[ b = 2.55 \times 10^{-13} \text{ for square well,} \]

\[ b = 2.45 \times 10^{-13} \text{ for Yukawa potential.} \] (54b)

Experiments on proton-proton scattering have also been done at higher energy, by Dearnley, Oxlby, and Perry33 and by R. R. Wilson and collaborators.27 These are not as accurate as those at lower energy. However, we have plotted them in Fig. 4, together with the continuation of the straight line of Fig. 3. The agreement is not very good. In the case of the experiments of Wilson \( et \) \( al. \) the deviation is easily within the given experimental error. However, the point of Dearnley \( et \) \( al. \) is definitely off the straight line. The deviation is in the direction expected for a square well, while all other arguments favor something similar to a Yukawa potential. Moreover, the deviation is 4 times as great as expected for a square well. In fact, it was already noticed by Dearnley \( et \) \( al. \) that their cross section was lower (therefore \( k \cot \delta \) larger) than would be expected from the square well used by Breit \( et \) \( al. \) to fit the

---

30 Blair, Freier, Lampi, Sleator, and Williams, Phys. Rev. 74, 553 (1948).
31 Herb, Kerst, Parkinson, and Plain, Phys. Rev. 55, 998 (1939).
33 Dearnley, Oxlby, and Perry, Phys. Rev. 73, 1290 (1948).
low energy data. The direction of the deviation precludes its explanation as a tensor force effect on the $P$ waves. Because of the excellent fit to the straight line at lower energies, we find this deviation hard to understand.

VII. COMPARISON OF PROTON-PROTON AND NEUTRON-PROTON SCATTERING

Breit, Condon, and Present first pointed out the approximate equality of the proton-proton potential and the neutron-proton potential in the singlet state. It is the purpose of this section to compare proton-proton and neutron-proton interactions without calculating the nuclear potential explicitly.

In addition to the functions $w, \varphi$ used in Section V to describe the proton-proton scattering, we shall use also the function $u$ which would be obtained in the same nuclear potential without the Coulomb potential, and its asymptotic function $\psi$. Then $u$ satisfies Eq. (5) and $\psi$ has the form (7).

The problem is greatly simplified by considering all these functions for energy zero. It is true that direct experiments on proton-proton scattering at this energy would not give any information about the nuclear force between the protons. However, the value of the function $f$, Eq. (51) and Fig. 3, for $E=0$ will give us all the necessary information about the wave functions $w$ and $\varphi$ for zero energy, in particular their behavior for small $r$. The intercept of the straight line of Fig. 3 gives

$$f(0) = 8.62.$$

We shall first investigate the behavior of the Coulomb comparison function $\varphi$. Inserting (51) in (49) we find that for very small $r$, $\varphi'$ is given by

$$\varphi'(r) = (2/D) \ln(2r/D) + C + \frac{1}{2} f(0)$$

and that

$$\varphi = 1 + r[\varphi'(r) - 2/D].$$

In $\varphi'$, terms of order $r^2$ have been neglected which will be permissible for our purposes. In $\varphi'$, however, we shall need the next term which may be obtained either from YWB or by integration of (39), using (56a):

$$\varphi' = \varphi' + (2r/D)(\varphi' - 4/D).$$

Now let us obtain a relation between wave functions with and without Coulomb field in the same nuclear potential $V$ just as we previously compared wave functions of different energy. The wave equations for the two functions to be compared are (37) and (5), and since $V$ is supposed to be the same, we have, dropping the subscript 1:

$$uw - uw'|_1 = (2/D) \int_0^R uwdr/r.$$

A similar relation holds for the "asymptotic functions" $\psi$ and $\varphi$ whose wave equations also differ by the Coulomb potential:

$$\psi\varphi' - \varphi\psi' = (2/D) \int_{r_1}^R \psi dr/r.$$  (57a)

In this case, we do not integrate from $r=0$ because $\varphi'$ would be infinite at this limit, and the integral on the right-hand side would diverge. We have therefore used an arbitrary lower limit $r_1$, and we shall now define $r_1$ by requiring that the right-hand sides of (57) and (57a) be equal, in other words by the equation

$$\int_{r_1}^\infty (\psi\varphi - u\psi) dr/r = \int_0^{r_1} u\psi dr/r.$$

An evaluation of $r_1$ will be given below.

Now, since the right-hand sides of (57) and (57a) have been made equal, the left-hand sides are also equal. At the upper limits, the integrated terms are equal by the definition of $\psi, \varphi$ as the asymptotic expressions for $u, w$. At the lower limit, the integrated term in (57) is zero, therefore that in (57a) must also be zero. In other words, at the point $r_1$ the logarithmic derivatives of $\psi$ and $\varphi$ are equal,

$$\psi/\psi' = (\varphi'/\varphi) r_1.$$

But $\varphi'/\varphi$ can, at any point, be determined from (56a), (56b). On the other hand, $\psi$ must have the form

$$\psi = 1 - \alpha r$$

since it is the asymptotic solution for energy zero in the absence of nuclear and Coulomb potential. The constant $\alpha_P$ can thus be determined from (59) in terms of the "observed" intercept $f(0)$, Eq. (55).

![Fig. 4. Experiments on proton-proton scattering from 7 to 15 MeV, $f$ vs. $E$. The straight line is the same as in Fig. 3, the experiments do not agree very well with it. ○ Dearnley, Oxley, and Perry; △ Wilson and Creutz; ▲ Wilson.](image)
Then \( \alpha_P \) can be interpreted as an equivalent reciprocal scattering length, i.e., as the reciprocal scattering length which would be obtained for neutron-proton scattering if the nuclear potential were the same as for proton-proton scattering. This can then be compared with the measured \( \alpha_P = 1/a_0 \) for singlet neutron-proton scattering.

Inserting (56a), (56b), and (60) into (59) gives, after some simple algebra and neglect of second-order terms in \( r_1/D \):

\[
-\alpha_P = \varphi'(r_1) + (4r_1/D)(\varphi'' - 2/D),
\]

(61)

where \( \varphi' \) is still given by (56). Greater accuracy could be obtained using the representation of \( \varphi \) in terms of Bessel functions.\(^ \text{39} \)

That it is possible to find a point \( r_1 \) at which the logarithmic slopes of the Coulomb function \( \varphi \) and the straight line \( \psi \) are equal, is due to the peculiar behavior of the Coulomb function (see Fig. 5). As shown by (56a), the function \( \varphi \) begins at \( r = 0 \) with the value 1 and logarithmically infinite negative slope. It reaches a minimum and then rises. At larger \( r \), it shows the typical exponential rise expected inside the Coulomb potential barrier. There must therefore be a point where the function \( \varphi \) has the same logarithmic slope as any given straight line.

We shall now determine \( r_1 \). Since \( \psi' / \psi \) depends only slightly on \( r_1 \) (Eq. (56)), an approximate value of \( r_1 \) will be sufficient, and since the Coulomb potential is unimportant inside the nuclear potential, it is permissible to replace the Coulomb functions \( \varphi, \psi \) in the definition (58) of \( r_1 \) by the "neutral" functions \( \varphi, \psi, u \). We shall do the calculation explicitly for the specially simple case \( \alpha = 0 \) which corresponds to a resonance level at zero energy. This is a good approximation because \( \alpha \) is actually small; a result for finite \( \alpha \) will be given below. If we take \( \alpha = 0 \) and a square well, \( u \) is given by \( u_0 \) in (35a). Since \( u = \psi \) for \( r > b \), (58) becomes

\[
\int_0^b \psi^2 dr/r = \ln(b/r_1) = \int_0^b u^2 dr/r
\]

\[
= \int_0^b \sin^2(\pi r/2b) dr/r = \frac{1}{2}(C + \ln \pi - Ci\pi),
\]

(62)

where \( Ci \) is the integral cosine,

\[
Ci x = -\int_x^\infty \cos y y dy.
\]

(62a)

Therefore

\[
\ln(r_1/b) = -0.8245, \quad r_1 = 0.4384b
\]

(63)

so that \( r_1 \) turns out considerably smaller than the effective range which, with our assumptions, is equal to \( b \). With (54a), we get

\[
r_1 = 1.12 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm.}
\]

(63a)

We shall show below that (63) remains a very good approximation, even for finite scattering length, but that the approximation would be considerably less good if we replaced \( b \) by \( r_0 \) in (63). This makes the calculation slightly involved: one needs \( \alpha \) to obtain \( b \) from \( r_0 \) using the curves of BJ, but one needs \( b \) to calculate \( \alpha \). In practice, a very rough estimate of \( \alpha \) suffices to get an accurate value for \( b \) so that there is no real difficulty.

Using \( b \) from (54a), and using (63), (56), (65a), (61), (38), and (55) we get:

\[
\varphi_0'(r_1) = (2/D)[\ln(2b/D) + 4.06]
\]

\[
= 0.568 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1},
\]

(64)

\[
\varphi_0(r_1) = 1.0245,
\]

(64a)

\[
-\alpha_P = 0.585 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1},
\]

(65)

where the subscripts \( P \) and \( S \) stand for proton and square well, respectively. This result may be compared with the neutron-proton scattering in the singlet state which gives, according to (26a)

\[
-\alpha_N = -1/\alpha_N = 0.421 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1}.
\]

(66)

For a Yukawa potential we shall not do the exact calculation but choose an approximate wave function of the form (again for zero binding energy)

\[
u_0 = 1 - e^{-br}.
\]

(67)

As Schwinger\(^ \text{4} \) has shown, such a wave function when used in the variational method, will give the depth of the potential correctly within 1 part in 10,000. Chew\(^ \text{20} \) has pointed out that \( u_0 \) itself agrees

\(^{13} \) Geoffrey F. Chew, Phys. Rev. 74, 809 (1948).
with the exact wave function within 3 percent. The parameter \( \beta \) is related to the parameter in the meson potential and also directly to the effective range which is

\[
r_0 = 2 \int_0^\infty (1 - u_o^2)dr = 3/\beta.
\]

For the “effective Coulomb radius” we get then the equation

\[
\int_0^\infty \psi^2dr/r = \ln(R/r_1) = \int_0^\infty u_o^2dr/r = \ln(\beta R/2) + C,
\]

so that

\[
r_1 = 2/(\beta \gamma) = 2r_o/3\gamma = 0.374r_0 = 0.374b = 0.91 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm},
\]

using \( b \) from (54b) and with \( \gamma = e^C \). This gives instead of (64)–(65)

\[
\phi_0^o' = (2/D)[\ln(2b/D) + 3.90] = 0.509, \quad (69)
\]

\[
\phi_0 = 1.014, \quad (69a)
\]

\[
-\alpha_{PF} = 0.517 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1}, \quad (70)
\]

where the subscript \( Y \) stands for Yukawa potential.

It is seen that the Yukawa potential gives a result somewhat closer to the neutron-proton result (66). This is in agreement with the results of Breit, Hoisington, Share, and Thaxton\(^{39,4} \) obtained by explicit calculation of the nuclear potentials. However, the difference between the Yukawa and the square well results is not large, and, judging from Blatt and Jackson’s results for other phenomena, the other potentials commonly used (exponential and Gaussian) are almost certain to lie in between. This means, then, that there is a definite difference between the nuclear forces in the singlet state for neutron-proton and for proton-proton. This result follows also from the explicit calculations of Breit et al., if the modern value of the neutron-proton cross section, Eq. (20b), is used.

On the other hand, the difference between neutron-proton and proton-proton force is obviously quite small, viz. about 0.1–0.16 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1}. This figure might properly be compared with the reciprocal range of the force which is about 4 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1}. In agreement with this, Breit et al.\(^{39} \) found that the difference between the depths of the two potentials (for the same range and shape) need only be 1.5–3 percent. Thus the hypothesis of the charge-independence of nuclear forces is still very good, provided, of course, that range and shape are the same for which, unfortunately, there is still no experimental proof.

In (63), (68) we have used wave functions for infinite scattering length. For finite scattering length, the case of a square well can easily be treated and gives

\[
r_1 = 0.4384b(1 + 0.114ab + 0.471a^{2b^2} + \cdots),
\]

where \( b \) is the intrinsic range and \( \alpha \) the reciprocal scattering length. Using \( \alpha \) from (65) and \( b \) from (54a), gives for the parenthesis in (71) the value \( 1 - 0.0065 \); an exact calculation gives 1–0.0072. Thus \( r_1/b \) is almost unchanged. However,

\[
r_0/b \approx 1 - 4\pi^2ab = 1.0640
\]

differs appreciably from unity: This shows that it is indeed a much better approximation to use \( b \) in (63) than to use \( r_0 \). Now a slight change in \( r_1 \), by the relative amount \( \epsilon \), will give a change of \(-\alpha \) by

\[
-\delta \alpha = (2e/D)(1 + 2r_1\phi_0) = 0.39 \epsilon = -0.0028
\]

with the values of \( \phi_0 \), \( r_1 \), etc. given above. This is practically negligible and changes (65) to

\[
-\alpha_{PF} = 0.582 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1}.
\]

For the Yukawa well, the approximate wave function

\[
\psi = 1 + \alpha r - e^{-\beta r}
\]

gives

\[
r_1 = (2/\beta \gamma)[1 - 0.245\alpha/\beta - 0.051\alpha^2/\beta^2 + \cdots],
\]

and \( \beta \) is related to the effective range by

\[
\beta r_0 = 3 + 4\alpha/\beta.
\]

In our case, we get

\[
3r_1\gamma/2r_0 = 1 - 0.067,
\]

\[
b/r_0 = 1 - 0.097,
\]

\[
3r_1\gamma/2b = 1.033.
\]

The change of \( r_1 \) with \( \alpha \), for given \( b \), is therefore slightly greater than for the square well, and we get

\[
-\delta \alpha = 0.0112,
\]

\[
-\alpha = 0.529 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-1}.
\]

This makes the difference between Yukawa and square well somewhat smaller, the difference between the proton-proton and neutron-proton scattering somewhat larger.

Finally, we shall compare the asymptotic wave functions with and without Coulomb potential, \( \phi \) and \( \psi \) (see Fig. 5). The Coulomb function looks fairly complicated, mainly because of its logarithmically infinite slope at \( r = 0 \); but all this complication makes very little difference for the value of the function, owing to the very large value of the “proton Bohr radius” \( D \) which is about 20 times the effective range. With the constants as observed

\(^{39} \) Breit, Hoisington, Share, and Thaxton, Phys. Rev. 55, 1103 (1939).
(Eq. (55)), the function \(\varphi\) has a minimum at
\[
 r_{\text{min}} = \frac{1}{2} D e^{-i} = 0.216 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm},
\]
where
\[
 i = C + \frac{1}{2}f(0).
\]
(Eq. 73)
The result (73) is about the Compton wave-length of the proton, \(\hbar/Mc\). At its minimum, \(\varphi\) has the value
\[
\varphi_{\text{min}} = 1 - e^{-i} = 0.9925,
\]
which is very close to unity.

The two functions \(\varphi\) and \(\psi\) are very close together for all values of \(r\) inside the range of the nuclear forces. Neglecting higher terms,
\[
\psi = 1 + (2r/D)(\xi + \ln 2r/D),
\]
\[
\varphi = 1 + (2r/D)(\xi + \ln 2r/D - 1),
\]
and the ratio is
\[
\frac{\psi}{\varphi} = 1 + (2r/D)(\ln r_1/r + 1).
\]
As is clear from the definition of \(r_1\) in (59), the ratio \(\psi/\varphi\) has a maximum at \(r = r_1\) whose value is
\[
\frac{\psi(r_1)}{\varphi(r_1)} = 1 + 2r_1/D = 1.040 \text{ for square well}
\]
\[
= 1.032 \text{ for Yukawa potential}.
\]

At other values of \(r\), the functions are closer together. This shows that it must be a very good approximation to replace \(\varphi\) and \(\psi\) by \(\psi\) and \(\mu\), respectively, in calculating \(r_1\). Also it shows that for a given nuclear potential, \(r_0\) and the correction \(P\) (see Section IV) must have substantially the same values as in the absence of the Coulomb potential.
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A band system of \(\text{H}_2\) is described which has an upper state \((2ps)^1\Sigma^+\). Although this state has two electrons excited, its energy is about the same as that of the states with only one electron excited to a two-quantum state. The position of the lines and their intensities are very irregular. These irregularities, however, can be satisfactorily explained as being due to the interaction with the \((1s\sigma)(2s\sigma)^1\Sigma^+\) state.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a previous paper\(^1\) the system \(2s^1\Sigma \rightarrow 2p^1\Sigma\) of the hydrogen molecule was discussed. The analysis of the upper state \(2s^1\Sigma\), or more completely \((1s\sigma)(2s\sigma)^1\Sigma\), revealed strong perturbations which could only be accounted for by the presence of another electronic state slightly above the \(2s^1\Sigma\) state. The nature of the perturbations showed that the perturbing state must be a \(^1\Sigma_g^+\) state, with the same symmetry properties as the \(2s^1\Sigma\) state. As all the low lying states of the molecule with one electron excited were already accounted for, this had to be a state with both electrons excited, and some arguments were given which made it probable that this hypothetical state was \((2ps)^2\Sigma^+\).

The existence of a doubly excited stable state with such low energy seems at first sight rather surprising, and it is, therefore, highly desirable to obtain further information concerning this state. So far the only evidence for its existence has been furnished by the perturbations in the \(2s^1\Sigma\) state. Naturally the situation would be strengthened a great deal if bands could be found coming from this \((2ps)^2\Sigma\) state. Such bands have been available since 1937, but inconsistencies in their structure made some of them rather uncertain, so that they were not published. In the meantime, quantitative intensity measurements\(^2\) in the infra-red have become available which make it possible in many doubtful cases to judge whether the bands are genuine or not. In this way the regularities previously found were sifted and amplified and they are now believed to be correct at least in their essential points, and they form the basis of the present paper. The evidence is derived entirely from the \(\text{H}_2\) spectrum.

\(^1\) G. H. Dieke, Phys. Rev. 50, 797 (1936).