First results for electromagnetic three-nucleon form factors from high-precision two-nucleon interactions
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The electromagnetic form factors of the three-nucleon bound states were calculated in Complete Impulse Approximation in the framework of the Covariant Spectator Theory for the new high-precision two-nucleon interaction models WJC-1 and WJC-2. The calculations use an approximation for the three-nucleon vertex functions with two nucleons in the same shell. The form factors with WJC-2 are close to those obtained with the older model WJC-1 and to nonrelativistic potential calculations with lowest-order relativistic corrections, while the form factors with the most precise two-nucleon model WJC-1 exhibit larger differences. These results can be understood when the effect of the different types of pion-nucleon coupling used in the various models is examined.


I. INTRODUCTION

The electromagnetic form factors of nucleons provide important information about their internal structure. They have been used extensively in order to test models of the nuclear dynamics and of the associated electromagnetic currents. As electron scattering experimenters, such as the ones performing at Jefferson Lab, reach larger and larger values of the momentum transferred by a virtual photon to the struck nucleon, it becomes increasingly important to incorporate the requirements of special relativity in a reliable way into the theoretical description of the process.

The Covariant Spectator Theory (CST) was designed as a manifestly covariant theory, especially suited for the description of few-nucleon problems. In a recent paper, we presented the rst CST calculations of the electromagnetic three-nucleon (3N) form factors in Complete Impulse Approximation (CIA), which is defined as the complete 3N current except for interaction currents, i.e., diagram s where the photon couples to an intermediate interacting two-nucleon (NN) system. However, the term “impulse approximation” can be misleading because it depends on the frame work used.

For instance, in a very successful approach used by the Pisa-Lab collaboration, the dynamics is based on the nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation, and relativistic corrections are added perturbatively. We call the corresponding approximation with relativistic corrections “IARC". In this framework, two- and three-body interaction currents are later added to the IARC results. These include rst-order NN contact interactions which are equivalent to the already at the CIA level automatically and to all orders included “Z-graphs" in the CST. This is an example of a more general observation: what counts as interaction current in one approach may be part of the impulse approximation in another.

In Ref. [2], our focus was to study the model dependence of the electromagnetic 3N form factors in CST. We performed calculations for a family of closely related relativistic two-nucleon interaction models and found that the CST results behave very reasonably. In most cases, a direct comparison of our CIA results with experimental data is not useful because we expect interaction currents to be significant. However, the comparison with IARC results is instructive, and it appears that the surprising close agreement between the two approaches (at least for Q > 4 fm⁻¹), when models are compared that yield the same 3N binding energy, is no coincidence. The main reason seems to be that all CST models used in the comparison employ pseudovector coupling for the pion-nucleon vertices. This kind of coupling suppresses negative-energy states (corresponding to Z-graphs), which are included in CIA but not in IARC. It is therefore understandable that no large differences between the two calculations emerge, as long as other aspects of the dynamics in the two approaches are comparable.

It would be interesting to submit this interpretation to a test. One only needs to perform two calculations in CIA with two NN models that are as similar as possible in their ability to describe the NN data and the 3N binding energy. One of them should be based on pure pseudoscalar pion-nucleon coupling, while the other should include an admixture of pseudoscalar pion-nucleon coupling and thus increase the weight of Z-graphs. If the above interpretation is correct, the model with pure pseudovector coupling will be close to the IARC result, while there should be larger deviations in the case of the model with some pseudoscalar coupling.

We are indeed in a position to perform this test. In a recent paper, we published two realistic CST models...
els for the neutron-proton interaction, both of which describe the np scattering observables with $^{27}$N data for the most recent 2007 database. The rst model, W JC-1, based on the exchange of 8 bosons and fitted with 27 adjustable parameters, features a mixture of pseudovector and pseudoscalar pion-nucleon coupling. The second model, W JC-2, based on the exchange of 6 bosons and with only 15 adjustable parameters, uses pure pseudovector pion-nucleon coupling. The two models can be considered to be essentially on-shell equivalent, and both reproduce also the experimental value of the triton binding energy of 8.48 MeV.

There is, however, one obstacle to performing the CIA calculations with these models W JC-1 and W JC-2: Some of the diagrams that compose the CIA 3N current depend on the 3N vertex function with two nucleons off mass shell. A computer code for the calculation of these vertex functions for the new models W JC-1 and W JC-2 is at present in development, but not yet ready to be used in the calculation of the 3N form factors.

This obstacle can be overcome if we apply an approximation in which 3N vertex functions with two nucleons off mass shell are appropriately replaced by vertex functions with only one nucleon off mass shell. We can test the quality of this approximation, which we call "CIA-0" by applying it to one of the models previously used in [2] and comparing the approximate form factors to the respective full CIA result.

Of course, if it turns out that CIA-0 is a reliable approximation, the 3N form factors obtained from the results with only one nucleon off mass shell par t i c l e s t h r ough an i t e r at i on o f th e 3N vertex functions.

The com plate form of the electromagnetic 3N current in CST was derived in [2] and used in [2] for the rst time to calculate the 3N form factors in CIA. Figure 2 displays the complete current, and CIA is defined through diagrams A to F.

We denote the photon four-momentum by $q$, and we label the nucleon four-momenta $k_i$ such that always $k_1^2 = k_2^2 = m^2$, where $m$ is the nucleon mass. For the cases where a nucleon absorbs a photon, we introduce the notation $k_i = k_1$. The momenta $k_3$ is not an independent variable; in the CST, the energy-momentum four-vector is conserved and is determined through the mon ementa of nucleons 1 and 2 and the total 3N momentum $P_3$ in the initial and $P_3^2 = P_3 + q$ in the final state.

The 3N current in CIA is given in algebraic form by

$$ J_{CIA} = \sum_{12} \frac{m^2 d^3k_1 d^3k_2}{E(k_1)E(k_2)(2\pi)^3} \sum_{12} (k_1; k_2; P_3) \left[ 1 + 2P_{12} \right] (k_3; k_3) \left[ 1 + 2P_{12} \right] (k_1; k_2; P_3) $$

where $E(k) = \sqrt{m^2 + k^2}$, $P_{12}$ is a permutation operator which interchanges particles 1 and 2, and $\sum_{12}$ is a phase with $= +1$ (1) for bosons (fermions), $G \circ (k)$ is the propagator of an o-shell nucleon with four-momentum $k$, and $\circ (k^2; j)$ is the single nucleon current for o-shell nucleons with incoming (outgoing) four-momentum $k$ ($k^2$). Summation over repeated Dirac indices is implied. The 3N vertex functions are solutions of Faddeev-type CST integral equations [3] and were obtained numerically for the 3N interaction models considered here [4, 5]. The relativistic wave functions are defined as

$$ (k_1; k_2; P_3) = G \circ (k_3) \left[ 1 + 2 P_{12} \right] (k_1; k_2; P_3). $$

and we use a shorthand for the contraction of Dirac in-

$$ 1 \circ (k_1; k_2; P_3) = G \circ (k_3) \left[ 1 + 2 P_{12} \right] (k_1; k_2; P_3). $$

and we use a shorthand for the contraction of Dirac in-

$$ 1 \circ (k_1; k_2; P_3) = G \circ (k_3) \left[ 1 + 2 P_{12} \right] (k_1; k_2; P_3). $$

In the second and third line of Eq. (1), corresponding to diagram (B + C + E + F) of Fig. [1], the vertex function appears with two nucleon momenta $o$ mass shell. The solutions of the CST equation for the 3N bound state have only one nucleon (nucleon 3), but one can obtain vertex functions with two o-shell particles through an iteration of the 3N equation
with an $o$-shell two-nucleon scattering amplitude,

\[
\langle k_1 \, k_2 \, p_{F\pm} \rangle = \frac{Z}{M} \frac{a_{s}^2 k_0^2}{E(k_0^2)(2 \pi)^3} \left[ \langle k_2 \, k_0^2 \, p_{23} \rangle \right]^{2} \langle P_{12} \rangle \neq \langle k_1 \, k_0^2 \, p_{F\pm} \rangle ;
\]

\hspace{0.5cm} \text{(4)}

Here, $M = \langle k_2 \, k_0^2 \, p_{23} \rangle$ is the scattering amplitude of nucleons 2 and 3 with total momentum $p_{23}$, and the real state momenta of nucleons 2, $k_2$, is o-mass shell, while its initial state momenta, $k_0^2$, is o-mass shell (nucleon 3 is o-shell in either state).

As pointed out in the Introduction, the 3N vertex functions with both nucleons o-shell in the real state are not available at this time for the new NN interactions WCJC-1 and WCJC-2. Moreover, it is rather awkward to calculate and manipulate these double-o-shell vertex functions numerically, because with one additional continuous variable (the o-shell energy of nucleon 2) they occupy much more computer storage space and slow down the calculations.

For these practical reasons, we introduce here a simple approximatiion which replaces the vertex function with two nucleons o-mass shell by others with only one nucleon o-mass shell.

In order to motivate this approximation, consider for instance diagram (C) and (F) of Fig. 4. The vertex function in the initial state, \((k_1 \, k_2 \, p_{F\pm})\), depends on the o-shell momenta $k_2 = k_0^2$, $k_2$. Since $k_2$ is o-mass shell, for all photon momenta the momenta of nucleon $k_2$ is also o-shell on mass shell. We may therefore expand the vertex function in the o-shell energy of nucleon 2 around its on-shell value. If we keep only the zeroth-order term of the expansion and eliminate the corresponding negative-energy channel of nucleon 2 (with negative spin), we obtain a known vertex function with two nucleons on mass shell. We call this approximation \("CIA-0\)" referring to the zeroth-order expansion involved.

While this approximation is easy to apply, its formulation is somewhat awkward because of its frame dependence. In our numerical calculations, the 3N vertex function is expressed in terms of variables for nucleons 2 and 3 which are defined in the rest frame of the (23) pair where the CST equation for the two-nucleon scattering amplitudes is solved numerically. We can write

\[
\langle k_1 \, k_2 \, p_{F\pm} \rangle = \langle k_1 \, L(k_{23}) \, k_2 \, p_{F\pm} \rangle ;
\]

\hspace{0.5cm} \text{(5)}

where the Lorentz transformation \(L(k_{23})\) takes the system of nucleons 2 and 3 from its rest frame \(\mathbf{e}\), where their momenta are $k_2$ and $k_3$, to the 3N rest frame \(\mathbf{e}\), where their momenta are $k_2 = L(k_{23}) \, k_2$, and $k_3 = L(k_{23}) \, k_3$, and where their total two-body momenta is $k_{23} = k_2 + k_3 = P_{F\pm} - k_1$.

We denote now the four-momentum $P_{F\pm}$ to have the same three-vector part as $k_{23}$ but to be on a mass shell, i.e., $P_{F\pm} = (E(k_{23}) \, k_{23})$, and we replace the momentum $k_2$ by $k_{23}$ in the vertex function (5).

In order to eliminate the negative energy states of nucleon 2, we first write the propagator of nucleon 2 in terms of its form in the pair rest frame \(\mathbf{e}\),

\[
G = \langle k_2 \rangle = \sum \langle L(k_{23}) \rangle S^{-\frac{1}{2}}(L(k_{23})) \frac{(m + \not{k}_2)}{m^2} \left( \frac{L(k_{23})}{(k_{23})^2} \right) \frac{1}{i} \frac{S^{-\frac{1}{2}}(L(k_{23}))}{1};
\]

\hspace{0.5cm} \text{(6)}
where \( S(L(k_{23})) \) is the Dirac space representation of the Lorentz transformation \( L(k_{23}) \).

Now we keep only the component with positive \( \uparrow \) spin in the rest frame e,

\[
\frac{m + \mathbf{r}_2}{m^2 - (\mathbf{r}_2)^2}
\]

with the positive-energy projector

\[
(r_2) = \frac{m + \mathbf{r}_2}{2m} ;
\]

The approximation CIA-0 can then be defined as the replacement

\[
G \rightarrow (k_2) \quad (k_1; k_2; \mathbf{P}_e) !
\]

\[
S \rightarrow \left( L(k_{23}) \right) \frac{m + (r_2)}{m} \left( L(k_{23}) \right) \frac{1}{2} \left( L(k_{23}) \right)
\]

in Eq. (1), as well as an analogous replacement for

\[
(k_1; k_2; \mathbf{P}_e) G \rightarrow (k_2)
\]

which occurs in diagrams (B) and (E).

Note that the projector \( P \) eliminates negative-energy states of nucleon 1 in the two-body rest frame \( e \), but this does not eliminate all 2-graph contributions from the calculation. They are still present through the negative-energy states of nucleon 3, and they are also re-generated to some extent when the state of nucleon 2 is boosted to other frames.

The approximation \( \text{CIA-0} \) may look complicated, but it is actually easy to implement in our numerical calculations. For instance, in the case of diagram C \( n \) merely amounts to replacing in Eq. (B64) of Ref. [2] the zero-shell energy \( p_0 \) of nucleon 2 by the corresponding on-shell value \( E(p) \) in the argument of the partial wave vertex function \( C(q^0; m; 12323T) \), and restricting the summation over the \( \uparrow \) spins of nucleon 2 to the positive-energy value \( E = +P \) only.

The electron magnetic current for an \( \uparrow \) -shell nucleon can be written in the form

\[
j_e(k^0; k) = f_3(k_1; k_2; k^0 F) F_{1N}(Q^2) + f_5(k_1; k_2; k^0 F) F_{2N}(Q^2) + g_0(k_1; k_2; k_2^0 F) F_{3N}(Q^2)
\]

where \( f_3, f_5, \) and \( g_0 \) are nucleon \( \uparrow \) -shell form factors associated with the boson-nucleon vertices, and \( F_{1N} \) and \( F_{2N} \) are the usual electron magnetic Dirac and Pauli form factors. Since projects onto negative energy states, the form factor \( F_{3N} \) belongs to a term that contributes only if the nucleon is in a negative-energy state before and after the photon-nucleon vertex. We adopt the usual convention \( Q^2 = p^2 \).

### Table I: Parameters \( F_0 \) and \( k \) (in \( \text{fm}^{-1} \)) of the scaling functions \( F_i(Q) \) of Eq. (12) by which the electron magnetic 3N form factors are divided in the general linear scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( F_i )</th>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>( F_0 )</th>
<th>( k )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 3H )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.760488</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3He )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.799411</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isoscalar</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.778026</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isovector</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.842695</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The isospin dependence of the electron magnetic form factors is, for \( i = f_1; 2; 3 \) and the nucleon isospin projection \( 1 \),

\[
F_{1N}(Q^2) = F_0 e^{k Q^2}: (11)
\]

In previous calculations [2], we found that the 3N form factors are quite insensitive to the inclusion and variations of the \( \uparrow \) -shell nucleon form factors. Therefore we emulate in the calculations of this work the simpler on-shell nucleon current, with \( f_0 = f_0^0 = 1 \) and \( g_0 = 0 \). For the Dirac and Pauli form factors, we chose the parametrization of Galster [3], in order to compare with TARC results provided to us by M. Arcucci [4] who used the same paramaterization.

With the CIA-0 approximation in place, the electromagnetic 3N form factors are calculated numerically from the 3N vertex functions, which were obtained by solving the 3N CST equation in helicity partial wave form. The applied techniques are described in detail in Ref. [2].

### III. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

We calculated the electron magnetic 3N form factors for three NN interaction models, W16, WJC-1 and WJC-2, for moment of transfer up to \( Q = 9 \text{ fm}^{-1} \). The results are displayed in Figs. 2 and 3.

Since the form factors fall several orders of magnitude, and the traditional log-plots tend to obscure details in some places and overemphasize others, we divide them by simple scaling functions of the form

\[
F_i(Q) = F_0 e^{k Q^2}: (12)
\]

Table I shows the parameters of the scaling function for each case. We also list the magnetic moment entries in Table II, and the charge and magnetic radius entries in Table III.

First, we start with a comparison of the curves for W16 in CIA and in CIA-0, which clearly demonstrates the high quality of the approximation. The differences between the exact calculation and the approximation are hardly noticeable up to values of \( Q \) around 7 \( \text{fm}^{-1} \), and in general appear to be insignificant. We may therefore
FIG. 2: (Color online) Charge form factors of the 3N bound states, $^3$H (first row), $^3$He (second row), and the isoscalar (third row) and isovector (fourth row) combinations. In each case, the figure on the left shows the form factor in the traditional semi-log plot, while the figure on the right shows the same form factor divided by a scaling function of Eq. (12) on a linear scale. The solid line is the result for N-N model W 16 in CIA, the dotted line is the approximation CIA-0 for the same model. The dashed line is model W JC-1, and the dash-dotted line is model W JC-2, both in CIA-0. For comparison, the solid line with theoretical error bars is the result of an IARC calculation by Marcucci [10] based on the AV18/UIX potential. All calculations employ the on-shell single-nucleon current, with the Galster parameterization of the nucleon form factors [9]. The full circles represent the experimental data [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9].
assembe that the results for W JC-1 and W JC-2 obtained here only in C IA-0 should also be very close to the exact C IA result.

Note that there are caveats to this conclusion: the quality of C IA-0 compared to C IA was really tested only for W 16, a model with a very smooth choice for the deformation of the kernel (and hence the vertex function) when both nucleons o-shell. The W JC models have a more complex o-shell structure (corresponding to the prescription C discussed in Ref.[6]) and their o-shell extrapolations will not be as smooth. In addition, W JC-1 has a mixed pseudoscalar-pseudovector-pion-nucleon coupling, and it is conceivable that the pseudoscalar part of this coupling might introduce further differences between C IA and C IA-0 to which W 16 is not sensitive. Our conclusions must therefore be taken with these particular grains of salt. In any case, C IA-0 should be a better approximation to C IA at smaller Q, simply because the nucleon involved is taken less far o-shell mass.

We turn now to a comparison of the form factors for different models of the NN interaction. The authors show that the W JC-2 form factors stay close to the ones of W 16, while, in most cases, W JC-1 begins to deviate somewhat at smaller values of Q. W JC-1 and W 16 are also close to the IARC results, typically up to about Q = 6 fm \(^{-1}\). This supports the conjecture made in the Introduction, namely that the suppression of Z-graphs through the use of pseudovector-pion-nucleon coupling is mainly responsible for the close agreement between the C ST and IARC.

A part from the issue of the type of pion-nucleon coupling, the C ST models include other boson-exchanges with o-shell coupling. Most notably, those due to scalar isoscalar (5) and isovector (1) exchanges have been found to have a very strong in uence on the quality of the NN ts and on the triton binding [8]. One might expect them to have a strong in uence on the 3N form factors as well.

The results indicate that this is only indirectly the case, namely through their effect on the binding energy. W hen the scalar o-shell coupling strength is varied without constraining the triton binding energy, the 3N form factors show substantial variations [2]. On the other hand, models W 16 and W JC-2 have quite different scalar o-shell coupling constants, but yield the same triton binding energy. The close similarity of the 3N form factors, at least up to internal radii of Q, in implies that the electron magnetic structure of the 3N bound state is not modifed too much by the scalar o-shell coupling. This conclusion receives even stronger support from the observation that also the IARC calculation, which of course has no o-shell couplings at all, essentially coincides with both W 16 and W JC-2 up to about Q = 6 fm \(^{-1}\) in the charge form factors, and up to somewhat smaller values of Q for the magnetic form factors.

It follows then that most of the difference in the behavior of the W JC-1 from factors cannot be attributed to the models larger scalar o-shell couplings [2], unless the dependence turns out to be highly non-linear.

W hat about the contributions of Z-diagram s and pion exchange currents? In Ref.[6] it was shown that pion exchange currents bring the calculations closer to the experimental data. The form of these exchange currents depends on the structure of the NN coupling. For pseudoscalar coupling there is no NN contact interaction, but there are large contributions from Z-diagrams. The opposite is true for pseudovector coupling. Here, the minimal substitution \( g_{NN} \) into the m on etum dependent interaction, \( g_{NN} = 2m \) (where \( q \) is the pion m on etum), leads to the contact interaction, \( g_{NN} = 2m \), but the Z-diagram s that are produced by a pseudovector interaction are strongly suppressed (and vanish in the nonrelativistic limit). Furthermore, there is an equivalence theorem that has been known for many decades [3]: in the nonrelativistic limit, the Z-diagram s derived from pseudoscalar coupling are identical to the contact interaction derived from pseudovector coupling (and the pseudovector Z-diagram s vanish). The pseudovector interaction equals the pseudoscalar Z- diagram.

This discussion is helpful in interpreting the di erence between our results for W JC-1 and W JC-2/W 16/IARC. The C IA calculations reported here include Z-diagram s (to all orders) but do not include contact interactions. These are included in the diagram s G-J of Fig.[1] and are excluded from both the C IA and C IA-0 calculations. They must be added separately, just as in the work of Ref.[4]. Now, the pion-nucleon vertex can be written in the general form \( g_{NN} (1 + (1 - g_{NN}) q = 2m \), where \( g_{NN} \) is the pseudoscalar-pseudovector mixing parameter [3].

### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( (1/H) )</th>
<th>( (1/H) )</th>
<th>( s )</th>
<th>( v )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 16 (CIA)</td>
<td>2.544</td>
<td>-1.747</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>-2.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 16 (CIA-0)</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>-1.743</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>-2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W JC-1 (CIA-0)</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>-1.648</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>-2.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W JC-2 (CIA-0)</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>-1.742</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>-2.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IARC</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>-1.763</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>-2.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>-2.128</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>-2.553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( r_{NN} (1/H) )</th>
<th>( r_{NN} (1/H) )</th>
<th>( r_{NN} (1/H) )</th>
<th>( r_{NN} (1/H) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 16 (CIA)</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>2.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 16 (CIA-0)</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>2.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W JC-1 (CIA-0)</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>2.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W JC-2 (CIA-0)</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>2.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>1.840</td>
<td>1.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.086 0.030 0.181 0.153

---

\( \text{Table II: Magnetic moments in nuclear magnetic moments (n.m.)} \)

\( \text{Table III: Root-mean-square charge and magnetic radii in fm.} \)
FIG. 3: (Color online) Magnetic form factors of the 3N bound states, $^3\text{H}$ (first row), $^3\text{He}$ (second row), and the isoscalar (third row) and isovector (fourth row) combinations. In each case, the figure on the left shows the form factor in the traditional semilog plot, while the figure on the right shows the same form factor divided by a scaling function on a linear scale. The meaning of the various curves is the same as in Fig. 2.
The NN models used in Ref. [2] such as W 16, as well as W JC-2, use pure pseudovector coupling, \( w_{16} = 0 \). Hence the Z-diagram contributions of these models are very small, and it is not surprising that they are quite close to the IARC result. However, in W JC-1 the neutral and charged pions are treated separately, and the mixing parameter for the charged pions is \( w_{16} = 0.312 \). The Z-diagram contributions from this model should be large, but of the opposite sign from those from a pure pseudoscalar theory (corresponding to \( w_{16} = +1 \)). Hence we can expect the Z-diagram contributions from W JC-1 to move the theory further away from the data, which is what we observe. We expect this effect to be more than cancelled once the contact interactions are included, which for W JC-1 will have a strength 1.312 times a pure pseudovector coupling.

It is certainly not possible to draw very strong conclusions based on these results alone. There are simply too many variables in play, and it would require many more test calculations to try to disentangle them. However, it is a very interesting situation to have essentially on-shell equivalent interactions, which agree in the 3N binding energy, but lead to different 3N form factors. It has often been argued that electromagnetic probes provide a means to distinguish otherwise equivalent NN interaction models, and in this case we can actually see it happening. From this point of view, it is perhaps less surprising that W JC-1 differs somewhat from the other models, but rather that W JC-2, W 16, and IARC are so close to each other. After all, IARC is calculated from the largely phenomenological nonrelativistic Argonne AV18 two-nucleon and UX irreducible 3N force, where the latter is used to make up for the missing 3N binding energy of the AV18 potential alone. In contrast, the CST models do not add any irreducible 3N forces, and it is through \( o \)-shell couplings purely relativistic effects that effective 3N forces are implicitly generated. Moreover, relativity is in place only in very different ways. It is not at all obvious that the two approaches should yield similar results.

It would be premature to favor one or the other of the models W JC-1 or W JC-2 at this time. Their ability to reproduce the data can only be judged rigorously after all, or at least the dominant interaction currents are added. Compared to the interaction currents of Ref. [2], some are already accounted for in CIA, others need to be added as well, such as the boson-in-light terms. Probably more important than the latter, there are interaction currents induced by total on-shell dependencies in the vertices due to \( o \)-shell boson-nucleon coupling, which have never been evaluated. It may very well turn out that they have a stronger effect with W JC-1 than with W JC-2.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have performed the first calculations of the electromagnetic 3N form factors with the new covariant two-nucleon interaction NN models W JC-1 and W JC-2, which yield an excellent description of the neutron-proton observables below 350 M eV for the most recent 2007 data base [6]. The form factors were calculated in Complete Pulse Approximation (CIA), in which for practical reasons we replaced 3N vertex functions with two-body-mass-shell nucleons by corresponding vertex functions with only one nucleon mass shell. This procedure of approximating the full CI A results, denoted as 'CIA-0', was tested with the older two-nucleon model W 16, for which the full C I A result is also available, and found to be of very good quality.

We compare the form factors of W JC-1 and W JC-2 to those of W 16, and also to calculations of nonrelativistic in pulse approximation with relativistic corrections (IARC) by Marcucci and collaborators [5,14]. Relating the observed differences in the various results to the underlying nuclear dynamics, we reach the following principal conclusions:

(i) The 3N binding energy determines the electromagnetic 3N form factors in pulse approximation up to unexpectedly large values of the transferred momentum. The closely related family of NN models investigated in Ref. [2], where variations in the strengths of the scalar \( o \)-shell coupling led to significantly different 3N binding energies, showed much larger changes in the form factors than the models considered here, which all have the same binding energy.

(ii) The scalar \( o \)-shell coupling does not directly exert a strong influence on the shape of the form factors. When the 3N binding energy is constrained to be equal, the different scalar \( o \)-shell coupling strength can yield very similar form factors, as one can see comparing W JC-2 and W 16.

(iii) In some cases, model W JC-1 deviates moderately from the others. This appears to be due to its mixed pseudoscalar-pseudovector pion-nucleon coupling (W JC-2 and W 16 have pure pseudovector pion-nucleon coupling, whereas in the nonrelativistic framework the two couplings are equivalent). In CST, pseudoscalar-pion-nucleon coupling automatically includes Z-diagrams, while they are suppressed for pseudovector coupling. When Z-diagrams are explicitly added to IARC in the form of NN contact interactions [5], the calculated form factors move closer to the experimental data, whereas the W JC-1 form factors lie further away than the other models with pure pseudovector coupling. This is consistent, because the sign of the pseudoscalar coupling in W JC-1 is opposite to the one used in Ref. [2].

(iv) The results of this work confirm the conjecture formulated in the Introduction, namely that the reason for the good agreement of the CST models with the IARC results is the suppression of Z-diagrams through pseudovector pion-nucleon coupling.
The CST two-nucleon interaction models WJC-1 and WJC-2 not only give an excellent fit to the available two-nucleon scattering observables, but also provide a solid basis for a relativistic theory of the 3N system. Without additional irreducible 3N forces, the 3N binding energy is reproduced, and the electron magnetic 3N form factors turn out very similar to previous nonrelativistic results. No unusually large interaction currents seem to be required in order to achieve a quantitative description of the experimental data.
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