

Estimating Inverse Scattering Potentials for n - p System Using Variational Monte Carlo & Neural Networks

Anil Khachi^{1*}, Gabor Balassa^{2*†}

¹Department of Applied Science
Chandigarh Engineering College
Chandigarh Group of Colleges
Jhanjeri, Mohali- 140307, Punjab, Bharat (India)

²Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics
Wigner Research Centre for Physics
Konkoly-Thege Miklós út 29-33, 1121 Budapest, Hungary ¹

*both authors contributed equally

July 8, 2024

Abstract

The Riccati-type nonlinear differential equation, also known as the Variable Phase Approach or Phase Function Method, is used to construct local inverse potentials for the 3S_1 and 1S_0 states of the deuteron. The Morse potential has been optimized by adjusting parameters using the Variational Monte Carlo (VMC) and Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) type Neural Networks (NN). The inverse potentials obtained from VMC and NN show almost identical parameters. In VMC, all three parameters of the Morse potential are varied to obtain the phase shifts, while in NN, the 3D-parameter optimization problem is converted to a 1D-parameter optimization problem, thus reducing optimization parameters, time, and computational cost.

Recently, the GRANADA group published a comprehensive partial wave analysis of scattering data, which includes 6713 np phase shift data points from 1950 to 2013. Using the final experimental data points from GRANADA, we obtained the parameters for the Morse potential by minimizing the mean square error (MSE) as the cost function. The MSE using VMC (NN) is found to be 0.65 (2.5) for the 1S_0 state and 0.16 (0.22) for the 3S_1 state. Various quantum functions, such as phase $\delta(r)$, amplitude $A(r)$, and wave function $u(r)$, are described up to 5 fm with energies $E_{lab} = [1 - 350 \text{ MeV}]$.

keywords: n-p scattering, variable phase approach (VPA), Morse potential, scattering phase shifts, Variational Monte Carlo, Neural Networks

*anilkhachi1990@gmail.com

†balassa.gabor@wigner.hu

1 Introduction

In the 1950s, the first paper about inverse problems emerged in fields like physics (quantum scattering theory, electrodynamics, and acoustics), geophysics (electro-, seismo-, and geomagnetic exploration), and astronomy [1]. As computers became more powerful, these problems became useful in almost every academic field that relies on mathematical models, such as medicine, industry, ecology, economics, linguistics, and social sciences. To understand the structure of the nucleus, one of the essential methods involved is scattering. Under scattering, phase shifts play a vital role in partial wave analysis that further helps in obtaining the scattering amplitude by which the elastic scattering properties of the physical system can be calculated.

Under the “standard approach” the main objective of theoretical physicists is to calculate the wavefunction from which other scattering properties like phase shifts, low energy scattering parameters, static properties, etc., can be obtained. It is to be noted that the experimentalists do not get wavefunction as an output of an experiment; rather, one gets outputs like differential cross-sections and total cross-sections, transition energies, etc., which are a result of the interaction processes. Phase shifts are further related to the cross sections. The interaction is portrayed from the experimental outputs in $V(r)$ vs r (fm) plots.

According to Schwinger, Landau and Smorodinsky [2] “The meeting place between theory and experiment is not the phase shifts themselves but the value of the variational parameters implied by phase shifts”.




Figure 1: Different models found in the literature to obtain cross-section. In this work, we have employed a variable phase approach or phase function method (VPA/PFM) that is wavefunction independent while the rest are wavefunction dependent.

Various methods can be used to obtain the scattering phases by solving the Schrödinger equation, like the Born approximation, Brysk’s approximation, and other successive ap-

proximation techniques. These methods for phase shift and hence cross-section calculations have been shown in Fig.1 which are wavefunction dependent. In our earlier papers, we applied VPA or PFM for studying n-p [3, 4, 5], n-d [6] and n- α [7] using Morse potential. In a recently published work by our group, Sastri *et al.* utilized a genetic algorithm to achieve a global minimum in parameters for $\alpha - \alpha$ scattering [8]. Recently Blassal has applied VPA to inverse scattering problem where he used noncausal Volterra series, and multilayer perceptron (MLP) neural networks to estimate the scattering potentials for deuteron 3S_1 ground state [9]. Also, Romualdi and Marchetti using VPA, presented a machine learning model based on convolutional neural networks that is capable of yielding accurate scattering phase shifts for three-dimensional spherically symmetric potentials [10]. Blassal has also applied VPA to $n - \alpha$ inverse scattering problem using neural networks [11]. Knowing that using VPA, phase shifts of the nucleon-nucleon scattering can be obtained using different types of potentials (high-precision phenomenological potentials) and interaction models between two nucleons. The current paper is an extension of our recently published work [12] and deals with comparing the results for n-p scattering using two different optimization techniques i.e., VMC and multilayer perception type NN. Hence, the major objectives of this paper are

- (i) optimize Morse potential by two different optimization techniques i.e., variational Monte Carlo (*three parameters: V_0, r_m & a_m*) and multilayer perceptron type Neural Networks (*only one parameter: only V_0*).
- (ii) obtain various quantum mechanical functions like δ_0, A_0 & u_0 vs r for 3S_1 and 1S_0 state of deuteron

It should be noted that the true nuclear potentials are non-local, which has not been accounted for in this work and will be included later for higher partial waves of the deuteron.

2 Methodology

The Morse function is given by [13]

$$V(r) = V_0 \left(e^{-2\frac{(r-r_m)}{a_m}} - 2e^{-\frac{(r-r_m)}{a_m}} \right) \quad (1)$$

In the above equation, the parameters $V_0, r_m,$ and a_m represent the strength of interaction between the particles, the equilibrium distance at which maximum attraction is felt, and the shape of the potential, respectively. The Morse potential possesses several distinguishing properties that differentiate it from other phenomenological potentials, including:

1. The Schrödinger equation is exactly solvable for this potential.
2. Morse function which has all the features observed in scattering phenomena such as strong repulsion at extremely short distances, an attractive nature at intermediate distances, and a quickly decaying tail for the long-range [4].
3. Unlike other phenomenological potentials such as Manning-Rosen [14], Malfliet-Tjon [15], Hulthén [16], and others, the Morse potential has an exact analytical expression for the 1S_0 state phase shift.

4. It exhibits a relatively simpler wave function [17].
5. It is a shape-invariant potential.

Hence, it can be considered a good choice for modelling the interaction between neutron and proton.

2.1 Variable Phase Approach (VPA) or Phase Function Method (PFM)

The Schrödinger wave equation for a spinless particle with energy E and orbital angular momentum ℓ undergoing scattering is given by

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \left[\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + (k^2 - \ell(\ell + 1)/r^2) \right] u_\ell(k, r) = V(r)u_\ell(k, r) \quad (2)$$

In the above equations $k_{c.m.} = \sqrt{E_{c.m.}/(\hbar^2/2\mu)}$, $\hbar^2/2\mu = 41.47 \text{ MeV fm}^2$ and the energy of projectile E_{lab} is converted into center of mass energy $E_{c.m.}$ for non-relativistic kinematics as $E_{c.m.} = \frac{M_p}{M_n + M_p} E_{lab}$. The second-order differential equation Eq.2 has been transformed to the first-order non-homogeneous differential equation of Riccati type [18, 19] given by

$$\delta'_\ell(k, r) = -\frac{V(r)}{k(\hbar^2/2\mu)} \left[\cos(\delta_\ell(k, r)) \hat{j}_\ell(kr) - \sin(\delta_\ell(k, r)) \hat{\eta}_\ell(kr) \right]^2 \quad (3)$$

Prime denotes differentiation of phase function with respect to distance and the Riccati Hankel function of first kind is related to $\hat{j}_\ell(kr)$ and $\hat{\eta}_\ell(kr)$ by $\hat{h}_\ell(r) = -\hat{\eta}_\ell(r) + i \hat{j}_\ell(r)$. In integral form, the above equation can be written as

$$\delta(k, r) = \frac{-1}{k(\hbar^2/2\mu)} \int_0^r V(r) \left[\cos(\delta_\ell(k, r)) \hat{j}_\ell(kr) - \sin(\delta_\ell(k, r)) \hat{\eta}_\ell(kr) \right]^2 dr \quad (4)$$

Eq.3 is numerically solved using Runge-Kutta 5th order (RK-5) method [20] with initial condition $\delta_\ell(0) = 0$. The above equation can be used to evaluate the phase function $\delta(r)$, which defines the total phase shift up to r . Then the phase shift (solution of a non-linear differential equation) is the limiting value

$$\delta = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \delta_\ell(r) \quad (5)$$

To calculate δ the phase function $\delta(k, r)$ is evaluated up to a cut-off point at which $\delta(k, r)$ saturates or stabilizes. The physical implication of the cut-off point is that it is the radial distance beyond which the inter-nuclear potential can be considered zero. For $\ell = 0$, the Riccati-Bessel and Riccati-Neumann functions \hat{j}_0 and $\hat{\eta}_0$ get simplified as $\sin(kr)$ and $-\cos(kr)$, so Eq.3, for $\ell = 0$ becomes

$$\delta'_0(k, r) = -\frac{V(r)}{k(\hbar^2/2\mu)} \sin^2[kr + \delta_0(k, r)] \quad (6)$$

In the above equation, the function $\delta_0(k, r)$ was termed ‘‘Phase function’’ by Morse and Allis [21]. Similarly, by varying the Bessel functions for various ℓ values by using following recurrence relations [22]

$$\hat{j}_{\ell+1}(kr) = \frac{2\ell + 1}{kr} \hat{j}_\ell(kr) - \hat{j}_{\ell-1}(kr) \quad (7)$$

$$\hat{\eta}_{\ell+1}(kr) = \frac{2\ell + 1}{kr} \hat{\eta}_{\ell}(kr) - \hat{\eta}_{\ell-1}(kr) \quad (8)$$

The equation for amplitude function[23] with the initial condition is obtained in the form

$$A'_{\ell}(r) = -\frac{A_{\ell}V(r)}{k} \left[\cos(\delta_{\ell}(k, r)) \hat{j}_{\ell}(kr) - \sin(\delta_{\ell}(k, r)) \hat{\eta}_{\ell}(kr) \right] \\ \times \left[\sin(\delta_{\ell}(k, r)) \hat{j}_{\ell}(kr) + \cos(\delta_{\ell}(k, r)) \hat{\eta}_{\ell}(kr) \right] \quad (9)$$

for $\ell = 0$ amplitude function becomes

$$A'_0 = -\frac{A_0V(r)}{k \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \right)} \left[\cos \delta_0 \cdot \sin(kr) - \sin \delta_0 \cdot (-\cos(kr)) \right] \\ \times \left[\sin \delta_0 \cdot \sin(kr) + \cos \delta_0 \cdot (-\cos(kr)) \right] \quad (10)$$

also, the equation to obtained wavefunction[23] is

$$u_{\ell}(r) = A_{\ell}(r) \left[\cos(\delta_{\ell}(k, r)) \hat{j}_{\ell}(kr) - \sin(\delta_{\ell}(k, r)) \hat{\eta}_{\ell}(kr) \right] \quad (11)$$

For $\ell = 0$ the wavefunction takes the following form

$$u_0(r) = A_0(r) \left[\cos \delta_0(r) \cdot \sin(kr) - \sin \delta_0(r) \cdot \cos(kr) \right] \quad (12)$$

Detailed flowchart to obtain inverse potential, amplitude and wavefunction has been shown in Fig. 2 where the first block contains model parameters, the second block contains Morse potential, the third block contains the main VPA/PFM equation which gives δ as output, the fourth block contains amplitude function and final block contains wavefunction equation.




Figure 2: Detailed flowchart for obtaining phase shift, amplitude function and wavefunction for n-p system. RK5 has been used for numerical analysis.

2.2 Optimization of Morse parameters using *VMC*

Typically, *VMC* is utilized for obtaining the ground state energy for a given potential. The method initiates with a trial wavefunction, which is varied at a random location by a random amount in the Monte-Carlo sense. Then, the energy is determined using the newly obtained wavefunction and the variational principle is applied. This process is done iteratively till one converges to the ground state. Here, we consider varying the potential instead of the wavefunction and minimize variance with respect to experimental data, as follows:

Initialisation step: To begin the optimisation procedure, Morse parameters V_0 , r_m and a_m are given some initial values. The phase equation is integrated using the RK-5 method for different values of k , a function of lab energies E , to obtain the simulated *SPS*, say δ_k^{sim} . The mean square error (*MSE*) has been determined with respect to the *SPS* analysis data of Wiringa *et al.*, [6], say δ_k^{exp} , as

$$MSE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\delta_i^{expt} - \delta_i^{sim})^2 \quad (13)$$

This is named as MSE_{old} and is also assigned to MSE_{min} .

1. Initialization of model parameters:

First, we create an array of scattering energies $[E_1, E_2, E_3\dots]$ and their corresponding phase shifts $[\delta_1, \delta_1, \delta_1\dots]$. Then we start by choosing the initial values for the interaction potential V_0 , i.e., a, b, c , etc., based on experimental data.

2. Solving VPA/PFM equation using RK method:

In this step, we numerically solve the VPA equation (Eq. 3) using the Runge-Kutta method (specifically, the RK-5 method used here) to obtain the simulated scattering phase shifts (SPS), which we call δ_{old} . We then calculate the mean square error (MSE) between the simulated SPS and the experimental data and record it as MSE_{old} . In this step, the VPA equation Eq. 3 is solved numerically using the Runge Kutta method (RK-5 method in this work) to obtain simulated scattering phase shifts (SPS) and named it as δ_{old} . The mean absolute percentage error for simulated SPS w.r.t. experimental data is calculated and saved as MSE_{old} .

3. Monte Carlo step:

In this step, a random number, say ' r ' is generated within an interval $[-I, I]$ and then add the perturbation ' r ' to one of the three parameters, e.g., $V_{a_{new}} = V_a + r$.

4. Recalculating the Scattering Phase Shifts:

The scattering phase shift is again calculated by considering a new set of perturbed parameters, i.e., $V_{a_{new}}$. The mean absolute percentage error is again calculated and saved as MSE_{new} .

5. Variational step:

In this step, the condition, i.e. $MSE_{new} < MSE_{old}$ is checked. If this condition is true, then the parameter V_a is updated to $V_{a_{new}}$ otherwise, the old value is retained.

6. Iterative steps:

Repeat steps 3, 4, and 5 for all the model parameters to complete one iteration. After a particular number of iterations, the size of the interval ' r ' is reduced to check if there is any further reduction in MSE . The procedure is finished when MSE reaches convergence, i.e. when the MSE ceases to change.

2.3 Optimization Using Neural Networks

Parameter optimization of more than two free parameters could be, in general, a very time-consuming task if we do not have any preliminary knowledge, at least on the order of magnitude of the parameters. In the case of the variable phase approximation with Morse potentials, we would need to identify three parameters that seemingly do not depend on each other in any way. In the case of the 3S_1 triplet state, we have seen that the problem could be reduced to a 2-parameter optimization problem due to the dependency of V_0 on a_m [5]. Following on this, we could assume that even if there is no analytic relation between all of the parameters in the entire range they span, there could be approximate relations between them in some well-defined region in \mathcal{R}^3 , which we will call the operating range of the approximation. As we are dealing with the quantum scattering problem, where the available measured quantities are the asymptotic phase shifts, we will use them as 'input's for the approximations. Furthermore, we also need to decide in what order we would like to estimate the parameters. Here, we will reduce the original 3-parameter problem to a 1-parameter optimization problem by keeping V_0 as the

free parameter and finding two functions that will approximate the a_m and r_m parameters from the knowledge of V_0 and the measured asymptotic phase shifts. Therefore, we intend to identify two functions, $F_1()$, and $F_2()$ as follows:

$$\tilde{a}_m = F_1(V_0, \delta(k_1), \delta(k_2), \dots, \delta(k_n)), \quad (14)$$

and

$$\tilde{r}_m = F_2(\tilde{a}_m, V_0, \delta(k_1), \delta(k_2), \dots, \delta(k_n)), \quad (15)$$

where $\delta(k_i)$ is a 'measured' asymptotic phase shift at k_i momentum, while \tilde{a}_m and \tilde{r}_m are the estimated parameters. As it can be seen, here we approach the problem in two steps, where the first step consists of the estimation of the a_m parameter from the knowledge of the V_0 parameter, and the $\delta(k_i)$ phase shifts. The estimated parameter \tilde{a}_m is assumed to be close to its true value $\tilde{a}_m \approx a_m$, however, we do not need it to be exactly the same because in a real-life experiment, we will also have a certain amount of noise in the measured phase shifts as well. Due to the possible noise in the parameters, we will also use \tilde{a}_m for further estimations, where we will try to find the $F_2()$ function, which will give us an estimated value for the last parameter r_m . Therefore, in $F_2()$, we will use the previously approximated \tilde{a}_m parameter as an input.

In the following, we have to decide on how to find the $F_1()$ and $F_2()$ functions. In general, we need a nonlinear relationship between many parameters for which neural networks could provide a great and easy way to approach the problem, therefore, we choose F_1 and F_2 to be two distinct multilayer perceptron (MLP) type neural networks, with the inputs and outputs shown in Eq. 14 and in Eq. 15. To train the two MLP's, we have to generate a certain amount of data with the variable phase approximation, and then divide it for training, validation, and testing purposes. As it is impossible to cover the whole range of phase shifts and input parameters, it is necessary to set an operating range for our approximation by constraining some of the data. In this case, we have many options, e.g., one could constraint the interval of the phase shifts so that we only use potentials during the training, which will result in phase shifts in a certain range, e.g., $[0, \pi]$. By knowing the range of phase shifts we would like to use in the model, this method could greatly simplify the training procedure. Another possibility would be to simply constrain the input parameters V_0 , a_m , r_m of the Morse potentials. Both methods would require some preliminary knowledge of the problem to which we would like to apply the model, however, in this case, we have more than enough knowledge of the system. First of all, we know that in s-wave nucleon-nucleon scattering, the effective range of the potential is around a few fermi in distance, and not considering the possible large repulsive core at small distances, the effective magnitude of the potentials should not exceed a few hundreds of MeV's. We also know that due to the lack of many bound states, the magnitude of the phase shifts is somewhere between $[-2\pi, 2\pi]$. From the phase shift measurements, which we will use in our estimations later, we could constraint the phase shifts much more, however, to keep a certain kind of 'overhead' for the network, we will try not to constraint the training too much. This will be useful in keeping good generalization properties later.

Considering all the above, the estimation of the $F_1()$, and $F_2()$ functions by MLP networks will go as follows:

- Generate 10.000 Morse potentials with the parameters chosen from $V_0 \in [-250, 250]$ MeV, $a_m \in [0, 1]$ fm, and $r_m \in [0, 5]$ fm. These parameters will give many different but still physically sensible potentials in the phase shift range we are interested in.

- Calculate the phase shifts for the generated potentials at incident energies of $E = 0.1, 1, 5, 10, 25, 50, 100, 150, 200, 250, 300$ MeV. The phase shift at these values will be the input parameters for the $F_1()$, and $F_2()$ functions, and the energies correspond to the measurements.
- Normalize the inputs and outputs between $[-1, 1]$, then train the first MLP (corresponding to the $F_1()$ function) with the normalized V_0 , $\delta(k_i)$, and a_m values.
- Using the response of the first MLP (\tilde{a}_m) train the second MLP, which then again corresponds to the $F_2()$ function.

By training the network this way, we will be able to reduce the original 3-parameter optimization problem to only 1 with V_0 as the only free parameter, as each V_0 with a specific $\delta(k_1), \delta(k_2), \dots, \delta(k_n)$ will correspond to a specific \tilde{a}_m , and \tilde{r}_m . Another important task still remains, namely, determining the complexity of the two MLP's, which in this case means the number of hidden layers and the number of neurons in each hidden layer. As there is no exact method to determine this, we rely on trying out different networks and choosing one that has some optimal behaviour for us. In our case, it was important to be able to reach good generalization relatively quickly and optimize the network like that. By trying out different configurations, we set the two MLP's so that they both have 4 hidden layers, each having 200 neurons with a rectified linear unit (ReLU) as the activation function. The generated 10.000 samples were divided so that we used 7000 for training, 2000 for validation, and the remaining 1000 for testing. The results for the training of both networks can be seen in Fig. 3, where the upper row corresponds to $F_1()$, while the lower row corresponds to $F_2()$. On the left side, the mean squared error is shown for both the training and validation sets during the training procedure, while on the right side, the estimated values (of the normalized a_m , and r_m) are compared to the true values for the 30 test data.

As can be seen from the test data, both networks were able to reach a very good generalization, corresponding to only a few percent relative error. By applying the trained neural networks, it is now possible to estimate the interaction potentials for s-wave scattering and compare the obtained parameters to the previously determined ones. To do this, the measured 1S_0 and 3S_1 nucleon-nucleon scattering phase shifts will be used as input parameters. Now we only need to adjust the values for V_0 , so a simple parameter sweep will be enough for our purposes. The inversion process will thus go as follows:

- Choose a V_0 , and calculate the corresponding \tilde{a}_m , and \tilde{r}_m parameters by the trained neural networks using the measured phase shifts $\delta(k_1), \dots, \delta(k_n)$.
- With V_0 , \tilde{a}_m , and \tilde{r}_m generate a Morse potential and calculate the phase shifts at the specified energies.
- Compare the results to the measurements and calculate the mean squared error for the phase shifts defined as before.

By sweeping through V_0 we could map the whole parameter space, however, in each sweep, we have to check if the obtained \tilde{a}_m , and \tilde{r}_m parameters are inside the operating range of the neural networks. In practice, this should not be a problem when a good generalization is obtained, but nevertheless, it is always important to check if the estimation is still in the region where we want to use the neural network. Following the steps described below,




Figure 3: MSE and comparison of the true and estimated values of the two neural networks corresponding to the $F_1()$ (upper row), and $F_2()$ (bottom row) functions. On the left side, the mean squared error is shown during training for the training and validation data, while on the right side, the outputs of the networks are compared to the true values for the 30 test data (normalized).

we have made sweeps with $\Delta V_0 = 0.25$ MeV for both the 1S_0 and 3S_1 scattering cases. The corresponding mean squared errors are shown in Fig. 4 and in Fig. 5.

In both cases, there is a clear minimum in the mean squared errors that can be seen during the sweeps. The corresponding parameters calculated by the neural networks are summarized in Tab. 1. Let us also compare the re-calculated phase shifts with the obtained parameters with the measured phase shifts, which can be seen in Fig. 6 both for the 1S_0 and for the 3S_1 cases. The results are also compared to the ones obtained by the VMC method, giving a very good match in both cases.

The method described here can be used to describe other scattering scenarios as well, e.g., p- or d-wave scattering, or it can be used to model other types of potentials with more free parameters. Even though the trained networks have good generalization properties, they are still approximations of the true parameters. Therefore, a possible extension of the model would be to give pre-estimated values to the parameters involved, and then, using those values as initial conditions, use some other optimization method, e.g., the previously described Monte-Carlo optimization, to obtain a better estimation of the true parameters.

3 Results and Discussion

Using the two different methods we obtained inverse potentials for deuteron 1S_0 and 3S_1 state. The obtained parameters are shown in Fig. 1 and are very close to each other.

The original 3-D optimization problem using VMC has been reduced to 1-D optimization by using NN.




Figure 4: MSE for the 1S_0 scattering scenario during the V_0 parameter sweep with $\Delta V_0 = 0.25$ MeV. A clear minimum can be seen at $V_0 = 73.5$ MeV, which corresponds to $\tilde{a}_m = 0.363$ fm, and $\tilde{r}_m = 0.881$ fm.

For 1S_0 state in the region $0 \leq r \leq 1$ fm, the low-energy projectile faces the attractive part of the potential. As the energy increases to 350 MeV the repulsive interaction takes place, indicating that the interaction is occurring near the repulsive core. According to the VPA/PFM equation, the repulsive potential will result in negative phase shifts. This phenomenon is depicted in Fig. 6 (*top left*) with experimental data (black circle), estimated VMC results (solid red), and estimated neural network results (dashed blue) respectively. For $r \geq 1$ fm, the interaction moves towards the attractive core of the potential, leading to positive phase shifts. The estimated potential for 1S_0 state using VMC and NN is shown in Fig. 6 (*bottom left*) and both can be seen in very close agreement.

Table 1: 1S_0 & 3S_1 Model Parameters using Variational Monte Carlo and Neural Networks (VMC/NN) for Morse potential. VMC parameters are taken from [12].

States	$V_0(\text{MeV})$	$r_m(\text{fm})$	$a_m(\text{fm})$	MSE
1S_0	70.438/73.5	0.901/0.881	0.372/0.363	0.65/2.5
3S_1	114.153/115.25	0.841/0.832	0.350/0.347	0.16/0.22

The SPS vs r plot for 1S_0 and 3S_1 saturates after some spatial interval, depicting the vanishing of potential for larger distances. The amplitude variation for the 1S_0 state is shown in Fig. 7 (*mid*). Finally, the wave functions are plotted at various energies ($E = 10, 50, 150,$ and 250 MeV) shown in Fig. 7 (*bottom*).

Similarly, for 3S_1 state, the comparative potential using VMC and NN is shown in Fig. 6 (*bottom right*), SPS vs. r in Fig. 8 (*top*), amplitude function in Fig. 8 (*mid*) and wavefunction 8 (*bottom*) respectively. A similar trend like in 1S_0 SPS vs. r has been observed for the 3S_1 state, which has a much deeper potential of about 114 MeV. The

jump in SPS vs r plots for the 3S_1 state is encountered because of the involved depth of the 3S_1 potential. Similarly, a more peaked amplitude is observed for the 3S_1 state. Model parameters obtained through VMC and NN are shown in Tab. 1. Similarly, we have obtained the quantum mechanical functions for higher partial channels of deuteron like P and D where the optimization has been performed using VMC in tandem with VPA and the next task is to apply NN for similar work which is under process [24].

Overall, the results indicate that our inverse procedure is validated by obtaining the wavefunctions in close agreement with the Av-18 potential and JISP [25, 26]. However, a certain phase lag in wavefunction is observed between our results and those of NIJM-II and JISP [25, 26]. This phase lag can be attributed to the simplistic Morse model (central potential) used in our approach. Adding realistic interactions (central & non-central) may lead to more accurate results that are beyond the scope of the present work. Also to refine the results, we can apply the Combinatorial Data Analysis (CDA) procedure developed by our group [5]. This procedure can generate a certain class of isospectral potentials that may provide a better agreement between the compared wavefunctions in this work.




Figure 5: MSE for the 3S_1 scattering scenario during the V_0 parameter sweep with $\Delta V_0 = 0.25$ MeV. A clear minimum can be seen at $V_0 = 115.25$ MeV, which corresponds to $\tilde{a}_m = 0.347$ fm, and $\tilde{r}_m = 0.832$ fm.




Figure 6: Top row shows scattering phase shifts for 1S_0 and 3S_1 state and bottom row shows their respective potentials obtained by the VMC, and the NN method. The optimum parameters attained are shown in table 1.




Figure 7: SPS $\delta(r)$, Amplitude $A(r)$, and wavefunction $u(r)$ for the 1S_0 state.




Figure 8: SPS $\delta(r)$, Amplitude $A(r)$, and wavefunction $u(r)$ for the 3S_1 state.

4 Conclusion

The obtained phases serve as a quantum mechanical magnification glass, allowing us to explore the intricacies of the nuclear domain. The variation of phase shift with distance provides a beautiful demonstration that, for repulsive potentials, the phase shift δ takes on positive values, while for attractive potentials, it assumes negative values. This observation aligns perfectly with the main equation of the Variable Phase Approach. Our two different techniques, i.e., VMC and MLP type Neural Networks in tandem with VPA/PFM are effective in obtaining Phase shift $\delta(r)$, amplitude $A(r)$ and Wave function $u(r)$ for 1S_0 and 3S_1 states. Also, this work progresses in the direction of having a minimum number of parameters involved, thus saving computational time and cost.

This combined computational approach of variational Monte Carlo and Neural Networks to constructing inverse potentials offers certain advantages, although further improvements are desired for enhanced performance. Moreover, this methodology can be extended to investigate a wide range of scattering scenarios, including $n-\alpha$, $p-\alpha$, $n-C$, and higher partial waves (P, D, F, G, H, I & J) involved in np scattering. Also, it is well known that true nuclear interactions are known to be non-local, but that is not under the scope of the present work. The determination of a non-local potential using two different techniques for deuteron's higher partial waves will be our next objective.

5 Acknowledgements

A.K. is grateful to Chandigarh Group of Colleges (CGC) Jhanjeri for providing computational facilities. Also, A.K. is thankful to Dr. Ashwani Kumar Sharma (HOD Applied Physics CEC) for providing me with enough time to complete this paper.

Declaration

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Kabanikhin S I 2020 Inverse problems of natural science. Comput. Math. Math. Phys. 60 911-4
- [2] Blatt J M and Jackson J D 1949 On the interpretation of neutron-proton scattering data by the Schwinger variational method. Phys. Rev. 76 18
- [3] Khachi A, Kumar L and Sastri O S K S 2021 Neutron-Proton Scattering Phase Shifts in S-Channel using Phase Function Method for Various Two Term Potentials. J. Nucl. Phys. Mater. Sci. Radiat. Appl. 9 87-93
- [4] Sastri O S K S, Khachi A and Kumar L 2022 An Innovative Approach to Construct Inverse Potentials Using Variational Monte-Carlo and Phase Function Method: Application to np and pp Scattering. Braz. J. Phys. 52 58
- [5] Khachi A, Kumar L, Kumar M G and Sastri O S K S 2023 Deuteron structure and form factors: Using an inverse potential approach. Phys. Rev. C 107 064002

- [6] Awasthi S and Sastri O S K S 2023 Real and Imaginary Phase Shifts for Nucleon-Deuteron Scattering using Phase Function Method. arXiv:2304.10478
- [7] Kumar L, Khachi A and Sastri O S K S 2022 Phase Shift Analysis for Neutron-Alpha Elastic Scattering Using Phase Function Method with Local Gaussian Potential. J. Nucl. Phys. Mater. Sci. Radiat. Appl. 9 215-21
- [8] Sastri O S K S, Sharma A and Awasthi A 2024 Constructing inverse scattering potentials for charged particles using a reference potential approach. Phys. Rev. C 109 064004
- [9] Balassa, G., 2022. Estimating scattering potentials in inverse problems with Volterra series and neural networks. The European Physical Journal A, 58(9), p.186.
- [10] Romualdi A and Marchetti G 2021 Machine learning S-wave scattering phase shifts bypassing the radial Schrödinger equation. Eur. Phys. J. B 94 1-8.
- [11] Balassa G 2023 Fixed-energy inverse scattering with radial basis function neural networks and its application to neutron- α interactions. Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. 2023 113A01
- [12] Khachi A, Kumar L, Awasthi A and Sastri O S K S 2023 Inverse potentials for all ℓ channels of neutron-proton scattering using reference potential approach. Phys. Scr. 98 095301
- [13] Morse P M 1929 Diatomic molecules according to the wave mechanics. II. Vibrational levels. Phys. Rev. 34 57
- [14] Khirali B, Behera A K, Bhoi J and Laha U 2020 Scattering with Manning–Rosen potential in all partial waves. Ann. Phys. 412 168044
- [15] Malfliet R A and Tjon J A 1969 Solution of the Faddeev equations for the triton problem using local two-particle interactions. Nucl. Phys. A 127 161-8
- [16] Bhoi J and Laha U 2017 Hulthen potential models for $\alpha - \alpha$ and $\alpha - {}^3\text{He}$ elastic scattering. Pramana 88 1-6
- [17] Matsumoto A 1988 Generalised matrix elements in discrete and continuum states for the Morse potential. J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. 21 2863
- [18] Calogero F 1967 Variable Phase Approach to Potential Scattering (New York: Academic)
- [19] Babikov V V E 1967 The phase-function method in quantum mechanics. Sov. Phys. Usp. 10 271
- [20] Butcher J C 1996 A history of Runge-Kutta methods. Appl. Numer. Math. 20 247-60
- [21] Morse P M and Allis W P 1933 The effect of exchange on the scattering of slow electrons from atoms. Phys. Rev. 44 269

- [22] Palov A P and Balint-Kurti G G 2021 VPA: computer program for the computation of the phase shift in atom-atom potential scattering using the variable phase approach. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 263 107895.
- [23] Zhaba V I 2019 The variable phase approach: phase, amplitude and wave functions of the states for np-system for Argonne v18 potential. *World Sci. News* 123 161-80
- [24] Khachi A 2023 Phase shift, Amplitude and Wavefunctions for np-system using Morse Potential by Calogero's Approach. [arXiv:2308.03824](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.03824)
- [25] Mazur A I, Shirokov A M, Vary J P, Weber T A, Zaitsev S A and Mazur E A 2007 Nonlocal nucleon-nucleon interaction *JISP. Bull. Russ. Acad. Sci.: Phys.* 71 754-63
- [26] Shirokov A M, Mazur A I, Zaytsev S A, Vary J P and Weber T A 2004 Nucleon-nucleon interaction in the J-matrix inverse scattering approach and few-nucleon systems. *Phys. Rev. C* 70 044005