

Charge-Current and Neutral-Current Quasielastic Neutrino(Antineutrino) Scattering on ^{12}C with Realistic Spectral and Scaling Functions

**A.N. Antonov¹, M.V. Ivanov^{1,2}, M.B. Barbaro³, J.A. Caballero⁴,
G.D. Megias⁴, R. González-Jiménez⁴, C. Giusti⁵, A. Meucci⁵,
E. Moya de Guerra², J.M. Udías²**

¹Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences,
Sofia 1784, Bulgaria

²Grupo de Física Nuclear, Departamento de Física Atómica, Molecular y Nuclear,
Universidad Complutense de Madrid, CEI Moncloa, 28040 Madrid, Spain

³Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Torino and INFN, Sezione di Torino,
Via P. Giuria 1, 10125 Torino, Italy

⁴Departamento de Física Atómica, Molecular y Nuclear, Universidad de Sevilla, 41080
Sevilla, Spain

⁵Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Pavia and INFN, Sezione di Pavia,
via Bassi 6 I-27100 Pavia, Italy

Results of calculations of charge-current (CC) [1] and neutral-current (NC) [2] quasielastic (anti)neutrino scattering cross sections on ^{12}C target are presented. They are obtained using a realistic spectral function $S(p, \mathcal{E})$ [2] that gives a scaling function in accordance with the (e, e') scattering data. The spectral function accounts for the nucleon-nucleon correlations by using natural orbitals from the Jastrow correlation method and has a realistic energy dependence. In the calculations the standard value of the axial mass $M_A = 1.032$ GeV is used. The role of the final-state interaction on the spectral and scaling functions, as well as on the cross sections is accounted for. Our results in the CC case are compared with those from other theoretical approaches, such as the Superscaling Approach (SuSA) and the relativistic Fermi gas (RFG), as well as with those of the relativistic mean field (RMF) and the relativistic Green's function (RGF) in the NC case. Based on the impulse approximation our calculations for the CC scattering underpredict the MiniBooNE data but agree with the data from the NOMAD experiment. The NC results are compared with the empirical data of the MiniBooNE and BNL experiments. The discussion includes the possible missing ingredients in the considered theoretical methods (see also [4]).

References

- [1] M.V. Ivanov, A.N. Antonov, J.A. Caballero, G.D. Megias, M.B. Barbaro, E. Moya de Guerra, and J.M. Udias, *Phys. Rev. C* **89** (2014) 014607.

- [2] M.V. Ivanov, A.N. Antonov, M.B. Barbaro, C. Giusti, A. Meucci, J.A. Caballero, G.D. Megias, R. Gonzalez-Jimenez, E. Moya de Guerra, and J.M. Udiás, *Phys. Rev. C* **91** (2015) 034607.
- [3] A.N. Antonov, M.V. Ivanov, J.A. Caballero, M.B. Barbaro, J.M. Udiás, E. Moya de Guerra, and T.W. Donnelly, *Phys. Rev. C* **83** (2011) 045504.
- [4] M.B. Barbaro, C. Albertus, J.E. Amaro, A.N. Antonov, J.A. Caballero, T.W. Donnelly, R. Gonzalez-Jimenez, M.V. Ivanov, E. Moya de Guerra, G.D. Megias, I. Ruiz Simo, and J.M. Udiás, arXiv: 1411.5981 [nucl-th]; in “Nuclear Theory”, *Proceedings of 33rd International Workshop on Nuclear Theory, Rila Mountains, Bulgaria, 22–28 June 2014*, vol. **33**, ed. by A. Georgieva and N. Minkov, Heron Press, Sofia, pp. 75–86 (2014), ISSN 1313-2822 [and references therein]