

# Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

## Recent Work

### Title

LONG RANGE ABSORPTION IN THE HEAVY-ION OPTICAL POTENTIAL

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2f8340k7>

### Author

Baltz, A.J.

### Publication Date

1977-08-01

0 0 0 0 4 8 0 4 1 0 1

UC-34d

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

LBL-6581 e.1  
Preprint


LONG RANGE ABSORPTION IN THE HEAVY-ION OPTICAL POTENTIAL

A. J. Baltz, S. K. Kauffmann,  
N. K. Glendenning, and K. Pruess

August 1977

Prepared for the U. S. Energy Research and  
Development Administration under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

**For Reference**  
Not to be taken from this room



RECEIVED  
LAWRENCE  
BERKELEY LABORATORY  
OCT 17 1977  
LIBRARY AND  
DOCUMENTS SECTION

LBL-6581 e.1

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

## LONG RANGE ABSORPTION IN THE HEAVY-ION OPTICAL POTENTIAL

A. J. Baltz,\* S. K. Kauffmann,  
N. K. Glendenning, and K. Pruess

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

## ABSTRACT

The long range imaginary optical potential arising from quadrupole Coulomb excitation is derived in closed form. An analytical closed form for sub-Coulomb elastic scattering is obtained by inserting this potential into a weak absorption model.

---

\*Permanent address: Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, N.Y. 11973.

A long-range absorption in the heavy-ion optical potential due to Coulomb excitation of a low-lying collective quadrupole state has been the subject of some interest recently. An experimental specimen is the elastic scattering data of 90 MeV  $^{18}\text{O}$  on  $^{184}\text{W}$ .<sup>1</sup> These data show a Fresnel pattern damped below the Rutherford cross section that is well reproduced by a coupled channels calculation which includes Coulomb excitation of the 111 keV  $2^+$  rotational state in  $^{184}\text{W}$ .

An alternative theoretical description is the construction of an optical model component arising from two-step contributions to elastic scattering. This can be done using the Feshbach projection operator formalism.<sup>2</sup> In this framework, Love, Terasawa, and Satchler have recently obtained a formula for a long-range imaginary potential (which we will refer to as the LTS potential) by making the approximation of using plane wave intermediate states along with a classical correction for the Coulomb braking.<sup>3</sup> The potential obtained is dominantly negative-imaginary, and apart from finite-size corrections, has a radial dependence of  $R^{-5} [1 - (Z_1 Z_2 e^2 / R E_{\text{cm}})]^{-1/2}$ .

In this letter we show that it is possible to derive a more exact expression for this long-range imaginary optical potential by making use of Coulomb-distorted scattering states and a Coulomb-distorted Green's function. The result shows some interesting differences from the LTS potential. Furthermore, we obtain an analytical closed form for the differential elastic cross section below the Coulomb barrier based on a weak absorption model.

The potential component to be evaluated may be written<sup>2</sup>

$$V(r, r') = V_f(r) G_2(r, r') V_i(r') \quad (1)$$

where  $G_2$  is the Green's function for the intermediate  $2^+$  state, and  $V_f, V_i$  are the quadrupole operators connecting ground and excited state, i.e.,

$$V_i(r') = \frac{4\pi Z_p e (B(E2))^{\frac{1}{2}}}{5\sqrt{5}} \frac{1}{r'^3} \sum_{M'} Y_{2M'}(\hat{r}') \quad , \quad (2)$$

and likewise *mutatis mutandis* for  $V_f$ . A partial wave expansion of  $G_2$  may be made in coordinate space

$$G_2 = -\frac{2\mu}{k\hbar^2} \sum_{\ell'm'} F_{\ell'}(r_<) H_{\ell'}(r_>) Y_{\ell'm'}(\hat{r}) Y_{\ell'm'}^*(\hat{r}') \quad , \quad (3)$$

where  $F_{\ell'}(r_<)$  and  $H_{\ell'}(r_>)$  will be taken to be the regular and outgoing boundary Coulomb wave functions respectively. One then obtains a non-local,  $\ell$ -dependent contribution to the optical potential

$$U_{\ell}(r, r') = -\frac{2\mu}{k\hbar^2} \frac{4\pi}{25} Z_p^2 e^2 B(E2) \sum_{\ell'} \langle \ell 0 2 0 | \ell' 0 \rangle^2 \times \frac{1}{r^3} \frac{1}{r'^3} F_{\ell'}(r_<) H_{\ell'}(r_>) \quad . \quad (4)$$

A "trivially equivalent local potential"<sup>3</sup> may now be defined in perturbation theory:

$$U_{\ell}(r) F_{\ell}(r) = \int dr' U_{\ell}(r, r') F_{\ell}(r') \quad . \quad (5)$$

Recalling that

$$H_{\ell'}(r_>) = G_{\ell'}(r_>) + iF_{\ell'}(r_>) \quad , \quad (6)$$

the local potential takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{\ell}(r) = & - \frac{2\mu}{\hbar^2} \frac{4\pi}{25} Z_p^2 e^2 B(E2) \uparrow \sum_{\ell'} \langle \ell 0 20 | \ell' 0 \rangle^2 \frac{1}{r^3} \\
 & \times \left[ i \frac{F_{\ell'}(r)}{F_{\ell}(r)} \int_0^{\infty} dr' F_{\ell'}(r') \frac{1}{r'^3} F_{\ell}(r') \right. \\
 & + \frac{F_{\ell'}(r)}{F_{\ell}(r)} \int_r^{\infty} dr' G_{\ell'}(r') \frac{1}{r'^3} F_{\ell}(r') \\
 & \left. + \frac{G_{\ell'}(r)}{F_{\ell}(r)} \int_0^r dr' F_{\ell'}(r') \frac{1}{r'^3} F_{\ell}(r') \right] \quad . \quad (7)
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice here the clean separation of the real and imaginary parts of this potential. Obviously both real components will oscillate in sign as a function of  $r$  ; this behavior is confirmed in computer evaluation of Eq. (7). These real components merely serve to put insignificant "hair" on top of the real Coulomb potential and will not be considered further. On the other hand, we can evaluate the imaginary component in closed form.

For the sake of simplicity in derivation we assume no energy loss in the quadrupole transition. However, a semi-classical energy loss factor  $g_2(\xi)$  is applied to our results at the end.<sup>3</sup>  $g_2(\xi)$  is merely the ratio  $f_2(\eta, \xi)/f_2(\eta, 0)$ , where  $\xi$  is the adiabaticity parameter  $\xi = \frac{1}{2} \eta \Delta E / E_{cm}$ , and  $f_2(\eta, \xi)$  is the standard factor of Alder et al.<sup>4</sup> which we assume for  $\eta = \infty$ . In the derivation of our closed form it will be assumed that

either  $\eta$  or  $\hat{\ell} = \ell + \frac{1}{2}$  are large, the usual semi-classical conditions.<sup>4</sup> Use is made of the closed forms for the  $1/R^3$  Coulomb integrals<sup>5,4</sup> and the Coulomb wave function recurrence relations. One obtains finally the long range imaginary potential for a given partial wave  $\ell$ :

$$U_{\ell}(r) = -i \frac{2\mu}{k\hbar^2} \frac{\pi}{50} Z_p^2 e^2 B(E2) \uparrow g_2(\xi) \left[ \left( \frac{\eta^2 k^2 (3\hat{\ell}^2 + \eta^2)}{\hat{\ell}^2 (\hat{\ell}^2 + \eta^2)^2} - \frac{\eta k^2}{\hat{\ell}^3} \arctan \frac{\hat{\ell}}{\eta} \right) \frac{1}{r^3} + \frac{4\eta k \hat{\ell}^2}{(\hat{\ell}^2 + \eta^2)^2} \frac{1}{r^4} + \frac{2\hat{\ell}^4}{(\hat{\ell}^2 + \eta^2)^2} \frac{1}{r^5} \right]. \quad (8)$$

where  $\mu$  is the reduced mass of the system,  $Z_p$  is the projectile charge,  $k$  is the wave number, and  $\eta$  is the usual Sommerfeld parameter.

This potential at first sight seems quite different from the LTS potential. It is specifically  $\ell$ -dependent with  $1/R^5$ ,  $1/R^4$ , and  $1/R^3$  radially dependent terms in contrast to the  $\ell$ -independent, dominantly  $1/R^5$ , LTS behavior. As  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ , the  $1/R^5$  term dominates in our potential and the ratio of LTS to ours approaches  $4/3$ . The physical correspondence between the approximate LTS potential and our more exact form may be seen in Fig. 1. The LTS potential crosses our  $\ell$ -dependent potential several Fermis outside of the classical turning point for the small and intermediate  $\ell$ -values of interest. Paradoxically, due to the  $\ell$ -dependence, our  $1/R^5$  term has the longest range, while the  $1/R^3$  term has the shortest range.

Our formula has been compared with the results of a computer evaluation of the imaginary part of Eq. (7) for the case in Fig. 1, and for all partial waves agreement is quite good (to within several percent, except for computationally unstable points where  $1/F_0(r)$  becomes large). For the lower partial waves in above-barrier scattering, one should properly consider



nuclear effects both in the wave functions and in the quadrupole operator, but for the present we do not consider these questions, arguing that our potential is sufficient as it stands to describe the unambiguously long-range part of the imaginary optical potential.

The potential derived is suitable as it stands to be incorporated into already existing optical model codes. However, we will not pursue this at present. Rather we will consider the effects of long-range absorption in the case of sub-Coulomb elastic scattering and derive a formula for the cross section in analytical closed form. This approach turns out to provide the most concise way to compare our potential with the LTS potential. Moreover, studying long-range absorption below the Coulomb barrier insures that the effect will not be obscured by the short-range nuclear surface absorption which dominates cross sections beyond the critical angle; this is a nuclear analogy to eclipsing the solar disc to better observe the corona.

Since our long-range imaginary potential is weak and smoothly varying in both  $r$  and  $\hat{\ell}$ , it will produce a non-diffractive quasi-classical absorptive effect on trajectories passing a few diffuseness lengths or more outside the nuclear surface. We have extended the strong absorption formula of Frahn<sup>6</sup> to include this superimposed weak absorption, whose contribution to the complex phase shifts is calculated by inserting Eq. (8) into a perturbative JWKB integral developed previously.<sup>7</sup> We will describe in detail the resulting formula for elastic scattering above the Coulomb barrier in a subsequent publication. Below the Coulomb barrier, our result becomes independent of nuclear surface parameters other than  $B(E2)\uparrow$ , and we obtain a simple form for the elastic scattering ratio to Rutherford

cross section

$$\frac{\sigma(\theta)}{\sigma_R(\theta)} = \exp(-Kf(\theta)) \quad , \quad (9)$$

where all the specific parameters of the reaction are contained in the constant

$$K = \frac{16\pi}{225} \frac{k^4}{\eta^2} \left[ \frac{B(E2)\uparrow g_2(\xi)}{z_T^2 e^2} \right] \quad , \quad (10)$$

and  $f(\theta)$  is a universal function of angle

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta) = & \frac{9}{4} \left[ \left( \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^4 \left( \frac{4}{3} D^4 + \frac{104}{105} D^5 \right) \right. \\ & + (\sin\theta)^2 \left( \frac{\pi}{4} D^3 + \left( \frac{64 - 15\pi}{30} \right) D^4 \right) \\ & + \left( \left( 3 + \left( \tan \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^2 \right) \left( \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^4 \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \left( \tan \frac{\theta}{2} \right)^3 \left( \frac{\pi - \theta}{2} \right) \left( D^2 + \frac{2}{3} D^3 \right) \right] \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$D = \frac{1}{1 + \csc \frac{\theta}{2}} \quad (12)$$

This analytical form for  $f(\theta)$  has the smooth behavior exhibited in Fig. 2a.

We may also obtain an expression identical to the above for the cross section produced by the LTS potential except that a different universal function of angle  $\bar{f}(\theta)$  is involved. We have plotted the universal below-barrier ratio  $\bar{f}(\theta)/f(\theta)$  in Fig. 2b. This ratio deviates

from unity by up to 33-1/3% at forward angles, but this will not show up in most reactions due to the small magnitude of  $f(\theta)$ . At intermediate angles of about  $40^\circ$  to  $110^\circ$  the ratio deviates little from unity, implying excellent agreement for the predictions of the two potentials. However, beyond  $110^\circ$  (corresponding to LTS cut-off of the Coulomb correction factor at  $R_d/0.9$ ) there is no theory from the LTS potential but only a possible prescription. For the sake of analytical tractability we have merely ignored the cut-off in the ratio calculation. Clearly without the arbitrary cut-off, LTS predictions deviate substantially from those of our potential at very large angles as is illustrated in Fig. 2c. Here are plotted cross sections in a realistic case for which data exists at two angles:  ${}^8_{16}\text{O} + {}^{162}_{\text{Dy}}$  at 48 MeV. There is also similar data for  ${}^{16}_{16}\text{O} + {}^{152}_{\text{Sm}}$  for which  $\sigma/\sigma_R$  is 0.56(1) at  $120^\circ$ (lab) and 0.51(1) at  $140^\circ$  as compared with our calculated values of 0.57 and 0.49, respectively. The excellent agreement between the calculated cross section and the existing data in these two cases seems to encourage further experiments to obtain complete angular distributions in sub-Coulomb elastic scattering.

The remarkable point of such experiments is that there is a non-trivial theory with no free parameters, which can be evaluated without a computer, that gives specific cross-section predictions. Indeed, in the situation where the long-range potential arises dominantly from a single state, sub-Coulomb elastic scattering analyzed in terms of our analytical expression might provide an alternate method of determining the experimental  $B(E2)$  to that single state.

## FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

\*Permanent address: Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973.


1. C. E. Thorn, M. J. LeVine, J. J. Kolata, C. Flaum, P. D. Bond, and J. C. Sens, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 384 (1977).
2. H. Feshbach, Ann. of Phys. 19, 287 (1962).
3. W. G. Love, T. Terasawa, and G. R. Satchler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 6 (1977); Nucl. Phys. (to be published).
4. K. Alder, A. Bohr, T. Huus, B. Mottelson, and A. Winther, Rev. Mod. Phys. 28, 432 (1956).
5. L. C. Biedenharn and C. M. Class, Phys. Rev. 98, 691 (1955).
6. W. E. Frahn, "Heavy-Ion High-Spin States and Nuclear Structure," Vol. I (International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, 1975), p.215.
7. S. K. Kauffmann, "Relation of Phase Shifts to Potential Parameters in the Elastic Scattering of Very Heavy Ions," (University of Cape Town, Department of Physics preprint, Cape Town, 1976).
8. I.Y. Lee and J.X. Saladin, Phys. Rev. C 9, 2406 (1974).

Work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration.

Figure Captions


Fig. 1.  $\ell$ -dependent imaginary optical potential obtained from Eq. (8) compared with the LTS potential for  $^{18}\text{O} + ^{184}\text{W}$  at 90 MeV.

Fig. 2. (a) Universal function of angle  $f(\theta)$ .  
(b) Ratio of  $\bar{f}(\theta)$  for the LTS potential to  $f(\theta)$  for our potential.  
(c) Elastic scattering cross section for  $^{16}\text{O} + ^{162}\text{Dy}$  at 48 MeV calculated from Eq. (9) incorporating  $f(\theta)$  for our potential and  $\bar{f}(\theta)$  for the LTS potential. Data are from Lee and Saladin.<sup>8</sup>



XBL 778-1635

Fig. 1



XBL 778-1636

Fig. 2

This report was done with support from the United States Energy Research and Development Administration. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the United States Energy Research and Development Administration.



TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT  
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720