

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

RADIATIVE PION CAPTURE IN ${}^6\text{Li}^+$

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/51b9259t>

Authors

Baer, Helmut W.
Bistirlich, James A.
Crowe, Kenneth M.
et al.

Publication Date

1973-05-01

RADIATIVE PION CAPTURE IN ${}^6\text{Li}^+$


Helmut W. Baer, James A. Bistirlich,
Kenneth M. Crowe, Nico de Botton, and Jerome A. Helland
and Peter Truöl

May 1973

Prepared for the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

For Reference

Not to be taken from this room



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.

Radiative Pion Capture in ${}^6\text{Li}^\dagger$

Helmut W. Baer, James A. Bistirlich,
Kenneth M. Crowe, Nico de Botton,* and Jerome A. Helland[#]

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

and

Peter Truöl[§]

Physik-Institut der Universität Zürich
Zürich, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

The photon spectrum from the reaction ${}^6\text{Li} (\pi^-, \gamma)$ was measured with high resolution in the 50- to 150-MeV region by using an electron-positron pair spectrometer. The total fraction of pions absorbed radiatively is $4.4 \pm 0.6\%$ with branching ratios to the ${}^6\text{He}$ ground state of $0.31 \pm 0.04\%$ and to the 1.8-MeV state of $0.15 \pm 0.03\%$ in disagreement with previous experimental results, but in qualitative agreement with theoretical predictions. Evidence for higher excitations is observed in addition to quasifree capture accompanied by neutron emission.

I. INTRODUCTION

Within the last several years it has been realized that radiative pion capture provides a new probe of nuclear structure. Studies¹ on ^{12}C and ^{16}O have shown that the photon spectra in the 90- to 140-MeV region exhibit a fine structure, with resonance-like peaks that can be identified as enhanced transitions to known collective $T = 1$ ($J^\pi = 1^-, 2^-$) excitation modes of the mass-12 and -16 systems. Such transitions were predicted by Delorme and Ericson² (1966), Anderson and Eisenberg³ (1966), and Überall⁴ (1966) prior to their direct observation by Bistirlich et al.¹ (1966). Calculations^{5,6} based on an impulse approximation Hamiltonian, with amplitudes deduced from the elementary capture process $\pi^- p \rightarrow n\gamma$, and on nuclear-model wave functions which were representations of the SU(4) classification of giant resonances, have resulted in qualitative agreement with the data.¹ For more quantitative studies a number of improvements must be made. First, recent pionic x-ray data indicate⁷ that for light nuclei, $4 < A < 16$, the pion is absorbed by the nucleus predominantly from the 2p Bohr orbital, rather than the 1s orbit as many authors assumed. Thus, to deduce correct radiative branching ratios from the theoretical transition matrix elements one needs pion-capture schedules. These have just recently been published⁷ for ^6Li and ^{12}C . Second, the theoretical calculations of Skupsky⁸ (1971), Vergados and Baer⁹ (1972), and Maguire and Wertz¹⁰ (1972) have shown that for 2p capture, terms in the effective Hamiltonian dependent on pion momentum make sizeable contributions. Therefore the simple $(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\epsilon}) e^{i \vec{k} \cdot \vec{r}}$ operator employed in nearly all earlier calculations is inadequate. Third, there has been the experimental problem that, even with 2-MeV resolution at 130 MeV, the

measurements¹ have not been able to isolate transitions to individual nuclear states which could serve as test cases. The present work, in measuring the $\pi^- + {}^6\text{Li}(1^+) \rightarrow \gamma + {}^6\text{He}(0^+, \text{g.s.})$ transition, achieves this.

Much of the interest in the above transition centers on the fact that it might be used to test the PCAC hypothesis and soft-pion limit for complex nuclei. The approach based on these assumptions¹¹ (referred to in the literature as the elementary particle treatment of nuclei) permits one to determine the radiative π -capture rate from the 1s Bohr orbital, shown to be a matrix element of the axial-vector current, from the rates of other weak and electromagnetic processes involving the same states or their analogs in the isobaric multiplet. The transition ${}^6\text{Li}(1^+) \rightarrow {}^6\text{He}(0^+)$ is particularly well suited for this type of study since the β -decay¹² and μ -capture¹³ rates are known and the 0^+ analog in ${}^6\text{Li}$ at 3.562 MeV¹² has a well-measured γ -decay width. In addition the inelastic electron scattering to this state has been measured by several groups.¹⁴ Using the experimental rates, Delorme,¹⁵ Fulcher and Eisenberg,¹⁶ Pascual and Fujii,¹⁷ and Griffiths and Kim¹⁸ have used the elementary particle approach to predict the radiative π -capture rate for ${}^6\text{Li}(1^+) \rightarrow {}^6\text{He}(0^+)$. It is of considerable interest to test these predictions as well as others based on nuclear-model wave functions, such as those by Vergados and Baer,⁹ and Roig and Pascual.¹⁹ Comparison with the theoretical calculations of Maguire and Werntz,¹⁰ who use the impulse approximation Hamiltonian but relate the nuclear matrix elements to other measured quantities, is also of interest. The only experimental value for the branching ratio of this transition was that of Deutsch et al.¹³ (1968), which was thought to be in agreement with theory. However, the

more recent calculations, when combined with the improved x-ray data, are lower by factors of 2 to 3 from this experimental result. Thus it seemed important to remeasure this quantity which has been cited as evidence for the validity of the PCAC and soft-pion theorem approaches.

II. EXPERIMENT

The experiment was carried out in the stopped pion beam of the LBL 184-inch cyclotron. The experimental setup is shown in Fig. 1. The incoming pions pass a beam telescope, which includes a lucite Čerenkov detector to discriminate against electrons and a CH₂ degrader. The pions are brought to rest in a 7.6-cm diameter by 9-cm high cylinder of 96% enriched ⁶Li (200g). Anticounters after the target and in front of the photon detector ensure the detection of a neutral particle in coincidence with a stopped pion. A 180° pair-spectrometer identical to the one described in detail in Ref. 1, except for the wire spark chambers, was employed to detect high-energy photons. The photons are converted in 3% radiation lengths (0.22g/cm²) of gold. The coordinates of the electron-positron pair were measured with three wire spark chambers consisting of four planes each. The wire spacing was 0.1 cm, and the wire angles with the horizontal midplane of the magnet were +12°, -12°, -12°, and 0°. The 12° stereo view had to be used to keep the magnetostrictive readout wires out of the high-field region. This reduces the spatial resolution for the critical horizontal coordinate to 0.5 cm for a given spark, and limits our energy resolution to 2 MeV FWHM at 130 MeV. The signal of two non-adjacent scintillator pair counters out of the eight pair counters across the magnet completed our trigger requirements. A PDP 15 on-line computer performed the tasks of the recording the data and consistently monitoring

the performance of the chambers.

The overall acceptance of the spectrometer and its resolution were checked repeatedly between ${}^6\text{Li}$ runs with a 15-cm diameter, thin-window liquid hydrogen target, mounted on rails. Figure 2a shows one of the calibration spectra and Fig. 2b shows the combined acceptance of the spectrometer, i.e., the product of solid angle, detection and conversion efficiency divided by 4π . This curve was calculated with a Monte Carlo simulation of the spectrometer and it includes the efficiency of the off-line analysis program, which selects the 4-10% good triggers from the total sample. The different classes of background events are described in Ref. 1, and were easily distinguishable from the desired pairs. About 30000 triggers have been examined by eye in a direct display of the chamber information to eliminate possible bias of the selection programs. Using the mesonic capture, $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$, we check the acceptance in the region $55 < E_\gamma < 83$ MeV; the radiative capture, $\pi^- p \rightarrow \gamma n$, yields a single line with $E_\gamma = 129.4$ MeV. With an accuracy of 10% (statistical and systematic errors combined in quadrature) we find that the hydrogen results agree with the expected values ²⁰ as shown in Table I. The number of pions captured in the target was determined from the number of pions stopped as a function of degrader thickness with and without the target material present. In this way electronic and geometric inefficiencies, including decays, could be accounted for properly within an accuracy of $\pm 4\%$. A small correction (2.4%) is applied to account for the photons that convert in the target and the anticounter in front of the spectrometer.

The following corrections to the number of photons in the spectrum or the number of pions captured in the target are neglected, so that our

quoted rates could be subject to an additional small systematic normalization error:

- a) photons produced by pions interacting in flight ($\sim 4\%$),
- b) nonradiative pion absorption in flight (+1%),
- c) pions stopping in the ${}^7\text{Li}$ content of the target (4.4%),
- d) photons produced in the reaction ${}^7\text{Li} (\pi^-, \gamma)$ (-2.7%); the ratio of radiative pion capture of ${}^7\text{Li}$ to ${}^6\text{Li}$ is measured to be 0.58 ± 0.07^{28} .

III. RESULTS

The photon spectrum is shown in Fig. 3 together with calculations based on the pole model^{21,22} and three-body phase space (${}^5\text{He}\pi$). The experimental spectrum exhibits three components:

- a) a discrete line at 132 MeV corresponding to the ${}^6\text{He}$ (g.s.) transition,
- b) a continuum component associated with quasifree capture, i.e., the ${}^5\text{He} + n$ (${}^4\text{He} + n + n$) channels,
- c) possible resonances at higher excitations around 105, 111, and 119 MeV.

Expressed in photon energies, we have the ${}^6\text{He}$ (g.s.) ($J^\pi = 0^+$, $T = 1$) transition at $E_\gamma = 133.95$ MeV, the transition to the 1.8-MeV state¹² ($J^\pi = 2^+$, $T = 1$) at $E_\gamma = 132.19$ MeV, the ${}^4\text{He} + n + n$ threshold at 133.00 MeV, and the ${}^5\text{He} + n$ threshold at 132.06 MeV. With a resolution of 2 MeV the spectrum does not clearly show the separation of the ground state from the first excited state and the onset of the two break-up channels.

A. ${}^6\text{He}$ Ground State and 1.80-MeV State

Three different methods were employed to extract the ground-state transition rate:

1) The hydrogen line at 129.41 MeV was shifted by 4.54 MeV and then normalized to the upper end of the lithium spectrum ($E_\gamma > 132$ MeV). Here we assume only that contributions from other channels are small. Comparison with the other two methods described below indicate that this assumption is indeed correct.

2) We assumed that the quasifree capture can be described by the single-proton exchange model.²¹ We selected Δ values at the nucleus vertex suited for (${}^4\text{He}+n$)+n ($\Delta=6.56$) and the ${}^5\text{He}+n$ ($\Delta=7.43$ MeV) channel. The ground-state transition rate was found not to depend too critically on the choice of this parameter (see Table II.) and is in agreement with the value obtained with the first method.

3) Single as well as a two-neutron emission, when calculated with phase space or the pole model, exhibits a dependence on the photon energy near the maximum value E_0 given closely by the form

$$k * \sqrt{E_0 - E_\gamma}.$$

We fit the spectrum above 120 MeV with this function plus two lines at the correct energies for the 0^+ and 2^+ states.

There are two observations which force us to consider the population of the 1.8-MeV state. One is the fact that a single level fit with one Breit-Wigner shaped resonance folded with the resolution as obtained from the hydrogen spectrum yields values for the level position of $E_0 = 133.4$ MeV and a width of $\Gamma = 0.5 - 0.7$ MeV, where we expect $\Gamma = 0$ and $E_0 = 134.0$. Since the energy scale was frequently checked with

hydrogen runs, and we find the correct energy for the ${}^3\text{He}(\pi^-, \gamma){}^3\text{H}$ reaction to be reported elsewhere,²³ we can exclude the possibility of an instrumental energy shift. To exclude further possible shifts, the fits were repeated for different subsets of data, each one with a resolution taken from a hydrogen run during the same running period. Second, we can improve considerably the fit to the upper end of the spectrum (a factor of 3 in χ^2) obtained with method 3 above if we introduce a second line at 132.19 MeV. The results of these fits are summarized in Table IIa.

In addition to the two line fits given in the table, we attempted to verify the position of the second level by leaving the position and width of the level as a free parameter. When doing this, the fit resulted in values $E_x = 1.6 \pm 0.1$ MeV and $0 < \Gamma < 0.25$ MeV for the position and width, respectively. These numbers are in agreement with the known values¹² for the 2^+ state of $E_x = 1.80 \pm 0.03$ and $\Gamma = 0.112 \pm 0.002$ MeV. The ground-state branching ratio obtained this way is lower by 7%, the 1.8-MeV branching ratio higher by 13.5%, and the $\chi^2/\text{degree of freedom}$ decreases by 15%.

The parameters of the different fitting procedures are summarized in Table IIa and the fitted curves are shown in Fig. 4. In Fig. 4b the ${}^6\text{He}$ (g.s.) contribution has been subtracted from the data. One can see clearly that one must assume the population of the 2^+ state if one does not introduce an unusual behavior of the continuum at its endpoint.

B. Continuum and Possible Resonances

From Fig. 3 it can be seen that neither phase space nor the one-proton-exchange pole model^{21,22} give a good description of the spectrum

below 128 MeV. There are indications of some resonance-like structures in the spectrum at approximately 120 and 110 MeV and possibly near 105 MeV. To describe these, we fit three Breit-Wigner resonances plus the pole model²¹ ($\Delta = 6.56$ MeV) to the data and obtain the fit shown in Fig.

3. The corresponding resonance width, positions, and partial branching ratios are given in Table IIb. Evidence from other experiments regarding higher resonances in the mass-6 system⁵⁰ is discussed in the next section.

IV. DISCUSSION

In Table III we compare the ground-state transition rate with the different theoretical predictions and with the only previous measurement. As in the case of ^{12}C (Ref. 1), a large discrepancy exists between the pair spectrometer value and that obtained from the activation method. The latter is higher by a factor of 3.3. This disagreement is unexplained, but there are indications²⁶ that neutron-induced activity in the target may account for the higher rate. Since the 1.8-MeV state is observed to decay entirely via particle emission ($\Gamma_{\gamma}/\Gamma < 4 \times 10^{-4}$ ²⁷), it cannot contribute the ^6He β -activity. The excellent agreement of our hydrogen calibration data with the accurately measured values gives us confidence in our absolute normalization. Furthermore, we note that our total capture rate, $4.4 \pm 0.6\%$, is even higher than the older NaI value.²⁸

The quantity we measure is the branching ratio R_{γ} of radiative to total capture from all atomic orbitals. This ratio is related to the theoretical matrix elements for each pion initial state by the incoherent sum over all Bohr orbitals

$$R_{\gamma} = \sum_{n\ell} \frac{\lambda_{\gamma}(n\ell)}{\lambda_a(n\ell)} \omega(n\ell),$$

where the quantities $\lambda_Y(n\ell)$ [$\lambda_a(n\ell)$] are the radiative [total] capture rates from orbital $n\ell$. The $\omega(n\ell)$ are the probabilities / π -atom from orbital $n\ell$. It is generally assumed that the ratio radiative/total capture is independent of the principal quantum number n and depends only on ℓ . Therefore the quantity

$$R_Y = \frac{\Lambda_Y(1s)}{\Lambda_a(1s)} \sum_n \omega(ns) + \frac{\Lambda_Y(2p)}{\Lambda_a(2p)} \sum_n \omega(np)$$

is compared with experiment.

There have been seven evaluations of the ground-state transition rate; however, only three attempts have been made to calculate the 2p contribution also. Griffiths and Kim,¹⁸ Fulcher and Eisenberg,¹⁶ and Pascual and Fujii¹⁷ use the "elementary particle" method and their results could in principle check the more model-dependent calculations of Vergados and Baer,⁹ Roig and Pascual,¹⁹ and Maguire and Werntz¹⁰ with the impulse-approximation and shell-model wave functions. The accuracy of the elementary particle approach, however, is limited through the quality of the input data from the other reactions; e.g., the transition rate for the process ${}^6\text{Li}(\mu^-, \nu_\mu) {}^6\text{He}$ is known to only 20%:¹³

$(1.60 \pm 0.33 - 0.133) \times 10^3 \text{ sec}^{-1}$. The difference between the result of Fulcher and Eisenberg¹⁶ and Griffiths and Kim¹⁸ is traced¹⁶ to the use of the axial form factor as determined from β decay and μ capture, respectively. However, the calculations differ also in other aspects, such as the treatment of the distortion of the pionic orbit due to the strong

interaction²⁹ or the choice of the correction factor³⁰ that is introduced into the soft-pion result. The most detailed treatment with the elementary particle method is the one of Delorme,¹⁵ where all corrections have been included,³¹ and also an attempt has been made to evaluate the 2p capture rate. The agreement between the impulse approximation and the elementary particle results is quite good. For the 2p-contribution one has to rely on the model-dependent calculations. The three impulse-approximation calculations^{9,10,19} differ in the following respect: In the calculations of Refs. 9 and 10 the distortion of the pionic orbit is taken into account by a multiplicative factor; in Ref. 19 the distorted pion wave function is kept in the matrix element. The coefficients in the effective Hamiltonian differ but not very much. Roig and Pascual¹⁹ and Maguire and Werntz¹⁰ use a set obtained from pion-photo production multipole tables of Berends et al.³² Vergados and Baer⁹ use two sets, one due to Ref. 2 which has been shown to be in error by Maguire and Werntz,¹⁰ the other one due to Ref. 33 which is close to the ones used by the other groups. It is therefore not surprising that all calculations agree very well, if only the coefficients in the shell-model wave functions (e.g., the size parameter of the p-shell harmonic oscillator) are chosen in such a way that other transition rates involving the same levels are well reproduced. Roig and Pascual vary the parameters to fit the rms radius of ${}^6\text{Li}$, the ft value for the ${}^6\text{He} \rightarrow {}^6\text{Li} + e^+ + \nu$ decay, the width of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ (3.56 MeV) $\rightarrow {}^6\text{Li}$ (g.s.) + γ magnetic dipole transition, and the ${}^6\text{Li}(\mu^-, \nu_\mu) {}^6\text{H}$ (g.s.) μ capture rate. Similarly, Maguire and Werntz use inelastic electron scattering to the ${}^6\text{Li}$ (3.56 MeV) state, in addition. Vergados and Baer give two values: one for a size parameter to fit the

energy calculations, the other one fitting the rms radius. The latter gives better agreement with our data.

From the standpoint of testing nuclear wave function, the ratio $R_Y(2^+)/R_Y(0^+)$ is of interest. In this ratio, though experimentally not too well determined because of the lack in resolution, the errors introduced from the pionic x-ray data cancel to a large degree. The theoretical result of Vergados²⁴ is 0.18 ± 0.03 , in disagreement with our experimental result of 0.49 ± 0.10 . Although this value depends on the way the background is treated, there does seem to be disagreement with theory. We can think of the following sources for this.

1) An enhancement of the rate for the reaction ${}^6\text{Li}(\pi^-, \gamma)\text{He}^4 nn$ near the threshold. This is possible when the absorption proceeds via the absorption of the pion on a quasifree deuteron in the ${}^6\text{Li}$ (deuteron exchange) and the $d(\pi^-, \gamma)2n$ spectrum has the usual shape influenced by the n-n final-state interaction.³⁴

2) The shell-model wave functions do not describe the 1.8-MeV state too well. Since harmonic oscillator wave functions were used, the fact that the 1.8-MeV state is unbound may not be properly taken into account. One expects for the unbound state that the nucleon wave function extends beyond the nuclear surface, more than is assumed in the calculation. Since this will place the nucleons closer on the average to the π^- , it is not unreasonable to expect an enhancement in the transition rate relative to the ground state above that given by the shell-model calculation.

Of the three resonances for which our data gives some evidence, there is supporting evidence for the one at $E_x \sim 23$ MeV in the mirror nucleus ${}^6\text{Be}$. Here a $T = 1, T_z = -1$ ($I_z = +1$) resonance is observed at

approximately the same energy. Measurements of ${}^3\text{He}$ - ${}^3\text{He}$ elastic scattering^{35,36} and the radiative ${}^3\text{He}$ capture reaction³⁷ ${}^3\text{He}({}^3\text{He}, \gamma){}^6\text{Be}$ determined $L = 3$, $S = 1$, $T = 1$ for this resonance, and it has been identified with the ${}^{33}\text{F}$ state predicted at ~ 27 MeV by Thompson and Tang.³⁸ Observation of the $T_z = 0$ member of this isobaric triad in ${}^6\text{Li}$ was reported by Ventura et al.³⁹ To our knowledge this is the first evidence found for the $T_z = +1$ member in ${}^6\text{He}$.

The possible peak at $E_\gamma = 118.8$ MeV would correspond to an excitation energy in the ${}^6\text{He}$ of 15.6, or 3.3 MeV about the threshold for the break-up of the ${}^6\text{He}$ into two tritons. Considerable discussions have centered recently around the existence of a $T = 1$ level in the $A = 6$ system above the ${}^3\text{H}$ - ${}^3\text{H}$, ${}^3\text{He}$ - ${}^3\text{H}$, and ${}^3\text{He}$ - ${}^3\text{He}$ threshold for ${}^6\text{He}$, ${}^6\text{Li}$, and ${}^6\text{Be}$, respectively. The existence of such a level was originally put forward by Fowler⁴⁰ as a possible explanation of the low solar neutrino flux observed by Davis et al.⁴¹ The properties of this 0^+ level and evidence for and against its existence were later discussed by Fetisov and Kopysov⁴² and by Barker.⁴³ The only other evidence for a level in this energy region in ${}^6\text{He}$ comes from the reaction ${}^7\text{Li}(p, 2p){}^6\text{He}$, but the proposed spin-parity values are $J = 1^-$ or 2^- .¹² In ${}^6\text{Li}$, however, inelastic scattering indicated a level at 15.8 MeV with $J^\pi = 0^+$, 1^+ , or 2^+ .¹² A recent repetition of this experiment⁴³ with 37-, 50-, and 60-MeV electrons scattered at 180° did not observe any narrow transitions in the excitation region from 9 to 18 MeV, and an upper limit of 3 eV is placed on the M1 ground-state transition width for a narrow 0^+ state near 15.2 MeV in ${}^6\text{Li}$. Unfortunately we can only estimate the width very crudely, and the transition rate given in Table II for this level depends,

of course, strongly on the model used to subtract quasifree capture. It seems desirable, however, to estimate theoretically the possible width and position of the proposed level in ${}^6\text{He}$ and its possible rate for our reaction.

A possible third level, at $E_x \sim 30$ MeV, cannot be identified with any known states. However, the weak statistical evidence for it as well as the problem of knowing the quasifree background--e.g., reactions like $\pi^- + {}^6\text{Li} \rightarrow {}^4\text{He}^* + n+n+\gamma$ might yield spurious resonances in ${}^6\text{He}$ --preclude further comment.

The authors wish to thank Dr. John Vergados for communicating unpublished results and for helpful discussions. We gratefully acknowledge the continued cooperation of James Vale and members of the 184-inch cyclotron crew. The experiment and its analysis would not have been possible without the assistance given by Dennis Soon, Patrick Craig, and Susan Cooper in taking data and scanning events and by Victor Elischer and James Elliott in programming. One of us (P.T.) wishes to express his thanks for the continued hospitality and support extended to him by the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

Footnotes and References

†Work done under the auspices of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

*Permanent address: DPLN/HE, C.E.N. SACLAY, BP n^o 2, 91-Gif sur Yvette, France.

‡Present address: Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, University of California, Los Alamos, N.M.

§Part of this work was done while at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley.

- ¹J. A. Bistirlich, K. M. Crowe, A. S. L. Parsons, P. Skarek, and P. Truöl, *Phys. Rev. C* **5**, 1867 (1972).
- ²J. Delorme and T. E. O. Ericson, *Phys. Letters* **21**, 98 (1966).
- ³D. K. Anderson and J. M. Eisenberg, *Phys. Letters* **22**, 164 (1966).
- ⁴H. Überall, *Suppl. Nuovo Cimento* **4**, 781 (1966).
- ⁵F. J. Kelly, and H. Überall, *Nucl. Phys. A118*, 302 (1968).
- ⁶J. D. Murphy et al., *Phys. Rev. Letters* **19**, 714 (1967).
- ⁷W. W. Sapp, Jr., M. Eckhouse, G. H. Miller, and R. E. Welsh, *Phys. Rev. C* **5**, 690 (1972).
- ⁸S. Skupsky, *Nucl. Phys. A178*, 289 (1971) and *Phys. Letters* **36B**, 271 (1971).
- ⁹J. D. Vergados and H. W. Baer, *Phys. Letters* **B41**, 560 (1972).
- ¹⁰W. Maguire and C. Werntz, Catholic Univ. preprint (1972).
- ¹¹For a recent review see A. Figureau, *Proc. Int. Seminar on π -Nucleus Interactions*, Strasbourg (1971); also, M. Ericson and M. Rho, *Phys. Reports* **5C**, 59 (1972).
- ¹²T. Lauritsen and F. Ajzenberg-Selove, *Nucl. Phys.* **78**, 1 (1966).
- ¹³J. P. Deutsch, L. Grenacs, P. Igo-Kemenes, P. Lipnik, and P. C. Macq, *Phys. Letters* **26B**, 315 (1968).
- ¹⁴R. M. Hutcheon, T. E. Drake, V. W. Stoble, B. A. Beer, and H. S. Caplan, *Nucl. Phys. A107*, 266 (1968); R. Neuhausen and R. M. Hutcheon, *Nucl. Phys. A164*, 497 (1971); G. C. Li, I. Sick, R. R. Whitney, and M. R. Yearian, *Nucl. Phys. A162*, 583 (1971).
- ¹⁵J. Delorme, *Nucl. Phys. B19*, 573 (1970).
- ¹⁶L. P. Fulcher and J. M. Eisenberg, *Nucl. Phys. B18*, 271 (1970).
- ¹⁷P. Pascual and A. Fujii, *Nuovo Cimento* **65A**, 411 (1970); Erratum **67A**,

135 (1970).

¹⁸D. Griffiths and C. W. Kim, Phys. Rev. 173, 1584 (1968).

¹⁹F. Roig, P. Pascual, preprint, G.I.F.T. (Spain) (April 1972).

²⁰V. T. Cocconi et al., Nuovo Cimento 22 494 (1961).

²¹L. G. Dakhno, Yu D. Prokoshkin Yad. Fiz. 7, 565 (1968) [transl.:
Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 7, 351 (1968)]. The deficiencies of this model are
discussed in Ref. 1; it is again used since no better approach seems
available at present.

²²There is an error in Eq. (9) of Ref. 21; the numerator should read
 $E_Y^2 (\mu - \Delta - E_Y)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We have also calculated the photon spectrum, putting
in the complete kinematics, including the nuclear recoil, and show this
result in Fig. 3.

²³H. W. Baer, J. A. Bistirlich, K. M. Crowe, N. de Botton, J. A. Helland,
and P. Truöl, to be published.

²⁴J. D. Vergados, private communication, 1973.

²⁵Our results given in a preliminary analysis of the ⁶Li spectrum for
the ground-state transition rate should then be taken as the sum of the
contributions for the first two states. [H. W. Baer, J. A. Bistirlich,
K. M. Crowe, J. A. Helland, and P. Truöl, *Few Particle Problems in the
Nuclear Interaction*, Los Angeles (Ed. I. Slaus, S. A. Moszkowski, R. P.
Haddock, W. T. H. van Oers, North-Holland, 1972) p. 877.]

²⁶See Ref. 1, Section III B2.

²⁷K. Hünchen, F. Kropf, and H. Wäffler, Nucl. Phys. 58, 477 (1964).

²⁸H. Davies, H. Muirhead, and J. N. Woulds, Nucl. Phys. 78, 673 (1966).

²⁹Neglected in Ref. 17 and 18; correction factors in other studies are
0.65 (Ref. 9 and 15), 0.70 (Ref. 10), 0.76 (Ref. 19), and 0.83 (Ref. 16).

³⁰Only applied in Ref. 7.

³¹In eq. 4.3 of Ref. 15 for $\Gamma_{1s}^{(\pi, \gamma)}$ a correction factor to the soft pion result of 1.35^2 is used. A new evaluation of the ρ -Meson contribution to this number shows this factor to be more like 1.22^2 , reducing $1s$ -radiative absorption rate to the ground-state by a factor of 0.817.

J. Delorme, private communication.

³²F. A. Berends, A. Donnachie, D. Weaver, Nucl. Phys. *B4*, 1 (1968).

³³M. Kawaguchi, H. Ohtsubo, Y. Sumi, Prog. Theor. Phys. (Kyoto) Suppl. Ex. No. (1968), 28.

³⁴R. P. Haddock, R. M. Salter, M. E. Zeller, J. B. Czirr, D. R. Nygren, Phys. Rev. Letters *14*, 318 (1965).

³⁵A. D. Bacher, T. A. Tombrello, E. A. McClatchie, F. Resmini, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory Report UCRL-1866, Annual Report 1968.

³⁶J. G. Jenkin, W. D. Harrison, R. E. Brown, Phys. Rev. *C1*, 1622 (1970).

³⁷E. Ventura, J. R. Calarco, C. C. Chang, E. M. Dierner, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. *17*, 585 (1972), private communication with C. C. Chang.

³⁸D. R. Thompson, Y. C. Tang, Nucl. Phys. *A106*, (1968).

³⁹E. Ventura, C. C. Chang, W. E. Meyerhof, Nucl. Phys. *A173*, 1 (1971).

⁴⁰W. A. Fowler, Nature *238*, 24 (1972).

⁴¹R. Davis, Jr., L. C. Rogers, V. Radeka, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. *16*, 631 (1971).

⁴²V. N. Fetisov, Yu S. Kopysov, Phys. Letters *40B*, 602 (1972); ZhETF Pis. Red. *16*, 58 (1972).

⁴³F. C. Barker, Phys. Letters *42B*, 313 (1972).

⁴⁴R. J. Harris, W. B. Shuler, M. Eckhouse, R. T. Siegel, R. E. Welsh, Phys. Rev. Letters *20*, 505 (1968).

⁴⁵M. Krell, T. E. O. Ericson, Nucl. Phys. *B11*, 521 (1969).

- ⁴⁶G. Backenstoss, *Ann. Rev. Nuclear Sci.* 20, 467 (1970).
- ⁴⁷C. Backenstoss, Koch, private communication (1973).
- ⁴⁸M. Ericson, T. E. O. Ericson, *Ann. Phys.* 36, 323 (1966); M. Ericson, *Compt. rend.* 258, 1471 (1963).
- ⁴⁹L. W. Fagg, W. L. Bendel, N. Eusslin, E. C. Jones, H. Überall, C. Werntz, Naval Research Laboratory Preprint, Washington D.C. (1973); see also L. S. Cardman, S. P. Fivozinsky, J. S. O'Connell, S. Penner, *Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* 18, (1973), 78; C. Werntz, H. Überall, *Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* 18, (1973), 79.
- ⁵⁰For a discussion of excitations in ⁶He see R. H. Stokes, P. G. Young, *Phys. Rev.* 3C, 984 (1971).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Fig. 1. The electron-positron pair spectrometer and range-telescope geometry. The trigger for an event was $\pi_1 \times \pi_2 \times \pi_3 \times \bar{\pi}_s \times \bar{\pi}_c \times (A \times B)_i \times (A \times B)_k$, $i \neq k$, $k \pm 1$.
- Fig. 2. (a) Photon spectrum for π^- capture in Hydrogen. The distortion of the rectangular shape of the π^0 spectrum is due to the reduction in efficiency at the low-energy end. The Panofsky ratio deduced in this experiment is $P = 1.56 \pm 0.10$.
(b) Efficiency of pair spectrometer as a function of photon energy.
- Fig. 3. The ⁶Li (π^- , γ) photon spectrum in the 50-150 MeV regions. The instrumental line shape, shown in Fig. 2b, causes the peak in the spectrum to appear 2 MeV lower than the photon energy. We therefore indicate break-up thresholds and the position of the 2+ and 0+ states shifted down by 2 MeV.

Solid line: fit to spectrum between 98 and 135 MeV assuming 2 lines at $E_x = 0$ and 1.80 MeV, 3 Breit-Wigner resonances at $E_x = 15.6, 23.2,$ and 29.7 MeV, and the pole model²¹ with $\Delta = 6.56$ MeV using relative strengths given in Table IIb; long-dashed-line: Pole-Model of Ref. 21 with $\Delta = 6.56$; short-dashed-line; Pole-Model with complete kinematics²²; dash-dot-line: ${}^5\text{He} + n + \gamma$ phase space, normalized to same number of photons as pole model.²²

- Fig. 4. (a) Upper end of ${}^6\text{Li}$ spectrum; solid line: single line fit ($E_\gamma = 133.96$) + $k \cdot \sqrt{133.02 - E_\gamma}$; dashed line: contribution from the ${}^6\text{He}$ g.s. in the single line fit; dashed-dotted-line: contribution from ${}^6\text{He}$ g.s. in two-line fit ($E_x = 0$ and 1.80 MeV).
- (b) Upper end of ${}^6\text{Li}$ spectrum with ${}^6\text{He}$ -g.s. contribution subtracted; dashed line: Background as in (a) and single line at $E_x = 1.80$ MeV; solid line: sum of background and 1.8 MeV state.






Fig. 1

XBL 732-2240




XBL732-2241

Fig. 2



XBL733-2433

Fig. 3



XBL732-2238

Fig. 4

TABLE I

Total capture rates in Hydrogen and Lithium

Nucleus	Target Mass [g/cm ²]	Number of photons			Number of Pions		Branching ratio	
		N _{γ1} ^{a)} [10 ³]	N _{γ2} ^{b)} [10 ³]	N _{γ3} ^{c)} [10 ⁸]	N _{π1} ^{d)} [10 ¹⁰]	N _{π2} ^{e)} [10 ¹⁰]	R _γ ^{f)} [%]	R _γ ^{g)} [%]
H ₂ (nγ)	.99	2.55±.05	2.55±.05	1.12±.08	.0405	.0264±.019	42.4±4.4	39.5±.3 ²⁰⁾
H ₂ (nπ ₀)	.99	1.52±.04	7.96±.51	3.49±.26	.0405	.0264±.0019	66.0±6.4	60.5±.3 ²⁰⁾
Panofsky- ratio			1.56±0.10					1.53±0.2 ²⁰⁾
⁶ Li	2.76	9.77±10	12.74±1.26	5.50±.68	1.66	1.25±.06	4.4±.6	3.3±.2 ²⁸⁾

- a) Raw number of events
b) Number of events corrected for energy dependent efficiency η_γ (130) = 1
c) Number of photons into full solid angle
d) Raw number of stopping pions
e) Pions captured in the target
f) this experiment $N_{\gamma 3}/N_{\pi 2}$
g) previous experiments

TABLE II a) Experimental branching ratios for ${}^6\text{Li}$ (to ground state + 1.8 MeV state of ${}^6\text{He}$)

Energy [MeV]	Ground - State Width [MeV]	R(0+) [%]	1.8 MeV - State Energy	Width	R(2+)	χ^2/DF Degrees of Freedom	Number of Data points	Energy-Region used in the fit	Method of fit
133.46±.07	.58±.16	.464±.048				1.39	29	121 - 135	1 Breit-Wigner + Pole model ($\Delta=6.56$)
133.31±.08	.74±.18	.521±.053				1.81			" " ($\Delta=7.43$)
133.95	.0	.369±.043				4.05	29	121 - 135	Line + Pole model ($\Delta=6.56$)
133.95	.0	.390±.049				6.57			" " ($\Delta=7.43$)
133.95	.0	.370±.045				4.69	29	121 - 135	Line + $k*\sqrt{(133.00 - E_\gamma)}$
		.296±.035							Hydrogen line, shift and normalized at $E_\gamma > 132$ MeV
133.95	.0	.307±.035	132.19	.1	.140±.025	1.50	29	121 - 135	Two lines + Pole model ($\Delta=6.56$)
133.95	.0	.306±.035	132.19	.1	.189±.027	1.72			" " ($\Delta=7.43$)
133.95	.0	.306±.035	132.19	.1	.151±.026	1.74	29	121 - 135	Two lines + $k*\sqrt{(133.00 - E_\gamma)}$
[133.95	.0]	.306±.035	[132.16	.1]	.151±.026				Extracted values

TABLE II b)

Experimental Branching Ratios for ${}^6\text{Li}$ (Total Spectrum)

Energy [MeV]	Width [MeV]	R _Y ^{a)} [%]	Energy [MeV]	Width [MeV]	R _Y ^{b)} [%]	${}^6\text{He}$ Excitation Energy
133.96	0	.307±.035	133.96	0.	.308±.033	0.
132.16	.1	.140±.205	132.16	.1	.189±.027	1.8
118.80±.46 ^{c)}	2.67±1.90	.238±.113	118.75±.49	1.67±1.97	.143±.082	15.6±.5
111.51±.73 ^{c)}	4.33±3.37	.346±.265	111.30±.74	4.08±3.12	.282±.185	23.2±.7
104.92±1.29 ^{c)}	7.39±4.24	.502±.302	104.86±1.06	5.65±3.65	.339±.202	29.7±1.3
Pole		2.864±.292			3.181±.312	Pole
		4.392±.584			4.462±.512	Total
		1.21			1.22	X ² /Degree of Freedom
		75			75	Data points
		98<E _Y <135			98<E _Y <135	Energy-Region

a) Pole-model with $\Delta = 6.56$ (${}^4\text{He} + n + n$ upper cut-off)

b) Pole-model with $\Delta = 7.43$ (${}^5\text{He} + n$ upper cut-off)

c) The indicated uncertainties for the parameters of the Breit-Wigner resonances do not reflect the uncertainties of the pole model.

TABLE III

Comparison of experimental and theoretical capture rates to the ${}^6\text{He}$ (0^+) ground state and ${}^6\text{He}$ (2^+) first excited state

$\lambda_Y(1s)$ [$\times 10^{15} \text{sec}^{-1}$]	$\frac{\lambda_Y(1s)^a)}{\lambda_a(1s)}$ [%]	$\lambda_Y(2p)$ [$\times 10^{15} \text{sec}^{-1}$]	$\frac{\lambda_Y(2p)^b)}{\lambda_a(2p)}$ [%]	$\frac{\lambda_Y(1s)}{\lambda_a(1s)} \times \Sigma\omega + \frac{\lambda_Y(2p)}{\lambda_a(2p)} \times \Sigma\omega$ [%]	Reference
1.46 \pm .22	.50 \pm .08	4.12 \pm .62	.18 \pm .06	.31 \pm .07	Roig, Pascual (1972) ¹⁹⁾ ground state (IA)
1.51 \pm .15	.51 \pm .06	5.26 \pm .06	.23 \pm .06	.34 \pm .07	McGuire, Wernitz (1972) ¹⁰⁾ (theoretical) (IA)
2.08	.70 \pm .05	4.32	.19 \pm .05	.39 \pm .08	Vergados, Baer (1972) ⁹⁾
1.40	.47 \pm .03	4.44	.19 \pm .05	.30 \pm .05	Vergados, Baer (1972) ⁹⁾
2.3 \pm .5	.78 \pm .18		.52 \pm .14	.62 \pm .11	Delorme (1970) ¹⁵⁾ (EP)
1.86 \pm .18	.63 \pm .08			[.25 \pm .07] ^{d)}	Pascual, Fujii (1970) ¹⁷⁾ (EP)
1.9 $^{+.4}_{-.2}$.64 $^{+.14}_{-.08}$			[.26 $^{+.08}_{-.07}$] ^{d)}	Fulcher, Eisenberg (1970) ¹⁶⁾ (EP)
1.65	.56 \pm .04			[.23 \pm .06] ^{d)}	Griffiths, Kim (1968) ¹⁸⁾ (EP)
				.306 \pm .035	This experiment ²⁵⁾ (experimental)
				1.0 \pm .1	Deutsch et al. (1968) ¹³⁾
.227	.076 \pm .051	1.57	.069 \pm .018	.07 \pm .02	Vergados (1972) ²⁴⁾ 1.8 MeV state (theoretical)
				.151 \pm .026	This experiment (experimental)
.11		.36		.18 \pm .03	Vergados ²⁴⁾ $R_Y(1.8)/R_Y(0)$
				.49 \pm .10	This experiment "

For the total pion absorption rate and the capture schedule we use the experimental values from pionic-X-ray data

a) $\lambda_a(1s) = \frac{1}{h} \Gamma_{2p \rightarrow 1s}$: $(2.95 \pm .20) \times 10^{17} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ Backenstoss, Koch (exp.)⁴⁷⁾
 2.28 \pm .76 Harris et al. (exp.)⁴⁴⁾
 2.13 Krell, Ericson, (theor.)⁴⁵⁾

b) $\lambda_a(2p)$: $(2.28 \pm .61) \times 10^{13} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ Sapp et al.⁷⁾
 3.4 Ericson, Ericson⁴⁸⁾
 1.06 Backenstoss⁴⁶⁾

c) $\Sigma\omega(ns) = .40 \pm 0.9$; $\Sigma\omega(np) = 1 - \Sigma\omega(ns)$ Sapp et al.⁷⁾

d) 1s-capture only

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or 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.

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