LBL-15211
Preprint c2

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED
LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY
FEB 28 1983
LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Submitted to Zeitschrift für Physik

ENERGY EQUILIBRATION AND ANOMALOUS MASS DRIFT IN HEAVY ION COLLISIONS

Luciano G. Moretto

October 1982

NUCLEAR SCIENCE DIVISION

LBL-15211
c.2

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098

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.

LBL-15211

ENERGY EQUILIBRATION AND ANOMALOUS MASS DRIFT IN HEAVY ION COLLISIONS

Luciano G. Moretto

Instituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare
Laboratorio Nazionale del Sud
Catania, Italy

and

Nuclear Science Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

This work was partially supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Division of Nuclear Physics of the Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.

ENERGY EQUILIBRATION AND ANOMALOUS MASS DRIFT IN HEAVY ION COLLISIONS

Luciano G. Moretto

Instituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare
Laboratorio Nazionale del Sud
Catania, Italy

and

Nuclear Science Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

ABSTRACT

The lack of mass drift towards symmetry observed in many Kr-induced reactions, and the excessive mass drift towards larger asymmetry in Ne,Ar-induced reactons, is explained in terms of a dynamical driving force towards larger mass asymmetries due to the attempt of the smaller fragment to contain its temperature gradient with respect to the heavy fragment.

INTRODUCTION

Two striking, apparently unrelated open problems in our understanding of deep inelastic processes are the anomalous drift in mass asymmetry on one hand, and the unexpected thermal partition of the energy between fragments even at small Q-values on the other.

The former effect can be observed in the reluctance of the Kr-like fragment in reactions such as Kr + Er, Kr + Au, etc.[1] to drift toward symmetry as suggested by the potential energy surface, except at the largest energy losses. The counterpart of this effect is the overeagerness of more asymmetric systems to drift towards greater mass asymmetries well above the expectation from potential energy considerations, as observed in reactions like Ne, Ar, + Au, etc.[1] Such experimental facts seem to suggest that the evolution along the mass asymmetry coordinate is controlled by something beyond the relevant static potentials, most likely by dynamical effects. The latter effect is the surprising interfragment thermal equilibration which is observed even at small Q-values, i.e., at short interaction times, as experimentally found, for instance, from the number of neutrons emitted by each fragment.[2-4] This surprise arises from two sources: the short interaction time on the one hand, and the straightforward prediction on the other that just about any mechanism responsible for the energy dissipation tends to deposit approximately equal energy on both fragments, thus leading to a non-thermal distribution.

While these two features seem to be unrelated at first glance, they may well be connected at a deeper level as we intend to show.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND A SIMPLE MODEL

One could make a qualitative argument as follows. Let us assume that particle exchange is the primary means of energy dissipation. It follows that initially, the nearly equal amounts of energy given to both fragments will create a temperature imbalance in favor of the light fragment which in turn will grow hotter. Let us further assume that the one-sided particle flux depends on the temperature of the sending fragment. This would be the case for an ideal classical gas and could be the case for a Fermi gas where particles must overcome a sizable barrier. In this way, an imbalance is created in the two flows, the light fragment sending more particles, and of higher energy, than it receives. This response of the system has two effects. On the one hand, it tends to contain the temperature gradient by forcing higher energy particles into the heavy fragment and, much more important, by forcing a greater energy deposition on the heavy fragment through the flux imbalance. On the other hand, it inevitably forces the light fragment to become progressively lighter. In other words, the light fragment fights the temperature gradient at the expense of its own mass.

In order to illustrate this effect, a simple model can be set up which captures the flavor of the physics although it does not have any pretense to be realistic. The model is the following: Let us consider two containers, A, very large, and B, very small, in order to simulate an asymmetric system. They both contain the same ideal classical gas at the initial temperature T_0. The containers are connected through a small hole and B moves with initial velocity V with respect to A.

Let us calculate for B the particle number N, the velocity V, and the temperature T as a function of the time t. Assuming unity for the particle masses and neglecting the form-factor associated with the size of the hole, one obtains for N:

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = \sqrt{\frac{T_o}{2\pi}} - \sqrt{\frac{T}{2\pi}} \quad . \tag{1}$$

Similarly, for the momentum loss one has:

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = \frac{d(NV)}{dt} = -V\sqrt{\frac{T}{2\pi}} = V\,\frac{dN}{dt} + N\,\frac{dV}{dt} \tag{2}$$

or using (1):

$$\frac{d\ln V}{dt} = -\frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\frac{T_o}{2\pi}} \quad . \tag{3}$$

For the energy one obtains:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = 2\left(\sqrt{\frac{T_o}{2\pi}}\,T_o - \sqrt{\frac{T}{2\pi}}\,T\right) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{T_o}{2\pi}}\,V^2 \quad . \tag{4}$$

Notice that the factor of two preceding the first term arises from the average energy flow 2T or $2T_o$. For the temperature, one obtains simply:

$$\frac{2}{3N}\left[2\sqrt{\frac{T_o}{2\pi}}\,T_o - \left(\frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\frac{T_o}{2\pi}} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{T}{2\pi}}\right)T + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{T_o}{2\pi}}\,V^2\right] \quad . \tag{5}$$

We can now define the natural units of the problem:

$$n = \frac{N}{N_0} ; \quad \tau = t\sqrt{\frac{T_0}{2\pi}} ; \quad v = \frac{V}{\sqrt{T_0}}$$

$$T^* = \frac{T}{T_0}$$

In these units, the three differential equations read:

$$\frac{dn}{d\tau} = 1 - \sqrt{T^*} \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{d\ln v}{d\tau} = -\frac{1}{n} \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{dT^*}{d\tau} = \frac{2}{3n}\left[2 - T^*\left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{T^*}\right) + \frac{1}{2}v^2\right] \tag{8}$$

Equation (8) shows that, early in the collision, the temperature of B must increase ($T^*>1$). Thus, Eq. (6) implies that the number of particles n in B must decrease. The rise in temperature is checked by the first term in the right-hand side of Eq. (8) which tends to drive the system towards thermal equilibrium, still at the expense of n.

The full solutions of Eqs. (6), (7), and (8) are shown in Figs. 1, 2, and 3 for various values of the initial velocity. Figure 1 shows that the fragment B experiences a temperature pulse, which is of course larger for larger values of initial velocity, and which decays almost completely within one relaxation time for the velocity. Conversely, Fig. 2 shows a dramatic drop in particle number as a function of time, again the effect being stronger at larger initial velocities. Figure 3 shows the time dependence of the velocity. Notice, especially for the larger initial velocities, that its decay is not rigorously exponential.

CONCLUSIONS

As qualitatively expected, the model shows that: 1) the small fragment becomes hotter than the heavy fragment (in this case the heavy fragment, being infinitely massive, does not warm-up); 2) the temperature increase occurs early in time and is quickly checked and reduced by a diffusion imbalance; 3) the temperature containment is achieved at the expense of the particle number of the small fragment. In other words, the model predicts a driving force of dynamical origin towards larger asymmetries. Obviously, this model strives for simplicity at the expense of realism and it should be considered but an analogue, or perhaps just a metaphor, of what really may go on in a nuclear collision. Yet, the flavor of the physics may encourage those who deal and have dealt extensively with one-body dissipation and transfer to see whether such ideas may find a natural application in their treatment. One might expect this effect to be relevant especially in the quasi-elastic region where the marginal overlap of the two nuclear surfaces does create a barrier that the nucleons must negotiate in order to go from one nucleus to the other.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges with gratitude the partial support of the Instituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Laboratorio Nazionale del Sud. The warm hospitality and cordial atmosphere provided by the director, Prof. E. Migneco, and by his colleagues is gratefully appreciated.

This work was partially supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Division of Nuclear Physics of the Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.

REFERENCES

1. For the abundant literature on experimental mass or charge distributions, see a review article like:

   W. U. Schröder and J. R. Huizenga, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. 27 (1977) 465.

   M. Lefort and C. Ngô, Ann. Phys. NY 3 (1978) 5.

   L. G. Moretto and R. P. Schmitt, Rep. Prog. Phys. 44 (1981) 533.
2. B. Tamain, R. Chechik, H. Fuchs, F. Hanappe, M. Morjean, C. Ngô and J. Péter, Nucl. Phys. A330 (1979) 253.
3. Y. Eyal, A. Gavron, I. Tserruya, Z. Fraenkel, Y. Eisen, S. Wald, R. Bass, G. R. Gould, G. Kreyling, R. Renfort, K. Stelzer, R. Zitzmann, A. Gobbi, U. Lynen, H. Stelzer, I. Rode, and R. Bock, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41 (1978) 625.
4. D. Hilscher, J. R. Birkelund, A. D. Hoover, W. U. Schröder, W. W. Wilke, J. R. Huizenga, A. Mignerey, K. L. Wolf, H. F. Breuer and V. E. Viola, Phys. Rev. C20 (1979) 576.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Dependence of the temperature of container B upon time for different initial velocities.

Fig. 2. Dependence of the number of particles in B upon time for different initial velocities.

Fig. 3. Dependence of the velocity of B upon time for different initial velocities.



XBL 8211-3367

Fig. 1



XBL 8211-3365

Fig. 2



XBL 8211-3366

Fig. 3

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. 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 Department of Energy.

Reference to a company or product name does not imply approval or recommendation of the product by the University of California or the U.S. Department of Energy to the exclusion of others that may be suitable.

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