

Weak interference between the 1^- states in the vicinity of α -particle threshold of ^{16}O

M. Katsuma^{1,2}

¹ Advanced Mathematical Institute, Osaka City University, Japan,

² Institut d'Astronomie et d'Astrophysique, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Abstract. The subthreshold 1_1^- state at an excitation energy $E_x = 7.12$ MeV in ^{16}O has been believed to enhance the S -factor of $^{12}\text{C}(\alpha,\gamma)^{16}\text{O}$. The enhancement seems to originate from strong interference between 1_1^- and 1_2^- ($E_x \approx 9.6$ MeV) in the vicinity of the α -particle threshold. However, weak interference between them and a resulting small $E1$ S -factor are exemplified with R -matrix theory. Including a higher-order correction of the resonance parameters, the present example appears to reproduce the experimental data consistently. It would therefore be possible that the $E1$ S -factor is reduced at low energies.

Keywords: $^{12}\text{C}(\alpha,\gamma)^{16}\text{O}$, R -matrix method, Stellar nucleosynthesis

The 1_1^- ($E_x = 7.12$ MeV) and 1_2^- ($E_x \approx 9.6$ MeV) states in ^{16}O play an important role in the low-energy extrapolation of $^{12}\text{C}(\alpha,\gamma)^{16}\text{O}$ cross sections. If complicated process of compound nuclei is assumed, strong interference between them is expected, and $E1$ transition becomes predominant. At present, this interference has been believed to describe the cross section at $E_{c.m.} = 300$ keV. However, I have predicted a small $E1$ S -factor at this energy from the potential model (PM) [1], because non-absorptive scattering results in weak coupling between shell and cluster structure in ^{16}O . Besides, I have shown that $E2$ transition is dominant because 2_1^+ ($E_x = 6.92$ MeV) has $\alpha+^{12}\text{C}$ structure [2,3].

In this paper, weak interference between 1_1^- and 1_2^- , and the resulting small $E1$ S -factor are exemplified with R -matrix theory [4]. I estimate their reduced α -particle widths from [1,2], and use the conventional R -matrix method [5,6]. In addition, the formal parameters are obtained from an exact expression, including a higher-order correction, because it has been reported that the parameters for 1_2^- are not appropriately treated in the linear approximation [5]. This correction ensures that R -matrix calculations correspond to the experimental data.

Before showing an example of calculations, let me describe the R -matrix parameters. The Schrödinger equation is solved with the R -matrix,

$$R_L(E_{c.m.}) = \sum_n \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_{nL}^2}{\tilde{E}_{nL} - E_{c.m.}} + \mathcal{R}_{\alpha L}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha L}$ is the non-resonant component. \tilde{E}_{nL} and $\tilde{\gamma}_{nL}$ are the *formal* resonance energy and *formal* reduced width, respectively. These are different from the Breit-Wigner (observed) parameters, E_{nL} , γ_{nL} . The conversion is given as




Fig. 1. An example of R -matrix calculations of (a) $E1$ S -factor of $^{12}\text{C}(\alpha,\gamma)^{16}\text{O}$, (b) β -delayed α -particle spectrum of ^{16}N , (c) p -wave phase shift of $\alpha+^{12}\text{C}$ elastic scattering. The solid, dotted, and dashed curves are the results of the present work, R -matrix method [9], and PM [1], respectively. The experimental data are taken from [9,10,11]. (d) The resultant R -matrix is illustrated with the solid curve. The dashed curve is the sum of 1_3^- , 1_4^- , and non-resonant components.

$$\tilde{E}_{nL}(E_{c.m.}) = E_{nL} + \tilde{\gamma}_{nL}^2(E_{c.m.})\Delta_L(E_{nL}, a_c) [1 + d_{nL}] \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{nL}^2(E_{c.m.}) = \frac{\gamma_{nL}^2}{1 - \gamma_{nL}^2 \Delta'_L(E_{nL}, a_c) [1 + Q_{nL}(E_{c.m.}, a_c)]}, \quad (3)$$

where Q_{nL} is the higher-order correction of the resonance parameters, depending on energies. Note that $Q_{nL} = 0$ was used in most of reactions [5,6]. Δ_L is the shift function, $\Delta'_L = d\Delta_L/dE$. d_{nL} is a parameter for multi-levels, and it is adjusted self-consistently so as to satisfy $\Delta_L(E_{nL}, a_c)R_L(E_{nL}) = 1$; $d_{11} = -1.0133$, $d_{21} = 0$. The observed parameters are 1_1^- : $E_{11} = -0.0451$ MeV, $\gamma_{11} = 0.345$ MeV $^{1/2}$; 1_2^- : $E_{21} = 2.434$ MeV, $\gamma_{21} = 0.850$ MeV $^{1/2}$. a_c is the channel radius, $a_c = 4.75$ fm. All nucleons are interacting close together in the internal region, whereas nucleons are well-separated into α and ^{12}C outside the region. Other observed parameters are taken from [7]. ANC of 1_1^- is 5.0×10^{28} fm $^{-1}$ [1,8].

The example of the small $E1$ S -factor is shown by the solid curve in Fig. 1(a). The present example includes the component of the subthreshold state, and it resembles PM [1] (dashed curve). The interference between 1_1^- and 1_2^- appears to be weak. The corresponding calculations of the β -delayed α -particle spectrum of ^{16}N and the p -wave phase shift of $\alpha+^{12}\text{C}$ elastic scattering are consistent with the experimental results [9,10]. (Fig. 1(b) and 1(c)) So, the small $E1$ S -factor in Fig. 1(a) is in agreement with these experimental data. The experimental α -particle width of 1_2^- ($\Gamma_\alpha^{\text{exp}} = 420 \pm 20$ keV [7]) is also reproduced by the present

example, $\Gamma_\alpha^{\text{th}} = 432$ keV. The dotted curves are the R -matrix calculations [9] with $Q_{nL} = 0$, in which the narrow reduced widths are assumed. The derived 1_2^- width [9] does not reproduce the experimental one. Compared with the solid curves, Q_{nL} is found to reduce the $E1$ S -factor at low energies. In fact, a large energy shift for 1_2^- is expected from the large reduced width of $\alpha+^{12}\text{C}$ cluster structure. (Eq. (2)) So, the resultant energy of the 1_2^- pole is found to be located in the vicinity of 1_1^- . (Fig. 1(d)) This proximity of the poles suppresses their interference, and it consequently makes the small $E1$ S -factor below the barrier.

The present example can be replaced with my previous result from PM, so I could use a hybrid model [12], $E1(R\text{-matrix})+E2(\text{PM})$. The resulting total S -factor and reaction rates are confirmed to be concordant with [1,13].

In summary, the weak interference between 1_1^- and 1_2^- , and the small $E1$ S -factor have been exemplified with R -matrix theory. The formal parameters are obtained from the exact expression, including the higher-order correction. The reduced α -particle widths of 1_1^- and 1_2^- are estimated from PM. The present example is consistent with the experimental results of the β -delayed α -spectrum of ^{16}N , the p -wave phase shift, and the α -decay width of 1_2^- . In the example, the pole energy of 1_2^- is located in the vicinity of 1_1^- . This proximity suppresses their interference, and it makes the small $E1$ S -factor below the barrier. It would therefore be possible in the R -matrix method that the $E1$ S -factor is reduced from the enhanced value currently expected. At the same time, the reaction rates are confirmed to be obtained from the direct-capture mechanism [1,13].

I am grateful to Prof. S. Kubono for his comments. I also thank M. Arnould, A. Jorissen, K. Takahashi, H. Utsunomiya, Y. Ohnita, and Y. Sakuragi for their hospitality at Université Libre de Bruxelles and Osaka City University.

References

1. Katsuma, M.: Phys. Rev. C **78**, 034606 (2008); *ibid.* **81**, 029804 (2010); *ibid.* **90**, 068801 (2014); Proc. of NIC XIV, JPS Conf. Proc. **14**, 021009 (2017).
2. Katsuma, M.: Phys. Rev. C **81**, 067603 (2010); J. Phys. G **40**, 025107 (2013); EPJ Web of Conferences **66**, 03041 (2014).
3. Fujiwara, Y., *et al.*: Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **68**, 29 (1980) and references therein.
4. Katsuma, M.: arXiv:1701.02848 [nucl-th].
5. Descouvemont, P.: Theoretical Models for Nucl. Astrophysics. Nova Science (2003).
6. Thompson, I.J., Nunes, F.: Nuclear Reactions for Astrophysics. Cambridge Univ. Press (2009); Lane, A.M., Thomas, R.G.: Rev. Mod. Phys. **30**, 257 (1958).
7. Tilley, D.R., Weller, H.R., Cheves, C.M.: Nucl. Phys. A **564**, 1 (1993).
8. Oulebsir, N., *et al.*: Phys. Rev. C **85**, 035804 (2012); Brune, C.R., *et al.*: Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4025 (1999); Belhout, A., *et al.*: Nucl. Phys. A **793**, 178 (2007).
9. Azuma, R.E., *et al.*: Phys. Rev. C **50**, 1194 (1994).
10. Tang, X.D., *et al.*: Phys. Rev. C **81**, 045809 (2010); Plaga, R., *et al.*: Nucl. Phys. A **465**, 291 (1987); Tischhauser, P., *et al.*: Phys. Rev. C **79**, 055803 (2009).
11. Kunz, R., *et al.*: Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3244 (2001); Assunção, M., *et al.*: Phys. Rev. C **73**, 055801 (2006); Plag, R., *et al.*: *ibid.* **86**, 015805 (2012); Ouellet, J.M.L., *et al.*: *ibid.* **54**, 1982 (1996); Makii, H., *et al.*: *ibid.* **80**, 065802 (2009).
12. Langanke, K., Koonin, S.E.: Nucl. Phys. A **439**, 384 (1985); *ibid.* **410**, 334 (1983).
13. Katsuma, M.: Astrophys. J. **745**, 192 (2012); PoS (NIC XIII) 106 (2015).