

# Fractional calculus within the optical model used in nuclear and particle physics

**Richard Herrmann**

GigaHedron, Berliner Ring 80, D-63303 Dreieich, Germany

E-mail: herrmann@gigahedron.com

**Abstract.** The optical model is a fundamental tool to describe scattering processes in nuclear physics. The basic input is an optical model potential, which describes the refraction and absorption processes more or less schematically. Of special interest is the form of the absorption potential. With increasing energy of the incident projectile, a derivation of this potential must take into account energy dependent transition from imaginary surface to volume terms. We discuss the deficiencies of the classical approach and propose an alternative method based on concepts developed within the framework of fractional calculus, which allows to describe a smooth transition from surface to volume absorption in a natural way.

PACS numbers: 45.10.Hj, 24.10.Ht, 21.65.+f, 12.39.Pn, 13.60.Fz, 13.85.Dz, 25.40.Cm, 25.40.Dn, 13.75.Cs, 21.30.Fe, 21.30.-x

## 1. Introduction

Geiger's, Marsden's and Rutherford's [Geiger and Marsden (1909), Rutherford (1911)] scattering experiments mark a twofold highlight in the development of physics.

A new view on the atom emerged, overcoming Thomson's plum pudding model [Thomson (1904)] and splitting the atom into two distinct spatial areas, the outer atomic shell and the inner nucleus, which in the following caused a specialization of research fields of the same kind, namely from a uniform view at the atom to two at first independent research areas of atomic shell physics, which in addition covers to a large extent the study of chemical reactions and nuclear physics, which concentrates on the study of atomic nucleus itself.

Furthermore this was the onset of an active exploration of the properties of nuclear matter.

Besides the passive observation of nuclear properties, which started with Becquerel's [Becquerel (1896)] accidental discovery that uranium salts spontaneously emit a penetrating radiation, which he called radioactivity and in the course of time unveiled spontaneous decay phenomena (loosely sorted by emitted particle pass) , like  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$ , cluster decay [Rose and Jones (1984)] even up to nuclear fission [Flerov and Petrzhak (1940)] now the active scattering process allowed for a detailed study of the nucleus with different projectile-target combinations within a large range of incident energies.

Motivated by Joliot and Curie's [Joliot and Curie (1934)] experiments Fermi [Fermi (1934)] performed a first systematic study for different target nuclei using

slow neutrons, which had passed the pond beyond the physics institute in Rome [?] from a natural beryllium source instead of  $\alpha$ -particles as projectiles bombarding different chemical target elements. Subsequent experiments by Hahn and Strassmann [Hahn and Straßmann (1939)] were correctly interpreted as an induced fission of a nucleus by Meitner and her nephew Fritsch [Meitner and Fritsch (1939)].

The development of accelerators made it possible to realize scattering experiments with well defined projectile energies and different projectiles. While Hofstadter [Hofstadter (1956)] in Stanford used electrons to study the properties of nuclear matter, later light nuclei were used to produce trans-uranium and super-heavy elements [Oganessian *et al* (2004)].

A milestone was the acceleration of uranium beyond the Coulomb-barrier and the studies on uranium-uranium scattering at GSI in Darmstadt to generate for a short time the strongest electromagnetic fields possible [Aleksandrov *et al* (2022)] and to study the properties of large size nuclear molecules [Reinhardt and Greiner (1977), Reinhardt *et al* (1981)].

Increasing the incident energy in heavy ion collisions allowed to investigate the properties of nuclear matter at extreme pressures and temperatures and thus to observe compression phenomena and possible phase transitions like deconfinement processes in quark-gluon-plasma [Rafelski and Müller (1982), Rafelski and Müller (1986)].

Last not least, the collision of two neutron stars [Oppenheimer and Volkoff (1939)], which may be reckoned as the ultimate nuclear scattering process may be a rare event, but it generates significant signatures, which have been detected by the LIGO experiment [Abbot *et al* (2017)].

Thus a vast amount of experimental scattering data for different projectile-target combinations over a large energy range has been accumulated in the last 120 years. For an interpretation and categorization of these data appropriate theoretical models have been derived and applied.

In the range from 1 - 1000 MeV per nucleon for the incident projectile the optical model plays an outstanding role and has proven highly successful for analysing data on elastic and inelastic scattering of nucleons, deuterons and light elements.

The basic idea behind the optical model is the interpretation of nuclear scattering using the terminology of classical optics and interpreting nuclear matter as a nebular glass body. For that purpose nuclear potentials are introduced such that the elastic and inelastic contributions of a complex scattering processes are described of in terms of refraction and absorption processes. At first this is a purely phenomenological ansatz which in the course of time has been motivated by a derivation of the potentials used from reasonably chosen nucleus-nucleus interactions.

In this paper, we will concentrate on absorption process and its energy dependence described with optical model potentials. With increasing energy of the incident projectile, a derivation of this potential must take into account the observed smooth transition from surface to volume absorption.

We will first discuss the deficiencies of the classical approach, which is accepted practice for more than 60 years now.

We will then propose an alternative method, which is based on concepts developed within the framework of fractional calculus and we will demonstrate the superiority of this approach.

## 2. The optical model - classical approach

We will now collect the necessary information on the classical derivation of optical model potentials as a basis for our criticism of the classical standard method.

The major idea behind the optical model is the representation of a nucleus by a mean field potential or optical potential  $U(\vec{r}, E)$  being at least a function of space coordinates and energy of the incident particle.

The direct interaction of the incident particle with a target nucleus is considered as an interaction with the optical potential only, leading to a quantum model and the corresponding Schrödinger equation

$$\left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta + U(\vec{r}, E)\right)\Psi(\vec{r}, E) = E\Psi(\vec{r}, E) \quad (1)$$

which is solved with appropriate boundary conditions leading to differential and total elastic scattering angular distributions and the reaction cross section, which is equal to the sum of cross sections for all allowed inelastic processes.

The optical potential is a complex quantity. It contains besides a real component  $V(\vec{r}, E)$  which accounts for elastic scattering only also an imaginary component  $W(\vec{r}, E)$ , which represents all inelastic processes, which happen during the scattering process.

$$U(\vec{r}, E) = V(\vec{r}, E) - iW(\vec{r}, E) \quad (2)$$

In view of the optical model, these terms are interpreted as a description of refraction and absorption (note the minus sign) processes during the scattering event respectively and were first discussed as an appropriate approach for the nuclear scattering case by Ostrofsky and later Bethe [Ostrofsky *et al* (1936), Bethe (1940), Hodgson (1967)].

Since it is found experimentally that scattered nucleons are polarised even with an unpolarised incident beam, the optical model potential is extended by a spin-orbit term

$$U_{so}(\vec{r}, E) = (V_{so}(\vec{r}, E) - iW_{so}(\vec{r}, E))\vec{L} \cdot \vec{s} \quad (3)$$

where  $\vec{L}$  is the angular momentum and  $\vec{s}$  are the Pauli spin operators. From experiment, there is no evidence for a significant imaginary spin-orbit contribution, so in general  $W_{so}$  is ignored.

Finally, for protons we have an additional Coulomb term  $V_c(\vec{r})$ .

The complete optical potential therefore is given by:

$$U_{tot}(\vec{r}, E) = V(\vec{r}, E) - iW(\vec{r}, E) + U_{so}(\vec{r}, E) + V_c(\vec{r}) \quad (4)$$

There are two types of approaches, which developed historically step by step to obtain a reasonable form of the optical potential:

At first, a phenomenological approach, using analytical functions for well depths, e.g. Woods-Saxon potentials, where the parameters are adjusted using experimental data [Woods and Saxon (1954), Becchetti and Greenlees (1969)].

Furthermore, we have microscopic optical potentials, which are based on an effective nucleon-nucleon interaction folded with reasonable nuclear density matter distributions, where in the idealized case there is no parameter adjustment necessary[Satchler and Love (1979), Varner *et al* (1991), Woods *et al* (1982), ?].

A simplification, which is widely used in literature, is the restriction of the problem to spherical symmetry. The Schrödinger equation (2) separates in spherical

coordinates and we are left with the relevant radial part with central potentials  $U_{tot}(\vec{r}, E) = U_{tot}(r, E)$ .

For this case we may introduce the  $r$ -dependent form factors  $f(r), g(r), h(r)$

$$U_{tot}(r, E) = V(E)f(r) - iW(E)g(r) + V_{so}(E)h(r) + V_c(r) \quad (5)$$

A classical choice for the central potential form factor  $f(r)$  is given in close analogy to nuclear density or potential distributions used in shell model calculations or derived from mean field calculations in lowest order is the Woods-Saxon potential [Woods and Saxon (1954)]:

$$f(r) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{(r-R_0)/a_0}} \quad (6)$$

where  $R_0$  is the average radius of the spherical target nucleus, which is given assuming incompressibility of nuclear matter as  $R_0 = r_0 A^{1/3}$  and  $a_0$  is a measure of the skin size of the nucleus.

The absorption form factor  $g(r)$  accounts for all inelastic processes. The standard narrative for the energy dependence of this term reads as follows:

For low energies, absorption occurs mainly at the nuclear surface. Consequently for low energies the form of  $g$  is chosen as the derivative of the Woods-Saxon potential, which defines a surface contribution  $g(E \approx 0) = g_s$

$$g_s(r) = a_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f(r) \quad (7)$$

where  $a_0$  with dimension length guarantees correct potential energy units. The spin-orbit form factor  $h(r)$  is then given by the Thomas-form  $g(r)/r$ . For higher energies absorption more and more happens throughout the nuclear volume. As a consequence as a function of energy a sliding transition from surface to volume absorption is observed.

Introducing an energy dependent mixing coefficient  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  and the two potential depths  $W_s, W_v$ , the imaginary part of the central potential is therefore given as:

$$Wg(r) = \alpha W_s g_s(r) + (1 - \alpha) W_v f(r) \quad (8)$$

$$= \alpha W_s a_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f(r) + (1 - \alpha) W_v f(r) \quad (9)$$

In other words: With increasing incident energy of the projectile the experimental data may be interpreted correctly assuming a smooth transition from surface to volume type absorption. Within the framework of optical potentials this behaviour is modelled by first introducing a surface potential defined as the rate of change of a given volume potential and then calculate a weighted sum of these two potentials.


This procedure is common practice for more than 60 years now and has not been seriously questioned since its introduction. As an example, in figure 1 we have plotted the energy dependence of the factors

$$Wg(r) = (-W_v + 4a_0 W_s \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) f(r) \quad (10)$$

with

$$W_v(E) = \max \left( 0, 0.22E - \begin{cases} 2.70 & \text{protons} \\ 1.56 & \text{neutrons} \end{cases} \right) \quad (11)$$

$$W_s(E) = \max \left( 0, -0.25E + 12.0 \frac{N - Z}{A} + \begin{cases} 11.8 & \text{protons} \\ 13.0 & \text{neutrons} \end{cases} \right) \quad (12)$$



**Figure 1.** Energy dependence for  $W_v^I, W_s^I$  for  $I \in \{\text{protons, neutrons}\}$  for  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  from [Becchetti and Greenlees (1969)].

We conclude, that a plausible physical concept has been realized at best only pragmatically, just good enough to serve as a tool in order to classify the accumulated experimental data.

A gradual transition from surface to volume potential is an essential requirement for a correct treatment of the energy dependence of the absorption term of optical model potentials. This physical fact should be correctly treated within the optical model. Neither the physical justification for this requirement nor the mathematical treatment has changed essentially through the last 60 years [Hodgson (1967), Woods *et al* (1982), Koning and Delaroche (2003)].

But already Roger Bacon in his *opus majus* pointed out, that one cause of error is the force of habit [Bacon (1267)].

So its time for a change: In the following we will propose an adequate treatment of the energy dependent absorption potential by using appropriate mathematical tools.

Our approach follows a new path to generate the progression between surface and volume absorption extending the concept of a surface definition given in terms of standard differential vector calculus.

We will describe a smooth transition between first derivative (surface) potential and zeroth, which means no derivative (volume) potential applying a fractional derivative of order  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  to the potential such that the absorption potential becomes

$$Wg(r) = W_\alpha a_o^\alpha \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial r^\alpha} f(r) \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \quad (13)$$

For the cases  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\alpha = 1$  this reduces to the volume and surface type potential

respectively, while for all intermediate cases we obtain a new fractional potential, which is much closer to the physical interpretation given above than the standard approach.

We will first present the surface definition based on classical vector calculus which we will then extend to the fractional case introducing an appropriate fractional derivative and applying fractional vector calculus methods.

### 3. The surface term in the optical model potentials

Nucleon density  $\rho(r)$  and collective volume potential  $V_{\text{vol}}$  are related via a folding procedure of type

$$V_{\text{vol}}(r) = W_v \int_G d^3r' w(r, r') \rho(r') = (w * \rho)(r) = W_v f(r) \quad (14)$$

with a weight  $w(r, r')$ , which models the effective short range nucleon-nucleon interaction in the collective model and the Coulomb interaction for protons respectively. It should be emphasized, that a given potential may be the result of different weight/density combinations, e.g. the weights  $w_C$  modelling a Coulomb type interaction, which may be attractive, repulsive or zero for the interacting objects,  $w_\delta$  being Dirac's  $\delta$ -function modelling an attractive strong contact interaction and  $w_Y$  being a Yukawa type function respectively modelling an effective soft core interaction.

$$w_C = \frac{e}{|r - r'|} \quad e \in \{+1, -1, 0\} \quad (15)$$

$$w_\delta = -\delta(|r - r'|) \quad (16)$$

$$w_Y = -e^{-2|r-r'|} |r - r'| \quad (17)$$

and densities

$$\rho_{ws} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{(r-R_0)/a_0}} \quad (18)$$

$$\rho_H = H(|r - r'|) \quad (19)$$

with  $H$  being the Heavyside step function.

At first glance, it seems trivial, that a corresponding nuclear surface potential  $V_{\text{surf}}$  was then directly related to the nuclear surface  $S$

$$V_{\text{surf}}(r) = W_s a_0 \int_G d^3r' w(r, r') S(r') = W_s a_0 (w * S)(r) \quad (20)$$

with a scaling factor  $a_0$  with dimension [fm] in order to preserve potential energy units.

But what is a nuclear surface?

An elegant general definition of a surface, which actually is as appealing as Euclid's definition of a circle, determines a surface via the spatial change of a density. In multi-dimensional space this change is calculated using the gradient operator  $\nabla$  and thus differential calculus enters.

Actually there are two candidates for a useful definition of a surface:

The first one generates an absolute value:

$$S_{\text{magnitude}}(r) = |\nabla \rho(r)| = \sqrt{\nabla \rho(r) \cdot \nabla \rho(r)} \quad (21)$$

This surface definition implies isotropy of the surface generation since the gradient direction information is lost and only the magnitude remains. It measures the

maximum rate of density change at a given position  $r$  and is widely used within edge detection algorithms used in image processing [Gonzales and Woods (2018)].

The second possible definition is oriented:

$$S_{\text{directional}}(r) = \vec{v} \cdot \nabla \rho(r) \quad (22)$$

This surface we call directional since it is based on the definition of a directional derivative, which is given by the projection of the density gradient on an arbitrary vector  $\vec{v}$  and gives the rate of density change in direction  $\vec{v}$ . Consequently in contrast to the  $S_{\text{mag}}$  definition which always results in a positive sign for the surface, here we obtain a positive sign for the surface for increasing density and a negative sign for decreasing density.

In case of an optical model potential, the definition (22) seems appropriate. Therefore we obtain a possible definition for a surface potential

$$V_{\text{surf}}(r) = W_s a_0 \int_G d^3 r' w(r, r') \vec{v}' \cdot \nabla \rho(r') \quad (23)$$

where the factor  $a_0$  has dimension length to ensure correct energy units.

In order to make our argument as clear as possible, in the following we will discuss a simplified scenario;

In the following we restrict to spherically symmetric densities  $\rho(r, \phi, \theta) = \rho(r)$ , restrict to collective interactions  $w(|r - r'|)$  where the spatial behaviour depends on the distance only, with the volume element  $\sqrt{g} = r'^2 \sin(\theta')$  and spherical surface shells setting  $\vec{v}(r, \phi, \theta) = \{-1, 0, 0\}$  (23) simplifies to

$$V_{\text{Vol}}(r) = W_v \int_G \sqrt{g} dr' d\theta' d\phi' w(|r - r'|) \rho(r') \quad (24)$$

$$V_{\text{surf}}(r) = -W_s a_0 \int_G \sqrt{g} dr' d\theta' d\phi' w(|r - r'|) \frac{\partial}{\partial r'} \rho(r') \quad (25)$$

For the idealized case setting the collective nuclear interaction potential  $w(|r - r'|) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \delta(|r - r'|) / \sqrt{g}$  we obtain the set of volume and surface potentials as

$$V_{\text{Vol}}(r) = W_v f(r) \quad (26)$$

$$V_{\text{surf}}(r) = -W_s a_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f(r) \quad (27)$$

Thus the problem is reduced to the one dimensional case, which suffices to clarify our viewpoint.

In order to model a gradual transition between these both limiting cases we will apply methods developed within the framework of fractional calculus.

The basic research area of fractional calculus is to extend the conceptual framework and the corresponding definitions of a derivative operator from integer order  $n$  to arbitrary order  $\alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is a real or complex value or even more complicated a complex valued function  $\alpha = \alpha(r)$ :

$$\frac{d^n}{dr^n} \rightarrow \frac{d^\alpha}{dr^\alpha}, \quad n \in N, \alpha \in \{R, C\} \quad (28)$$

Several concepts coexist to realize this idea. In the following, we will first state the problem, we want to solve and will then present an appropriate solution, which much better conforms with the hitherto collected requirements.

#### 4. The optical model in view of fractional calculus

Extending the concept of a derivative operator to fractional order  $\alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is a real number with the property  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , such that we obtain a smooth transition between the cases  $n = 0$  and  $n = 1$  allows to extend the definition of an integer gradient to a fractional gradient operator too. In cartesian coordinates we propose [Tarasov (2021)]:

$$\nabla^\alpha(x, y, z) = \left( \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial x^\alpha}, \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial y^\alpha}, \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial z^\alpha} \right), \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in R \quad (29)$$

or in spherical coordinates

$$\nabla^\alpha(r, \phi, \theta) = \left( \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial r^\alpha}, \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial \phi^\alpha}, \frac{1}{r \sin(\theta)} \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial \theta^\alpha} \right), \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in R \quad (30)$$

and use this fractional gradient to define a unique fractional potential in cartesian coordinates

$$V(\vec{r}, \alpha) = W_\alpha a_0^\alpha \int_G d^3 r' w(r, r') \vec{v}' \cdot \nabla^\alpha \rho(r') \quad (31)$$

$$= W_\alpha a_0^\alpha (w * \nabla^\alpha \rho)(\vec{r}) \quad (32)$$

$0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in R$

where the factor  $a_0^\alpha$  ensures correct units and  $W_\alpha$  is now a function of  $\alpha$ . The limiting cases corresponding to (26) are then

$$V(r, \alpha = 0) = V_{\text{vol}}(r) \quad (33)$$

$$V(r, \alpha = 1) = V_{\text{surf}}(r) \quad (34)$$

and consequently

$$W_\alpha(\alpha = 0) = W_v \quad (35)$$

$$W_\alpha(\alpha = 1) = W_s \quad (36)$$

For central potentials we may switch to spherical coordinates and with  $\vec{v}(r, \phi, \theta) = (-1, 0, 0)$  and are lead to the fractional extension of (26):

$$V(r, \alpha) = W_\alpha a_0^\alpha \int_G \sqrt{g} dr' d\theta' d\phi' w(|r - r'|) \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial r'^\alpha} \rho(r') \quad (37)$$

$$= W_\alpha a_0^\alpha (w * \partial^\alpha \rho)(r) \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in R \quad (38)$$

which in the case of the attractive contact potential  $w(|r - r'|) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \delta(|r - r'|) / \sqrt{g}$

$$V(r, \alpha) = W_\alpha a_0^\alpha \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial r^\alpha} \rho(r), \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in R \quad (39)$$

With (31) for the general cartesian and (37) for the spherically symmetric case respectively we propose fractional optical model potentials for an adequate description of the energy dependence of nuclear absorption processes. In the following we will give closed form solutions for the important case of spherical Woods-Saxon type densities.

#### 5. Derivation and applications of the fractional model potential

We choose a Liouville type fractional derivative with slightly adjusted bounds for an arbitrary density  $\rho(r)$  which is defined as a sequential operation: A fractional integral is followed by an ordinary derivative.

$$\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial r^\alpha} \rho(r) = \rho^{(\alpha)}(r) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} I^{1-\alpha}(r) \rho(r) \quad (40)$$



Consequently, if we know the fractional integral  $I^\alpha$ , we also know the fractional derivative of  $\rho(r)$ .

The fractional integral  $I^{1-\alpha}\rho(r)$  is given by a convolution with a weakly singular kernel  $w_L(h) = h^{-\alpha}$  and thus we will apply the following definition:

$$\rho^{(\alpha)}(r) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(w_L * \rho)(r) \quad (41)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int_{-\infty}^0 dh h^{-\alpha} \rho(r+h) \quad (42)$$

This at first abstract fractional derivative definition (42) allows a provisional physical interpretation:

We rewrite (42) as a sum

$$\rho^{(\alpha)} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \int_{-\infty}^0 dh h^{-\alpha} \rho(r-h) - \int_0^{\infty} dh h^{-\alpha} \rho(r+h) \right) \quad (43)$$

Within a classical picture [Ehrenfest (1927)], the fractional derivative is a weighted energy dependent sum of the projection of the density change along the classical trajectory expectation value of an incoming projectile, which runs from  $\infty \leq x \leq +\infty$  onto the radial vector. The weight function may be considered as the idealized hadronic analogue to a Bragg energy deposition curve, with a singularity at the position of closest approach to the origin [Bragg and Kleeman (1904), Bragg and Kleeman (1905), Wilson (1946)].

Note that due to our definition of a fractional derivative it follows a weak correspondence principle for  $\alpha$  being even and odd respectively, if analytically continued from  $0 < \alpha < 1$  to  $\alpha > 0$ :

$$\rho^{(\alpha)}(r) = \begin{cases} +\rho^{(n)}(r) & \alpha \rightarrow n, n \text{ even} \\ -\rho^{(n)}(r) & \alpha \rightarrow n, n \text{ odd} \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

which in a natural way yields the required sign change in (24) and (26) for volume and surface part respectively.

Let us now apply (42) to the important case of a density of Woods-Saxon type

$$\rho_{WS}(r) = \rho_0 \frac{1}{1 + e^{\frac{r-R_0}{a_0}}} \quad (45)$$

we obtain an analytic solution for the fractional derivative of  $\rho_{WS}$  according to (40):

$$\rho_{WS}^{(\alpha)}(r) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_{-\infty}^0 dh h^{-\alpha} \rho_{WS}(r+h), \quad 0 < \alpha < 1 \quad (46)$$

$$= -\rho_0 a_0^{1-\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \text{Li}_{1-\alpha}(-e^{(R_0-r)/a_0}) \quad (47)$$

$$= -\rho_0 a_0^{-\alpha} \text{Li}_{-\alpha}(-e^{(R_0-r)/a_0}) \quad (48)$$

$$= \rho_0 a_0^{-\alpha} F_{-\alpha-1}((R_0-r)/a_0) \quad (49)$$

where  $\text{Li}_\gamma(x)$  is the polylogarithm of fractional order  $\gamma$ , in our case with  $-1 < \gamma < 0$  or equivalently from a physicist's point of view  $F_\beta(x)$  is the Fermi-Dirac integral of fractional order  $\beta$ , in our case with  $-2 < \beta < -1$ , which occurred in physics at first for the special case  $\beta = 1/2$  in the description of a degenerated electron gas in metals [Pauli (1927), Sommerfeld (1928)].

This is the central result of our discussion so far. We have derived a closed formula for the fractional derivative of a Woods-Saxon type density in terms of

fractional polylogarithms [Costin and Garoufalidis (2007), Tao (2022)], which allows for a smooth transition between the two extremal cases of volume and surface interpretation respectively.

Normalization of the density  $\rho_{WS}^{(\alpha)}(r)$  may be achieved, integrating the density to obtain the correct number of protons/neutrons for a given nucleus. This integral may also be interpreted as a special case of a Mellin-transform of a Fermi-Dirac integral which as been considered by Dingle [Dingle (1957)].

$$\text{Vol}_{WS}(r, \alpha) = 4\pi \int_0^\infty r^2 dr \rho_{WS}^{(\alpha)}(r) \quad (50)$$

$$= 4\pi \int_0^\infty r^2 dr a_0^{-\alpha} \text{Li}_{-\alpha}(-e^{(R_0-r)/a_0}) \quad (51)$$

$$= 8\pi a_0^{3-\alpha} \text{Li}_{3-\alpha}(-e^{(R_0-r)/a_0}) \quad (52)$$

With the help of the asymptotic formula [Wood (1992)]

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \text{Li}_p(\pm e^w) = -\frac{w^p}{\Gamma(1+p)} \quad p \neq -1, -2, \dots, -n \quad (53)$$

in the limit  $a_0 \rightarrow \infty$  it follows for a homogeneous sphere with radius  $R_0$ :

$$\text{Vol}_{WS}(r, \alpha) = \lim_{a_0 \rightarrow \infty} 8\pi a_0^{3-\alpha} \text{Li}_{3-\alpha}(-e^{(R_0-r)/a_0}) \quad (54)$$

$$= \frac{8\pi}{\Gamma(4-\alpha)} R_0^{3-\alpha} \quad (55)$$

which indeed yields the two limiting cases for volume and surface term normalization respectively:

$$\text{Vol}_{WS}(r, \alpha) = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{3}\pi R_0^3 & \alpha = 0 \\ 2\pi R_0^2 & \alpha = 1 \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

Let us finally connect the fractional derivative density  $\rho_{WS}^{(\alpha)}(r)$  with the fractional optical potential absorption term  $V$  according to (37):

$$V(r, \alpha) = W_\alpha a_0^\alpha \int_G \sqrt{g} dr' d\theta' d\phi' w(|r-r'|) \frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial r'^\alpha} \rho(r') \quad (57)$$

$$= W_\alpha a_0^\alpha (w * \rho^{(\alpha)})(r) \quad (58)$$

$$= W_\alpha a_0^\alpha (w * w_L * \rho)(r) \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \quad (59)$$

with only one parameter potential depth  $W_\alpha$ .

For the simplified case of an attractive contact interaction in spherical coordinates

$$w_\delta = w(r, r') = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \delta(|r-r'|)/\sqrt{g} \quad (60)$$


the corresponding fractional potential  $V_{fWS}(\alpha)$  based on the Woods-Saxon type density  $\rho_{WS}^{(\alpha)}(r)$  follows as:

$$V_{fWS}(r, \alpha) = W_\alpha a_0^\alpha \rho_{WS}^{(\alpha)}(r) \quad (61)$$

$$= W_\alpha \rho_0 \text{Li}_{-\alpha}(-e^{(R_0-r)/a_0}) \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \quad (62)$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(E)$  is a function of energy.

In the top row of figure 2 we show a least square fit of the derived fractional Woods-Saxon potential from (61) with the absorption potential based on parameters (10) from Becetti and Greensleves (10) for incident neutrons and protons respectively in the energy range  $10 \leq E \leq 50$  [MeV] for  $\text{Pb}^{208}$ .




**Figure 2.** Top: Using parameters (10) from Becetti and Greenslevs the absorption potentials for incident neutrons and protons respectively are plotted in the energy range 10 – 50 MeV for  $Pb^{208}$ .

Bottom: Using parameters derived from the microscopic model proposed by Bauge and co-workers [Bauge *et al* (1998), Bauge *et al* (2001)] the absorption potentials for incident neutrons and protons respectively are plotted in the energy range 10 – 100 MeV for  $Pb^{208}$ . Squares indicate the original potential, dashed lines the the optimum fit in the range  $0 < r < 2R_0$  for the proposed fractional derivative based potential (62). Thick lines the optimum fit for the extended Woods-Saxon plus damped oscillatory potential (62).

The graphs of the adjusted parameters  $R_0, a_0, V_0, \alpha$ , of the new fractional potential are shown with thick lines in figures 6 and 7 for neutrons and protons respectively. The energy dependence of  $\alpha$  is nearly linear. Introducing a scaling factor  $e_0$ [MeV] we obtain:

$$\alpha(E) \sim 1 - E/e_0 \quad 0 \leq E/e_0 \leq 1 \quad (63)$$

$$(64)$$



**Figure 3.** Fit of densities given by ( ) for classical Woods-Saxon and Woods-Saxon with damped oscillatory admixture protonNeutron.

The gross features of both potential types are similar, indicating that the fractional approach leads to reasonable results. A significant difference shows up in the intermediate energy region inside the nucleus. Due to the simple form of the classical absorption potential, which is a superposition only of the Woods-Saxon potential and its derivative, inside the nucleus there is only a constant contribution, while the fractional analogue shows a definite dominant slope in the inner region.

This behaviour is a direct consequence of the fractional approach which introduces a new quality named non locality when performing the convolution integral with the weakly singular kernel  $w_L$  and thus performing a infinite weighted sum density values along the path.

The fractional approach anticipates the development of more sophisticated microscopic optical model potentials, where an effective nucleon-nucleon interaction is folded with the matter density distribution [Koning and Delaroche (2003)]. Both mechanisms introduce non-local aspects.

In the next section, we consider the consequences of a non-local approach.

## 6. Non-locality

Mainly there are two optimizations included within microscopic optical models. First, attempts are made to generate a more sophisticated density distribution for the nucleons and second, an appropriate choice is made for the collective effective nucleon potential, which is used for the folding procedure of the density to yield appropriate collective optical potential contributions.

This folding procedure incorporates the concept on non-locality into the optical model, provided that an appropriate non-local kernel is used.

We consider as an example for microscopic models the model of Bauge and co-workers [Bauge *et al* (1998), Bauge *et al* (2001)]. In order to generate the imaginary optical model potential contribution we used the code MOM [Bauge (2001)], which comes with a test file with precalculated neutron/proton densities for  $Pb^{208}$  which are the folded with a modified effective nucleon interaction, which yields corresponding optical model potentials.

In the bottom part of figure 2 we compare the absorption potentials from Bauge and co-workers [Bauge *et al* (2001)] for scattering of neutron/proton projectiles with the double magic lead-target  $Pb^{208}$  for incident energies in the range of 10-100 MeV directly with the fractional Woods-Saxon type potential according to (57):

$$V(r, \alpha) \sim (w_\delta * w_L * \rho_{WS})(r) \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \alpha \in R \quad (65)$$

which is obtained by first folding the local density (45) of Woods-Saxon type with the non local fractional derivative operator to obtain a non local fractional density and folding the resulting fractional non local density which is then followed followed by folding an the attractive, but local contact potential  $w_\delta(r, r')$  from (60) in spherical coordinates. This means, that in the fractional approach non-locality only enters via the weakly singular kernel  $w_L$ .

In the derivation of the absorption potential according to semi-microscopic models, non-locality enters via the use of a non-local kernel of e.g. Gogny-type [Dechargè and Gogny (1980)] folding with a nucleon density, derived by HFB-calculations. In addition for protons the Coulomb interaction is an additional specific kernel folded with the proton density. Formally written as

$$V(r, \alpha) \sim (w_{\text{Gogny}} * \tilde{\rho})(r) \quad (66)$$

where  $\tilde{\rho}(r)$  is indicated in figure 3 with squares. The graphs in figure 2 fit much better for the microscopic model, the slope of the potential inside the nucleus, which is the main extension of Becetti's approach is appropriately modelled by the fractional potential fit, the rms-error reduces one order of magnitude to  $e_{rms} \approx 10^{-3}$ .

Motivated by the functional behaviour of the more sophisticated density distribution from HFB-calculations, we finally want to present a simple extension of the pure Woods-Saxon type densities, which will yield an even better agreement with the potentials presented by Bauge and co-workers [Bauge *et al* (2001)].


Extending the Woods-Saxon density (45) by a damped oscillatory part via

$$\rho_{WSDO} = \rho_{WS} + \rho_{DO} \quad (67)$$


where  $\rho_{DO}$  is given by

$$\rho_{DO}(r) = \rho_0 e^{-kr} \cos(mr + \phi) \quad \{k, m, \phi\} \in R, \alpha, k > 0 \quad (68)$$

with a damping factor  $k > 0$ , oscillator frequency  $m$  and a phase  $\phi$ .



**Figure 4.** Fit result of the energy dependent absorption potential from Bauge and co-workers [Bauge *et al* (2001)] with the fractional Woods-Saxon potential (62) (thick lines), and with the fractional Woods-Saxon plus damped oscillation potential (70)(dashed lines).



**Figure 5.** Root mean square error for the fits plotted in figure 4. Dashed lines show the error for the standard Woods-Saxon potential (62), thick lines show the error for for the extended Woods-Saxon plus damped oscillation potential (70). The overall agreement with the potential increases by a factor 2-3.

Since the fractional derivative of the exponential is easily calculated with the help of (42):

$$\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial r^\alpha} e^{-kr+\phi} = k^\alpha e^{-kr+\phi} \quad \{k, \phi\} \in C, \Re(\alpha, k) > 0 \quad (69)$$

we obtain for the fractional derivative of  $\rho_{DO}$ :

$$\rho_{WSDO}^{(\alpha)}(r) = \frac{1}{2} \rho_0 e^{-kx} \left( e^{i(mx+\phi)} (k - im)^\alpha + e^{-i(mx+\phi)} (k + im)^\alpha \right) \quad \{k, m, \phi\} \in R, \alpha, k > 0 \quad (70)$$

with the property that for the complex conjugate  $\overline{\rho_{WSDO}^{(\alpha)}(r)} = \rho_{WSDO}^{(\alpha)}(r)$  holds.

$\rho_{idx}^{(\alpha)}(r)$	$\alpha$	$R_0$	$a_0$	$V_0$	$V_1$	$k$	$m$	$\phi$	error
neutrons									
WS	0.243	7.35	0.67	9.12					7.2E-2
WSDO	0.285	7.21	0.744	9.60	0.21	0.076	0.96		2.7E-2
WSDOP	0.284	7.22	0.744	9.58	0.21	0.075	0.955	0.036	2.7E-2
protons									
WS	0.380	7.69	0.680	15.69					1.4E-1
WSDO	0.416	7.54	0.732	16.66	0.48	-0.13	0.84		4.8E-2
WSDOP	0.420	7.54	0.746	16.66	0.49	-0.14	0.92	-0.31	4.3E-2

**Table 1.** Example fit parameters for the absorption potential figure 4 for 40 MeV projectile energy. Listed are values for  $\rho_{WS}^{(\alpha)}(r)$ , the fractional standard Woods-Saxon potential (62),  $\rho_{WSDO}^{(\alpha)}(r)$  and  $\rho_{WSDOP}^{(\alpha)}(r)$ , the extended Woods-Saxon plus damped oscillation potential (70) without/with phase shift.

In figure 4 we compare the fractional standard Woods Saxon potential (62) and the extended Woods-Saxon potential (70) in the region 10-100 MeV projectile energy for the double magic  $Pb^{208}$  with the semi-microscopic absorption potential from [Bauge (2001)]. As examples, in figure 5 we plot the error for 30-70 MeV and in table 1 we list the fit parameters for the case 40 MeV in order to give an impression of the parameter change when applying the different model potentials .

From the figures we may deduce, that the fractional Woods-Saxon potential, which is obtained folding an Laplace type weight with a Woods-Saxon type density function anticipates already the non-local extensions from the more sophisticated semi-microscopic models. In addition, taking into account a possible density fluctuation by extending to a fractional Woods-Saxon potential with damped oscillation reduces the difference between the extended fractional and microscopic approach by a factor 2-3 and allows a variation of the resulting fractional absorption potential similar to the semi-microscopic models including non-local effects.

## 7. The fractional global parameter set


In the previous section we have applied the generated fractional model potential to a single nucleus, namely lead. Now we want to extend the model parameter set to a wider range of nuclear targets.

Optimized parameter sets for the classical models have been reported for nucleon elastic scattering e.g. by [Becchetti and Greenlees (1969), Rapaport *et al* (1986), Walter and Guss (1986), Varner *et al* (1991), Koning and Delaroche (2003)] for a large variety of nuclei and energies. These were obtained by a fit with experimental cross sections and lead to corresponding optical potentials.

We will use a simpler approach by fitting parameters for the previously derived fractional optical model potential directly with the classical optimal potential parameters given by Becetti and Greensleves according to (10).

We perform a two step procedure: First for every valid projectile, energy and nuclear asymmetry combination we fit the classically absorption potential with the fractional Woods Saxon model. The resulting multi-dimensional point cluster is then fitted with an appropriately chosen fitting function.

As a fitting function ansatz which will minimize the error of the given fractional



**Figure 6.** For  $R_0$ ,  $a_0$ ,  $V_0$  and  $\alpha$  the global fit (dashed line) according to (71) with (thick line) according to () is plotted for 3 different nuclei (Pb, Sn, Fe) in the energy range  $10 \leq E \leq 40$  for incident neutron projectiles.

absorption potential (61) cluster we use an quadratic ansatz with parameters nucleon number  $A$ , asymmetry  $I = (N - Z)/A$  and energy  $E$ :

$$f_{\tau}^{\mu}(A, I, E) = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^{i,j,k=2} b_{ijk} E^i I^j A^k, \quad (71)$$

$$\mu \in \{\alpha, a_0, R_0, V_0\}$$


$$\tau \in \{\text{neutrons, protons}\}$$

In tables 2 and 3 we have listed the adjusted  $b_{ijk}$  for  $\alpha$ ,  $R_0$ ,  $a_0$  and  $V_0$  for neutrons and protons respectively. In figures 6 and 7 the corresponding graphs for the optimum parameter sets are plotted.

For parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $R_0$ ,  $V_0$  of the fractional model we obtain an almost linear behaviour throughout the periodic table in the proposed energy region. Especially the fractional parameter  $\alpha$  shows a dominant linear dependence from energy almost independently of the target nucleus.

Of course this is only a coarse adjustment of the fractional parameters, because we compared results only on the potential level. In a next step, a fine tuning of the fractional parameters requires the application determining measured cross sections.





**Figure 7.** For  $R_0$ ,  $a_0$ ,  $V_0$  and  $\alpha$  the global fit (dashed line) according to (71) with (thick line) according to () is plotted for 3 different nuclei (Pb, Sn, Fe) in the energy range  $10 \leq E \leq 40$  for incident proton projectiles.

## 8. A-posteriori legitimation of the classical approach

Despite the fact, that the fractional derivative is the correct method to realize the intended smooth transition from surface to volume absorption potentials there remain open questions:

Why does the classical description of the same phenomenon in terms of a simple superposition of the first and zeroth derivative lead to comparable results? Is this a special case for functions of Woods-Saxon type only?

In the following we will give an answer presenting a different interpretation of a fractional derivative, which is based on an infinite series expansion of the fractional derivative in terms of integer derivatives.

At a first glance it is tempting to assume the fractional calculus approach to derive a reasonable optical potential as a fractional derivative of the nuclear density function was a simple series expansion of the same derivative in terms of integer derivatives

$$\rho^{(\alpha)}(x) \stackrel{?}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{c}_i(\alpha) \rho^{(i)}(x) \quad (72)$$

with spatially independent coefficients  $\tilde{c}_i(\alpha)$ . and the classical approach was then interpreted as a truncation of this series to two terms only, namely  $i = 0, 1$  for the zeroth and first derivative of the density function.

This is one of the typical pitfalls in fractional calculus, things are not such simple. One of the premises for any reasonable definition of a fractional derivative

neutrons	$\mu$			
	$\alpha$	$R_0$	$a_0$	$V_0$
$b_{000}$	1.16002	3.23855	6.31512E-1	5.83134E1
$b_{100}$	-2.09028E-2	2.79605E-2	-7.64432E-3	-1.97058
$b_{200}$	-1.39729E-4	-2.26493E-4	1.09326E-4	1.87064E-2
$b_{010}$	-5.36764E-2	-4.36717E-1	2.12094E-1	4.68971E1
$b_{110}$	1.27116E-2	2.65314E-2	-1.84521E-2	2.50232E-1
$b_{210}$	1.88482E-4	-2.30697E-5	1.4966E-4	-2.36055E-2
$b_{020}$	-1.05737	5.21175	-2.16473	-2.15378E1
$b_{120}$	1.20967E-1	-6.0039E-1	2.65391E-1	3.2181
$b_{220}$	-3.00816E-3	1.2824E-2	-6.02127E-3	-6.33512E-2
$b_{001}$	9.60025E-4	2.61872E-2	4.3146E-4	2.39938E-2
$b_{101}$	-1.41237E-4	2.19149E-4	-7.05559E-5	-4.22499E-3
$b_{201}$	2.5512E-6	-3.698E-6	1.20596E-6	8.4832E-5
$b_{011}$	-2.30815E-3	6.80988E-3	-2.49754E-4	9.36127E-2
$b_{111}$	3.34947E-4	-9.15282E-4	1.39433E-4	-5.23342E-3
$b_{211}$	-7.41202E-6	1.77282E-5	-3.16304E-6	5.68913E-5
$b_{021}$	1.36172E-2	-5.81241E-2	1.76318E-2	-1.02795E-1
$b_{121}$	-1.76209E-3	7.27927E-3	-2.49776E-3	-1.11364E-2
$b_{221}$	4.02172E-5	-1.61211E-4	5.92301E-5	3.87674E-4
$b_{002}$	-1.70111E-6	-3.67824E-5	-7.23149E-7	-3.58834E-5
$b_{102}$	2.47862E-7	-4.0281E-7	1.26007E-7	6.93429E-6
$b_{202}$	-4.31213E-9	6.61254E-9	-2.1266E-9	-1.36821E-7
$b_{012}$	4.73126E-6	-1.62584E-5	-9.71364E-7	-3.56636E-4
$b_{112}$	-7.41566E-7	2.40676E-6	-3.18572E-7	2.02272E-5
$b_{212}$	1.60083E-8	-4.79778E-8	8.58725E-9	-2.79077E-7
$b_{022}$	-2.99806E-5	1.31688E-4	-2.86779E-5	9.99785E-4
$b_{122}$	4.14497E-6	-1.7493E-5	5.08152E-6	-2.76855E-5
$b_{222}$	-9.54636E-8	3.92787E-7	-1.27997E-7	2.01557E-8

**Table 2.** Fit parameters  $b_{ijk}$  according to eq. 71 for neutrons

the fractional extension of the classical Leibniz product rule is to be fulfilled, which is given by:

$$(\psi \chi)^{(\alpha)}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{j} \psi^{(\alpha-j)}(x) \chi^{(j)}(x) \quad (73)$$

Rewriting the analytic function  $\rho(x)$  as a general product:

$$\rho(x) = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} x^{\beta} \rho(x) = x^0 \rho(x) \quad \beta, x \geq 0 \quad (74)$$

or equivalently setting  $\psi(x) = x^0 = 1$  and consequently interpreting the term  $\partial_x^{\alpha-j} \psi(x)$  as the fractional integral of a constant function proves its  $x$  dependence even for the case of integer  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha = n \in N$ . So, despite the fact, that the fractional extension of the Leibniz product rule is the correct starting point for a series expansion of the fractional derivative in term of integer derivatives, we obtain space dependent

protons	$\mu$			
	$\alpha$	$R_0$	$a_0$	$V_0$
$b_{000}$	1.45738	2.97928	6.91304E-1	6.22561E1
$b_{100}$	-3.57272E-2	5.61629E-2	-1.73707E-2	-2.54804
$b_{200}$	-1.52847E-5	-6.78655E-4	2.71946E-4	2.87836E-2
$b_{010}$	-1.73192	2.17068	3.82327E-2	1.89994E1
$b_{110}$	1.55702E-1	-2.18343E-1	6.80405E-2	3.28564
$b_{210}$	-2.0218E-3	4.64791E-3	-1.47557E-3	-8.31024E-2
$b_{020}$	2.79229	-3.24036	9.68804E-1	2.80201E1
$b_{120}$	-2.6603E-1	3.36065E-1	-1.01722E-1	-3.36481
$b_{220}$	4.72882E-3	-7.92969E-3	2.43325E-3	9.59847E-2
$b_{001}$	2.60798E-3	2.47759E-2	1.33373E-3	5.46996E-2
$b_{101}$	-2.64892E-4	4.22512E-4	-1.35713E-4	-5.91297E-3
$b_{201}$	4.94074E-6	-7.91767E-6	2.52546E-6	1.15096E-4
$b_{011}$	-6.62564E-3	1.46379E-2	-3.2664E-3	3.00421E-2
$b_{111}$	7.43875E-4	-1.52236E-3	3.51202E-4	-6.14844E-4
$b_{211}$	-1.81707E-5	3.72658E-5	-9.11869E-6	-7.04581E-5
$b_{021}$	6.71699E-3	-2.75892E-2	5.68185E-3	-1.28594E-1
$b_{121}$	-8.09413E-4	2.78814E-3	-5.82523E-4	1.03988E-2
$b_{221}$	2.20862E-5	-6.63321E-5	1.45556E-5	-1.46995E-4
$b_{002}$	-6.07232E-6	-2.85172E-5	-4.5608E-6	-1.24689E-4
$b_{102}$	6.01584E-7	-1.25619E-6	4.47185E-7	1.29714E-5
$b_{202}$	-1.14806E-8	2.48641E-8	-8.89248E-9	-2.55434E-7
$b_{012}$	3.11991E-5	-9.71514E-5	3.37022E-5	3.20899E-4
$b_{112}$	-3.159E-6	9.46288E-6	-3.2767E-6	-3.44315E-5
$b_{212}$	7.16834E-8	-2.12167E-7	7.35789E-8	8.89428E-7
$b_{022}$	-6.24725E-5	2.38078E-4	-8.37765E-5	-7.11391E-4
$b_{122}$	6.24831E-6	-2.2947E-5	8.04581E-6	7.14510E-5
$b_{222}$	-1.43356E-7	5.07704E-7	-1.78026E-7	-1.69351E-6

**Table 3.** Fit parameters  $b_{ijk}$  according to eq. 71 for protons

coefficients  $c_i(\alpha, x)$ .

$$\rho^{(\alpha)}(x) \stackrel{!}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c(\alpha, x) \rho^{(i)}(x) \quad (75)$$

Nevertheless, we propose two approaches to eliminate the spatial dependence of the coefficients in (75). The first approach is based on the Gaussian least squares method determining the coefficients  $\tilde{c}_i(\alpha)$  within a given interval  $[a, b]$  as solutions of the overdetermined system of equations ( $N \gg M \in N$ ):

$$\delta \sum_{i=0}^{(b-a)/N} \left( \rho^{(\alpha)}(x_i) - \sum_{i=0}^M \tilde{c}_i(\alpha) \rho^{(i)}(x) \Big|_{x_i} \right)^2 = 0 \quad (76)$$

Especially for the Woods-Saxon type functions we will focus on the vicinity of  $x = x_s = R_0$ , since only at this point we expect a significant contribution of higher order integer derivatives, while for  $x \rightarrow 0$  and  $x \rightarrow \infty$  besides the constant higher order

derivatives ( $i > 0$ ) are negligible. We therefore postulate, that a valid comparison of contributions of higher order derivatives makes sense only in the vicinity of  $R_0$ .

Setting  $M = 4$ ,  $a = R_0 - \Delta$ ,  $b = R_0 + \Delta$  with  $\Delta = 0.1R_0$  and  $N = 100$  we obtained the set  $\{\tilde{c}_0(\alpha), \tilde{c}_1(\alpha), \tilde{c}_2(\alpha), \tilde{c}_3(\alpha)\}$ . In figure 8 the values are plotted.

We will now derive an alternative definition of a fractional derivative

$$\frac{\partial^\alpha}{\partial x^\alpha} f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j(x) \frac{\partial^j}{\partial x^j} f(x) \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \quad (77)$$

$$= c_0(x) f(x) + c_1(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x) + H(x, \alpha) \quad (78)$$

We will then demonstrate, that the hitherto used classical approach covers the first two terms of this series expansion only, which seems quite a poor approximation at first. We will then derive an error estimate and will deduce, that the contribution of higher order terms in the series expansion are surprisingly small for Woods-Saxon type functions for  $\alpha$  in the range  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ .

For Woods-Saxon type densities there are two conditions fulfilled.

First there exists a mirror point  $x_s$  with the property:

$$2\rho(x_s) = \rho(x_s + h) + \rho(x_s - h) \quad (79)$$

In the special case of the Woods-Saxon type density  $x_s = R_0$ .

Second we have an asymptotic development of the form  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{WS} = 0$  and even better introducing the residual  $R(\alpha, x_s)$

$$R(\alpha, x_s) = \partial_{x_s} \int_{x_s}^{\infty} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x+h) < \epsilon \quad (80)$$

we have  $R(\alpha, x_s) < \epsilon$  such that

$$\partial_x \int_0^{\infty} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x+h) = \partial_x \int_0^{x_s} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x+h) + R(\alpha, x_s) \quad (81)$$

$$\approx \partial_x \int_0^{x_s} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x+h) \quad (82)$$

Indeed for the Woods-Saxon density  $\rho_{WS}$  the residual is nothing else but the upper incomplete polylogarithm and we can give an upper estimate for  $\epsilon$  using properties of the exponential integral  $E_\alpha(x)$

$$R(\alpha, x_s) = \partial_{x_s} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_{x_s}^{\infty} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \frac{1}{1 + e^{(R_0-x)/a_0}} \quad (83)$$


$$< \partial_{x_s} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_{x_s}^{\infty} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} e^{-(R_0-x)/a_0} \quad (84)$$

$$= e^{\frac{R_0-x_s}{a_0}} \frac{x_s^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \left(1 + \frac{x_s}{a_0} e^{x_s/a_0} E_\alpha(x_s/a_0)\right) \quad (85)$$


which at  $x_s = R_0$  for the worst case  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  results in

$$R(\alpha, x_s) < \epsilon = 2e^{-\frac{R_0}{a_0}} \quad (86)$$

In practice this yields a value  $\epsilon \approx 4.0 \times 10^{-3}$  for  $\text{Ca}^{40}$  and  $\epsilon \approx 5.0 \times 10^{-5}$  for  $\text{Pb}^{208}$  respectively, which indeed is negligible compared to the exact value which is of order 1.



**Figure 8.** For  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  coefficients  $\tilde{c}_j$  as a function of  $\alpha$  from optimum fit of the fractional polylogarithm in the vicinity  $\Delta$  of  $R_0$ . Signs are adjusted such that  $\tilde{c}_j(\alpha) = 1$  for  $\alpha = j$ . The region  $0 < \alpha < 1$  may be directly compared with the classical ansatz e.g. (8) or (10)



**Figure 9.** Coefficients  $c_j$  as a function of  $\alpha$  from the series expansion of the fractional polylogarithm in terms of integer derivatives of order  $j$  at  $\tilde{x}_s = 1$ , see 95. Signs are adjusted such that  $c_j(\alpha) = 1$  for  $\alpha = j$ . The region  $0 < \alpha < 1$  may be directly compared with the classical ansatz e.g. (8) or (10)

Now with (79) we obtain for (82)

$$\partial_x \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^\infty dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x+h)|_{x_s} \approx$$

$$\partial_{x_s} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^{x_s} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} (2\rho(x_s) - \rho(x_s - h)) \approx \quad (87)$$

$$2\rho(x_s) \partial_{x_s} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^{x_s} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} - \partial_{x_s} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^{x_s} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x_s - h) \approx \quad (88)$$

$$2\rho(x_s) \frac{x_s^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} - \partial_{x_s} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^{x_s} dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x_s - h) \quad (89)$$

The last term in (89) is nothing else but the Riemann definition of a fractional derivative at  $x_s$ :

$${}_R \partial_x^\alpha \rho(x) = \partial_x \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^x dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x-h) \quad (90)$$

With the nice property that the integral converges for  $\rho(x) = x^\beta$ , even for  $\beta = 0$ :

$${}_R \partial_x^\alpha x^\beta = \frac{\Gamma(1+\alpha)}{\Gamma(1+\alpha-\beta)} x^{\beta-\alpha}, \quad \beta \geq 0 \quad (91)$$

The Leibniz product rule then follows as

$${}_R \partial_x^\alpha \rho(x)|_{x_s} = x^{-\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+j)} x^j \partial_x^j \rho(x)|_{x_s} \quad (92)$$

Thus we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^\infty dh \frac{1}{h^\alpha} \rho(x+h)|_{x_s} \approx \\ 2\rho^{(0)}(x_s) \frac{x_s^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} - x_s^{-\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+j)} x_s^j \rho^{(j)}(x_s) = \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

$$\rho^{(0)}(x_s) \frac{x_s^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} - x_s^{-\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+j)} x_s^j \rho^{(j)}(x_s) \quad (94)$$

which is the series expansion of our Liouville type fractional derivative in terms of ordinary integer derivatives  $\rho^{(n)}(x_s)$  of order  $n$  at  $x = x_s = R_0$ , with accuracy given by  $R(\alpha, x_s) < \epsilon$ .

In order to compare the different coefficients we perform a scaling transformation of the form

$$\tilde{x}_s = x_s/R_0 \quad (95)$$

and set  $\tilde{x}_s = 1$ . It then follows an approximate analytic expression for the coefficients  $c_j$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(\alpha)}(\tilde{x})|_{\tilde{x}=1} \approx & \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \rho^{(0)}(\tilde{x})|_{\tilde{x}=1} - \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)} \rho^{(1)}(\tilde{x})|_{\tilde{x}=1} \\ & - \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+j)} \rho^{(j)}(\tilde{x})|_{\tilde{x}=1} \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j \rho^{(j)}(\tilde{x})|_{\tilde{x}=1} \quad (97)$$




Figure 10. Coefficients  $c_j$  as a function of  $\alpha$  from (99) and (103).

It follows an analytic expression for the coefficients

$$c_j = \begin{cases} +1/\Gamma(1-\alpha) & j=0 \\ -\binom{\alpha}{j}/\Gamma(1-\alpha+j) & j>0 \end{cases} \quad (98)$$

For the lowest coefficients we explicitly obtain:

$$c_j = \begin{cases} +1/\Gamma(1-\alpha) & j=0 \\ -\alpha/\Gamma(2-\alpha) & j=1 \\ +\frac{1}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)/\Gamma(3-\alpha) & j=2 \\ -\frac{1}{6}\alpha(1-\alpha)(2-\alpha)/\Gamma(4-\alpha) & j=3 \end{cases} \quad (99)$$

In figure 9 we have plotted these coefficients:

Since the Riemann fractional derivative (100) applied to the exponential is given by:

$${}_R\partial_r^\alpha e^{-kr} = r^\alpha E_{1,1-\alpha}(-kr) \quad (100)$$

$$= (-k)^\alpha e^{-kr} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha\Gamma(-\alpha, -kr)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}\right) \quad (101)$$

$$= (-k)^\alpha e^{-kr} Q(-\alpha, 0, -kr) \quad k, r \geq 0 \quad (102)$$

where  $E_{\alpha,\beta}(z)$ ,  $\Gamma(a, z)$  and  $Q(a, z_0, z_1)$  are the generalized Mittag-Leffler-[Mittag-Leffler (1903), Wiman (1905)], the incomplete  $\Gamma$ - and the generalized regularized incomplete  $\Gamma$ -function [Wolfram (2022)], we may easily obtain an analytical

estimate for the influence  $I(\alpha)$  of the higher order derivative contributions. We calculate the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients  $c_j$ :

$$I(\alpha) = \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \left| \binom{\alpha}{j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+j)} \right| \quad (103)$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j \binom{\alpha}{j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+j)} - c_0 - c_1 \quad (104)$$

$$= (-1)^\alpha Q(-\alpha, 0, -1) + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} - \frac{\alpha}{\Gamma(2-\alpha)} \quad (105)$$

Within the relevant region  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  this function is extremal at  $I(\alpha = 0.58) \approx 0.12$ , while  $|c_0| + |c_1| \approx 1$ . Therefore we obtain the result, that the contribution of higher order integer derivatives beyond  $j = 1$  is about 10% of the  $j = 0, 1$  part. Of course, nothing is said about the higher order function derivatives  $f^{(j>1)}$  and their influence on the total fractional derivative  $f^{(\alpha)}$ . In addition, our derivation is restricted to the close vicinity of  $R_0$  which once again shows the limitations of a local approach.

Therefore we may deduce, that in the case of classical Woods-Saxon type functions, which fulfill the requirements (79) and (80) the classical approach to generate the absorption part of the optical potential as a superposition of the original function and its first derivative may be considered as the lowest order local approximation to an a priori non-local problem, the smooth transition from surface to volume absorption.

The fractional derivative approach automatically implies a non-local view to the same problem and offers a consistent solution.

It may indeed be considered sheer luck, that the practical differences of both approaches turn out to be small in the cases considered so far.

## 9. Conclusion

The optical model plays a fundamental role to interpret scattering data in nuclear and particle physics. In order to conform with experimental findings, the absorption process may be understood assuming a smooth transition from surface to volume absorption with increasing energy of the incident particle.

In this paper we proposed a new and as we think only appropriate treatment of this problem.

Based on the observation, that a surface may be considered as a more or less drastic change of a given density and the fact, that such a change may be described using methods of vector calculus we introduced a fractional gradient definition based on methods developed in fractional calculus, which allows to determine the required smooth transition from volume to surface potentials.

We derived closed form solutions for the practically important cases of Woods-Saxon and Woods-Saxon-plus-damped-oscillation functions in terms of higher order transcendental functions namely poly-logarithms.

We applied these new fractional potentials to macroscopic and semi-microscopic non-local models and found, that non-local effects, which are a natural property of the fractional approach, are nicely reproduced.

We finally presented arguments, that the hitherto accepted classical solution, which is a simple superposition of a Woods-Saxon function and its derivative may be considered as the lowest order local approximation to the full non-local problem, which



in our opinion can only be formulated adequately within the framework of fractional calculus.

On the other hand, this paper is also a lesson how progress in physics evolves. More than 60 years ago, a first solution for optical absorption potentials has been proposed, which since then has been used to categorize and interpret experimental data. Since then, this problem was considered as solved and consequently there was no demand for a more sophisticated solution nor a different vista.

Now a new viewpoint based on fractional calculus leads to new insights and surprising interrelations on this classical field of research.

## 10. Acknowledgments

We thank A. Friedrich for her support and useful discussions. Numerical calculations were partly performed on the  $\pi$ -dron-cluster at the HPC testing facilities at gigahedron, Germany.

## 11. Bibliography

- [Abbot *et al* (2017)] Abbot, LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration (2017). *GW170817: Observation of gravitational waves from a binary neutron star inspiral* Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 161101,
- [Aleksandrov *et al* (2022)] Aleksandrov, I. A. Di Piazza, A. and Plunien, G. and Shabaev, V. M. (1977). *Stimulated vacuum emission and photon absorption in strong electromagnetic fields* Phys. Rev. D. **105**, 116005, 13pp.
- [Altarelli and Parisi (1977)] Altarelli, G. and Parisi, G. (1977). *Asymptotic freedom in parton language* Nucl. Phys. **126**, 298–318,
- [Bacon (1267)] Bacon, R. (1267) *Opus majus* Translated by Robert Belle Burke, Cambridge Library Collection - Physical Sciences, Cambridge University Press (2010)
- [Bauge *et al* (1998)] Bauge, E., Delaroche, J. P. and Girod, M. (1998). *Semimicroscopic nucleon-nucleus spherical optical model for nuclei with  $A > 40$  at energies up to 200 MeV* Phys. Rev. C **58**, 1118–1145,
- [Bauge *et al* (2001)] Bauge, E., Delaroche, J. P. and Girod, M. (2001). *Lane-consistent, semi microscopic nucleon-nucleus optical model* Phys. Rev. C **63**, 024607,
- [Bauge (2001)] Bauge, E., Delaroche, J. P. and Girod, M. (2001). *The MOM semi microscopic optical model potential program* Phys. Rev. C **63**, 024607,
- [Becchetti and Greenlees (1969)] Becchetti, F. D. and Greenlees, G. W. (1969). *Nucleon-nucleus optical-model parameters,  $A > 40$ ,  $E < 50$  MeV* Phys. Rev. **182**, 1190–1209,
- [Becquerel (1896)] Becquerel, H. (1896). *Sur les proprietés différentes des radiations invisibles émises par les sels d'uranium* Compt. Rendus. T. **122**, 689–694,
- [Berger *et al* (1991)] Berger, J. F., Girod, M. and Gogny, D. M. (1991). *Time-dependent quantum collective dynamics applied to nuclear fission* Comp. Phys. Comm. **63**, 365–374,
- [Bethe (1940)] Bethe, H. A. (1940). *A continuum theory of the compound nucleus* Phys. Rev. **57**, 1125–1144,
- [Bragg and Kleeman (1904)] Bragg, W. H. and Kleeman, R. (1904). *On the ionization curves of radium* Philos. Mag. **8:48**, 726–738,
- [Bragg and Kleeman (1905)] Bragg, W. H. and Kleeman, R. (1905). *On the  $\alpha$  particles of radium, and their loss of range in passing through various atoms and molecules* Philos. Mag. **10:57**, 318–340,
- [Capote *et al* (2009)] Capote, R., Herman, M., Obložinský, P., Young, P. G., Goriely, S., Belgya, T., Ignatyuk, A. V., Koning, A. J., Hilaire, S., Plujko, V. A., Avrigeanu, M., Bersillon, O., Chadwick, M. B., Fukahori, T., Ge, Z., Han, Y., Kailas, S., Kopecky, J., Maslov, V. M., Reffo, G., Sin, M., Soukhovitskii, E. Sh. and Talou, P. (2009). *RIPL - Reference input parameter library for calculations of nuclear reactions and nuclear data evaluations* Nucl. Data Sheets **110** 3107–3214 , Special Issue on Nuclear Reaction Data,
- [Costin and Garoufalidis (2007)] Costin, O. and Garoufalidis, S. (2007). *Resurgence of the fractional polylogarithms* arXiv:math/0701743v4 [math.CA]

- [Dechargè and Gogny (1980)] Dechargè, J. and Gogny, D. (1980). *Hartree-Fock-Bogolyubov calculations with the D1 effective interaction on spherical nuclei* Phys. Rev. C **21**, 1568–1593,
- [Dingle (1957)] Dingle, R. B. (1957) *The Fermi-Dirac integrals*  $\mathcal{F}_p(\eta) = (p!)^{-1} \int_0^{\infty} \varepsilon^p (e^{\varepsilon - \eta} + 1)^{-1} d\varepsilon$   
Applied Scientific Research **6** 225–239,
- [Dirac (1984)] Dirac, P. A. M. (1984) *The requirements of fundamental physical theory* Eur. J. Phys. **5** 65–67,
- [Ehrenfest (1927)] Ehrenfest, P. (1927) *Bemerkung über die angenäherte Gültigkeit der klassischen Mechanik innerhalb der Quantenmechanik* Z. Phys. **45** 455–457,
- [Fermi (1934)] Fermi, E. (1934) *Possible production of elements of atomic number higher than 92* Nature **133** 898–899,
- [Fermi (1954)] Fermi, L. (1954) *Atoms in the family: My life with Enrico Fermi*, University of Chicago Press, ISBN 0-88318-524-5
- [Flerov and Petrzhak (1940)] Flerov, G. N. and Petrzhak, K. A. (1940) *Spontaneous fission of uranium* J. Phys. **3** 275–280
- [Geiger and Marsden (1909)] Geiger, H. and Marsden, E. (1909). *On a diffuse reflection of the  $\alpha$ -particles* Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **82**, 495–500,
- [Goldschmidt *et al* (2015)] Goldschmidt, A., Qiu, Z., Shen, C and Heinz, U. (2015). *Collision geometry and flow in uranium + uranium collisions* Phys. Rev. C **92**, 044903,
- [Gomes (1959)] Gomes, L. (1959). *Imaginary part of the optical potential* Phys. Rev. C **116**, 1226–1229,
- [Gonzales and Woods (2018)] Gonzales, R. C. and Woods, R. E. (2018). *Digital image processing. 4<sup>th</sup> edition* Pearson, Harlow, England
- [Hahn and Straßmann (1939)] Hahn, O. and Straßmann, F. (1939) *Über den Nachweis und das Verhalten der bei der Bestrahlung des Urans mittels Neutronen entstehenden Erdalkalimetalle* Die Naturwissenschaften **27** 11–15,
- [Hilfer (2000)] Hilfer, R. (2000) *Applications of fractional calculus in physics* World Scientific Publ., Singapore
- [Hodgson (1967)] Hodgson, P. E. (1967). *The optical model of the nucleon-nucleus interaction* Annu. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **17**, 1–32,
- [Hofstatter (1956)] Hofstatter, R. (1956). *Electron scattering and nuclear structure* Rev. Mod. Phys. **28**, 214–254,
- [Hossenfelder (2018)] Hossenfelder, S. (2018). *Lost in math: How beauty leads physics astray* Rev. Mod. Phys. **28**, 214–254,
- [Joliot and Curie (1934)] Joliot, F. and Curie, I. (1934). *Artificial production of a new kind of radioelement* Nature **133**, 201–202,
- [Jones (1963)] Jones, P. B. (1963). *The optical model in nuclear and particle physics* Interscience Tracts on Physics and Astronomy, **14**, Wiley and Sons, New York, London
- [Koning and Delaroche (2003)] Koning, A. J. and Delaroche, J-P. (2003). *Local and global nucleon optical models from 1 keV to 200 MeV* Nucl. Phys. **713**, 231–310,
- [Liouville (1832)] Liouville, J. (1832) *Sur le calcul des différentielles à indices quelconques* J. École Polytechnique **13** 1–162,
- [Meitner and Fritsch (1939)] Meitner, L. and Fritsch, O. R. (1939) *Disintegration of uranium by neutrons: A new type of nuclear reaction* Nature **143** 239–240,
- [Mellin (1897)] Mellin, H. (1897) *Über hypergeometrische Reihen höherer Ordnungen* ex Officiina typographica Societatis litterariae fennicae **23**(7) 10pp, Helsingfors, Finland
- [Mittag-Leffler (1903)] Mittag-Leffler, M. G. (1903) *Sur la nouvelle fonction  $E_\alpha(x)$*  Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris **137** 554–558.
- [Mueller *et al* (2011)] Mueller, J. M. *et al* (2011) *Asymmetry dependence of nucleon correlations in spherical nuclei extracted from a dispersive-optical-model analysis* Phys. Rev. C **83** 064605, 32pp.,
- [Oganessian *et al* (2004)] Oganessian, Yu. Ts. *et al* (2004) *Measurements of cross sections for the fusion-evaporation reactions Pu-244 (Ca-48,xn) (292-x)114 and Cm-245 (Ca-48,xn) (293-x)116* Phys. Rev. C **69** 054607,
- [Oldham and Spanier (1974)] Oldham, K. B. and Spanier, J. (1974) *The fractional calculus* Academic Press, New York
- [Oppenheimer and Volkoff (1939)] Oppenheimer, J. R. and Volkoff, G. M. (1939) *On massive neutron cores* Phys. Rev. **55** 374–381,
- [Ostrowsky *et al* (1936)] Ostrowsky, M, Breit, G. and Johnson, D. P. (1936). *The excitation function of lithium under proton bombardment* Phys. Rev. **49**, 22–34,
- [Pauli (1927)] Pauli, W. (1927). *Über Gasentartung und Paramagnetismus* Z. Phys. A **41**, 81–102,

- [Rafelski and Müller (1982)] Rafelski, J. and Müller (1982). *Strangeness production in the quark-gluon plasma* Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**,1066–1069,
- [Rafelski and Müller (1986)] Rafelski, J. and Müller (1986). *Erratum: strangeness production in the quark-gluon plasma* Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2334,
- [Rapaport *et al* (1986)] Rapaport, J. , Kulkarni, V. and Finlay, R. W. (1979). *A global optical-model analysis of neutron elastic scattering data* Nucl. Phys. **A330**, 15–28,
- [Reinhardt and Greiner (1977)] Reinhardt, J. and Greiner, W. (1977). *Quantum electrodynamics of strong fields* Rep. Prog. Phys. **40**, 219–295,
- [Reinhardt *et al* (1981)] Reinhardt, J. , Müller, B. and Greiner, W. (1981). *Theory of positron production in heavy-ion collisions* Phys. Rev. A **24**, 103–128,
- [Riemann (1847)] Riemann, B. (1847) *Versuch einer allgemeinen Auffassung der Integration und Differentiation* in: Weber, H. and Dedekind, R. (Eds.) (1892) *Bernhard Riemann's gesammelte mathematische Werke und wissenschaftlicher Nachlass* Teubner, Leipzig, reprinted in *Collected works of Bernhard Riemann* Dover Publications (1953) 353–366
- [Rose and Jones (1984)] Rose, H. J. and Jones, G. A. (1984) *A new kind of natural radioactivity* Nature **307** 245–247,
- [Rutherford (1911)] Rutherford, R. (1911). *The scattering of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  particles by matter and the structure of the atom* The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science **21**, LXXIX., 669–688,
- [Rutherford (1919)] Rutherford, R. (1919). *Collision of  $\alpha$  particles with light atoms. IV. An anomalous effect in nitrogen* The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science **37**, LIV., 581–587,
- [Satchler and Love (1979)] Satchler, G. R. and Love, W. G. (1979). *Folding model potentials from realistic interactions for heavy-ion scattering* Phys. Rep. **55** 183–254,
- [Sommerfeld (1928)] Sommerfeld, A. (1928). *Zur Elektronentheorie der Metalle auf Grund der Fermischen Statistik* Z. Phys. A **47**, 1–32,
- [Tao (2022)] Tao, J. (2022). *Zeta annuities, fractional calculus, and polylogarithms* available at SSRN: [ssrn.com/abstract=4049283](https://ssrn.com/abstract=4049283)
- [Tarasov (2008)] Tarasov, V. E. (2008). *Fractional vector calculus and fractional Maxwell's equations* Annals of Physics **323**, 2756–2778
- [Tarasov (2016)] Tarasov, V. E. (2016). *Leibniz rule and fractional derivatives of power functions* J. Comput. Nonlinear Dynam., **11**, 031014, 4 pp.
- [Tarasov (2021)] Tarasov, V. E. (2021). *General fractional vector calculus* Mathematics, **9**, 2816
- [Thomson (1904)] Thomson, J. J. (1904). XXIV. *On the structure of the atom: an investigation of the stability and periods of oscillation of a number of corpuscles arranged at equal intervals around the circumference of a circle; with application of the results to the theory of atomic structure* Philosophical Magazine Series 6, **7** **39**, 237–265
- [Tooper (2021)] Tooper, R. F. (1969). *On the equation of state of a relativistic Fermi-Dirac as at high temperatures* APJ, **156**, 1075–1100
- [Varner *et al* (1991)] Varner, R. L., Thompson, W. J, McAbee, T. L. Ludwig, E. J. and Clegg, T. B, (1991) *A global nucleon optical model potential* Phys. Rep. **201** 57–119,
- [Walter and Guss (1986)] Walter, R. L and Guss, P. P, (1986) *A global optical model for neutron scattering for  $A > 53$  and  $10 < E < 80$  MeV* Proc. Int. Conf. on Nuclear Data for Basic and Applied Sciences, Santa Fe, N.M., U.S.A., Gordon and Breach, p.1079
- [Wilson (1946)] Wilson, R. R., (1946) *Radiological use of fast protons* Radiology **47:5** 487–491,
- [Wiman (1905)] Wiman, A. (1905) *Über den Fundamentalsatz in der Theorie der Funktionen  $E_a(x)$*  Acta Math. **29** 191–201,
- [Wolfram (2022)] Wolfram, S. (2022) *Wolfram Mathematica documentation center*
- [Wood (1992)] Wood, D. C. (1992). *The computation of polylogarithms*, Technical Report 15-92, Canterbury, UK: University of Kent Computing Laboratory
- [Woods *et al* (1982)] Woods, C. L., Brown, B. A. and Jelley, N. A. (1982). *A comparison of Woods-Saxon and double-folding potentials for lithium scattering from light target nuclei* J. Phys. G.: Nucl. Phys. **8**, 1699–1719,
- [Woods and Saxon (1954)] Woods, R. D. and Saxon, D. S. (1954). *Diffuse surface optical model for nucleon-nuclei scattering* Phys. Rev. **95**, 577–578
- [Wolt (2017)] Wolt, P. (2017) *Not even wrong: The failure of string theory and the search for unity in physical law*, Basic Books, NY
- [Xu *et al* (2016)] Xu, C. , Yan, Y. and Shi, Z. (2016). *Euler sums and integrals of polylogarithm functions* J. Num. Th. **165**, 84–108