

Reply to the "Comments to the paper "Detailed study of the astrophysical direct capture reaction ${}^6\text{Li}(p, \gamma){}^7\text{Be}$ in a potential model approach" " by S.B. Dubovichenko, A.S. Tkachenko, R. Ya. Kezerashvili, arXiv:2401.04281 (2024)

E.M. Tursunov,^{1,2,*} S.A. Turakulov,^{1,†} and K.I. Tursunmakhatov^{3,‡}

¹*Institute of Nuclear Physics, Academy of Sciences,
100214, Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

²*National University of Uzbekistan, 100174 Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

³*Gulistan State University, 120100, Gulistan, Uzbekistan*

Abstract

The differences in potential models used in our work and in the original paper of the authors of the Comment are discussed. The neglecting of simple rules of reaction calculations is shown as a possible origin of the defect in the temperature dependence of the reaction rates in the work of the authors of the Comment.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Ef,12.39.Fe,12.39.Ki

* tursune@inp.uz

† turakulov@inp.uz

‡ tursunmahatovkahramon@gmail.com

As the authors of the original paper "Detailed study of the astrophysical direct capture reaction ${}^6\text{Li}(p,\gamma){}^7\text{Be}$ in a potential model approach" published in Ref. [1] we confirm that there are several points in the Comments which should be taken into the consideration.

Firstly, the Gaussian potentials are widely used by many authors in nuclear, atomic, and particle physics. In nuclear physics, the most famous $\alpha - \alpha$ potential was published a long time ago in Ref. [2]. The authors of the Comment stated that the $p + {}^6\text{Li}$ potentials in Ref. [1] are slightly modified versions of their original potentials from Ref. [3]. However, as can be found in Ref. [1], the parameters of the Gaussian potentials in the most important initial S -wave and final P -wave states have been adjusted to the experimental data, deduced from recent research collaboration reports.

The S -wave Gaussian potential of Ref. [1] with parameters $V_0 = -52.0$ MeV and $\alpha_0 = 0.297$ fm $^{-2}$ were adjusted to reproduce the low-energy astrophysical S-factor of the LUNA collaboration published in Ref. [4]. This potential additionally reproduces the experimental phase shifts at low energies of Ref. [5]. On the other hand, the parameters of the S -wave potential of Ref. [3] are different: $V_0 = -58.0$ MeV and $\alpha_0 = 0.4$ fm $^{-2}$. The most important point here is that these potentials yield quite different S -wave scattering lengths, $a_{01} = 10.01$ fm of Ref. [1] and $a_{01} = 11.45$ fm of Ref. [3]. Since the S -wave scattering cross-section at low energies is defined by the square of the scattering length, the above potentials differ by about 30% in the description of the scattering cross-section. The parameters of the final state ${}^2P_{3/2}$ -wave ($V_0 = -76.6277$ MeV, $\alpha_0 = 0.175$ fm $^{-2}$) and ${}^2P_{1/2}$ -wave ($V_0 = -74.8169$ MeV, $\alpha_0 = 0.1731$ fm $^{-2}$) potentials of Ref. [1] have been adjusted to new central empirical squared ANC values of 4.81 fm $^{-1}$ and 4.29 fm $^{-1}$ from Ref. [6] for the ${}^7\text{Be}(3/2^-)$ ground and ${}^7\text{Be}(1/2^-)$ excited bound states, respectively. The closest versions (2 and 5) of the potential model of Ref. [3] yield the corresponding estimates of 5.1076 fm $^{-1}$ and 4.6656 fm $^{-1}$, respectively. Since the astrophysical S-factor is defined by the square of the ANC, one can easily find that the differences in the corresponding values of Ref. [1] and Ref. [3] are of order 20%.

Another important point is that the correct description of the direct LUNA data for the astrophysical S -factor and empirical reaction rates requires a reproduction of both absolute values and energy dependence of the S -factor and temperature dependence of the reaction rates. A reproduction of the temperature dependence means that the theoretical curve should be parallel to the empirical curve. Although the theoretical curve of Ref. [3] lies close to the empirical reaction rates of the LUNA collaboration inside the error bar, they are not

parallel each to other. A possible reason could be the neglecting of simple rules of reaction calculations in Ref. [3]. Namely, the authors use the atomic mass units, $m_p=1.00727647$ amu, $m(^6\text{Li})=6.01347746$ amu for the calculations of the astrophysical S -factor and the reaction rates. However, they put $\hbar^2/m_0 = 41.4686$ MeV fm² instead of $\hbar^2/m_0 = 41.8016$ MeV fm², which is not consistent with the chosen system of units. Our calculations show that such a drawback seriously affects the final results for the astrophysical S -factor and reaction rates.

- [1] E.M. Tursunov, S.A. Turakulov, and K.I. Tursunmakhatov, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 065801 (2023).
- [2] B. Buck, H. Friedrich, and C. Wheatley, *Nucl. Phys. A* **275**, 246 (1977).
- [3] S.B. Dubovichenko, A.S. Tkachenko, R.Y. Kezerashvili, N.A. Burkova, and A.V. Dzhazairov-Kakhramanov, *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, 065806 (2022).
- [4] LUNA Collaboration (D. Piatti, T. Chillery, R. Depalo, M. Aliotta, D. Bemmerer, A. Best, A. Boeltzig, C. Brogini, C.G. Bruno, A. Caciolli *et al.*), *Phys. Rev. C* **102**, 052802(R) (2020).
- [5] M. Skill, R. Baumann, G. Keil *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. A* **581**, 93 (1995).
- [6] G.G. Kiss, M. La Cognata, R. Yarmukhamedov, K.I. Tursunmakhatov, I. Wiedenhöver, L. T. Baby, S. Cherubini, A. Cvetinović, G. D'Agata, P. Figuera *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **104**, 015807 (2021).