

Reaction of deuteron with a heavy nucleus at low energies

Pankaj Jain^{1*}, Harishyam Kumar^{2†} and K. Ramkumar^{2‡}

¹ Department of Space, Planetary and Astronomical Sciences & Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, 208016, India

² Physics Department, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, 208016, India

July 23, 2024

Abstract

We extend the recently proposed mechanism for inducing low energy nuclear reactions (LENR) to compute the reaction rate of deuteron with a heavy nucleus. The process gets dominant contribution at second order in the time dependent perturbation theory and is assisted by a resonance. The reaction proceeds by breakdown of deuteron into a proton and a neutron due to the action of the first perturbation. In the second, nuclear perturbation, the neutron gets captured by the heavy nucleus. Both perturbations are assumed to be electromagnetic and lead to emission of two photons, one at each vertex. The heavy nucleus is taken to be ^{58}Ni although many other may be considered. The reaction rate is found to be very small unless assisted by some special conditions. In the present case we assume the presence of a nuclear resonant state. In the presence of such a state we find that the reaction rate is sufficiently large to be observable in laboratory even at low energies.

1 Introduction

Nuclear fusion are expected to be strongly suppressed at low energies due to the Coulomb barrier [1]. However, there exists considerable experimental evidence that such reactions may occur at observable rates even at very low energies [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. The current status is reviewed in [8, 9, 10, 11]. Theoretically, there have been many attempts to explain these processes in terms of electron screening [12, 13, 14], correlated states [15, 16], electroweak interactions [17], formation of clusters of nuclear particles [18], relativistic electrons in deep orbits [19] and phonon induced reactions [20]. A critical review of many claims in this field is provided in [21].

It has been proposed that there exist additional processes which open up at second order in the perturbation theory for which the rate may be significant even at low energies. [22, 23, 24, 25]. These reactions are different from the standard first order fusion process which is heavily

*pkjain@iitk.ac.in

†hari@iitk.ac.in

‡kaanapuliramkumar08@gmail.com

suppressed [1]. The basic idea is that the reaction proceeds due to two interactions with widely different distance scales. The first perturbation causes the system to go into a state which is a linear superposition of all eigenstates of the unperturbed Hamiltonian. Due to the presence of eigenstates of relatively high energy, it is possible that the Coulomb barrier may not be a very serious issue. Although the amplitude for such high energy eigenstates is suppressed, the suppression may not be as strong as that due to the Coulomb barrier. The resulting amplitude gets contribution from relatively large atomic scale distances and we refer to it as the molecular matrix element. The second perturbation leads to the nuclear transition and gets contribution from small distances. We refer to it as the nuclear matrix element.

We applied this formalism explicitly to the process involving fusion of proton with deuteron to form helium nucleus with $A = 3$ [23, 24]. The perturbation was assumed to be electromagnetic leading to either emission or absorption of photons. The dominant process was found to be the one in which two photons are spontaneously emitted. The rate was found to be very small in free space due to cancellation among different eigenstates contributing to the intermediate state. Similar phenomenon is seen for other low energy nuclear processes [26, 27, 28]. However it was argued that in a medium, under special conditions, the rate may be significant and observable [23, 24, 25, 26, 28]. This mechanism has also been used to provide the theoretical explanation for the experimentally observed low energy reaction of Palladium with Deuteron in medium to produce Silver and neutron [29].

It has recently been shown that the rate may be substantial, even in free space, in the presence of a resonance [27]. In this paper we considered the reaction in which an incident proton converts into a neutron through weak interactions and the neutron gets absorbed by a heavy nucleus emitting a photon. We applied this explicitly to the case of nickel nucleus with $A=58$ which has a resonance at 7 keV with width of approximately 7 eV. The rate for this process was found to be relatively large and observable. Here we extend this mechanism to another process involving fusion of deuteron ${}^2\text{H}$ and a heavy nucleus ${}^A\text{X}$ of atomic number Z and atomic mass A . The process we shall consider is the following:



where Y may consist of a wide range of final states. In this paper we shall confine ourselves to a particular process in which the final state involves two photons. In this case,

$$Y = \gamma(\omega_1) + \gamma(\omega_2). \quad (2)$$

and both perturbations are electromagnetic.

Within the framework of the second order perturbation theory, the reaction proceeds in two steps. Due to the action of the first perturbation, the deuteron forms an intermediate state with emission of a photon and a proton. We refer to this as the first vertex, as shown in Fig. 1. The second perturbation leads to capture of neutron by the nucleus ${}^A\text{X}$ with emission of another photon. We refer to this as the second vertex. We point out that the photon with frequency ω_1 can also be emitted from the second vertex and that with frequency ω_2 from the first vertex. The intermediate state, formed after the action of the first perturbation, involves superposition of all eigenstates of the unperturbed Hamiltonian. The ${}^2\text{H}$ is initially in the ground state. The next state available is the one in which the neutron and the proton are barely free. This state




Figure 1: Schematic illustration of the reaction described in Eq. 1.

corresponds to zero kinetic energies for both of these particles. In the second order perturbation theory we need to sum over all intermediate eigenstates, up to infinite energy.

2 Deuteron-X fusion at second order in perturbation theory

The Hamiltonian of the system is given by

$$H = H_0 + H_I \quad (3)$$

where H_0 denote the unperturbed Hamiltonian and H_I is a time dependent perturbation. The unperturbed part contains the kinetic energy terms and screened Coulomb and nuclear potentials. We assume a simple spherical well model for the neutron-proton nuclear potential. Hence for small separations, the potential experienced by the neutron-proton system is given by

$$V_{pn} = -V_0 \quad (4)$$

for $r < r_0$ and $V_{pn} = 0$ for larger distances. Here we set $V_0 = 34.6$ MeV and $r_0 = 2.066$ fm which leads to the deuteron bound state of correct binding energy. For the nuclear potential of the X nucleus we use the shell model potential, same as that used in [27],

$$V_X = -\frac{V_0}{1 + \exp[(r - R_X)/a_X]} \quad (5)$$

where, $V_0 = 50$ MeV, $a_X = 0.524$ fm and $R_X = 1.25A^{1/3}$ [30]. This leads to the nickel 2p state at energy of -9.2 MeV, in good agreement with the observed value of -9 MeV for ^{59}Ni .

We denote the coordinates of proton, neutron and the X nucleus by \vec{r}_1 , \vec{r}_2 and \vec{r}_X respectively. We define the relative coordinate $\vec{r} = \vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1$ and denote the center of mass coordinate of the proton-neutron system by \vec{R}_{cm} . The overall center of mass coordinate of the three particle system is denoted by \vec{R}'_{cm} . The initial state wave function can be expressed as

$$\Psi_i = \Psi_{cm}(\vec{R}'_{cm})\psi_D(\vec{r}, \vec{R}_{cm}) \quad (6)$$

where $\Psi_{cm}(\vec{R}'_{cm})$ is the overall center of mass wave function and ψ_D is the deuteron wave function. We assume that in the initial state the deuteron and X atoms form a molecular bound state. We may express the deuteron wave function as

$$\psi_D(\vec{R}_{cm}, \vec{r}) = \psi_i(\vec{R}_{cm})\chi_D(r) = \psi_i(\vec{R}_{cm})\frac{u_D(r)}{\sqrt{4\pi}r} \quad (7)$$

where $\chi_D(r)$ is the deuteron nuclear ground state wave function corresponding to $l = 0$ and ψ_i is the molecular bound state wave function of the deuteron-X system. We shall assume that the molecular wave function ψ_i is spherically symmetric. The nucleus X is assumed to be very heavy and we ignore its recoil, which is expected to be a good approximation. We point out that the overall center of mass motion does not add any essential detail to the calculation and only impose overall momentum conservation.

The interaction Hamiltonian [31, 32] is given by

$$H_I(t) = \sum_i \frac{Z_i e}{cm_i} \vec{A}(\vec{r}_i, t) \cdot \vec{p}_i \quad (8)$$

where Z_i , m_i , \vec{r}_i and \vec{p}_i are respectively the charge, mass, position vector and momentum vector of the particle i . The electromagnetic field operator $\vec{A}(\vec{r}, t)$ is given by

$$\vec{A}(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\vec{k}} \sum_{\beta} c \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\omega}} \left[a_{\vec{k},\beta}(t) \vec{\epsilon}_{\beta} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}} + a_{\vec{k},\beta}^{\dagger}(t) \vec{\epsilon}_{\beta}^* e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}} \right] \quad (9)$$

The leading order contribution to the process in Eq. 1 with Y given by Eq. 2 is obtained at second order in the time dependent perturbation theory. Let the wave vectors of the two emitted photons be \vec{k}_1 and \vec{k}_2 and their frequencies ω_1 and ω_2 respectively. The transition amplitude at this order can be expressed as,

$$\langle f|T(t_0, t)|i\rangle = \left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}\right)^2 \sum_{E_n} \int_{t_0}^t dt' e^{i(E_f - E_n)t'/\hbar} \langle f|H_I(t')|n\rangle \int_{t_0}^{t'} dt'' e^{i(E_p + E_n - E_i)t''/\hbar} \langle pn|H_I(t'')|i\rangle. \quad (10)$$

where the sum is over the intermediate neutron states. Here $|pn\rangle$ denotes the intermediate state proton and neutron wave function with E_p , E_n being the energies of the proton and neutron states respectively produced at the first vertex.

2.1 Molecular Matrix Element

Let us first consider the transition from initial to intermediate state which we refer to as the molecular matrix element. We note that in the sum over i in Eq. 8 only the proton contributes while computing the matrix element in the integral over t'' . Either of the two photons can emerge from this interaction leading to two amplitudes. Let us first write to the amplitude corresponding to emission of photon with frequency ω_1 . The t'' integral then gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^{t'} dt'' e^{i(E_p + E_n - E_i)t''/\hbar} \langle pn|H_I(t'')|i\rangle &= -\frac{ie\hbar}{m_p} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\omega_1 V}} \langle pn|\vec{\epsilon}_{\beta}^* \cdot \vec{p}_1|i\rangle \\ &\times \frac{e^{i(E_p + E_n - E_i + \hbar\omega_1)t'/\hbar}}{E_p + E_n - E_i + \hbar\omega_1} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where we have dropped the term depending on the arbitrary initial time t_0 which is expected to give negligible contribution [31, 32]. The matrix element can be written as [32]

$$\langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{p}_1 | i \rangle = \frac{im_1}{\hbar} (E_p + E_n - E_i) \langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{r}_1 | i \rangle \quad (12)$$

We next express \vec{r}_1 as

$$\vec{r}_1 = \vec{R}_{cm} - \frac{m_2}{M} \vec{r} \quad (13)$$

where $M = m_1 + m_2$, with $m_1 = m_p$ and $m_2 = m_n$. Let us assume that the R_{cm} dependence of the wave function is given by,

$$\psi_i = \frac{N_{cm}}{\sqrt{4\pi}} e^{-(R_{cm}-R_0)^2/\Delta^2} \quad (14)$$

where N_{cm} is the normalization factor. This is essentially the molecular bound state wave function of the D-X system and is controlled by the molecular potential. Here we directly assume the form of the wave function, applicable at R_{cm} larger than roughly 1 atomic units. For smaller R_{cm} values the form will be modified by the Coulomb repulsion and at nuclear distances by the nuclear potential. However, this region contributes negligibly to the molecular matrix element and hence the difference can be ignored. The assumed form is convenient since it allows analytic calculations. A more realistic form is expected to have a similar behavior and hence will not lead to substantially different results. We consider values of R_0 and Δ roughly equal to 3.5 and 0.3 in atomic units, which are reasonable for a molecular bound state. Note that with these values the wave function is heavily suppressed for distances smaller than about 1 atomic unit.

The matrix element on the right hand side of Eq. 12 can now be computed by solving the Schrodinger equation to obtain all eigenstates of the proton neutron system in terms of the relative coordinate \vec{r} . Here the initial state is the ground state, i.e. the deuteron. We ignore the $l = 2$ component of deuteron and set $l = 0$, where l is the orbital quantum number. Hence the initial state has quantum numbers $S = 1$, $l = 0$ and $j = 1$. The dominant contribution from the intermediate state is obtained with orbital quantum number $l = 1$. Hence, with $S = 1$ we can have $j = 0, 1, 2$.

Let us consider the initial state with $m = 1$ where $\langle j_z \rangle = \hbar m$. The spin part of the wave function is not affected in the entire process. Hence both the proton and neutron have spin up for the entire process and here we focus entirely on the space part of the wave function. Let us choose the photon momentum \vec{k}_1 such that,

$$\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} = k_{\gamma 1} (\cos \theta_{\gamma 1} \hat{z} + \sin \theta_{\gamma 1} (\cos \phi_{\gamma 1} \hat{x} + \sin \phi_{\gamma 1} \hat{y})) \quad (15)$$

The two polarization vectors of this photon can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\epsilon}_{1a} &= -\sin \theta_{\gamma 1} \hat{z} + \cos \theta_{\gamma 1} (\cos \phi_{\gamma 1} \hat{x} + \sin \phi_{\gamma 1} \hat{y}) \\ \vec{\epsilon}_{1b} &= -\sin \phi_{\gamma 1} \hat{x} + \cos \phi_{\gamma 1} \hat{y} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here we consider only the polarization vector $\vec{\epsilon}_{1a}$. The other polarization will add incoherently and can only enhance the computed result. We can express the matrix element as

$$\langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{r}_1 | i \rangle = \int \int d^3 r d^3 R_{cm} \Psi_{pn}^* (\vec{r}, \vec{R}) \vec{\epsilon}_{1a}^* \cdot \vec{r}_1 e^{-i\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} \cdot \vec{r}_1} \psi_i (R_{cm}) \chi(r) \quad (17)$$

Here Ψ_{pn} is the intermediate state wave function of the proton-neutron system. It is a wave function of neutron and proton in the potential due to the X particle.

The wave function Ψ_{pn} is somewhat complicated and we make some simplifying assumptions. Let us first consider this wave function in the absence of the particle X . In this case the \vec{R}_{cm} dependence is expected to be a plane wave and we can express it as,

$$\Psi_{pn} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} e^{i\vec{k}_+ \cdot \vec{R}_{cm}} \chi_{pn}(\vec{r}) \quad (18)$$

where $\vec{k}_+ = \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2$ and \vec{k}_1 and \vec{k}_2 are the proton and neutron wave vectors respectively. The wave function χ_{pn} is the $l = 1$ proton-neutron wave function in the nuclear potential corresponding to $E > 0$. It depends on $\vec{k}_- = (\vec{k}_2 - \vec{k}_1)/2$ and we express it as,

$$\chi_{pn} = \frac{u_{pn}(r)}{r} \zeta(\hat{r}) \quad (19)$$

where the angular dependence is contained in $\zeta(\hat{r})$ and can be read off from $l = 1$ part of the plane wave expansion

$$e^{i\vec{k}_- \cdot \vec{r}} = 4\pi \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^l i^l j_l(k_- r) Y_l^m(\hat{r}) Y_l^{m*}(\hat{k}_-) \quad (20)$$

We point out that we are not explicitly displaying the spin part of the wave function since it does not play any role in our calculation. The wave function Ψ_{pn} gets modified due to the presence of the particle X and the factorized form assumed in Eq. 18 is not applicable. We are interested in the final state in which proton is free and neutron gets captured by X . Hence a reasonable approximation is to assume a plane wave form for the proton and determine the neutron wave function by using Schrodinger equation. For the molecular matrix element we require this wave function only at large distances from X , i.e. large R_{cm} . This is because the initial state wave function is strongly suppressed at small R_{cm} . Furthermore, the dominant contribution is obtained for very small values of the relative coordinate $r = |\vec{r}|$. Hence it is reasonable to assume following form of the wave function,

$$\Psi_{pn} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \psi_n(R_{cm}) e^{i\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{R}_{cm}} \chi_{pn}(\vec{r}) \quad (21)$$

Here, in the intermediate state ψ_n refers to the neutron wave function in the presence of the particle X . It depends on the variable \vec{r}_2 . However since only very small values of r contribute to molecular matrix element, it is reasonable to assume $\vec{r}_2 \approx \vec{R}_{cm}$. Similarly we have assumed $\vec{r}_1 \approx \vec{R}_{cm}$. The wave function ψ_n may be obtained by solving the Schrodinger equation for neutron in the presence of particle X . As we shall have seen in [27], a significant contribution is obtained only in the presence of a resonance in the nuclear matrix element. This is applicable as long as we assume free space wave functions at large distances. In order to include the contribution of resonance, here we directly model the phase shift in the wave function [27], as explained later in this section.

The matrix element can be written as

$$\langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{r}_1 | i \rangle = \langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{R}_{cm} | i \rangle - \frac{m_2}{M} \langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{r} | i \rangle \quad (22)$$

Let us first consider the matrix element corresponding to \vec{R}_{cm} . We have

$$\langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{R}_{cm} | i \rangle = \int \int d^3 r d^3 R_{cm} \Psi_{pn}^*(\vec{r}, \vec{R}) \vec{\epsilon}_{1a}^* \cdot \vec{R}_{cm} e^{-i\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} \cdot \vec{R}_{cm}} e^{i\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} \cdot \vec{r} m_2 / M} \psi_i(R_{cm}) \chi_D(r) \quad (23)$$

We get dominant contributions only from very small values of r , of the order of the deuteron radius. Hence the exponential factor involving r can be set to unity at leading order. The integral over r then involves a direct overlap between the deuteron bound state wave function and a free proton-neutron wave function corresponding to deuteron potential. This clearly vanishes and hence, to leading order, this matrix element is zero. We therefore focus on the second matrix element on the right hand side of Eq. 22 which involves \vec{r} . This matrix element can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle pn | \vec{\epsilon}_\beta^* \cdot \vec{r} | i \rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \int \int d^3 r d^3 R_{cm} \chi_{pn}^*(\vec{r}) e^{-i\vec{k}_+ \cdot \vec{R}_{cm}} \vec{\epsilon}_{1a}^* \cdot \vec{r} e^{-i\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} \cdot \vec{R}_{cm}} e^{i\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} \cdot \vec{r} m_2 / M} \psi_i(R_{cm}) \chi_D(r) \\ &= I_a I_b \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

$$I_a = \int d^3 r \chi_{pn}^*(\vec{r}) \vec{\epsilon}_{1a}^* \cdot \vec{r} e^{i\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} \cdot \vec{r} m_2 / M} \chi_D(r) \quad (25)$$

and

$$I_b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \int d^3 R_{cm} \psi_n^*(R_{cm}) e^{-i\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{R}_{cm}} e^{-i\vec{k}_{\gamma 1} \cdot \vec{R}_{cm}} \psi_i(R_{cm}) \quad (26)$$

The wave function χ_{pn} depends on the wave vector \vec{k}_- and is normalized to a plane wave. We denote the angular coordinates of \vec{k}_- as (θ_-, ϕ_-) . We get contributions from all the three components $l_z = -1, 0, 1$. Performing the angular integrals in I_a , we find that

$$I_a = \frac{1}{2} I_\Omega I'_a \quad (27)$$

where

$$I'_a = \int dr u_{pn}^*(r) r u_D(r) \quad (28)$$

and

$$I_\Omega = -\cos \theta_- \sin \theta_{\gamma 1} + \sin \theta_- \cos \theta_{\gamma 1} \cos(\phi_- - \phi_{\gamma 1}) \quad (29)$$

The radial integral in Eq. 27 gets dominant contribution from the leading order term proportional to j_1 and is approximately proportional k_- at low energies relevant to our calculation. The integral I_b can be expressed as,

$$I_b = \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{V} K} \int_0^\infty dR_{cm} u_n^*(R_{cm}) \sin(K R_{cm}) e^{-(R_{cm} - R_0^2)^2 / \Delta^2} \quad (30)$$

where $K = |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_{\gamma 1}|$ and we have expressed $\psi_n = u_n / R_{cm}$.

At large distances, the intermediate state neutron wave function can be written as

$$u_n(r_2) = \sin(k_2 r_2 + \delta(k_2)) \quad (31)$$

where $\delta(k_2)$ is the phase shift. Here we directly model the phase shift for the neutron-nickel system by taking guidance from the observed data. This system shows the first resonance at 7 keV which has a width of about 7 eV. We denote the value of k_n corresponding to the resonance as k_R . We are interested in a phase shift which accurately models this resonance. The standard expansion of the phase shift for $l = 0$ can be written as,

$$k \cot \delta = -a_1 + a_2 k^2 + \dots \quad (32)$$

We use the expansion up to k^6 and model the phase shift as,

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \delta &= \frac{-k_n}{\sqrt{k_n^2 + (a_1 - a_2 k_n^2)^2 (1 + b_1 k_n^2 + b_2 k_n^4)^2}} \\ \cos \delta &= \frac{(a_1 - a_2 k_n^2)(1 + b_1 k_n^2 + b_2 k_n^4)}{\sqrt{k_n^2 + (a_1 - a_2 k_n^2)^2 (1 + b_1 k_n^2 + b_2 k_n^4)^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Here we have isolated the factor $a_1 - a_2 k_n^2$ which leads to a resonance at $k_n = k_R = \sqrt{a_1/a_2}$. This is a generalization of the model used in [27] and allows us to properly model the height of the resonance. As expected, $\delta = 0$ in the limit k_n goes to zero. We can now directly choose the parameters a_1 , a_2 , b_1 and b_2 so that the phase shift is properly modelled at low energies, as explained later. The main assumption in this model is that the k_n dependence of the nuclear matrix element is dominated by the resonant term which is given by the denominator in Eq. 33.

Here, as well as [27], we are directly modelling the resonance in terms of the phase shift and not using a potential model. We may also consider some simple potential models to determine if they lead to a result which is not negligible. Here we consider a square well potential, with $V = -V_0$ for $r < r_0$ and $V = 0$ for $r \geq r_0$. In general this potential produces resonances with rather wide width which will lead to an amplitude close to zero. However, it is possible to find a resonance close to $E = 0$, with energy slightly larger than zero and with a relatively narrow width. Such a resonance exists, for example, for parameters, $V_0 = 30$ MeV and $r_0 = 2.19529 \times 10^{-4}$ atomic units (approximately 10 fm). The nuclear bound state energy for these parameters is found to be -22.2 MeV. We find many such parameter choices which allow presence of a low energy resonance. For such cases, we find a non-negligible contribution for small K of order unity. In our calculation we did not include the neutron bound states in the sum over intermediate states. However, these states are highly suppressed at large distances and will lead to extremely small molecular matrix elements. Hence, it is reasonable to neglect the contribution from such states. A more detailed investigation of potential models is postponed to future research.

2.2 Nuclear Matrix Element

We next consider the nuclear matrix element $\langle f | H_I(t') | n \rangle$. In this case, the intermediate state neutron undergoes fusion with the heavy nucleus. As for the case of free neutron, a wide range of processes associated with standard neutron capture can take place. Here we shall focus on the process with photon emission. The process is complicated since as the neutron interacts with the nucleus, it can interact with all the nucleons, leading to a change in the multiparticle wave function. Furthermore, the photon can be emitted by any one of the proton or neutron in

the system. Here we assume that we can treat the nucleus X as a single particle of charge Z_X . We take the emitted photon momentum to be $\vec{k}_{\gamma 2}$. Let the angular coordinates of this photon momentum be $(\theta_{\gamma 2}, \phi_{\gamma 2})$. We point out that we also need to add the amplitude for which photon one and two are interchanged, i.e. photons with frequencies ω_1 and ω_2 are emitted from second and first vertex in Fig. 1 respectively.

In order to proceed further we need to specify the final state eigenfunction. We take this state to be $l = 1, j = 3/2$ shell model state with one unpaired neutron in the outer most shell. As stated above we shall consider the state for which neutron has spin up and set $j_z = 3/2$. We point out that ^{58}Ni (spin 0) satisfies our requirements. It has 30 neutrons which means that it has two neutrons in the outermost $2p_{3/2}$ level. Adding one more neutron in the $l = 1$ level will lead to a total spin $3/2$ with $j_z = 3/2$. Using the square well potential (Eq. 5), we find that the energy eigenvalue of this state is 9.1 MeV in good agreement with the observed value. We point out that we can get transitions into other states also but this choice is convenient, as explained below. Furthermore the heavy nucleus need not be Ni. It would be interesting to consider other possibilities.

We perform the calculation by specializing to a particular polarization vector of the emitted photon with frequency ω_2 . This is taken to be

$$\vec{\epsilon}_{2b} = -\sin \phi_{\gamma 2} \hat{x} + \cos \phi_{\gamma 2} \hat{y} \quad (34)$$

The photon is emitted only by the particle X . We denote its position vector by \vec{r}_X . Let \vec{R}'_{cm} and \vec{r}' be respectively the center of mass and relative coordinate of the neutron- X system. The matrix element can be expressed as,

$$\langle f | H_I(t') | n \rangle = \frac{iZ_X e}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2V\omega_2}} e^{iE_{\gamma 2} t' / \hbar} (E_f - E_n) \langle f | \vec{\epsilon}_{2b}^* \cdot \vec{r}_X | n \rangle \quad (35)$$

where $|n\rangle$ represents the neutron intermediate state of energy E_n . We express \vec{r}_X in terms of the center of mass coordinate \vec{R}'_{cm} and relative coordinate \vec{r}' of the neutron- X system,

$$\vec{r}_X = \vec{R}'_{cm} - \frac{m_2}{M'} \vec{r}' \quad (36)$$

where $M' = m_X + m_2$ is the mass of the final state nucleus.

We first consider

$$\langle f | \vec{\epsilon}_{2b}^* \cdot \vec{R}'_{cm} | n \rangle = \int d^3 R'_{cm} d^3 r' \psi_f^*(\vec{r}') \psi_{f_c}^*(\vec{R}') \vec{\epsilon}_{2b}^* \cdot \vec{R}'_{cm} e^{-ik_{\gamma 2} [\vec{R}'_{cm} - \frac{m_2}{M'} \vec{r}']} \psi_{nX}(\vec{r}') \psi_{nXc}(\vec{R}') \quad (37)$$

Here ψ_{nX} and ψ_{nXc} are the intermediate state wave functions of the neutron- X . Similarly ψ_f and ψ_{f_c} are the final state wave functions. Let us consider the integral over r' . Since the final state wave function is significant only for very small values of r' , we can drop the \vec{r}' dependent term in the exponential to leading order. The integral then vanishes since the two \vec{r}' dependent wave functions are orthogonal to one another. We next consider the \vec{r}' dependent term. We obtain

$$\langle f | \vec{\epsilon}_{2b}^* \cdot \vec{r}' | n \rangle = \int d^3 R'_{cm} d^3 r' \psi_f^*(\vec{r}') \psi_{f_c}^*(\vec{R}') \vec{\epsilon}_{2b}^* \cdot \vec{r}' e^{-ik_{\gamma 2} [\vec{R}'_{cm} - \frac{m_2}{M'} \vec{r}']} \psi_{nX}(\vec{r}') \psi_{nXc}(\vec{R}') \quad (38)$$

Integration over the center of mass variable just imposes the overall momentum conservation and we focus on the relative variable. Again we can drop the \vec{r}' dependence in the exponential function. The state $\psi_f(\vec{r}')$ is the $l = 1$ state of the shell model nuclear wave function, as discussed above. The state ψ_{nX} is taken to the $l = 0$ state which gives dominant contribution for energies under consideration. Note that the neutron-proton system has $l = 1$. The neutron intermediate state can take all l values which can lead to $l = 1$ for the neutron-proton system. However the values $l \neq 0$ for the neutron state lead to very small amplitudes and can be neglected. The matrix element can be written as,

$$\langle f | \vec{\epsilon}_{2b}^* \cdot \vec{r}' | n \rangle = I'_\Omega I_f \quad (39)$$

where

$$I_f = \int dr' u_f^*(r') r' u_n(r') \quad (40)$$

and

$$I'_\Omega = i \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{3}} e^{-i\phi_{\gamma 2}} \quad (41)$$

Here we have expressed $\psi_f = Y_1^1(\hat{r}') u_f(r')/r'$ and $\psi_{nX} = Y_0^0 u_n(r')/r'$.

We estimate the nuclear matrix element I_f at $k_n = 0$ using the shell model potential for the wave functions given in Eq. 5. However to determine its dependence on k_n we directly use the model for the phase shift given in Eq. 33. We note that I_f is expected to be almost independent of k_n at low energies. At medium energies it has a mild dependence and shows dramatic change close to resonance. This is captured by the following overall factor in the wave function u_n at very small r' , corresponding to nuclear distances,

$$\frac{a_1}{\sqrt{k_n^2 + (a_1 - a_2 k_n^2)^2 (1 + b_1 k_n^2 + b_2 k_n^4)^2}} \quad (42)$$

which goes to unity in the limit $k_n \rightarrow 0$. This will lead to the proper behaviour of the standard neutron absorption cross section both at low energy and in the vicinity of the resonance. The parameters are taken to be $a_1 = 1.6 \times 10^4$, $a_2 = 1.2 \times 10^{-2}$, $b_1 = 0$ and $b_2 = 8.0 \times 10^{-11}$, which correctly model the observed resonance in neutron-nickel system and energy of 7 keV. Here we have set $b_1 = 0$ for simplicity. This parameter can be adjusted by making a more detailed fit to the observed neutron absorption cross section. Here we are only interested in the contribution from resonance and it is reasonable to set it to zero. We point out that the estimated value of I_f , using the shell model potential, leads to a good agreement of the standard neutron absorption cross section on ^{58}Ni with photon emission, which is found to be about 200 barns at incident energy of 10^{-5} eV.

3 Reaction Rate

We can express the transition matrix element as,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f | T(t, t_0) | i \rangle &= i \frac{e^2 Z_X m_2}{2\hbar^2 M' V} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\omega_1 \omega_2}} I'_\Omega \sum_n \int_{t_0}^t dt' e^{i(E_f - E_i + E_{\gamma 1} + E_{\gamma 2} + E_p)t'/\hbar} \\ &\times \sum_n I_f I_a I_b \frac{(E_f - E_n)(E_p + E_n - E_i)}{E_p + E_n - E_i + E_{\gamma 1}} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where $E_{\gamma_1} = \hbar\omega_1$ and $E_{\gamma_2} = \hbar\omega_2$. As mentioned earlier, we also need to add another amplitude in which the two photons are reversed. However, in most of the kinematic regime only one of the two amplitudes dominate and we can neglect the other. This is because we obtain dominant contribution from the neutron momentum k_n , and hence K , close to the resonant value. Since $\vec{K} = \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_{\gamma_1}$, for a fixed final state proton momentum, it is clear that we obtain dominant contribution from a narrow range of photon momentum \vec{k}_{γ_1} emerging from the first vertex. In other words, for any event, given the observed proton momentum, the photon momentum \vec{k}_{γ_1} is fixed within a narrow range, with the corresponding value of \vec{k}_{γ_2} being very different. Hence the second amplitude in which the photon with momentum \vec{k}_{γ_1} emerges from the second vertex will give negligible contribution and, for brevity, we neglect it. The sum over the intermediate neutron states can be computed by converting it into an integral $\int V d^3k_2/(2\pi)^3$.

The transition rate can now be expressed as

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = \frac{1}{\Delta T} \int \frac{V d^3k_p V d^3k_1 V d^3k_2}{(2\pi)^9} |\langle f | T(t_0, t) | i \rangle|^2 \quad (44)$$

where ΔT is the total time. The time integral in the transition matrix element is proportional to $\Delta T \delta(E_f - E_i + E_{\gamma_1} + E_{\gamma_2} + E_p)$. The reaction rate can now be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP}{dt} &= \frac{\alpha^2}{64\pi^5 \hbar^3 c^2} \left(\frac{Z_X m_2}{M'} \right)^2 V \int k_p^2 dk_p d\Omega_p dk_{\gamma_1} k_{\gamma_1} d\Omega_{\gamma_1} E_{\gamma_2} |I'_\Omega|^2 \\ &\times \left| \frac{V}{(2\pi)^3} \int dk_n k_n^2 d\Omega_n I_f I'_a I_\Omega I_b \frac{(E_f - E_n)(E_n + E_p - E_i)}{E_p + E_n - E_i + E_1} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $d\Omega_{\gamma_1}$ and $d\Omega_{\gamma_2}$ are the measures for the angular integrations over the two photon momenta and $d\Omega_2$ corresponds to the intermediate state neutron. The integration over the proton angular variables is trivial and just gives 4π .

The reaction rate for the deuteron-nickel system is found to be approximately 100 per sec. This is a fairly large rate and easily observable experimentally. The photon energy E_2 shows a broad peak centered at approximately 2 MeV. As mentioned earlier, the energy of the first photon E_1 for any event is fixed by the requirement that $K = |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_{\gamma_1}|$ is close to the resonant value, which in the present case is found to be approximately 1140 in atomic units.

In our calculation we have focussed on the contribution from a single isolated resonance. It is important to determine whether the contribution from other resonances may change our result significantly. We have tested this possibility by assuming a resonance at a higher value of k_n with the value of K fixed to approximately 1140, applicable for the resonance under consideration. We find that the amplitude falls exponentially if the value of k_n is widely different from K and hence the contribution from other resonances is expected to be negligible.

4 Conclusions

In this paper we have computed the rate for the nuclear reaction given in Eq. 1 at second order in time dependent perturbation theory. The initial state consists of a deuteron and a heavy

nucleus ${}^A\text{X}$ at very low energies, of order eV or less. The reaction proceeds by formation of an intermediate state which is composed of a free proton and neutron. Despite the low energy of the initial state, such a state can exist for a small time interval. Due to the small time interval, this leads to a suppression factor in the rate of this process. However this suppression is not as prohibitive as the very strong suppression arising due to Coulomb barrier. Hence the rate of this process may be substantially higher in comparison to expectations based on the standard Coulomb barrier. The neutron gets captured by the heavy nucleus which is assumed to happen with emission of a photon, although other reactions may also be possible. Overall the final state consist of a proton, two photons and the nucleus ${}^{A+1}\text{X}$.

We have computed the rate assuming that the initial state deuteron is bound to the heavy nucleus with the formation of a molecule, with the wave function given by Eq. 14. Furthermore we have considered, as an example, the heavy nucleus to be ${}^{58}\text{Ni}$ which absorbs a neutron into the $2p_{3/2}$ level. We find that the rate for such a process is, in general, very small. However, in the presence of a resonance the rate may be substantial and observable [27]. We find that there exists an isolated resonance in the neutron-nickel system at energy of 7 keV, which has a width of approximately 7 eV. Assuming that this resonance dominates the amplitude, we find that the rate for the process is approximately 100 per second, which is easily observable. This rate turns out to be much larger than that found for the weak interaction process considered in [27]. The process leads to emission of two photons and a proton, with one of the photons showing a broad peak at approximately 2 MeV. Furthermore, the total momentum of the second photon and proton should show a peak at 1140 in atomic units, i.e. close to the resonant value k_R .

We have pointed out that besides the process considered, several other transitions are possible in which only one or no photon may be emitted. Alternatively, the transition may not be to the ground state of ${}^{59}\text{Ni}$. In this case, the two primary photons would have lower total energy and will be followed by a cascade of lower energy photons. These lower energy photons have a much higher probability of being captured by the medium and hence will lead to excess heat in the medium. Excess heat will also be generated by the nuclear recoil, which will lead to transfer of energy to the medium. Hence we also expect to see lower energy primary photons along with a cascade of lower energy photons and excess heat in the medium. A detailed study of this process is postponed to future research.

References

- [1] D. D. Clayton, Principles of stellar evolution and nucleosynthesis. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968.
- [2] A. Huke, K. Czernski, P. Heide, G. Ruprecht, N. Targosz, and W. Żebrowski, “Enhancement of deuteron-fusion reactions in metals and experimental implications,” Phys. Rev. C, vol. 78, p. 015803, Jul 2008.
- [3] E. Storms, “Introduction to the main experimental findings of the lenr field,” Current Science, vol. 108, pp. 535–539, 02 2015.

- [4] M. McKubre, “Cold fusion – cmns – lenr; past, present and projected future status,” Journal of Condensed Matter Nuclear Science, vol. 19, pp. 183–191, 2016.
- [5] F. Celani, B. Ortenzi, A. Spallone, C. Lorenzetti, E. Purchi, S. Fiorilla, S. Cupellini, M. Nakamura, P. Boccanera, L. Notargiacomo, G. Vassallo, and R. Burri, “Steps to identify main parameters for the generation in sub-micrometric materials: Measurements by isoperibolic and air-flow calorimetry,” Journal of Condensed Matter Nuclear Science, vol. 29, pp. 52–74, 2019.
- [6] T. Mizuno and J. Rothwell, “Excess heat from palladium deposited on nickel,” Journal of Condensed Matter Nuclear Science, vol. 29, pp. 21–33, 2019.
- [7] M. Srinivasan and K. Rajeev, “Chapter 13 - transmutations and isotopic shifts in lenr experiments,” in Cold Fusion (J.-P. Biberian, ed.), pp. 233 – 262, Elsevier, 2020.
- [8] S. B. Krivit, Development of Low-Energy Nuclear Reaction Research, ch. 41, pp. 479–496. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2011.
- [9] L. I. Urutskoev, Low-Energy Nuclear Reactions: A Three-Stage Historical Perspective, ch. 42, pp. 497–501. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2011.
- [10] M. Srinivasan, G. Miley, and E. Storms, Low-Energy Nuclear Reactions: Transmutations, ch. 43, pp. 503–539. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2011.
- [11] J. P. Biberian (Ed.), Cold Fusion: Advances in Condensed Matter Nuclear Science. Elsevier, 2020.
- [12] V. Pines, M. Pines, A. Chait, B. M. Steinetz, L. P. Forsley, R. C. Hendricks, G. C. Fralick, T. L. Benyo, B. Baramsai, P. B. Ugorowski, M. D. Becks, R. E. Martin, N. Penney, and C. E. Sandifer, “Nuclear fusion reactions in deuterated metals,” Phys. Rev. C, vol. 101, p. 044609, Apr 2020.
- [13] H. Assenbaum, K. Langanke, and C. Rolfs, “Effects of electron screening on low-energy fusion cross sections,” Zeitschrift für Physik A Atomic Nuclei, vol. 327, no. 4, pp. 461–468, 1987.
- [14] S. Ichimaru, “Nuclear fusion in dense plasmas,” Reviews of Modern Physics, vol. 65, no. 2, p. 255, 1993.
- [15] V. Vysotskii and M. Vysotsky, “Coherent correlated states and low-energy nuclear reactions in non stationary systems,” The European Physical Journal A, vol. 49, 08 2013.
- [16] S. Bartalucci, V. I. Vysotskii, and M. V. Vysotsky, “Correlated states and nuclear reactions: An experimental test with low energy beams,” Phys. Rev. Accel. Beams, vol. 22, p. 054503, May 2019.
- [17] Y. Srivastava, A. Widom, and L. Larsen, “A primer for electro-weak induced low energy nuclear reactions,” Pramana - Journal of Physics, vol. 75, pp. 617–637, 02 2010.

- [18] C. Spitaleri, C. Bertulani, L. Fortunato, and A. Vitturi, “The electron screening puzzle and nuclear clustering,” Physics Letters B, vol. 755, pp. 275 – 278, 2016.
- [19] J.-L. Paillet and A. Meulenber, “On highly relativistic deep electrons,” Journal of Condensed Matter Nuclear Science, vol. 29, pp. 472–492, 02 2019.
- [20] P. Hagelstein, “Deuterium evolution reaction model and the fleischmann–pons experiment,” Journal of Condensed Matter Nuclear Science, vol. 16, pp. 46–63, 02 2015.
- [21] V. A. Chechin, V. A. Tsarev, M. Rabinowitz, and Y. E. Kim, “Critical review of theoretical models for anomalous effects in deuterated metals,” International Journal of Theoretical Physics, vol. 33, p. 617–670, Mar 1994.
- [22] P. Kálmán and T. Keszthelyi, “Forbidden nuclear reactions,” Phys. Rev. C, vol. 99, p. 054620, May 2019.
- [23] P. Jain, A. Kumar, R. Pala, and K. P. Rajeev, “Photon induced low-energy nuclear reactions,” Pramana, vol. 96, no. 96, 2022.
- [24] P. Jain, A. Kumar, K. Ramkumar, R. Pala, and K. P. Rajeev, “Low energy nuclear fusion with two photon emission,” JCMNS, vol. 35, p. 1, 2021.
- [25] K. Ramkumar, H. Kumar, and P. Jain, “A toy model for low energy nuclear fusion,” Pramana, vol. 97, no. 109, 2023.
- [26] H. Kumar, P. Jain, and K. Ramkumar, “Low energy nuclear reactions in a crystal lattice,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01853, 11 2023.
- [27] K. Ramkumar, H. Kumar, and P. Jain, “Low energy nuclear reactions through weak interactions,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11550, 2024.
- [28] P. Jain and H. Kumar, “Medium assisted low energy nuclear fusion,” arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04428, 2024.
- [29] T. Gadly, S. Phapale, S. Gamre, P. Jain, H. Kumar, S. Poudel, S. Desai, A. Pathak, A. Srivast, A. Kumar, et al., “Transmutation of palladium at electrochemical interfaces: Experimental and theoretical validation with second order perturbation theory,” 2024.
- [30] K. S. Krane, Introductory nuclear physics. New York, NY: Wiley, 1988.
- [31] E. Merzbacher, Quantum Mechanics. Wiley, 1998.
- [32] J. Sakurai, Advanced Quantum Mechanics. Always learning, Pearson Education, Incorporated, 1967.