

# Transition strengths from $^{10}\text{B}(e, e')^{10}\text{B}$

D. J. Millener

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973

## Abstract

Inelastic electron scattering form factors are fitted with polynomial times Gaussian expressions in the variable  $y = (bq/2)^2$  to extract electromagnetic transition strengths at the photon point.

## 1 Introduction

The table of radiative widths from the 1979 Ajzenberg-Selove tabulation was based on the low- $q$  results of Spamer [1] (Darmstadt) for the 6.03-MeV  $4^+; 0$  level and the 7.48-MeV  $2^+; 1$  level, together with the  $180^\circ$  results of Fagg et al. [2] (NRL) for a number of levels. The 1984 and 1988 tabulations added results based on the work of Ansaldo et al. [3] (Saskatoon) for  $0.61 < q < 1.81 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  but did not take into account the erratum to that work [3].

The more recent work of Cichocki et al. [4] (NIKHEF) gives longitudinal and transverse form factors in the range  $0.48 < q < 2.58 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  for most levels up to the 6.56-MeV  $4^-; 0$  level. The analysis in this work includes extensive shell-model calculations and the extraction of  $B(C2)$  values for five levels of  $^{10}\text{B}$ . The analysis also includes data up to  $q \sim 4 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  taken at  $180^\circ$  for the ground-state, the 1.74-MeV level, and the 5.17-MeV level [5] (Bates). For most transitions, the form factors are plotted as a function of the effective momentum transfer  $q_{\text{eff}} = q(1 + 2.75/E_0)$ , where the beam energy  $E_0$  is in MeV. This way of relating form factors in the plane-wave and distorted-wave Born approximations must also be applied to the data from the earlier works.

Cichocki et al. used a polynomial times Gaussian ( $e^{-y}$ ) in the variable  $y = (bq/2)^2$ , where  $b$  is the harmonic oscillator parameter, to represent the form factors and extract  $B(C2)$  values. The procedure is spelled out by Millener et al. [6] who defined

$$B(C\lambda, q) = f^{-2} \frac{Z^2}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{(2\lambda + 1)!!}{q^\lambda} \right] F_L^2, \quad (1)$$

$$B(M\lambda, q) = f^{-2} \frac{Z^2}{4\pi} \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + 1} \left[ \frac{(2\lambda + 1)!!}{q^\lambda} \right] F_T^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $f = f_{\text{SN}} f_{\text{c.m.}} e^{-y}$  takes out the exponential dependences in the (theoretical) form factor. In the conventional definition of  $B(C\lambda, q)$  and  $B(M\lambda, q)$ , we should set  $f = 1$ . Because nature does not know about  $f_{\text{c.m.}}$  (and even in theory we don't need it if we use an appropriate system of relative coordinates), we perform the fit, with  $f = f_{\text{SN}} e^{-y}$ , to

$$B(\lambda, q)^{1/2} = f (A + By + Cy^2 + \dots) \quad (3)$$

$$= \left[ \frac{b}{2} \right]^\lambda (A' + B'y + C'y^2 + \dots). \quad (4)$$

## 2 Corrections for electron distortion

We use the effective momentum transfer  $q_{\text{eff}} = q(1 + 2.75/E_0)$  prescription [4] to approximately correct the original data for electron distortion so that we can use form factors calculated in the plane-wave Born approximation. This is especially important at low incident energies  $E_0$  and needs to be performed for the Darmstadt [1], NRL [2], and Saskatoon [3] data as sketched in the next subsections.

### 2.1 Darmstadt data

The measured quantity is the ratio of inelastic to elastic cross section and we could use this data together with a modern parametrization of the elastic cross section. The derived quantity  $B(\lambda, q)$  is tabulated as a function of  $q^2$  where

$$q^2 = 2k_0^2 (1 - \cos\theta) (1 - k/k_0) + k^2 \quad (5)$$

and  $k = E_x/\hbar c$  and  $k_0 = E_0/\hbar c$  ( $\hbar c = 197.32696$  MeV.fm). We recalculate  $q$  and calculate  $q_{\text{eff}}$  using the tabulated values of  $E_0$  and  $\theta$ . The units for  $B(\lambda, q)$  are given as  $10^{-51}$  cm<sup>4</sup> = 10 fm<sup>4</sup> for C2 and  $10^{-28}$  cm<sup>2</sup> =  $10^{-2}$  fm<sup>2</sup> for M1. We absorb the factor of  $\alpha\hbar c = e^2$  from the expressions of Spamer [1] so that  $B(\lambda, q)$  is expressed in the conventional units of  $e^2 \cdot \text{fm}^{2\lambda}$ . Then, from Eqs. (1) and (2) (with  $f = 1$ ) in terms of the  $B(\lambda, q)$  tabulated in Ref. [1]

$$F_L^2 = 10 B(C2) \times 2.234 \times 10^{-3} \times q^4 \quad (6)$$

for the longitudinal form factor of the 6.025-MeV  $4^+; 0$  level, and

$$F_T^2 = 10^{-2} B(M1) \times 1.117 \times 10^{-1} \times q^2 \quad (7)$$

for the transverse form factor of the 7.477-MeV  $2^+; 1$  level.

### 2.2 NRL data

Fagg et al. [2] give the 180° cross sections in nb/sr ( $= 10^{-7}$  fm<sup>2</sup>/sr) for three incident energies (40.5, 50.6, and 60.6 MeV and we have ( $e^2 = 1.44$  MeV.fm)

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \frac{Z^2 e^4}{4 E_0^2 R} \cdot F_T^2 \quad (8)$$

with the recoil factor  $R = (1 + 2E_0/M)$  ( $M =$  nuclear mass, and e.g.,  $R = 1.013$  for  $E_0 = 60.6$  MeV) and  $q$  from Eq. (5).

### 2.3 Saskatoon data

The data are already tabulated as form factors and we simply change  $q$  to  $q_{\text{eff}}$ .

### 3 C2 transitions

In their appendix, Cichocki et al. [4] extract B(C2) values for five states using Eq. (3), perhaps without the inclusion of the single-nucleon form factor  $f_{SN}$  but this is essentially irrelevant at the photon point. For the 6.025-MeV level, the low- $q$  data from Darmstadt and the Saskatoon data were also included. In the following subsections, we discuss fits to each level starting with the 6.025-MeV  $4^+; 0$  level. As in Ref. [4], the oscillator parameter is fixed at 1.60 fm. In principle, we could include  $b$  in the fit but it turns out that  $b = 1.60$  fm is close to the optimum value. Besides a change of  $b$  in Eq. (4) is compensated for by a change in  $A'$  when fitting to data. Of course, theoretical B(C2) values calculated with harmonic oscillator wave functions scale as  $b^4$ .

#### 3.1 The 6.025-MeV $4^+; 0$ level

The original Darmstadt value for the B(C2) is  $24.4 \pm 2.5 e^2\text{fm}^4$  (the inclusion of 5 data points from Orsay lead to a slightly smaller value of  $23.4 \pm 2.5 e^2\text{fm}^4$ ) - this value is quite well reproduced in the first line of Table 1. Taking the effect of distortion into account via the  $q_{\text{eff}}$  prescription results in a considerably lower value of  $17.34 \pm 1.97 e^2\text{fm}^4$  (note that  $B(\text{C}2) = (b/2)^4 A^2$ ) as pointed out by Cichocki et al. [4] - taking the  $q$  values from Table 1 of Spamer [1] instead of recomputing them gives  $B(\text{C}2) = 17.66 \pm 1.98 e^2\text{fm}^4$ . Note that the parameter  $B$  is not well determined and that the  $e^{-y}$  term in the oscillator form factor pretty much takes into account the terms involving the transition radius in the original Darmstadt paper. As the third line of Table 1 shows one can obtain a one-parameter fit of similar quality but with a smaller error because of the restrictive nature of the fitting function. The fact that essentially a p-shell form factor fits so well is surprising because the transition is very strong and the higher-order terms responsible for this should lead to a  $B$  coefficient which is

Table 1: Fits to C2 form factors for the 6.025-MeV  $4^+; 0$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations. When  $\chi^2/\text{DF}$  is greater than one, the error on B(C2) is inflated by the square root of this quantity.

Data	N	$\chi^2/\text{DF}$	$A$	$B$	$C$	$D$	B(C2)
D <sup>a</sup>	9	0.392	7.707(410)	-2.18(231)			24.33(259)
D <sup>b</sup>	9	0.346	6.507(369)	2.14(178)			17.34(197)
D	9	0.365	6.746(139)				18.64(77)
N+S	28	1.59	6.707(131)	-0.945(290)	0.435(173)	-0.010(30)	18.42(91)
N+S <sup>c</sup>	25	1.69	6.600(194)	-0.545(556)	0.032(452)	0.013(109)	17.84(137)
N+S <sup>c</sup>	25	1.62	6.619(108)	-0.607(194)	0.085(71)		17.95(74)
N+S+D	37	1.28	6.761(106)	-1.052(244)	0.491(71)	-0.108(27)	18.72(66)
N+S+D <sup>c</sup>	34	1.33	6.727(137)	-0.875(417)	0.275(360)	-0.040(90)	18.53(87)
N+S+D <sup>c</sup>	34	1.30	6.682(91)	-0.707(169)	0.118(64)		18.29(57)

<sup>a</sup> Uncorrected Darmstadt data.

<sup>b</sup> Darmstadt data vs.  $q_{\text{eff}}$  with  $q$  from  $E_0, \theta$ .

<sup>c</sup>  $q_{\text{eff}} < 2 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ .

negative (e.g., the harmonic oscillator form factor for the  $2\hbar\omega$  giant quadrupole resonance is of the form  $y(1 - 1/3y)e^{-y}$  and coherence at low  $q$  means a negative coefficient for the next term).

If we fit the NIKHEF data using a 3-parameter polynomial, the  $\chi^2/DF$  is 1.77; for the NIKHEF + Saskatoon data, it is 2.02. Adding an extra term to take care of the high- $q$  behavior leads to some improvement (line 4 of Table 1). Removing the three data points with  $q_{\text{eff}} > 2 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  doesn't lead to much change, although a three-parameter fit is now possible, as the next two lines of Table 1 show. The final three lines of Table 1 show fits to the complete data set. The four-parameter fit gives  $B(C2) = 18.7 \pm 0.7 e^2\text{fm}^4$ . To compare with the electromagnetic value for the  $4^+ \rightarrow gs$  transition, we multiply by 7/9 and convert to Weisskopf units (1 W.u. =  $1.2797 e^2\text{fm}^4$ ) getting  $11.4 \pm 0.4 \text{ W.u.}$  This agrees with the electromagnetic value of  $12.4 \pm 1.8 \text{ W.u.}$ , which is derived from the  $\omega\gamma$  value from the  ${}^6\text{Li}(\alpha, \gamma)$  reaction and an E2/M1 mixing ratio.

### 3.2 The 0.718-MeV $1^+; 0$ level

The lifetime for this long-lived level is precisely known,  $\tau = 1.020 \pm 0.005 \text{ nsec.}$  This corresponds to a  $B(C2)$  for electron scattering of  $1.796(9) e^2\text{fm}^4$ . The value of  $1.71(14) e^2\text{fm}^4$  in the first line of Table 2 derived from the NIKHEF data is in good agreement. Therefore including the electromagnetic value as a data point changes the  $\chi^2$  only slightly. A three-parameter fit gives a significant increase in  $\chi^2$ .

Table 2: Fits to C2 form factors for the 0.718-MeV  $1^+; 0$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60 \text{ fm.}$  The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations. The error on  $B(C2)$  is inflated by  $\sqrt{\chi^2/DF}$ .

Data	N	$\chi^2/DF$	$A$	$B$	$C$	$D$	$B(C2)$
N	14	1.29	2.045(73)	-1.042(155)	0.390(94)	-0.058(17)	1.71(14)
N+EM	15	1.21	2.093(5)	-1.144(51)	0.450(47)	-0.068(11)	1.795(9)

### 3.3 The 2.154-MeV $1^+; 0$ level

The first line of Table 3 shows a 3-parameter fit to all the NIKHEF data points while the next line shows the same fit with the highest  $q$  data point removed. The 2-parameter fit in the third line shows very little deterioration in  $\chi^2$ . The last line shows a 1-parameter fit which is still acceptable in terms of  $\chi^2$  but is certainly not as good as the other fits. The  $\chi^2$  doesn't change for  $b = 1.56 \text{ fm}$  or  $b = 1.66 \text{ fm}$  and neither does  $B(C2)$  to any significant extent.

The electromagnetic data in the current tabulation gives  $0.75(9) e^2\text{fm}^4$  for the  $B(C2)$  up. This depends on a number of values for lifetime ( $2.13 \pm 0.20 \text{ ps}$ ) and the ground-state branch ( $21.1 \pm 1.6 \%$ ). Probably, the previous lifetime average of  $2.30 \pm 0.26 \text{ ps}$  should be used but this only gets the  $B(C2)$  down to  $0.69 e^2\text{fm}^4$  (the lowest  $\gamma$ -ray branch of 17.5% would give  $0.57 e^2\text{fm}^4$ ).

Table 3: Fits to C2 form factors for the 2.154-MeV  $1^+; 0$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations.

Data	N	$\chi^2/DF$	$A$	$B$	$C$	$D$	B(C2)
N	13	0.84	0.963(50)	0.091(74)	-0.015(22)		0.380(36)
N <sup>a</sup>	12	0.40	1.005(52)	0.010(81)	0.013(25)		0.413(43)
N <sup>a</sup>	12	0.39	0.981(27)	0.052(17)			0.394(22)
N <sup>a</sup>	12	1.15	1.047(14)				0.449(14)

<sup>a</sup> Highest  $q$  data point removed.

### 3.4 The 3.587-MeV $2^+; 0$ level

The first line of Table 4 shows a 3-parameter fit to all the NIKHEF data points which yields  $B(C2) = 0.616 \pm 0.044 e^2\text{fm}^4$  which is in reasonable agreement with the electromagnetic value of  $0.85 \pm 0.25 e^2\text{fm}^4$ . The latter depends on lifetime, branch, and mixing ratio.

Table 4: Fits to C2 form factors for the 3.587-MeV  $2^+; 0$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations.

Data	N	$\chi^2/DF$	$A$	$B$	$C$	$D$	B(C2)
N	16	1.16	1.226(42)	-0.130(64)	0.061(21)		0.616(44)
N	16	1.21	1.261(61)	-0.226(139)	0.129(91)	-0.014(18)	0.652(63)

### 3.5 The 5.920-MeV $2^+; 0$ level

The first line of Table 5 shows a 3-parameter fit to all the NIKHEF data points while the next line shows the same fit with the highest  $q$  data point removed. The 2-parameter fit in the third line shows very little deterioration in  $\chi^2$ . The same can be said of the 1-parameter fit in the last line but the B(C2) changes from 0.164 to 0.202 as  $b$  changes from 1.55 fm to 1.65 fm. In 2-parameter or 3-parameter fits the  $\chi^2$  and B(C2) vary little with modest changes in  $b$ .

Table 5: Fits to C2 form factors for the 5.920-MeV  $1^+; 0$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations.

Data	N	$\chi^2/DF$	$A$	$B$	$C$	$D$	B(C2)
N	12	0.89	0.555(91)	0.279(182)	-0.157(83)		0.126(35)
N <sup>a</sup>	11	0.87	0.602(100)	0.161(213)	-0.089(105)		0.148(49)
N <sup>a</sup>	11	0.85	0.679(38)	-0.015(44)			0.189(21)
N <sup>a</sup>	11	0.78	0.667(13)				0.182(7)

<sup>a</sup> Highest  $q$  data point removed.

## 4 M3 transitions

In addition to the transition to the 1.74-MeV  $0^+; 1$  level, the transverse form factor to the 5.164-MeV  $2^+; 1$  level is dominantly M3 with a small correction for M1 at low  $q$ . The  $q_{\text{eff}}$  prescription can be used on the Saskatoon data but the NIKHEF data for the  $0^+; 1$  level is given as a function of  $q$  and can't be corrected without a knowledge of  $E_0$  for each point. However, a B(M3) is available from a DWBA analysis of the data. Note that for  $A = 10$ , 1 W.u. =  $35.548 \mu^2\text{fm}^4 = 0.3932 e^2\text{fm}^6$ .

### 4.1 The 1.740-MeV $0^+; 1$ level

We first note that  $\Gamma_\gamma = (1.05 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-9}$  from the original analysis of the Saskatoon data (see erratum of Ref. [3]) corresponds to  $B(\text{M3}\uparrow) = (8.27 \pm 1.97) e^2\text{fm}^6 = (748 \pm 178) \mu^2\text{fm}^4$ .

The first line of Table 6 gives  $B(\text{M3}\uparrow) = (804 \pm 110) \mu^2\text{fm}^4$  for a fit to the data as a function of  $q$ . This is reduced to  $(688 \pm 101) \mu^2\text{fm}^4$  for a fit to the data as a function of  $q_{\text{eff}}$ . The value from a DWBA fit to the complete data set shown in Ref. [4] is  $633 \mu^2\text{fm}^4$  (R. Hicks, private communication).

Table 6: Fits to M3 form factor for the 1.740-MeV  $0^+; 1$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations. The unit for B(M3) is  $e^2\text{fm}^6$ . First line  $q$ , second line  $q_{\text{eff}}$ .

Data	N	$\chi^2/\text{DF}$	$A$	$B$	B(M3 $\uparrow$ )
S	8	0.37	5.823(400)	0.213(400)	8.89(122)
S	8	0.36	5.386(396)	0.522(388)	7.61(112)

### 4.2 The 5.164-MeV $2^+; 1$ level

The original analysis of the Saskatoon data [3] gave  $B(\text{M3}\uparrow) = (21.6 \pm 2.2) e^2\text{fm}^6 = (1953 \pm 19) \mu^2\text{fm}^4$ . This fit included an M1 contribution.

The first two lines of Table 7 contain no correction for the M1 contribution at low  $q$ . The first line fits the Saskatoon and NIKHEF data as a function of  $q_{\text{eff}}$  while the second line also contains the Catholic University of America low  $q$  data. A significant difference in the extracted B(M3) can be seen when the two points with  $q_{\text{eff}} < 0.8 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  are removed from the S+N data set (third line).

Finally, we subtract an M1 contribution calculated by normalizing the computed M1 shell-model form factor to the B(M1) obtained from electromagnetic data. Because there is such a large cancellation for the lowest  $q$  data point of the CUA data set, we omit this point entirely. This results in  $B(\text{M3}\uparrow) = 19.4 \pm 2.0 e^2\text{fm}^6$  or  $(1756 \pm 181) \mu^2\text{fm}^4$ ;  $B(\text{M3}\downarrow) = 27.2 \pm 2.8 e^2\text{fm}^6$  or  $(69.1 \pm 7.1)$  W.u. This corresponds to  $\Gamma_\gamma = (1.00 \pm 0.10) \times 10^{-6} \text{ eV}$ .

## 5 M1 transition for the 7.48-MeV level

Ansaldo et al. [3] give  $\Gamma_\gamma^0 = 11.75 \pm 0.75 \text{ eV}$  for this strong M1 transition while Spamer [1] gives  $\Gamma_\gamma^0 = 12.0 \pm 2.2 \text{ eV}$ . However, Chertok [7] corrected the later value to  $11.0 \pm 2.2 \text{ eV}$

Table 7: Fits to M3 form factor for the 5.164-MeV  $2^+; 1$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations. The unit for B(M3) is  $e^2\text{fm}^6$ .

Data	N	$\chi^2/\text{DF}$	$A$	$B$	$C$	B(M3 $\uparrow$ )
S+N	17	0.51	9.611(543)	-3.059(945)	1.608(364)	24.2(27)
S+N+CUA	20	0.68	9.913(397)	-3.571(726)	1.793(294)	25.8(21)
S+N <sup>a</sup>	15	0.37	8.672(838)	-1.569(1380)	1.090(502)	19.7(38)
S+N+CUA <sup>b</sup>	19	0.39	8.612(452)	-1.466(805)	1.052(319)	19.4(20)

<sup>a</sup>  $q_{\text{eff}} > 0.81 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ .

<sup>b</sup> Theoretical  $F_T^2(\text{M1})$  normalized to  $B(\text{M1}) = 0.023 \pm 0.006$  W.u. subtracted and CUA  $q = 0.41 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  point omitted because of a large cancellation.

after distortion corrections were taken into account. Note that  $1 \text{ W.u.} = 1.7905 \mu^2 = 0.0198 e^2\text{fm}^2$ .

The fit as a function of  $q_{\text{eff}}$  in the first line of Table 8 yields  $\Gamma_\gamma^0 = 10.84 \pm 1.58 \text{ eV}$ . Adding the CUA data points gives  $\Gamma_\gamma^0 = 11.00 \pm 1.14 \text{ eV}$ . The Saskatoon contains three points around the second maximum of the M1 form factor. Adding these data points gives a worse fit and  $\Gamma_\gamma^0 = 11.35 \pm 0.37 \text{ eV}$ . Increasing the number of parameters to three improves the fit but gives a substantially larger B(M1) value corresponding to  $\Gamma_\gamma^0 = 12.55 \pm 0.58 \text{ eV}$ .

As far as the B(M1) is concerned, it is preferable to stick with the value derived from the low- $q$  data.

Table 8: Fits to M1 form factor for the 7.48-MeV  $2^+; 1$  level using Eq. (3). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations. The unit for B(M1) is  $e^2\text{fm}^2$ .

Data	N	$\chi^2/\text{DF}$	$A$	$B$	B(M1 $\uparrow$ )
D	12	0.56	0.133(10)	-0.0126(945)	0.0177(26)
D+CUA	15	0.54	0.134(7)	-0.0123(45)	0.0180(19)
D+CUA+S	23	0.95	0.136(2)	-0.162(5)	0.0185(6)
D+CUA+S	23	0.58	0.1432(33)	-0.196(13)	0.023(8) 0.0205(10)

## 6 C3 transitions

Cichocki et al. [4] present data on the form factors for the  $2^-$ ,  $3^-$ , and  $4^-$  levels at 5.110 MeV, 6.127 MeV, and 6.561 MeV. The longitudinal form factor for the isolated 6.56-MeV level is best defined. The C3 Weisskopf unit is  $5.94 e^2\text{fm}^6$ .

### 6.1 The 6.56-MeV $4^-; 0$ level

The C1 and C3 harmonic oscillator form factors for  $1\hbar\omega$  transitions cannot be distinguished. However, the shell-model calculations in Ref. [4] indicate the the C3 transition is dominant for the  $4^-$  level.

The first line of Table 9 shows a 4-parameter fit to the full NIKHEF data set which shows that B,C, and D are not determined and that there is a large error on B(C3). The second line shows a 3-parameter fit and a significant change in B(C3) (but within errors). Because we are interested in pinning down a low- $q$  parameter, the third line shows the effect of omitting the two highest  $q$  data points. Now C is undetermined and the final line shows a 2-parameter fit to the reduced data set (there is no change in the overall  $\chi^2$ ). Then  $B(C3\uparrow) = 21.8 \pm 1.1 e^2\text{fm}^6$  and  $B(C3\downarrow) = 17.0 \pm 0.9 e^2\text{fm}^6 = 2.9 \pm 0.2 \text{ W.u.}$

Table 9: Fits to C3 form factor for the 6.560-MeV  $4^-; 0$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations. The unit for B(C3) is  $e^2\text{fm}^6$ .

Data	N	$\chi^2/\text{DF}$	$A$	$B$	$C$	$D$	B(C3 $\uparrow$ )
N	14	0.87	8.642(1180)	-0.115(1880)	-0.597(871)	0.112(122)	19.6(54)
N	14	0.86	9.621(479)	-1.764(522)	0.189(126)		24.3(24)
N <sup>a</sup>	12	0.89	9.115(651)	-1.077(793)	-0.004(210)		21.7(31)
N <sup>a</sup>	12	0.80	9.127(233)	-1.093(121)			21.8(11)

<sup>a</sup>  $q_{\text{eff}} < 2.2 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ .

## 6.2 The 6.13-MeV $3^-; 0$ level

This form factor is not so well defined because of the difficulty of separating the cross section from the strong  $4^+$  level at 6.025 MeV. Again, the shell-model calculations of Ref. [4] indicate the the C3 transition is dominant but in this case a significant C1 contribution is also predicted.

The first line of Table 10 shows a 3-parameter fit to the full NIKHEF data set which is poor and gives a large error on B(C3). The second line shows the effect of omitting the two highest  $q$  data points and reducing the number of parameters by one. A better  $\chi^2$  is obtained in the last line by omitting two high data points. Then  $B(C3\uparrow) = B(C3\downarrow) = 33.1 \pm 2.7 e^2\text{fm}^6 = 5.6 \pm 0.5 \text{ W.u.}$

Table 10: Fits to C3 form factor for the 6.130-MeV  $3^-; 0$  level using Eq. (4). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations. The unit for B(C3) is  $e^2\text{fm}^6$ .

Data	N	$\chi^2/\text{DF}$	$A$	$B$	$C$	B(C3 $\uparrow$ )
N	13	3.55	10.27(81)	-1.30(134)	-1.20(50)	27.6(82)
N <sup>a</sup>	11	2.85	11.21(38)	-0.96(33)		33.0(38)
N <sup>b</sup>	9	1.54	11.25(39)	-1.13(34)		33.1(27)

<sup>a</sup>  $q_{\text{eff}} < 1.7 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ .

<sup>b</sup> Points at  $q_{\text{eff}} = 1.08$  and  $1.46 \text{ fm}^{-1}$  omitted.

### 6.3 The 5.11-MeV $2^-; 0$ level

Here, the shell-model calculations of Ref. [4] indicate that the C1 transition is dominant over C3. In addition, there exists a non-zero  $B(E1\downarrow)$  of  $(5.0 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-4}$  W.u. that arises from isospin mixing. This corresponds to  $B(E1\uparrow) = (1.07 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{-4} e^2\text{fm}^2$ .

The first line of Table 11 assumes good isospin and therefore no A coefficient. Allowing A to be non-zero improves the fit (second line). Including the photon point in the fit worsens the  $\chi^2$  somewhat but still gives a reasonable fit.

Table 11: Fits to the longitudinal form factor for the 5.110-MeV  $2^-; 0$  level using Eq. (3). The harmonic oscillator parameter is fixed at  $b = 1.60$  fm. The quantities in parentheses are standard deviations.

Data	N	$\chi^2/\text{DF}$	A	B	C	B(C1 $\uparrow$ )
N	8	1.62		0.259(11)	-0.100(13)	0.0
N	8	0.83	-0.036(16)	0.366(47)	-0.171(33)	$(1.3 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-3}$
N <sup>a</sup>	9	1.16	-0.0106(11)	0.290(12)	-0.121(13)	$(1.09 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-4}$

<sup>a</sup> Including electromagnetic data for the photon point.

## 7 Higher levels

Ansaldo et al. [3] give a longitudinal form factor for a level at 8.07 MeV with a width of 760 keV, which they assign as  $2^+; 0$ , and a transverse form factor for the  $2^+; 1/3^-; 1$  doublet at 8.9 MeV. Fitting the data for the 8.07-MeV level yields a  $B(C2\uparrow) = 5.1 \pm 0.7 e^2\text{fm}^4$ . This is about a quarter of the strength of the very strong transition to the 6.025-MeV  $4^+$  level. As Zeidman et al. [8] note, this should lead to a very strong excitation in inelastic pion scattering which is not seen. In fact, even adding the cross sections for states at 7.8 and 8.07 MeV still gives less than 25% of the expected cross section for an isoscalar C2 excitation.

For the 8.9-MeV doublet, it is difficult to say anything much without guidance from the shell-model as to the dominant multipoles expected. The state is stronger than expected for an isovector excitation in inelastic pion scattering [8].

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-98CH10886.

## References

- [1] E. Spamer, Z. Phys. 191 (1966) 24.
- [2] L.W. Fagg, R.A. Lindgren, W.L. Bendel, and E.C. Jones, Phys. Rev. C 14 (1976) 1727.
- [3] E.J. Ansaldo, J.C. Bergstrom, R. Yen, and H.S. Caplan, Nucl. Phys. A 322 (1979) 237; A 342 (1980) 532(E).
- [4] A. Cichocki, J. Dubach, R.S. Hicks, G.A. Peterson, C.W. de Jager, H. de Vries, N. Kalantar-Nayestanaki, and T. Sato, Phys. Rev. C 51 (1995) 2406.

- [5] R.S. Hicks, J. Button-Shafer, B. Debebe, J. Dubach, A. Hotta, R.L.Huffman, R.A. Lindgren, G.A. Peterson, R.P. Singhal, and C.W. de Jager, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60 (1988) 905.
- [6] D.J. Millener, D.I. Sober, H. Crannell, J.T. O'Brien, L.W. Fagg, S. Kowalski, C.F. Williamson, and L. Lapikás, *Phys. Rev. C* 39 (1989) 14.
- [7] B.T. Chertok, *Phys. Rev.* 187 (1969) 1340.
- [8] B. Zeidman, D.F. Geesaman, P. Zupranski, R.E. Segel, G.C. Morrison, C. Olmer, G.R. Burleson, S.J. Greene, R.L. Boudrie, C.L. Morris, L.W. Swensson, G.S. Blanpied, B.G. Ritchie, and C.L. Harvey Johnstone, *Phys. Rev. C* 38 (1988) 2251.