

# Statistical evolution of fragment isospin in nuclear multifragmentation.

A.S. Botvina

Gesellschaft für Schwerionenforschung, D-64291 Darmstadt, Germany  
and Institute for Nuclear Research, 117312 Moscow, Russia

## Abstract

Two instructive effects concerning fragment production at disintegration of finite nuclei are predicted with the statistical multifragmentation model: (1) a concentration of neutrons in intermediate mass fragments during the phase transition, (2) the break of the spatial symmetry of the fragment's isospin distribution, as well as of the symmetry of the fragment's emission from a statistical source, induced by the external Coulomb field.

The knowledge of the isotope composition of fragments produced in nuclear multifragmentation can help in resolving the important problems: Do the fragments keep the memory of the initial dynamical stage or are they produced statistically? How does the isospin influence disintegration of finite nuclei and what is the difference to the case of nuclear matter? What is the isospin dependence of the nuclear equation of state? Generally, this study addresses an intriguing interdisciplinary problem of the phase transition in a finite-size two-component system (i.e. in a nucleus consisting of neutrons and protons), that is instructive for all fields dealing with finite systems. The problem was investigated within the statistical multifragmentation model (SMM) [1], which is successfully used for explanation of experimental data. A new Markov chain method of partition generation was incorporated in the model [2], that allows for considering the multifragmentation process on a solid microcanonical basis. The presented results reflect statistical properties of the fragment production and can be used for identification of the phenomenon.

Presently, one of the extensively discussed topics is the isospin fractionation at disintegration of excited nuclei [3]. Fig. 1 shows mass distributions and neutron-to-proton ratios ( $N/Z$ ) of the fragments produced after multifragmentation of a Au source (mass number  $A_s=197$ , charge  $Z_s=79$ ), the




Figure 1: The neutron-to-proton ratio  $N/Z$  and relative yield of hot primary fragments produced after break-up of Au nuclei at different excitation energies: 3 (solid lines), 4 (dashed lines), 5 (dotted lines) and 8 (dot-dashed lines) MeV per nucleon.

calculations were performed at the standard SMM parameters [1]. One can see a general statistical trend: the  $N/Z$  ratio of hot primary fragments increases with their mass numbers. This is a consequence of the interplay between the Coulomb and symmetry energy contributions to the binding energy of fragments [1]. This trend persists up to  $A \leq A_s/2$ , while at larger  $A$  the finite-size effects due to the mass and charge conservation prevail. In

Fig. 1 one can also see the evolution of the N/Z ratio and mass distribution of fragments in the excitation energy range  $E_s^*=3-8$  MeV/nucleon. This energy range is usually associated with a liquid-gas type phase transition in finite nuclei, where the fragment mass distribution evolves from the U-shape, at the multifragmentation threshold  $E_s^* \sim 3$  MeV/nucleon, to an exponential fall at high energies. During this evolution the temperature reaches a "plateau" and is nearly constant [1]. As the energy increases the N/Z ratio of primary intermediate mass fragments (IMF, charges  $Z=3-20$ ) increases, too. The reason is that the heaviest neutron-rich fragments are destroyed at increasing excitation energy, and some of their neutrons are bound in the IMFs, since the number of free neutrons is still small at this stage. Simultaneously, the N/Z ratio of the heaviest fragments decreases slightly. At very high excitation energy ( $E_s^* > 8$  MeV/nucleon) the N/Z ratio of IMFs does not rise anymore but drops because no heavier fragments are left and the number of free neutrons increases rapidly, together with the temperature. This isospin evolution shows how the isospin fractionation phenomenon predicted for nuclear matter [4] actually shows up in finite nuclear systems. In the region associated with the phase transition in neutron-rich nuclear systems we expect rather increasing neutron content of IMFs than increasing the number of free neutrons. Such a mechanism is consistent with recent experimental data [5].

In peripheral nucleus-nucleus collisions at projectile energies of 10–100 MeV/nucleon the break-up of highly excited projectile-like nuclei is fast (the characteristic time is around 100 fm/c) and happens in the vicinity of a target-like residue. In this case the Coulomb field of the target residue can influence the fragmentation of the projectile source and break the symmetry of the phase space population which exists for an isolated statistical source. This leads to spatial asymmetry of the fragment emission: small fragments are preferably emitted to the side of the target [6]. SMM calculations were performed for the Au projectile source which was placed at a fixed distance (20 fm) from another Au source simulating the target residue. This distance was obtained under the assumption that the break-up happens at  $\sim 100$  fm/c after a peripheral collision of a 35 A·MeV Au projectile with a Au target.

Fig. 2 shows the spatial distributions of yields and N/Z ratios of hot primary IMFs with  $Z=8$  and the biggest fragments in the freeze-out volume along the axis connecting the projectile and target sources. It is seen that in the case of a single isolated source all distributions are symmetric with respect to the center of mass of the source. In the case of an external




Figure 2: Freeze-out coordinate distributions of the neutron-to-proton ratio  $N/Z$  of primary fragments with  $Z=8$  (top panel) and relative yields of the primary  $Z=8$  and biggest fragments (middle and bottom panels) produced at break-up of a Au source at an excitation energy of 3 MeV/nucleon. The freeze-out density is  $\rho_s = \rho_0/6$  ( $\rho_0 \approx 0.15 \text{ fm}^{-3}$  is the normal nuclear density). The second Au nucleus is placed at  $-20 \text{ fm}$  from the geometrical center of the freeze-out volume. Dotted lines: the isolated Au source, dashed lines: Coulomb interaction with the second Au nucleus is included, solid lines: angular momentum of  $150 \hbar$  is included as well.

Coulomb field induced by the target source, the IMFs are mainly located at the target side while the biggest fragments are shifted to the opposite direction. Such positioning of fragments minimizes the Coulomb energy of the target-projectile system. If we take into account an angular momentum possibly transferred to the projectile source during the collision the N/Z ratio of the IMFs increases considerably and becomes larger for the IMFs which are closer to the target. The reason is an interplay between the Coulomb and rotational energy. An angular momentum favors the emission of IMFs with larger mass numbers, providing a larger moment of inertia, in order to minimize the rotational energy and maximize the entropy. On the other side the Coulomb interaction, depending also on the fragment distance to the target, prevents the emission of IMFs with large charges. As a result of the interplay of these two factors we obtain neutron-rich fragments. The subsequent Coulomb propagation pushes the IMFs in the direction of the target providing predominant population of the midrapidity kinematic region by neutron-rich IMFs. This mechanism should be considered as a purely statistical alternative to a dynamical explanation of the neutron-rich IMF emission at midrapidity referring to the "neck fragmentation" phenomenon [7, 8]. Theoretically such a process is an example of a new kind of statistical emission induced by an inhomogeneous external long-range field [6].

## References

- [1] J.P.Bondorf et al., *Phys. Rep.* **257**, 133 (1995).
- [2] A.S.Botvina and I.N.Mishustin. GSI preprint 2000-50, Darmstadt, 2000; nucl-th/0011072, 2000.
- [3] H.S.Xu et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 716 (2000).
- [4] H.Müller and B.D.Serot, *Phys. Rev.* **C52**, 2072 (1995).
- [5] P.M.Milazzo et al., *Phys. Rev.* **C62**, 041602(R) (2000).
- [6] A.S.Botvina et al., *Phys. Rev.* **C59**, 3444 (1999).
- [7] J.F.Dempsey et al., *Phys. Rev.* **C54**, 1710 (1996).
- [8] Y.Larochelle et al., *Phys. Rev.* **C62**, 051602(R) (2000).