

# Uncorrelated scattering approximation for the scattering and break-up of weakly bound nuclei on heavy targets

A.M. Moro, J.A. Caballero and J. Gómez-Camacho

Departamento de Física Atómica, Molecular y Nuclear, Universidad de Sevilla, Apdo. 1065, E-41080 Sevilla, Spain

## Abstract

The scattering of a weakly bound (halo) projectile nucleus by a heavy target nucleus is investigated. A new approach, called the Uncorrelated Scattering Approximation, is proposed. The main approximation involved is to neglect the correlation between the fragments of the projectile in the region where the interaction with the target is important. The formalism makes use of hyper-spherical harmonics, Raynal-Revey coefficients and momentum-localized wave functions to expand projectile channel wave functions in terms of products of the channel wave function of the individual fragments. Within this approach, the kinetic energy and angular momentum of each fragment is conserved during the scattering process. The elastic, inelastic and break-up S-matrices are obtained as an analytic combination involving the bound wave function of the projectile and the product of the S-matrices of the fragments. The approach is applied to describe the scattering of deuteron on  $^{58}\text{Ni}$  at several energies. The results are compared with experimental data and continuum-discretized coupled-channels calculations.

PACS numbers: 24.10.Eq;24.50.+g;03.65.Nk;25.10.+s;25.70.Bc;25.70.Mn

*Keywords:* Nuclear Reactions, Scattering Theory, Three-Body Problem, Halo Nuclei, Elastic Scattering, Inelastic Scattering, Break-up Reactions.

# 1 Introduction

In the last years one of the main interests in nuclear physics has been focused on the study of halo nuclei, *i.e.*, weakly bound and spatially extended systems where one or two particles (generally neutrons) have a high probability of being at distances larger than the typical nuclear radii (see refs. [1, 2] for a general review on these nuclei). The ability to produce secondary beams of halo nuclei opened new possibilities of investigating their structure. Two basic experimental probes involving high energy reactions have been developed to study halo structure. The first one is to measure the momentum distributions of the fragments coming out after a collision with light stable nuclei [3, 4]. The second probe treats the analysis of Coulomb break-up cross section when the nuclei are incident on highly charged targets [5–7].

The first type of reactions has been treated in detail in a series of publications by the group of Aarhus [8–11]. Here, the simplest approach to understand halo nuclei fragmentation reactions involves the instantaneous removal of one of the particles from the few-body halo system. Within this approach, known as “sudden approximation”, one assumes that the binding system is removed without disturbing the motion of the constituent particles. This approximation is only justified for reaction times much shorter than the characteristic time for the motion of the particles within the few-body system. The sudden approximation has been extensively applied to the study of three-body halo nuclei, and in particular to the Borromean systems, *i.e.*, three-body systems where all two-particle subsystems are unbound [12–14]. Final interaction between the two non-disturbed spectators seems to play a crucial role in order to explain the narrow neutron momentum distributions measured. The participant-target interaction was first described considering only absorption. Further improvements have been included recently, treating the interaction between the target and each of the halo particles by means of a phenomenological optical potential [15]. The total cross section is then obtained by adding the contributions from all the participants in the halo nucleus. Processes where two or three halo particles interact simultaneously with the target are neglected. This is consistent with the fact that the model is only accurate for the outer part of the wave function [11, 15]. This means that those geometric configurations where more than one halo particle get close to the target during the collision should be excluded. This shadowing effect has been treated in previous works under different approaches. In the analysis of the Aarhus group the shadowing is accounted for by excluding the

participant wave function inside spheres around the two spectators [11, 15].

The second type of probe to study the structure of halo nuclei is by means of Coulomb elastic break-up reactions with a projectile, composed by a core and valence neutrons, incident on highly charged targets. The Surrey group has studied in detail elastic scattering of halo nuclei from target within the “adiabatic” approach, *i.e.*, the intrinsic motion is very slow compared to the scattering motion [16–19]. Moreover, the interaction between the projectile and the target is described considering only the interaction between the core and the target. This requirement is relevant to Coulomb dominated processes when the core is charged and the valence particle is neutral. In the case that strong interactions dominate, the above requirement is most likely to be valid when the number of core nucleons greatly exceeds the number of valence nucleons [16]. Within these approximations, the elastic differential cross section factorizes into two terms, the cross section for a point-like projectile scattered by the target, and a form factor that contains the effects of the projectile structure. The range of validity of the adiabatic approximation is also discussed in [17, 18] concluding that for a pure strong interaction the adiabatic approach is justified for a given projectile–target system at sufficiently high energy. On the contrary, in the case in which the Coulomb interaction dominates the validity of the “adiabatic” approach is questionable at forward scattering angles.

Apart from the approaches mentioned, several other models have been proposed in the literature, starting from the pioneering work of Bang and Pearson [20], including eikonal [21–23], semi-classical [24, 25], and mixed approaches to describe direct and sequential break-up [26].

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we develop the formalism of the uncorrelated scattering approximation (USA). Here the basic assumption is to neglect the correlation between the fragments in the region where the interaction with the target is strong. In this situation the orbital angular momenta and kinetic energies of the fragments are conserved during the collision process, and this leads to an analytic expression for the S-matrix of the composite system in terms of the S-matrices of the fragments. In section 3 we present a preliminary application of the developed approach to the case of elastic and break-up deuteron scattering on  $^{58}\text{Ni}$ . In section 4 the conclusions are presented.

## 2 The Uncorrelated Scattering Approximation

In this section we introduce a new approach to describe the scattering of a weakly bound nucleus by a heavy target. As it will be shown later, the S-matrices to the bound and break-up states of the composite system are given in terms of the ground state wave function and the S-matrices corresponding to the interaction of the fragments with the target.

The interaction of a composite particle with the target can be expressed as the sum of two terms. On one side, an average force acting on the centre of mass of the projectile, which makes the projectile to scatter but does not excite or break it. On the other side, tidal forces that make the projectile rotate, excite or break up. Then, when a composite particle scatters from a target there are two opposite effects: i) the interaction between the fragments tending to keep the fragments bound, and ii) the tidal forces tending to break the system. In order to simplify our discussion, we assume that the mass of the target is much larger than the masses of the fragments. The Hamiltonian can be written then as

$$H = \frac{\vec{P}^2}{2M} + \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2m} + v_{AB}(r) + v_{AT}(R_{AT}) + v_{BT}(R_{BT}) \quad (1)$$

$$= \frac{\vec{P}_A^2}{2m_A} + \frac{\vec{P}_B^2}{2m_B} + v_{AB}(r) + v_{AT}(R_{AT}) + v_{BT}(R_{BT}) \quad (2)$$

where  $M = m_A + m_B$  and  $m = m_A m_B / (m_A + m_B)$ . In this model, the interaction between projectile and target can be written as the sum of a folding potential,  $v_F(R) = \langle \phi_0 | v_{AT} + v_{BT} | \phi_0 \rangle$ , which does not affect the internal structure of the projectile, and a tidal potential,  $v_T(R, r) = v_{AT}(R_{AT}) + v_{BT}(R_{BT}) - v_F(R)$ , which tends to break the projectile. The function  $|\phi_0\rangle$  describes the intrinsic ground state of the projectile. Note that for large distances  $R$ , the tidal forces, coming from the gradient of  $v_T$ , are negligible compared to the force between the fragments, coming from the gradient of  $v_{AB}$ , that tend to keep them bound. Hence, it is reasonable to ignore the tidal forces for large distances.

On the contrary, for small distances  $R$ , tidal forces can be large. In this case a reasonable approach is to ignore the force between the fragments, substituting the potential  $v_{AB}$  by a suitable constant  $\bar{v}$ . For very tightly bound systems, tidal forces may not be strong enough to overcome the force between the fragments for any distance  $R$ . For these systems, scattering will

be predominantly elastic and governed by the folding potential. However, for weakly bound systems there will be a critical distance  $R_m$  below which tidal forces overcome the force between the fragments. The distance  $R_m$  can be associated to an angular momentum  $L_m$ , so that  $R_m$  is the turning point of the wave-function, fulfilling

$$\frac{L_m(L_m + 1)}{2MR_m^2} + v_f(R_m) = E - \epsilon_0 . \quad (3)$$

Note that for  $L > L_m$ , tidal forces are not very important because the turning point is beyond  $R_m$ . On the contrary, for  $L < L_m$  tidal forces will be important, and the correlation between the fragments may be neglected.

Let us consider the situation in which tidal forces can be neglected. Thus, the Hamiltonian  $H$ , approximated by  $H^F$ , can be decomposed as follows,

$$H^F = h_r + h_R \quad (4)$$

$$h_r = \frac{\vec{p}^2}{2m} + v_{AB}(r) \quad (5)$$

$$h_R = \frac{\vec{P}^2}{2M} + v_F(R) . \quad (6)$$

The eigenstates of  $H^F$  for a total energy  $E$  can be expanded in terms of products of eigenstates of the internal Hamiltonian  $h_r$  corresponding to energies  $\epsilon_n$ , times eigenstates of  $h_R$  corresponding to energies  $E - \epsilon_n$ . We make use of a discrete and finite basis of  $N$  normalizable states of the relative motion of the fragments. These basis states include the bound states of the projectile and the resonant states of the continuum. Diagonalizing the internal Hamiltonian  $h_r$  in this basis, one obtains the eigenstates  $|nIM\rangle$  with internal energies  $\epsilon_n$ . Thus, the energy of the relative motion of the projectile and target in the asymptotic region is  $E_n = E - \epsilon_n$ . The states that correspond to energies  $E_n < 0$  do not contribute to the wave function asymptotically and, therefore, we restrict our basis space to  $E_n > 0$ . The states  $|nIM\rangle$  are characterized by a given angular momentum  $I, M$ . Thus, we can write

$$\langle \vec{r} | nIM \rangle = \phi_n(r) Y_{IM}(\hat{r}) \quad (7)$$

$$\langle \vec{p} | nIM \rangle = \tilde{\phi}_n(p) Y_{IM}(\hat{p}) \quad (8)$$

in coordinate and momentum space, respectively.

For the purpose of defining scattering magnitudes, let us consider the Hamiltonians free from the interaction with the target  $H^0$ , where  $H^F = H^0 + v_F(R)$ . The regular solutions of  $H^0$  are characterized by a total energy  $E$ , orbital angular momentum  $L$ , internal angular momentum of the fragments  $I$ , total angular momentum  $J$  and internal energy  $\epsilon_n$ :

$$|\Psi_{nILJM_J}^0(E)\rangle = \mathcal{J}_L(P_n R) |n(LI)JM_J\rangle, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_L$  represents a regular wave function of the free Hamiltonian that is just proportional to a Bessel function  $j_L(P_n R)$ , whereas  $|n(LI)JM_J\rangle$  is the channel wave function in which the internal state with angular momentum  $I$  is coupled to the relative angular momentum  $L$  to produce the total angular momentum  $J, M_J$ . The momentum associated to the relative motion is given by  $\vec{P}_n^2/2M = E - \epsilon_n$ . If one constructs wave packets out of this wave function, one will have incoming waves for  $t \rightarrow -\infty$ , and outgoing waves for  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . The scattering in  $H^F$  is such that the incoming waves will be unmodified, while the outgoing waves will be affected by the S-matrix due to the folding potential  $S_F(L, E_n)$ , which will be diagonal in the channel basis.

Let us now neglect the correlation between the projectile fragments. Then, the interaction  $v_{AB}$  is replaced by a constant  $\bar{v}$ . The total Hamiltonian can be written in terms of two non-interacting Hamiltonians

$$\bar{H} = h_A + h_B + \bar{v} \quad (10)$$

$$h_A = \frac{\vec{P}_A^2}{2m_A} + v_{AT}(R_{AT}) \quad (11)$$

$$h_B = \frac{\vec{P}_B^2}{2m_B} + v_{BT}(R_{BT}) . \quad (12)$$

The eigenstates of  $\bar{H}$  corresponding to an energy  $E$  can be expanded in terms of the product of eigenstates of  $h_A$  and  $h_B$ , such that  $E = E_A + E_B + \bar{v}$ . Given the adequate boundary conditions, it is straightforward to solve the scattering problem for the Hamiltonian  $\bar{H}$ . We consider the Hamiltonian free from interactions with the target  $\bar{H}^0$ , so that  $\bar{H} = \bar{H}^0 + v_{AT}(R_{AT}) + v_{BT}(R_{BT})$ . A solution of this Hamiltonian is given by the product of regular wave functions in the co-ordinates  $R_{AT}$  and  $R_{BT}$ , characterized by angular momenta  $L_A, M_A$  and  $L_B, M_B$ , and energies  $E_A$  and  $E_B$ .

$$|\Psi_{L_A M_A L_B M_B}^0(E)\rangle = \mathcal{J}_{L_A}(P_A R_{AT}) \mathcal{J}_{L_B}(P_B R_{BT}) |L_A M_A L_B M_B\rangle. \quad (13)$$

Then, constructing a wave-packet, we find that for  $t \rightarrow -\infty$ , the wave function is given by the product of incoming wave functions, while for  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  it is given by the product of outgoing wave functions. Cross terms containing the product of an incoming wave on one co-ordinate and an outgoing wave on the other are cancelled for  $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ . Then, if we switch on the interactions  $v_{AT} + v_{BT}$ , the incoming part is unaffected, while the outgoing part gets multiplied by the product of the elastic S-matrices generated by each potential. This means that the three-body S-matrix for the Hamiltonian  $\bar{H}$  is diagonal in the basis characterized by the linear momenta and angular momenta of each fragment, and is given by the product of the S-matrices of each fragment  $S(L_A, E_A)S(L_B, E_B)$ .

A basic point in order to deal with the matching is to realize that the wave functions of  $\bar{H}^0$  can be characterized by the hyper-angular momentum  $K$ . In a basis of hyper-spherical harmonics, the wave functions obtained in the absence of interactions can be written as

$$|\Psi_{KILJM_J}^0(E)\rangle = \mathcal{J}_K(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R})|K(LI)JM_J\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_K(x)$ , that is proportional to the Bessel function  $J_{K+2}(x)$ , is a regular solution of free three-body problem in terms of the hyper-radius  $\mathcal{R}$ , given by  $\mathcal{R}^2 = R^2 + r^2m/M$ , and the hyper-momentum  $\mathcal{P}$ , given by  $\mathcal{P}^2/2M = E - \bar{v}$ . The wave function  $|K(LI)JM_J\rangle$  can be written in terms of the hyper-angle  $\alpha$  that defines the ratio of  $p$  to  $\mathcal{P}$ , *i.e.*,  $\sin \alpha = (\sqrt{M/m})p/\mathcal{P}$ . Explicitly,

$$|K(LI)JM_J\rangle = \int_0^{\pi/2} d\alpha f_K^{LI}(\alpha) |\alpha(LI)JM_J\rangle, \quad (15)$$

with  $f_K^{LI}(\alpha)$  a function given in terms of the Jacobi polynomials (see appendix). The hyper-angular momentum  $K$  provides an upper bound for  $L$  and  $J$ , *i.e.*,  $J \leq L+I \leq K$ . Thus, if we take a value of  $K$  given by  $K_m = L_m$ , we can argue that for  $K > K_m$  tidal forces are less important than the forces between the fragments. On the contrary, when  $K \leq K_m$  the forces between the fragments will be small compared to the tidal forces. The relative importance of tidal forces compared to the forces between the fragments depends obviously on the values of  $R_{AT}$ ,  $R_{BT}$  and  $r$ . However, within the USA approach, such relative importance between both types of forces is basically determined by the value of  $K$ .

The Uncorrelated Scattering Approximation (USA) uses the expansion of the scattering wave function in terms of the hyper-angular momentum  $K$ .

Then, the Hamiltonian  $H$  is approximated by  $H^F$  for the components of the wave function such that  $K > K_m$ . Thus, tidal forces are ignored and the scattering is governed by the folding potential. This means that no excitation or break-up of the projectile occurs in these components. On the contrary, for  $K \leq K_m$  the Hamiltonian  $H$  is approximated by  $\bar{H}$ . Then, the correlation between the particles is ignored. It is very important to realize that the USA formulates different approximations for  $H$  in terms of the value of  $K$ , and not in terms of  $R$ . Thus,  $\bar{H}$  ( $H^F$ ) is the approximate expression of  $H$  for any  $R$ , provided that  $K \leq K_m$  ( $K > K_m$ ).

It is important to formulate the USA to ensure that the interaction does not couple states with  $K \leq K_m$  to states with  $K > K_m$ . In order to do that, let  $P$  be the projector on the states with  $K \leq K_m$  and  $Q$  the projector on the rest of states. The full Hamiltonians  $H$  can be expressed as  $HP + HQ$ . The USA implies that the term  $HP$  is approximated by  $P\bar{H}P$ , while  $HQ$  is approximated by  $QH^F$ . This ensures that the time evolution of a state  $|i\rangle$  is given by the sum of the evolution of  $P|i\rangle$  and that of  $Q|i\rangle$ , which remain mutually orthogonal.

We can now study what our approximation implies regarding the S-matrix. We start with a regular solution of  $H$  and then we construct a wave packet. For  $t \rightarrow -\infty$  the wave packet will be characterized by an incoming wave function times an internal state given by the ket  $|i\rangle = |nLIJM_J\rangle$ . The wave-packet for  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  will be a product of outgoing waves times a combination of states  $|f\rangle = |n'L'I'J'M'_J\rangle$ , multiplied by certain coefficients, which are the matrix elements of the S-matrix operator between the states  $\langle f|$  and  $|i\rangle$ . Then,

$$\langle f|S|i\rangle = \langle f|SP|i\rangle + \langle f|SQ|i\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Within the USA model, the Hamiltonian  $H$  is replaced by  $H^F$  when referred to states with  $K > K_m$ . This implies that the operator  $SQ$  can be approximated by  $S_F Q$ , where  $S_F$  is a c-number given by the elastic S-matrix for the calculation involving the folding potential. For  $K \leq K_m$  the Hamiltonian  $H$  can be substituted for  $\bar{H}$ , implying that the operator  $SP$  can be approximated by  $\bar{S}P$ , where  $\bar{S}$  is the S-matrix for the Hamiltonian  $\bar{H}$ . As we will see in next section,  $\bar{S}$  can be expressed in terms of the product of S-matrices of the two particles  $A$  and  $B$ , and it remains in the space of states with  $K \leq K_m$ . Thus,  $SP \simeq P\bar{S}P$ . Finally, we can write

$$\langle f|S|i\rangle \simeq S_F \delta_{f,i} + \langle f|\Delta S|i\rangle, \quad (17)$$

where  $\Delta S = P(\bar{S} - S_F)P$ . Therefore, within the Uncorrelated Scattering Approximation, the S-matrix is given by the sum of two terms: the S-matrix coming from the folding model, which contributes only to the elastic scattering, and a correction term that affects only to the components with  $K \leq K_m$ , and which contains all the excitation and break-up effects. This term is given by the difference between the S-matrices of the two uncorrelated fragments and the S-matrix from the folding model.

## 2.1 Boundary conditions

Let us proceed now to describe the boundary conditions. Consider a regular solution of  $H^0$ , characterized by a total energy  $E$ , orbital angular momentum  $L$ , internal angular momentum of the fragments  $I$ , total angular momentum  $J$  and internal energy  $\epsilon_n$ :

$$|\Psi_{nILJM_J}^0(E)\rangle = \mathcal{J}_L(P_n R)|n(LI)JM_J\rangle. \quad (18)$$

The state  $|n(LI)JM_J\rangle$  can be written explicitly as

$$|n(LI)JM_J\rangle = \int_0^\infty p^2 dp \tilde{\phi}_n(p) |p(LI)JM_J\rangle. \quad (19)$$

The channel wave function  $|n(LI)JM_J\rangle$  can be projected with the operator  $P$ , extracting the components with  $K \leq K_m$ . Thus, we have

$$P|n(LI)JM_J\rangle = \sum_{K=L+I}^{K_m} \langle K|n\rangle_{LI} |K(LI)JM_J\rangle, \quad (20)$$

where the overlap is given by

$$\langle K|n\rangle_{LI} = \int_0^{p_m} dpp \left[ \frac{d\alpha(p)}{dp} \right]^{1/2} f_K^{LI}(\alpha(p))^* \tilde{\phi}_n(p). \quad (21)$$

Thus, the asymptotic regular wave function, projected by  $P$  and written as an eigenstate of  $\bar{H}^0$ , becomes

$$P|\Psi_{nLIJM_J}^0(E)\rangle = \sum_K \langle K|n\rangle_{LI} |\Psi_{KLIJM_J}^0(E)\rangle \quad (22)$$

where

$$|\Psi_{KLIJM_J}^0(E)\rangle = \mathcal{J}_K(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R})|K(LI)JM_J\rangle. \quad (23)$$

Using the Raynal-Revai transformation [27], the incident wave function can be expressed in terms of the angular momenta associated to the coordinates  $R_{AT}, R_{BT}$ ,

$$|K(LI)JM_J\rangle = \sum_{L_A L_B} \langle L_A L_B | LI \rangle_{JK} |K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle, \quad (24)$$

with  $J \leq L_A + L_B \leq K$ . Thus, we can write

$$|\Psi_{KLIJM_J}^0(E)\rangle = \sum_{L_A L_B} \langle L_A L_B | LI \rangle_{JK} |\Psi_{K L_A L_B J M_J}^0(E)\rangle. \quad (25)$$

Note that the Raynal-Revai coefficient vanishes for  $K < L + I$  or  $K < L_A + L_B$ . The state  $|\Psi_{K L_A L_B J M_J}^0(E)\rangle$  is a regular solution of  $\bar{H}^0$  for specific values of  $L_A, L_B$  and  $K$

$$|\Psi_{K L_A L_B J M_J}^0(E)\rangle = \mathcal{J}_K(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{R})|K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle. \quad (26)$$

The angular momenta  $L_A$  and  $L_B$  are separately conserved in the scattering process due to  $\bar{H}$ . However, the hyper-angular momentum  $K$ , which is a good quantum number for  $\bar{H}^0$ , is no longer conserved by  $\bar{H}$ . Thus, one can proceed by using a new basis that keeps  $L_A$  and  $L_B$  as quantum numbers, but replaces  $K$  with other quantum number which is conserved by  $\bar{H}$ . Note that this Hamiltonian (12) conserves the energy, and hence the asymptotic momentum of each particle separately. In the appendix we show how to transform the states characterized by the values of  $K$  up to  $K_m$  into states that have, approximately, a defined value of the momentum of each particle. This transformation is achieved in terms of the Momentum Localized States (MLS)  $|\ell(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle$ . These states depend on the momenta  $P_A$  and  $P_B$  which are strongly peaked around the values  $P_A^\ell = \mathcal{P}\sqrt{M_A/M}\cos(\beta_\ell)$  and  $P_B^\ell = \mathcal{P}\sqrt{M_B/M}\sin(\beta_\ell)$ , respectively. The energies are given by  $E_A^\ell = (E - \bar{v})\cos^2(\beta_\ell)$  and  $E_B^\ell = (E - \bar{v})\sin^2(\beta_\ell)$ . The relation between the localized states and the original states is given by means of an orthogonal transformation,

$$|K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_\ell} \langle \ell | K \rangle_{L_A L_B} |\ell(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle, \quad (27)$$

where the number of momentum localized states,  $n_\ell$ , coincides with the number of states with definite  $K$ ,  $n_\ell = [(K_m - L_A - L_B)/2] + 1$ . The coefficients

of the transformation are analytic expressions given in the appendix. Then, we can write

$$|\Psi_{KLAL_BJM_J}^0(E)\rangle = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_\ell} \langle \ell|K\rangle_{L_AL_B} |\Psi_{\ell L_AL_BJM_J}^0(E)\rangle . \quad (28)$$

The state  $|\Psi_{\ell L_AL_BJM_J}^0(E)\rangle$  corresponds to a regular wave function in which the two particles  $A$  and  $B$  have linear momenta with narrow distributions around  $P_A^\ell$  and  $P_B^\ell$ , and angular momenta  $L_A$  and  $L_B$ , respectively. If we define

$$\langle \ell L_AL_B|nLI\rangle_J = \sum_{K=L_A+L_B}^{K_m} \langle K|n\rangle_{LI} \langle L_AL_B|LI\rangle_{JK} \langle \ell|K\rangle_{L_AL_B}, \quad (29)$$

which is a coefficient that depends on the bound wave functions and on analytic transformation coefficients, we can write finally,

$$P|\Psi_{nILJM_J}^{(0)}(E)\rangle = \sum_{L_AL_B} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_\ell} \langle \ell L_AL_B|nLI\rangle_J |\Psi_{\ell L_AL_BJM_J}^0(E)\rangle. \quad (30)$$

Note that this transformation relates the asymptotic states that define the boundary condition of the scattering problem, with the states for which each particle has a well defined angular and linear momentum. From this expression, we can construct the incoming and outgoing waves just by making the adequate wave-packets. For  $t \rightarrow -\infty$ , eq. (30) relates the incoming parts of  $P|\Psi_{nILJM_J}^{(0)}(E)\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_{\ell L_AL_BJM_J}^0(E)\rangle$ , while for  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , it relates the outgoing parts.

## 2.2 S-matrix to bound and resonant break-up states

Within the Uncorrelated Scattering Approximation, the two particles scatter independently inside the interaction region where the full Hamiltonian, projected on values  $K \leq K_m$ ,  $PHP$ , is replaced by  $P\bar{H}P$ . The S-matrix is simply expressed in a basis of momentum localized states  $|\Psi_{\ell L_AL_BJM_J}^0(E)\rangle$ . A wave packet of these states at  $t \rightarrow -\infty$  evolves according to  $PHP$  to give for  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , the product of the S-matrices  $S_A(L_A, E_A^\ell)S_B(L_B, E_B^\ell)$  times the wave-packet. Note that in writing this expression, one substitutes the narrow energy distributions of  $E_A$  and  $E_B$  of the MLS state for their central values  $E_A^\ell, E_B^\ell$ .

The matrix elements of  $P\bar{S}P$  in the channel basis  $|nLIJ\rangle$  can be evaluated considering the transformation (30),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n'I'L'J|P\bar{S}P|nILJ\rangle &= \sum_{L_AL_B} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_\ell} \langle \ell L_AL_B|nLI\rangle_J \langle n'L'I'|\ell L_AL_B\rangle_J \\ &\times S_A(L_A, E_A^\ell) S_B(L_B, E_B^\ell), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

with  $J \leq L_A + L_B \leq K_m$ .

In order to evaluate the matrix elements for  $PS_F P$  one should note that the operator  $S_F$  is a function of the orbital angular momentum  $L$  and the energy of relative motion  $E_n$ . It conserves the orbital angular momentum  $L$  and the internal angular momentum  $I$ , and is independent on  $K$ . Moreover, the operator  $P$  conserves  $L$  and  $I$  and projects on  $K \leq K_m$ . Thus, we can write

$$\langle n'I'L'J|PS_F P|nILJ\rangle = \delta_{I'I} \delta_{L'L} S_F(L, E_n) \sum_K^{K_m} \langle n'|K\rangle_{IL} \langle K|n\rangle_{IL}, \quad (32)$$

that can be also expressed in the form,

$$\langle n'I'L'J|PS_F P|nILJ\rangle = \sum_{L_AL_B} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_\ell} \langle \ell L_AL_B|nLI\rangle_J \langle n'L'I'|\ell L_AL_B\rangle_J S_F(L, E_n), \quad (33)$$

where we have used orthogonality properties.

Then, the final expression for the S-matrix in the Uncorrelated Scattering Model results

$$\langle n'I'L'J|S|nILJ\rangle = \delta_{n'n} \delta_{I'I} \delta_{L'L} S_F(L, E) + \langle n'I'L'J|\Delta S|nILJ\rangle, \quad (34)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n'I'L'J|\Delta S|nILJ\rangle &= \sum_{L_AL_B} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n_\ell} \langle \ell L_AL_B|nLI\rangle_J \langle n'L'I'|\ell L_AL_B\rangle_J \\ &\times \left\{ S_A(L_A, E_A^\ell) S_B(L_B, E_B^\ell) - S_F(E, L) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

This expression is valid for elastic scattering, inelastic scattering to bound states and break-up to resonant states in the continuum. We also notice that the expression (34) can be interpreted as the matrix element of the operator  $S_F + \Delta S$ , with  $\Delta S = P(\bar{S} - S_F)P$ , between the initial and final internal states.

### 2.3 Partial non-resonant breakup cross section

In the previous section we have derived expressions for the S-matrix elements corresponding to final states, bound or resonant, that can be represented by normalizable wave functions. They are given in terms of the matrix elements of the operator  $\Delta S$  that is naturally described in the MLS basis  $|\ell(L_A L_B)J\rangle$ , in which this operator is diagonal. Thus, only the overlap between the wave function of the final state and the states in the MLS basis is required to be known. The same procedure could be applied to calculate break-up to non-resonant continuum states. Provided that the corresponding wave functions are known in momentum representation, the overlap can be obtained.

In this section we do not calculate the expressions for the break-up to specific states in the continuum as they should depend on the detailed continuum states wave functions considered. Instead, we derive closed expressions for the non-resonant break-up cross sections, integrated over all the possible values of the energies of the fragments, but characterized by a certain angular momentum of the fragments  $I'$  and of the relative motion  $L'$ .

Making use of the completeness relation for the internal eigenstates, it is possible to derive a closed expression for the partial breakup cross section leading from the initial bound state  $|nLIJ\rangle$  to all the final non-resonant continuum states characterized by the set of angular momenta  $\{L', I', J\}$ . We denote this cross section by  $\sigma_J^{bu}(nLI \rightarrow L'I')$ . The details of the derivation are given in [28] and will be published elsewhere. In this situation the final expression for the partial breakup cross section within the USA is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_J^{bu}(nLI \rightarrow L'I') &= \frac{\pi}{P_0^2} (2L+1) \left\{ \sum_K |\langle K(L'I')J | \Delta S | nLIJ \rangle|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{n'} |\langle n'L'I'J | \Delta S | nLIJ \rangle|^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where  $P_0$  is the asymptotic incident momentum of the projectile. This expression has a simple interpretation. The first term is the cross section induced by the operator  $\Delta S$  to all the states labeled by the angular momenta  $K, L', I', J$ , that include the contribution of the bound and resonant states, which are explicitly subtracted by the second term. The summation with respect to  $K$  is extended to all the values between  $L' + I'$  and  $K_m$ .

It is also possible to obtain a compact expression for the breakup cross section corresponding to a total angular momentum  $J$ ,  $\sigma_J^{bu}(nLI)$ . This is

achieved upon summation of  $\sigma_J^{bu}(nLI \rightarrow L'I')$  on the angular momenta  $L'$  and  $I'$  and taking into account the completeness property of the states  $|K(L'I')JM_J\rangle$ . This leads to the close expression

$$\sigma_J^{bu}(nLI) = \frac{\pi}{F_0^2}(2L+1) \left\{ \langle nLIJ | (\Delta S)^+ \Delta S | nLIJ \rangle - \sum_{n'L'I'} |\langle n'L'I'J | \Delta S | nLIJ \rangle|^2 \right\}. \quad (37)$$

Then, within the USA, the non-resonant breakup cross section for a given total angular momentum is calculated as the dispersion of the operator  $\Delta S$  in the ground state of the projectile, subtracting the contribution of the other bound and resonant states.

### 3 Application to the $d + {}^{58}\text{Ni}$ reaction

In this section we apply the uncorrelated scattering approximation to the analysis of elastic and breakup scattering of  $d$  by  ${}^{58}\text{Ni}$ . Though the USA is expected to work better for more loosely bound projectiles such as  ${}^8\text{B}$  or  ${}^{11}\text{Be}$ , for which the correlations between the fragments are weaker than for the deuteron, we start studying the case of the deuteron because this is a much better known system for which numerous calculations and experimental data already exist.

The reaction  $d + {}^{58}\text{Ni}$  has been extensively studied by the Kyushu group by means of Continuum Discretized Coupled Channel Calculations (CDCC) [29–31]. It has also been used as a test case of the adiabatic approximation [32] and the Glauber multiple-scattering theory [33]. All these approaches predict an important effect of the coupling to the breakup channels that results in a significant departure of their predictions compared to the folding model calculation. This is a characteristic phenomenon of reactions involving halo nuclei. Therefore, some of the conclusions arising from the analysis of reactions with deuterons can be also extended to the case of exotic nuclei.

We first analyze the elastic scattering data at 80 MeV. As already mentioned, the calculation of the elastic  $S$ -matrix elements within the USA requires the following ingredients:

i) The internal wave function of the deuteron. Within the USA this wave function enters in both the folding potential and the coefficients  $\langle n|K\rangle_{LI}$  appearing in eq. (34). We adopt in this work a simple model of the deuteron

which results from the assumption that the proton-neutron potential is separable in momentum space [34]. In this model the S-wave component of the deuteron ground state is described in momentum space by the simple analytic expression

$$\tilde{\phi}_0(p) = N \frac{\exp(-p^2/2mC)}{p^2 + 2mB}, \quad (38)$$

where  $\hbar/\sqrt{mC}$  is related to the range of the proton-neutron interaction,  $B$  is the binding energy of the deuteron ( $B = 2.22$  MeV) and  $N$  is a normalization constant. We neglect the small D-wave component of the ground state wave function and the proton and neutron intrinsic spins.

ii) The second ingredient of the USA refers to the two-body  $S$  matrices for the constituents. In the case of the deuteron, the proton-target and neutron-target  $S$ -matrices ( $S_p, S_n$ ) are required for values of the angular momenta in the interval  $0 \leq L_p, L_n \leq K_m$ , and values of the energies determined by the momentum localized states, which lie in the range  $0 \leq E_p, E_n \leq E - \bar{v}$ . These  $S$  matrices have been calculated by means of optical potentials as it is done in the CDCC, adiabatic and Glauber calculations. In these formalisms the proton and neutron optical potentials are evaluated at half of the incident deuteron energy and so, the energy dependence of the optical potential parameters is neglected. This approximation is based on the assumption that the proton and neutron move approximately with the same velocity of the deuteron center of mass, and the dispersion around this value is small. Those configurations for which one of the fragments carry the whole available energy must be highly suppressed. Within the USA this fact is explicitly included in the coefficients,  $\langle n(LI)J|\ell L_A L_B \rangle$ , that can be physically regarded as the amplitude probability of having the constituents of the projectile with angular momenta  $L_A$  and  $L_B$ , and energies  $E_A^\ell$  and  $E_B^\ell$  within a state characterized by the relative angular momentum  $L$ , internal momentum  $I$  and total angular momentum  $J$ . In fact, these coefficients favour those configurations for which each one of the particles carries half of the incident angular momentum and half of the available energy, according to a classical picture. It is important to note that, within the USA, the energy dependence of the optical potential is naturally taken into account by solving the proton-target and neutron-target Schrödinger equations at definite scattering energies. In particular, we perform the calculations with the optical potentials of Ref. [35].

The USA also requires the introduction of two parameters, the average

potential,  $\bar{v}$ , and the cut-off hyper angular momentum,  $K_m$ . These parameters have a clear physical interpretation and so they could be set to some reasonable values, or otherwise fitted to improve the agreement with exact calculations. Nevertheless, we keep in mind that our purpose in developing the model is to apply it to weakly bound systems for which  $K_m$  must be large and  $\bar{v}$  small. Then, we have adopted the simplest approach. We take  $K_m$  large enough to achieve convergence for the S-matrix elements. This means that the correlations between the fragments can be neglected even at large distances. For the average potential we take  $\bar{v}=0$ . Several test calculations have revealed a weak dependence on this parameter. Hence its choice does not affect significantly the results.

The calculated angular distribution of the elastic differential cross section, divided by the Rutherford cross section, is plotted in Fig. 1. Experimental data are represented by circles. The dotted line refers to the folding calculation, which clearly overestimates the cross section at intermediate angles. The dashed line is the result of the CDCC calculation taken from [29] that, compared with the folding model, predicts a significant reduction of the cross section at intermediate angles. This is a consequence of the coupling to breakup channels. The solid line corresponds to the USA calculation with the cutoff hyper angular momentum  $K_m=30$ , for which convergence of the S-matrix elements is achieved. As shown, experimental data are not accurately reproduced by the full USA calculation that overestimates the reduction of the cross section with respect to the folding model due to break-up effects.

In order to provide an explanation of this result we investigate the partial breakup cross section,  $\sigma_J^{bu}$ . Within the USA, this quantity can be easily evaluated without any explicit description of the continuum states, by means of eq. (37) that only requires the introduction of the ground state wave function. In Fig. 2 we show the distribution of  $\sigma_J^{bu}$  versus the total angular momentum  $J$  calculated in the USA (thin solid line). This result is compared with the CDCC calculation (dashed line) performed within the subspace  $I'=0, 2$ . Thus, in order to enable a meaningful comparison between both approaches, we have also calculated within USA, the contribution to the breakup cross section due to the S ( $I'=0$ ) and D ( $I'=2$ ) components. The result, plotted in Fig. 2 by the thick solid line, shows a fairly good agreement with the CDCC calculation (dashed line) [29, 30]. Apart from the agreement in the overall magnitude, the angular momentum dependence is also accurately reproduced, including the surface-peak nature of the elastic breakup process.

From the results for the partial breakup cross section (Fig. 2), it is clear




Figure 1: Elastic differential cross sections angular distributions (as ratio to Rutherford) for  $d + {}^{58}\text{Ni}$  scattering at 80 MeV. The dotted, dashed and thin solid line correspond, respectively, to the folding, CDCC and full USA calculations. The thick solid line is the restricted USA calculation which contains only the effect of  $l' = 0, 2$  breakup states. Experimental data [36] are given by circles.

that the USA predicts an important contribution to the breakup coming from continuum states with internal angular momenta  $I' > 2$ . Austern *et al.* [31] have studied the convergence of the CDCC calculation for this reaction with respect to the cut-off internal angular momentum. Their calculations reveal a small contribution to the breakup cross section coming from breakup channels with  $I' > 2$ . For example, within the model space  $I'=0,1,2,4,6$ , for which a good convergence of the solution is achieved, the breakup cross section associated to  $J=17$  is 17.27 mb, whereas the USA predicts a value of 22 mb. We interpret this discrepancy as a consequence of the basic approximation involved in the USA, *i.e.*, to neglect the correlations between the constituents in the scattering process. In this sense, our treatment is opposite to the adiabatic approximation, in which the internal coordinate is assumed to be frozen during the collision, keeping the constituents strongly correlated, and thus avoiding the breakup to high angular momentum states.

This effect could also explain the discrepancy encountered for the differential elastic cross section. In order to provide a numerical assessment of this hypothesis we have performed a new calculation for the elastic cross section in which the contribution of the continuum channels with  $I' \neq 0, 2$  has been excluded in an effective way. We recall that the elastic S-matrix in the USA is given by the sum of two terms, the first one coming from the folding potential and the latter,  $\Delta S$ , which describes dynamic polarization effects due to the coupling to breakup channels. Therefore, this second term arises from the effect of the tidal forces. However, the tidal potential  $v_T$  has vanishing diagonal matrix elements on the ground state of the projectile. Thus, the contribution of break-up states with angular momenta  $I'$  to the elastic matrix elements of  $\Delta S$  (up to lowest order in the tidal forces) depends on second order coupling through the expression

$$\langle \phi_0 LIJ | \Delta S(I') | \phi_0 LIJ \rangle \propto \sum_{bu, L'} \langle \phi_0 LIJ | v_T | bu; L'I'J \rangle G^+(bu; L'I'J) \langle bu; L'I'J | v_T | \phi_0 LIJ \rangle, \quad (39)$$

where  $G^+(bu; L'I'J)$  is a propagator and the sum extends to the breakup states. In the particular case in which off-shell dependence is removed from the the breakup states involved in the propagator, the right hand side of eq. (39) is proportional to the square of the distorted wave integral of the tidal potential. To lowest order, this term is simply proportional to the break-up cross section.

A restriction in the number of breakup states considered will produce

a reduction in the elastic matrix elements of  $\Delta S$ . The results presented in Fig. 2 show that the USA calculation including  $I' = 0, 2$  break-up is correct, whereas the calculation of break-up to larger angular momentum is overestimated. Thus, making use of the proportionality between elastic matrix elements of  $\Delta S$  and the break-up cross section, we get

$$\langle nLIJ|\Delta S(I' = 0, 2)|nLIJ\rangle = \langle nLIJ|\Delta S|nLIJ\rangle \frac{\sigma_J^{bu}(I' = 0, 2)}{\sigma_J^{bu}}, \quad (40)$$

where  $\sigma_J^{bu}(I' = 0, 2)$  is the restricted breakup cross section and  $\Delta S(I' = 0, 2)$  its associated elastic S-matrix contribution. The corresponding elastic differential cross section resulting from this prescription, which we call “restricted” USA calculation, is represented by the thick solid line in Fig. 1. The result is in very good agreement with the experimental data, supporting the hypothesis that the strong coupling to high spin breakup states within USA is responsible for the reduction in the elastic cross sections. If this coupling to high spin states ( $I' > 2$ ) is excluded from the calculation, and the elastic matrix elements are modified accordingly, then both the elastic differential cross sections and the partial break-up are well described.

An interesting question is to assess the validity of the USA at low energies where other models, which are successfully applied to the high energy regime, fail to reproduce the experimental data. This is the case of the sudden approximation and, in particular the Glauber model, that can be regarded as a high energy approximation to the adiabatic treatment. To this end we have applied the USA to the reaction  $d + {}^{58}\text{Ni}$  at 21.6 and 56 MeV, for which experimental data are available [37]. We use the same wave function for the deuteron ground state as in the previous calculations. The Perey optical model parameterization [38] for protons and neutrons has been selected. The angular distribution of the elastic differential cross section is shown in Figs. 3 and 4 where we compare the experimental data with the USA result (thin solid line), the USA result considering break-up with  $I' = 0, 2$  (thick solid line), the CDCC calculation (dashed line) and the folding model (dotted line).

The results obtained for 56 MeV, shown in Fig. 3, are qualitatively similar to the ones for 80 MeV (Fig. 1). The full USA calculation displays a too large reduction in the elastic cross section with respect to the folding model prediction. However, the “restricted” USA calculation, which considers only the effect of break-up to  $I' = 0, 2$ , reproduces accurately the experimental data.




Figure 2: Partial breakup cross section, as a function of the angular momentum. The thin solid line is total breakup cross section predicted by the USA calculation (eq. 37). The thick solid line corresponds also to the USA calculation, but including only the S and D continuum channels. The dashed line is the analogous calculation in the CDCC approach.




Figure 3: Elastic differential cross sections angular distributions for  $d + {}^{58}\text{Ni}$  at 56 MeV. The meaning of the curves is the same as in Fig. 1.

In Fig. 4 we present the results for 21.6 MeV. Here there is a fairly good agreement between the full USA calculation and the experiment up to 100 degrees. It is noticeable that the angular region between 50 and 100 degrees is even better described by the USA model than by the CDCC approach. The “restricted” USA calculation improves the agreement with the experimental data.

These results indicate that the USA is adequate to calculate deuteron break-up cross sections to states with  $I' = 0, 2$ , which are the most important break-up components, although it overestimates the break-up cross sections to deuteron states with  $I' > 2$ . As far as elastic scattering is concerned, the full USA calculation gives in general, a too strong reduction in the cross sections. However, the “restricted” USA calculation, which takes effectively into account only the effect of coupling to  $I' = 0, 2$  break-up states, reproduces satisfactorily deuteron elastic scattering data at all the energies considered.

Although more detailed tests should be required in order to delimit the range of validity of the USA, these preliminary results suggest that the model can be used as an alternative tool to analyze experimental data of halo nuclei




Figure 4: Elastic differential cross sections angular distributions for  $d + {}^{58}\text{Ni}$  at 21.6 MeV. The meaning of the curves is the same as in Fig. 1.

at relatively low energies, around and above the Coulomb barrier.

## 4 Summary and conclusions

We have developed a new approach, called the Uncorrelated Scattering Approximation (USA), applicable to the scattering of weakly bound nuclei. Our first requirement is that the target is very heavy compared with the fragments of the projectile. Although this assumption is not essential to the model it simplifies importantly the general formalism. The USA arises from the fact that the three-body Hamiltonian corresponding to a composite projectile can be written as a sum of two non-interacting two-body Hamiltonians in two limit cases: i) when the tidal forces are neglected, and ii) when the forces between the fragments of the projectile are neglected. In the first case, the projectile remains in its ground state, the interaction with the target is given by the folding potential and the S-matrix is given by the solution of the corresponding two-body scattering problem  $S_F(L, E)$ . In the second case, the particles scatter independently. This means that if the initial wave function is given by the product of incident waves of the particles, the wave function in the final state is characterized by a product of outgoing waves, multiplied by the corresponding S-matrices,  $S_A(L_A, E_A)S_B(L_B, E_B)$ . Thus, within the USA one neglects tidal forces in the scattering region corresponding to large separations, whereas in the scattering region, corresponding to small separations, the forces between the fragments of the projectile are ignored. The regions of large and small separations are defined in terms of the hyper angular momentum  $K$ . Large separations correspond to  $K > K_m$ , and small separations to  $K \leq K_m$ , with  $K_m$  defined such that its turning point corresponds to a distance  $R_m$  for which tidal forces and the forces between the fragments are comparable. For  $K > K_m$  the forces between the fragments dominate, while for  $K \leq K_m$  tidal forces are more important. Thus,  $K_m$  is a parameter of the USA model. The other parameter,  $\bar{v}$ , is a constant that substitutes the interaction between the fragments when  $K < K_m$ .

The proper boundary conditions for the region  $K \leq K_m$  requires the projection of the initial state in a discrete basis of states which are strongly localized for certain values of the relative momentum of the fragments. These momentum localized states can be transformed analytically to states which have definite values of the hyper-angular momentum  $K$ . Then, the Raynal-Revai coefficients are used to transform the initial states, given in terms of the

projectile-target angular momentum  $L$  and the internal angular momentum  $I$ , to states that depend directly on the angular momentum of the fragments with the target,  $L_A$  and  $L_B$ . Finally, a certain combination of  $K$ -values is done in order to obtain states with strongly localized values of the kinetic energy of each fragment. This procedure allows to write the S-matrix of the projectile in terms of the product  $S_A(L_A, E_A)S_B(L_B, E_B)$  of the S-matrices of the fragments, evaluated at certain values of the energy and angular momentum of the fragments with respect to the target. Then, the formalism can be applied directly to describe scattering to bound and resonant break-up states, as well as to direct break-up states.

The main advantage of the USA is that it allows to express the S-matrix of the composite system in terms of the wave function of the bound states and the scattering S-matrices of the fragments with the target. These S-matrices can be easily obtained from calculations that fit the cross sections of scattering experiments of the fragments with the target. In this sense, the fragment-target interaction is treated to all orders, and the only assumption one makes on the reaction dynamics is to neglect the correlation between the fragments. Thus, the USA approach presents some advantages compared with previous treatments. Effects of absorption or “shadowing”, which are included by means of *ad-hoc* profile functions in some spectator models [8,9], appear naturally here, as occurs in Glauber approaches [22,23], because the S-matrices  $S_A(L_A, E_A)$  and  $S_B(L_B, E_B)$  of the fragments include the effects of absorption for low  $L_A$  and  $L_B$  values. Compared with semi-classical approaches [24,25], the USA does not make use of the concept of classical trajectories for the relative motion. Compared with Glauber analyses [22,23], the USA justifies the expression of the three-body S-matrix in terms of the product of the S-matrices of the fragments from very general considerations, that do not require to make use of the eikonal assumption of forward scattering, or straight line trajectories. Also, our expressions depend on the S-matrices of the fragments evaluated at integer orbital angular momenta, while previous Glauber-type approaches rely on evaluating by interpolation the S-matrices of the fragments as a function of real impact parameters, which would correspond to non-integer L-values. Finally, the USA also differs from Glauber-type approaches, and other approaches based on the adiabatic approximation, for which the velocity of all the fragments with respect to the target is equal to the projectile velocity, and so the energies of the fragments are fixed quantities proportional to the masses. In the USA, the relative energy of the fragments with respect to the target,  $E_A^\ell$ ,  $E_B^\ell$  can take different

values, reflecting the fact that in the incident projectile the fragments have a certain momentum distribution. As the USA does not make use of the eikonal approximation, which is essentially a forward-scattering approach, we consider that it can be useful when applied to scattering of weakly bound halo nuclei at low scattering energies, comparable to the Coulomb barrier.

Apart from the theoretical formulation of the USA, we have also presented a preliminary application of the approach to the reaction  $d+^{58}\text{Ni}$  at 21.6 and 80 MeV. The parameter  $K_m$  is set to a large value, and  $\bar{v}$  is taken as zero. This corresponds to neglect completely the effect of proton-neutron correlation in the scattering. Concerning elastic scattering at 80 MeV, the USA gives rise to a depletion of the cross sections at intermediate angles with respect to the folding model prediction. The experimental data and the CDCC calculations also show this depletion, although not so large as in the USA model. The break-up cross sections at 80 MeV to  $I' = 0$  and  $I' = 2$  states in the USA approach is consistent with the CDCC calculation. However, break-up cross sections to  $I' > 2$  states, which are sizeable in the USA, are strongly suppressed in the CDCC calculations. When the USA calculation of the elastic scattering is modified to exclude effectively the coupling to  $I' > 2$  states, the experimental differential cross sections and CDCC calculations are very well reproduced. Using the same procedure for the elastic cross sections at 21.6 and 56 MeV, the experimental data are also accurately reproduced.

Our interpretation of these results for deuteron scattering is that the proton-neutron correlations, which are neglected in the USA calculation, play a significant role. These correlations show up in the evaluation of break-up cross sections to  $I' > 2$  states. Within the USA model, the proton and neutron scatter independently from the target, and so, after the scattering they have a certain probability to end up in a state with large relative angular momentum. However, in reality the proton and neutron remain correlated, and this correlation suppresses large  $I'$  break-up components in the wave function. Once these components are excluded, both elastic and break-up cross sections are well reproduced by the USA calculation.

We expect that, for the scattering of halo nuclei at energies around the Coulomb barrier, the effect of the correlations between the fragments will be less important than in the case of deuteron. Thus, the uncorrelated USA calculation will be more reliable and we may expect to see more clearly the features of the USA calculations. These include an important decrease of the elastic cross section with respect to the folding model prediction, and

sizeable contributions to break-up with large angular momentum between the fragments.

**Acknowledgements** We acknowledge fruitful discussions with J. Raynal and R.C. Johnson. This work has been partially supported by the Spanish CICYT project PB98-1111. A.M.M. acknowledges a grant from the Fundación Cámara of the Universidad de Sevilla. We are grateful to E. Stephenson and J. Al-Khalili for providing us with the experimental data for the reaction  $d + {}^{58}\text{Ni}$  in tabulated form.

## Appendix A

### Momentum Localized States associated to hyper-spherical harmonics (HH)

In this appendix we show how states characterized by definite values of the linear momenta of the constituents can be built starting from a truncated basis of hyper-spherical harmonics.

First, let us introduce the HH states,  $|K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle$ , characterized by the hyper-angular momentum  $K$ , the orbital angular momenta  $L_A$  and  $L_B$  of particles  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively, and the total angular momentum  $J$  and its projection  $M_J$ . We define the angle  $\beta$  that connects the linear momenta of the particles with the hyper-momentum  $\mathcal{P}$  through the relations  $P_A = (\sqrt{M_A/M})\mathcal{P} \cos \beta$  and  $P_B = (\sqrt{M_B/M})\mathcal{P} \sin \beta$ . The states  $|K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle$  can be expressed in terms of states with definite values of  $\beta$  as

$$|K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle = \int_0^{\pi/2} d\beta f_K^{L_A L_B}(\beta) |\beta(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$f_K^{L_A L_B}(\beta) = N_K^{L_A L_B} (\cos \beta)^{L_A+1} (\sin \beta)^{L_B+1} P_n^{(L_B+\frac{1}{2}, L_A+\frac{1}{2})}(\cos 2\beta), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $P_n^{(a,b)}$  denotes a Jacobi polynomial of degree  $n = (K - L_A - L_B)/2$  and  $N_K^{L_A L_B}$  represents the normalization constant

$$N_K^{L_A L_B} = \left[ \frac{2n!(K+2)(n+L_A+L_B+1)!}{\Gamma(n+L_A+\frac{3}{2})\Gamma(n+L_B+\frac{3}{2})} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The function  $f_K^{L_A L_B}(\beta)$  is normalized to unity in the variable in the variable  $\beta$ :

$$\int_0^{\pi/2} d\beta [f_K^{L_A L_B}(\beta)]^2 = 1. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

This property also guarantees that the HH are normalized to unity. The hyper-angular momentum can take the values  $K = L_A + L_B, L_A + L_B + 2, \dots$  giving rise to an infinite number of states in eq. (A.1). One of the basic ingredients in the Uncorrelated Scattering Approximation developed in Section III is the introduction of a maximum hyper-angular momentum  $K_m$  which reduces the infinite set of states to a finite one:  $K = L_A + L_B, L_A + L_B + 2, \dots, K_m$ . In terms of the index  $n$  we have the subset:  $n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ , with  $N = (K_m - L_A - L_B)/2 + 1$ .

The family of Jacobi polynomials,  $\{P_n^{(a,b)}(x); n = 0, \dots, N-1\}$ , constitute an orthogonal set of functions in the interval  $(-1, +1)$  with respect to the weight function  $\omega(x) = \frac{1}{4}(\frac{1-x}{2})^a(\frac{1+x}{2})^b$ :

$$\int_{-1}^1 dx \omega(x) [P_n^{(a,b)}(x)]^2 = h_n \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where

$$h_n = \frac{\Gamma[n+a+1]\Gamma[n+b+1]}{2(2n+a+b+1)n!\Gamma[n+a+b+1]}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

From this family of Jacobi polynomials a new set of  $N$  polynomials of degree  $N-1$  are defined as [39]

$$Q_{N-1}^{(a,b)}(x_\ell, x) = \sum_{K=L_A+L_B}^{K_m} [N_K^{L_A L_B}]^2 P_n^{(a,b)}(x) P_n^{(a,b)}(x_\ell); \quad \ell = 1, \dots, N. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Here,  $\{x_\ell; \ell = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  represent the zeros of the polynomial  $P_N^{(a,b)}(x)$ . Direct application of Christoffel-Darboux formula (see ref. [40]) on the previous expression leads to

$$Q_{N-1}^{(a,b)}(x_\ell, x) = \frac{P_{N-1}^{(a,b)}(x_\ell) k_{N-1} P_N^{(a,b)}(x)}{h_{N-1} k_N (x - x_\ell)} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where  $k_N$  is the coefficient of  $x^N$  in  $P_N^{(a,b)}(x)$ . The polynomials  $Q_{N-1}^{(a,b)}(x_\ell, x)$  are orthogonal in the same interval and relative to the same weight function

as the original polynomials. The expression above shows that the polynomial  $Q_{N-1}^{(a,b)}(x_\ell, x)$  vanishes at the points  $x = x_s; s = 1, \dots, N$  except at  $x = x_\ell$ .

The new set of polynomials allows us to construct Momentum Localized States (MLS) which are defined as

$$|\ell(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle = (w_{N\ell}^{L_A L_B})^{(1/2)} \int_0^{\pi/2} d\beta (\cos \beta)^{L_A+1} (\sin \beta)^{L_B+1} \\ \times Q_{N-1}^{(L_B+\frac{1}{2}, L_A+\frac{1}{2})}(x_\ell, \cos(2\beta)) |\beta(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle \quad (\text{A.9})$$

with

$$w_{N\ell}^{(L_A L_B)} = \left[ Q_{N-1}^{(L_B+\frac{1}{2}, L_A+\frac{1}{2})}(x_\ell, x_\ell) \right]^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Substituting the explicit expressions of  $h_{N-1}$ ,  $k_{N-1}$  and  $k_N$  [40] in (A.10) one gets

$$w_{N\ell}^{(L_A L_B)} = \frac{1}{2^3} \frac{(2N+a+b)^2}{(N+a)^2(N+b)^2} \frac{\Gamma[N+a+1]\Gamma[N+b+1]}{N! \Gamma[N+a+b+1]} \frac{1-x_\ell^2}{\left[ P_{N-1}^{(a,b)}(x_\ell) \right]^2}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where  $a = L_B + 1/2$  and  $b = L_A + 1/2$  in our case.

The state  $|\ell(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle$  is characterized by values of the momenta of the two particles sharply peaked around  $P_A^\ell = (\sqrt{M_A/M})\mathcal{P}\sqrt{(1+x_\ell)/2}$  and  $P_B^\ell = (\sqrt{M_B/M})\mathcal{P}\sqrt{(1-x_\ell)/2}$ . This localization is enhanced as the number of states increases which, in turn, depends on the cut off hyper-angular momentum  $K_m$ .

An orthogonal transformation can be defined between the truncated hyper-spherical basis and the MLS basis:

$$|\ell(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle = \sum_{K=L_A+L_B}^{K_m} \langle K|\ell\rangle_{L_A L_B} |K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

This relation can be inverted allowing to express the HH in terms of the MLS:

$$|K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle = \sum_{\ell=1}^N \langle \ell|K\rangle_{L_A L_B} |\ell(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

The coefficients of the transformation can be computed from the definition of the MLS and the polynomials  $Q_{N-1}(x_\ell, \cos(2\beta))$ :

$$\langle K|\ell\rangle_{L_A L_B} = (w_{N\ell}^{L_A L_B})^{1/2} N_K^{L_A L_B} P_n^{(L_B+1/2, L_A+1/2)}(x_\ell). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

In Fig. 5 the functions  $f_K^{L_A L_B}(\beta)$  (upper part) and the corresponding MLS (lower part) are plotted versus the variable  $\beta$  for the case  $L_A=L_B=5$ . A basis with  $N=5$  states has been used, corresponding to the values of the hyper-angular momentum  $K=10$  to 18, in units of two. The MLS are labeled with the index  $\ell$  which is associated with the roots of the Jacobi polynomial  $P_5^{(5+\frac{1}{2}, 5+\frac{1}{2})}(x)$ . Thus, the MLS  $\ell = 1$  is localized around  $x = -0.64$ , that corresponds to  $\beta = 1.13$ . In terms of the energy of the two particles this means that the fraction of the total available kinetic energy carried by particles  $A$  and  $B$  are  $E_A/(E - \bar{v}) = 0.18$  and  $E_B/(E - \bar{v}) = 0.82$ , respectively. This is in fact the most asymmetric situation for this value of  $K_m$ . On other side, the MLS  $\ell = 3$  corresponds to a physical situation in which both particles carries half of the total kinetic energy.

In a similar way, it is possible to define HH with definite values of the hyper-angular momentum  $K$ , orbital momentum  $L$ , intrinsic spin  $I$  and total angular momentum  $J$  and projection  $M_J$ . These new HH, denoted by  $|K(LI)JM_J\rangle$ , can be related to the set  $|K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle$  by means of the Raynal-Revai transformation [27]:

$$|K(LI)JM_J\rangle = \sum_{L_A L_B} \langle L_A L_B | LI \rangle_{JK} |K(L_A L_B)JM_J\rangle. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Introducing the angle  $\alpha$ , which denotes the ratio between the internal momentum  $p$  and the hyper-momentum  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $p = \mathcal{P} \sqrt{m/M} \sin \alpha$ , it is possible to expand the new HH as

$$|K(LI)JM_J\rangle = \int_0^{\pi/2} d\alpha f_K^{LI}(\alpha) |\alpha(LI)JM_J\rangle, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where the function  $f_K^{LI}(\alpha)$  is given by the analogous to (A.2), i.e.

$$f_K^{LI}(\alpha) = N_K^{LI} (\cos \alpha)^{L+1} (\sin \alpha)^{I+1} P_n^{(I+\frac{1}{2}, L+\frac{1}{2})}(\cos 2\alpha), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

with  $n = (K - L - I)/2$  in this case.

Introducing a cut-ff hyper-angular momentum,  $K_m$ , it is possible to construct a set of Momentum Localized States associated with the truncated




Figure 5:  $f_K^{L_A L_B}(\beta)$  versus the variable  $\beta$  for  $L_A = L_B = 5$  and  $K = 10, 12, 14, 16$  and 18 (upper figure) and associated Momentum Localized States, labeled by the index  $\ell$ , defined in the text (bottom figure).

basis  $|K(LI)JM_J\rangle$ ,  $L + I < K < K_m$ . They are developed in terms of the angle  $\alpha$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
|j(LI)JM_J\rangle &= (w_{Nj}^{LI})^{(1/2)} \int_0^{\pi/2} d\alpha (\cos \alpha)^{L+1} (\sin \alpha)^{I+1} \\
&\times Q_{N-1}^{(I+\frac{1}{2}, L+\frac{1}{2})}(x_j, \cos 2\alpha) |\alpha(LI)JM_J\rangle \quad (\text{A.18})
\end{aligned}$$

where  $N$  is the number of values of  $K$  of the HH truncated basis and  $\{x_j; j = 1, \dots, N\}$  represent the zeros of the polynomial  $P_N^{(I+\frac{1}{2}, L+\frac{1}{2})}(x)$ . The state  $|j(LI)JM_J\rangle$  is characterized by narrow distributions of the relative and center of mass momenta around the central values  $p_j = \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{M}} \mathcal{P} \sqrt{(1-x_j)/2}$  and  $P_j = \mathcal{P} \sqrt{(1+x_j)/2}$ .

The original basis and the MLS basis are related by means of the orthogonal transformation

$$|K(LI)JM_J\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle j|K\rangle_{LI} |j(LI)JM_J\rangle, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where the transformation coefficients are given by

$$\langle K|j\rangle_{LI} = (w_{Nj}^{LI})^{1/2} N_K^{LI} P_n^{(I+1/2, L+1/2)}(x_j). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

## References

- [1] P.G. Hansen, A.S. Jensen and B. Jonson, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 45, (1995) 591.
- [2] M.V. Zhukov et al., *Phys. Rep.* 231 (1993) 151.
- [3] T. Kobayashi et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 60 (1988) 2599.
- [4] N.A. Orr et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 69 (1992) 2050.
- [5] I. Tanihata et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 160 (1985) 380; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 55 (1985) 2676.
- [6] G. Baur and H. Rebel, *J. Phys. G* 20 (1994) 1.

- [7] H. Esbensen, G.F. Bertsch and C.A. Bertulani, Nucl. Phys. A581 (1995) 107; T. Kido, K. Yabana and Y. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. C53 (1996) 2296.
- [8] E. Garrido, D.V. Fedorov and A.S. Jensen, Phys. Rev. C53 (1996) 3159.
- [9] E. Garrido, D.V. Fedorov and A.S. Jensen, Phys. Rev. C55 (1997) 1327.
- [10] E. Garrido, D.V. Fedorov and A.S. Jensen, Nucl. Phys. A617 (1997) 153.
- [11] E. Garrido, D.V. Fedorov and A.S. Jensen, Europhysics Lett. 43 (1998) 386.
- [12] M.V. Zhukov, L.V. Chulkov, D.V. Fedorov, B.V. Danilin, J.M. Bang, J.S. Vaagen and I.J. Thompson, J. Phys. G20 (1994) 201.
- [13] A.A. Karsheninnikov and T. Kobayashi, Nucl. Phys. A567 (1995) 1.
- [14] M.V. Zhukov and B. Jonson, Nucl. Phys. A589 (1995) 1.
- [15] E. Garrido, D.V. Fedorov and A.S. Jensen, Phys. Rev. C58 (1998) R2654.
- [16] R.C. Johnson, J.S. Al-Khalili and J.A. Tostevin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 2771.
- [17] R.C. Johnson, Elastic Scattering and Elastic Break-up of Halo Nuclei in a Special Model, Proceedings of the European Conference on Advances in Nuclear Physics and Related Areas. Thessaloniki, Greece, 1997.
- [18] J.A. Tostevin, R.C. Johnson and J.S. Al-Khalili, Nucl. Phys. A630 (1998) 340c.
- [19] J.A. Tostevin, S. Rugmai and R.C. Johnson, Phys. Rev. C57 (1998) 3225.
- [20] J.M. Bang and C.A. Pearson, Nucl. Phys. A100 (1967) 1.
- [21] G.F. Bertsch, K. Hencken and H. Esbensen, Phys. Rev. C57 (1998) 1366.
- [22] J.M. Brooke, J.S. Al-Khalili, J.A. Tostevin, Phys. Rev.

- [23] F. Barranco and P. G. Hansen, Eur. Phys. J. A7 (2000) 479. C59 (1999) 1560.
- [24] C. Bertulani and L.F.Canto, Nucl. Phys. A539 (1992)63.
- [25] A. Romanelli, L.F.Canto, R. Donangelo and P. Lotti, Nucl. Phys. A588 (1995) 71c.
- [26] M. Zhukov et al, J. Phys. G20 (1994) 201.
- [27] J. Raynal and J. Revai, Nuovo Cim. 68A (1970) 612; J. Raynal, Nucl. Phys. A259 (1976) 272.
- [28] A.M. Moro, Ph.D. thesis, unpublished.
- [29] M. Yahiro, Y. Iseri, H. Kameyama and M. Kawai, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **89** (1986) 32.
- [30] Y. Iseri, M. Yahiro and M. Kamimura, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **89** (1986) 84.
- [31] N. Austern, Y. Isery, M. Kamimura, M. Kawai, G. Rawitscher and M. Yahiro, Phys. Rep. **154** (1987) 125.
- [32] R.C. Johnson and P.J. Soper, Phys. Rev. **C1** (1970), 976.
- [33] K. Yabana, Y. Ogawa and Y. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. **A539** (1992) 295; K. Yabana, Y. Ogawa and Y. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. **C45** (1992) 2909.
- [34] C. Marqués and J. Gómez Camacho, in Proceedings of the Joint Study Weekend HALO'98, Lisbon, April 1998 (unpublished).
- [35] F. D. Becchetti Jr, and G. W. Greenlees, Phys. Rev. 182 (1969) 1190.
- [36] E.J. Stephenson et al. Phys. Rev. **C28** (1983) 134.
- [37] C.M Perey and F.G. Perey, Phys. Rev. **C7** (1973), 590.
- [38] F.G. Perey, Phys. Rev. **131** (1963), 745. D. Wilmore and P.E. Hodson, Nucl. Phys. **55** (1964) 673;
- [39] F. Pérez-Bernal, J.M. Arias, M. Carvajal and J. Gómez-Camacho, Pys. Rev. A61 (1999) 042504.

- [40] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions, Dover Pub. (New York), 1972.