

Application of a new screening model to thermonuclear reactions of the rp process

Theodore E. Liolios *

Hellenic Naval Academy of Hydra

School of Deck Officers, Department of Science

Hydra Island 18040, Greece

Abstract

A new screening model for astrophysical thermonuclear reactions was derived recently which improved Salpeter's weak-screening one. In the present work we prove that the new model can also give very reliable screening enhancement factors (SEFs) when applied to the rp process. According to the results of the new model, which agree well with Mitler's SEFs, the screened rp reaction rates can be, at most, twice as fast as the unscreened ones.

PACS number(s): 26.30.+k, 26.50.+x, 26.20.+f, 26.65.+t

Typeset using REVTeX

*www.liolios.info

In a recent work [1] a new model was derived for weakly screened (WS) thermonuclear reactions, improving Salpeter's one [2]. The screening enhancement factor (SEF) of the novel model was shown to coincide with Salpeter's and Mitler's [3] for proton-proton solar reactions, thus confirming again that, as far as screening uncertainties are concerned, the relevant pp neutrino fluxes are confined within very robust limits.

Actually Salpeter's model suffers from the break-down of the WS limit (the very limit that generates it) inside the tunneling region. On the other hand Mitler's model has made the arbitrary assumption that at close distances from all nuclei in the plasma the electron density is practically equal to the average electron density in the plasma. The new model modified Mitler's method assuming a very natural behavior for the charge density around the nucleus and adopting the DH formalism only where it is really valid.

We briefly give the most essential information of the three models (Salpeter's, Mitler's and the author's) for a binary proton-induced thermonuclear reaction $p + \frac{A}{Z} M_N$ in completely ionized astrophysical plasmas at temperature T_6 and density ρ :

A) Salpeter's model

Salpeter's SEF is given by

$$f_s = \exp\left(\frac{Ze^2}{R_D kT}\right) = \exp\left(0.188Z\chi\rho^{1/2}T_6^{-3/2}\right) \quad (1)$$

where R_D is the Debye-Huckel radius and χ the parameter which incorporates all the information about plasma composition and degeneracy:

$$\chi = \sqrt{\sum_{i \neq e} \frac{X_i Z_i^2}{A_i} + \theta(a) \sum_{i \neq e} \frac{X_i Z_i}{A_i}} \quad (2)$$

Electron degeneracy is taken into account via the degeneracy factor $\theta(a)$ which is a function of the respective degeneracy parameter a (for details see [1]), while X_i is the abundance of nuclei $\frac{A_i}{Z_i} M$ in the plasma.

B) Mitler's model

According to Mitler's model at short distances from all nuclei the electron density is constant and equal to the average electron density in the plasma. The arbitrariness of this assumption is obvious since it can only apply safely to completely degenerate electron environments. Even in strongly degenerate plasmas a proton-rich nucleus is expected to polarize the electron cloud in its immediate vicinity thus rendering the assumption of a constant electron density questionable. The degree to which this polarization occurs is actually the degree of the error committed by Mitler's model. Therefore, when thermonuclear reactions of the rp-process are considered and the degeneracy is usually incomplete Mitler's assumption should be questioned.

The distance from the target nucleus at which the constant electron density N_e is replaced by the Debye-Huckel density, according to Mitler is:

$$x = (\zeta + 1)^{1/3} - 1 \quad (3)$$

where the dimensionless parameter ζ is:

$$\zeta(Z, \rho, T) = \frac{3Z}{4\pi N_e R_D^3} \quad (4)$$

In the framework of the same model the screening energy shift U_e^M is

$$U_e^M = \frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2}{R_D kT} \left(\frac{1 + x/2}{1 + x + x^2/3} \right) \quad (5)$$

which yields Mitler's SEF :

$$f_M = \exp \left[\frac{Z e^2}{R_D kT} \left(\frac{1 + x/2}{1 + x + x^2/3} \right) \right] \quad (6)$$

We can vividly depict the connection between Mitler's SEF and its generator (i.e. Salpeter's SEF) by writing

$$f_M = (f_S)^{g(x)} \quad (7)$$

where

$$g(x) = \left(\frac{1 + x/2}{1 + x + x^2/3} \right) \quad (8)$$

Mitler also elaborated his model considering the effects of the cloud of the second member ($Z_2 e$) of the binary thermonuclear reaction and deriving a formula for the relevant SEF which, after some algebra, can be written again as a function of Salpeter's SEF:

$$f_M^* = (f_S)^{g^*(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)} \quad (9)$$

where

$$g^*(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \frac{9}{10} \left(\frac{1}{\zeta_1 \zeta_2} \right) \left[(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + 1)^{5/3} - (\zeta_1 + 1)^{5/3} - (\zeta_2 + 1)^{5/3} + 1 \right] \quad (10)$$

and ζ_1, ζ_2 are the dimensionless parameters given by Eq. (4) for each of the two reacting nuclei. Since we will study proton-induced reactions let us now assume that the parameter ζ_2 corresponds to a proton then $\zeta_1 = Z\zeta_2$ where we have dropped the indices from the atomic number so that $Z_1 = Z$ and $Z_2 = 1$. In such a case

$$g^*(Z, \rho, T) = \frac{9}{10} \left(\frac{1}{Z\zeta^2} \right) \left[(Z\zeta + \zeta + 1)^{5/3} - (Z\zeta + 1)^{5/3} - (\zeta + 1)^{5/3} + 1 \right] \quad (11)$$

C) The novel model.

In Ref. [1] a new model was derived which avoids any arbitrary assumption about the electron density around the target nucleus. According to that model the SEF for a proton-induced thermonuclear reaction $p + \frac{A}{Z} M_N$ should be given as a function of Salpeter's SEF modified as follows

$$f = f_s^{G(x_0, x'_0)} \quad (12)$$

where the parameters x_0, x'_0 are obtained by solving the following equations:

$$\frac{e^{x'_0}}{x_0'^3} \left[2 - e^{-x'_0} (x_0'^2 + 2x'_0 + 2) \right] = \frac{e^{x_0}}{x_0^2} \left[1 - e^{-x_0} (x_0 + 1) \right] \quad (13)$$

$$x_0 e^{x_0} = 1.88 Z_{\max} Z \chi \rho^{1/2} T_6^{-3/2} \quad (14)$$

and the exponent is given by the relation

$$G(x_0, x'_0) = \frac{1}{x_0} - \frac{e^{-x_0}}{x_0} - 2 \frac{x_0}{x_0'^3} e^{x'_0 - x_0} + \frac{x_0}{x_0'^3} (2 + x'_0) e^{-x_0} + \frac{x_0}{x_0'^2} e^{x'_0 - x_0} \quad (15)$$

Actually, Eq. (15) appears in the derivation of a novel screened Coulomb potential $\Phi(r)$ given by [1]

$$\Phi(r) = \frac{Z_0 e}{r} - \frac{Z_0 e}{R_D} G(x_0, x'_0) + O(r^2) \quad (16)$$

That potential, by means of a well established mechanism [4], yields a shift in the relative energy (the screening energy) which reads

$$U_e = \frac{Z_0 Z_1 e^2}{R_D} G(x_0, x'_0) \quad (17)$$

Using Eq. (17) in the framework of Salpeter's model described above, we arrive at Eq. (12)

According to Ref. [1], for a pure hydrogen plasma $Z_{\max} = 1$, while for a zero metallicity plasma $Z_{\max} = 2$. The fact that the novel model disregards all screening effects of nuclei other than protons and alpha particles can be easily justified since for stellar environments where the rp-process takes place the abundances of nuclei other than protons and alpha-particles are orders of magnitude smaller. Therefore, as regards composition, the parameter χ appearing in Eq. (14) is practically an exclusive function of $X_1, X_2, A_1, A_2, Z_1, Z_2$, which justifies the zero metallicity scenario.

We need to underline that the above three models A,B,C are valid provided that all nuclei in the plasma are in a non-degenerate liquid state. In a stellar environment where the rp process occurs that condition is fully satisfied even at ultra-degenerate conditions such as $T = 10^6 K$ and $\rho = 10^6 g/cm^3$.

To prove the reliability of the new model we will first show that screening effects in the rp-process follow a very simple pattern. The charge carried along by the proton as it collides with a proton-rich target can be disregarded and so can cloud fluctuations and dynamic effects. This can be proved in the following plausible way:

In proton-induced thermonuclear reactions of the form $p + \frac{A}{Z} M_N$ we can define two possible limits according to those defined in the laboratory [5,6]:

I) The Sudden Limit (SL), where the charge density around the target nucleus remains unaffected by the presence of the impinging proton, throughout the tunneling process. (In pycnonuclear reactions that limit was called "static lattice approximation" [7])

II) The Adiabatic Limit (AL), where the charge density around the target nucleus is assumed to respond so fast that it actually corresponds to the charge $(Z + 1)e$ of a new combined nucleus consisting of the initial target nucleus (Ze) plus the impinging proton ($+e$). (In pycnonuclear reactions that limit was called "fully relaxed approximation" [7])

These two assumptions bracket the behavior of the plasma screening effect so that all other fine phenomena such as charge cloud deformations, dynamic screening etc. are included in these two limits. Note that Mitler has pointed out that the application of the target-projectile model on SEFs is wrong (see for example Ref. [9]) because the ensuing formulas are not commutative with respect to the target-projectile pair as demanded by the thermonuclear reaction rate. However, this is not the case when protons react with heavily charged nuclei because the classical turning point of such reactions is so deep inside the screening cloud of the target nucleus that it makes no difference which member of the pair the cloud is attributed to. Thus, this common cloud can be either considered completely frozen during tunnelling (SL) or rapidly responding to the presence of the proton (AL).

In Figure 1 we plot the variation of the exponent g (given by Eqs. (8), (11)) with respect to the parameter ζ (given by Eq.(4)) for the three different limits discussed in the text. The parameter ζ assumes all its possible values, that is from very small values occurred in weakly degenerate, weakly screened environments to large values occurred in completely degenerate, strongly screened ones. The arrows indicate that screening and degeneracy are both increasing functions of ζ . The solid curve corresponds to Mitler's Sudden Limit (i.e. Eq. (8)), the dotted curve corresponds to Mitler's Adiabatic Limit (i.e. setting $Z \rightarrow Z_1 + 1$ in Eq. (8)) and the dashed curve corresponds to Mitler's complex SEF which takes into account fine screening effects (i.e. Eq.(11)). By observing Fig. 1 we can easily realize that for reactions of the rp-process where $Z > 7$ all fine screening effects of Mitler's model can be disregarded. Moreover the difference between the SL and the AL in such reactions is so narrow that Mitler's model can be accurately represented in the rp-process by the use of its simple SL SEF, i.e. Eq. (7).

Note that the method of the SL and AL should be applied with caution to the CNO solar cycle where even a small perturbation in the value of the SEF can cause notable uncertainties to the neutrino fluxes [10,11].

In order to illustrate the degree of validity of the three models when applied to the solar CNO cycle we produced Figure 2 (in accordance with Figure 3 of Ref. [12]). According to that figure the discrepancy between the SL and the AL observed for both Mitler's and the author's models is large enough to cause notable uncertainties in the production of the solar neutrino fluxes. According to Fig.2 the SEF for the solar reaction $^{14}\text{N}(p, \gamma)^{15}\text{O}$ is confined within a maximum (f_{max}) and a minimum (f_{min}) value derived respectively by the author's AL model and Mitler's complex model. The two values bear a difference of 7%, which reflects linearly on the neutrino fluxes generated by the reactions $^{13}\text{N}(e^+\nu_e)^{13}\text{C}$ and $^{15}\text{O}(e^+, \nu_e)^{15}\text{N}$. However, as has been pointed out in Ref. [1] it is very reasonable to assume that the respective SEF cannot practically lie outside the robust AL and SL limits of the novel model, which deviate from each other by 3.5%.

Although the new model allows for the marginal uncertainty of 3.5% in the CNO cycle, when applied to more advanced stages such as the rp process that uncertainty becomes negligible.

In figures 3a,3b,3c we plot the plasma SEFs with respect to density for a very important reaction [13] of the rp-process $^{18}F(p, \gamma)^{19}Ne$ according to the three models described in the text at temperatures $T_6 = 100, 500, 1000$. The density $\rho_2 (= \rho/100 \text{ g/cm}^3)$ ranges from typical solar values to extremely large ones typically found on neutron star surfaces. For simplicity we have assumed a zero-metallicity stellar plasma and a hydrogen-helium composition typical [13] of the rp-process : $X = 0.7, Y = 0.3$. We have also added Salpeter's screening formula [2] for completely degenerate plasmas which is actually the limit of Mitler's model for similar conditions. We observe that for plasmas which are not completely degenerate the author's model gives roughly the same results as Mitler's one. However, for ultradegenerate (UD) environments (irrelevant to the rp process) Mitler's formula is more reliable than the author's as it approximates better the relevant Salpeter's SEF formula

$$f_s^{UD} = 0.205 \left(\frac{\rho}{\mu_e} \right)^{1/3} \left[(Z + 1)^{5/3} - Z^{5/3} - 1 \right] \quad (18)$$

whose validity is very plausible in pycnonuclear regimes [7].

In Figures 4a,4b we derive the SEFs for another important reaction of the rp-process $^{50}Fe(p, \gamma)^{51}Co$ at relevant temperatures. For such proton-rich targets as ^{50}Fe the author's model is much more reliable than Mitler's whose assumption that the electron density around the target nucleus ^{50}Fe cannot practically be accurate. The coincidence of the three models in question is due to the fact that at large temperatures the plasma is only weakly screened and therefore even Salpeter's model gives reasonable results.

We should point out that throughout this study we have focused on binary thermonuclear reactions disregarding all nuclear correlation effects which introduce [8] an additional (multiplicative) screening enhancement factor to the thermonuclear reaction rate. In fact, in the density-temperature domain of the rp process the stellar plasma is only weakly coupled (see for example Fig.1 of Ref. [7]), which means that the Coulomb energy between ions is much smaller than the average thermal energy of the ionic fluid. For such weakly coupled plasmas all internuclear many-particle correlations can be disregarded [7,8] since the plasma coupling constant is always $\Gamma \ll 1$.

We can also use the ratio [8] Λ between the thermal De Broglie wavelength and the ionic spacing to support our simplification. This ratio for all reactions, temperatures and densities encountered in the rp process is much smaller than unity ($\Lambda \ll 1$), which justifies the assumption that all microscopic nuclear correlations can be disregarded (for a detailed discussion see Ref. [8]).

Conclusions

Naturally, Salpeter's model cannot be applied to thermonuclear reaction of the rp process, since as has been proved in Ref. [1] its validity can only be justified in the study of pp reactions of weakly screened, weakly degenerate environments.

Mitler's model on the other hand assumes a constant electron density around the target nucleus which cannot be taken for granted for proton-rich nuclei and partially degenerate

stellar environments. In fact Mitler’s model doesn’t tend to Salpeter’s formula for completely degenerate environments where Salpeter’s Eq. (18) is valid. It actually tends to it when the parameter ζ is very large and that is an imperfection that should be noted.

The new model (C) fortified with the SL and AL assumptions seems to be the most reliable one for the description of the screening enhancement effect in the rp process. The most important aspect of the new model is that it can derive a SEF as a function of Salpeter’s SEF which in turn can take into account various plasma processes.

We have applied our model to various other rp astrophysical reactions and we have observed that the screening effect can accelerate the thermonuclear reaction rates of the rp process by (at most) a factor of two.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. The variation of the exponent g (given by Eqs. (8), (11)) with respect to the parameter ζ (given by Eq.(4)) for the three different limits discussed in the text. The parameter ζ assumes all its possible values, that is from very small values occurred in weakly degenerate, weakly screened environments to large values occurred in completely degenerate, strongly screened ones. The arrows indicate that screening and degeneracy are both increasing functions of ζ . The solid curve corresponds to Mitler’s Sudden Limit (i.e. Eq. (8)), the dotted curve corresponds to Mitler’s Adiabatic Limit (i.e. setting $Z \rightarrow Z_1 + 1$ in Eq. (8)) and the dashed curve corresponds to Mitler’s complex SEF which takes into account fine screening effects (i.e. Eq.(11)).

Figure 2

The plasma SEF for the reaction $^{14}N(p, \gamma)^{15}O$ according to the three models described in the text at $T_6 = 15$. For simplicity we have assumed a zero-metallicity stellar plasma and a hydrogen-helium composition of : $X = 0.7, Y = 0.3$. The upper (lower) solid curve stands for the author’s AL (SL) model, the upper (lower) dashed curve stands for Mitler’s AL (SL) model, the dash-dotted curve represents Mitler’s formula for two ionic screening clouds while the dotted curve stands for Salpeter’s weak-screening model.

Figure 3a.

The plasma SEF with respect to density for the reaction $^{18}F(p, \gamma)^{19}Ne$ according to the three models described in the text at $T_6 = 100$. For simplicity we have assumed a zero-metallicity stellar plasma and a hydrogen-helium composition typical of the rp-process : $X = 0.7, Y = 0.3$. The solid curve stands for the author’s model, the dashed curve stands for Mitler’s SL model while the dotted curve stands for Salpeter’s weak-screening model. We have also added the dash-dotted curve which corresponds to Salpeter’s screening formula for completely degenerate plasmas. The vertical bar indicates the barrier beyond which electron degeneracy is complete.

Figure 3b.

The plasma SEF with respect to density for the reaction $^{18}F(p, \gamma)^{19}Ne$ according to the three models described in the text at $T_6 = 500$ (see figure 3a for details).

Figure 3c.

The plasma SEF with respect to density for the reaction $^{18}F(p, \gamma)^{19}Ne$ according to the three models described in the text at $T_6 = 1000$ (see figure 3a for details).

Figure 4a


The SEFs for the reaction ${}^{50}\text{Fe}(p, \gamma){}^{51}\text{Co}$ according to the three models described in the text at $T_6 = 300$ (see figure 3a for details).


Figure 4b


The SEFs for the reaction ${}^{50}\text{Fe}(p, \gamma){}^{51}\text{Co}$ according to the three models described in the text at $T_6 = 1000$ (see figure 3a for details).


REFERENCES


- [1] T.E.Liolios, nucl-th/0210031, submitted for publication
- [2] E. E. Salpeter, Aust. J. Phys. **7**, 373 (1954).
- [3] H. E. Mitler, Astrophys. J. **212**, 513 (1977).
- [4] T.E.Liolios, Phys.Rev.C **61**, 55802(2000)
- [5] T.E.Liolios, Nucl.Phys.A.**693**,847(2001)
- [6] T.E.Liolios, nucl-th/0211072, submitted for publication
- [7] E.E.Salpeter, H.M.Van Horn, Astrop.J. **155**, 183(1969)
- [8] Rev.Mod.Physics, Vol.65, No.2, (1993) 255
- [9] A.G.Cameron, Astrophys.J.**130**, 916(1959)
- [10] J. N. Bahcall, *Neutrino Astrophysics*, §3.2 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989).
- [11] B.Ricci, S.Degl'Innocenti, G.Fiorentini, Phys.Rev.C. **52**, 1095(1995)
- [12] H. Dzitko *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **447**, 428 (1995).
- [13] R.K.Wallace and S.E. Woosley, Astrop.J.S. **45**, 389(1981)















$^{50}\text{Fe}(p,\gamma)^{51}\text{Co}$
 $T_6=1000, X=0.7, Y=0.3$



NeutronStarDensities