

Core Excitation in $^{12}\text{C}(^{23}\text{Al}, ^{22}\text{Mg})\text{X}$ at energy 74 MeV/n

Sarla Devi¹ and Ravinder Kumar^{1*}

¹*Department of Physics, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science & Technology,
Murthal, Sonapat-131039 Haryana, INDIA*

Introduction

A lot of attention from experimentalists and physicists has been carried out by the novel structure named ‘halo’. Halo contains a two or three-body system with a “core+ valance nucleon(s)” structure where valance nucleon(s) have a low binding energy [1]. Neutron halos are larger in numbers than proton halos due to the existence of the Coulomb Barrier in the proton halo. Besides this, some proton halos are discovered like ^8B , $^{26-28}\text{P}$, ^{17}Ne , ^{17}F [2-3], and many are under investigation. ^{23}Al plays a vital role in $^{22}\text{Mg}(p,\gamma)^{23}\text{Al}$ astrophysical reaction and has been studied by many researchers to find more clear structural information in past years [4-7]. In the study by R. N. Panda et. al. [6], the reaction cross-section of ^{23}Al at carbon target at 30 MeV/n and 74 MeV/n beam energy is produced theoretically by using diffusion parameter value $a_0=0.6$ fm, but this value is unable to produce the LMD (Longitudinal Momentum Distribution) data rather $a_0=2.0$ fm provides a more accurate picture of momentum distribution. On the other hand, a study carried out by A. Banu et. al. at 50 MeV/n (using $a_0=0.6$ fm) provided a good interpretation of these observables [7]. Also, the binding energy used in both studies is different. Also, in Ref. [6], the core excitation is not taken into account but must be taken as the core ^{22}Mg is supposed to be highly deformed, and the ground state of ^{23}Al is supposed to have core excited components [7] and many studies revealed the significance of excitation in reaction mechanisms for a clear interpretation of the experimental data [8-11].

So, here we studied the nuclear breakup reaction $^{12}\text{C}(^{23}\text{Al}, ^{22}\text{Mg})\text{X}$ at 74 MeV/n beam states. The ^{23}Al is supposed to have in its ground state with $J^\pi=5/2^+$, which is produced by coupling

core states (I_c) and valance proton state ($2s_{1/2}$ or $1d_{5/2}$). The core is assumed in states $0^+(E_x^c = 0.0)$, $2_1^+(E_x^c = 1.247)$, $4_1^+(E_x^c = 3.308)$, and $4_2^+(E_x^c = 5.293)$ [7]. The well-known Glauber Eikonal model-based code MOMDIS for the knockout reaction has been used for the calculations [12]. The parameters used for the wavefunction calculations are taken the same from Ref. [7], which are $a_0 = 0.6$ fm and $r_0 = 1.18$ fm. The effective binding energy $S_p^{\text{eff}} = E_x^c + S_p$ is produced keeping all parameters fixed where $S_p = 0.141$ MeV. The Hartree-Fock densities of ^{22}Mg (core) and ^{12}C (target) are used for calculating S-matrix using t- $\rho\rho$ formalism. The Spectroscopic Factor (SF) is taken as unity throughout the calculations.

Results

We have calculated the proton removal breakup cross-section and Full Width at Half Maxima (or width) of LMD for the breakup reaction of halo ^{23}Al on target ^{12}C at 74 MeV/n incident beam energy. Table 1 shows all the assumed configurations as well as the calculated results for the nuclear breakup (both stripping and diffraction contribution).

Table 1: Breakup cross-section and width of LMD corresponding to different core excited states for ^{23}Al ($J^\pi=5/2^+$).

E_x^c (MeV)	$I_c \otimes$ proton Configuration	σ_{total} (mb)	FWHM (MeV/c)
0.0	$0^+ \otimes 1d_{5/2}$	37.13	213.97
1.247	$2_1^+ \otimes 1d_{5/2}$	31.61	236.17
3.308	$4_1^+ \otimes 1d_{5/2}$	26.39	260.47
5.293	$4_2^+ \otimes 1d_{5/2}$	23.27	277.53
1.247	$2_1^+ \otimes 2s_{1/2}$	56.79	80.77

*Electronic address: drravinderkumar.phy@dcrustm.org

The observed pattern in cross-section and LMD width with core excitation energy are plotted in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 for $1d_{5/2}$ configurations. The decrease (increase) in the cross-section (width of LMD) is observed. The variations are per the uncertainty principle i.e. effective binding energy increases with excitation which results in decreasing halo character.




Fig 1. Breakup cross-section variation with core excitation energy for d-state.




Fig 2. LMD width variation with core excitation energy for d-state.

Here, it can be seen that the LMD width for all the d-configurations lies in the range of experimental data i.e. 232 ± 28 MeV/c, ranges between 204 to 260 MeV/c (expect $4_2^+ \otimes 1d_{5/2}$ gives 270 MeV/c). But $2_1^+ \otimes 1d_{5/2}$ configuration shows the LMD width closer (236 MeV/c) to the mean exp. value (232 MeV/c) as seen in Ref. [7] (the inclusive mean value of LMD width is 180 MeV/c which matches for $2_1^+ \otimes 1d_{5/2}$ value).

Conclusion

The core excitation is included in $^{12}\text{C}(^{23}\text{Al}, ^{22}\text{Mg})\text{X}$ breakup reaction at incident energy 74 MeV/n. The excitation effect of the core states on single proton breakup cross-section and width of LMD has been found. It has been observed that the cross-section decreases with increasing core excitation energy while the LMD width increases as in Ref. [13]. The observed changes for d-state in cross-section are $\sim 37\%$ however in LMD width is $\sim 30\%$. The changes are 7.05% and 5.6%, respectively, with per MeV change in core excitation energy. Thus, core excitation amended the results in a significant way.

Acknowledgment: S. Devi wants to express gratitude for the financial support from CSIR, New Delhi getting as SRF (09/1063(0029)/2019-EMR-I).

References

- [1] Tanihata et al., Phys. Lett. B 160,380 (1985).
- [2] R. Morlock et al., Phys. Rev. Lett., 79, 3837 (1997).
- [3] A. Navin et al., Phys. Rev. Lett., 81, 5089 (1998).
- [4] D. Q. Fang et al., Chin. Phys. Lett., 22, 572 (2005).
- [5] B. Longfellow et al., Phys. Rev. C, 101, 031303 (2020).
- [6] R. N. Panda et al, Phys. Atom. Nucl., 81, 417 (2018).
- [7] A. Banu et al, Phys. Rev. C, 84,015803 (2011).
- [8] A. M. Moro and R. Crespo, Phys. Rev. C, 85, 054613 (2012).
- [9] A. M. Moro and J. A. Lay, Phys. Rev. C, 109, 232502 (2012).
- [10] S. Devi and R. Kumar, Phys. Part. Nucl. Lett., 20, 17 (2023).
- [11] S. Devi and R. Kumar, Indian J. Pure Appl. Phys., 62, 682 (2024).
- [12] C. Bertulani, A. Gade, Comp. Phys. Comm. 175, 5 (2006).
- [13] S. Devi and R. Kumar, Proceedings of the DAE Symp. on Nucl. Phys. 64, 551 (2019).