IFUSP/P-97

SPREADING WIDTH AND BRANCHING RATIOS OF ISOLATED DOORWAY RESONANCES

by

W. Mittig

Instituto de Física - Universidade de São Paulo

C.P. 20516, São Paulo, Brasil

ABSTRACT

A lower limit for the spreading width of doorway resonances is derived as a function of absorption coefficients and the branching ratio of the doorway to channels that are not directly coupled to it. Equations are obtained that provide a means of experimental determination of the fluctuating part of the cross sections without measurement of the fine structure.

NUCLEAR REACTIONS. Doorway states, fluctuation cross section, spreading width and branching ratios discussed

I. INTRODUCTION

Isobaric analogue states (IAS) have become a standard tool for the study of nuclear structure. Due to the fact that IAS are doorway states that couple to the more complicated $T_<$ states of the compound nucleus, cross sections may contain an apreciable amount of fluctuation cross section. This fluctuating part is neglected in nearly all analyses of experimental data on heavy nuclei. One reason is that it is difficult to calculate except in simple cases, the other is that from theoretical arguments using the Hauser-Feshbach theory one expects it to be small if the number of open neutron channels is big. (Eq. 13.9.12 and 13.9.14 of ref. 1).However the use of the Hauser-Feshbach theory is not exactly justified and one would like a more direct experimental criterion. The fact that attempts to measure the fine structure of isobaric analogue resonances (IAR) in the lead region failed, can be due to the absence of fine structure or insufficient experimental energy resolution. We want to derive here some relations that can be used to get an experimental determination of the fluctuating part of the cross-section without measurement of the fine structure. Of course, the formulas derived here, do not apply only to IAR, but more generally to doorway resonances. In the following we shall omit all geometrical factors associated with the cross-section.

II. S-MATRIX AND BRANCHING RATIOS

Following ref. 1 we can write the energy averaged part of the S-matrix for a single doorway resonance

$$< S_{cc'} > = e^{i(\delta_c+\delta_{c'})} \left[\tau_c \, \delta_{cc'} - i \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}_c^{1/2} \; \tilde{\Gamma}_{c'}^{1/2}}{E-E_o + i/2 \; \Gamma_T} \right] \quad (1)$$

with

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_c = \Gamma_c \, e^{2i\theta_c} \quad (2)$$

$$\Gamma_T = \Gamma^{\downarrow} + \sum_{c_p} \frac{2}{1+\tau_{c_p}} \cos 2\theta_{c_p} \; \Gamma_{c_p} \quad (3)$$

where Γ_T is the total width, $\Gamma^{\downarrow}$ is the spreading width, E_o is the resonance energy, θ_c is the resonance mixing phase, δ_o and τ_c are the optical model phase shift and absorption coefficient respectively. One can define $\Gamma^{\uparrow} = \sum_{c_p} \Gamma_{c_p}$. The sum in Eq. 3 is over all channels c_p that are directly coupled to the doorway (for IAR all proton channels).

From Eq. 1 it follows

$$\text{Re} <S_{cc}> = \tau_c \cos 2\delta_c + \frac{\Gamma c}{(E-E_o)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \Gamma_T^2} \; x \quad (4)$$

$$x \; \{\sin 2(\delta_c+\theta_c) \; (E-E_R) - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_T \cos 2 \; (\delta_c+\theta_c)\}$$

From unitarity it follows for the total reaction cross-section in a channel c, omitting an eventual infinite contribution from elastic coulomb scattering,

$$\sigma_{c,total} = 2(1 - \mathrm{Re}\, S_{cc}) \tag{5a}$$

and therefore

$$\langle\sigma_{c,total}\rangle = 2(1 - \mathrm{Re}\, \langle S_{cc}\rangle) \tag{5b}$$

In the following we will suppose that the energy dependence of δ_c, θ_c and τ_c is slow as compared to the resonant part of S. Then we can split $\langle\sigma_{c,total}\rangle$ in an energy independant part and a resonating part

$$\langle\sigma_{c,total}\rangle = \langle\sigma_{c,total}\rangle_{res} + \langle\sigma_{c,total}\rangle_{off} \tag{6}$$

For the resonating part at $E=E_o$ we have

$$\langle\sigma_{c,total}\rangle_{res}\Big|_{E=E_o} = 4\,\Gamma_c \cos 2(\delta_c+\theta_c) \,/\, \Gamma_T \tag{7}$$

The energy averaged cross section $\langle\sigma_{c,c_p}\rangle$ can be written, using $S_{cc_p} = \langle S_{cc_p}\rangle + S^{fl}_{cc_p}$

$$\langle\sigma_{cc_p}\rangle = \left|\,\delta_{cc_p} - \langle S_{cc_p}\rangle\right|^2 + \langle|S^{fl}_{cc_p}|^2\rangle \tag{8}$$

$$= \delta_{cc_p}(1-2\tau_c\cos 2\delta_c+\tau_c^2) + \frac{\Gamma_c\,\Gamma_{c_p}}{(E-E_o)^2+(\Gamma_T/2)^2} +$$

$$+\,\delta_{cc_p}\frac{2\,\Gamma_c}{(E-E_o)^2+(\Gamma_T/2)^2}\{\tau_c(\sin 2\theta_c(E-E_o)-\tfrac{1}{2}\Gamma_T\cos 2\theta_c)$$

$$-(E-E_o)\sin 2(\theta_c+\delta_c) + \tfrac{1}{2}\,\Gamma_T\cos 2(\theta_c+\delta_c)\} + \langle|S^{fl}_{cc'}|^2\rangle$$

Splitting as be[illegible] a resonant part $<\sigma_{cc'}>_{res}$ and a background term $<\sigma_{cc'}>_{off}$ c[illegible]s for $E=E_o$

$$<\sigma_{cc_p}>_{res}\Big|_{E=E_o} = \frac{4\Gamma_c\,\Gamma_{c_p}}{\Gamma_T^2} + \delta_{cc_p}\frac{4\Gamma_c}{\Gamma_T}\left(\cos 2(\delta_c+\theta_c)-\tau_c\cos 2\theta_c\right)+$$

$$+ <|S^{fl}_{cc_p}|^2>_{res}\Big|_{E=E_o}$$

We can now define a branching ratio to the channel c_p

$$B_{c_p} = \frac{<\sigma_{c,c_p}>_{res}\big|_{E=E_o}}{<\sigma_{c,total}>_{res}\big|_{E=E_o}} \tag{10}$$

$$= \frac{\Gamma_{c_p} + \delta_{c,c_p}\Gamma_T\left(\cos 2(\delta_c+\theta_c) - \tau_c\cos 2\theta_c\right) + \frac{\Gamma_T^2}{4\Gamma_c}<|S^{fl}_{cc_p}|^2>_{res}\big|_{E=E_o}}{\Gamma_T\cos 2(\delta_c+\theta_c)}$$

The branching ratio B_{c_p} can be directly measured by $(p,n\,\bar{p})$ or $(^3He,\,d\,\bar{p})$ reaction. Γ_{c_p}, Γ_T, δ_{c_p}, τ_{c_p} and θ_{c_p} can be obtained from analysis of (p,p') data at least in the case of elastic scattering that is dominated by the interference between the Coulomb amplitude and $<S_{cc}>$, and where thus $|S^{fl}_{cc}|^2$ can be neglected in nearly all practical cases. Then Eq. 10 can be used to determine $<|S^{fl}_{cc_p}|^2>_{res}$. If one uses the resonance integral $\int<\sigma_{cc_p}>_{res}\,dE$ instead of the on-resonance cross section it is easy to see (see too ref. 2) that the same relation (10) (for) the branching ratio is obtained except that the term $\Gamma_T^2<|S_{c,c_p}^{fl}|^2>_{res}\big|_{E=E_o}/(4\Gamma_c)$ must be substituted by $\int<|S^{fl}_{c,c_p}|^2>_{res}\,dE\;\Gamma_T/(2\pi\Gamma_c)$. The branching ratio B_p to channels that are directly coupled to the doorway (proton channels) is given by $B_p = \sum_{c_p} B_{c_p}$. This implies for the branching ratio to neutron channels $B_n = 1-B_p$. If now, $<|S^{fl}_{c,c_p}|^2>_{res}$ is positive, Eq. 10 can be used to obtain some inequalities. In ref. 3 the following approximate relation is given for the resonating part of the fluctuating cross-section

$$<\sigma^{fl}_{c,c_p}>^{res} = \frac{\Gamma_c \Gamma_{c_p}}{(E-E_o)^2 + \Gamma_T^2/4} \cdot \frac{\Gamma_T \bar{\tau} - \Gamma^{\uparrow}}{\Gamma^{\uparrow}} \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{\tau}$ is the mean absorption in the channels c_p. Even if (11) is approximate, it should supply a good criterion under what conditions $<|S^{fl}_{c,c_p}|^2>_{res}$ is positive. As one sees from Eq.11 this is always the case for $\bar{\tau} \geq \Gamma^{\uparrow}/\Gamma_T$. For analogue states one has typically $\Gamma^{\uparrow}/\Gamma_T \lesssim 0.5$. This means the condition for a positive value of $<\sigma^{fl}_{c,c_p}>_{res}$ is $\bar{\tau} > 0.5$. This condition of moderate absorption holds for most experimental cases. With the assumption $<|S^{fl}_{c,c_p}|^2>_{res} \geq 0$ one obtains from Eq. 10

$$B_p \geq \frac{\sum_{c_p} \Gamma_{c_p} + \Gamma_T (\cos 2(\delta_c+\theta_c) - \tau_c \cos 2\theta_c)}{\Gamma_T \cos 2(\delta_c+\theta_c)} \quad (12)$$

Eq. (12) is the same if resonance integrals are used instead of the on-resonance cross-section. With $B_n=1-B_p$ one gets from Eq.(12)

$$B_n \leq \frac{\Gamma_T \tau_c \cos 2\theta_c - \Gamma^{\uparrow}}{\Gamma_T \cos 2(\delta_c+\theta_c)} \quad (13)$$

Using Eq. 3 one can write Eq.13 in an other form

$$\Gamma^{\downarrow} \geq \frac{1}{\tau_c \cos 2\theta_c - B_n \cos 2(\theta_c+\delta_c)} \sum_{c_p} \Gamma_{c_p} \left[1+ \frac{2 B_n}{1+\tau_{c_p}} \cos 2\theta_{c_p} \times \right.$$

$$x \cos 2(\theta_c+\delta_c) + \frac{2}{1+\tau_{c_p}} \tau_c \cos 2\theta_c \cos 2\theta_{c_p} \Big] \quad (14)$$

This establishes a lower limit for $\Gamma^{\downarrow}$. We will discuss Eq. 14 with some simplifying assumptions. Let's suppose $\cos 2\theta_{c_p} \sim 1$, $\cos 2(\theta_c+\delta_c) \sim 1$, and $\tau_{c_p} \simeq \overline{\tau}$, which is justified when the phase shifts are small and the absorption coefficients don't vary much in the different channels c_p. Then (14) simplifies to

$$\Gamma^{\downarrow} \geq \frac{1-\overline{\tau}+2B_n}{(\overline{\tau}-B_n)(1+\overline{\tau})} \Gamma^{\uparrow} = \frac{1-\overline{\tau}+2B_n}{1+\overline{\tau}} \Gamma_T \quad (15)$$

For weak absorption $\overline{\tau} \sim 1$, this still simplifies to

$$\Gamma^{\downarrow} \geq \frac{B_n}{1-B_n} \Gamma^{\uparrow} = B_n \Gamma_T \quad (16)$$

We note here, that in the Eqs. (12)-(16) the equality is valid when and only when the fluctuating part of the cross-section is zero. Therefore all these equations can be used to determine wether or not the fluctuating part of the cross-sections can be neglected. However Eq. 10 seems best suited to determine the fluctuating cross-section because the values that enter in (10) are more easily determined experimentally.

If the fluctuating part of the cross-section can be neglected, experimental data can be analysed using a S-matrix of Eq.1 only, and the analysis of (p,p') data will give $B_{pp} = \sum_{c_p} \Gamma_{c_p}/\Gamma_T = \Gamma^{\uparrow}/\Gamma_T$. In Eqs. (12)-(16) the equality holds in this case, and for weak absorption and small phase shifts Eq. 16 gives $\Gamma^{\downarrow} = B_n \Gamma_T$, or $\Gamma^{\uparrow}/\Gamma_T = B_p$. Therefore, for small absorption and small phase-shifts, a necessary condition for the neglection of the fluctuating part of the cross-section is $B_{pp} = B_p$. In table 1 some experimental values for B_{pp} and B_p are given. Within experimental errors, the equality seems to hold, as soon as the IAR is above neutron threshold, with perhaps the exception of ^{208}Bi, where there is some difference between B_{pp} and B_p somewhat out of error bars. It would be better to use Eq. (14) or Eq. (15) instead of Eq. 16, because they involve less assumptions (Eq. 15 gives $(B_p \div (1-\bar{\tau})) = \Gamma^{\uparrow}/\Gamma_T = B_{pp}$) but the low experimental precision does not seem to justify the extra effort implied. Better precision measurements would be necessary.

III. DISCUSSION

For moderate absorption ($\tau \gtrsim \Gamma^{\uparrow}/\Gamma_T$) lower limits have been derived for the spreading width. Equations have been obtained that permit the experimental determination of the fluctuating part of the cross-section without measurement of the fine structure. Experimental information known to the author is not precise enough to provide a good test of the equations derived. Good quality (^3He,d $\bar{p}$) and (p,n $\bar{p}$) measurements of branching ratios would be welcome.

The author thanks M.S.Hussein and J.L.Foster for clarifying discussions.

TABLE 1

nucleus	ℓ	B_p	reaction	B_{pp}	E_n (MeV)
^{93}Tc	2	1.0±.03 [a]	(^{3}He,d$\bar{p}$)	.05 [b]	-3.42
^{95}Tc	2	1.0 [c]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)	.03 [d]	-0.1
^{97}Tc	2	0.09±.02 [c]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)	.08 [d]	1.7
^{112}In	0	0.32±.05 [c]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)	.40 [e]	3.45
^{115}Sb	0	1.0 [c]	(p.n $\bar{p}$)	.21 [f]	-0.73
^{117}Sb	0	0.31±.05 [c]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)	.38 [f]	1.50
^{119}Sb	0	0.38±.05 [c]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)	.34 [f]	2.74
^{125}I	0	0.30±.05	(p,n $\bar{p}$)	.27 [g]	3.48
^{208}Bi	1	1.04±.3 [i]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)	.61±.05 [j]	8.36
		1.9±.2 [e]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)		
		0.6-2 [m]	(p,n $\bar{p}$)		

a) ref. 4

b) ref. 5

c) ref. 6; in this work only the $\bar{p}$ cross-section has been measured. The branching ratio B_p has been deduced using a calculated total σ(p,n) cross-sections.

d) ref. 7

e) ref. 8

f) ref. 9

g) ref. 10

i) ref. 11

j) ref. 12

l) ref. 13

m) ref. 14; the authors point out that B_p depends critically on the underlying background in the $\bar{p}$ spectra.

CAPTION TO TABLES

TABLE 1 : The nucleus is the compound nucleus of the IAR.

ℓ is the multipolarity of the transition of the proton to the ground state of the final nucleus.

B_p is the branching ratio to proton channels as determined by $(p,n\,\overline{p})$ or $(^3He\ d\ \overline{p})$. B_{pp} is the ratio $\Sigma\,\Gamma_p/\Gamma_T$ as determined by analysis of (p,p') data.

E_n is the energy of the IAR above neutron threshold.

REFERENCES

1. C. Mahaux and H.A.Weidenmüller, Shell model approach to nuclear reactions, North-Holland Publishing Company,Amsterdam, London 1969, and references cited.

2. W. Mittig, to be published

3. M.S.Hussein, Phys. Rev. C 13 (1976) 1420.

4. S.Galès, private Communication.

5. Nuclear Data Sheets A-93, 1972, Vol.8, ed. by D.C.Kocher.

6. P.S.Miller and G.T.Garvey, Nuclear Physics A 163(1971) 65.

7. C.F.Moore, P. Richard, C.E.Watson, D.Robson and J.D.Fox Phys. Rev. 141(1966) 1166.

8. E. Abramson, R.A.Eisenstein, I. Plesser and Z.Vager Nucl. Phys. A 138(1969) 609.

9. P. Richard, C.F.Moore, J.A.Becker and J.D.Fox, Phys. Rev. 145(1966) 971.

10. J.L.Foster, P.J.Riley and C.F.Moore, Phys. Rev. 175(1968) 1498.

11. E.C.Booth and B.S.Madsen, Nucl. Phys. A 206(1973) 293.

12. T.J.Woods, G.J.Igo, C.A.Whitten, W.Dunlop and G.W.Hoffman, Phys. Lett. 34 B(1971) 594.

13. T.J.Woods, C.A.Whitten and G.J.Igo, Nucl. Phys. A 198 (1972) 542.

14. A. Galonsky, G.M.Crawley, P.S.Miller, R.R.Doering and D.M. Patterson, Phys. Rev. C 12(1975) 1072.

15. G.M. Crawley and P.S.Miller, Phys. Rev. C 6(1972) 306.