INSTITUTO GALEGO DE FÍSICA DE ALTAS ENERXÍAS

25 1999 2024

Quenching of spectroscopic factors in ^{10,12}Be(d, ^{3}He) reactions

M. Lozano-González, A. Matta, B. Fernández-Domínguez, F. Delaunay, J. Lois-Fuentes

USC-IGFAE and LPC-Caen

Status by October 2024

USC UNIVERSIDADE DE SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

MINISTERIO DE CIENCIA, INNOVACIÓN Y UNIVERSIDADES

AGENCIA ESTATAL DE INVESTIGACIÓN

EXCELENCIA MARÍA DE MAEZTU 2024-2029

XUNTA DE GALICIA

CENTROS

Cofinanciado por la Unión Europea

Fondos Europeos

A recap on spectroscopic factors

Spectroscopic factors shed light on the occupancy of single-particle states:

$$\left.\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right|_{exp} = C^2 S \cdot \left.\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right|_{s.p}, \quad \sum C^2 S = (2j+1) \text{ in IPSM}$$

Experimentally:
Reduction of $\sim 65\,\%$!

- **Short-range** correlations: tensor forces,...
- **Long-range**: vibrations, giant resonances,...



L. Lapikás, Nuclear Phys. A 553 (1993)

A long-standing puzzle

A trend with asymmetry energy $\Delta S \equiv S_n - S_p$ is found depending on the experimental **probe**!



T. Aumann et al. Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 118 (2021)

$\Rightarrow$ measure towards more exotic nuclei: $|\Delta S| \uparrow$

Importance of GMF

Towards exotic nuclei (loosely bound or halo), a ***geometrical mismatch factor*** emerges from the very different w.f. in the overlap:



A.Matta et al., Phys. Rev. C 92 (2015)



N. K. Timofeyuk, private communication (in E748 proposal)

$\Rightarrow$ Need to correct C^2S by its value!

Physics case of E748

E748 @ GANIL back in 2017. Using ^{10,12}Be(d,^{3}He) reactions to:

R_S and ΔS dependence:

- $\left\langle ^{10}\text{Be} \middle| ^{9}\text{Li} \right\rangle$, $\Delta S = -12.8$ MeV
- $\left\langle ^{12}\text{Be} \middle| ^{11}\text{Li} \right\rangle$, $\Delta S = -19.8$ MeV



Explore effects of GMF:

- $\left\langle ^{10}\text{Be} \middle| ^{9}\text{Li} \right\rangle$, GMF ~ 1
- $\left\langle ^{12}\text{Be} \middle| ^{11}\text{Li} \right\rangle$, GMF $\sim 0.5?$



Experimental technique

Tradional solid target experiment @ LISE



A glance at the analysis

1 Heavy ID at $0°$



2 Light PID in DSSD



3 E_x from **missing mass technique**

$$E_{\text{beam}} + (E,\theta)_{\text{Lab}} \rightarrow E_x$$

Results: ^{10}Be(d,d)^{10}Be

Useful for normalization purpouses.





Best fit is provided by newer **Haixia** OMP.

Results: ^{10}Be(d,d)^{10}Be

Experimental cross-section formula:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \frac{N}{N_{\text{beam}} N_{\text{targets}} \epsilon \Delta\Omega}$$

1 **Target thickness** not measured during experiment:

- Set it from normalization of elastic
- **Ongoing**: fix it from simulation

2 ZDD had a poor performance. Averaged ϵ:

- IC: $30\,\%$
- Plastic: $50\,\%$

Results: $^{10}Be(d,t)^{9}Be$

Relatively high statistics. Used for benchmarking analysis routines.





STA prediction:
$C^2S = 1.50$
Our result: $C^2S_{\text{exp}} = 2.08$

SFO-tls shell-model:
$C^2S = 2.51$

Results: $^{10}Be(d,{}^{3}He)^{9}Li$

$3/2^{-}$ ground state and $1/2^{-}$ 1st excited state.



Ground state



1st excited



Results: $^{10}Be(d,{}^{3}He)^{9}Li$





STA fit agrees with N. Timofeyuk prediction!

First direct measurement!

Results: $^{12}Be(d,d)^{12}Be$

As before, this is used for setting the normalization of all channels.





N_{targets} is determined from the weighted average of this and the $^{10}Be(d,d)$ result

Results: $^{12}Be(d,^{3}He)^{11}Li$

So far only the **ground state** $3/2^-$ $(\ell = 1)$ is analyzed.





Much lower cross section!

Expected sizeable contribution of GMF

Results: ^{12}Be(d,^{3}He)^{11}Li

So far only the **ground state** $3/2^-$ $(\ell = 1)$ is analyzed.





STA **not available** yet!

Shell model with SFO-tls:
$C^2S = 1.642$

Results: $^{12}Be(d,{}^{3}He)^{11}Li$

The reduction factor $R_S = C^2 S_{exp}/C^2 S_{SM}$ is computed:



What happens with 9Be?

R_S compatible with litterature

$\sim 20\,\%$ reduction
GMF playing a role
Need **STA**

Conclusions

Angular distributions for ^{10,12}Be(d,^{3}He) have been extracted and compared with DWBA

Found strong sensitivity to nuclear overlap: stdWS or newer STA

R_S for $\left\langle {}^{10}\text{Be} \middle| {}^{9}\text{Li} \right\rangle$ in agreement with systematics

R_S for $\left\langle {}^{12}\text{Be} \middle| {}^{11}\text{Li} \right\rangle$ displays a strong reduction linked to GMF

Current issues

1 Found a quite low efficiency for the ZDD. This lowers the general efficiency since it is mandatory to gate on the heavy particle to identify on the ToF plot.

3- Combined efficiency of IC (= CHIO) and PL

Algorithm to count efficiency on physics data:

1. Select all the physical runs for 10Be or 12Be with PID already applied (this implies good CATS reconstruction as there is a cut in target position)
2. Count events with Must2Multiplicity >= 1
3. Relatively to that, count events with 0 <= IC_E <= 3000 (there is a constant overflow at 60000)
4. Relatively to those good IC events, count QPlast > 0 (contrary to IC, here there is a constant underflow at -1000)

Here are the results for both beams

Beam	**IC / Must2**	**PL / IC**	**Combined [%]**
10Be	0.265027	0.532634	14.116
12Be	0.198695	0.587892	11.681

Current issues

2 Experimental and simulated σ do not match $\rightarrow$ Work in progress to infer target thickness from this feature.



Clearly all (but 10Be(d,d)...) agree when thickness $\sim 28\,\mu\text{m}$

Current issues

3 There is an issue with the CsI matching.



Check this link for further info

Current issues

4 What happens with the B(E2) deformations of $^{10-12}$Be?

^{10}Be(d,d)



^{12}Be(d,d)



Coulomb deformation:

$$p_2 = \sqrt{B(E2)}$$

Nuclear deformation:

$$p_2 = \beta_2 \cdot R_0 \text{ with}$$
$$R_0 = 1.3\,\text{fm} \cdot A^{1/3}$$

Acknowledgments

The E748 collaboration:

- Santiago:
  B. Fernández
- LPC-Caen:
  A. Matta
  F. Delaunay
  N. L. Achouri
  F. Flavigny
  J. Gibelin
  M. Marques
  N. Orr
- IJCLab:
  D. Beaumel
  M. Assié
  Y. Blumenfeld
  S. Franchoo
  A. Georgiadou
  V. Girard-Alcindor
  F. Hammache
  N. de Séreville
  A. Meyer
  I. Stefan
- GANIL:
  B. Jacquot
  O. Kamalou
  A. Lemasson
  M. Rejmund
  T. Roger
  O. Sorlin
  J.C. Thomas
  M. Vandebrouck
  B. Bastin
  F. de Oliveira
  C. Stodel
- RIKEN:
  S. Koyama
  D. Suzuki
- Surrey:
  N. Timofeyuk

Backup

Additional: ^{10}Be(p,p)

This ground state is employed to obtain the number of protons in the target





Additional: ^{12}Be(p,p)

Same as before but for ^{12}Be





Additional: inelastic B(E2) with protons

The deformations included in the potential are exactly the same as for (d,d) channel.

^{10}Be(p,p)



^{12}Be(p, p)



For ^{10}Be(p,p) efficiency is critical: events impinge onto the boundary of the telescope

Status with light isotopes

Several experiments allowed for the extraction of C^2S with Li-induced (d, ^{3}He) reactions:

Explored region





A. Matta et al., Phys. Rev. C 92 (2015)

Several challenges in this region:

1 Dealing with **unbound** nuclei (^{10}He)

2 Many-body dynamics and/or core excitations

Kinematical lines