

# PHY 982 Homework 2

John Ash, Mengzhi Chen, Tong Li, Jason Surbrook

February 27, 2018

## 1 Elastic scattering calculations of a nucleon on $^{208}\text{Pb}$ target

### 1.1 Coulomb scattering

In the case of point-Coulomb scattering, the Coulomb interaction between the projectile and the target with charges  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  is

$$V_c(R) = \frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2}{R^2}, \quad (1)$$

where  $R$  is the distance between them. The Schrödinger's equation with this potential can be solved analytically. Related discussions are detailed in Ref.[1]. In sum, the angular distribution of point-Coulomb potential is described by the differential cross section

$$\sigma(\theta) = \frac{\eta^2}{4k^2 \sin^4(\theta/2)}; \quad \eta = \frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2}{\hbar} \left( \frac{\mu}{2E} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mu$  is the reduced mass and  $k$  is the wave number with the energy  $E$ . It worth noticing that the Eq. 3 is the same as the classical *Rutherford cross section*.

When the finite size of the target is included, due to different charge distributions, the interaction between the projectile and the target becomes more complicated. The case for uniform distribution over a sphere are formulated in Ref. [1].

Normally, these potentials are not analytically solvable. Sometimes, we can apply the *plane wave Born approximation* (PWBA) for the Coulomb scattering. Under PWBA, the differential cross section is

$$\sigma(\theta) = \frac{\eta^2}{4k^2 \sin^4(\theta/2)} |F(\theta)|^2, \quad (3)$$

where  $F(\theta)$  is called the *form factor* related with the charge distribution as

$$F(\theta) = \int e^{i(\vec{k}_f - \vec{k}_i) \cdot \vec{r}'} \rho(r') d^3 r'. \quad (4)$$

In sum, we see the finite size of the target can give cross sections different from the point-like case.

## 1.2 The optical potential

In this section, we study the elastic scattering between nucleons and the  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  target with the help of FRESKO[2]. Their effective interaction is referred to as the optical potential. We take the global parameterization from Ref. [3, 4] as the input for FRESKO.

In the first step, we take two lab energies 5 and 50 MeV in our calculation. The results are shown in Figure 1. It gives the angular distributions in center of mass for protons and neutrons. For the 5 MeV proton, the curve agrees well with the *Rutherford cross section*. Given that the radius parameter of optical potential is  $r_w \sim 1.2 \text{ fm}$ , we can estimate the Coulomb barrier for a proton to overcome. It should be

$$E_{Coul} \approx \frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2}{r_w + R_2} \approx 15 \text{ MeV}. \quad (5)$$

We see that 5 MeV is much lower than the Coulomb barrier. Thus, this scattering can be referred as a point-like Coulomb scattering properly. The agreement with the *Rutherford cross section* also verifies this point. For neutrons, there is no Rutherford scattering cross section to compare against, hence the value of the neutron cross section being listed as  $\text{fm}^2$ . At 5 MeV the cross section hints at a broad diffraction pattern. Since 50 MeV is strong enough to overcome the Coulomb barrier, the effective interaction plays a role and induces a diffraction pattern in Figure 1. The neutron cross section exhibits a similar behavior, speaking to the dominance of the nuclear interaction at this energy. In order to explore the influence of the optical potential, we will use  $E_{lab} = 50 \text{ MeV}$  in our following calculations.

In our next step, we would like to see the influences of the depth of optical potential's imaginary part of the S-matrix. Fixing other parameters, we scale the depth of imaginary parts  $V_i$  (including volume, surface derivative and spin-orbit potentials) a factor of 1.5, 0.5 and 0. The modules of S-matrix with for the proton and the neutron are shown in Table 1 and 2. We can see that as we lower the depth,  $|\mathbf{S}|^2$  fluctuates and eventually converges to one which indicates an elastic scattering. It inspires us that the imaginary parts can describe absorptions in scattering processes. It also worth noticing the fluctuation of  $|\mathbf{S}|^2$  with varying  $V_i$  in each partial wave. For this reason, there is no simple monotonous relations between the relative depth  $\bar{V}$  and the total absorptive cross section.

Moreover, we are interested in the effects of different radius parameters. Again, fixing other parameters, we repeat our calculations by scaling the radius parameters  $r$  (including volume, surface derivative and spin-orbit potentials) a factor of 0.2, 0.5, 2, 3 and 4. The results are shown in Figure 2. For the proton, we observe the dramatic up-down shifts and denser diffraction patterns with increasing  $r$ . It's the synergistic effect by the Coulomb

Proton partial waves					
L	J	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=1.5)$	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=1.0)$	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=0.5)$	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=0.0)$
0	0.5	6.45E-04	2.33E-04	1.56E-02	1.0
1	0.5	9.17E-04	1.17E-03	1.63E-02	1.0
2	1.5	8.33E-04	1.28E-04	1.34E-02	1.0
1	1.5	9.19E-04	1.23E-03	1.74E-02	1.0
2	2.5	7.97E-04	1.17E-04	1.52E-02	1.0
3	2.5	1.27E-03	1.64E-03	1.81E-02	1.0
4	3.5	1.51E-03	2.89E-04	1.02E-02	1.0
3	3.5	1.27E-03	1.85E-03	2.11E-02	1.0
...	...	...	...	...	...

Table 1: The modules of S-matrix for proton partial waves with varying imaginary potentials, where  $\bar{V}$  is the scaled depth defined as  $V_i(new)/V_i(initial)$ .

Neutron partial waves					
L	J	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=1.5)$	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=1.0)$	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=0.5)$	$ \mathbf{S} ^2(\bar{V}=0.0)$
0	0.5	7.96E-05	1.06E-03	8.21E-03	1.0
1	0.5	1.60E-04	2.51E-04	5.50E-03	1.0
2	1.5	1.09E-04	1.08E-03	6.26E-03	1.0
1	1.5	1.69E-04	3.06E-04	6.80E-03	1.0
2	2.5	1.16E-04	1.25E-03	8.02E-03	1.0
3	2.5	1.26E-04	1.50E-04	5.48E-03	1.0
4	3.5	1.95E-04	1.14E-03	2.21E-03	1.0
3	3.5	1.42E-04	2.61E-04	8.83E-03	1.0
...	...	...	...	...	...

Table 2: The modules of S-matrix for neutron partial waves with varying imaginary potentials, where  $\bar{V}$  is the scaled depth defined as  $V_i(new)/V_i(initial)$ .




Figure 1: Differential cross sections for nucleons scattering with  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  at 5 and 50 MeV. Left panel is proton and right panel is neutron

and optical potentials. As for neutron, the changing of pattern is relative small as it only feels the optical potential.

The total reaction cross section is directly accessible in FRESKO. In order to align with existing experimental information on  $n + ^{208}\text{Pb}$ , a lab energy of 40 MeV is used. The value for this reaction's absorption cross section is 55.2 barns. Since it's a elastic scattering, the total reaction cross section takes the same value.

## 2 Fit optical potentials for elastic scattering of a nucleon on $^{208}\text{Pb}$ target

In this section we will do  $\chi^2$  data fitting to obtain optical potentials for the elastic scattering of a proton or neutron on  $^{208}\text{Pb}$ . Experimental data are taken from Ref. [5] for proton and and [6] for neutron. The beam energies of proton and neutron are 49.35 MeV and 40.0 MeV, respectively. In addition, we choose the optical parameters employed in Sec. 1 (Ref. [3, 4]) as the starting point of our fitting. All the results discussed in this section are generated by SFRESKO (Ref. [2]).

### 2.1 Fit process and results

All the intermediate and final results of our fitting are summarized in Table 3 (for proton) and Table 4 (for neutron). For simplicity, we neglect spin-orbit components at the beginning, and only volume real and volume imaginary components are included. Keeping the volume imaginary component unchanged, we fit the volume real part (index 2 in Table 3 and 4), which cannot reduce  $\chi^2/N$  to a low value. Then, we vary both volume real and imaginary parts simultaneously (index 3 in Table 3 and 4) and achieve a significant




Figure 2: Differential cross sections for nucleons scattering with  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  with different radius parameters at 50MeV, where ratio is defined as  $r_{\text{new}}/r_{\text{initial}}$ . Left panel is proton and right panel is neutron.

improvement. However, for proton the diffuseness parameter  $av$  becomes too small to be considered physical.

Another choice of optical potential is to use a surface imaginary component instead of a volume one. Starting from parametrization of index 4 in Table 3 and 4, we fit the volume real part and surface imaginary part (index 5 in Table 3 and 4). For both proton and neutron, a surface imaginary component gives a lower  $\chi^2/N$ , and thus we will add spin-orbit terms onto this optical potential form.

As shown in the last four lines in Table 3 and 4, we gradually add and fit different parameters in the spin-orbit term. As for proton, the description can hardly be improved by only adding a real spin-orbit potential (index 6 in Table 3). If we only add a imaginary spin-orbit component, the diffuseness parameter “awso” will become negative and thus unphysical (index 8 in Table 3), so we abandon this set of parameters. If both real and imaginary components of spin-orbit potential are included,  $\chi^2/N$  will slightly decrease from 4.860 to 3.611, (index 9 in Table 3), which indicates that the spin-orbit term is not very important for the description of elastic scattering of a proton on  $^{208}\text{Pb}$ .

As for neutron, the radius parameter “rvso” will become negative and unphysical when only a real spin-orbit component is included (index 6 in Table 4), so we abandon this set of parameters. By only adding an imaginary spin-orbit component,  $\chi^2/N$  is slightly lowered from 4.638 to 3.310 (index 8 in Table 4). When both real and imaginary spin-orbit parts are varied,  $\chi^2/N$  can be even lower (index 9 in Table 4). However, in this case the diffuseness “avso” will become less than radius “rvso”, which is unphysical and unacceptable. As no significant improvement is seen from adding spin-orbit term, we conclude that the spin-orbit term is not very important for the description of elastic scattering of a neutron on  $^{208}\text{Pb}$ .

Table 3: Fitting results of scattering of a proton on  $^{208}\text{Pb}$ . The unit of  $V_v$ ,  $W_v$ ,  $W_s$ ,  $V_{so}$  and  $W_{so}$  is MeV, and the unit of  $r_v$ ,  $a_v$ ,  $r_{wv}$ ,  $a_{wv}$ ,  $r_{ws}$ ,  $a_{ws}$ ,  $r_{vso}$ ,  $a_{vso}$ ,  $r_{wso}$  and  $a_{wso}$  is fm. Unphysical values are highlighted in red.

Index	Fit from	$V_v$	$r_v$	$a_v$	$W_v$	$r_{wv}$	$a_{wv}$	$W_s$	$r_{ws}$	$a_{ws}$	$V_{so}$	$r_{vso}$	$a_{vso}$	$W_{so}$	$r_{wso}$	$a_{wso}$	$\chi^2/N$
1	-	67.2	1.244	0.646	16.6	1.244	0.646	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78.285
2	1	46.1	1.262	0.574	16.6	1.244	0.646	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27.134
3	2	44.6	1.254	1.87E-04	4.89	1.726	0.171	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.479
4	-	46.1	1.262	0.574	-	-	-	19.5	1.246	0.615	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.335
5	4	45.3	1.229	0.528	-	-	-	13.2	1.295	0.713	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.860
6	5	45.2	1.232	0.489	-	-	-	12.7	1.295	0.732	0.14	1.07	0.55	-	-	-	4.838
7	-	45.2	1.232	0.489	-	-	-	12.7	1.295	0.732	-	-	-	-3.1	1.08	0.57	12.026
8	7	45.1	1.242	0.507	-	-	-	12.0	1.279	0.748	-	-	-	-2.1	0.66	-0.028	4.068
9	7	45.2	1.276	0.540	-	-	-	15.7	1.239	0.710	-6.9	0.84	0.55	-8.0	1.03	0.53	3.661

9

Table 4: Fitting results of scattering of a neutron on  $^{208}\text{Pb}$ . The unit of  $V_v$ ,  $W_v$ ,  $W_s$ ,  $V_{so}$  and  $W_{so}$  is MeV, and the unit of  $r_v$ ,  $a_v$ ,  $r_{wv}$ ,  $a_{wv}$ ,  $r_{ws}$ ,  $a_{ws}$ ,  $r_{vso}$ ,  $a_{vso}$ ,  $r_{wso}$  and  $a_{wso}$  is fm. Unphysical values are highlighted in red.

index	Fit from	$V_v$	$r_v$	$a_v$	$W_v$	$r_{wv}$	$a_{wv}$	$W_s$	$r_{ws}$	$a_{ws}$	$V_{so}$	$r_{vso}$	$a_{vso}$	$W_{so}$	$r_{wso}$	$a_{so}$	$\chi^2/N$
1	-	50.6	1.244	0.646	15.6	1.244	0.646	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	261.394
2	1	40.3	1.245	0.903	15.6	1.244	0.646	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46.553
3	2	41.9	1.154	0.762	6.598	1.383	0.824	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.900
4	-	40.3	1.245	0.903	-	-	-	13.8	1.246	0.510	-	-	-	-	-	-	98.423
5	4	36.4	1.269	0.585	-	-	-	14.4	1.097	0.500	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.638
6	5	36.1	1.277	0.578	-	-	-	15.7	1.108	0.498	8.3	-4.3	3.2	-	-	-	3.084
7	-	36.4	1.269	0.585	-	-	-	14.4	1.097	0.500	-	-	-	-3.1	1.08	0.57	35.163
8	7	36.4	1.273	0.593	-	-	-	15.2	1.109	0.519	-	-	-	-3.1	1.09	0.43	3.310
9	8	35.8	1.266	0.592	-	-	-	14.9	1.107	0.513	4.9	1.03	1.23	-3.0	1.06	0.81	2.258

## 2.2 Sensitivity of final parameters to the initialization

Still empty.

## References

- [1] Ian J Thompson and Filomena M Nunes. Nuclear reactions for astrophysics: principles, calculation and applications of low-energy reactions. pages 62–64,129–131, 2009.
- [2] I.J. Thompson. Fresco, coupled reaction channels calculations. <http://www.fresco.org.uk/>. Accessed Feb 25, 2018.
- [3] Roberto Capote, Michel Herman, P Obložinský, PG Young, Stéphane Goriely, T Belgia, AV Ignatyuk, Arjan J Koning, Stéphane Hilaire, Vladimir A Plujko, et al. RIPL—reference input parameter library for calculation of nuclear reactions and nuclear data evaluations. *Nuclear Data Sheets*, 110(12):3107–3214, 2009.
- [4] AJ Koning and JP Delaroche. Local and global nucleon optical models from 1 keV to 200 MeV. *Nuclear Physics A*, 713(3-4):231–310, 2003.
- [5] G.S. Mani, D.T. Jones, and D. Jacques. Elastic scattering of 50 MeV protons by nuclei in the range from  $^{42}\text{Ca}$  to  $^{208}\text{Pb}$ . *Nuclear Physics A*, 165(2):384 – 392, 1971.
- [6] R. P. DeVito, Dao T. Khoa, Sam M. Austin, U. E. P. Berg, and Bui Minh Loc. Neutron scattering from  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  at 30.4 and 40.0 MeV and isospin dependence of the nucleon optical potential. *Phys. Rev. C*, 85:024619, Feb 2012.