

# Four-body continuum-discretized coupled-channels calculations using a transformed harmonic oscillator basis

M. Rodríguez-Gallardo<sup>1,2,3</sup>, J. M. Arias<sup>2</sup>, J. Gómez-Camacho<sup>2</sup>,  
R. C. Johnson<sup>3</sup>, A. M. Moro<sup>2</sup>, I. J. Thompson<sup>3,4</sup>, and J. A. Tostevin<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Centro de Física Nuclear, Universidade de Lisboa,*

*Av. Prof. Gama Pinto nº 2, 1649-003 Lisboa, Portugal*

<sup>2</sup> *Departamento de Física Atómica, Molecular y Nuclear,*

*Universidad de Sevilla, Apartado 1065, 41080 Sevilla, Spain*

<sup>3</sup> *Department of Physics, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, United Kingdom and*

<sup>4</sup> *Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, PO Box 808, L-414, Livermore, CA 94551, USA*

(Dated: December 11, 2018)

The scattering of a weakly bound three-body system by a target is discussed. A transformed harmonic oscillator basis is used to provide an appropriate discrete and finite basis for treating the continuum part of the spectrum of the projectile. The continuum-discretized coupled-channels framework is used for the scattering calculations. The formalism is applied to different reactions,  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{12}\text{C}$  at 229.8 MeV,  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{64}\text{Zn}$  at 10 and 13.6 MeV, and  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{208}\text{Pb}$  at 22 MeV, induced by the Borromean nucleus  ${}^6\text{He}$ . Both the Coulomb and nuclear interactions with a target are taken into account.

PACS numbers: 21.45.+v, 21.10.-k, 27.20.+n, 24.10.-i, 24.10.Eq, 25.60.-t, 25.60.Bx, 03.65.Ca

## I. INTRODUCTION

The development of radioactive nuclear beam facilities has allowed the study of nuclei far from the line of stability, bringing to the fore new nuclear structure problems. A significant topic in recent years has been the study of halo nuclei [1, 2, 3]. These are weakly bound, spatially extended systems, typically comprising a core and one or two valence nucleons. Particularly interesting examples of such systems are Borromean nuclei, i.e., three-body composite systems with no binary bound states. These nuclei have attracted special attention because their loosely bound nature reflects a delicate interplay between two- and three-body forces, constituting a challenge to existing theories, and a motivation for the development of new ones. The detailed structure of the continuum spectrum of these systems is still not fully understood, partially due to the ambiguities associated with the underlying forces between the constituents. Due to their low binding energy, halo nuclei are easily broken up in the nuclear and Coulomb field of the target nucleus. Therefore few-body reaction theories, developed to extract reliable information from experimental data of reactions involving loosely bound systems, have to include, as an essential ingredient, a realistic description of coupling to the continuum part of the spectrum.

From the theoretical point of view, the treatment of reactions involving loosely bound systems must deal with the complication that these continuum breakup states are not square-normalizable. A convenient method to circumvent this problem is to replace the states in the continuum by a finite set of normalized states, thus providing a discrete basis that, hopefully, can be truncated to a small number of states and yet provide a reliable description of the continuum. Several prescriptions to construct such a discrete basis have been proposed. For

two-body composite systems, where the continuum states are easily calculated, one can use a discretization procedure in which the continuum spectrum is truncated at a maximum excitation energy and divided into energy intervals. For each interval, or bin, a normalizable state is constructed by superposition of scattering states within that bin interval. The method, normally used in the continuum-discretized coupled-channels (CDCC) framework [4, 5], has been very useful in the description of elastic and breakup observables in reactions involving weakly bound two-body projectiles.

An alternative to the binning procedure is to represent the continuum spectrum by the eigenstates of the internal Hamiltonian in a basis of square integrable (or  $L^2$ ) functions, such as Laguerre [6, 7, 8], Gaussian [9, 10] or Sturmian [11, 12, 13, 14] functions. In practice, the diagonalization is performed in a finite (truncated) set of states and the resulting eigenstates, also known as *pseudo-states* (PS), are regarded as a finite and discrete representation of the spectrum of the system. The pseudo-states are then used within a coupled-channels calculation in the same way as the continuum bins.

The PS method has the appealing feature of being readily applicable also to describe the spectrum of three-body systems, in which case the Hamiltonian is diagonalized in a complete set of square-integrable functions for the three-body Hilbert space. Several applications of this method can be found in the literature, for both structure [15] and reaction problems [16]. In the latter case, the method is an extension of the CDCC formalism to reactions with three-body projectiles, using a pseudo-state model for the continuum.

One such PS method proposed recently is the Transformed Harmonic Oscillator (THO) method [17, 18]. Given the ground-state wave function of the system, the THO method performs a Local Scale Transformation

(LST) [19] that converts the bound ground-state wave function of the system into the ground-state wave function of a Harmonic Oscillator (HO). Once the LST is obtained, the HO basis can be transformed, by the inverse LST, to a discrete basis in the physical space. The THO basis functions are not eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian (except for the ground state) but the Hamiltonian can be diagonalized in an appropriate truncated basis to produce approximate eigenvalues and eigenfunctions. This method has been shown to be useful for describing the two-body continuum in both structure [17, 18, 20] and scattering [21, 22, 23] problems. In a recent work [24] the THO method was generalized to describe continuum states of three-body systems, based on expansion in Hyperspherical Harmonics (HH) [25]. In particular the method was applied to the Borromean nucleus  ${}^6\text{He}$ , for which several strength functions, including the dipole and quadrupole Coulomb transition strengths, were calculated. These observables are found to converge quickly with respect to the number of THO basis states included. Furthermore, the calculated strength distributions are in very good agreement with those obtained using three-body scattering wave functions [26].

Most of our knowledge of  ${}^6\text{He}$  comes from the analysis of reactions where secondary beams collide with stable nuclei. These experiments have been performed with both light [27, 28] and heavy targets [29, 30, 31, 32, 33], and at low and high energies, providing a body of data which can be used to benchmark reaction and structure models. The theoretical understanding of reactions involving a three-body projectile, such as  ${}^6\text{He}$ , is a complicated task because it requires the solution of a four-body scattering problem. At high energies, a variety of approximations have been used such as semiclassical approximations [34, 35, 36], *frozen halo* or adiabatic approximations [37, 38], Multiple Scattering expansions [39, 40, 41], four-body DWBA [42, 43], among others. However, at energies of a few MeV per nucleon, some of these approximations are not justified. Then the use of the CDCC method is an alternative to solve these problems. For a four-body problem (three-body projectile) this method has already been applied using a PS basis based on Gaussian functions. The scattering of  ${}^6\text{He}$  by  ${}^{12}\text{C}$  [16] and  ${}^{209}\text{Bi}$  [44] have been studied. In both cases a good agreement was obtained with the experimental data of Refs. [45, 46] and [31], respectively.

In this work, we study the scattering of a three-body projectile by a target using the CDCC formalism. The novel feature of the present approach is the use of the THO PS basis to represent the states of the projectile. These states are then used to generate the projectile-target coupling potentials that enter the system of coupled equations. Furthermore, we have developed a new procedure to calculate these coupling potentials making use of an expansion of the wave functions of the projectile internal states in a HH basis.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section II the three-body discretization method is presented. In Sec-

tion III the multipole expansion of the interaction potential between the projectile and the target is addressed. In Section IV we describe the three-body model for the Borromean nucleus  ${}^6\text{He}$ . In Section V we apply the formalism to the reactions  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{12}\text{C}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=229.8$  MeV,  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{64}\text{Zn}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=13.6$  and 10 MeV, and  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{208}\text{Pb}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=22$  MeV. Finally, Section VI summarizes and draws conclusions.

## II. THREE-BODY CONTINUUM DISCRETIZATION METHOD

The THO discretization method applied to a three-body system is described in detail in Ref. [24]. For completeness, in this Section we outline the main features of the formalism. In the three-body case, it is convenient to work with the hyperspherical coordinates  $\{\rho, \alpha, \hat{x}, \hat{y}\}$ . They are obtained from the Jacobi coordinates  $\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\}$  that are illustrated in Fig. 1. The variable  $\mathbf{x}$  is proportional to the relative coordinate between two of the particles, with a scaling factor depending on their masses [20] and  $\mathbf{y}$  is proportional to the coordinate from the center of mass of these two particles to the third particle, again with a scaling factor depending on their masses. From these coordinates, the hyperradius ( $\rho$ ) and the hyperangle ( $\alpha$ ) are defined as  $\rho = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$  and  $\tan \alpha = x/y$ . Obviously there are three different Jacobi sets but  $\rho$  is the same for all of them.

For a three-body system the discretization method has two parts. First, the wave functions of the system are expanded in Hyperspherical Harmonics (HH) [25]. We define states of good total angular momentum as

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\beta j \mu}(\Omega) = \sum_{\nu l} \langle j_{ab} \nu I l | j \mu \rangle \chi_I^{\nu} \times \sum_{m_l \sigma} \langle l m_l S_x \sigma | j_{ab} \nu \rangle \Upsilon_{K l m_l}^{l_x l_y}(\Omega) \chi_{S_x}^{\sigma}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\Upsilon_{K l m_l}^{l_x l_y}(\Omega)$  are the hyperspherical harmonics that depend on the angular variables  $\Omega \equiv \{\alpha, \hat{x}, \hat{y}\}$ ,  $\chi_{S_x}^{\sigma}$  is the spin wave function of the two particles related by the coordinate  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $\chi_I^{\nu}$  is the spin function of the third particle. Each component of the wavefunction (or channel) is defined by the set of quantum numbers  $\beta \equiv \{K, l_x, l_y, l, S_x, j_{ab}\}$ . Here,  $K$  is the hypermomentum,  $l_x$  and  $l_y$  are the orbital angular momenta associated with the Jacobi coordinates  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $l = l_x + l_y$  is the total orbital angular momentum,  $S_x$  is the spin of the particles related by the coordinate  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $j_{ab} = l + S_x$ . Finally,  $j = j_{ab} + I$  is the total angular momentum, with  $I$  the spin of the third particle, which we assume fixed. The physical states of the system can now be expressed as a linear combination of the states given by Eq. (1) as

$$\psi_{j \mu}(\rho, \Omega) = \sum_{\beta} R_{\beta j}(\rho) \mathcal{Y}_{\beta j \mu}(\Omega), \quad (2)$$

where  $\{R_{\beta j}\}$  are the hyperradial wave functions.

Secondly, the THO method is used to obtain the functions  $R_{\beta j}(\rho)$ . Writing the ground-state wave function in the form of Eq. (2), the equation that defines the LST for each channel  $\beta$  is

$$|N_{B\beta}|^2 \int_0^\rho d\rho' \rho'^5 |R_{B\beta}(\rho')|^2 = \int_0^s ds' s'^5 |R_{0K}^{HO}(s')|^2, \quad (3)$$

where  $R_{B\beta}(\rho)$  is the bound ground-state hyperradial wave function for the channel  $\beta$ , with  $N_{B\beta}$  the normalization factor, and  $R_{0K}^{HO}(s)$  is the ground-state hyperradial wave function of the HO for the hypermomentum  $K$ , that is already normalized. Finally, the THO basis is constructed for each channel by applying the LST,  $s_\beta(\rho)$ , to the HO basis

$$\begin{aligned} R_{i\beta}^{THO}(\rho) &= \frac{\mathcal{N}_{iK}}{\mathcal{N}_{0K}} N_{B\beta} R_{B\beta}(\rho) L_i^{K+2}(s_\beta(\rho)^2), \quad (4) \\ \psi_{i\beta j\mu}^{THO}(\rho, \Omega) &= R_{i\beta}^{THO}(\rho) \mathcal{Y}_{\beta j\mu}(\Omega) \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

where the  $L_i^\lambda(t)$  are generalized Laguerre polynomials and  $\mathcal{N}_{iK}$  is the normalization constant of the HO basis. Here the index  $i$  denotes the number of hyperradial excitations. Note that as  $i$  increases, the functions  $R_{i\beta}^{THO}(\rho)$  become more oscillatory and explore larger distances.

For channels with quantum numbers that do not contribute to the ground-state wave function, the (ground state) channel with the closest quantum labels to the channel of interest is used to construct the LST. One important point concerns the label  $K$  which governs the  $\rho^K$  behavior of the hyperradial wave function close to the origin. To guarantee the correct behavior of the wavefunction, we select a channel from the ground-state wave function with the same  $K$ . If this is not possible, a channel with  $K-1$  is used and the corresponding hyperradial wave function is then multiplied by  $\rho$ .

The required discrete eigenstates are now calculated by diagonalizing the three-body Hamiltonian of the projectile in a finite THO basis up to  $n_b$  hyperradial excitations in each channel,

$$\phi_{nj\mu}^{THO}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\beta} \sum_{i=0}^{n_b} C_n^{i\beta j} \psi_{i\beta j\mu}^{THO}(\rho, \Omega), \quad (6)$$

where  $n$  labels the eigenstates for a given angular momentum  $j$  and  $\varepsilon_{nj}$  will be the associated energy. Replacing in this expression the functions  $\psi_{i\beta j\mu}^{THO}(\rho, \Omega)$  by their explicit expansion in terms of the HH, Eq. (5), and performing the sum in the index  $i$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n_b$ , we can express the PS basis states as

$$\phi_{nj\mu}^{THO}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\beta} R_{n\beta j}^{THO}(\rho) \mathcal{Y}_{\beta j\mu}(\Omega). \quad (7)$$

Note that the choice of the HO parameter has no influence in the calculation of the LST since changes to this parameter are equivalent to making a linear transformation in the oscillator variable  $s$ . This gives the same result for the right part of Eq. (3).




Figure 1: (Color online) Relevant coordinates for the scattering of a three-body projectile by a structureless target.

### III. MULTIPOLE EXPANSION OF THE PROJECTILE-TARGET POTENTIAL

The eigenstates given in Eq. (7) are a discrete representation of the states of the three-body projectile. From them, the four-body wavefunction of the projectile-target system, schematically depicted in Fig. 1, is formed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{JM}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) &= \sum_{nj\mu LM_L} \phi_{nj\mu}^{THO}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \langle LM_L j\mu | JM \rangle i^L \\ &\times Y_{LM_L}(\hat{R}) \frac{1}{R} f_{Lnj}^J(R), \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{R}$  is the coordinate from the target to the center of mass of the projectile,  $L$  is the orbital angular momentum of the projectile-target relative motion and  $J$  is the total angular momentum,  $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{j}$ . The radial functions  $f_{Lnj}^J(R)$  satisfy the system of coupled equations

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_r} \left( \frac{d^2}{dR^2} - \frac{L(L+1)}{R^2} \right) + \varepsilon_{nj} - E \right] f_{Lnj}^J(R) \\ + \sum_{L'n'j'} i^{L'-L} V_{Lnj, L'n'j'}^J(R) f_{L'n'j'}^J(R) = 0, \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_r$  is the reduced mass of the projectile-target system. The coupling potentials  $V_{Lnj, L'n'j'}^J(R)$  are then

$$V_{Lnj, L'n'j'}^J(R) = \langle Lnj JM | \hat{V}_{pt}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) | L'n'j' JM \rangle, \quad (10)$$

where the ket  $|Lnj JM\rangle$  denotes the function  $\Phi_{Lnj}^{JM}(\hat{R}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  given by

$$\Phi_{Lnj}^{JM}(\hat{R}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mu M_L} \phi_{nj\mu}^{THO}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \langle LM_L j\mu | JM \rangle Y_{LM_L}(\hat{R}). \quad (11)$$

To calculate these coupling potentials, a multipole expansion of the projectile-target interaction is developed. The procedure is analogous to that for a three-body problem reported in Ref. [47]. In that work the traditional method of bin averaging was used as discretization method instead of the THO method. We assume that the projectile-target interaction is the sum of the interactions of each particle of the projectile with the target,  $V_{kt}(\mathbf{r}_k)$  with  $k = 1, 2, 3$ . For each pair potential, an appropriate

Jacobi set is chosen so that the corresponding coordinate  $\mathbf{r}_k$  depends only on the vectors  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_k$ . Assuming that the potentials are central, the coefficients of the multipole expansion are generated as

$$\mathcal{V}_Q^k(R, y_k) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} V^k(r_k) P_Q(z_k) dz_k, \quad (12)$$

where  $P_Q(z_k)$  is a Legendre polynomial,  $Q$  is the multipole order and  $z_k = \hat{\mathbf{y}}_k \cdot \hat{\mathbf{R}}$  is the cosine of the angle between  $\mathbf{y}_k$  and  $\mathbf{R}$ . So, the coupling potential can be expressed as

$$V_{Lnj, L'n'j'}^J(R) = \sum_Q (-1)^{J-j} \hat{L} \hat{L}' \begin{pmatrix} L & Q & L' \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} W(LL'jj', QJ) F_{nj, n'j'}^Q(R), \quad (13)$$

where the radial form factor  $F_{nj, n'j'}^Q(R)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} F_{nj, n'j'}^Q(R) &= (-1)^{Q+2j-j'} \hat{j} \hat{j}' (2Q+1) \sum_{\beta\beta'} \sum_{k=1}^3 \sum_{\beta_k\beta'_k} N_{\beta\beta_k} N_{\beta'\beta'_k} \\ &\times (-1)^{l_{xk}+S_{xk}+j'_{abk}-j_{abk}-I_k} \delta_{l_{xk}l'_{xk}} \delta_{S_{xk}S'_{xk}} \hat{l}_{yk} \hat{l}'_{yk} \hat{l}_k \hat{l}'_k \hat{j}_{abk} \hat{j}'_{abk} \begin{pmatrix} l_{yk} & Q & l'_{yk} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\times W(l_k l'_k l_{yk} l'_{yk}; Q l_{xk}) W(j_{abk} j'_{abk} l_k l'_k; Q S_{xk}) W(j j' j_{abk} j'_{abk}; Q I_k) \\ &\times \int \int (\sin \alpha_k)^2 (\cos \alpha_k)^2 d\alpha_k \rho^5 d\rho R_{n\beta j}^{THO}(\rho) \varphi_{K_k}^{l_{xk} l_{yk}}(\alpha_k) \mathcal{V}_Q^k(R, y_k) \varphi_{K'_k}^{l'_{xk} l'_{yk}}(\alpha_k) R_{n'\beta' j'}^{THO}(\rho), \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\beta_k$  being the set of quantum numbers in the  $k$ 'th Jacobi system where the potential depends on  $x_k$ , and  $\beta$  being the set in the Jacobi system in which the states of the projectile are calculated. The matrix elements  $N_{\beta\beta_k}$  transform the hyperangular, angular and spin part of the wave functions from one Jacobi set to another. Their explicit expression as a function of the Raynal-Revai coefficients is developed in Ref. [48]. Note that Eqs. (13) and (14) are completely general, and do not depend on the nature of the basis.

#### IV. STRUCTURE MODEL FOR ${}^6\text{He}$

The  ${}^6\text{He}$  nucleus is treated here as a three-body system, comprising an inert  $\alpha$  core and two valence neutrons. The ground state has total angular momentum  $j^\pi = 0^+$  with experimental binding energy of 0.973 MeV. The ground state wave function was obtained by solving the Schrödinger equation in hyperspherical coordinates, following the procedure described in [25, 48], and making use of the codes FACE [48]+ STURMXX [49]. In these calculations, the  $n$ - ${}^4\text{He}$  potential was taken from Ref. [50]. It consists of an energy independent Woods-Saxon potential, supplemented by a spin-orbit term with a Woods-Saxon derivative radial shape. This potential

reproduces the low-energy s- and p-phase shifts up to 10 MeV. For the  $NN$  interaction we used the potential proposed by Gogny, Pires and Turreil (GPT) [51], which contains central, spin-orbit and tensor components. This interaction was developed to give simultaneously an acceptable fit to two nucleon scattering data up to 300 MeV and to describe reasonably the properties for finite nuclei, particularly the radii, within the Hartree-Fock approximation. Besides the two-body ( $n-n$  and  $n-\alpha$ ) potentials, the model Hamiltonian also includes a simple phenomenological three-body force, depending only on the hyperradius, according to the following power form

$$v_{3b}(\rho) = -\frac{a}{1 + (\rho/b)^c}, \quad (15)$$

where  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  are adjustable parameters. This potential is introduced to correct the under-binding caused by our neglect of other configurations, such as the  $t+t$  channel.

We have performed different calculations that truncate the maximum hypermomentum at  $K_{\max} = 2, 4, 6, 8$ , and 10, respectively. For each value of  $K_{\max}$ , the three-body potential has been adjusted to give the same binding energy and mean square radius (for  $j^\pi = 0^+$  states) and the same position for the  $2^+$  resonance (for  $j^\pi = 2^+$  states). The latter value was also used for the  $j^\pi = 1^-$  states.





Table I: Optical model parameters used in this work. All potentials are parametrized using the usual Woods-Saxon form, with a real volume part and volume ( $W_v$ ) and surface ( $W_d$ ) imaginary part. Reduced radii are related to physical radii by  $R = r_0 A_T^{1/3}$ .

System	$V_0$ (MeV)	$r_0$ (fm)	$a_0$ (fm)	$W_v$ (MeV)	$W_d$ (MeV)	$r_i$ (fm)	$a_i$ (fm)
$n+^{12}\text{C}$	49.46	1.115	0.57	3.05	7.48	1.15	0.5
$\alpha+^{12}\text{C}$	100.	1.289	0.71	19.98		1.738	0.495
$n+^{64}\text{Zn}$	51.82	1.203	0.668	0.29		1.203	0.668
					5.97	1.279	0.534
$\alpha+^{64}\text{Zn}$	123	1.676	0.43	20.40		1.467	0.43
$n+^{208}\text{Pb}$	47.37	1.222	0.726		6.24	1.302	0.351
$\alpha+^{208}\text{Pb}$	96.44	1.376	0.625		32.	1.216	0.42

as in the four-body CDCC calculation of Matsumoto et al. [16] for the same reaction. We also show the analogous calculation when omitting all the couplings to the continuum (one channel calculation) with a dashed line. For the reaction at 229.8 MeV we conclude that the effect of coupling to the continuum is a reduction of the cross section for angles beyond  $5^\circ$ . This effect has also been observed in the scattering of  $^{11}\text{Be}+^{12}\text{C}$  at  $E \simeq 49$  MeV per nucleon [37], and is probably present in other reactions induced by weakly bound projectiles at energies of a few tens of MeV per nucleon. That the no-continuum coupling calculation reproduces the data reasonably well at the larger angles is probably fortuitous, and cannot be attributed to the adequacy of this approximation. As we have shown, continuum couplings are very important in this reaction.

We also show in Fig. 3 the full CDCC calculation for  $n_b=2$  (dotted line). This calculation is practically indistinguishable from the calculation with  $n_b=4$ , indicating that it is not necessary in this case to have a very precise discretization of the continuum in terms of excitation energy. We found that a maximum excitation energy of  $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}=30$  MeV provided good convergence for all the values of  $n_b$  presented.

$^6\text{He}+^{64}\text{Zn}$ . We have studied this reaction at two different energies, namely, 13.6 MeV and 10 MeV, for which experimental data exist [58]. The  $n+^{64}\text{Zn}$  potential was taken from the global parametrization of Koning and Delaroche [59]. For the  $\alpha+^{64}\text{Zn}$  system, we took the optical potential derived in Ref. [58]. The parameters are listed in Table I. The coupled equations were solved up to  $J=60$  and 40, respectively, and for projectile-target separations up to  $R_m=100$  fm.

In Figs. 4 and 5 we present the experimental and calculated angular distributions of the elastic cross section for these two reactions. The dashed lines correspond to the one channel calculations (i.e., omitting the continuum) and the thick solid lines are the full four-body CDCC calculations for a basis with  $n_b=4$ .

At  $E_{\text{lab}}=13.6$  MeV (Fig. 4), the one-channel calculation




Figure 3: (Color online) Elastic differential cross section relative to Rutherford as a function of the scattering angle in the projectile-target center of mass for the reaction  $^6\text{He}+^{12}\text{C}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=229.8$  MeV. Experimental data are from Ref. [45].

tion exhibits a pronounced rainbow peak at around  $30^\circ$ , which is much smaller in the data. Also, this calculation gives a too small cross section at large angles. Inclusion of couplings to the continuum suppresses this rainbow, and enhances the backward angles cross section, improving the agreement with the data in the whole angular range. In the same figure, we also show the full CDCC calculation for a basis with  $n_b=2$  (dotted) and 6 (dot-dashed). These two calculations are very close to  $n_b=4$  showing a very good convergence with respect  $n_b$ . The maximum excitation energy required for convergence depended somewhat on the value of  $n_b$ , ranging from  $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}=7$  MeV (for  $n_b=2$ ) to  $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}=6$  MeV (for  $n_b=6$ ).

At  $E_{\text{lab}}=10$  MeV (Fig. 5), the full CDCC calculation also improves the agreement with the data at backward angles, although some underestimation remains. Interestingly, the data suggests the presence of a rainbow at around  $50^\circ$ , which is not present in our calculation. It should be noted that the experimental error bars are large at this energy, so more accurate measurements would be needed to make more definite conclusions about this apparent discrepancy. Again, in the same figure, we show the full CDCC calculation for a basis with  $n_b=2$  (dotted) and 6 (dot-dashed). In this case, we find that the convergence with respect  $n_b$  is slower. However the calculations with  $n_b=4$  and 6 are quite close and give a reasonable convergence. As in the previous case, the maximum excitation energy required for convergence depended somewhat on the value of  $n_b$ , ranging from  $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}=9$  MeV (for  $n_b=2$ ) to  $\varepsilon_{\text{max}}=5$  MeV (for  $n_b=6$ ).

$^6\text{He}+^{208}\text{Pb}$ . We have performed calculations for this




Figure 4: (Color online) Elastic differential cross section relative to Rutherford as a function of the c.m. scattering angle for the reaction  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{64}\text{Zn}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=13.6$  MeV. Experimental data are from Ref. [58].




Figure 5: (Color online) Elastic differential cross section relative to Rutherford as a function of the c.m. scattering angle for the reaction  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{64}\text{Zn}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=10$  MeV. Experimental data are from Ref. [58].

reaction at 22 MeV, in order to compare with the recent data of Sánchez-Benítez et al. [60]. We took the  $n+{}^{208}\text{Pb}$  potential from Ref. [61] and the  $\alpha+{}^{208}\text{Pb}$  potential from Ref. [62]. The parameters for these potentials are also listed in Table I. The coupled equations were solved up to  $J = 150$  and matched to their asymptotic solution at




Figure 6: Convergence of the differential elastic cross section with respect to  $K_{\text{max}}$ , for the reaction  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{208}\text{Pb}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=22$  MeV. All the calculations use  $n_b = 4$  for the number of hyper-radial excitations and the maximum excitation energy was set to 8 MeV.

$R_m = 200$  fm.

First, we discuss the convergence of the calculation with respect to the hypermomentum ( $K_{\text{max}}$ ) and the hyper-radial excitation ( $n_b$ ). In Fig. 6, we show the calculations with different values of  $K_{\text{max}} = 2, 4, 6, 8$  and for the same value of  $n_b=4$ . For a meaningful comparison, in all these cases the three-body potential was adjusted in order to give the same binding energy and rms radius, for  $j = 0^+$  and the same position for the resonance, for  $j = 2^+$ . We found a relatively fast convergence with respect to this parameter. In particular, the calculations with  $K_{\text{max}} = 6, 8$  and 10 are very similar (for clarity, the latter has been omitted from the figure). For rest of reactions the results are quite similar, achieving the convergence for  $K_{\text{max}} = 6$  or 8.

The convergence with respect to  $n_b$  for this reaction is illustrated in Fig. 7. For clarity, we show only the results for even values of  $n_b$ . Unlike the previous cases, the convergence rate found in this case was rather slow. Although the differences in the calculated cross sections are less than 5%, the oscillatory pattern at the rainbow region changes from one value of  $n_b$  to another. A possible explanation for this slow convergence rate is given below.

In Fig. 8 we compare the experimental and calculated angular distributions of the elastic cross section. The dashed line is the one channel calculation and the thick solid line the full CDCC calculation including the continuum. The latter uses  $K_{\text{max}} = 8$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\text{max}} = 8$  MeV,  $n_b = 4$ . The one channel calculation shows a rainbow that disappears in the full calculation, in agreement with the data.




Figure 7: Convergence of the differential elastic cross section with respect to  $n_b$ , for the reaction  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{208}\text{Pb}$  at  $E_{\text{lab}}=22$  MeV.

At backward angles, the agreement with the data is improved when we include the coupling to the continuum. In order to show the contribution of the couplings to each  $j$ , we also include in this figure the calculation including only  $j = 0^+$  states (dotted line) and the calculation with  $j = 0^+, 1^-$  states (thin solid line). From these calculations we can conclude that dipole couplings are the main responsible for the characteristic reduction of the cross section at the angles around the rainbow. The strong influence of dipole couplings might explain the slow convergence with respect to the parameter  $n_b$  found for this reaction. These couplings are very sensitive to the excitation energy of dipole states, which appear at different positions in our discrete representation of the  ${}^6\text{He}$  continuum, as we vary the number of hyperradial excitations,  $n_b$ . By contrast, in the  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{12}\text{C}$  case, dipole excitations are very small, and this might explain the fast convergence with respect to  $n_b$  in that case.

Moreover, we find that the range of the form factors [Eq. (14)] changes significantly for the different pseudo-states as  $n_b$  is changed. This could also contribute to the slow convergence at scattering energies close to the Coulomb barrier.

## VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The collision of a loosely bound three-body projectile with a target nucleus has been studied in the framework of the continuum-discretized coupled-channels (CDCC) method. A set of normalizable states, also known as pseudo-states, is used to represent the three-body continuum of the projectile. In particular we took the Trans-



with respect to  $n_b$  was found to depend very much on the specific reaction. For the reaction  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{12}\text{C}$  at 229.8 MeV the convergence was found to be very fast, with  $n_b = 2$  providing fully converged results. For  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{64}\text{Zn}$  at near-barrier energies, we required  $n_b \approx 4$  for an acceptable convergence. Finally, for  ${}^6\text{He}+{}^{208}\text{Pb}$  at 22 MeV, the convergence was found to be slow and oscillatory. In fact, our biggest calculation, corresponding to  $n_b = 6$ , is still not fully converged. Because of computational limitations we have not explored this question further, as required to study the convergence of the calculations with respect to the basis size.

This work shows that the use of the transformed harmonic oscillator basis, developed in previous works, combined with the standard CDCC method, provides a reliable procedure for the treatment of the scattering of a loosely bound three-body projectile by a target. It will be interesting to compare this method with other representations of the continuum, including the standard discretization procedure in terms of continuum bins which, in the case of three-body projectiles, requires the calcu-

lation of the three-body scattering states. This work is underway and the results will be published elsewhere.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the DGICYT under projects FIS2005-01105 and FPA 2006-13807-C02-01, and in part by the FCT under the grants POCTI/ISFL/2/275 and POCTI/FIS/43421/2001. This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. J.A.T. acknowledges the support of the the United Kingdom Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC) under Grant No. EP/D003628. A.M.M. acknowledges a research grant from the Junta de Andalucía. M.R.G. acknowledges a research grant from the Ministerio de Educación and support from the Marie Curie Training Site program.

- 
- [1] K. Riisager, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 1105 (1994).  
 [2] P. G. Hansen, A. S. Jensen, and B. Jonson, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **45**, 591 (1995).  
 [3] A. S. Jensen, K. Riisager, D. V. Fedorov, and E. Garrido, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 215 (2004).  
 [4] M. Yahiro, Y. Iseri, H. Kameyama, M. Kamimura, and M. Kawai, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **89**, 32 (1986).  
 [5] N. Austern, Y. Iseri, M. Kamimura, M. Kawai, G. Rawitscher, and M. Yahiro, *Phys. Rep.* **154**, 125 (1987).  
 [6] I. Bray, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **85**, 1 (1995).  
 [7] Z. C. Kuruoglu and F. S. Levin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 899 (1982).  
 [8] Z. C. Kuruoglu, *Phys. Rev. C* **43**, 1061 (1991).  
 [9] T. Matsumoto *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **68**, 064607 (2003).  
 [10] A. Macías, F. Martín, and M. Yáñez, *Phys. Rev. A* **36**, 4179 (1987).  
 [11] R. C. Johnson and P. C. Tandy, *Nucl. Phys.* **A235**, 56 (1974).  
 [12] B. Anders and A. Lindner, *Nucl. Phys.* **A296**, 77 (1978).  
 [13] W. M. Wendler, A. Lindner, and B. Anders, *Nucl. Phys.* **A349**, 365 (1980).  
 [14] A. Laid, J. A. Tostevin, and R. C. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. C* **48**, 1307 (1993).  
 [15] E. Hiyama, Y. Kino, and M. Kamimura, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **51**, 223 (2003).  
 [16] T. Matsumoto, E. Hiyama, K. Ogata, Y. Iseri, M. Kamimura, S. Chiba, and M. Yahiro, *Phys. Rev. C* **70**, 061601(R) (2004).  
 [17] F. Pérez-Bernal, I. Martel, J. M. Arias, and J. Gómez-Camacho, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 052111 (2001).  
 [18] F. Pérez-Bernal, I. Martel, J. M. Arias, and J. Gómez-Camacho, *Few-Body Syst. Supl.* **13**, 217 (2001).  
 [19] I. Zh. Petkov and M. V. Stoitsov, *C. R. Acad. Bulg. Sci.* **34**, 1651 (1981).  
 [20] M. Rodríguez-Gallardo, J. M. Arias, and J. Gómez-Camacho, *Phys. Rev. C* **69**, 034308 (2004).  
 [21] A. M. Moro, J. M. Arias, J. Gómez-Camacho, I. Martel, F. Pérez-Bernal, R. Crespo, and F. Nunes, *Phys. Rev. C* **65**, 011602(R) (2002).  
 [22] I. Martel, F. Pérez-Bernal, M. Rodríguez-Gallardo, J. M. Arias, and J. Gómez-Camacho, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052708 (2002).  
 [23] A. M. Moro, F. Pérez-Bernal, J. M. Arias, and J. Gómez-Camacho, *Phys. Rev. C* **73**, 044612 (2006).  
 [24] M. Rodríguez-Gallardo, J. Arias, J. Gómez-Camacho, A. M. Moro, I. J. Thompson, and J. A. Tostevin, *Phys. Rev. C* **72**, 024007 (2005).  
 [25] M. V. Zhukov, B. V. Danilin, D. V. Fedorov, J. M. Bang, I. J. Thompson, and J. S. Vaagen, *Phys. Rep.* **231**, 151 (1993).  
 [26] I. J. Thompson, B. V. Danilin, V. D. Efros, J. S. Vaagen, J. M. Bang, and M. V. Zhukov, *Phys. Rev. C* **61**, 024318 (2000).  
 [27] F. Aksough *et al.*, Review of the University of Milano, Ricerca Scientifica ed educazione permanente **Suppl. 122** (2003).  
 [28] P. Egelhof, *Nucl. Phys.* **A722**, C254 (2003).  
 [29] T. Aumann, L. V. Chulkov, V. N. Pribora, and M. H. Smedberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **A640**, 24 (1998).  
 [30] T. Aumann *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **59**, 1252 (1999).  
 [31] E. F. Aguilera *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **63**, 061603(R) (2001).  
 [32] E. F. Aguilera *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5058 (2000).  
 [33] O. R. Kakuee *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **A728**, 339 (2003).  
 [34] R. J. Glauber, in *Lectures in Theoretical Physics*, Edited by W.E. Brittin (Interscience, New York, 1959), vol. 1, p. 315.  
 [35] G. D. Alkhalzov *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2313 (1997).  
 [36] J. S. Al-Khalili and J. A. Tostevin, *Phys. Rev. C* **57**, 1846 (1998).  
 [37] R. C. Johnson, J. S. Al-Khalili, and J. A. Tostevin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2771 (1997).  
 [38] J. A. Christley, J. S. Al-Khalili, J. A. Tostevin, and R. C. Johnson, *Nucl. Phys.* **A624**, 275 (1997).  
 [39] A. K. Kerman, H. McManus, and R. M. Thaler, *Ann.*

- Phys. (N.Y.) **8**, 551 (1959).
- [40] K. M. Watson, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1388 (1957).
- [41] R. Crespo and R. C. Johnson, Phys. Rev. C **60**, 034007 (1999).
- [42] R. Chatterjee, P. Banerjee, and R. Shyam, Nucl. Phys. **A692**, 476 (2001).
- [43] S. N. Ershov, B. V. Danilin, J. S. Vaagen, A. A. Korshennikov, and I. J. Thompson, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 054608 (2004).
- [44] T. Matsumoto, T. Egami, K. Ogata, Y. Iseri, M. Kamimura, and M. Yahiro, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 051602(R) (2006).
- [45] V. Lapoux *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **66**, 034608 (2002).
- [46] M. Milin *et al.*, Nuc. Phys. **A730**, 285 (2004).
- [47] F. M. Nunes and I. J. Thompson, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 2652 (1999).
- [48] I. J. Thompson, F. M. Nunes, and B. V. Danilin, Comput. Phys. Commun. **161**, 87 (2004).
- [49] I. J. Thompson, Unpublished. User manual available from the author (2002).
- [50] J. Bang and C. Gignoux, Nucl. Phys. **A313**, 119 (1979).
- [51] D. Gogny, P. Pires, and R. de Tournel, Phys. Lett. **B32**, 591 (1970).
- [52] A. M. Moro, K. Rusek, J. M. Arias, J. Gómez-Camacho, and M. Rodríguez-Gallardo, Phys. Rev. C **75**, 064607 (2007).
- [53] R. C. Johnson and P. J. R. Soper, Nucl. Phys. **A182**, 619 (1972).
- [54] I. J. Thompson, Comp. Phys. Rep. **7**, 167 (1988).
- [55] A. M. Lane and R. G. Thomas, Rev. Mod. Phys. **30**, 257 (1958).
- [56] B. A. Watson, P. P. Singh, and R. E. Seguel, Phys. Rev. **182**, 977 (1969).
- [57] S. M. Smith *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A207**, 203 (1973).
- [58] A. Di Pietro *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 044613 (2004).
- [59] A. J. Koning and J. P. Delaroche, Nucl. Phys. **A713**, 231 (2003).
- [60] A. M. Sánchez-Benítez *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A803**, 30 (2008).
- [61] M. L. Roberts *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **44**, 2006 (1991).
- [62] A. R. Barnett and J. S. Lilley, Phys. Rev. C. **9**, 2010 (1974).