Evolution of fusion hindrance for asymmetric systems at deep sub barrier energies

A. Shrivastava^{a,b,*}, K. Mahata^{a,b}, S.K. Pandit^{a,b}, V. Nanal^c, T. Ichikawa^d, K. Hagino^e, A. Navin^f, C.S. Palshetkar^a, V.V. Parkar^a, K. Ramachandran^{a,b}, P.C. Rout^{a,b}, Abhinav Kumar^a, A. Chatterjee^a, S. Kailas^a

> ^aNuclear Physics Division, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai 400085, India ^bHomi Bhabha National Institute, Anushaktinagar, Mumbai 400094, INDIA ^cDNAP, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai 400005, India ^dYukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan ^eDepartment of Physics, Tohuku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan ^fGANIL, CEA/DRF - CNRS/IN2P3, Bd Henri Becquerel, BP 55027, F-14076 Caen Cedex 5, France

Measurements of fusion cross-sections of ⁷Li and ¹²C with ¹⁹⁸Pt at deep sub-barrier energies are reported to unravel the role of the entrance channel in the occurrence of fusion hindrance. The onset of fusion hindrance has been clearly observed in ${}^{12}C + {}^{198}Pt$ system but not in ${}^{7}Li + {}^{198}Pt$ system, within the measured energy range. Emergence of the hindrance, moving from lighter (${}^{6,7}Li$) to heavier (¹²C,¹⁶O) projectiles is explained employing a model that considers a gradual transition from a sudden to adiabatic regime at low energies. The model calculation reveals a weak effect of the damping of coupling to collective motion for the present systems as compared to that obtained for systems with heavier projectiles.

Keywords: fusion cross sections, deep sub barrier energies, coupled channels calculations, adiabatic model

MotorAbstractMeasurements of fusion cross-sections of ⁷Li and ¹²C with ¹⁹
the entrance channel in the occurrence of fusion hindrance. The
system but not in ⁷Li + ¹⁹⁸Pt system, within the measured energy
heavier (¹²C, ¹⁶O) projectiles is explained employing a model that
at low energies. The model calculation reveals a weak effect of th
as compared to that obtained for systems with heavier projectiles
Keywords: fusion cross sections, deep sub barrier energies, coup**1. Introduction**Fusion reactions in the vicinity of the Coulomb barrier have
been investigated in the past to explore the mechanism of tun-
neling through multidimensional barriers, thereby giving an in-
sight into the role of different intrinsic properties of the entrance
channel. Recent efforts towards developing new methods to
precisely measure very low fusion cross-sections have stimu-
lated new activities, distinct to energies deep below the barrier.
Fusion data at these low energies can be uniquely used to inter-
pret the reaction dynamics from the touching point to the region
of complete overlap of the density distribution of the colliding
nuclei, not accessible through any other reaction [1, 2]. This
opens up the possibility to study effects of dissipative quantum
tunneling, which has relevance in many fields of physics and
chemistry [3]. The data in this energy range was shown to have
strong implications on the fusion with light nuclei of astrophys-
ical interest [2].Mat deep sub-barrier energies, a change of slope of the fusion
excitation function compared to coupled-channels (CC) calcu-

At deep sub-barrier energies, a change of slope of the fusion excitation function compared to coupled-channels (CC) calculations was observed initially in symmetric systems involving medium-heavy nuclei and was referred to as the phenomenon of fusion hindrance [4, 5]. The models suggested to explain this behavior have different physical basis. The model proposed by Misicu and Esbensen is based on a sudden approximation [6], where a repulsive core is included to take into account the nuclear compressibility arising due to Pauli exclusion principle when the two nuclei overlap. On the other hand at low energies, the nucleus-nucleus interaction potentials extracted from

Email address: aradhana@barc.gov.in (A. Shrivastava)

the microscopic time-dependent Hartree-Fock theory indicate that after overlap of two nuclei, internal degrees of freedom reorganise adiabatically [7]. The model proposed by Ichikawa et al. [8] to explain the deep sub-barrier fusion data is based on such an adiabatic picture. Here a damping factor imposed on the coupling strength as a function of the inter-nuclear distance, takes into account a gradual change from the sudden to the adiabatic formalism [9, 10]. A recent work, applying the random-phase-approximation (RPA) demonstrates that the fusion hindrance originates from damping of quantum vibrations when the two nuclei adiabatically approach each other [11, 12]. The role of quantum de-coherence that effectively cause a reduction in coupling effects has also been investigated [13, 14].

In all the above models, fusion hindrance is a generic property of heavy-ion collision below certain threshold energy. Due to challenges involved with measurement of low cross-section (~nb), there are only a limited number of studies involving fusion hindrance. As discussed in a recent review article [2], these studies have mainly concentrated around medium-heavy $(A \sim 100)$, medium $(A \sim 50)$ and light $(A \sim 10)$ symmetric systems [4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21], covering a wide range of reduced masses, Q-values and nuclear structure properties. Most of the measurements employed recoil mass analyzers and hence are restricted to symmetric or nearly symmetric systems. In such cases the evaporation residues have sufficient recoil velocities for being detected at the focal plane of the spectrometer. The data corresponding to asymmetric systems, presently scarce, are vital to establish the generic nature of the fusion hindrance and for the improvement of current theoretical models. The only exception being the two systems ${}^{16}\text{O} + {}^{208}\text{Pb}$ [14] and ⁶Li + ¹⁹⁸Pt [22] that used different methods for fusion cross-

^{*}Corresponding author





Figure 2: (Color online) Results from the adiabatic model calculation for ${}^{12}C + {}^{198}Pt$ system compared with the experimental (a) fusion cross-sections, (b) logarithmic derivative along with S-factor (inset) (c) average angular momentum and (d) fusion barrier distribution. Calculations using with and without a damping factor for the coupling strength are shown as solid and dashed-dot curves respectively.

3. Calculations

Coupled-channels calculations using the code CCFULL [29] were performed for both the systems. In the case of $^{7}\text{Li} + ^{198}\text{Pt}$ system, a standard Woods-Saxon potential (WS) was used with $V_0=110$ MeV, $r_0=1.1$ fm and a=0.63 fm. These calculations included two phonon quadrupole excitation of ¹⁹⁸Pt in the vibrational and the first excited state of ⁷Li in the rotational mode. The CC calculations reproduce the data well for energies around and well below the barrier as seen in Fig. 1(a). Fusion hindrance has not been observed in this system in the measured energy range with the cross-section as low as ≈ 180 nb. The threshold energy for observing fusion hindrance obtained from the systematics of Ref. [30] and the adiabatic model [8] is 20.4 MeV and 21.1 MeV, respectively. However, from an extrapolation of the experimental data, this energy is found to be \approx 19 MeV (Fig. 1(a) inset). Hence it will be interesting to extend the measurement of fusion cross-sections below the lowest energy of the present measurement (20 MeV).

The corresponding calculations for ${}^{12}C + {}^{198}Pt$ were performed using a WS potential with $V_0=95$ MeV, $r_0=1.13$ fm and a=0.66 fm. The coupling to the quadrupole phonon excitation for ¹⁹⁸Pt and the first two excited states of ¹²C belonging to the ground state rotational band were included. The quadrupole and hexadecapole deformation parameters used were taken from Ref. [31]. The effect of coupling to the ¹²C rotational states is not as strong as in the well deformed heavy nuclei. Coupling to one neutron, two neutron and one proton transfer reaction were not included in the present scheme as their effect was found to be negligible for this system [25]. The result from the CC calculations are compared with the experimental data in Fig. 1(b). A change of slope as compared to CC calculations is clearly observed, both in the measured fusion excitation function as well as in the L(E) plot, confirming the onset of fusion hindrance. The energy at which the deviation in the slope occurs was estimated to be 50 ± 1 MeV using the method described in Ref. [32]. The calculated threshold energy according to the adiabatic model [8] is 49 MeV while that from the systematics (43.7 MeV) [30] is much lower than the observed value.

In order to explain the fusion data at energies deep below the barrier in case of ${}^{12}C + {}^{198}Pt$ system, calculations were performed using the adiabatic model of Ref. [9, 10]. This model employs a gradual diminishing of the coupling strength while going from the two body sudden to one body adiabatic potential as the two nuclei begin to overlap. The calculations adopted a Yukawa-plus-exponential (YPE) potential as a basic ion-ion potential with radius, $r_0=1.20$ fm and diffuseness, a=0.68 fm. The coupling scheme was the same as that described earlier for this system. The calculated fusion cross-sections without damping, shown as the dot-dashed curves in Fig. 2(a), already provide a good fit, although the calculation underestimates the data for L(E) at the lowest energies (see Fig. 2(b)). The calculations shown here differ slightly from those in Fig 1(b). This is due to the use of different potentials (YPE and Woods-Saxon) in these two calculations, and the fact that the YPE potential is thicker than the Woods-Saxon potential (due to the saturation condition at the touching point in the YPE potential). Further discussion about the choice of potentials used in the present work can be found in section IIC of Ref. [10]. Fig. 2 also shows the results of the calculation with the inclusion of a damping factor (r_{damp} =1.18 fm and a_{damp} =0.5 fm), which are in excellent agreement with both the fusion and the L(E) data. As can be seen from the figure, the effect of the damping is observed to be small in the present case when compared to that observed in studies involving heavier projectiles [10]. A systematic investigation of various systems showed that the radius parameter, related to the density distribution of the colliding nuclei, is almost constant [10]. On the other hand a_{damp} , associated with the damping strength of quantum vibrations that depends on the structure of interacting nuclei, was found to vary between 0.5 and 1.2 fm. The values of r_{damp} and a_{damp} obtained in the present work are within the range of the values reported in Ref. [10].

The adiabatic calculations were compared with other observables derived from the fusion data. The astrophysical S-factor representation (S(E)) of the experimental data is shown in the inset of Fig. 2(b). The observed S-factor maximum is not as pronounced as found for the case of the symmetric systems involving medium mass nuclei, but similar to that for $^{16}O + ^{208}Pb$ system [1, 2, 33]. The calculated S(E) match well with the data over the entire energy range. The average angular momenta ($\langle l \rangle$) computed from the fusion excitation function as suggested in Ref. [34] and the fusion barrier distribution (DB) are also well described by the adiabatic calculation (Fig. 2(c) and (d)).

Similar calculations were performed for ⁷Li + ¹⁹⁸Pt using the YPE potential ($r_0=1.195$ fm and a=0.68 fm) with the coupling scheme being the same as that described above for this system. The calculations explain the data well up to the measured energy. The values of r_{damp} and a_{damp} can not be determined uniquely with the present data as no change of slope of the fusion excitation function was observed. For example, values of the damping factor parameters $r_{damp}=1.16$ fm and $a_{damp}=0.5$

fm, would give rise to a small deviation in the slope at energy \sim 19 MeV. The threshold energy for observing hindrance is expected to be below this value.

4. Discussion

We now discuss the general trend of fusion excitation function at deep sub-barrier energies for asymmetric systems involving light projectiles, namely, ⁶Li + ¹⁹⁸Pt [22], ⁷Li + ¹⁹⁸Pt, $^{12}C + ^{198}Pt$ and $^{16}O + ^{208}Pb$ [14, 35]. $^{6,7}Li + ^{198}Pt$ are among the few systems, that have been probed for hindrance studies, having positive Q-values for the formation of compound nucleus [2]. As 6,7 Li are weakly bound nuclei (6 Li, S_{α/d}=1.47 MeV and ⁷Li, $S_{\alpha/t}$ =2.47 MeV), the role of the breakup channel at energies relevant to the fusion hindrance needs to be considered as well. The influence of breakup on fusion and total reaction cross-sections has been extensively investigated [36, 37]. Recent studies have also illustrated the importance of transfer followed by breakup channels [38, 39]. However, inclusion of such processes simultaneously in a coupled channels framework to predict complete fusion cross-section is still a challenging task [36].

To study the onset of the fusion hindrance for asymmetric systems involving light projectiles, the ratio [4] of experimental fusion cross-section to that obtained from the standard CC calculations are shown in Fig. 3(a). The ratio remains close to one at near and deep sub-barrier energies in case of systems involving the lightest projectiles ^{6,7}Li, showing no deviation even at energy as low as ~ 10 MeV below the barrier. However, for the heavier projectiles ¹²C and ¹⁶O, there is a significant change in the slope with respect to the calculations at the lowest energies (V_B - E_T~ 6 MeV). The fusion hindrance becomes gradually larger in moving from lighter (^{6,7}Li) to the relatively heavier projectiles (¹²C and ¹⁶O).

To further investigate the evolution of the fusion hindrance for different entrance channels, the ratio of the slopes of the logarithmic derivatives, $R = (dL(E)/dE)/(dL_{cs}(E)/dE)$ at the crossover point between the L(E) and $L_{cs}(E)$ [28, 33], as a function of $Z_1.Z_2$ is plotted in Fig. 3(b). The data used are from [2, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 28] and the present measurements. The ratio R is a measure of the fusion hindrance. If the ratio approaches unity, the logarithmic slope of the data approaches the value for a constant S-factor and the sub-barrier hindrance can be considered to be absent while larger values of R indicate that the fusion cross section drops more rapidly implying a large hindrance [28, 33]. The quantity $Z_1 Z_2$ is related to the strength of the coupling between the relative motion and the internal degrees of freedom. That is, when the nuclear coupling strength is estimated at the barrier position, it is proportional to $Z_1.Z_2$ in the linear coupling approximation, where the nuclear coupling form factor is proportional to dV_N/dr (notice that $dV_N/dr = -dV_C/dr$ at the barrier position) [1]. A strong correlation can be seen between R and $Z_1.Z_2$ for different target projectile combinations (Fig. 3(b)). Such a correlation was shown previously in Ref. [28, 33]. It was pointed out that the weaker hindrance with decreasing charge product implies that reactions of astrophysical interest are unlikely to be hindered.



Figure 3: (color online) (a) Ratio of the measured and calculated fusion cross-sections as a function of energy with respect to the Coulomb barrier for $^{6.7}\text{Li} + ^{198}\text{Pt}, \, ^{12}\text{C} + ^{198}\text{Pt}, \, ^{16}\text{O} + ^{208}\text{Pb}$ systems. The calculated values correspond to the standard coupled-channels calculations using the code CCFULL (b) Ratio of the slopes of L(E) and L_{cs}(E) calculated at their crossing point, as a function of the charge product of the reactants (Z₁.Z₂), for data from the present measurement and literature [2, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 28]. Filled and open circles represent the data and extrapolated values obtained from the fit to L(E), respectively. The dashed line is obtained by fitting the data (filled circles) to an exponential function.

If the fusion hindrance is due to the damping of the coupling to collective motion, as the adiabatic model suggests, then the effect of hindrance is expected to be small for lower values of $Z_1.Z_2$.

The trend of the fusion hindrance seen in Fig. 3(b), for reactions with light projectiles, is expected to have an impact on the synthesis of light elements in astrophysical environment. For energies relevant to astrophysical interest, the reaction rates are obtained from the extrapolated S-factor. In Ref. [40] a method was proposed to extrapolate S-factors for lighter systems, using the hindrance effect observed in heavier systems. The results from this method show that the presence of the fusion hindrance can change the abundance of many isotopes in massive late-type stars, reduce reaction rates for carbon and oxygen fusion reactions (eg. ${}^{12}C + {}^{12}C, {}^{12}C + {}^{16}O, \text{ and } {}^{16}O + {}^{16}O)$ on stellar burning and nucleosynthesis [41]. Based on the correlation observed in Ref. [28] and shown in Fig. 3(b), including the new measurements, the fusion hindrance for such light systems is expected to be weaker than those for heavy systems at energies corresponding to the peak of the S-factor. At energies just below the S-factor peak, the sudden and adiabatic model calculations show different behaviors for the heavier systems. The calculations of the sudden model fall off steeply below the peak of the S-factor implying a strong hindrance. In contrast a much weaker energy dependence of S(E) is expected from the adiabatic model [1, 2]. At present, calculations from both the sudden and the adiabatic models are not available at energies of astrophysical interest, close to the Gamow peak. It will be interesting to extend these calculations to the relevant energies. The reliability of such theoretical prediction can only be confirmed when cross-sections for light ion fusion reactions, from challenging measurements at low energies will become available.

5. Conclusion

In summary, the occurrence of fusion hindrance is clearly observed in case of ${}^{12}C + {}^{198}Pt$. The adiabatic model calculation indicates a weak effect of the damping for the present system as compared to that obtained for systems with heavier projectiles. On the other hand fusion hindrance has not been observed in case of ^{7}Li + ^{198}Pt , within the measured energy range. The corresponding threshold energy estimated from the present measurement is found to be lower than the predicted values [8, 30]. The fusion hindrance at energies deep below the barrier becomes progressively significant in going from the light $(^{6,7}Li)$ to heavier (¹²C, ¹⁶O) projectiles. A strong correlation has been obtained between the degree of hindrance and the charge product over a wide range of target-projectile combinations. The observed trend reveals a weaker influence of hindrance on fusion involving lighter nuclei. This result together with a nearly flat energy dependence of S(E) in the adiabatic model at very low energies, implies that the effect of fusion hindrance will be less substantial on astrophysical reaction rates for the production of light elements in stellar environments. New measurements of fusion cross-sections involving low Z elements including those of astrophysical relevance, and extension of existing theoretical models that explain fusion hindrance to the energies close to the Gamow peak would be of interest.

6. Acknowledgments

We are thankful to the accelerator staff for a smooth operation. AN acknowledges the support through the LIA France-India agreement.

References

- [1] K. Hagino and N. Takigawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. 128 (2012) 1001.
- [2] B.B. Back, H. Esbensen, C.L. Jiang and K.E. Rehm, Rev. Mod. Phys. 86 (2014) 317, and references therein.
- [3] A.O. Caldeira and A.J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 46 (1981) 211; Ann. of Phys. 149 (1983) 374.
- [4] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002) 052701.
- [5] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 93 (2004) 012701.
- [6] S. Mişicu and H. Esbensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96 (2006) 112701; *ibid.* Phys. Rev. C 75 (2007) 034606.
- [7] K. Washiyama and D. Lacroix, Phys. Rev. C 78 (2008) 024610; A.S. Umar and V.E. Oberacker, Phys. Rev. C 74 (2006) 021601(R).
- [8] T. Ichikawa, K. Hagino and A. Iwamoto, Phys. Rev. C 75 (2007) 057603; *ibid.* Phys. Rev. C 75 (2007) 064612.
- [9] T. Ichikawa, K. Hagino and A. Iwamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 (2009) 202701; *ibid*. Prog. theor. Phys. suppl. 196 (2012) 269.
- [10] Takatoshi Ichikawa, Phys. Rev. C 92 (2015) 064604.
- [11] Takatoshi Ichikawa and Kenichi Matsuyanagi, Phys. Rev. C 88 (2013) 011602(R).
- [12] Takatoshi Ichikawa and Kenichi Matsuyanagi, Phys. Rev. C 92 (2015) 021602(R).
- [13] A. Diaz-Torres *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C 78 (2008) 064604; Phys. Rev. C 81 (2010) 041603(R).
- [14] M. Dasgupta et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 99 (2007) 192701.
- [15] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev.C 71 (2005) 044613.
- [16] A. M. Stefanini et al. Phys. Rev. C 82 (2010) 014614.

- [17] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. C 82 (2010) 041601.
- [18] G. Montagnoli et al., Phys. Rev. C 85 (2012) 024607; ibid. 82 (2010) 064609.
- [19] G. Montagnoli et al., Phys.Rev. C 87 (2013) 014611.
- [20] A. M. Stefanini et al., Phys. Lett. B 728 (2014) 639.
- [21] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 113 (2014) 022701.
- [22] A. Shrivastava *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 (2009) 232702.
 [23] A. Lemasson *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. A 598 (2009) 445.
- [23] A. Lemasson *et al.*, Nucl. Insu. Meth. A.
- [24] A. Gavron, Phys. Rev. C 21 (1980) 230.
- [25] A. Shrivastava *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 699, *ibid.* Phys. Rev. C 63 (2001) 054602.
- [26] W.-M. Yao et al., J. Phys. G 33 (2006) 1.
- [27] A. Shrivastava et al., Phys. Letts. B 718 (2013) 931.
- [28] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. C 73 (2006) 014613.
- [29] K. Hagino et al., Comp. Phys. Comm. 123 (1999) 143.
- [30] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. C 79 (2009) 044601.
- [31] M. Yasue *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A 394 (1983) 29.
- [32] Ei Shwe Zin Thein, N. W. Lwin, and K. Hagino, Phys. Rev. C 85 (2012) 057602.
- [33] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. C 75 (2007) 057604.
- [34] A.B. Balantekin and P.E. Reimer, Phys. Rev. C 33 (1986) 379; C.V.K. Baba, Nucl. Phys. A 553 (1993) 719c.
- [35] C.R. Morton et al., Phys. Rev. C 60 (1999) 044608.
- [36] L.F. Canto, P.R.S. Gomes, R. Donangelo, J. Lubian, M.S. Hussein, Phys. Rep. 596 (2015) 1.
- [37] X.P. Yang, G. L. Zhang and H. Q. Zhang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C 87 (2013) 014603.
- [38] D. H. Luong et al., Phys. Lett. B 695 (2011) 105.
- [39] A. Shrivastava et al., Phys. Lett. B 633 (2006) 433.
- [40] C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. C 75 (2007) 015803.
- [41] L.R. Gasques et al., Phys. Rev. C 76 (2007) 035802.