## First Experimental Test of the Ratio Method

S. Ota, P. Capel, G. Christian, V. Durant, K. Hagel, E. Harris, R. Johnson, Z. Luo, F. Nunes, M. Roosa, A. Saastamoinen & D. Scriven



20 August 2024

### <span id="page-1-0"></span>Halo Nuclei

Exotic nuclei found far from stability

- Light, n-rich nuclei
- Low  $S_n$  or  $S_{2n}$

### Exhibit large matter radius :



neutrons tunnel far from the core and form a halo





Short lifetime  $[t_{1/2}$ (<sup>11</sup>Be) = 13 s]  $\Rightarrow$  studied mostly through reactions : elastic scattering, breakup, transfer. . .

We propose a new reaction observable : the Ratio Method

## <span id="page-2-0"></span>How it all began...

With Mahir Hussein, study of angular distributions for scattering and breakup of halo nuclei

 $^{11}$ Be + Pb @ 69A MeV



Very similar features for scattering and breakup :

- oscillations at fwd angles
- Coulomb rainbow  $( \sim 2^{\circ})$
- oscillations at large angles (N/F interferences)

⇒projectile scattered similarly whether bound or broken up

[\[PC, Hussein, Baye PLB 694, 448 \(2010\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2010.08.072)

## How it all began...

With Mahir Hussein, study of angular distributions for scattering and breakup of halo nuclei

 $^{11}$ Be + Pb @ 69A MeV



Very similar features for scattering and breakup :

- oscillations at fwd angles
- Coulomb rainbow  $( \sim 2^{\circ})$
- oscillations at large angles (N/F interferences)

 $\Rightarrow$  projectile scattered similarly whether bound or broken up

Then I showed this to Ron Johnson. . .

[\[PC, Hussein, Baye PLB 694, 448 \(2010\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2010.08.072)

REB assumes [\[Johnson, Al-Khalili, Tostevin PRL 79, 2771 \(1997\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.2771)

• adiabatic approximation

$$
\bullet\ U_{\mathrm{n}T}=0
$$

 $\Rightarrow$  excitation and breakup due to recoil of the core

REB assumes [\[Johnson, Al-Khalili, Tostevin PRL 79, 2771 \(1997\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.2771)

• adiabatic approximation

$$
\bullet\ U_{\mathrm{n}T}=0
$$

 $\Rightarrow$  excitation and breakup due to recoil of the core

Elastic scattering :  $\frac{d\sigma_{\rm el}}{d\Omega}$  =  $|F_{00}|^2 \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)$ ! pt with  $F_{00} = \int |\Phi_0|^2 e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} d\mathbf{r}$   $\mathbf{Q} \propto (\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}')$ ⇒scattering of compound nucleus ≡

form factor  $\times$  scattering of pointlike nucleus

REB assumes [\[Johnson, Al-Khalili, Tostevin PRL 79, 2771 \(1997\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.2771)

• adiabatic approximation

$$
\bullet \, U_{\mathrm{n}T} = 0
$$

 $\Rightarrow$  excitation and breakup due to recoil of the core

Elastic scattering :  $\frac{d\sigma_{\rm el}}{d\Omega}$  =  $|F_{00}|^2 \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)$ ! pt with  $F_{00} = \int |\Phi_0|^2 e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} d\mathbf{r}$   $\mathbf{Q} \propto (\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}')$ ⇒scattering of compound nucleus ≡

form factor  $\times$  scattering of pointlike nucleus

Similarly for breakup : 
$$
\frac{d\sigma_{bu}}{dEd\Omega} = |F_{E0}|^2 \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{pt}
$$
  
with  $|F_{E0}|^2 = \sum_{ljm} \left| \int \Phi_{ljm}(E) \Phi_0 e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} dr \right|^2$ 

 $\Rightarrow$  explains similarities in angular distributions

REB assumes [\[Johnson, Al-Khalili, Tostevin PRL 79, 2771 \(1997\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.2771)

• adiabatic approximation

$$
\bullet\ U_{\mathrm{n}T}=0
$$

 $\Rightarrow$  excitation and breakup due to recoil of the core

Elastic scattering :  $\frac{d\sigma_{\rm el}}{d\Omega}$  =  $|F_{00}|^2 \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)$ ! pt with  $F_{00} = \int |\Phi_0|^2 e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} d\mathbf{r}$   $\mathbf{Q} \propto (\mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}')$ ⇒scattering of compound nucleus ≡

form factor  $\times$  scattering of pointlike nucleus

Similarly for breakup : 
$$
\frac{d\sigma_{bu}}{dEd\Omega} = |F_{E0}|^2 \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{pt}
$$
  
with  $|F_{E0}|^2 = \sum_{ljm} \left| \int \Phi_{ljm}(E) \Phi_0 e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} dr \right|^2$ 

 $\Rightarrow$  explains similarities in angular distributions provides the idea for the Ratio Method. . .

The Ratio Idea  $[PC, Johnson, Nunes PLB 705, 112 (2011)]$ 

$$
d\sigma_{\text{bu}}/d\sigma_{\text{el}} = |F_{E0}(\boldsymbol{Q})|^2/|F_{00}(\boldsymbol{Q})|^2
$$

- independent of reaction mechanism not affected by  $U_{PT} \Rightarrow$  the same for all targets
- probes only projectile structure
- no need to normalise experimental cross sections

The Ratio Idea  $[PC, Johnson, Numbers\ PLB 705, 112 (2011)]$ 

$$
d\sigma_{\text{bu}}/d\sigma_{\text{el}} = |F_{E0}(\boldsymbol{Q})|^2/|F_{00}(\boldsymbol{Q})|^2
$$

- independent of reaction mechanism not affected by  $U_{PT} \Rightarrow$  the same for all targets
- probes only projectile structure
- no need to normalise experimental cross sections

Alternative : [\[PC, Johnson, Nunes PRC 88, 044602 \(2013\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.88.044602)

$$
\mathcal{R}_{\int \text{sum}} = \frac{\int \frac{d\sigma_{\text{bu}}}{dEd\Omega} dE}{\frac{d\sigma_{\text{el}}}{d\Omega} + \frac{d\sigma_{\text{inel}}}{d\Omega} + \int \frac{d\sigma_{\text{bu}}}{dEd\Omega} dE} \stackrel{\text{REB}}{=} 1 - |F_{00}|^2
$$

The Ratio Idea  $[PC, Johnson, Nunes PLB 705, 112 (2011)]$ 

$$
d\sigma_{\text{bu}}/d\sigma_{\text{el}} = |F_{E0}(\boldsymbol{Q})|^2/|F_{00}(\boldsymbol{Q})|^2
$$

- independent of reaction mechanism not affected by  $U_{PT} \Rightarrow$  the same for all targets
- probes only projectile structure
- no need to normalise experimental cross sections

Alternative : [\[PC, Johnson, Nunes PRC 88, 044602 \(2013\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.88.044602)

$$
\mathcal{R}_{\int \text{sum}} = \frac{\int \frac{d\sigma_{\text{bu}}}{dEd\Omega} dE}{\frac{d\sigma_{\text{el}}}{d\Omega} + \frac{d\sigma_{\text{inel}}}{d\Omega} + \int \frac{d\sigma_{\text{bu}}}{dEd\Omega} dE} \stackrel{\text{REB}}{=} 1 - |F_{00}|^2
$$

Test this experimentally @ TAMU

 ${}^{11}$ Be+C  $\rightarrow$   ${}^{10,11}$ Be+C @ 22.5A MeV

### <span id="page-11-0"></span>Measurement @ TAMU :  $^{11}$ Be + C @ 22.5*A* MeV à **22.5 MeV/u 11Be** on **C target** (17 mg/cm2) **104 pps**



- Use K500 TAMU Cyclotron
- Primary beam of <sup>13</sup>C @ 30*A* MeV on Be target
- Produces a secondary beam of <sup>11</sup>Be @ 22.5A MeV
- $10^4$  pps with 85% <sup>11</sup> Be on secondary target  $[C_{nat} (17 mg/cm<sup>2</sup>)]$
- $\bullet$  Products  $^{10,11}$ Be detected with BlueSTEAI

### Blue-STEAl

Blue aluminum chamber of Silicon TElescope Arrays for light nuclei



**Fig. 3.** Screw hole mapping in the 30.48 cm × 30.48 cm floor flange of the BlueSTEAl [Ota *et al.* [NIM A 1059, 168946 \(2024\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2023.168946) interval, the Si detectors are typically distanced downstream from the target by one of  $\alpha$ 

- Scattering chamber to study direct reactions in inverse kin.
- 4 Si stripped detectors can be used as  $\Delta E$ - $E$  telescope arrays
- (see below) and to bias the target ladder (made of aluminum) to collect Different possible configurations to measure are optionally used to host detectors which need high voltage such as
- Fig. 2. Calculation  $\sigma \approx 1$ ► forward  $\theta \ge 4^\circ$
- ► up to large angles  $\theta \lesssim 30^\circ$ ► up to large angles  $\theta \lesssim 30^{\circ}$

#### [Data](#page-13-0)  $11_{\text{Be} + \text{C} \text{ @ } 22.5A \text{ MeV}}$

#### <span id="page-13-0"></span><sup>11</sup>Be + C @ <sup>22</sup>.5*<sup>A</sup>* MeV (inclusive) breakup & scattering



• Clean data [Ota, PC et al. [arXiv:2407.15535\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.15535)

- Well reproduced with accurate reaction calculations with optical potentials from double folding of  $\chi_{\text{EFT}}$   $V_{\text{NN}}$  of cutoff
	- $\cdot$   $R_0$  = 1.2 fm excellent agreement with data
	- $\cdot$  *R*<sub>0</sub> = 1.6 fm too soft  $\Rightarrow$  too large cross sections



• Well reproduced with accurate reaction calculations with optical potentials from double folding of  $\chi_{\text{EFT}}$   $V_{\text{NN}}$  of cutoff

- $\cdot$   $R_0 = 1.2$  fm excellent agreement with data
- $\cdot$  *R*<sub>0</sub> = 1.6 fm too soft  $\Rightarrow$  too large cross sections
- Ratio  $\mathcal{R}_{\int \mathrm{sum}}$  has smooth angular dependence
	- $\rightarrow$  both cutoffs in agreement with data

## <span id="page-15-0"></span><sup>11</sup>Be + Pb @ 19*A* MeV

Similar data on Pb from Lanzhou [Duan et al. PRC 105, 034602 (2022)]



Calculations in excellent agreement with data

[Ota, PC et al. [arXiv:2407.15535\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.15535)

- Little influence of optical potentials (Coulomb dominated)
- **•** Ratio
	- $\cdot$  removes the angular dependence
	- reproduced by theory

### <span id="page-16-0"></span>Summary and outlook

- The ratio method is new reaction observable to study halo nuclei, predicted to be
	- $\rightarrow$  independent of reaction process (and optical potentials)
	- $\triangleright$  very sensitive to structure observables

[\[PC, Johnson, Nunes PLB 705, 112 \(2011\)\]](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2011.09.105)

- Confirmed this with first measurement @ TAMU <sup>11</sup>Be+C @ 22.5A MeV [Ota, PC et al. [arXiv:2407.15535\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.15535) (and re-analysis of Lanzhou data  $^{11}$ Be+Pb @ 19A MeV) but inclusive breakup  $\Rightarrow$  limited accuracy
- We need to measure the ratio
	- $\triangleright$  with exclusive breakup (n in coincidence)
	- $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  at higher beam energy

will enable a direct comparison to f<mark>orm factor</mark>  $|F_{E0}|^2$ 

• Plan to do that  $@$  FRIB for  ${}^{19}C...$ 

## Thanks to my collaborators

Shuya Ota

Experimental team

Mahir Hussein†

Ron Johnson

Filomena Nunes

Victoria Durant





**AM** Cyclotron Institute

Universidade de São Paulo

**UNIVERSITY OF SURREY** 

IOHANNES GUTENBERG



. . . and to you for your attention !

# <span id="page-18-0"></span>Future  $\omega$  FRIB (MoNA) : breakup and scattering of  $^{19}C$



- at larger beam energy viz. 100*A* MeV
- C and/or Pb targets
- use MoNA to detect n in coincidence

#### ⇒kill two birds with one stone

- **•** Test the full ratio method
- Study accurately  $^{19}C$  :
	- $\cdot$  *S* n
	- $\overline{M}$  ANC
	- $\triangleright$  Resonance structure

# Configurations 1 & 2

#### We used two configurations of the Si detectors used in pairs for ∆*E*-*E* PID





 $\bullet$  Config. 1 :

 $\cdot$  2 "near" @ 5 cm  $(\theta_{\text{lab}} = 17^{\circ} - 31^{\circ})$ <br>18 cm  $\cdot$  2 "far" @ 18 cm

 $(\theta_{\rm lab} = 5^{\circ} - 10^{\circ})$ 

<sup>2</sup> Config. 2 :

 $\cdot$  2 detectors at 10 cm

 $(\theta_{\text{lab}} = 8^{\circ} - 18^{\circ})$ 

#### PID



- Very clear PID by  $\Delta E$ - $E$  in the Si telescopes
- Test with empty target (inset) confirms  $^{11}$ Be and  $^{10}$ Be come from reaction with target
	- $\blacktriangleright$  <sup>11</sup>Be : scattering (el. & inel.)
	- $\blacktriangleright$  <sup>10</sup>Be : 1-n removal (incl. bu)
- Clear PID in phoswich plastic scintillator placed 30 cm downstream to measure beam rate

#### Comparison to REB form factor  $^{11}$ Be + C @ 22.5A MeV  $^{11}$ Be + Pb @ 19A MeV



REB form factor disagrees with data

- $\bullet$  On C :  $U_{nT}$  not negligible
- On Pb : adiabatic approximation not fully valid
- ⇒need to measure
	- n in coincidence
	- consider low  $^{10}$ Be-n energies





[PC, Johnson, Nunes PLB 705, 112 (2011), PRC 88, 044602 (2013)]

Dynamical calculations confirm the idea :

- Same pattern for scattering and breakup
- Ratio is smooth ⇒ removes sensitivity to reaction mechanism
- In excellent agreement with REB form factor  $|F_{E0}|^2$
- Small influence of
	- $\cdot$  *U<sub>nT</sub>* (shift of breakup)
	- Dynamics (on Pb at fwd angles)

### DEA calculation of the ratio @ 70*A* MeV



[PC, Johnson, Nunes PLB 705, 112 (2011), PRC 88, 044602 (2013)]

Dynamical calculations confirm the idea :

- Same pattern for scattering and breakup
- Ratio is smooth  $\Rightarrow$  removes sensitivity to reaction mechanism
- In excellent agreement with REB form factor  $|F_{E0}|^2$
- **•** Small influence of
	- $\cdot$  *U<sub>nT</sub>* (shift of breakup)
	- Dynamics (on Pb at fwd angles)
- Independent of the target

# Sensitivity to the projectile structure

Because insensitive to *UPT* and reaction dynamics very sensitive to projectile structure

Angular dependence and magnitude of form factor  $F_{E0}$  change with



- neutron binding energy  $E_0$
- orbital angular momentum  $\ell$

[PC, Johnson, Nunes PLB 705, 112 (2011) PRC 88, 044602 (2013)]

# Sensitivity to the projectile structure

Because insensitive to *UPT* and reaction dynamics very sensitive to projectile structure

Angular dependence and magnitude of form factor  $F_{E0}$  change with



- neutron binding energy  $E_0$
- orbital angular momentum  $\ell$

[PC, Johnson, Nunes PLB 705, 112 (2011) PRC 88, 044602 (2013)]

Ratio idea extended to

- low beam energy (20A MeV) [Colomer *et al.* PRC 93, 054621 (2016)]
- proton halos [Yun, Colomer et al. JPG 46, 105111 (2019)]

Short review : [PC, Johnson, Nunes EPJA 56, 300 (2020)]

#### **Framework**

Projectile (*P*) modelled as a two-body system : core (*c*)+loosely bound neutron (n) described by

- $H_0 = T_r + V_{cn}(r)$
- *V<sup>c</sup>*<sup>n</sup> adjusted to reproduce *P* spectrum

Target *T* seen as structureless particle



*P*-*T* interaction simulated by optical potentials

 $\Rightarrow$  breakup reduces to three-body scattering problem :

$$
[T_R + H_0 + U_{cT} + U_{nT}] \Psi(r, R) = E_T \Psi(r, R)
$$

with initial condition  $\Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}) \longrightarrow e^{iKZ + \cdots}$  $\phi_0(r)$