

Comparison of Calculations of  
Neutron Cross Sections on  
Deformed Nuclei Between Hauser-  
Feshbach and Deformed Hauser-  
Feshbach Models

S. M. Grimes  
Ohio University

## Conventional Hauser-Feshbach

$$\langle \sigma_{ab} \rangle = \frac{2}{(2I_1+1)(2I_2+1)} \sum_{J'} \int \frac{d\Omega'}{4\pi} (2J'+1) T_{in} T_{out} \langle \sigma \rangle(U \uparrow, J \uparrow, J' \uparrow) / \sum_{J'} \int \frac{d\Omega'}{4\pi} T_{out} \langle \sigma \rangle(u \uparrow, J \uparrow, J' \uparrow)$$

- Have sums over the final angular momentum values.
- Integrals over outgoing energies.
- No allowance for dependence on K
- Formalism enforces spherical symmetry even on deformed nuclei.

## Analogous problem in 1960's

- Studies of  $^{59}\text{Co}(p,p')$ ,  $^{59}\text{Co}(p,\alpha)$ ,  $^{56}\text{Fe}(\alpha,p)$ ,  $^{56}\text{Fe}(\alpha,\alpha')$  at same center of mass energy
- $R = \frac{\sigma(^{59}\text{Co}, p, p')}{\sigma(^{59}\text{Co}, p, \alpha)} / \frac{\sigma(^{56}\text{Fe}, \alpha, p)}{\sigma(^{56}\text{Fe}, \alpha, \alpha')}$
- Should be 1 by the independence hypothesis
- Hauser-Feshbach results in  $R = 1.15$  change in the  $p$  and  $\alpha$  branching ratio with  $J$ .
- The  $\alpha$  and proton bombardments give different  $J$  distributions.
- Experiment gave  $R = 1.4$
- $^{59}\text{Co} + p$  gives isospin 2 and 3
- $^{56}\text{Fe} + \alpha$  gives only isospin 2
- The branching ratio depends on isospin as well as  $J$ .

# A New HF Formulation

- Add sum over  $T_i$  (Compound Nucleus).
- Make final level densities a function of final  $T_i$
- Sum over Final  $T_i$
- Replace Transmission Coefficients with
- $\tau = T \langle T_{I1} T_{I1Z} T_{I2} T_{I2Z} | T_{I3} T_{I3Z} \rangle^2$
- Result:  $R=1.65$
- Can reproduce experimental  $R= 1.4$  by invoking isospin mixing

- Density of  $T_i$  levels is much larger than  $T_{i+1}$  mixing is one way.
- $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$   $\mu = 1$  recovers the no isospin result.

# Analogous Situation for K

1. Add sum over compound K
2. Add sum over final K'.
3. Enter level density as a function of K'.
4. T is replaced by :

$$\tau = T \langle J_1 K_1 J_2 K_2 | J_3 K_3 \rangle_2$$

# Results can be understood to be consequences of:

## 1. K selection rules

- For example in decay from  $3^-$  to  $2^+$  state
  - In spherical basis, E1 decay can occur
  - In Deformed Basis  $|\Delta K| \leq 1$  for E1
    - J =  $3^-$  K = 3 level needs E3 to go to J =  $2^+$  K = 0
    - J =  $3^-$  K = 3 level could decay to J =  $2^+$  K = 2 level with E1

- $J = 5 + 1/2$  level can decay with S wave neutron to  $2^+$  in spherical basis.
  - $J = 5 + 1/2$  level cannot decay with S wave neutron to  $J = 2$ ,  $K = 0$  in deformed basis unless  $K = 1/2$ .
2. Level of spin  $J$  in spherical basis is  $2J+1$  degenerate, level of spin  $J$  is singly degenerate for  $K = 0$ , and doubly degenerate if  $K \neq 0$  in a deformed basis.
- in spherical basis a  $4^+$  level has 9 states or ~twice the degeneracy of a  $2^+$  level with 5 states (9/5).
  - In deformed basis: the ratio of states between a  $4^+$  and  $2^+$  can be 1 if the  $K$  values are the same.



- Ratio can be 2 if for  $4^+$ ,  $K \neq 0$  and  $2^+$ ,  $K=0$
- Ratio can be 0.5 if for  $4^+$ ,  $K=0$  and  $2^+$ ,  $K \neq 0$
- Cross sections for nearby levels of same  $J^\pi$  can differ by a factor of 2 if one has  $K=0$  and the other has  $K \neq 0$ .
- For odd  $A$ ,  $K=0$  is not allowed. All degeneracies are equal!

# Calculations have been done for:

- $n + {}^{168}\text{Er}$
- $n + {}^{183}\text{W}$
- $n + {}^{182}\text{W}$
- $n + {}^{25}\text{Mg}$
- $\alpha + {}^{22}\text{Ne}$
- For:
  - $0.5 \text{ MeV} \leq E \downarrow n \leq 15 \text{ MeV}$  and
  - $3 \text{ MeV} \leq E \downarrow \alpha \leq 15 \text{ MeV}$

TABLE III. Cross-section ratio values for  $n + {}^{182}\text{W}$ .

Reaction	Bombarding energy (MeV)					
	0.5	1	4	7	10	14
$(n, \alpha)$	1.67	1.77	1.85	1.7	1.51	1.3
$(n, p)$			0.98	1.0	1.0	1.0
$(n, 2n)$						0.97
$(n\alpha, \alpha n)$						1.52
$(n, \gamma)$	1.12	1.07	1.03	1.01		
<i>The following are the ten lowest levels of <math>{}^{182}\text{W}</math>:</i>						
$(n, n') J = 0 K = 0^+$	0.56	0.52	0.36	0.30	0.27	0.24
$(n, n') J = 2 K = 0^+$	2.12	2.21	1.25	1.42	1.26	1.14
$(n, n') J = 4 K = 0^+$	3.25	3.44	2.84	2.3	2.15	1.96
$(n, n') J = 6 K = 0^+$		3.56	3.75	3.16	2.93	2.71
$(n, n') J = 0 K = 0^+$			0.377	0.322	0.273	0.24
$(n, n') J = 8 K = 0^+$			3.6	3.87	3.59	3.58
$(n, n') J = 2 K = 0^+$			1.68	1.45	1.28	1.14
$(n, n') J = 2 K = 2^+$			0.75	0.67	0.59	0.54
$(n, n') J = 1 K = 1^-$			0.54	0.46	0.40	0.35
$(n, n') J = 3 K = 2^+$			0.99	0.89	0.8	0.73

# General Trends

- Continuum effects small on shape and magnitude.
- Average  $J$  of continuum states changes by 20-30%
- Large  $J$  resolved states reduced.
- Small  $J$  states enhanced.

# Additional Discovery

- Bethe introduced  $\langle J^2 \rangle = \langle J_z^2 \rangle + 1/2$
- Bohr and Mottelson give:

$$\langle J^2 \rangle \text{ def } (u) = \sigma_{\perp}^2 \rho_{\text{spherical}}(u)$$

- This is often used to determine  $\rho(u)$  at the binding energy from the  $1/2^+$  density.
- Calculations show this is not correct.
- Adding rotational bands skews the J distribution towards large J.
- Correct formula is not as simple and form is given in S.M. Grimes, Phys. Rev. C**88**, 024613 (2013).
- The correct form can change the ratio  $\rho(u, 1/2) / \rho(u, \text{total})$  by 30-35%.

- Comparison of results with no K mixing, moderate K mixing and complete K mixing shows low sensitivity to mixing.
- Complete K mixing does **not** restore results to traditional Hauser-Feshbach .
- No calculations have been made yet for fissionable nuclei.