MASTER

A STUDY OF THE $(p, d^3\text{He})$ REACTION AS A QUASI-FREE REACTION PROCESS

A. A. COWLEY, P. G. ROOS, N. S. CHANT

R. WOODY III, H. D. HOLMGREN AND D. A. GOLDBERG

Physics Paper
77-124

Tech Report
77-034

November 1976

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

A Study of the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ Reaction as a Quasi-Free Reaction Process[†]

A. A. Cowley^{††}, P. G. Roos, N. S. Chant, R. Woody III^{†††}

H. D. Holmgren and D. A. Goldberg

Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742

ABSTRACT: The $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction on ^6Li , ^7Li , ^9Be , and ^{12}C has been investigated in conjunction with studies of the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction on the same targets. Coincident data for all four targets were obtained at a bombarding energy of 100 MeV for numerous angle pairs in order to test the reaction mechanism. Comparisons of the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ data to both $(p, p\alpha)$ data and distorted wave impulse approximation calculations (DWIA) indicate a dominance of the direct quasi-free reaction process $(p + \alpha \rightarrow d + ^3\text{He})$. The absolute α -particle spectroscopic factors extracted using DWIA analysis are in agreement with the values obtained in the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction.

NUCLEAR REACTIONS, ^6Li , ^7Li , ^9Be , ^{12}C $(p, d^3\text{He})$, $E_0 = 100$ MeV; measured $d^3\sigma/d\Omega_d d\Omega_{^3\text{He}} dE_d(\theta_d, \theta_{^3\text{He}}, E_d)$; coplanar geometry; DWIA analysis; deduced α -particle spectroscopic factors.

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Energy Research and Development Administration, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

[Handwritten signature]

I. INTRODUCTION

In a previous paper¹ we presented a detailed experimental study of the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction on four $1p$ -shell nuclei. These data provided strong evidence for the interpretation of the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction at 100 MeV as a quasi-free alpha particle knockout reaction. Moreover, a distorted wave impulse approximation (DWIA) analysis^{1,2} of the data provided absolute α -particle spectroscopic factors which agreed with theoretical predictions. In conjunction with the experimental work on the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction, data were also obtained for the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction to test its possible interpretation in terms of a quasi-free reaction process; several other experimental studies³⁻⁶ have suggested the importance of such a process in three-body final state reactions.

To illustrate what we mean by the term "quasi-free reaction" let us compare the two reactions $A(p, p\alpha)B$ and $A(p, d^3\text{He})B$. In Fig. 1 we present for these reactions the first order diagrams which we assume represent the dominant processes in the region of interest. We see that the reactions differ only in the upper vertex, which in the first case represents elastic p - α scattering and in the second case represents the $^4\text{He}(p, d)^3\text{He}$ reaction. It is the nature of the respective upper vertices which give rise to our use of the terms quasi-free elastic scattering and quasi-free reaction.

Assuming that the first order diagram dominates and that the corrections to it are adequately treated using DWIA, then, based on Fig. 1, we would expect to obtain identical nuclear structure information from the $(p, p\alpha)$ and $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reactions. Since generally the quasi-free elastic scattering cross section is larger than the quasi-free reaction cross section by approximately the ratio of the two-body cross sections associated with the upper vertex, it would appear to be experimentally advantageous to study the former process.

Thus before presenting the results it is worthwhile suggesting several important reasons for studying such quasi-free reactions.

Firstly, a practical reason is that there appear to be no significant contributions due to sequential events of the type

In contrast, for $(p, p\alpha)$ near 100 MeV the sequential processes

create some difficulty¹ and require that the experiments be carried out at relatively large proton angles (generally $\theta_p > 75^\circ$) where the cross sections are small, in order to prevent contamination of the quasi-free peak by the sequential processes. Thus one generally obtains much cleaner quasi-free reaction spectra at the expense of somewhat longer running times.

Secondly, the comparison of the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ and $(p, p\alpha)$ reactions may provide additional information on the four-particle structure in the target nucleus and/or detailed information on the $p + \alpha$ -cluster interaction. For example if we consider the four-particle internal structure in the target nucleus as a superposition of the α ground-state configuration plus excited states of the α particle, then the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction can in principle occur not only through $p - \alpha$ elastic scattering but also via proton inelastic scattering from the excited states to the α -particle ground state. In the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction similar effects should be present. A detailed comparison of the two reactions may then elucidate the importance of such effects. An attempt to utilize this feature of the quasi-free reaction has been made by Grossiord, et al.⁴ who have studied the ${}^6\text{Li} (d, tp) {}^4\text{He}$ reaction in order to obtain information on the deuteron deformation in ${}^6\text{Li}$. A theoretical attempt

to include the scattering from excited states of the " α " cluster to the ground state by means of Glauber theory has also been made.⁷ However, distortion effects due to the residual nucleus B would have to be included in the calculations before reaching any definitive conclusions concerning the importance of these terms.

In the present paper we present extensive experimental data for the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction on the same p-shell targets (^6Li , ^7Li , ^9Be , and ^{12}C) studied with the $(p, p\alpha)$ experiment. These data provide independent tests of the reaction mechanism (i.e., tests of the dominance of the quasi-free reaction mechanism). We also make direct comparisons to the $(p, p\alpha)$ data to ascertain the similarity of the two reactions as would be expected from the diagrams presented in Fig. 1 and direct comparisons with DWIA calculations.

II. THEORY

In the plane wave impulse approximation (PWIA) expression corresponding to the two diagrams in Fig. 1, the triple differential cross section for both quasi-free elastic scattering and quasi-free reactions can be expressed in identical form as

$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 dE_1} = KF \cdot \left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{1-2} \cdot S_\alpha \left| \phi(-\vec{p}_B) \right|^2 \quad (1)$$

where KF is a known kinematic factor and $\left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{1-2}$ is the (off-energy-shell) two-body cross section [p- α elastic scattering for $(p, p\alpha)$ and $^4\text{He}(p, d)^3\text{He}$ for the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction]. The quantity S_α is an α -particle spectroscopic factor, and $\phi(-\vec{p}_B)$ represents the lower vertex which is common to both reactions. This latter quantity is the Fourier transform of the overlap integral between the internal wave function of the target nucleus A and the internal wave

functions of the residual nucleus B and the α particle (i.e., it is basically the momentum space wave function of the α cluster in the nucleus) and is normalized to unity. The momentum $\vec{p}_B$ is the recoil momentum of the residual nucleus, a quantity which can be deduced from the experimental measurements. Based on the first order diagrams and the PWIA expression given in Eq. 1, it is clear that the two reactions in principle contain identical nuclear structure information on α clustering in the target nucleus.

For the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction we have shown that the PWIA interpretation is inadequate for quantitative comparisons, but that most of the gross features predicted by the PWIA are evident in the data. This result suggested that one could assume the dominance of the first order $(p, p\alpha)$ diagram and include distortion effects due to the residual nucleus B via the distorted wave impulse approximation (DWIA). The resultant DWIA calculations for the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction provided excellent agreement with the experimental data. One expects similar results for the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reactions.

The DWIA formalism for the general reaction of the type $A(a, cd)B$ has been developed by Chant and Roos.^{2,8} The inclusion of distortion effects with the DWIA preserves the form of Eq. 1 for both reactions and modifies only the ϕ^2 term of the PWIA expression (Eq. 1) replacing it by the distorted momentum distribution

$$\left| \phi(-\vec{p}_B) \right|^2 = \sum_{\Lambda} \left| T_{BA}^{\alpha L \Lambda} \right|^2 \quad (2)$$

where the amplitude $T_{BA}^{\alpha L \Lambda}$ is given by

$$T_{BA}^{\alpha L \Lambda} = \frac{1}{(2L+1)^{1/2}} \int \chi_d^{(-)*}(\vec{r}) \chi_c^{(-)*}(\vec{r}) \chi_a^{(+)}(\vec{r}) \phi_{L\Lambda}^{\alpha}(\vec{r}) d\vec{r} \quad (3)$$

The χ 's represent distorted waves for the incoming and outgoing particles, $\gamma = \frac{A}{B}$ and $\phi_{L\Lambda}^{\alpha}(\vec{r})$ is the coordinate-space wave function of the α cluster. The inclusion of distortion has been shown^{1,2,6,8} to produce large effects in cluster knockout reactions, even up to energies of order 600 MeV, and must be included in order to extract any quantitative nuclear structure information from such reactions.

III. EXPERIMENT

The experimental arrangement has been described in detail in our previous paper¹ on the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction which was performed simultaneously. Briefly, a 100 MeV proton beam from the University of Maryland Cyclotron was focused on targets placed at the center of a 150 cm diameter scattering chamber. The outgoing particles were detected by two detector telescopes placed coplanar with and on opposite sides of the incident beam. The detector telescope for p, d, and t consisted of a 1 mm Si surface barrier ΔE , followed by a 2.5 cm diameter x 5 cm thick NaI(Tl) crystal ($\Delta\Omega = 4.83$ msr); the telescope for ^3He and ^4He consisted of a 200 μm Si surface barrier ΔE followed by a 3mm Si(Li) E detector ($\Delta\Omega = 1.21$ msr). Conventional electronics were used and five linear signals, gated by appropriate logic signals, were sent to ADC's interfaced to an on-line IBM 360/44 computer. These linear signals consisted of the two ΔE outputs, the two E outputs and a TAC output which measured the time difference between the two ΔE signals (with a resolving time of approximately 1.5ns) allowing the simultaneous storage of real and accidental coincidence events. Software data handling was performed by the versatile code⁹ P2P. Further experimental details can be found in Ref. 1.

Since we wished to investigate the appropriateness of the DWIA equivalent of Fig. 1, angle pairs $(\theta_d, \theta_{^3\text{He}})$ were generally chosen such that the residual

undetected nucleus B was left with relatively small recoil momentum $\vec{p}_B$. For each target except ^{12}C , primary emphasis was placed on the one angle pair ($\theta_p = \theta_d \approx 81^\circ, \theta_\alpha = \theta_{^3\text{He}} \approx -41^\circ$) which for both the (p,p α) and (p,d ^3He) reactions corresponded to quasi-free angle pairs; i.e., in both reactions zero recoil momentum of the residual nucleus was kinematically allowed at that same angle pair. In the following we refer to this particular set of angles as the "double quasi-free angle pair." At these angles the simultaneous accumulation of data for the two reactions provided the most complete comparison (maximum range of recoil momentum), and is free of most relative errors. For ^{12}C , data were obtained only at (p,p α) quasi-free angle pairs. However, the minimum recoil momentum for the (p,d ^3He) reaction was still sufficiently small to allow a useful comparison of the two reactions.

Data at additional angle pairs were obtained, providing further tests of the reaction mechanism. Most of these angle pairs corresponded to (p,p α) quasi-free angle pairs, although the minimum recoil momenta for (p,d ^3He) were still relatively small. For $^6\text{Li}(p,d^3\text{He})^2\text{H}$ a series of quasi-free angle pair data were obtained in order to study the angular dependence of the zero recoil momentum point ($\vec{p}_B = 0$). These data provide a test of the factorization approximation made in the DWIA.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A variety of experimental results have been obtained and in the following subsections we present not only the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ results, but also make detailed comparisons with the $(p, p\alpha)$ data which has been shown to be in excellent agreement with the DWIA knockout theory. Although many of the presentations of the data contain overlapping information the breakdown most clearly separates various features of the reactions.

A. Binding Energy Spectra

Consider a reaction of the type $A(a, cd)B$ in which the energies of the outgoing particles c and d are measured at (θ_c, θ_d) . From these data one can calculate the binding energy $F_3 = E_c + E_d + E_B = E_a + Q + E^*$ where the E_i are the energies of the various particles (E_B , the energy of the undetected recoiling nucleus, is calculated from the three-body kinematics), Q is the ground state Q -value of the reaction, and E^* is the excitation energy in the residual nucleus B . A plot of the number of coincident events versus $E^* = E_a + Q - F_3$ represents the probability of excitation of the various states in the final nucleus. If the concepts of quasi-free elastic scattering and quasi-free reactions (as represented by Fig. 1) have any validity then the excitation energy spectra of the $(p, p\alpha)$ and $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reactions should be nearly identical. Small differences might be expected from such effects as differing distortions in the two types of reactions, and differing energy dependence in the two-body cross sections $\left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{1-2}$, and from the experimental restriction that thresholds created by the $\Delta E, E$ coincidence requirement in each telescope limit the range of energy sharing contained in the summation.

However, we would not expect to observe any major differences.

In Fig. 2 we present the excitation energy spectra for the two reactions on the four target nuclei. For ${}^6\text{Li}$, ${}^7\text{Li}$, and ${}^9\text{Be}$ the angles correspond to quasi-free angles, whereas for ${}^{12}\text{C}$ the angle differs slightly from the quasi-free $(p, d^3\text{He})$ angle. We observe that the spectra are basically identical, and that little evidence is seen for excited states beyond that of the 2.9 MeV region in ${}^8\text{Be}$.

B. Energy Sharing $\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_d d\Omega_{{}^3\text{He}} dE_d}$

For each set of angle pairs and each state in the final nucleus we have projected the data onto the deuteron energy axis to obtain the triple differential cross section $d^3\sigma/d\Omega_d d\Omega_{{}^3\text{He}} dE_d$. Typical data for quasi-free angles are presented in Fig. 3 along with the DWIA calculations discussed in Sect. V. The deuteron energy corresponding to zero recoil momentum of the undetected residual nucleus is indicated by an arrow on the energy axis. The data for ${}^6\text{Li} \rightarrow {}^2\text{H}$, ${}^9\text{Be} \rightarrow {}^5\text{He}$ and ${}^{12}\text{C} \rightarrow {}^8\text{Be}(0^+)$ clearly show the peak at approximately zero recoil momentum expected for the reaction proceeding via the direct (p, d) interaction on an S-state alpha cluster. For ${}^7\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He}) {}^3\text{H}$, which must proceed via an interaction with a P-state α particle, we see evidence of a slight dip near $\vec{p}_B = 0$, but not as pronounced as that observed in the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction.¹ The data for ${}^{12}\text{C}(p, d^3\text{He}) {}^8\text{Be}$ (2.9 MeV region) have been excluded from consideration due to the presence of mixed angular momentum transfer as discussed in Ref. 1.

As a further test of the quasi-free reaction mechanism, we have compared the three-body cross sections divided by the kinematic factor for various quasi-free angle pairs. In the DWIA we have

$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_d d\Omega_{^3\text{He}} dE_d} / \text{KF} = S_\alpha \cdot \left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{\text{p-d}} \cdot \phi_{\text{DW}}^2 \quad (4)$$

Since explicit DWIA calculations indicate that the distortion effects are not strongly angle-and-energy-dependent and the variation in

$\left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{\text{p-d}}$ is small over the energy sharing spectrum, the shape of the quantity defined in Eq. 4 should be angle independent for any particular reaction.

In Fig. 4 we present the three-body cross section divided by K.F. versus the measured recoil momentum for the $^9\text{Be}(p, d^3\text{He})^5\text{He}$ reaction. The data for different angles have been normalized near zero recoil momentum. In agreement with DWIA expectations we find nearly identical shapes for the various angles presented. Other targets and angle pairs produce comparable agreement.

Finally, in the spirit of the diagrams given in Fig. 1 comparing the direct $(p, d^3\text{He})$ and $(p, p\alpha)$ reactions, we compare the three-body cross sections divided by $\text{K.F.} \times \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}$ for the two reactions versus recoil momentum. For $(p, p\alpha)$ the values of $\left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{\text{p-}\alpha}$ were obtained by interpolation of $p-\alpha$ elastic scattering (see Ref. 1), whereas for $(p, d^3\text{He})$ a constant cross section has been used. Interpolation of the available $^4\text{He}(p, d)^3\text{He}$ data¹⁰ shows that the variation is small over the kinematic range of the energy sharing spectrum. For this comparison we have used the data corresponding to the double quasi-free angle pair, i.e., the angle pair such that it is kinematically possible for both reactions to leave the residual nucleus at rest. Since these data were taken simultaneously they are free of many relative errors. These comparisons are presented in Fig. 5, where the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ results have been normalized to the $(p, p\alpha)$ results near zero recoil momentum. The agreement between the two reactions is quite good, with the exception of the regions in the $(p, p\alpha)$ spectra which contain sequential events (the right hand side of $p_B = 0$), and the region of the minimum in the ^7Li reactions. A discussion of the relative normalization of these

two reactions, which depends on both the two-body cross sections and the relative distortion effects, is deferred until Sect. V.

The shapes and intercomparisons of the energy sharing data presented above all point to the dominance of the first order quasi-free reaction diagram.

C. Angular Distributions

Again assuming relatively constant distortion effects, the factorization of the two-body cross section assumed in the DWIA implies that the angular dependence of the $(p, d)^3\text{He}$ reaction for fixed recoil momentum should be dominated by the angular dependence of the two-body cross section $\left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{p-d}$. In order to test this assumption we have plotted $\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_d d\Omega_{^3\text{He}} dE_d} / \text{K.F.}$ for fixed recoil momentum ($p_B \approx 0$ MeV/C) versus the two-body center-of-mass angle calculated for the final state of the three-body system. In the DWIA the angular dependence of this quantity should be essentially the same as the two-body $^4\text{He}(p, d)^3\text{He}$ reaction. Explicit DWIA calculations show that the variation in $|\phi_{\text{DW}}|^2$ over the angular range studied is less than 8%. Unfortunately only for ^6Li is the angular range sufficiently large to provide a satisfactory test. In Fig. 6 we present these results for $p_B \approx 0$ MeV/C. Also presented in Fig. 6 are the available two-body $^4\text{He}(p, d)^3\text{He}$ cross section data.¹⁰

In spite of the lack of free (p, d) data, a comparison with the available data strongly supports the factorization approximation for the $^6\text{Li}(p, d)^3\text{He}^2\text{H}$ reaction. For the other nuclei studied the available data lie in the rather flat portion of the two-body cross section ($\theta \approx 100^\circ \rightarrow 130^\circ$), and one can only say that the data are consistent with the factorization approximation and the quasi-free reaction mechanism concept.

V. DWIA CALCULATIONS

Theoretical calculations for the present $(p, d^3\text{He})$ data have been carried out using the general DWIA code of Chant.^{2,8} The calculations have been described in detail in Refs. 2 and 8. Since our desire is to compare to the previous $(p, p\alpha)$ analysis, we have tried to be as consistent as possible with these previous calculations.

A. DWIA Parameterization

In the DWIA code the α -particle bound state wave function, which represents a complicated overlap integral between the internal wave functions of the initial and final state nuclei, is approximated by an α -particle bound in a Woods-Saxon well with a depth chosen to reproduce the α -particle separation energy. The parameters of this well are taken from the $(p, p\alpha)$ analysis and are listed in Table I. As discussed in Ref. 1 the 1p harmonic oscillator shell model suggests the quantum numbers 2S for ^6Li , 2P for ^7Li and 3S for ^9Be and ^{12}C .

For the incident proton we have used the same optical potentials as previously¹. For the emitted deuteron we have followed the approach of Watanabe¹¹, who writes the deuteron potential as

$$U_d(\mathbf{r}) = \int d\mathbf{s} \left[U_p(\mathbf{r}_p) + U_n(\mathbf{r}_n) \right] \phi_d^2(\mathbf{s}) \quad (5)$$

where only the S-wave part of ϕ_d , the deuteron ground state wave function, is considered. In Eq. 5 for the deuteron potential the position of the center-of-mass of the deuteron is $\vec{r} = \frac{1}{2}(\vec{r}_n + \vec{r}_p)$, with $\vec{s} = \vec{r}_n - \vec{r}_p$. The optical potentials U_p and U_n for protons and neutrons are required at approximately half the deuteron energy. For these nucleon potentials we have taken the exit

proton optical model potential from our $(p,p\alpha)$ analysis and scaled the well depth using the appropriate energy dependence for this energy region. This approach leads to potentials quite similar to those which actually fit elastic deuteron scattering,¹¹ and it was felt that the use of the nucleon optical potentials from the $(p,p\alpha)$ analysis would provide a more systematic comparison of the two reactions. The deuteron potential calculated by means of this method deviates very slightly from a Woods-Saxon form. For the actual DWIA calculation it was necessary to use an "equivalent" Woods-Saxon deuteron potential which has the same half-radius, RMS radius and volume integral as the folded potential. Finally for the exit ^3He particle we have tried two different potentials. Firstly, we have used a potential obtained from analyses^{12,13,14} of ^3He elastic scattering from ^6Li , ^3H and ^2H . Secondly, we have used the same potential as was used for the α -particle in the $(p,p\alpha)$ analysis. We argue that these choices represent the largest reasonable variation possible for the ^3He potential. In fact differences between these two potentials have very little effect on the shape of the cross section and affect the magnitude by less than 15% for all targets. We therefore present only the results for the ^3He potential.

All potential parameters are presented in Table I. For most calculations these parameters were fixed independent of the outgoing energy. Calculations, in which well depths were varied to account for the energy dependence, showed relatively small effects on the shape compared with the experimental errors.

B. Comparison With Experimental Data

In Fig. 3 we present the DWIA calculations normalized to the experimental data for one pair of angles (for all nuclei except carbon these angles correspond to the double quasi-free angle). Agreement between experiment and theory

at other angle pairs is of comparable quality. Due to the lack of experimental ${}^4\text{He}(p,d){}^3\text{He}$ data we have used a constant cross section $\left. \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right|_{p=d}$ in Eq. 1. This cross section was obtained by interpolation of the available data presented in Fig. 6 at a two-body angle corresponding to the zero recoil momentum point. Although the free (p,d) data is sparse the proximity of the present data to the 85 MeV results allows us to interpolate the two body cross section to an expected accuracy of better than $\pm 25\%$.

Overall, the agreement in shape between experiment and DWIA theory is rather good. However, for ${}^6\text{Li}$ the theoretical curve is similar to the corresponding $(p,p\alpha)$ predictions whereas one sees in Fig. 5a that the ${}^6\text{Li}(p,p\alpha)$ distribution is narrower than the $(p,d){}^3\text{He}$ results. Thus for ${}^6\text{Li}(p,d){}^3\text{He}$ the theoretical curve is somewhat narrower than experiment unlike the corresponding $(p,p\alpha)$ results. In the case of ${}^7\text{Li}$ we observe that the almost complete filling in of the expected minimum is not reproduced by the DWIA calculation. This is a somewhat disappointing result, and it seems unlikely that it could be explained as a simple distortion effect. Calculations including the finite solid angle and energy resolution¹⁵ only remove about 50% of this discrepancy. It is possible that these results indicate the presence of some higher order process not subject to the same angular momentum transfer requirements.

The ${}^9\text{Be}(p,d){}^3\text{He}{}^5\text{He}$ results presented in Fig. 3c are in very good agreement, including a slight improvement when one includes equal amounts of S-state and D-state knockout as predicted by the shell model calculations of Kurath.¹⁶ Finally for ${}^{12}\text{C}(p,d){}^3\text{He}{}^8\text{Be}(0+)$ the agreement between theory and experiment is reasonable when one considers the rather large experimental errors.

In normalizing the DWIA calculation to the experiment we extract the

alpha particle spectroscopic factor S_α . In common with our earlier analyses of $(p, p\alpha)$ reactions these are absolute spectroscopic factors. In Table II we present the extracted S_α for the angle pairs shown in Fig. 3. In addition we present the extracted S_α for the $(p, p\alpha)$ experiment¹ at these same angle pairs. The errors in S_α represent statistical and relative experimental errors, but do not include any error in the two-body cross sections. Considering the expected uncertainty of approximately $\pm 25\%$ from the interpolation of the two-body cross sections, the agreement between the two experiments is remarkably good.

For completeness we have also presented in Table II theoretical predictions of S_α . These results in terms of the $(p, p\alpha)$ experiment have been discussed in detail in Ref. 1.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In the present work we have made a detailed study of the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction at 100 MeV. The data generally show the qualitative features expected of a quasi-free reaction proceeding via the (p, d) interaction with an α cluster in the target nucleus. Furthermore comparisons of the experimental data to both $(p, p\alpha)$ experimental data and DWIA calculations show rather good quantitative agreement. In particular within the accuracy of the present work the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction appears to be dominated by the direct quasi-free reaction. With the possible exception of the filling in of the minimum for ^7Li , no strong evidence (beyond the approximately $\pm 25\%$ uncertainty in the S_α due to the two-body (p, d) data) is seen for other types of processes not contained in the DWIA or for differences in the proton-4 particle cluster interaction between $(p, p\alpha)$ and $(p, d^3\text{He})$. More detailed experimental data will be required if these effects are to be observed. Thus we conclude that the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction on p-shell nuclei is dominated by the quasi-free reaction process, and that absolute

α -particle spectroscopic factors can be extracted from this reaction via the use of a DWIA analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Drs. H. G. Pugh, R. A. J. Riddle, and S. M. Smith for useful discussions based on their observations of a quasi-free reaction at the Maryland cyclotron prior to this work. We gratefully acknowledge the support of the entire cyclotron staff during these studies. Finally, we are indebted to the University of Maryland Computer Science Center for their generous allocation of computer time for the DWIA calculations.

REFERENCES

- † Work supported in part by U.S.E.R.D.A.
 †† On leave of absence from the CSIR, Pretoria, South Africa
 ††† Present address Athens, Georgia
1. P. G. Roos, et al., Phys. Rev. C, to be published.
 2. N. S. Chant and P. G. Roos, Phys. Rev. C, to be published.
 3. M. Furic, et al., Phys. Lett. 39B, 629 (1972).
 4. J. Y. Grossiord, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 173 (1974).
 5. Ivo Slaus, et al., Phys. Rev. C 8, 444 (1973); R. G. Allas, et al., Phys. Rev. C 9, 787 (1974).
 6. P. G. Roos and N. S. Chant, in Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Clustering Phenomena in Nuclei, College Park, Maryland, 1975, edited by D. A. Goldberg, J. B. Marion and S. J. Wallace (ERDA Technical Information Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee), p. 242.
 7. V. V. Balashov, Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Clustering Phenomena in Nuclei, College Park, Maryland, 1975, op. cit, p. 281.
 8. N. S. Chant and P. G. Roos, Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Clustering Phenomena in Nuclei, College Park, Maryland, 1975, op. cit, p. 265.
 9. P. Frisbee and N. R. Yoder, University of Maryland Technical Report No. 73-043 (unpublished).
 10. The $^4\text{He}(p,d)^3\text{He}$ data at various energies were taken from: (31.5 MeV), S. M. Bunch, H. H. Forster, and C. C. Kim, Nucl. Phys. 53, 241 (1964); (46.8 MeV), J. G. Rogers, et al., Nucl. Phys. A136, 433 (1969); (55 MeV), S. Hayakawa, et al., J. Phys. Soc. Japan 19, 2004 (1964); (85 MeV), L. G. Votta, P. G. Roos, N. S. Chant and R. Woody, III, Phys. Rev. C 10, 520 (1974); (93 MeV), W. Selove and J. M. Teem, Phys. Rev. 112, 1658 (1958); (156 MeV), M. Bernas, et al., Phys. Lett. 25B, 260 (1967).
 11. Shiguo Watanabe, Nucl. Phys. 8, 484 (1958); F. G. Perey and G. R. Satchler, Nucl. Phys. A97, 515 (1967).
 12. C. C. Chang, private communication.
 13. P. G. Roos, et al., Nucl. Phys. A257, 317 (1976); E. E. Gross et al., Phys. Rev. C 5, 602 (1972).
 14. F. Hinterberger, et al., Nucl. Phys. A111, 265 (1968).

15. Finite resolution effects were calculated with the code MOMRATH, J. W. Watson, private communication.
16. D. Kurath, Phys. Rev. C 7, 139 (1973).
17. I. V. Kurdyumov, V. G. Neudatchin, and Yu. F. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. 31B, 426 (1970).
18. Yu. F. Smirnov and D. Chlebowska, Nucl. Phys. 26, 306 (1961).

TABLE I - OPTICAL POTENTIAL PARAMETERS^{a)}

REACTION	SYSTEM	V	r_0	a	r_c	W	W_d	r_0'	a'	Ref.
${}^6\text{Li}(p, d){}^3\text{He} {}^2\text{H}$	$p + {}^6\text{Li}^{(b)}$	16.6	1.16	0.75	1.80	0.1	3.9	1.37	0.63	1
	$d + {}^2\text{H}$	6.68	1.66	0.69	1.60	3.2	0	1.66	0.69	
	${}^3\text{He} + {}^2\text{H}$	80.5	1.20	0.70	1.30	0	8.9	1.20	0.65	14
	Bound State	77.0	1.47	0.71	1.47					1
${}^7\text{Li}(p, d){}^3\text{He} {}^3\text{H}$	$p + {}^7\text{Li}^{(b)}$	17.5	1.33	0.65	1.83	11.6	0	1.46	0.44	1
	$d + {}^3\text{H}$	27.2	1.39	0.52	1.30	0	4.2	1.32	0.62	
	${}^3\text{He} + {}^3\text{H}$	215.0	1.25	0.58	1.40	20.0	0	1.82	0.20	13
	Bound State	91.9	1.43	0.72	1.43					1
${}^9\text{Be}(p, d){}^3\text{He} {}^5\text{He}$	$p + {}^9\text{Be}^{(b)}$	19.3	1.33	0.65	1.89	10.5	0	1.46	0.44	1
	$d + {}^5\text{He}$	58.4	1.35	0.90	1.30	0	5.8	1.17	0.73	
	${}^3\text{He} + {}^5\text{He}$	82.7	1.20	0.77	1.40	18.4	0	1.67	0.73	12
	Bound State	89.3	1.35	0.73	1.35					1
${}^{12}\text{C}(p, d){}^3\text{He} {}^8\text{Be}$	$p + {}^{12}\text{C}^{(b)}$	21.2	1.33	0.65	1.33	6.5	0	1.46	0.44	1
	$d + {}^8\text{Be}$	63.2	1.29	0.80	1.30	0	3.8	1.15	1.06	
	${}^3\text{He} + {}^8\text{Be}$	82.7	1.20	0.77	1.40	18.4	0	1.67	0.73	12
	Bound State	89.9	1.23	0.75	1.23					1

a) The optical potential is defined to be:

$$V_{\text{opt}} = -Vf(r, r_0, a) - i(W - 4W_d a' \frac{d}{dr})f(r, r_0', a') + V_{\text{Coulomb}} \quad \text{where } f(r, r_0, a) = [1 - \exp(\frac{r - r_0 A^{1/3}}{a})]^{-1};$$

A is the target mass; V_{Coulomb} is the Coulomb potential of a uniform sphere of charge of radius $r_c A^{1/3}$.

b) These well depths were multiplied by $\frac{B}{A}$ in order to exclude crudely the interaction of the incoming proton with the alpha cluster.

TABLE II. Absolute spectroscopic factors for double quasi-free angle pairs extracted by means of the DWIA analysis. The errors in the spectroscopic factors extracted for the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction only reflect relative errors in the 3-body cross sections. An additional estimated uncertainty of $\pm 25\%$ in the $^4\text{He}(p, d)^3\text{He}$ cross section should be considered.

REACTION	θ_1/θ_2 (degrees)	S_α (EXPT)	S_α (THEORY)
$^6\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He})^2\text{H}$	81.9/-40.9	0.52 ± 0.03	$1.0 \rightarrow 1.1$ ^{b)}
$^6\text{Li}(p, p\alpha)^2\text{H}$	81.9/-40.9	0.59 ± 0.04 ^{a)}	
$^7\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He})^3\text{H}$	81.3/-41.0	1.09 ± 0.11	
$^7\text{Li}(p, p\alpha)^3\text{H}$	81.3/-41.0	0.94 ± 0.07 ^{a)}	1.12 ^{c)}
$^9\text{Be}(p, d^3\text{He})^5\text{He}$	81.2/-41.0	0.47 ± 0.04	
$^9\text{Be}(p, p\alpha)^5\text{He}$	81.2/-41.0	0.43 ± 0.04	0.57 ^{d)}
$^{12}\text{C}(p, d^3\text{He})^8\text{Be}(0+)$	90/-35.7	0.56 ± 0.12	
$^{12}\text{C}(p, p\alpha)^8\text{Be}(0+)$	90/-35.7	0.59 ± 0.09 ^{a)}	0.55 ^{d)}

a) Values from Ref. 1

b) Ref. 17

c) Ref. 18

d) Ref. 16

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Fig. 1 First order diagrams for the $A(p, p\alpha)B$ and $A(p, d^3\text{He})B$ reactions.
- Fig. 2 Binding energy spectra versus excitation energy for the $(p, p\alpha)$ and $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reactions at a bombarding energy of 100 MeV and angle pairs $\theta_p = \theta_d = \theta_1$ and $\theta_\alpha = \theta_{^3\text{He}} = \theta_2$.
- Fig. 3a Three-body cross section for the $^6\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He})^2\text{H}$ reaction at 100 MeV. The arrow on the deuteron energy axis indicates the location of zero recoil momentum. The curve is a DWIA calculation normalized to the data (see Sect. IV).
- Fig. 3b Three-body cross section for the $^7\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He})^3\text{H}$ reaction at 100 MeV. (See Fig. 3a caption)
- Fig. 3c Three-body cross section for the $^9\text{Be}(p, d^3\text{He})^5\text{He}$ reaction at 100 MeV. (See Fig. 3a caption).
- Fig. 3d Three-body cross section for the $^{12}\text{C}(p, d^3\text{He})^8\text{Be}(0+, \text{g.s.})$ reaction at 100 MeV (see Fig. 3a caption).
- Fig. 4 $\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_d d\Omega_{^3\text{He}} dE_d} / \text{KF}$ (see Eq. 4) versus recoil momentum for the $^9\text{Be}(p, d^3\text{He})^5\text{He}$ reaction at three angle pairs. The different angle pairs have been normalized near $p_B = 0$.
- Fig. 5a The ratio $\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 dE_1} / \text{KF} \times \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \Big|_{1-2}$ for the $^6\text{Li}(p, p\alpha)^2\text{H}$ and the $^6\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He})^2\text{H}$ reactions. For the $(p, p\alpha)$ reaction $\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \Big|_{1-2}$ has been obtained by interpolation, whereas for the $(p, d^3\text{He})$ reaction a constant $\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \Big|_{1-2}$ has been assumed. The two sets of data have been normalized near $p_B = 0$.
- Fig. 5b The ratio $\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 dE_1} / \text{KF} \times \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \Big|_{1-2}$ for the $^7\text{Li}(p, p\alpha)^3\text{H}$ and the $^7\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He})^3\text{H}$ reactions (see Fig. 5a caption).
- Fig. 5c The ratio $\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 dE_1} / \text{KF} \times \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \Big|_{1-2}$ for the $^9\text{Be}(p, p\alpha)^5\text{He}$ and $^9\text{Be}(p, d^3\text{He})^5\text{He}$ reactions (see Fig. 5a caption).
- Fig. 5d The ratio $\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 dE_1} / \text{KF} \times \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \Big|_{1-2}$ for the $^{12}\text{C}(p, p\alpha)^8\text{Be}(0+)$ and $^{12}\text{C}(p, d^3\text{He})^8\text{Be}(0+)$ reactions (see Fig. 5a caption).
- Fig. 6 Quasi-free angular distribution for the $^6\text{Li}(p, d^3\text{He})^2\text{H}$ reaction at 100 MeV. The data points (Δ) represent $\frac{d^3\sigma}{d\Omega_d d\Omega_{^3\text{He}} dE_d} / \text{KF}$ at $p_B \approx 0$ MeV/c for various angle pairs plotted versus the two-body center-of-mass scattering angle. The solid curves are smooth curves drawn through the available $^4\text{He}(p, d)^3\text{He}$ data¹¹. The absolute normalization of the quasi-free angular distribution is based on interpolation of the (p, d) data.

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3a

Fig. 3b

Fig. 3c

Fig. 3d

Fig. 4

Fig. 5a

Fig. 5b

Fig. 5c

Fig. 5d

Fig. 6