

ER-gated spin distribution measurement for $^{19}\text{F}+^{197}\text{Au}$

Gonika^{1,*}, J. Gehlot¹, V. I. Chepigin², M. L. Chelnokov²,
T. Varughese¹, Tathagata Banerjee^{1†}, A. Jhingan¹, S.
Nath¹, I. Mazumdar³, N. Madhavan¹, and A. V. Yeremin^{2‡}

¹Inter-University Accelerator Centre, Aruna Asaf Ali Marg, New Delhi 110067, India

²Flerov Laboratory of Nuclear Reactions, JINR, Dubna 141980, Russia and

³Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai 400005, India

Study of heavy ion fusion reactions provides valuable insights into the dynamics of a fused compound nucleus (CN). Detection of an evaporation residue (ER) serves as a direct evidence of CN formation and the spin distribution reveals information about the angular momenta that survive both compound and non-compound nuclear fission [1]. Notably, the partial wave distribution is more sensitive to the finer details of theoretical models than the cross section, making the spin distribution a crucial tool for testing and refining fusion theories. Despite its importance, detailed studies on ER spin distribution for heavy CN are quite limited.

Berriman *et al.* [2] measured ER cross sections and fission fragment (FF) mass distributions for three reactions, *viz.*, $^{12}\text{C}+^{204}\text{Pb}$, $^{19}\text{F}+^{197}\text{Au}$ and $^{30}\text{Si}+^{186}\text{W}$, all forming the same compound nucleus $^{216}\text{Ra}^*$. The authors of this work observed signatures of quasifission in the two reactions induced by heavier projectiles. However, a study of FF angular distribution by Tripathi *et al.* [3] found no evidence of quasifission in $^{19}\text{F}+^{197}\text{Au}$, revealing a striking discrepancy between the two investigations. To probe this inconsistency further, we carried out ER-gated spin distribution measurements for $^{19}\text{F}+^{197}\text{Au}$.

The experiment was performed using the Hybrid Recoil mass Analyzer (HYRA) [4] at IUAC, New Delhi. The HYRA, coupled with

the TIFR 4π spin spectrometer [5], was operated in gas-filled mode. A pulsed ^{19}F beam, with a pulse separation of $2\ \mu\text{s}$, was obtained from the 15UD Pelletron and bombarded on a ^{197}Au ($250\ \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$) target. Measurements were carried out at beam energies (E_{lab}) ranging from 90 to 115 MeV. ERs produced in the reaction were separated from the background by the HYRA and detected by a multi-wire proportional counter (MWPC) placed at the HYRA focal plane. Fig. 1 shows a two-dimensional spectrum of well-separated ERs.




FIG. 1: ERs, produced in the reaction $^{19}\text{F}+^{197}\text{Au}$ at $E_{\text{lab}} = 110\ \text{MeV}$, identified by energy loss (ΔE) in the MWPC and the time-of-flight (TOF).

The TIFR 4π spin spectrometer, consisting of 32 NaI(Tl) scintillation detectors arranged in a soccer-ball configuration around the HYRA target chamber, was employed to measure the fold distribution of low-energy non-statistical γ -rays emitted from the decay cascade of the ERs, allowing the determination of angular momentum distribution. Raw γ -fold distributions were recorded at each E_{lab} . To extract the true ER γ -fold distribution, the raw spectra were gated with the

[†]Present address: Universita degli Studi di Napoli “Federico II”, 80126 Napoli, Italy

[‡]Deceased

*Electronic address: gonika@iuac.res.in

ERs detected at the focal plane. Raw and ER-gated γ -fold distributions at $E_{\text{lab}} = 110$ MeV are shown in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2: Measured γ -fold distributions (ungated and ER-gated) for $^{19}\text{F}+^{197}\text{Au}$ at $E_{\text{lab}} = 110$ MeV.

The γ -multiplicity distribution was derived from the ER-gated γ -fold distribution using the following equation

$$P(F) = \sum_{M=0}^{M_{\text{max}}} S(F, M)P(M), \quad (1)$$

where $P(F)$ represents the γ -fold distribution, $S(F, M)$ is the response matrix of the detector array and $P(M)$ is the γ -multiplicity distribution. The response matrix of the spin spectrometer was obtained using a recursive algorithm [6].




FIG. 3: Experimental γ -fold and γ -multiplicity distributions for $^{19}\text{F}+^{197}\text{Au}$ at $E_{\text{lab}} = 110$ MeV.

For constructing the multiplicity distribution, we assumed a function $P(M)$ of the form

$$P(M) = \frac{2M + 1}{1 + \exp\left(\frac{M - M_0}{\Delta M}\right)}, \quad (2)$$

with two free parameters M_0 and ΔM . Using Eq. 2, $P(F)$ was calculated based on Eq. 1

and the experimental γ -fold distribution was compared with the calculated values. The parameters M_0 and ΔM were varied to achieve the best fit of the experimental γ -fold distribution. Fig. 3 shows both the experimental and best-fitted γ -fold distributions, as well as the derived γ -multiplicity distribution at $E_{\text{lab}} = 110$ MeV.

To obtain the spin distribution, one can construct a more generalized relation between the mean γ -multiplicity $\langle M_\gamma \rangle$ and the mean angular momentum $\langle \ell_{\text{CN}} \rangle$ [7], based on the decay pattern of the CN, of the form

$$\langle \ell_{\text{CN}} \rangle = \Delta I_{\text{ns}} (\langle M_\gamma \rangle - M_{\gamma s}) + \sum_i \Delta I_i M_i + I_0, \quad (3)$$

with $i = \gamma s, n, p, \alpha$. Here, ΔI_{ns} is the average spin carried away by the non-statistical γ -rays, ΔI_i are the spins carried away by statistical γ -rays (γs), neutrons (n), protons (p) and α -particles (α) and M_i are the corresponding multiplicities. I_0 denotes the ground-state spin of the CN.

Dynamical model calculations will complement the experimental efforts to understand the intricate reaction dynamics. Further analysis and theoretical study are underway.

The authors thank the Pelletron crew of IUAC for providing pulsed beam with requisite specifications throughout the experiment.

References

- [1] D. Ackermann, *Yad. Fiz.* **66**, 1150 (2003).
- [2] A. C. Berriman *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **413**, 144 (2001); D. J. Hinde *et al.*, *J. Nucl. Radiochem. Sci.* **3**, 31 (2002).
- [3] R. Tripathi *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **71**, 044616 (2005).
- [4] N. Madhavan *et al.*, *Pramana -J. Phys.* **75**, 317 (2010).
- [5] G. Anil kumar *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* **76**, 611 (2009).
- [6] A. Maj *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. A* **571**, 185 (1994).
- [7] A. M. Stefanini *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. A* **548**, (1992) 453.