



LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

Reaction Mechanisms of Pair Transfer

I. J. Thompson, B. A. Brown

April 10, 2012

50 Years of Nuclear BCS

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed 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 Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Chapter 1

Reaction mechanisms of pair transfer

Ian Thompson

*Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory,
PO Box 808, L-414, Livermore, CA 94551, USA*

B. Alex Brown

NSCL, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 58824

1. Introduction

Much of the evidence for nucleonic pairing in nuclei comes from energy expectation values, but important further information comes from the *transfer* of pairs of nucleons to or from another nucleus of known structure. Indeed, much of what we have learned about nuclear properties have been derived from experiments involving the collision, or reaction, between two nuclei. In this regard, a more fundamental understating of nuclear reactions has been, and will continue to be (especially in the FRIB era), crucial to the nuclear physics community. This chapter focuses on the theory, calculation and model results for the reactions mechanisms of pair transfer.

Here we consider the reaction mechanisms for pair transfer between two nuclei, for reactions that we can describe as $A(B+2, B)A+2$. Here, the two nucleons may be two neutrons, two protons, or a proton and a neutron, and are transferred from core B to core A . The nucleons may transfer either in one *simultaneous* step, or one after the other *sequentially*. If a distinguishable proton and a neutron are transferred, then both proton-then-neutron and neutron-then-proton routes need to be considered. Furthermore, these sequential and simultaneous routes contribute amplitudes that all add together *coherently*. This feature enables us to probe the nature of coherent two-nucleon superpositions in nuclei. Conversely, these superpositions, coupling orders and phase conventions have all to be defined consistently in a

good calculation.

Subsequent sections will therefore consider the definition of two-nucleon overlap functions, their coordinate transformations, the definition of transfer matrix elements along with zero-range approximations and non-orthogonality corrections. Finally, some results are shown to illustrate the coherence effects in the reaction mechanisms of pair transfers.

In the last 50 years, a significant number of papers have been presented in which absolute differential cross sections have been calculated, and compared with experimental results.¹⁻¹⁹ Traditionally, for example in,⁹ the theory predictions have fallen well below the experimental data. This ratio has been called the ‘unhappiness factor’.^{20,21} Most previous calculations modeled the transfer of a dineutron as a single cluster. Only from Charlton⁸ were sequential transfer contributions considered. We see now that modern calculations are in considerably better agreement with experiment.

2. Bound states and vertex functions

The general theory of nucleon pair bound states defines the overlap function $\phi_I^J(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \langle \Phi_A(I) | \Phi_{A+2}(J) \rangle$ in terms of the Jacobi coordinates \mathbf{r} between the two nucleons, and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ between their center of mass (cm) and the core A . The core spin is I and the spin of the $A+2$ composite state is J . When intrinsic spins s_1, s_2 are also included in a particular coupling order such as $|\{L, (\ell, (s_1 s_2) S) j\} J_{12}, I; J\rangle$, we have the partial wave expansion

$$\phi_I^J(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sum_{L\ell S j J_{12} I} \phi_{I\mu_I}(\xi_c) \phi_{s_1}^{\sigma_1} \phi_{s_2}^{\sigma_2} Y_L^\Lambda(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) Y_\ell^\mu(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) \frac{1}{r\rho} u_{12}(r, \rho) \langle J_{12} M_{12} I \mu_I | J M \rangle \langle L \Lambda j m_{12} | J_{12} M_{12} \rangle \langle \ell \mu S \Sigma | j m_{12} \rangle \langle s_1 \sigma_1 s_2 \sigma_2 | S \Sigma \rangle \quad (1)$$

for some radial wave function $u_{12}(r, \rho)$ that can be given either as a cluster product of single-particle wave functions $u_{12}(r, \rho) = \Phi_L(r) \phi_\ell(\rho)$, input directly as a two-dimensional distribution e.g. from a Faddeev bound-state calculation, or calculated from the correlated sum of products of single-particle states with independent coordinates. These two-nucleon wave functions will in general be the eigenstates of a three-body bound state Schrödinger equation

$$[T_{\mathbf{r}} + T_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} + V_{1A} + V_{2A} + V_{12} - \varepsilon] \phi_I^J(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = 0, \quad (2)$$

where the V_{iA} are the potentials between nucleon i and the core, and V_{12} is the pairing interaction between the two nucleons.

Such two-particle states that come from shell-model calculations or from Sturmian-basis calculations²² are usually described by means of the $|\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2\rangle$ coordinates, and then transformed internally into the centre-of-mass coordinates $|\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}\rangle$ of Eq. (1) using $\mathbf{r}_i = x_i\mathbf{r} + y_i\boldsymbol{\rho}$. For equal mass particles, $x_1 = x_2 = 1$, and $y_1 = -y_2 = \frac{1}{2}$. This describes a pair state as

$$\varphi_{12}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_i c_i |(\ell_1(i), s_1)j_1(i), (\ell_2(i), s_2)j_2(i); J_{12})\rangle \quad (3)$$

The coefficients c_i for correlated basis states i and the single-particle wave functions $\varphi_{\ell sj}(\mathbf{r})$ contain all the physics information about the bound state needed to do a transfer calculation. Shell model codes can produce the coefficients c_i needed here in terms of previously calculated eigenstates of the A and the $A + 2$ systems.

The *vertex functions* of these bound states are defined to be these bound state wave functions $\phi_I^J(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ multiplied by the potentials which have zero effects after the transfer step is performed and all exit channel nuclei have completely separated. These potentials are therefore the sum V of the binding potentials $V_i^{\text{sp}} = V_{\ell sj}(\mathbf{r}_i)$ to give $V = V_{1A}^{\text{sp}} + V_{2B}^{\text{sp}}$. (These are the individual potentials that should appear in the bound-state equation $[T_{\mathbf{r}} + V_{\ell sj}(\mathbf{r}) - \varepsilon]\varphi_{\ell sj}(\mathbf{r}) = 0$.) The vertex function does *not* include the nucleon-nucleon pair interaction $V_{12}(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)$, since this potential produces binding effects in both the initial and final bound states. We denote by $V\phi_I^J(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ the vertex function after transformation into Jacobi coordinates by the same method used to transform the wave function itself.

3. Post and prior coupling forms

We now consider the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} for the whole system of $A+B+2$ nucleons and described by system wave function Ψ . Let the various $A+2$ and $B+2$ bound states be denoted by Φ_i for various i . Then we may expand Ψ in terms of the Φ_i with some coefficients $\psi_i(\mathbf{R}_i)$ depending on the two-body separation vectors \mathbf{R}_i , as $\Psi = \sum_i \psi_i(\mathbf{R}_i)\Phi_i$.

The model Schrödinger's equation $[\mathcal{H} - E]\Psi = 0$ when projected separately onto the different basis states Φ_j , yields the set of equations

$$[E_j - H_j] \psi_j(\mathbf{R}_j) = \sum_{i \neq j} \langle \Phi_j | \mathcal{H} - E | \Phi_i \rangle \psi_i(\mathbf{R}_i). \quad (4)$$

which couple together the unknown wave functions $\psi_i(\mathbf{R}_i)$. The channel Hamiltonians are defined by $H_j - E_j = \langle \Phi_j | \mathcal{H} - E | \Phi_j \rangle$ such that the E_j are the asymptotic kinetic energies in channel j .

The matrix element $\langle \Phi_j | \mathcal{H} - E | \Phi_i \rangle$ has two different forms, depending on whether we expand

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} - E &= H_j - E_j + V_j \text{ (the 'post' form)} \\ &= H_i - E_i + V_i \text{ (the 'prior' form)}. \end{aligned}$$

The name (post or prior) is determined by whether it is the initial or final channel whose Hamiltonian is used. The above Eq. (4), as set up, has i as the initial channel and j as the final channel for the indicated coupling. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_j | \mathcal{H} - E | \Phi_i \rangle &= V_{ji}^{\text{post}} + [H_j - E_j] K_{ji} \quad (\text{post}) \\ \text{or} &= V_{ji}^{\text{prior}} + K_{ji} [H_i - E_i] \quad (\text{prior}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where

$$V_{ji}^{\text{post}} \equiv \langle \Phi_j | V_j | \Phi_i \rangle, \quad V_{ji}^{\text{prior}} \equiv \langle \Phi_j | V_i | \Phi_i \rangle, \quad K_{ji} \equiv \langle \Phi_j | \Phi_i \rangle. \quad (6)$$

The overlap function $K_{ji} = \langle \Phi_j | \Phi_i \rangle$ in Eq. (5) arises from the non-orthogonality between the basis states Φ_i and Φ_j if these are in different mass partitions. The K_{ji} are non-local operators that go to zero asymptotically. (Within the same partition, the Φ_i are inelastic states, and form an orthogonal set.)

The *first-order DWBA* matrix element use entrance ψ_i and exit ψ_j channel wave functions satisfying $[H_i - E_i]\psi_i = 0$ and $[H_j - E_j]\psi_j = 0$ respectively. Its matrix element is

$$T_{ji}^{(1)} = \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | \mathcal{H} - E | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle \quad (7)$$

The prior form of this is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ji}^{(prior)} &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | H_i - E_i + V_i | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | V_i | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle + \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | \Phi_i [H_i - E_i] \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | V_i | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle + 0 \\ &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | V_{ji}^{\text{prior}} | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Similarly, the equivalent post form is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ji}^{(post)} &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | H_j - E_j + V_j | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | V_j | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle + \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | [H_j - E_j] \Phi_j | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | \Phi_j | V_j | \Phi_i \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle + 0 \\ &= \langle \psi_j^{(-)} | V_{ji}^{\text{post}} | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Thus the non-orthogonality term disappears in first-order DWBA. Post and prior first-order DWBA matrix elements can be made to exactly agree numerically, if sufficient care is taken to ensure convergence of the non-local form factors.

Let a *second-order DWBA* matrix element use entrance channel i , exit channel k , and some intermediate channel j , as $i \rightarrow j \rightarrow k$. The propagation in the intermediate channel may be described in terms of the Greens function G_j , or equivalently within an iterated coupled-channels set. The two-step DWBA matrix element is

$$T_{ki}^{(2)} = \langle \psi_k^{(-)} | \langle \Phi_k | \mathcal{H} - E | \Phi_j \rangle G_j \langle \Phi_j | \mathcal{H} - E | \Phi_i \rangle | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle . \quad (10)$$

Now there are *four* matrix elements that may be calculated, according to the first and the second Hamiltonian form chosen: post-post, post-prior, prior-post, and prior-prior. The terms prior and post for each step are used to refer to the initial or final channels *of that step*, not the overall incoming or outgoing channels. In ‘prior-post’, the prior refers to the first step, and the post refers to the second step.

The post-post form of this, for example, is

$$T_{ki}^{(post,post)} = \langle \psi_k^{(-)} | \langle \Phi_k | H_k - E_k + V_k | \Phi_j \rangle G_j \langle \Phi_j | H_j - E_j + V_j | \Phi_i \rangle | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle . \quad (11)$$

Here the $[H_k - E_k]$ can operate on the final ψ_k to give zero, but little can simplify the $[H_j - E_j]$ since $[H_j - E_j]G_j \neq 0$ always. Thus

$$T_{ki}^{(post,post)} = \langle \psi_k^{(-)} | V_{kj}^{post} G_j V_{ki}^{post} | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle + \langle \psi_k^{(-)} | V_{kj}^{post} G_j [H_j - E_j] K_{ji} | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle \quad (12)$$

This second term is called a ‘non-orthogonality term’ since it involves the bound-state non-orthogonality overlaps $K_{ji} = \langle \Phi_j | \Phi_i \rangle$, which is significant when R_i and R_j are both within the range of the bound states.

Similar analyses for post-prior and prior-prior two-step DWBA expression also have non-orthogonality terms in the final form. The prior-post form, however, is

$$T_{ki}^{(prior,post)} = \langle \psi_k^{(-)} | \langle \Phi_k | H_k - E_k + V_k | \Phi_j \rangle G_j \langle \Phi_j | H_i - E_i + V_i | \Phi_i \rangle | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle . \quad (13)$$

Here the $[H_i - E_i]$ can also operate on the initial ψ_i , to give zero, as well as $[H_k - E_k]$ on the ψ_k , so we have the simplest form

$$T_{ki}^{(prior,post)} = \langle \psi_k^{(-)} | V_{kj}^{post} G_j V_{ji}^{prior} | \psi_i^{(+)} \rangle \quad (14)$$

The non-orthogonality terms can thus be made to disappear in second-order DWBA if the first and second steps use the prior and post interactions

respectively. When they are included as necessary, the results should be the same whatever post or prior forms are used.

In third and higher-order transfer calculations, some non-orthogonality terms will always be present, but most pair transfer mechanisms can be well modeled as two-step processes.

4. Two-nucleon transfer interaction

We now consider the specific transfer matrix element $V_{ji}^{\text{prior}} = \langle \Phi_j | V_i | \Phi_i \rangle$. Given an expression for this prior form, we may calculate the post interaction easily as $V_{ji}^{\text{post}} = (V_{ij}^{\text{prior}})^\dagger$. Take Φ_j to refer to the bound states of nucleus $A+2$ outside core A , and Φ_i analogously for nucleus B .

The transfer interaction has therefore the non-local matrix element

$$V_{ji}(\mathbf{R}_j, \mathbf{R}_i) = \langle \phi_{I_A}^{J_A}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_A) | V_{1B}^{\text{sp}} + V_{2B}^{\text{sp}} + U_{AB} - U_i | \phi_{I_B}^{J_B}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_B) \rangle. \quad (15)$$

As is usual in transfer operators, there are three kinds of potentials appearing here. First there are the binding potentials $V_{1B}^{\text{sp}}(\mathbf{r}_{1B}) + V_{2B}^{\text{sp}}(\mathbf{r}_{2B})$. Since these binding potentials always appear while multiplied by their bound state wave functions, we need only store and use the vertex functions defined in section 2. Second there is the ‘core-core’ potential $U_{AB}(\mathbf{R}_{AB})$ between the core nuclei A and B . Finally is subtracted an optical potential. In this prior form we subtract the optical potential in the initial channel, $U_i(\mathbf{R}_i)$. The difference $U_{AB} - U_i$ of the two optical potentials is called the *remnant term*, and is sometimes taken to be small.

The integrals in Eq. (15) include integrating over the two-nucleon separation \mathbf{r} as well as over their cm distance $\boldsymbol{\rho}_A$ from the core A . The \mathbf{r} coordinate appears in both the initial and final states, and so is not labeled by A or B . This has the important consequence that neither the distance nor the angle of the \mathbf{r} coordinate is changed in the transfer. Neither, therefore, is their relative angular momentum ℓ , and, for similar reasons, nor their spin couplings S and total angular momentum j . The two neutron transfer can hence be viewed as the transfer of a ‘structured particle’ $(\ell, (s_1 s_2) S) j$, and then becomes similar to single-particle transfers of above. This means that when we also integrate over the coordinates $\boldsymbol{\rho}_A$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}_B$, we can use the standard procedures already developed for one-particle transfer interactions.

5. Coordinate transformations

The transfer mechanism requires the pair wave function to be expressed in the form of Eq. (1), so independent-particle forms of Eq. (3) have to be transformed in their coordinates as

$$\varphi_{12}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_u c_i \sum_{L\ell S j} |L, (\ell, (s_1 s_2) S) j; J_{12} T\rangle \phi_{L(\ell S) j}^{J_{12} T, i}(r, \rho) \quad (16)$$

A particular basis state i in the (r, ρ) coordinates is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{L(\ell S) j}^{J_{12}, i}(r, \rho) &= \langle L, (\ell, (s_1 s_2) S) j; J_{12} | (\ell_1(i), s_1) j_1(i), (\ell_2(i), s_2) j_2(i); J_{12} T \rangle \\ &\times \langle [Y_L(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) Y_\ell(\hat{\rho})]_\lambda | [\varphi_{\ell_1 s_1 j_1}(\mathbf{r}_1) \varphi_{\ell_2 s_2 j_2}(\mathbf{r}_2)]_{J_{12} T} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where (suppressing the i indices for clarity)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle L, (\ell, (s_1 s_2) S) j; J_{12} T | (\ell_1, s_1) j_1, (\ell_2, s_2) j_2; J_{12} T \rangle &= \sum_\lambda \hat{\lambda} \hat{S} \hat{j}_1 \hat{j}_2 \\ &\times \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 & \ell_2 & \lambda \\ s_1 & s_2 & S \\ j_1 & j_2 & J_{12} \end{pmatrix} \frac{1 + (-1)^{\ell+S+T}}{\sqrt{2(1 + \delta_{\ell_1, \ell_2} \delta_{j_1, j_2})}} \hat{j} \hat{\lambda} W(L\ell J_{12} S; \lambda j) (-1)^{\ell+L-\lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The radial overlap integral can be derived by means of harmonic-oscillator expansions,²³ with the Bayman-Kallio expansion²⁴ or using the Moshinsky solid-harmonic expansion.²⁵ This last method gives

$$\begin{aligned} &K_{\ell_1 \ell_2}^\lambda(r, \rho) \quad (20) \\ &= \langle [Y_L(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) Y_\ell(\hat{\rho})]_\lambda | [\varphi_{\ell_1}(\mathbf{r}_1) \varphi_{\ell_2}(\mathbf{r}_2)]^\lambda \rangle \\ &= \sum_{n_1 n_2} \begin{pmatrix} 2\ell_1+1 \\ 2n_1 \end{pmatrix}^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 2\ell_2+1 \\ 2n_2 \end{pmatrix}^{\frac{1}{2}} (x_1 r)^{\ell_1-n_1} (y_1 \rho)^{n_1} (x_2 r)^{n_2} (y_2 \rho)^{\ell_2-n_2} \\ &\times \sum_Q \mathbf{q}_{\ell_1 \ell_2}^Q(r, \rho) (2Q+1) \widehat{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_1 - n_1 \ell_2 - n_2} \widehat{L \ell} \\ &\times \sum_{\Lambda_1 \Lambda_2} \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 - n_1 & n_2 & \Lambda_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \ell_2 - n_2 & n_1 & \Lambda_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 & L & Q \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_2 & \ell & Q \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\times (-1)^{\ell_1 + \ell_2 + L + \Lambda_2} (2\Lambda_1 + 1)(2\Lambda_2 + 1) W(\Lambda_1 L \Lambda_2 \ell; Q \lambda) \\ &\times \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 - n_1 & n_2 & \Lambda_1 \\ n_1 & \ell_2 - n_2 & \Lambda_2 \\ \ell_1 & \ell_2 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$ is a binomial coefficient. The kernel function $\mathbf{q}_{\ell_1 \ell_2}^Q(r, \rho)$ is the Legendre expansion of the product of the two radial wave functions in terms

of φ , the cosine of the angle between \mathbf{r} and $\boldsymbol{\rho}$:

$$\mathbf{q}_{\ell_1, \ell_2}^Q(r, \rho) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{+1} \frac{\varphi_{\ell_1 s_1 j_1}(r_1)}{r_1} \frac{\varphi_{\ell_2 s_2 j_2}(r_2)}{r_2} P_Q(u) du \quad (22)$$

6. Zero-range and other approximations

The coupling potentials $V_{ji}(\mathbf{R}_j, \mathbf{R}_i)$ of Eq. (15) are *non-local*, in the sense that in general the initial and final radii, \mathbf{R}_j and \mathbf{R}_i , will be different. They will not only have different magnitudes, but also different directions. In the early days of transfer modeling, the calculations became much more practical if a *zero-range* approximation could be found, in which the coupling was restricted to $\mathbf{R}_j = \alpha \mathbf{R}_i$ for some constant α (which need not be unity).

When the projectile is a light ion such as ${}^3\text{H}$, ${}^3\text{He}$ or ${}^4\text{He}$ for nucleus $B+2$, then the binding potential sum $V_{1B}^{\text{sp}} + V_{2B}^{\text{sp}}$ will have short range. We may therefore consider approximating

$$[V_{1B}^{\text{sp}} + V_{2B}^{\text{sp}}] \phi_{I_B}^{J_B}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_B) \sim D_0 \delta(\boldsymbol{\rho}_B) \phi_{nn}^B(\mathbf{r}) \quad (23)$$

for some nucleon-nucleon wave function $\phi_{nn}(\mathbf{r})$ that we are free to choose. This a zero-range approximation. Note that it is only $\boldsymbol{\rho}_B$ which needs to have zero range, not \mathbf{r} . The constant D_0 is called the *zero-range constant*.

If, furthermore, we can neglect the remnant term $U_{AB} - U_i$, then the transfer coupling of Eq. (15) can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ji}(\mathbf{R}_j, \mathbf{R}_i) &= \langle \phi_{I_A}^{J_A}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_A) | V_{1B}^{\text{sp}} + V_{2B}^{\text{sp}} | \phi_{I_B}^{J_B}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_B) \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi_{I_A}^{J_A}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_A) | D_0 \delta(\boldsymbol{\rho}_B) \phi_{nn}^B(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \\ &= D_0 \langle \phi_{nn}^B(\mathbf{r}) | \phi_{I_A}^{J_A}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_A) \rangle \delta(\boldsymbol{\rho}_B) \\ &= D_0 \langle \phi_{nn}^B(\mathbf{r}) | \phi_{I_A}^{J_A}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_A) \rangle \delta(\beta \left(\mathbf{R}_j - \frac{A}{A+2} \mathbf{R}_i \right)) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

since

$$\mathbf{R}_j - \frac{A}{A+2} \mathbf{R}_i = \boldsymbol{\rho}_B / \beta \quad \text{for} \quad \beta = \frac{2(A+B+2)}{(A+2)(B+2)} \quad (25)$$

That is, we arrive at a ‘form factor’ $\langle \phi_{nn}^B(\mathbf{r}) | \phi_{I_A}^{J_A}(\mathbf{r}, -\mathbf{R}_j) \rangle$ that is local in $\mathbf{R}_j = \frac{A}{A+2} \mathbf{R}_i = -\boldsymbol{\rho}_A$ because of the delta function $\delta(\boldsymbol{\rho}_B)$. To find the form factor, we need to determine the average nucleon-nucleon relative wave function $\phi_{nn}^B(\mathbf{r})$ in the light ion, and project the heavy-nucleus two-body wave function $\phi_{I_A}^{J_A}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_A)$ onto this relative motion. This gives a function only of the distance $\rho_A = R_j$ and the angles. The kinematics for this zero-range approximation are identical to those for the one-body transfer of a

Table 1. Two-neutron overlap function for $\langle^{122}\text{Sn}|^{124}\text{Sn}\rangle$

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| $1g_{7/2}^2$ | 0.62944 |
| $2d_{5/2}^2$ | 0.59927 |
| $2d_{3/2}^2$ | 0.71913 |
| $3s_{1/2}^2$ | 0.51892 |
| $1h_{11/2}^2$ | -1.24399 |

mass-2 cluster from core B to core A . A local-energy approximation may be used to improve the treatment of the finite range of the vertex function, just as for one-body transfers.

This makes clear the conclusion stated at the end of section 4, namely that transfer reactions only probe in the unknown nucleus those components of nn relative motion that already exist in the known nucleus. Since the known light nuclei ^3H , ^3He and ^4He have predominantly s -wave relative motion between the two transferred nucleons, our transfer reactions will only probe pairing states of s -wave relative motion in the target. The *magnitude* of the transfer cross section will be proportional to the form factor overlap $\langle\phi_{nn}^B(\mathbf{r})|\phi_{IA}^{JA}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\rho}_A)\rangle$.

Zero-range approximations can be also used for some of the sequential steps involving these light nuclei, but not all of them if we are using ‘prior-post’ couplings to avoid non-orthogonality corrections. For stripping reactions such as (t,p), the first prior (t,d) step has no good zero-range approximation, and for pickup reactions such as (p,t), the second post (d,t) step must be treated in full finite range for the same reason.

7. Results

In this short paper we will focus on the reaction mechanisms for the pair transfer $^{124}\text{Sn}(p,t)^{122}\text{Sn}$ at 25 MeV, using the overlap function shown in Table 1 we find by overlapping the shell-model wave functions for the ground states of ^{122}Sn and ^{124}Sn . The theory of these overlaps was explained by Cohen and Kurath²⁷ for p -shell nuclei. We compare with the experimental data of Guazzoni *et al.*²⁶

We use the triton potential of Li,²⁸ the deuteron potential of Daehnick,²⁹ and the proton potential of Chapel Hill 89.³⁰ All the two-neutron wave functions are constructed within the half-separation-energy approximation. For a triton wave function we use the pure s^2 configuration found by the product of eigenstates at the half-separation energy (4.24 MeV) in a Woods-




Fig. 1. Simultaneous (short dash), sequential (dot-dash) and simultaneous+sequential (solid line) cross sections for the reaction $^{124}\text{Sn}(p,t)^{122}\text{Sn}$ at 25 MeV, in comparison with the experimental data of Guazzoni *et al.*²⁶

Saxon potential with $V = 77.83$ MeV, $R = 0.95$ fm, and $a = 0.65$ fm. The Sn wave functions shown in Table 1 are found at the half-separation energy (7.219 MeV) in a WS potential with $r = 1.17$ fm, and $a = 0.75$ fm that has the fixed spin-orbit component $V_{so} = 6.2$ MeV, $r = 1.01$ fm, and $a = 0.75$ fm.

The complete cross section prediction is shown in Fig. 1. We see the excellent agreement between theory and experiment as already published.¹⁹ Now we see that, with good shell-model overlaps and proper finite-range and sequential contributions, the unhappiness factors are much closer to unity.

To see the importance of the non-orthogonality terms, and hence of choosing ‘prior-post’ couplings if non-orthogonality terms are to be avoided, Fig. 2 plots the different sequential cross sections for all possible combinations of post and prior for the two steps. The prior-post solid curve is the dot-dashed curve in Fig. 1. The other curves are all different from this one, and cannot be simply added to the simultaneous amplitude to get the correct result. This also implies that no complete calculation with only zero-range couplings is possible.




Fig. 2. Sequential cross sections for all possible combinations of post and prior for the two steps.

Finally, it is instructive to look at the interference effects between the various simultaneous and sequential contributions. To display these coherence effects, I choose to plot the scattering amplitude at zero degrees for the non-spin-flip amplitude $m_p = m_t = 1/2$ (the only non-zero amplitude at this angle). Fig. 3 plots all the simultaneous and sequential contributions from the different components listed in Table 1, along with their coherent sums. We see that all the contributions to the simultaneous transfer are constructively coherent, as are all the contributions to the total sequential amplitude. This constructive coherence follows from the signs of the amplitudes in Table 1, and reflects the significant pairing enhancement in ^{124}Sn . The total sequential and simultaneous amplitudes are not completely coherent with each other, however. This reflects the importance of the deuteron channel with its own specific optical potential, and is also shown by their slightly different shapes of angular distributions in Fig. 1.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the TORUS topical collaboration, and performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence




Fig. 3. Simultaneous (short dash), sequential (dot-dash) and simultaneous+sequential (solid line) amplitudes at zero degrees for the reaction $^{124}\text{Sn}(p,t)^{122}\text{Sn}$ at 25 MeV. The short lines show the individual contributions from the wave function components of Table 1, and the longer lines with symbols are their coherent sums.

Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

References

1. S. Yoshida, Note on the two-nucleon stripping reaction, *Nuclear Physics*. **33**, 685–692, (1962).
2. N. K. Glendenning, Nuclear spectroscopy with two-nucleon transfer reactions, *Phys. Rev.* **137**, B102–B113 (Jan, 1965).
3. J. Bjerregaard, O. Hansen, O. Nathan, and S. Hinds, The (t, p) reaction with the even isotopes of sm, *Nuclear Physics*. **86**(1), 145–166, (1966).
4. R. J. Ascutto and N. K. Glendenning, Inelastic processes in particle transfer reactions, *Phys. Rev.* **181**, 1396–1403 (May, 1969).
5. R. Ascutto, N. Glendenning, and B. Srensen, Confirmation of strong second order processes in (p, t) reactions on deformed nuclei, *Physics Letters B*. **34** (1), 17–20, (1971).
6. B. Bayman, Finite-range calculation of the two-neutron transfer reaction, *Nuclear Physics A*. **168**(1), 1–16, (1971).
7. R. Broglia, The pairing model, *Annals of Physics*. **80**(1), 60–85, (1973).

8. L. A. Charlton, Finite-range evaluation of (p - d , d - t) with momentum space techniques, *Phys. Rev. C* **14**, 506–513 (Aug, 1976).
9. M. Yasue, H. Yokomizo, S. Kubono, K. Koyama, S. Takeuchi, and H. Ohnuma, $^{12}\text{C}(p,t)^{10}\text{C}$ and $^{12}\text{C}(p,^3\text{He})^{10}\text{B}$ Reactions at $E_p = 51.9$ MeV, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*. **42**, 367, (1977).
10. N. Hashimoto and M. Kawai, The (p , d) (d , t) process in strong (p , t) reactions, *Progress of Theoretical Physics*. **59**(4), 1245–1260, (1978).
11. T. Takemasa, T. Tamura, and T. Udagawa, Exact finite range calculations of light-ion induced two-neutron transfer reactions, *Nuclear Physics A*. **321** (2), 269–294, (1979).
12. B. F. Bayman and J. Chen, One-step and two-step contributions to two-nucleon transfer reactions, *Phys. Rev. C* **26**, 1509–1520 (Oct, 1982).
13. E. Maglione, G. Pollarolo, A. Vitturi, R. Broglia, and A. Winther, Absolute cross sections of two-nucleon transfer reactions induced by heavy ions, *Physics Letters B*. **162**(13), 59–65, (1985).
14. M. Kurokawa, Y. Aoki, Y. Tagishi, and K. Yagi, One-and two-step processes in natural-and unnatural-parity $^{208}\text{Pb}(p,t)^{206}\text{Pb}$ reaction at $E_p = 22$ MeV, *Nucl. Phys. A*. **470**(2), 377–396, (1987).
15. M. Igarashi, K. Kubo, and K. Yagi, Two-nucleon transfer reaction mechanisms, *Physics Reports*. **199**(1), 1–72, (1991).
16. I. Tanihata, M. Alcorta, D. Bandyopadhyay, R. Bieri, L. Buchmann, B. Davids, N. Galinski, D. Howell, W. Mills, S. Mythili, R. Openshaw, E. Padilla-Rodal, G. Ruprecht, G. Sheffer, A. C. Shotter, M. Trinczek, P. Walden, H. Savajols, T. Roger, M. Caamano, W. Mittig, P. Roussel-Chomaz, R. Kanungo, A. Gallant, M. Notani, G. Savard, and I. J. Thompson, Measurement of the two-halo neutron transfer reaction $^1\text{H}(^{11}\text{Li},^9\text{Li})^3\text{H}$ at 3A MeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 192502 (May, 2008).
17. G. Potel, A. Idini, F. Barranco, E. Vigezzi, and R. A. Broglia, Single cooper pair transfer in stable and in exotic nuclei, *arXiv. nucl-th* (Jun, 2009).
18. G. Potel, F. Barranco, E. Vigezzi, and R. A. Broglia, Evidence for phonon mediated pairing interaction in the halo of the nucleus ^{11}Li , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 172502 (Oct, 2010).
19. G. Potel, F. Barranco, F. Marini, A. Idini, E. Vigezzi, and R. A. Broglia, Calculation of the transition from pairing vibrational to pairing rotational regimes between magic nuclei ^{100}Sn and ^{132}Sn via two-nucleon transfer reactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 092501 (Aug, 2011).
20. M. C. Mermaz, A. Greiner, B. T. Kim, M. A. G. Fernandes, N. Lisboa, E. Müller, W. Chung, and B. H. Wildenthal, Multinucleon transfer reactions induced by ^{18}O on ^{28}Si , *Phys. Rev. C*. **20**, 2130–2142 (Dec, 1979).
21. J. S. Vaagen and K. Kumar, Matrix elements for scattering and two-nucleon transfer operators derived from dynamic deformation theory wavefunctions, *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear Physics*. **5**(9), 1211, (1979).
22. J. Bang, F. Gareev, W. Pinkston, and J. S. Vaagen, One-and two-nucleon overlap functions in nuclear physics, *Phys. Rep.* **125**(6), 253–399, (1985).
23. T. Brody and M. Moshinsky, *Tables of Transformation Brackets*. (Monografias del Instituto de Fisica, 1960).

24. B. F. Bayman and A. Kallio, Relative-angular-momentum-zero part of two-nucleon wave functions, *Phys. Rev.* **156**, 1121–1128 (Apr, 1967).
25. M. Moshinsky, Transformation brackets for harmonic oscillator functions, *Nuclear Physics.* **13**(1), 104–116, (1959).
26. P. Guazzoni, L. Zetta, A. Covello, A. Gargano, B. Bayman, T. Faestermann, G. Graw, R. Hertenberger, H.-F. Wirth, and M. Jaskola, High-resolution measurement of the $^{118,124}\text{Sn}(p,t)^{116,122}\text{Sn}$ reactions: Shell-model and microscopic distorted-wave born approximation calculations, *Phys. Rev. C.* **83**(4), 044614 (Apr, 2011).
27. S. Cohen and D. Kurath, Two-nucleon transfer in the 1p shell, *Nucl. Phys. A.* **141**(1), 145–157, (1970).
28. X. Li, C. Liang, and C. Cai, Global triton optical model potential, *Nuclear Physics A.* **789**(14), 103–113, (2007).
29. W. W. Daehnick, J. D. Childs, and Z. Vrcelj, Global optical model potential for elastic deuteron scattering from 12 to 90 MeV, *Phys. Rev. C.* **21**, 2253–2274 (Jun, 1980).
30. R. Varner, W. Thompson, T. McAbee, E. Ludwig, and T. Clegg, A global nucleon optical model potential, *Physics Reports.* **201**(2), 57–119, (1991).