Fusion reactions and neutron transfer in collisions induced by Li isotopes on Sn and Zn targets
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COLLISIONS INDUCED BY WEAKLY BOUND NUCLEI

Weakly bound nuclei are characterized by

- low breakup threshold
- cluster structure
- diffuse matter distribution

Direct processes are expected to be favored

Which are the effects on fusion channel?

**Static effects:** diffuse structure \[\rightarrow\] lowering of Coulomb barrier

**Dynamic effects:** coupling not only to bound states but also to continuum

Some authors have predicted that coupling with breakup generates in CF cross section:

1. an **enhancement** at energies **below** the Coulomb barrier
2. a **reduction** at energies **above** the Coulomb barrier
BREAKUP AND FUSION

To study the effects of breakup on fusion

$^9\text{Be}$ ($S_n = 1.57 \text{ MeV}$)    $^6\text{Li}$ ($S_a = 1.48 \text{ MeV}$)    $^7\text{Li}$ ($S_a = 2.45 \text{ MeV}$)
on light, medium and heavy mass targets

Fusion evaporation reaction on:
✓ heavy targets $\Rightarrow$ easy CF and ICF separation
✓ light and medium targets $\Rightarrow$ difficult CF and ICF discrimination

Suppression of CF with respect to 1D BPM or experimental data concerning collisions induced by well bound nuclei on the same targets at energies above the barrier on heavy targets is a well establish effect

Complete Fusion Suppression factor ($SF_{\text{CF}}$)

$^9\text{Be}$

$^6\text{Li}$

$^7\text{Li}$

In $^6$Li-induced reactions SF is almost independent from $Z$ of the target nucleus. The same cannot be said for $^7$Li and $^9$Be induced reactions
The sub-barrier enhancement in $^{40}\text{Ca} + ^{96}\text{Zr}$ has been attributed to the presence of neutron transfer channels with large positive Q-values.

In $\text{Sn} + \text{Ni}$ and $\text{Te} + \text{Ni}$ fusion reactions, no sub-barrier fusion enhancement has been observed even in the presence of large Q-values for multineutron transfer.

Kohley, PRL 107 202701 (2011)
FUSION REACTIONS IN COLLISIONS INDUCED BY Li ON Sn TARGETS

To investigate the role played by the coupling to direct channels at energies above and below the barrier, we proposed to study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>Q (1n transfer)</th>
<th>Q (2n transfer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^6\text{Li} + ^{120}\text{Sn}$</td>
<td>0.51 MeV</td>
<td>-12.3 MeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^7\text{Li} + ^{119}\text{Sn}$</td>
<td>1.858 MeV</td>
<td>2.36 MeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^8\text{Li} + ^{118}\text{Sn}$</td>
<td>4.451 MeV</td>
<td>6.3 MeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^9\text{Li} + ^{117}\text{Sn}$</td>
<td>5.26 MeV</td>
<td>9.714 MeV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In these collisions it is possible to discriminate CF from ICF
- These reactions lead to the same compound nucleus and are characterized by different Q-values for neutron transfer

We wish to investigate:

- **Above the barrier** the complete fusion suppression in a target mass range never studied before
- **Below the barrier** the role played by the different n-transfer Q-values by comparing the fusion excitation functions for all the systems
ACTIVATION TECHNIQUE FOR FUSION CROSS SECTION MEASUREMENTS

The evaporation residues (E.R.) cannot be directly identified but are unstable and decay by Electron Capture.

To measure the fusion cross section we used an activation technique based on the off-line measurement of the atomic X-ray emission following the E.C.

“ON-LINE” TARGET ACTIVATION @ LNS

$^{6,7}\text{Li}$ delivered by TANDEM

93$\text{Nb}$ catchers are used in order to stop the residues emerging from the target.

Energy range investigated:
16 MeV $< E_{cm} <$ 24 MeV
($V_b = 19.2$ MeV)

Beam intensity from Rutherford scattering
The radioactive E.R. that should be observed in both reactions are:

**Complete Fusion:** I

**Incomplete Fusion:** Sb

From the X-ray energies we can only identify different elements but not different isotopes.
ACTIVITY CURVES

Different isotopes can be discriminated by following the X-ray activity as a function of time.

$^6\text{Li} + ^{120}\text{Sn (E=25MeV)}$

$^7\text{Li} + ^{119}\text{Sn (E=25 MeV)}$

From the fit of the activity curve, the experimental activity $A_{0\text{exp}}$ for each produced residue at the end of the irradiation is obtained.
By knowing:

- $A_{0\text{exp}}$
- $\varepsilon_{\text{Si(Li)}}$
- $k_{\alpha}$
- beam current
- target thickness

Production cross section for the E.R.

There is a good agreement between experimental data and CASCADE predictions.
Good agreement with respect to targets with higher Z

The SF of $^7$Li + $^{119}$Sn is lower than the values extracted for reactions induced on targets with higher Z.
To investigate effects of transfer Q-values we should compare all the Li+Sn systems and perform CDCC calculation.

![Graph showing fusion cross-section ratio against center-of-mass energy minus barrier for lithium and tin systems.]

Sub-barrier fusion enhancement in the $^7$Li induced collisions due to larger n-transfer Q value cannot be deduced from the present data.
Aim of the study:
investigate on possible effects on the sub-barrier fusion cross section due to:

- different structure
- different breakup threshold

\[ ^6\text{Li} \ (\alpha+d) \ S_\alpha = 1.4 \text{ MeV} \quad \text{no bound excited states} \]

\[ ^7\text{Li} \ (\alpha+t) \ S_\alpha = 2.5 \text{ MeV} \quad \text{first excited state } \sim 0.5\text{MeV} \]

We used the activation technique as in the case of Li+Sn ...

... BUT ...

discrimination of the CF and ICF is not possible
COMPARISON WITH GOMES et al. [1] $^{6,7}$Li+$^{64}$Zn

$^{6,7}$Li+$^{64}$Zn cross sections measured @ LNS are larger than the one previous measured.

This result appears to confirm the presence of possible experimental problems suggested by Gomes [Phys. Rev. C 79 (2009) 027606]

Above the Coulomb barrier complete fusion is the dominant process.

Below the barrier heavy residue production in the region is clearly dominated by d-ICF and n-transfer.
$^6\text{Li} + ^{64}\text{Zn}$ AND $^7\text{Li} + ^{64}\text{Zn}$ FUSION EXCITATION FUNCTION (I)

A clear enhancement of $^6\text{Li}$ induced reaction with respect to the $^7\text{Li}$ one is observed at energies below the Coulomb barrier.

$V_b$ and $R_b$ are taken from Canto et al., Nucl. Phys. A 821, 51 (2009)
This behavior has already been observed in fusion reaction induced by $^{6,7}\text{Li}$ on other targets. The origin of this increasing trend has been studied within CDCC calculations for the $^{6,7}\text{Li}+^{59}\text{Co}$ [A. D. Torres et al., Phys. Rev. C 68, 044607 (2003)]: it has been attributed to the different breakup thresholds of $^{6,7}\text{Li}$.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We performed fusion reactions induced by $^6$Li and $^7$Li to investigate the effects of breakup and neutron transfer on fusion process.

For Li+Sn reactions

- at energy **above** the barrier a suppression of CF excitation function with respect to 1D BPM was observed. The SF for the $^6$Li induced reaction is in agreement with the others reported in literature. The SF for the $^7$Li+$^{119}$Sn is lower than those extracted from reactions on heavier targets.
- at energies **below** the barrier, only from the comparison of the two system nothing could concluded about the possible influence of n-transfer Q-value.

In the future we would like to
- extend these measurements to lower energies.
- perform the $^8$Li+$^{118}$Sn $^9$Li+$^{117}$Sn experiments and compare the four fusion excitation functions.
- do CDCC calculations to take into account the coupling with breakup.

For the $^6,^7$Li+$^{64}$Zn reactions

- the comparison with CASCADE code has shown that direct reactions play an important role at sub-barrier energies
- a large sub-barrier enhancement of fusion excitation function in the case the $^6$Li+$^{64}$Zn with respect to $^7$Li+$^{64}$Zn.

As next step we will perform CDCC calculations to understand the origin of this enhancement.
COLLABORATION

A. Di Pietro¹ P. Figuera¹, M. Fisichella¹,² M. Lattuada¹,³, C. Maiolino¹, C. Marchetta¹, M. Milin⁴, A. Musumarra¹,³, V. Ostashko⁵, M.G. Pellegriti¹,³, C. Ruiz⁶, D. Santonocito¹, V. Scuderi¹,³, A. Shotter⁶,⁷ E. Strano¹,³, D. Torresi¹,³, M. Zadro⁸

¹INFN- Laboratori Nazionali del Sud and sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy
²Dipartimento di Fisica ed Astronomia, Università di Catania, Catania, Italy
³Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Messina, Messina, Italy
⁴Department of Physics Faculty of Science University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia
⁵KINR, Kiev, Ukraine
⁶TRIUMF, Vancouver, Canada
⁷School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
⁸Division of Experimental Physics Ruđer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia