



**HAL**  
open science

## Reaction cross section of the two-neutron halo nucleus $^{22}\text{C}$ At 235 MeV/nucleon

Yasuhiro Togano, T. Nakamura, Y. Kondo, N. Kobayashi, R. Tanaka, R. Minakata, S. Ogoshi, S. Nishi, D. Kanno, T. Nakashima, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Yasuhiro Togano, T. Nakamura, Y. Kondo, N. Kobayashi, R. Tanaka, et al.. Reaction cross section of the two-neutron halo nucleus  $^{22}\text{C}$  At 235 MeV/nucleon. 26th International Nuclear Physics Conference, Sep 2016, Adelaide, Australia. pp.054, 10.22323/1.281.0054 . hal-01555076

**HAL Id: hal-01555076**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01555076>**

Submitted on 21 May 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

# Reaction Cross Section Of The Two-neutron Halo Nucleus $^{22}\text{C}$ At 235 MeV/nucleon

---

**Y. Togano\***, T. Nakamura, Y. Kondo, N. Kobayashi, R. Tanaka, R. Minakata, S. Ogoshi, S. Nishi, D. Kanno, T. Nakashima, J. Tsubota, A. T. Saito

*Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan*

*E-mail: togano@phys.titech.ac.jp*

**J. A. Tostevin**

*Department of Physics, Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Surrey, GU2 7XH, United Kingdom*

**N. A. Orr, J. Gibelin, F. Delaunay, F. M. Marques, N. L. Achouri, S. Leblond, Q. Deshayes**

*LPC Caen, ENSICAEN, Université de Caen, CNRS/IN2P3, 14050 Caen Cedex, France*

**K. Yoneda, T. Motobayashi, H. Otsu, T. Isobe, H. Baba, H. Sato, Y. Shimizu, T. Kubo, N. Inabe, N. Fukuda, D. Kameda, H. Suzuki, H. Takeda, J. Lee, P. Doornenbal, S. Takeuchi**

*RIKEN Nishina Center, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

**T. Kobayashi, K. Takahashi, K. Muto**

*Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Miyagi 980-8578, Japan*

**T. Murakami, N. Nakatsuka**

*Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

**Y. Satou, S. Kim, J. Hwang**

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Seoul National University, 599 Gwanak, Seoul 151-742, Republic of Korea*

**T. Aumann**

*Institut für Kernphysik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany*

**D. Murai**

*Department of Physics, Rikkyo University, Tokyo 171-8501, Japan*

**A. Navin**

*GANIL, CEA/DRF-CNRS/IN2P3, F-14076 Caen Cedex 5, France*

**A. G. Tuff**

*Department of Physics, University of York, Heslington, York YO10 5DD, United Kingdom*

**M. Vandebrouck**

*IPN Orsay, Université Paris Sud, IN2P3-CNRS, F-91406 Orsay Cedex, France*

The reaction cross section ( $\sigma_R$ ) of the very neutron-rich carbon isotope  $^{22}\text{C}$  has been measured on a carbon target at 235 MeV/nucleon. A  $\sigma_R$  of  $1.280 \pm 0.023$  b was obtained for  $^{22}\text{C}$ , significantly larger than those for the neighboring isotopes, supporting the halo character of  $^{22}\text{C}$ . A  $^{22}\text{C}$  root-mean-squared matter radius of  $3.44 \pm 0.08$  fm was deduced using a four-body Glauber reaction model. This value is smaller than an earlier estimate of  $5.4 \pm 0.9$  fm derived from a  $\sigma_R$  measurement on a hydrogen target at 40 MeV/nucleon.

POS ( INPC2016 ) 054

*The 26th International Nuclear Physics Conference  
11-16 September, 2016  
Adelaide, Australia*

---

\*Speaker.

## 1. Introduction

The nuclear halo is a characteristic structure of nuclei far from stability, which is a dilute matter distribution extending far beyond the core of the nucleus [1]. Borromean two-neutron halo systems, such as  $^{11}\text{Li}$ , are of particular interest for the study of many-body effects, such as possible strong neutron-neutron ( $nn$ ) correlations [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11].

Recently, the most neutron-rich carbon isotope  $^{22}\text{C}$  (two-neutron separation energy  $S_{2n} = -0.14 \pm 0.46$  MeV [12]) has been paid sizable attention, due to a possible extended two-neutron halo structure - as suggested by a large root-mean-squared (rms) matter radius  $\tilde{r}_m$  of  $5.4 \pm 0.9$  fm deduced from the large reaction cross section ( $\sigma_R = 1.338 \pm 0.274$  b) measured on a proton target at 40 MeV/nucleon [13]. This value is significantly larger than those for well-known halo nuclei such as  $^{11}\text{Li}$ . The nucleus  $^{22}\text{C}$  is also significant in terms of the shell closure at  $N = 16$ , as was recently established for  $^{24}\text{O}$  [14, 15]. Importantly, if the  $N = 16$  shell closure in  $^{22}\text{C}$  is confirmed, the two-neutron valence configuration would be  $[2s_{1/2}]^2$ . Experimentally, evidence for  $N = 16$  closure has been found by using the neutron removal reaction on  $^{22}\text{C}$  [16].


The large uncertainties on the earlier measurement of  $\sigma_R$  and the deduced  $\tilde{r}_m$  [13] do not constrain the theoretical models. A mean-field model, using an adjusted Skyrme interaction, predicted  $\tilde{r}_m = 3.89$  fm [17]. Three-body model calculations for  $^{22}\text{C}$ , with dominant  $[2s_{1/2}]^2$  valence neutron configurations [18, 19], derive  $\tilde{r}_m$  in the range 3.50-3.70 fm. Due to the increased mass of  $^{22}\text{C}$  and the resulting smaller fractional contribution of the two valence nucleons to  $\tilde{r}_m$ , all three-body model calculations [18, 19, 20, 21] require extremely weak two-valence-neutron binding to produce an enhanced  $\tilde{r}_m$ . Given the significant error on the experimental estimate of Ref. [13] and that the theoretical values are within  $\sim 2\sigma$  of this value, more definitive conclusions require data of significantly higher precision.

In this spirit, the present paper reports a precise  $^{22}\text{C}$  reaction cross section ( $\sigma_R$ ) measurement on a carbon target at 235 MeV/nucleon. A more detailed description on the  $^{22}\text{C}$   $\sigma_R$  can be found in Ref. [22]. At this energy, unlike the earlier 40 MeV/nucleon proton target measurement, the assumed forward scattering dominance of the core and valence particles, that underpins the Glauber (eikonal) model description, is well satisfied. In addition, it has been shown that the optical limit (OL) approximation to Glauber theory provides an excellent description of the (reasonably well-bound) core-target systems without the need to consider additional corrections [23, 24] - a result of the highly absorptive nature of the core-target interactions in the case of a carbon target.

## 2. Experiment

The experiment was performed at the Radioactive Isotope Beam Factory (RIBF) accelerator complex operated by the RIKEN Nishina Center and Center for Nuclear Study, University of Tokyo. A beam of  $^{22}\text{C}$  was produced via projectile fragmentation of a 345 MeV/nucleon  $^{48}\text{Ca}$  beam from the Superconducting Ring Cyclotron incident on a 20 mm thick Be target. The  $^{22}\text{C}$  fragments were separated using BigRIPS [25]. The momentum acceptance was set to be  $\pm 3\%$ . The secondary beams were identified event-by-event by measuring the time-of-flight (TOF), magnetic rigidity ( $B\rho$ ), and energy loss ( $\Delta E$ ) with plastic scintillators, a multi-wire proportional counter, and an ionization chamber located at the focal planes of BigRIPS. The  $^{22}\text{C}$  beam was transported to

SAMURAI [26], and impinged on a carbon target with a thickness of  $1.789 \text{ g/cm}^2$ .  $^{19,20}\text{C}$  were also transported to SAMURAI as contaminants of  $^{22}\text{C}$  beams. The mean energies of the  $^{22}\text{C}$  beams at the middle of the target were 235 MeV/nucleon.



**Figure 1:** Schematic view of the experimental setup of SAMURAI.

The schematic view of the experimental setup at SAMURAI is shown in Fig. 1. The incoming beams were detected by a plastic scintillator and ionization chamber located upstream of the target. The incident angle and the position on the target were monitored by using two MWDCs just before the target. The target was surrounded by the DALI2 array [27] to detect de-excitation  $\gamma$  rays from excited outgoing fragments, which were used to estimate the inelastic cross section to bound excited states in target and projectile, as shown elsewhere [22].

The residues from the  $^{22}\text{C} + \text{C}$  reactions were identified using detectors located at the entrance and exit of the SAMURAI magnet - the detailed detector setup can be found in Ref. [26]. The  $B\rho$  values of the charged particles were reconstructed using the positions and angles at two multi-wire drift chambers FDC1 and FDC2 [26]. The TOF was obtained from the plastic scintillator hodoscope HODF located downstream of FDC2 with respect to the plastic scintillator upstream of the target. The  $\Delta E$  measured using FDC1 was also employed for the identification.

### 3. Results and discussions


The reaction cross section  $\sigma_R$  is related to the interaction cross section  $\sigma_I$  as,

$$\sigma_R = \sigma_I + \sigma_{inel}, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\sigma_{inel}$  corresponds to the inelastic cross section to the bound excited states of projectile and target. Since  $\sigma_{inel}$  is small relative to  $\sigma_I$  at the present beam energy, as is shown in elsewhere [22], the  $\sigma_I$  is regarded as  $\sigma_R$  in the following discussions. The  $\sigma_R$  were derived using the transmission method [28], where  $\sigma_R$  can be written as,

$$\sigma_R = -\frac{1}{N_t} \log \left( \frac{\Gamma}{\Gamma_0} \right). \quad (3.2)$$

Here,  $N_t$  is the number of target nuclei per unit area, while  $\Gamma$  is the ratio of the number of non-interacting outgoing particles to the number of incoming particles.  $\Gamma_0$  corresponds to  $\Gamma$  for an empty target, to take into account reactions in the detectors.




**Figure 2:** Mass number dependence of the reaction cross section for the carbon isotopes obtained in the present study.

Figure 2 shows the measured  $\sigma_R$  of the carbon isotopes in the present study. The  $\sigma_R$  values of  $^{19,20}\text{C}$  were extracted by using the  $^{19,20}\text{C}$  beams mixed in the main  $^{22}\text{C}$  beam. As seen from Fig. 2, the  $\sigma_R$  value for  $^{22}\text{C}$  is enhanced relative to those of  $^{19,20}\text{C}$ , consistent with a two-neutron halo character of  $^{22}\text{C}$ .

For the  $^{22}\text{C} + \text{C}$  system, a four-body (three-body projectile plus target) Glauber reaction model analysis [29, 30], previously applied to  $^{22}\text{C}$ , is employed. Full details of the physical inputs and the construction of the three-body model  $^{22}\text{C}$  ground-state wave functions can be found in Ref. [19]. In these calculations [19], the additional pair of valence neutrons in  $^{22}\text{C}$  are found to occupy the  $2s_{1/2}$  orbital, with minimal  $1d_{3/2}$  orbital occupancy. In this case, the  $^{20}\text{C}$  core has a filled  $1d_{5/2}$  sub-shell. With the  $1d_{5/2}$  orbital bound by  $S_n(^{20}\text{C}) = 2.93$  MeV, the  $^{20}\text{C}$  core rms radius is then

2.89 fm from a Hartree-Fock calculation with the SkX interaction [31]. This value is used when computing  $\tilde{r}_m$  of  $^{22}\text{C}$ .

Solutions of the  $^{22}\text{C}$  three-body wave functions use the Gogny, Pires and De Turreil (GPT)  $nn$  interaction. The  $n$ - $^{20}\text{C}$  interactions are described by Woods-Saxon potentials with a spin-orbit term. The parameters of these potentials in the  $2s_{1/2}$  and  $1d_{5/2,3/2}$  orbitals can be found in Ref. [19]. To provide a family of  $^{22}\text{C}$  three-body wave functions with different ground-state eigenstates (i.e. binding energies  $E_{3B} (= -S_{2n})$ ) and hence different sizes (rms hyperradii) we use a family of three-body Hamiltonians. These Hamiltonians differ in the choice of (i) the (unbound)  $2s_{1/2}$  state potential depth (and their s-wave  $n$ - $^{20}\text{C}$  scattering length) and (ii) the strength  $V_{3B}$  of an added attractive central hyperradial three-body force,  $V_{3B}(\rho) = -V_{3B}/(1 + [\rho/5]^3)$ , where  $\rho$  is the hyper-radius. Having fixed the Hamiltonian by choosing the above interaction strengths, the three-body wave function, its  $\tilde{r}_m$ , and  $S_{2n}(^{22}\text{C})$  are determined from the lowest eigenstate of the eigenvalue problem.



**Figure 3:** RMS matter radius dependence of the reaction cross section calculated by the four body Glauber model. The dashed lines represent the range of  $1\sigma$  error of the present experiment.

The filled squares in Fig. 3 show the dependence of the four-body Glauber calculations of  $\sigma_R$  on the  $\tilde{r}_m$  of the calculated three-body ground-state wave functions. All of the wave functions have dominant (92 – 94%)  $[2s_{1/2}]^2$  and smaller (2 – 4%)  $[1d_{3/2}]^2$  two-neutron configurations. The solid curve through the calculated results is a second order polynomial fit while the dashed horizontal lines correspond to the  $1\sigma$  error on  $\sigma_R$  from the present experiment. From the model calculations of the figure we can estimate  $\tilde{r}_m$  from the present data of  $3.44 \pm 0.08$  fm.

Consistent with our earlier discussion, this deduced  $\tilde{r}_m$  from the present few-body-model analysis is smaller, by about  $2\sigma$ , than the previously reported value ( $5.4 \pm 0.9$  fm [13]) with its large uncertainty. As was noted earlier, the present higher precision and more absorptive and surface dominated higher beam energy measurement on a nuclear (carbon) target, places the underpinning Glauber (eikonal) dynamical model description of the reaction used here on a much stronger footing regarding the magnitudes of multiple-scattering and other corrections [23, 24].

Our deduced  $\tilde{r}_m$  is also in agreement with values: (i) ranging from 3.6–3.75 fm for  $S_{2n}$  values between 400–600 keV, of the three-body model calculation of Ref. [18], and (ii)  $\tilde{r}_m = 3.4$  and 3.6 fm, with  $S_{2n}$  of 400 and 200 keV, of Ref. [20]. These models, like the present one, calculate an  $s$ -wave configuration of the two valence neutrons with probability  $\geq 90\%$ , in line with a picture in which the  $N = 16$  magicity persists at  $^{22}\text{C}$  – as suggested by other more fundamental approaches [32, 33]. However, the reaction cross section alone is somewhat insensitive to details of the microscopic structure and more precise, more exclusive reaction experiments and mass measurements are required.

#### 4. Summary

In summary, we have measured the reaction cross sections of  $^{22}\text{C}$  on a C target at 235 MeV/nucleon. The  $^{22}\text{C}$  reaction cross section was found to be much larger than that of  $^{20}\text{C}$ , supporting the two neutron halo nature of  $^{22}\text{C}$ . The deduced  $^{22}\text{C}$  rms matter radius,  $3.44 \pm 0.08$  fm, from the four-body Glauber reaction model analysis, is consistent with other theoretical predictions based on  $^{22}\text{C}$  three-body model wave functions [18, 20]. The present rms radius is smaller and has a much reduced uncertainty than that of Ref. [13]. More exclusive measurements, such as Coulomb dissociation and fast neutron-knockout reactions, will allow for a more detailed study of the structure of  $^{22}\text{C}$ , including the potential role of core excitations on the  $N = 16$  magicity [34, 35].

#### 5. Acknowledgments

The authors thank the staff of RIKEN RIBF for their efforts in providing the  $^{48}\text{Ca}$  beam. We are grateful to Dr. M. Takechi for discussions and providing the experimental data of Ref. [23]. The present work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. 24740154, MEXT KAKENHI Grant No. 24105005, the WCU (R32-2008-000-10155-0) and the GPF (NRF-2011-0006492) programs of NRF Korea, and the HIC for FAIR. J.A.T. acknowledges support of the Science and Technology Facility Council (UK) grants ST/J000051 and ST/L005743. N.L.A., F.D., J.G., F.M.M. and N.A.O. acknowledge partial support from the Franco-Japanese LIA-International Associated Laboratory for Nuclear Structure Problems. A.N. and J.G. would also like to acknowledge the JSPS Invitation Fellowship program for long-term research in Japan at the Tokyo Institute of Technology and RIKEN respectively.

#### References

- [1] K. Riisager, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 1105 (1994).
- [2] M. Matsuo, K. Mizuyama, and Y. Serizawa, Phys. Rev. C **71**, 064326 (2005).
- [3] K. Hagino, H. Sagawa, J. Carbonell, and P. Schuck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 022506 (2007).
- [4] K. Hagino, H. Sagawa, T. Nakamura, and S. Shimoura, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 031301 (2009).
- [5] T. Myo, K. Kato, H. Toki, and K. Ikeda, Phys. Rev. C **76**, 024305 (2007).
- [6] M. Zhukov *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **231**, 151 (1993).
- [7] N. Shulgina, B. Jonson, and M Zhukov, Nucl. Phys. A **825**, 175 (2009).



- [8] B. Acharya, C. Ji, and D. Phillips, Phys. Lett. B **723**, 196 (2013).
- [9] T. Nakamura *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 252502 (2006).
- [10] R. Sanchez *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 033002 (2006).
- [11] F. Marque's *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **476**, 219 (2000).
- [12] L. Gaudefroy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 202503 (2012).
- [13] K. Tanaka *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 062701 (2010).
- [14] A. Ozawa, T. Kobayashi, T. Suzuzki, K. Yoshida, and I. Tanihata, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5493 (2000).
- [15] M. Stanoiu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **69** 034312 (2004).
- [16] N. Kobayashi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 054604 (2012).
- [17] T. Inakura, W. Horiuchi, Y. Suzuki, and T. Nakatsukasa, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 064316 (2014).
- [18] W. Horiuchi and Y. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. C **74**, 034311 (2006).
- [19] Y. Kucuk, and J. A. Tostevin, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 034607 (2014).
- [20] S. N. Ershov, J. S. Vaagen, and M. V. Zhukov, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 034331 (2012).
- [21] M. Yamashita, R. M. de Carvalho, T. Frederico, and L. Tomio, Phys. Lett. B **697**, 90 (2011).
- [22] Y. Togano *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **761**, 412 (2016).
- [23] M. Takechi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 061601 (2009).
- [24] C. Bertulani and C. De Conti, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 064603 (2010).
- [25] T. Kubo, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. B, Beam Interact. Mater. Atoms **204**, 97 (2003).
- [26] T. Kobayashi *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. Sect. B Beam Interact Mater. Atoms **317**, 294 (2013).
- [27] S. Takeuchi *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A, Accel. Spectrom. Detect. Assoc. Equip. **763**, 596 (2014).
- [28] I. Tanihata, H. Savajols, and R. Kanungo, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **68**, 215 (2013).
- [29] J. S. Al-Khalili and J. A. Tostevin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3903 (1996).
- [30] J. S. Al-Khalili, J. A. Tostevin, and I. J. Thompson, Phys. Rev. C **54**, 1843 (1996).
- [31] B. A. Brown, Phys. Rev. C **58**, 220 (1998).
- [32] L. Coraggio, A. Covello, A. Gargano, and N. Itaco, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 064303 (2010).
- [33] G. R. Jansen, J. Engel, G. Hagen, P. Navratil, A. Signoracci, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 142502 (2014).
- [34] T. Suzuki, T. Otsuka, C. Yuan, and A. Navin, Phys. Lett. B **753** 199 (2016).
- [35] K. Ogata, T. Myo, T. Furumoto, T. Matsumoto, and M. Yahiro, Phys. Rev. C **88** 024616 (2013).