



Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED
LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY

JUL 1 1983


LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Submitted to the Australian Journal of Physics

NOTE ON NUCLEAR DISINTEGRATION WIDTHS

W.J. Swiatecki

May 1983



LBL-11403
c.2

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal 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 its 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, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

NOTE ON NUCLEAR DISINTEGRATION WIDTHS*

W.J. Swiatecki

Nuclear Science Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

July 1980

Revised May 1983

ABSTRACT

Symmetric expressions for fission and neutron (or other particle) emission widths, Γ_f, Γ_n , etc., are derived by applying uniformly the canonical version of the transition-state method to both cases. The resulting expression for the ratios Γ_n/Γ_f etc. is somewhat different from conventional formulae.

This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Division of Nuclear Physics of the Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098.

*To be published in the Butler memorial issue
of the Australian Journal of Physics.

1. Introduction

In connection with conventional discussions of the competition between decay of an excited compound nucleus by fission or neutron (or other particle) emission, one may ask to what extent is it justified or necessary to use formally asymmetric expressions for the partial widths Γ_f , Γ_n , when both widths are derivable by a general transition-state method that ought to yield symmetric expressions.

The usual lack of symmetry is evident, for example, in the formulae for Γ_f and Γ_n in Bohr and Wheeler's 1939 paper on nuclear fission [1], eqs. (31) and (33). (See also, for example, ref. 2, p. 228). Thus, in the formula for Γ_n , there is an extra power of the kinetic energy in the integrand and a different factor in front of the integral.

The reason for the lack of symmetry may be traced to the different treatments of the transition state in the two cases. In the case of fission the transition state or "activated complex" is defined in the canonical way as the system consisting of all the degrees of freedom near the saddle point except one, the fission or disintegration degree of freedom. In the case of neutron emission all three (translational) degrees of freedom of the neutron (as well as its spin) are singled out for special treatment. But is this asymmetry justified? Why not treat neutron (or proton, alpha, ...) emission according to the simplest version of the transition-state method, in which only the normal (radial or separation) degree of freedom is singled out as the disintegration mode, and the activated complex is defined as the residual nucleus plus the two transverse degrees of freedom plus the spin degree of freedom of the neutron? Or conversely, if one believes that it is worth the trouble to single out also the transverse and spin modes for special treatment, why not then single out analogously the transverse and spin modes

in the case of fission? [A transverse displacement of a neutron about to leave the surface of a nucleus may be regarded as a rotation of the system consisting of the residual nucleus and the neutron, accompanied by a slight (second-order) increase in the separation coordinate. The corresponding degree of freedom of a saddle-point shape in fission would be a slight rotation of this shape, accompanied by a second-order deformation in the fission degree of freedom. (In both cases, angular momentum may be preserved by an intrinsic counter-rotation of the constituents in the residual nucleus or in the saddle shape.)]

The singling out for special treatment of various degrees of freedom (such as collective rotations or vibrations) may, indeed, be justified when an improved treatment, going beyond the simplest statistical approach, is desired and believed possible. But it is probably true to say that the use of asymmetric formulae for Γ_f and Γ_n is often not the result of a desire to go beyond the approximation provided by a uniform statistical treatment of all degrees of freedom but is due to the apparent unavailability in the literature of the relevant symmetric formulae. The purpose of the present note is to derive these symmetric formulae by applying the canonical version of the transition-state method uniformly to fission and particle emission.

[Reference 3 provides a discussion of decay widths for the emission of fragments of any size--from neutrons to fission fragments--but the emphasis is on the form of the fragments' kinetic energy spectrum at infinity. The problem of energy spectra, involving as it does assumptions concerning how the fragments are accelerated beyond the saddle point by a combination of electric and nuclear forces, is more difficult than the discussion of decay rates (determined by conditions in the vicinity of the saddle point alone). Thus, the estimates of the energy spectra reported in ref. 3 do not bear directly on the question raised in the present note.]

2. The Canonical Transition State Method

In this method (see, for example, ref. 1), a microcanonical ensemble of $\rho(E)\Delta E$ nuclei is considered [here $\rho(E)$ is the level density of the system at energy E], and a calculation is performed of the number of systems that disintegrate per unit time. The ratio

$$\frac{\text{Number of disintegrations per unit time}}{\text{Total number of systems } (= \rho(E)\Delta E)}$$

is equal to the reciprocal of the average lifetime, t , for the disintegration of a system, and \hbar/t is the partial width Γ associated with the decay in question.

The number of disintegrations per unit time is calculated by focusing attention on the microcanonical ensemble near the saddle-point configuration. [In the case of neutron emission the saddle point is the configuration with the neutron (just) outside the range of interaction with the residual nucleus.] The total number of degrees of freedom (say N) is imagined to be split up into two sets: a single degree of freedom, q , in the disintegration direction and the remaining $N - 1$ degrees of freedom, which constitute the "activated complex". If p is the momentum conjugate to q then the density of states in the two-dimensional phase space (p, q) is $1/h$, and the number of states of the total system with q in the interval dq , p in the interval dp , and the energy in the interval ΔE is

$$\frac{1}{h} \rho^*(X) \Delta E dp dq \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $\rho^*(X)$ is the level density of the activated complex at excitation X .

This excitation is given by

$$X = E - B - K \quad , \quad (2)$$

where B is the potential energy of the saddle point (i.e. the potential energy

barrier against disintegration) and K is the kinetic energy in the disintegration degree of freedom q . Note the relations

$$K = \frac{p^2}{2m} \quad (3)$$

$$dK = \frac{pdp}{m} = vdp \quad , \quad (4)$$

where v is the velocity and m the effective mass associated with q . (The effective mass will not appear in the final rate formula.)

The subspace (p, q) is displayed in Fig. 1. The line $q = 0$ corresponds to the location of the saddle point. The possible values of p range from $-p_{\max}$ to $+p_{\max}$, where

$$\frac{p_{\max}^2}{2m} = E - B \quad . \quad (5)$$

Consider now a time interval Δt . The number of representative points in phase space that cross the saddle-point location $q = 0$ in the positive direction (and are, therefore, assumed to disintegrate in this time Δt) is given by summing up the number of systems inside the triangle OAB in Fig. 1, defined by $0 < p < p_{\max}$ and $0 < q < -v\Delta t$, i.e., by the following integral:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{p=0}^{p_{\max}} \int_{q=-v\Delta t}^0 \frac{1}{h} \rho^*(X) \Delta E dp dq \\ &= \frac{\Delta t \Delta E}{h} \int_0^{p_{\max}} dp v d\rho^*(X) \\ &= \frac{\Delta t \Delta E}{h} \int_0^{E-B} dK \rho^*(X) \quad . \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

The number of disintegrations per unit time follows by dividing by Δt and the reciprocal of the lifetime t by further division by $\rho(E)\Delta E$. Hence we get

the final canonical transition-state rate or lifetime formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\tau} &= \frac{1}{h\rho(E)} \int_0^{E-B} dK\rho^*(X) \\ &= \frac{1}{h\rho(E)} \int_0^{E-B} dX\rho^*(X) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

If quantal barrier penetration and reflection are assumed to be expressible by a penetrability/reflection factor $W(K)$, the generalized lifetime formula becomes

$$\frac{1}{\tau} = \frac{1}{h\rho(E)} \int_0^E dX\rho^*(X)W(K) \quad (8)$$

[For a thick parabolic barrier, whose characteristic "inverted frequency" $\hbar\omega$ is much less than B , we have

$$W(K) \approx \frac{1}{1+e^{-K/c}} \quad (9)$$

where $c = \hbar\omega/2\pi$.

When the barrier is not thick (proton, α -emission), a more sensible formula is actually the simpler expression

$$W(K) \approx \begin{cases} e^{K/c} & \text{for } K < 0 \\ 1 & \text{for } K > 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

For neutrons, $W(K)$ is identically zero when $K < 0$.]

3. The Γ_f/Γ_n Ratio

The ratio of a fission width to a neutron (or other particle) width is now given by the perfectly symmetric expression:

$$\frac{\Gamma_f}{\Gamma_n} = \frac{\int_0^E dx\rho_f^*(X)W_f(E-B_f-X)}{\int_0^E dX\rho_n^*(X)W_n(E-B_n-X)} \quad (11)$$

or

$$\frac{\Gamma_f}{\Gamma_n} = \frac{\int_0^{E-B_f} dX \rho_f^*(X)}{\int_0^{E-B_n} dX \rho_n^*(X)}, \quad (12)$$

if quantal reflection and penetrability are disregarded.

The level densities ρ_f^* and ρ_n^* refer to the respective activated complexes: the saddle-point shape, or the residual nucleus with a neutron outside it, and with one degree of freedom (the disintegration mode) frozen out in both cases.

4. Estimates of $\rho(E)$, $\rho_f^*(X)$, $\rho_n^*(X)$

As a first unrefined, baseline estimate for all the above functions ρ , ρ_f^* , ρ_n^* , let us take the formula given by Bohr and Mottelson [4] for the level density of a (spherically symmetric) Fermi gas with fixed (in particular zero) angular momentum and fixed parity [Vol. I, p. 155, eq. (2-5)]:

$$\rho(A, E) = \frac{\sqrt{a}}{24} \left(\frac{n^2}{2\mathcal{I}_{\text{rig}}} \right)^{3/2} \frac{1}{E^2} e^{2\sqrt{a}E} = \frac{C}{E^2} e^{2\sqrt{a}E}. \quad (13)$$

Here A is the particle number (so the number of degrees of freedom is $4A$ if the particles have spin), E is the excitation and \mathcal{I}_{rig} is the moment of inertia of a rigid body with the same density distribution as the Fermi gas. The level density parameter a is given by

$$a = \frac{\pi^2}{4} \frac{A}{E_{\text{Fermi}}} + \text{shape-dependent corrections}, \quad (14)$$

where E_{Fermi} is the Fermi energy. (The corrections may be estimated using Ref. 5.) Empirically one finds

$$a \approx \frac{A}{8.5 \text{ MeV}}.$$

[In applying these formulae we shall disregard the difference between the a appropriate to ρ (with $4A$ degrees of freedom) and ρ_f^* , ρ_n^* (with $4A - 1$ degrees of freedom). To illustrate the main point of the present note we shall also disregard shell effects and the shape dependences of C and a.]

The integrals over $\rho^*(X)$ appearing in $1/t$ are now readily carried out, either exactly, or by making the usual expansion about the upper limit of integration, where $X = E - B = X_0$, say. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{X_0} \frac{1}{X^2} e^{2\sqrt{aX}} dX &= \int_0^{X_0} e^{-2\ln X + 2\sqrt{aX}} dX \\ &= \int_0^{X_0} e^{-2\ln X_0 + 2\sqrt{aX_0} + \left(\frac{-2}{X_0} + \sqrt{\frac{a}{X_0}}\right)(X-X_0) + \dots} dX \\ &\approx \frac{1}{X_0^2} e^{2\sqrt{aX_0}} T \left[e^{(X-X_0)/T} \right]_0^{X_0} \\ &= \frac{T}{X_0^2} e^{2\sqrt{aX_0}} + \text{small corrections} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the temperature T is given by

$$\frac{1}{T} = \sqrt{\frac{a}{X_0}} - \frac{2}{X_0} \quad (16)$$

Using this result we find

$$\frac{1}{t_f} \approx \frac{1}{h} T_f \left(\frac{E}{E-B_f} \right)^2 e^{2\sqrt{a(E-B_f)} - 2\sqrt{aE}} \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{1}{t_n} \approx \frac{1}{h} T_n \left(\frac{E}{E-B_n} \right)^2 e^{2\sqrt{a(E-B_n)} - 2\sqrt{aE}} \quad (18)$$

and

$$\frac{\Gamma_f}{\Gamma_n} = \frac{t_n}{t_f} \approx \frac{T_f}{T_n} \left(\frac{E-B_n}{E-B_f} \right)^2 e^{2\sqrt{a}(E-B_f) - 2\sqrt{a}(E-B_n)} \quad (19)$$

In the above, B_n is the neutron separation energy, B_f the fission barrier, and the transition state temperatures are given by

$$\frac{1}{T_f} = \sqrt{\frac{a}{E-B_f}} - \frac{2}{E-B_f} \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_n} = \sqrt{\frac{a}{E-B_n}} - \frac{2}{E-B_n} \quad (21)$$

Note that when $B_n = B_f$, eq. 19 predicts Γ_f/Γ_n to be independent of energy and equal to one. On the other hand, using the conventional formula for Γ_n gives, for $B_n = B_f$, the ugly formula

$$\frac{\Gamma_n}{\Gamma_f} \approx \frac{2TA^{2/3}}{(\hbar^2/2mr_0^2)} \approx \frac{TA^{2/3}}{5} \quad (21a)$$

(ref. [2], p. 229, or ref. [3], p. 335. Here m is the neutron mass and r_0 is the nuclear radius constant.) According to ref. [2], Fig. VII-7, the empirical trends for Γ_n/Γ_f in the case of a number of heavy nuclei at excitations where the temperature appears to be $T \approx 0.4$ MeV show considerable scatter, but the average seems closer to 1 than to the value of about 3 suggested by eq. 21a. The significance of this is far from obvious, since the use of eq. 13 (with fixed C and a) for all the level densities is questionable, especially if shell effects are present. Thus the approximate agreement with eq. 19 might be spurious and due to cancellation of errors associated with the neglect of shell and deformation effects.

5. Note on the Neutron Spectrum

The present use of the canonical transition state method for calculating the average lifetime for neutron emission does not affect the estimate of the form of the energy spectrum of the emitted neutrons. Thus, the probability to find the emitted neutron's normal component of momentum (denoted now by p_z) in the slot dp_z is, according to eq. 6, proportional to

$$\rho^*(X)d(p_z^2) \propto \rho^*(E - B - K_z)p_z dp_z, \quad (22)$$

where K_z is the z-component of the neutron's kinetic energy. The probabilities to find the neutron's transverse components of momentum p_x , p_y in the slots dp_x , dp_y are proportional to $\rho^*(E - B - K_x)dp_x$ and $\rho^*(E - B - K_y)dp_y$, obtained directly from expressions analogous to eq. 1, before the flux integration. (The extra power of p_z in the probability associated with the normal direction reflects the enrichment of the outgoing flux in particles whose original momenta were toward the escape direction.) The probability to find the final momentum in the box $dp_x dp_y dp_z$ is now proportional to

$$\rho^*(E - B - K_x)\rho^*(E - B - K_y)\rho^*(E - B - K_z)dp_x dp_y p_z dp_z$$

Using the standard approximation that $\rho^*(X)$ is proportional to $e^{X/T}$, where T is the temperature, one finds the neutron spectrum to be proportional to

$$e^{-(K_x + K_y + K_z)/T} dp_x dp_y p_z dp_z,$$

i.e., to

$$K e^{-K/T} dK, \quad (23)$$

where K is now the total kinetic energy $K_x + K_y + K_z$. This is the standard result as regards the single power of the energy K in front of the exponential.

What is affected by the present treatment is the absolute factor in the decay mode but not the form of the energy spectrum.

6. Conclusion

The above discussion is not meant to imply that the suggested expression for the neutron evaporation lifetime t_n or width Γ_n is more accurate than conventional formulae, derived by a nonstandard transition-state method that singles out the neutron's three translational degrees of freedom and its spin (or by the equivalent method of detailed balance, underlying the evaporation model). What I do believe is that, especially in a discussion of the competition between fission and particle emission, the present treatment provides a conceptually cleaner set of baseline formulae, against which one may more readily ascertain the advantages of further refinements (such as the inclusion of shell effects, deformations, or the singling out for special treatment of selected degrees of freedom). The problem of disentangling these effects is quite complex and it may avoid confusion if at least a standard procedure--the canonical transition state method--is used uniformly to discuss different types of nuclear disintegrations.

Acknowledgment


This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Division of Nuclear Physics of the Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098.

References

1. N. Bohr and J.A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. 56, 426 (1939).
2. R. Vandenbosch and J.R. Huizenga, "Nuclear Fission", Academic Press, 1973.
3. L.G. Moretto, Nucl. Phys. A247, 211 (1975).
4. A. Bohr and B.R. Mottelson, "Nuclear Structure", W.A. Benjamin, Inc., 1975.
5. J. Toke and W.J. Swiatecki, Nucl. Phys. A372, 141 (1981).

Figure Caption

Fig. 1. The phase space of the disintegration degree of freedom q and its conjugate momentum p .



XBL 835-200

Fig. 1

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

Reference to a company or product name does not imply approval or recommendation of the product by the University of California or the U.S. Department of Energy to the exclusion of others that may be suitable.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720