

## 2<sup>+</sup> 40 MeV <sup>4</sup>He resonance in a 4 $\hbar\omega$ model space

J. J. Bevelacqua

United States Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, P.O. Box E, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

(Received 8 September 1980; revised manuscript received 24 November 1980)

Dynamical  $R$ -matrix methodology is used to determine the properties of the recently proposed  $J^\pi = 2^+$ ,  $\Gamma = 3.5$  MeV,  $E_x(\text{res}) = 40.2$  MeV resonance in <sup>4</sup>He. The calculations lead to a  $J^\pi = 2^+$  state with the following properties:  $\Gamma = 6.0$  MeV,  $E_x(\text{res}) = 40.3$  MeV, and  $T = 0$ . The calculations indicate the importance of 4 $\hbar\omega$  components in the proper description of the 40 MeV state.

NUCLEAR STRUCTURE Calculated via dynamical  $R$ -matrix methodology the following properties for the proposed 40 MeV resonance in <sup>4</sup>He:  $J^\pi = 2^+$ ,  $T = 0$ ,  $\Gamma = 6.0$  MeV, and  $E_x(\text{res}) = 40.3$  MeV.

### I. INTRODUCTION

In a recent Letter, McBroom *et al.*<sup>1</sup> measured the fore-aft asymmetry in the angular distributions for the <sup>3</sup>H( $p, \gamma_0$ )<sup>4</sup>He and <sup>4</sup>He( $e, ^3\text{H}$ ) $pe'$  reactions as a function of proton energies between 17 and 31 MeV. These asymmetry data suggest a new resonance having parameters  $J^\pi = 2^+$ ,  $\Gamma = 3.5$  MeV, and  $E_x(\text{res})$ , the resonance energy position, equal to 40.2 MeV. McBroom *et al.* also argue that this resonance establishes the importance of unusual (lower symmetry) components in the <sup>4</sup>He wave function near 40 MeV. These conclusions were based on a consideration of a 2 $\hbar\omega$  model space and supermultiplet partitions. In view of the importance of the 40 MeV resonance in understanding the structure and decay modes of <sup>4</sup>He, additional evaluation seems to be warranted.

This paper will present the results of model calculations which characterize the properties of the 40 MeV state in a 4 $\hbar\omega$  model space. Theoretical width and resonance predictions will also be compared with those of Ref. 1.

### II. BACKGROUND AND FORMALISM

The essential features of the model used in our theoretical analysis have been previously outlined<sup>2-4</sup>. The model is constructed within a 4 $\hbar\omega$  model space which is considerably larger than the 2 $\hbar\omega$  spaces usually employed in studies of <sup>4</sup>He.<sup>2</sup> The model basis states are completely antisymmetrized and translationally invariant harmonic oscillator eigenfunctions. The eigenenergies are obtained from the solution of the equation<sup>5</sup>

$$\sum_{\lambda'} \left[ \langle \lambda | H - E | \lambda' \rangle + \sum_c \gamma_{\lambda c} (b_{\lambda c} - b_c) \gamma_{\lambda' c} \right] A_{\lambda'} = 0, \quad (1)$$

where  $|\lambda\rangle$  are the basis states,  $A_\lambda$  are expansion amplitudes, and all other quantities appearing in Eq. (1) are defined in Refs. 2-4. The sum over

channels ( $c$ ) includes all contributions of 4 $\hbar\omega$  or less oscillator excitation from all three binary breakup channels—i.e.,  $p + ^3\text{H}$ ,  $n + ^3\text{He}$ , and  $d + ^2\text{H}$ . The effect of omitting the three-body ( $n + p + d$ ) and four-body ( $2n + 2p$ ) breakup channels on the level width is difficult to determine without detailed analysis, but a qualitative estimate can be gained from past <sup>4</sup>He, <sup>4</sup>Li, and <sup>4</sup>H calculations.<sup>2,3</sup> An analysis of these results indicates that three- and four-body breakup channels can have a sizable impact on the calculated widths. In particular, a factor of 2 effect was noted for the <sup>4</sup>H and <sup>4</sup>Li systems. The addition of three- and four-body breakup channels will likely have a small impact on the level position, since the addition of the three binary breakup channels has a small effect on the shell-model (no channel) level energy.<sup>2,3</sup>

Specific formulas for the resonance positions ( $E_R^\mu$ ) and level widths ( $\Gamma_R$ ) may be defined as

$$E_R^\mu = \text{Re}[E_\mu - \xi_\mu (E_R^\mu)] \quad (2)$$

and

$$\Gamma_R = -2 \text{Im}[E_\mu - \xi_\mu (E_R^\mu)], \quad (3)$$

where  $E_\mu$  is defined as the solution of Eq. (2), and  $\xi_\mu$  is defined in terms of known  $R$ -matrix energies and widths  $E_\mu$ ,  $\gamma_{\mu c}$  and standard Coulomb radial functions.<sup>6,7</sup> The reader should refer to Refs. 2-4 for details of the application of Eqs. 1-3 to the <sup>4</sup>He system.

Although 4 $\hbar\omega$  is a significant truncation of the complete  $J^\pi = 2^+$  model space, it does provide a 108 component wave function. This degree of wave function detail is significantly larger than the 13 component 2 $\hbar\omega$  basis configuration for  $J^\pi = 2^+$ . As noted, the 4 $\hbar\omega$  truncation introduces a dependency of the model solution on the basis space.<sup>2</sup> This dependency may be partially removed by adjusting the effective interaction to have the properties of the <sup>4</sup>He ground state and its

breakup clusters. This has been achieved<sup>2-4</sup> with a small (about 15%) modification of the Sussex interaction.<sup>8</sup>

The results of calculations for levels below 35 MeV were summarized in Table 4 of Ref. 2. (This is the  $E_R^{\text{unshifted}}$  spectrum of Ref. 3.) This table illustrates a common misconception about the widths of <sup>4</sup>He levels below 35 MeV excitation. McBroom *et al.*<sup>1</sup> note that the 1<sup>-</sup> and 2<sup>+</sup> states in this energy region are typically 10–15 MeV wide. Table 4 of Ref. 2 indicates that this is not the case, and that widths are more narrow—i.e., typically 2–6 MeV.<sup>9</sup> The 10 MeV claims for  $T=1$  levels are only gross estimates based on single particle widths.<sup>10</sup> In addition, narrow widths near 37 MeV have also been suggested.<sup>11-13</sup> It is, therefore, not surprising that the 40 MeV resonance<sup>1</sup> has a width less than the 10–15 MeV width suggested by McBroom *et al.*

A comment concerning the use of standard  $2\hbar\omega$  shell model calculations is also in order. These calculations may provide a reasonably accurate level scheme (if binding properties are ignored), but they do lead to an oversimplified view of the <sup>4</sup>He wave function.<sup>2-4</sup> In particular, only components up to  $2\hbar\omega$  are examined, and these are over-emphasized because higher excitation configurations ( $4\hbar\omega$ ,  $6\hbar\omega$ , etc.) are omitted. A  $4\hbar\omega$  space has similar problems since it omits  $6\hbar\omega$ ,  $8\hbar\omega$ , etc., but it does allow for about an order of magnitude more detail than the  $2\hbar\omega$  space—i.e., 108 versus 13 expansion states.

The oscillator content ( $2\hbar\omega$ ,  $4\hbar\omega$ ,  $6\hbar\omega$ , etc.) refers to the size of the  $|\lambda\rangle$  configuration space. The  $|\lambda\rangle$  basis states are defined in terms of radial ( $N$ ), orbital ( $L$ ), and spin ( $S$ ) quantum numbers

$$|\lambda\rangle = \left\{ \left[ \prod_{i=1}^3 R_{N_i L_i}(r_i) Y_{L_i M_i}(\hat{r}_i) \right]^L X(S) \right\}^{\pi}, \quad (4)$$

where the square brackets indicate coupling of internal coordinate angular momenta ( $L_i$ ) to form the total angular momentum ( $L$ ) of the system. The curly brackets signify the coupling of  $L$  to the total spin ( $S$ ) to form the total angular momentum ( $J$ ) and parity ( $\pi$ ) of the system.<sup>2,4</sup> The product is over all internal coordinates of the <sup>4</sup>He system (see Fig. 1 of Ref. 2):  $\vec{r}_1 = \vec{r}_{12}$  (the coordinate connecting the two neutrons),  $\vec{r}_2 = \vec{r}_{34}$  (the coordinate connecting the two protons), and  $\vec{r}_3 = \vec{r}_A$  (the coordinate connecting the centers of mass of the di-proton and dineutron systems). The quantities  $Y_{L_i M_i}(\hat{r}_i)$  are spherical harmonics normalized over the unit sphere<sup>14</sup> with  $M_i$  being the projection of  $L_i$  on the  $z$  axis of the  $\vec{r}_i$  coordinate. The spin function  $X(S)$  represents the spin coupling wave function for the <sup>4</sup>He system.<sup>2,4</sup> The radial func-

tions  $R_{NL}(r)$  are given by

$$R_{NL}(r) = \left[ \frac{2N!}{\Gamma(N + L + \frac{3}{2})} \right]^{1/2} r^L \exp(-\frac{1}{2}r^2) \mathcal{L}_N^{L+1/2}(r^2), \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_N^{L+1/2}(r^2)$  is a Laguerre polynomial as defined by Erdélyi *et al.*<sup>15</sup> and is normalized so that

$$\int_0^\infty [R_{NL}(r)]^2 r^2 dr = 1. \quad (6)$$

Using the above quantum number definitions permits the number of oscillator quanta ( $Q$ ) of a basis state to be determined from the relation

$$Q = 2(N_{12} + N_{34} + N_A) + L_{12} + L_{34} + L_A - 6, \quad (7)$$

where  $N_i$  can assume the integer values 1, 2, 3, . . . . For example, the first configuration appearing in Table I ( $N_{12} = N_{34} = N_A = 1$ ,  $L_{12} = L_A = 0$ , and  $L_{34} = 2$ ) contains  $2\hbar\omega$  of oscillator excitation.

Finally, a comment concerning the applicability of the present model to the <sup>3</sup>H( $p, \gamma_0$ )<sup>4</sup>He photoneuclear experiments, which were used to obtain the 2<sup>+</sup> (40 MeV) data, seems in order. The present model, based on direct transfer mechanisms, was shown to provide a consistent representation of <sup>4</sup>He giant dipole resonance results.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, it is expected that the model will also provide a good representation of the data,<sup>1</sup> if the reaction proceeds via a direct  $E2$  capture mode. Based on previous results,<sup>16</sup> it appears that the 2<sup>+</sup> (40 MeV) state is formed by a direct capture process in which the entrance channel  $d$ -wave proton makes an  $E2$  jump to a final bound  $s$  state.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The model of Refs. 2–4 predicts the second 2<sup>+</sup> state in <sup>4</sup>He has a resonance energy of 40.3 MeV and a width of 6.0 MeV. Furthermore, the state is  $T=0$  which was not discussed in Ref. 1. The calculated position is quite close to the McBroom *et al.* prediction of 40.2 MeV, but the model width is about 70% broader. The 6.0 MeV width implies that the 40 MeV state only survives for about  $10^{-22}$  sec. This lifetime suggests that many  $R$ -matrix components (see Table I) do not significantly contribute to the scattering process because there is not enough time for these states to be admixed via the  $E2$  operator into the initial state. Similar mixing was also noted in the  $E1$  transitions of Ref. 16. However, this does not imply that simple  $2\hbar\omega$  transitions dominate the scattering overlap and that the 2<sup>+</sup> (40 MeV) wave function is dominated by  $2\hbar\omega$  components. As will be noted below,  $4\hbar\omega$  states provide a significant contribution to the 40 MeV 2<sup>+</sup> level wave function.

The properties of the first (33 MeV) and second (40 MeV) 2<sup>+</sup> states in the <sup>4</sup>He continuum are com-

TABLE I. Amplitudes of basis states for the first two  $2^+$  states in the  ${}^4\text{He}$  system.

$N_A$	$L_{12}$	$N_{34}$	$L_{34}$	$N_{12}$	$L_A$	$L$	$S$	Amplitudes	
								$2^+$ (33.0)	$2^+$ (40.2)
1	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	0.102 24	-0.734 90
1	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	-0.031 04	-0.009 22
1	0	1	2	2	0	2	0	-0.010 09	0.213 69
2	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	-0.011 23	0.209 17
1	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	-0.033 78	0.063 24
1	0	2	0	1	2	2	0	0.004 91	0.010 06
1	0	1	0	2	2	2	0	-0.001 22	-0.013 56
2	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	-0.001 36	-0.006 64
1	0	1	2	1	2	2	0	0.003 11	0.015 75
1	2	1	0	1	0	2	0	-0.000 52	-0.002 81
1	2	2	0	1	0	2	0	-0.000 12	-0.010 04
1	2	1	0	2	0	2	0	-0.004 77	-0.005 82
2	2	1	0	1	0	2	0	0.001 60	0.011 60
1	2	1	2	1	0	2	0	-0.003 21	-0.014 78
1	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	0.001 26	0.005 96
1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	0.000 42	0.003 75
1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.000 15	-0.010 36
1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	-0.009 66	-0.016 09
1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	-0.000 04	-0.001 83
2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.000 40	0.007 79
1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0.000 25	0.008 00
1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	-0.003 29	0.001 48
1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	-0.000 04	-0.000 38
1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	-0.002 94	0.002 91
1	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0.001 78	0.001 66
1	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	-0.044 07	0.006 69
2	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	0.043 86	-0.009 46
1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	-0.000 77	-0.000 71
1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	-0.043 86	0.008 17
1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	-0.576 09	-0.033 91
1	1	1	0	1	3	2	1	0.074 45	-0.006 32
1	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	0.132 46	-0.026 44
1	3	1	0	1	1	2	1	-0.001 18	0.033 17
1	3	1	0	1	1	3	1	-0.489 55	-0.183 52
1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.040 65	0.096 69
1	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	0.084 10	-0.030 37
1	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	0.071 64	-0.033 09
2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.105 89	-0.005 88
1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	-0.538 43	-0.029 71
1	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	0.064 26	-0.006 57
1	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	0.003 92	0.033 19
2	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0.199 06	-0.027 36
1	0	1	3	1	1	2	1	0.042 54	0.025 32
1	0	1	3	1	1	3	1	0.096 76	-0.006 79
1	0	1	1	1	3	2	1	-0.044 90	0.240 48
1	0	1	1	1	3	3	1	0.004 21	-0.018 86
1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.023 67	-0.148 62
1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	-0.002 83	0.022 45
1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.011 87	-0.077 98
1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	0.008 61	-0.063 52
1	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	-0.010 43	0.066 93
1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	0.002 83	-0.028 28
1	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	0.003 69	-0.007 31
1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	0.042 36	-0.197 12
1	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	-0.003 34	0.013 35
1	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	0.002 37	-0.020 35
2	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	-0.022 26	0.129 37
1	1	1	3	1	0	2	0	0.010 30	-0.065 36

TABLE I. (Continued.)

$N_A$	$L_{12}$	$N_{34}$	$L_{34}$	$N_{12}$	$L_A$	$L$	$S$	Amplitudes	
								2 <sup>+</sup> (33.0)	2 <sup>+</sup> (40.2)
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	0.00288	-0.02835
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	-0.00398	0.00744
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	-0.00854	0.05793
1	3	1	1	1	0	2	0	-0.01063	0.06586
1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.05185	-0.12790
1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	-0.00064	0.00882
1	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	-0.01355	0.02921
2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	-0.01277	0.02869
1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	-0.01453	0.04039
1	1	2	1	1	0	2	1	-0.00557	0.02066
1	1	1	1	2	0	2	1	-0.00002	-0.00005
2	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	0.00067	0.01782
1	1	1	3	1	0	2	1	-0.01362	0.04058
1	1	1	3	1	0	3	1	-0.00040	0.00515
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0.00011	0.00011
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	-0.00013	-0.01818
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0.00025	0.01484
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	0.00023	0.00724
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	0.00004	0.00013
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	-0.00352	0.00359
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	0.00017	-0.00219
1	3	1	1	1	0	2	1	-0.00007	-0.00924
1	3	1	1	1	0	3	1	-0.00530	-0.31278
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	-0.05415	-0.00851
1	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	0.01056	0.08349
1	1	1	3	2	0	0	2	0.00936	0.08124
2	1	1	3	1	0	0	2	0.00521	-0.00796
1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	-0.05649	-0.08192
1	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	0.00035	-0.00021
1	1	1	1	2	0	1	2	-0.01318	0.06133
2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	0.00393	-0.00881
1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	0.00047	0.00618
1	1	2	1	1	0	2	2	0.00368	0.01146
1	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	0.00217	0.00983
2	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	0.00134	-0.02140
1	1	1	3	1	0	2	2	0.00213	0.01015
1	1	1	3	1	0	3	2	-0.00145	0.02492
1	1	1	3	1	0	4	2	-0.00347	-0.01388
1	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	-0.00022	-0.00748
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	-0.00499	0.00396
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	0.00316	-0.01705
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	0.00009	-0.00005
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	-0.00487	0.00395
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	-0.05335	0.01465
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	0.00263	0.00046
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	-0.05265	0.01463
1	1	1	1	1	2	4	2	0.05202	-0.01461
1	3	1	1	1	0	2	2	0.06592	0.00171
1	3	1	1	1	0	3	2	-0.09951	0.01341
1	3	1	1	1	0	4	2	0.06196	0.00493

pared in Table I. The 40 MeV level is dominantly composed of  $2\hbar\omega$  components (61.8%), while the 33 MeV state has a 31.4%  $2\hbar\omega$  contribution. Both 2<sup>+</sup> states are also highly fragmented.

Table II summarizes the considerable detail of

Table I according to specific  $LSJ$  components ( $^{2S+1}L_J$ )—i.e.,  $^5S_2$ ,  $^3P_2$ ,  $^5P_2$ ,  $^1D_2$ ,  $^3D_2$ ,  $^5D_2$ ,  $^3F_2$ ,  $^5F_2$ , and  $^5G_2$ . The entries in Table II represent the sum of all squared amplitudes in Table I which have the same  $LSJ$  quantum numbers. The quantum num-

TABLE II. *LSJ* configurations for the first two  $2^+$  states in  ${}^4\text{He}$ .

Configuration	% contribution to the wave function <sup>a</sup>	
	first $2^+$ state ( $E_x = 33.0$ MeV)	second $2^+$ state ( $E_x = 40.2$ MeV)
${}^5S_2$	0.3	1.4
${}^3P_2$	2.9	5.8
${}^5P_2$	0.3	1.1
${}^1D_2$	1.6	70.4
${}^3D_2$	32.4	7.3
${}^5D_2$	0.4	0.1
${}^3F_2$	59.9	13.8
${}^5F_2$	1.6	0.1
${}^5G_2$	0.7	0.0

<sup>a</sup>Total contribution may not equal 100% due to rounding errors.

bers *LSJ* were previously defined. The dominant configuration for the 40 MeV state is  ${}^1D_2$ , while the 33 MeV state is dominated by the  ${}^3F_2$  configuration. The reader should note that the model basis states are built on internal coordinates, and that traditional shell model coordinates may be obtained from three successive Moshinsky coordinate transformations.<sup>2,4</sup>

The results of Table I also indicate that both 33

and 40 MeV levels are complex and cannot be adequately understood in terms of a  $2\hbar\omega$  basis. In fact,  $4\hbar\omega$  may not be sufficient, but this larger basis provides a better representation of the  $2^+$  state. The high degree of fragmentation and the magnitude of the  $4\hbar\omega$  components suggests that attempts to describe the 40 MeV state in terms of a  $2\hbar\omega$  supermultiplet partition may lead to erroneous conclusions concerning the properties of this state. However, the multiplet approach and the  $4\hbar\omega$  approach presented herein suggest that the 40 MeV state is dominated by components from a supermultiplet partition less spatially symmetric than those usually associated with nucleon or electromagnetic channels.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Dynamical *R*-matrix calculations lead to predictions for the proposed  ${}^4\text{He}$  resonance of McBroom *et al.* which are in qualitative agreement with data. The model (experimental) predictions are as follows:  $J^\pi = 2^+(2^+)$ ,  $\Gamma = 6.0$  MeV (3.5 MeV), and  $E_x(\text{res}) = 40.3$  MeV (40.2 MeV). The model also predicts a  $T = 0$  assignment for this level. The 40 MeV level contains a significant  $4\hbar\omega$  component, and predictions based on  $2\hbar\omega$  considerations can only lead to a qualitative description of the 40 MeV level.

<sup>1</sup>R. C. McBroom, H. R. Weller, S. Manglos, N. R. Roberson, S. A. Wender, D. R. Tilley, D. M. Skopik, L. G. Arnold, and R. G. Seyler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 243 (1980).  
<sup>2</sup>J. J. Bevelacqua and R. J. Philpott, *Nucl. Phys.* **A275**, 301 (1977) and references therein.  
<sup>3</sup>J. J. Bevelacqua, *Phys. Rev. C* **16**, 107 (1977); **16**, 1675 (1977).  
<sup>4</sup>J. J. Bevelacqua, *Can. J. Phys.* **58**, 306 (1980).  
<sup>5</sup>A. M. Lane and D. Robson, *Phys. Rev.* **151**, 774 (1966); **178**, 1715 (1969); **185**, 1403 (1969).  
<sup>6</sup>A. M. Lane and R. G. Thomas, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **30**, 257 (1958).  
<sup>7</sup>R. J. Philpott, *Phys. Rev. C* **12**, 1540 (1975).  
<sup>8</sup>J. P. Elliott, A. D. Jackson, H. A. Mavromatis, E. A.

Sanderson, and B. Singh, *Nucl. Phys.* **A121**, 241 (1968).  
<sup>9</sup>E. K. Lin, R. Hagelberg, and E. L. Haase, *Nucl. Phys.* **A179**, 65 (1972).  
<sup>10</sup>C. Wertz and W. E. Meyerhof, *Nucl. Phys.* **A121**, 38 (1968).  
<sup>11</sup>R. A. Hardekopf, P. W. Lisowski, T. C. Rhea, and R. L. Walter, *Nucl. Phys.* **A191**, 481 (1972).  
<sup>12</sup>P. W. Lisowski, T. Rhea, R. L. Walter, C. E. Busch, and T. B. Clegg, *Nucl. Phys.* **A259**, 61 (1976).  
<sup>13</sup>J. J. Bevelacqua, *Phys. Rev. C* **16**, 1782 (1977).  
<sup>14</sup>M. E. Rose, *Elementary Theory of Angular Momentum* (Wiley, New York, 1957).  
<sup>15</sup>A. Erdélyi *et al.*, *Higher Transcendental Functions* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953), Vol. 2.  
<sup>16</sup>J. J. Bevelacqua, *Can. J. Phys.* **58**, 1555 (1980).