

Emission temperatures from widely separated states in ^{14}N - and ^{129}Xe -induced reactions

C. Schwarz, W. G. Gong,* N. Carlin,[†] C. K. Gelbke, Y. D. Kim,[‡] W. G. Lynch,
T. Murakami,[§] G. Poggi,^{||} R. T. de Souza,[¶] M. B. Tsang, and H. M. Xu**

*National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory and Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824*

D. E. Fields,^{††} K. Kwiatkowski, V. E. Viola, Jr., and S. J. Yennello**

Department of Chemistry and Indiana University Cyclotron Facility, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

(Received 29 March 1993)

Charged-particle correlations were measured for the reactions $^{14}\text{N}+^{197}\text{Au}$ and $^{14}\text{N}+^{27}\text{Al}$ at $E/A = 75$ MeV and for $^{129}\text{Xe}+^{27}\text{Al}$ and $^{129}\text{Xe}+^{122}\text{Sn}$ at $E/A = 31$ MeV. Relative populations of widely separated states in ^4He , ^5Li , and ^8Be , only weakly affected by side feeding, indicate emission temperatures of $T=4$ – 5 MeV for the ^{14}N -induced reactions and values about 1 MeV lower for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions.

PACS number(s): 25.70.Mn, 25.70.Gh

I. INTRODUCTION

Highly excited nuclear matter can be formed in intermediate-energy heavy-ion reactions. To address questions concerning the statistical properties of hot nuclei, it is important to determine their temperature. Experimental investigations have found evidence for a saturation in emission temperatures for fragments of $T=4$ – 6 MeV [1–27] and evidence for a possible limitation on excitation energy of targetlike residues [28–42]. However, it is not clear if this saturation of excitation energy arises from an instability of bulk nuclear matter which may be related to a phase transition or from dynamical limitations which may govern the energy dissipation into internal degrees of freedom. Both statistical [43,44] and dynamical [45,46] models predict that nuclear matter at sufficiently high temperatures expands due to the action of thermal pressure. The rate of this expansion and the

temperature at which fragments freeze out may depend on the nuclear equation of state [44,45]. In dynamical simulations little sensitivity of the energy deposition to the in-medium nucleon-nucleon cross section [45] is predicted. In statistical models, emission temperatures of bound systems appear to be related to the bulk instability of nuclear matter at low density and high temperature. In microcanonical models [43,47,48] this instability is manifested by the creation of new surfaces between hot fragments separating as the nuclear system undergoes a “cracking” phase transition at a characteristic cracking temperature of about 5 MeV. In another [44] model this instability is manifested by a rapid massive fragment formation during which the system remains at a constant temperature of about 5 MeV.

Until now, the relative populations of widely separated particle-unbound states have mainly been measured at forward angles for relatively light projectiles on heavy targets where contributions from the early nonequilibrated stages of the reaction predominate [8,10,12–15,18,20,27]. At such angles, the slopes of inclusive particle-energy spectra show “kinetic” temperatures of about 15–20 MeV [10,13] in the same reactions where the populations of excited states correspond to “emission” temperatures of about 3–5 MeV. Many explanations for these discrepancies have been offered [13,16,18,44,46,49]. Temperatures extracted from energy spectra for noncompound emission mechanism are likely to be misleading, however, because of their sensitivity to Coulomb barrier fluctuations [50], sequential feeding from higher-lying states, and dynamical effects such as collective motion [49,51–58] and nonequilibrium emission [59,60]. Sequential decay [5,18,61] and nonequilibrium phenomena can also influence the excited state population [17–19,45,46]. One must therefore extend the limited database upon which our present understanding is based. In this respect, it is interesting to extend emission temperature measurements to a va-

*Present address: Nuclear Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720.

[†]Present address: Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C. Postal 20516, CEP 01498, São Paulo, Brazil.

[‡]Present address: National Lab. for High Energy Physics (KEK), Department of Physics, 1-1 Oho, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan.

[§]Present address: Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606, Japan.

^{||}Present address: Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and INFN, Largo Enrico Fermi 2, 50125 Firenze, Italy.

[¶]Present address: Department of Chemistry, Indiana University Cyclotron Facility, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

**Present address: Cyclotron Institute, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.

^{††}Present address: P-2 Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545.

riety of entrance channel mass asymmetries. For comparisons with other observables that may be sensitive to the properties of an equilibrated residue and for comparisons with Boltzmann-Uehling-Uhlenbeck (BUU) predictions of the residue temperatures, measurements of emission temperatures at backward angles in normal kinematics are needed. Such measurements are, at present, scarce, and the relationship between the temperature for a hot equilibrated residue and the emission temperatures of fragments emitted from that residue has not been adequately explored.

In this paper, we report measurements of relative populations of widely separated states in ${}^4\text{He}$, ${}^6\text{Li}$, and ${}^8\text{Be}$ nuclei for ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ and ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$ collisions at $E/A = 75$ MeV and for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$ collisions at $E/A = 31$ MeV using the same detector geometry. Reactions induced by ${}^{14}\text{N}$ projectiles give rise to large contributions from the early nonequilibrated stages of the reactions and should, hence, be compared to previous measurements. For the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ reaction, emission from nearly equilibrated composite systems dominates and the extraction of unbound state populations will provide a test case for emission temperatures from equilibrated systems. The breakup scenario for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$ reactions is, at present, unknown. The present data may provide constraints on the scope of future measurements of symmetric collisions between heavy ions.

II. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

The experiment was performed using ${}^{14}\text{N}$ and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ beams of $E/A = 75$ MeV and of 31 MeV, respectively, extracted from the K1200 cyclotron of the NSCL: The beam intensities were 5×10^9 and 1×10^8 ions per second, respectively. For the ${}^{14}\text{N}$ beam we used ${}^{27}\text{Al}$ and ${}^{197}\text{Au}$ targets of areal densities 15 mg/cm² and 15.9 mg/cm², respectively, and for the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ beam we used ${}^{27}\text{Al}$ and ${}^{122}\text{Sn}$ targets of areal densities 5.6 mg/cm² and 5.3 mg/cm², respectively. Light charged particles were detected with two ΔE - E detector arrays, consisting of 300–400- μm -thick silicon ΔE detectors and 10-cm-long CsI(Tl) or NaI(Tl) E detectors.

The first array consisted of 37 Si-CsI(Tl) [62] telescopes and was centered at polar and azimuthal angles of $\Theta = 25^\circ$ and $\Phi = 0^\circ$. Each telescope had a solid angle of $\Delta\Omega = 0.37$ msr, and the angular spacing between adjacent telescopes was $\Delta\theta = 2.6^\circ$. Isotopic identification was achieved for hydrogen through beryllium isotopes. The software energy thresholds for p , d , t , ${}^3\text{He}$, ${}^4\text{He}$, ${}^6\text{He}$, ${}^6\text{Li}$, ${}^7\text{Li}$, ${}^8\text{Li}$, ${}^9\text{Li}$, ${}^7\text{Be}$, ${}^9\text{Be}$, ${}^{10}\text{Be}$, and ${}^{10}\text{B}$ were 10, 12, 15, 30, 35, 40, 60, 65, 70, 80, 90, 100, 110, and 130 MeV, respectively.

The second array, consisting of 13 Si-NaI(Tl) telescopes, was centered at $\Theta = 25^\circ$ and $\Phi = 90^\circ$. Each telescope in this array covered a solid angle of $\Delta\Omega = 0.5$ msr, and the angular spacing between adjacent telescopes was $\Delta\theta = 4.4^\circ$. Isotopically identified p , d , t , ${}^3\text{He}$, ${}^4\text{He}$, ${}^6\text{He}$, ${}^6\text{Li}$, and ${}^7\text{Li}$ particles were detected with energy thresholds of 12, 14, 16, 35, 40, 45, 80, and 90 MeV, respectively.

Coincidence and downscaled singles data were taken simultaneously. All data were corrected for random coincidences. Energy calibrations for individual detectors were obtained by elastically scattering α particles of 90, 116, and 160 MeV incident energy from a $(\text{CH}_2)_n$ target and detecting both the elastically scattered α particles and the recoil protons at various laboratory angles. This provided energy calibrations with an accuracy of about 2% for p , d , t , ${}^3\text{He}$, and ${}^4\text{He}$. Heavier particles are calibrated by calculating the energy loss in the corresponding silicon ΔE detector. This resulted in calibrations with accuracies of about 4% for lithium and 9% for boron; these calibration accuracies were assessed by comparing peak widths of experimental and calculated correlation functions (see Sec. IV B). For more details see Ref. [63].

III. INCLUSIVE SPECTRA

Examples of inclusive energy spectra for ${}^4\text{He}$, ${}^6\text{Li}$, and ${}^7\text{Be}$, detected at $\Theta_{\text{lab}} = 18^\circ$, 25° , and 33° , are shown in Figs. 1–3. Spectra for reactions induced by ${}^{14}\text{N}$ and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ projectiles are shown in the top and bottom panels, respectively. To determine appropriate input for Monte Carlo efficiency calculations, the yields for ${}^{14}\text{N}$ -induced reactions were fitted with a simple three-source parametrization similar to that adopted in Ref. [64]:

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\Omega dE} = \sum_{i=1}^3 N_i \sqrt{E - U_C} \times e^{-[E - U_C + E_i - 2\sqrt{E_i(E - U_C)} \cos \Theta]/T_i}. \quad (1)$$




FIG. 1. Inclusive ${}^4\text{He}$ yields, measured at $\Theta_{\text{lab}} = 18^\circ$, 25° , and 33° , for the reactions ${}^{129}\text{Xe} + {}^{27}\text{Al}$ and ${}^{129}\text{Xe} + {}^{122}\text{Sn}$ at $E/A = 31$ MeV (bottom panels) and the reactions ${}^{14}\text{N} + {}^{27}\text{Al}$ and ${}^{14}\text{N} + {}^{197}\text{Au}$ at $E/A = 75$ MeV (top panels).

Here, N_i , T_i , and Θ are the relative normalization, the kinetic temperature parameter, and the azimuthal angle, respectively. The energy E_i is the laboratory kinetic energy of a particle which is stationary in the rest frame of the i th source. The Coulomb energy U_C corrects for the Coulomb repulsion from heavy reaction residues, which are assumed to be at rest in the laboratory system.

For ^{129}Xe -induced reactions, a constant Coulomb cor-

rection U_C [as in Eq. (1)] cannot be applied in the laboratory frame because the reaction residues have a large velocity in the laboratory rest frame. This issue is important because our measurements include particles with energies near the projectile and compound nucleus Coulomb barriers. To achieve a reasonable reproduction of the measured spectra, we employed a two-source parametrization [65]:

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\Omega dE} = \sum_{i=1}^2 N_i \int_{U_1}^{U_2} dU \frac{\exp[-(U - U_C)^2/2\Delta_C^2]}{\Delta_C \sqrt{2\pi}} \sqrt{E(1 - U/E_{c.m.,i})} e^{-(E_{c.m.,i} - U)/T_i}, \quad (2)$$

which incorporates a Gaussian weighted smoothing of the Coulomb barrier of a source which is determined in a frame moving with the velocity of that source. In Eq. (2), U_C and Δ_C are the mean and the standard deviation, respectively, and $E_{c.m.,i} = E + E_i - 2\sqrt{E_i E} \cos \Theta$, where E_i is the kinetic energy of a particle at rest in source i . The integration limits were chosen as $U_1 = \max(0, U_C - 5\Delta_C)$ and $U_2 = \min(E_{c.m.,i}, U_C + 5\Delta_C)$. Fit parameters used for the description of the single fragment cross sections are shown in Table I. It must be stressed that the extracted source parameters are not uniquely determined due to the small angular range covered by our detector array. One has also to be cautious about the physical interpretation of the source temperatures because such parameters are known to be sensitive to collective motion.

IV. TWO-PARTICLE CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

A. Background subtraction

Products from the decay of particle-unstable nuclei were detected as coincident particles, and relative momentum spectra $Y_{\text{tot}}(q)$ were accumulated. The coincidence yield can be decomposed into two parts

$$Y_{\text{tot}}(q) = Y_c(q) + Y_{\text{back}}(q), \quad (3)$$

where $Y_c(q)$ results from the decay of particle-unbound states of excitation energy, $E^* = q^2/(2\mu) + Q$ (μ is the reduced mass, Q is the Q value). The background yield $Y_{\text{back}}(q)$ results from coincident particles emitted inde-




FIG. 2. Inclusive ^6Li yields, measured at $\Theta_{\text{lab}} = 18^\circ$, 25° , and 33° , for the reactions $^{129}\text{Xe} + ^{27}\text{Al}$ and $^{129}\text{Xe} + ^{122}\text{Sn}$ at $E/A = 31$ MeV (bottom panels) and the reactions $^{14}\text{N} + ^{27}\text{Al}$ and $^{14}\text{N} + ^{197}\text{Au}$ at $E/A = 75$ MeV (top panels).




FIG. 3. Inclusive ^7Be yields measured at $\Theta_{\text{lab}} = 18^\circ$, 25° , and 33° , for the reactions $^{129}\text{Xe} + ^{27}\text{Al}$ and $^{129}\text{Xe} + ^{122}\text{Sn}$ at $E/A = 31$ MeV (bottom panels) and the reactions $^{14}\text{N} + ^{27}\text{Al}$ and $^{14}\text{N} + ^{197}\text{Au}$ at $E/A = 75$ MeV (top panels).

pendently; it is largely determined by the available phase space. To remove the effects of detector thresholds and finite angular coverage, which influence Y_C and Y_B in similar fashion, we constructed the correlation function [10]

$$[1 + R(q)]_{\text{tot}} = \frac{Y_{\text{tot}}(q)}{C_{12}\sigma_1\sigma_2} \quad (4)$$

from the inclusive particle yields σ_1, σ_2 . The normalization constant C_{12} is determined from the requirement that $[1 + R(q)]_{\text{tot}} = 1$ for large values of q at which no particle-unstable decays contribute. At small relative momenta there is a minimum in the correlation function due to the Coulomb final state interaction between the two coincident particles. To account for this Coulomb minimum, we have parametrized the background correlation function as

$$[1 + R(q)]_{\text{back}} = 1 - e^{-(q^2/\Delta_b)^d}. \quad (5)$$

Here, the parameters Δ_b and d govern the width of the minimum at $q = 0$.

For our data analysis, we determined the sensitivity

of the extracted coincidence yield Y_c to uncertainties of the background by choosing two extreme assumptions for this background. (These two choices of background are indicated by dashed curves in Figs. 4–8.) For a given background, the yield of particle pairs due to sequential decay was extracted as

$$Y_c(q) = Y_{\text{tot}}(q) - C_{12}\sigma_1\sigma_2[1 + R(q)]_{\text{back}}. \quad (6)$$

B. Population of states

Information about relative populations of states are obtained from the relative decay yields. The coincidence yield $Y_c(E^*)$ resulting from the decay of particle-unstable states can be approximated by [10]

$$Y_c(E^*) = N \int dE \epsilon_c(E^*, E) \frac{dn(E)}{dE}, \quad (7)$$

where N is a normalization constant, $dn(E)/dE$ is the decay spectrum, $\epsilon_c(E^*, E)$ is the efficiency of the experimental apparatus for the detection of particle pairs re-

TABLE I. Fit parameters used for the description of the inclusive single fragment cross sections shown in Figs. 1–3. The spectra for the ^{14}N - and ^{129}Xe -induced reactions were fitted with Eqs. (1) and (2), respectively. The normalization constants N_i are given in units of $\text{mb}/(\text{sr MeV}^{3/2})$. Also given are the velocities β_{pro} and β_{CN} of the projectile and the compound nucleus.

Reaction	Fragment	β_{pro}	β_{CN}	U_C (MeV)	Δ_C (MeV)	i	N_i	β_i	T_i (MeV)
$^{14}\text{N}+^{27}\text{Al}$	^4He	0.40	0.14	5.85		1	0.59	0.340	7.9
						2	0.11	0.233	14.1
						3	0.25	0.104	9.1
	^6Li	0.40	0.14	8.01		1	1.8×10^{-2}	0.330	10.7
						2	5.3×10^{-3}	0.206	15.7
						3	3.5×10^{-2}	0.084	8.3
	^7Be	0.40	0.14	9.93		1	1.5×10^{-2}	0.331	11.1
						2	3.8×10^{-3}	0.211	14.3
						3	2.93	0.056	7.1
$^{14}\text{N}+^{197}\text{Au}$	^4He	0.40	0.026	17.9		1	1.35	0.334	8.7
						2	0.33	0.207	18.2
						3	1.38	0.077	10.0
	^6Li	0.40	0.026	25.8		1	7.0×10^{-2}	0.352	9.8
						2	9.9×10^{-3}	0.235	21.0
						3	2.9×10^{-2}	0.099	14.8
	^7Be	0.40	0.026	33.6		1	2.3×10^{-2}	0.339	12.1
						2	4.0×10^{-3}	0.209	20.0
						3	7.9×10^{-2}	0.058	12.2
$^{129}\text{Xe}+^{27}\text{Al}$	^4He	0.26	0.21	13.1	3.5	1	157	0.228	4.4
						2	32.6	0.039	25.3
	^6Li	0.26	0.21	21.5	7	1	1.34	0.220	6.6
						2	2.02	0.003	28.5
	^7Be	0.26	0.21	24.5	6	1	0.27	0.210	10.0
						2	4.23	0.004	16.6
$^{129}\text{Xe}+^{122}\text{Sn}$	^4He	0.26	0.13	7.8	7.5	1	210	0.211	6.2
						2	42.8	0.048	22.9
	^6Li	0.26	0.13	15.0	11	1	2.28	0.194	11.2
						2	2.33	0.014	17.2
	^7Be	0.26	0.13	19.6	15	1	0.54	0.189	12.8
						2	28.1	0.019	9.9

sulting from the decay of specific particle-unstable nuclei, and E and E^* denote the actual and measured excitation energies, respectively. For narrow, thermally populated states, the decay spectrum can be expressed as

$$\frac{dn(E)}{dE} = e^{-E/T} \sum_i \frac{(2J_i + 1)\Gamma_i/2\pi}{(E - E_i)^2 + \Gamma_i^2/4} \frac{\Gamma_{c,i}}{\Gamma_i}. \quad (8)$$

In Eq. (8), $\Gamma_{c,i}/\Gamma_i$ is the branching ratio for the decay of state i into the channel c and T is the emission temperature.

The efficiency function is obtained from Monte Carlo simulations, which take into account the kinetic energy spectra of the particle-unstable fragments, as well as the precise geometry and detector response and the angular straggling in the target [10]. Wherever possible, the kinetic energy spectrum for the particle-unstable fragments is assumed to be the same as the energy spectrum of the stable nuclei of the same isotope. For ${}^5\text{Li}$ or ${}^8\text{Be}$, where there are no particle-stable states, the energy spectra were assumed to be the same as for ${}^6\text{Li}$ and ${}^7\text{Be}$ fragments, respectively. The emission temperature T is extracted by comparing the calculated yields from the decay of two widely separated particle-unbound states with the experimental yields. The comparison can also involve the yield of particle-stable states i of the parent nucleus, which is given by

$$Y_{\text{stable}} = N\epsilon \sum_i (2J_i + 1). \quad (9)$$

Here, ϵ denotes the (singles) efficiency for detecting the stable fragments.

For broad states, the assumption of constant decay width Γ_C is not valid because penetrability effects have to be taken into account and the Breit-Wigner expression in Eq. (8) is not justified. For such states we used a one-level R -matrix formalism [66]. Here, the formal width of the level, $\Gamma_i = 2P_i\gamma_i^2$, and the resonance energy $E_i = E_R + \Delta_{li}$ are functions of the excitation energy E . Their energy dependence is expressed in terms of the penetrability P_i and shift function Δ_{li} for the relative angular momentum l between the particles. The parameters for the R -matrix formalism are taken from the literature [67–70].

Large distortions of the resonance-line shape can occur when fragments with different charge to mass ratios are accelerated in the Coulomb field of a heavy residue. Dependent on the geometrical decay configuration, this Coulomb distortion may increase or decrease the relative

momenta [71]. Such effects have been explored previously for the case of p - α correlations resulting from the decay of the ground state of ${}^5\text{Li}$ ($\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 1.5$) [72]. Integrating over the relative momentum distributions of the experimental and calculated peaks [Eq. (7)] reduces the uncertainty of extracting the resonance yield.

C. Experimental correlation functions

In this subsection we present the two-particle correlation functions measured in this experiment. These correlation functions were normalized at the relative momenta given in Table II. Aside from the detector energy thresholds, discussed in Sec. II, no further constraints on the data were applied. Figure 4 shows the correlation functions for p - t pairs. (Note the different vertical scales for the ${}^{14}\text{N}$ - and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions.) The first maximum corresponds to the $J^\pi = 0^+$ state in ${}^4\text{He}$ at 20.21 MeV ($\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 0.5$, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 1.00$). The second is due to the two overlapping $J^\pi = 0^-$ and 2^- states at 21.0 MeV and 21.8 MeV ($\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 0.84$, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.76$, and $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 2.01$, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.76$, respectively) [73]. Because of the folding of the decay yield with the detector efficiency [Eq. (7)], the peaks are slightly shifted to lower relative momenta, as compared to the exact locations of the states in ${}^4\text{He}$ at $q = 23, 41, 53$ MeV/ c . The magnitudes of the peaks of the correlation functions are much smaller for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions than for ${}^{14}\text{N}$ -induced reactions, suggesting a significantly larger space time extent for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions than for ${}^{14}\text{N}$ -induced reactions [65]. These correlation functions also exhibit a shift of the second peak to lower relative momenta by $\Delta q \approx 10$ MeV/ c . This shift may be induced by three-body Coulomb distortions caused by heavily charged reaction residues.

The dashed lines in Fig. 4 depict two extreme assumptions for the background correlation functions calculated by Eqs. (1) and (2). The minimum background correlation function was found by requiring that the peaks in the yields still look reasonable. The solid curves show correlation functions calculated for a background correlation function which is intermediate between the extremes shown by the dashed curves. In these calculations the individual states were assumed to be thermally populated and the overall normalization N was normalized to the data. Because of the width of the states and proximity to the decay threshold, an R -matrix parametrization was taken [67]. The calculated curves agree well with

TABLE II. Correlation functions for different two-particle combinations were normalized to unity at sufficient high relative momentum. The table shows the relative momentum range in MeV/ c used for this normalization for different particle pairs and target-projectile combinations.

Particle pair	${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$	${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$	${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$	${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$
p - t	160–300	100–200	100–200	110–200
p - α	130–200	110–160	90–140	110–180
d - ${}^3\text{He}$	150–220	150–220	120–220	120–220
α - α	260–330	260–330	260–330	260–330
p - ${}^7\text{Li}$	130–190	130–190	130–190	130–190




FIG. 4. p - t correlation functions for the reaction systems $^{14}\text{N}+^{27}\text{Al}$ and $^{14}\text{N}+^{197}\text{Au}$ at $E/A = 75$ MeV (upper panels), and $^{129}\text{Xe}+^{27}\text{Al}$ and $^{129}\text{Xe}+^{122}\text{Sn}$ at $E/A = 31$ MeV (lower panels). The dashed lines are extreme bounds for the background correlation function. The solid line is a calculation with $T = 5$ MeV for the ^{14}N and $T = 3$ MeV for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions for a background correlation function between the two extremes. For normalization see Table II.

^{14}N data. For ^{129}Xe -induced reactions, the location of the second peak is not well described.

The p - α correlation functions, shown in Fig. 5, exhibit two maxima. The broad maximum at $q \approx 50$ MeV/ c corresponds to the decay of the “ground state” of ^5Li ($J^\pi = 3/2^-$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 1.5$, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 1.00$ [72]). The peak at $q \approx 15$ MeV/ c is due to the three-body decay $^9\text{B} \rightarrow 2\alpha + p$ [71]. For the calculation of the efficiency function, the parent ^5Li distribution was parametrized with Eqs. (1) and (2) using the source parameters extracted for ^6Li . This assumption was motivated by the work of Chen *et al.* [12] who have shown that uncertainties due to the unknown energy spectra of the particle-unstable parent nuclei are much smaller than the uncertainties due to different assumptions regarding the background.

Similar to the p - t correlation, the ^5Li “ground state” peak for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions is about 8–10 times lower than for the ^{14}N -induced reactions. In both cases, the line shape of the ^5Li ground state is distorted by the presence of the emitting source described by Eq. (8). This distortion must be considered in the analysis. The solid lines in Fig. 5 show calculations for the ^{14}N -induced reactions assuming $T = 4$ MeV and for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions assuming $T = 3$ MeV, respectively. The R -matrix parameters were taken from Stambach and Walter [68]. The resonance energy for the calculated $3/2^-$ state was shifted to lower relative energy by 200 keV, an effect which may be caused by three-body Coulomb distortions caused by targetlike residues [71]. Except for the case of $^{129}\text{Xe}+^{27}\text{Al}$, where the ^9B decay is most significant, the curves in Fig. 5 agree very well with the data. For the yields given by the solid curves, the background was assumed to be given by the upper dashed curve in Fig. 5.

The largest peak in the d - ^3He correlation, Fig. 6, orig-




FIG. 5. p - α correlation functions for different reaction systems. The dashed lines are extreme bounds for the background correlation function. The solid line is a calculation with $T = 4$ MeV for the ^{14}N and $T = 3$ MeV for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions assuming the maximum background correlation function. The peak at $q \approx 15$ MeV/ q corresponds to a three-body decay $^9\text{B} \rightarrow 2\alpha + p$ and not to a decay of an $A = 5$ system. For normalization see Table II.

inates from the 16.7 MeV state in ^5Li ($J^\pi = 3/2^+$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 0.2$, $\Gamma_d/\Gamma = 0.86$ [72]). The R -matrix parameters were taken from Kunz [69]. For the ^{14}N -induced reactions one observes a broad maximum at $q \approx 90$ MeV/ c which results from the decay of the $1/2^+$ state in ^5Li . The region of the correlation function in the neighborhood of this peak was not fit because the R -matrix parametrization for this state is not known [69] (solid lines in Fig. 6). Because the correlation for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions is close to 1, it can be described by $Y_C=0$ if one assumes




FIG. 6. d - ^3He correlation functions for different reaction systems. The dashed lines are extreme bounds for the background correlation function. The solid line is a calculation with $T = 4$ MeV for the ^{14}N and $T = 3$ MeV for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions assuming a background correlation function between the two extremes. For normalization see Table II.

the maximum background correlation function shown by the upper dashed curve. It can also be somewhat better described by a nonzero resonance yield depicted by the calculated correlation function (solid curve) which assumes a background correlation function between the two extremes (depicted by the dashed lines).

Figure 7 shows α - α correlation functions. The peak at $q \approx 105$ MeV/c results from the decay of the 3.04 MeV state in ^8Be ($J^\pi = 2^+$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 1.5$, $\Gamma_\alpha/\Gamma = 1.00$ [72]). For the present investigation, the structures at lower relative momenta are not of interest; for a detailed discussion see Refs. [10,70]. To improve the agreement between calculated line shapes (solid lines in Fig. 7) and the data we have allowed the maximum background correlation, shown as the upper dashed line, to exceed unity. For ^{129}Xe -induced reactions the peaks of the correlation function due to the 2^+ state are only significantly smaller than for the ^{14}N -induced reactions. For the calculation of the efficiency function, the ^8Be parent distribution was assumed to be given by the parameters in Table I that were used to describe the ^7Be cross sections shown in Fig. 3.

The p - ^7Li correlation functions are shown in Fig. 8. The first maximum at $q \approx 25$ MeV/c corresponds to the 17.64 MeV state in ^8Be ($J^\pi = 1^+$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 10.7$ keV, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 1.00$ [72]), the second to the 18.15 MeV state ($J^\pi = 1^+$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 138$ keV). This state decays with $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.04$ to the 0.48 MeV state in ^7Li and with $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.96$ to the ground state of ^7Li [72]. The third peak consists of a group of states at 18.9 MeV ($J^\pi = 2^-$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 122$ keV, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.86$ [74]), 19.1 MeV ($J^\pi = 3^+$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 270$ keV, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 1.00$ [72]), 19.2 MeV ($J^\pi = 3^+$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 230$ keV, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.5$ [72]), 19.4 MeV ($J^\pi = 1^-$,




FIG. 7. α - α correlation functions for different reaction systems. The dashed lines are extreme bounds for the background correlation function. The solid line is a calculation with $T = 4$ MeV for the ^{14}N and $T = 3$ MeV for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions assuming the minimum background correlation function. The peak at $q=45$ MeV/c is largely due to the decay of the 2.43 MeV state in ^9Be ($^9\text{Be} \rightarrow 2\alpha + n$); in addition, it contains contributions from the “ghost peak” of the ^8Be ground state (see Ref. [10] and references therein). For normalization see Table II.




FIG. 8. p - ^7Li correlation functions for different reaction systems. The dashed lines are extreme bounds for the background correlation function. The solid line is a calculation with $T = 4$ MeV for the ^{14}N and $T = 3$ MeV for the ^{129}Xe -induced reactions assuming the maximum background correlation function. For normalization see Table II.

$\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} \approx 650$ keV; we assumed $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.5$ [72]), and 19.9 MeV ($J^\pi = 4^+$, $\Gamma_{\text{c.m.}} = 700$ keV, $\Gamma_p/\Gamma = 0.04$ [72]). We could not describe all these states assuming a thermal population of excited states in ^8Be and a background correlation function which increases monotonically with q according to Eq. (5). This may indicate a nonstatistical population of states. On the other hand, structures could occur in the correlation function due to three-body decays or decays to excited states in ^7Li . To explore this as a possible upper limit of the experimental background, we have explored hand-drawn dashed lines, shown in Fig. 8, as extreme limits to the background.

V. RESULTS

In general, sequential feeding from particle decays of heavier nuclei will influence the ratios of the yields of particle-unstable excited states for specific fragments. For ratios involving the particular excited states of ^4He , ^5Li , and ^8Be discussed in this paper, detailed calculations have shown that they are rather insensitive to sequential feeding corrections. Therefore emission temperature can be described by comparing the experimental yields to yields calculated by Eqs. (7) and (8). Figure 9 shows measured ratios of the p - t coincidence yield from the $J^\pi = 0^+$ state at 20.21 MeV to the measured particle-stable yield of ^4He . For this comparison, the yield from $J^\pi = 0^+$ state was integrated over the interval $q = 10$ – 30 MeV/c. The calculated resonances, given by the solid curves in Fig. 4, were integrated over the same relative momentum range as in the data. Ratios calculated as function of the temperature parameter T are shown in Fig. 9 as solid lines. The uncertainties for the experimental ratios (shaded areas in Fig. 9) are given by the uncertainties in the subtraction of the background function of the measured p - t yields. (This uncer-




FIG. 9. Ratios between the ($J^\pi = 0^+$) state at 20.21 MeV and the total yield of ${}^4\text{He}$. The upper panels show ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (left) and ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$ (right) at $E/A = 75$ MeV, the lower panel ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (left) and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$ (right) at $E/A = 31$ MeV, respectively.

tainty has been estimated from the dashed lines in Fig. 4.) These bounds determine the corresponding uncertainties of the extracted temperatures. For the ${}^{14}\text{N}$ -induced reactions, which are dominated by preequilibrium processes, apparent temperatures of $T = 4.8 \pm 0.3$ MeV ($T = 4.7 \pm 0.3$ MeV) for the ${}^{27}\text{Al}$ (${}^{197}\text{Au}$) target, respectively, were found. For the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions, which are more sensitive to equilibrium emission mechanisms, distinctly lower apparent temperatures of $T = 3.1 \pm 0.2$ MeV ($T = 3.5 \pm 0.3$ MeV) for the ${}^{27}\text{Al}$ (${}^{122}\text{Sn}$) target, respectively, were observed. Lower temperatures ($T = 2.2^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$ MeV) were measured by Dabrowski *et al.* [75] in ${}^{40}\text{Ar} + \text{Ag}$ collisions at $E/A=44$ MeV for ${}^4\text{He}$ fragments emitted at backward angles. This difference between our temperatures for the ${}^{122}\text{Sn}$ target and those of Dabrowski *et al.* are surprising and not understood.

To obtain the population ratios for states in ${}^5\text{Li}$, we used the particle-unstable “ground state” ($J^\pi = 3/2^-$), which decays into $p\text{-}\alpha$ pairs, and integrated the $p\text{-}\alpha$ yield from $q = 25$ MeV/ c to $q = 100$ MeV/ c (Fig. 5). The yield of the high-lying ($J^\pi = 3/2^+$) state at 16.7 MeV, which decays preferentially into $d\text{-}{}^3\text{He}$ pairs, was integrated from $q = 10$ MeV/ c to $q = 60$ MeV/ c (Fig. 6). Ratios calculated as a function of emission temperature are shown in Fig. 10 as solid lines. Again the ${}^{14}\text{N}$ -induced reactions reveal higher temperatures than those with ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ as projectiles. For the latter only upper limits could be estimated because the $d\text{-}{}^3\text{He}$ correlations (Fig. 6) were consistent with the maximum bound of the background correlation. Here, we found temperatures of $T = 3.9 \pm 0.3$ MeV ($T = 3.7 \pm 0.2$ MeV) for the ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$) reaction and temperatures of $T \leq 3.0$ MeV ($T \leq 3.5$ MeV) for the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$) reaction, respectively.

Population ratios of widely separated states in ${}^8\text{Be}$ fragments (Figs. 7 and 8) give similar results. Here, we analyzed the ratio between the ($J^\pi = 1^+$) state at 17.64 MeV, which decays in p and ${}^7\text{Li}$, and the ($J^\pi = 2^+$)




FIG. 10. Ratios between the ($J^\pi = 3/2^+$) state at 16.7 MeV in ${}^5\text{Li}$ and the ($J^\pi = 3/2^-$) particle-unstable “ground state.” The upper panels show ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (left) and ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$ (right) at $E/A = 75$ MeV, the lower panel ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (left) and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$ (right) at $E/A = 31$ MeV, respectively.

state at 3.04 MeV, which decays into two α particles. Yields of the $p\text{-}{}^7\text{Li}$ and $\alpha\text{-}\alpha$ decay channels were integrated from $q = 18$ MeV/ c to 32 MeV/ c and from $q = 65$ MeV/ c to 160 MeV/ c , respectively. Consistent with the results for ${}^4\text{He}$ and ${}^5\text{Li}$ fragments, higher temperatures are observed (Fig. 11) for ${}^{14}\text{N}$ -induced reactions at the higher incident energy of $E/A = 75$ MeV ($T = 4.9 \pm 0.9$ MeV for ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ and $T = 4.5 \pm 0.9$ MeV for ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$, respectively) and lower temperatures for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions at the lower incident energy of $E/A = 31$ MeV ($T = 3.3 \pm 0.5$ MeV for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ and $T = 3.9 \pm 1.0$ MeV for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$, respectively).

A summary of all extracted emission temperatures is shown in Fig. 12. The uncertainties are due to extreme




FIG. 11. Ratios between the ($J^\pi = 1^+$) state in ${}^8\text{Be}$ at 17.64 MeV and the ($J^\pi = 2^+$) state at 3.04 MeV. The upper panels show ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (left) and ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$ (right) at $E/A = 75$ MeV, the lower panel ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (left) and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$ (right) at $E/A = 31$ MeV, respectively.




FIG. 12. Extracted apparent temperatures from widely spaced levels of the fragments ${}^4\text{He}$, ${}^5\text{Li}$, and ${}^8\text{Be}$. The uncertainties are due to the extreme assumptions of the background correlation functions indicated in Figs. 4–8. The fragment averaged temperature bounds are marked by dashed lines. (For ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions the average was taken over the ${}^4\text{He}$ and ${}^8\text{Be}$ fragments.)

assumptions of the background correlation functions. Estimates of the range of emission temperatures consistent with these measurements are indicated by the dashed lines; for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions the average was taken over the ${}^4\text{He}$ and ${}^8\text{Be}$ fragments. Emission temperatures from the states discussed in this paper are expected to be robust with respect to distortions due to sequential feeding from heavier particle-unstable nuclei for temperatures less than 5 MeV [61]. The largest distortions were predicted for ${}^4\text{He}$ for which calculations at $T = 5$ MeV predict populations corresponding to extracted temperatures which are about 0.5 MeV lower due to sequential decay.

The extracted temperatures fall into the established systematics for light projectiles impinging on heavier targets. Figure 13 shows a comparison of the extracted temperatures for a variety of incident energies. The solid diamonds provide the results for normal kinematics (preequilibrium emission) and the solid circles provide the results for reverse kinematics (emission from target-like residues) obtained in the present work.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have measured the relative populations of widely separated states in ${}^4\text{He}$, ${}^5\text{Li}$, and ${}^8\text{Be}$ fragments. We studied ${}^{14}\text{N}$ -induced reactions at $E/A = 75$ MeV for which emission is dominated by the early nonequilibrated stages of the reaction and ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions at $E/A = 31$ MeV for which emission is dominated by the




FIG. 13. Systematics of emission temperature parameters extracted for light projectiles impinging on heavy targets. The upper, middle, and lower panels show temperatures extracted from relative populations of unbound states for ${}^4\text{He}$, ${}^5\text{Li}$, and ${}^8\text{Be}$ fragments, respectively. We included temperature parameters from [20] (crosses), [10,18,26] (open diamonds), [27] (star), and data (${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$) from this work (solid diamonds). Additional temperatures from the reaction ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ (this work) are plotted at $E/A = 31$ MeV (solid circles). The dashed lines show a least-squares fit to the full set of data.

later equilibrated stages of the reaction.

Average emission temperatures extracted from the relative populations of widely separated states are $T = 4.3 \pm 0.2$ MeV for ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ and $T = 4.1 \pm 0.2$ MeV for ${}^{14}\text{N}+{}^{197}\text{Au}$. These values are significantly smaller than the values of “kinetic temperature” parameters ($T \approx 18$ – 20 MeV) which characterize the slopes of the kinetic energy spectra of protons emitted at $\theta_{\text{lab}} \approx 25^\circ$ [65]. The extracted emission temperatures are consistent with previous measurements (Fig. 13). Their low values may be related to cooling due to expansion [43,44,48], to pre-equilibrium effects [20,45,55–58,76,77], or both.

Average emission temperatures extracted for the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions were lower by about 1 MeV, $T = 3.1 \pm 0.2$ MeV for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ and $T = 3.5 \pm 0.3$ MeV for ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$ (Fig. 12). For the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{27}\text{Al}$ reaction, these temperatures are slightly smaller than the kinetic temperature parameters $T \approx 4$ – 6 MeV which characterize the energy spectra for protons [65]. The same is true for the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}+{}^{122}\text{Sn}$ reaction for which the extracted temperature is slightly smaller than the kinetic temperature ($T \approx 4$ MeV) which characterizes the emission of protons [65] from the projectilelike source which dominates emission at the angles of the present measurement. Previous investigations [78] have reported that the apparent temperatures of such spectra are considerably larger than the temperature of compound systems. These studies suggest that such backward angle proton spectra may still be contaminated by preequilibrium emission.

Within experimental errors, the emission temperatures extracted for the ${}^{129}\text{Xe}$ -induced reactions are comparable

(though slightly smaller in magnitude) to temperatures previously extracted from other reactions at comparable incident energies per nucleon in which large nonequilibrium contributions could not be excluded (Fig. 13). For example, average emission temperatures of $T=3-4$ MeV were determined from the population of particle-unbound states of particles emitted at $\theta_{\text{lab}} \approx 38^\circ$ in the $^{14}\text{N}+^{\text{nat}}\text{Ag}$ reaction at $E/A=35$ MeV [18] and from the relative populations of particle-stable states in $^{32}\text{S}+^{\text{nat}}\text{Ag}$ (and $\theta_{\text{lab}} \approx 20^\circ-50^\circ$) [5].

The emission temperatures determined for $^{129}\text{Xe}+^{27}\text{Al}$ are also smaller than temperatures expected for equilibrated fusionlike residues. Linear momentum transfer (LMT) systematics [79] predict a ratio of the linear momentum transfer to the initial beam momentum of $p_{\parallel}/p_{\text{beam}} = 0.73$ and, as determined from an incomplete fusion scenario for the $^{129}\text{Xe}+^{27}\text{Al}$ reaction, an excitation energy of $E^*/A = 3.4$ MeV. Assuming a level density parameter of $a = A/8$ MeV $^{-1}$, this provides a compound nucleus temperature of 5.2 MeV, which is significantly larger than the observed emission temperature. This estimate of excitation energy from an incomplete fusion ansatz is an upper limit, however, since all the missing beam momentum is assumed to be carried away by particles moving with the beam velocity and with zero transverse momenta.

BUU transport equations calculations, which do account for particle emission at nonzero emission angles, predict residue temperatures of about 3 MeV for calculations of the similar $^{40}\text{Ar} + ^{124}\text{Sn}$ system, assuming a soft equation of state at low density [45]. Further measurements are needed to determine whether such calculations can also reproduce the energy spectra or other observables in this reaction.

While emission temperatures extracted for preequilibrium processes are distinguished from emission temperatures extracted for long time scale evaporation processes, we should emphasize that the present inclusive measurements cannot provide an unambiguous characterization of the emitting system (or systems). More specificity can only be obtained by measurements with full event characterization. Until now, only few such measurements have been performed [12,15,19]. These measurements reveal an increased degree of equilibration for central collisions [19], but otherwise rather similar [12,15,19] average emission temperatures for central and peripheral collisions. All existing experimental data on the relative populations of states indicate that fragment emission is favored when the emitting system (or systems) reaches temperatures of the order of 3–6 MeV. The present data indicate that the observed weak energy dependence [20] persists over a broad range of energies and reaction mechanisms, including emission from near-equilibrated heavy residues. The interpretation of this experimental observation, however, is still uncertain.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-89-13815 and the Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG-0288ER.40404.A. W.G.L. acknowledges the financial support of the U.S. Presidential Young Investigator Program, and N.C. acknowledges partial support by the FAPESP, Brazil. C.S. acknowledges the financial support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Federal Republic of Germany).

-
- [1] D. J. Morrissey, W. Benenson, E. Kashy, B. Sherrill, A. D. Panagiotou, R. A. Blue, R. M. Ronningen, J. van der Plicht, and H. Utsunomiya, *Phys. Lett.* **148B**, 423 (1984).
 - [2] D. J. Morrissey, W. Benenson, E. Kashy, C. Bloch, M. Lowe, R. A. Blue, R. M. Ronningen, B. Sherrill, H. Utsunomiya, and I. Kelson, *Phys. Rev. C* **32**, 877 (1985).
 - [3] D. J. Morrissey, C. Bloch, W. Benenson, E. Kashy, R. A. Blue, R. M. Ronningen, and R. Aryaeinejad, *Phys. Rev. C* **34**, 761 (1986).
 - [4] H. M. Xu, D. J. Fields, W. G. Lynch, M. B. Tsang, C. K. Gelbke, M. Maier, D. J. Morrissey, J. Pochodzalla, D. G. Sarantites, L. G. Sobotka, M. L. Halbert, D. C. Hensley, D. Hahn, and H. Stöcker, *Phys. Lett. B* **182**, 155 (1986).
 - [5] H. M. Xu, W. G. Lynch, C. K. Gelbke, M. B. Tsang, D. J. Fields, M. R. Maier, D. J. Morrissey, T. K. Nayak, J. Pochodzalla, D. G. Sarantites, L. G. Sobotka, M. L. Halbert, and D. C. Hensley, *Phys. Rev. C* **40**, 186 (1989).
 - [6] J. G. del Campo, J. L. Charvet, A. D'Onofrio, R. L. Auble, J. R. Beene, M. L. Halbert, and H. J. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 290 (1988).
 - [7] J. G. del Campo, R. L. Auble, J. R. Beene, M. L. Halbert, H. J. Kim, A. D'Onofrio, and J. L. Charvet, *Phys. Rev. C* **43**, 2689 (1991).
 - [8] J. Pochodzalla, W. A. Friedman, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, M. Maier, D. Ardouin, H. Delagrange, H. Doubre, C. Grégoire, A. Kyanowski, W. Mittig, A. Péghaire, J. Péter, F. Saint-Laurent, Y. P. Viyogi, B. Zwieglinski, G. Bizard, F. Lefébvre, B. Tamain, and J. Québert, *Phys. Lett.* **161B**, 275 (1985).
 - [9] J. Pochodzalla, W. A. Friedman, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, M. Maier, D. Ardouin, H. Delagrange, H. Doubre, C. Grégoire, A. Kyanowski, W. Mittig, A. Péghaire, J. Péter, F. Saint-Laurent, Y. P. Viyogi, B. Zwieglinski, G. Bizard, F. Lefébvre, B. Tamain, and J. Québert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 177 (1985).
 - [10] J. Pochodzalla, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, M. Maier, D. Ardouin, H. Delagrange, H. Doubre, C. Grégoire, A. Kyanowski, W. Mittig, A. Péghaire, J. Péter, F. Saint-Laurent, B. Zwieglinski, G. Bizard, F. Lefébvre, B. Tamain, J. Québert, Y. P. Viyogi, W. A. Friedman, and D. H. Boal, *Phys. Rev. C* **35**, 1695 (1987).
 - [11] Z. Chen, C. K. Gelbke, J. Pochodzalla, C. B. Chitwood, D. J. Fields, W. G. Lynch, and M. B. Tsang, *Phys. Lett. B* **186**, 280 (1987).
 - [12] Z. Chen, C. K. Gelbke, J. Pochodzalla, C. B. Chitwood, D. J. Fields, W. G. Gong, W. G. Lynch, and M. B. Tsang, *Nucl. Phys.* **A473**, 564 (1987).

- [13] Z. Chen, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Gong, Y. D. Kim, W. G. Lynch, M. R. Maier, J. Pochodzalla, M. B. Tsang, F. Saint-Laurent, D. Ardouin, H. Delagrange, H. Doubre, J. Kasagi, A. Kyanowski, A. Péghaire, J. Péter, E. Rosato, G. Bizard, F. Lefébvres, B. Tamain, J. Québert, and Y. P. Viyogi, *Phys. Rev. C* **36**, 2297 (1987).
- [14] Z. Chen, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Gong, Y. D. Kim, W. G. Lynch, M. R. Maier, J. Pochodzalla, M. B. Tsang, F. Saint-Laurent, D. Ardouin, H. Delagrange, H. Doubre, J. Kasagi, A. Kyanowski, A. Péghaire, J. Péter, E. Rosato, G. Bizard, F. Lefébvres, B. Tamain, J. Québert, and Y. P. Viyogi, *Phys. Lett. B* **199**, 171 (1987).
- [15] F. Saint-Laurent, A. Kyanowski, D. Ardouin, H. Delagrange, H. Doubre, C. Grégoire, W. Mittig, A. Péghaire, J. Péter, G. Bizard, F. Lefébvres, B. Tamain, J. Québert, Y. P. Viyogi, J. Pochodzalla, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, and M. Maier, *Phys. Lett. B* **202**, 190 (1988).
- [16] D. Fox, A. Cebra, J. Karn, C. Parks, A. Pradhan, A. Vander Molen, J. van der Plicht, G. D. Westfall, W. K. Wilson, and R. S. Tickle, *Phys. Rev. C* **38**, 146 (1988).
- [17] T. K. Nayak, T. Murakami, W. G. Lynch, K. Swartz, D. J. Fields, C. K. Gelbke, Y. D. Kim, J. Pochodzalla, M. B. Tsang, H. M. Xu, F. Zhu, and K. Kwiatkowski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1021 (1989).
- [18] T. K. Nayak, T. Murakami, W. G. Lynch, K. Swartz, D. J. Fields, C. K. Gelbke, Y. D. Kim, J. Pochodzalla, M. B. Tsang, H. M. Xu, F. Zhu, and K. Kwiatkowski, *Phys. Rev. C* **45**, 132 (1992).
- [19] F. Zhu, W. G. Lynch, D. R. Bowman, R. T. de Souza, C. K. Gelbke, Y. D. Kim, L. Phair, M. B. Tsang, C. Williams, H. M. Xu, and J. Dinius, *Phys. Lett. B* **282**, 299 (1992).
- [20] G. J. Kunde, J. Pochodzalla, J. Aichelin, E. Berdermann, B. Berthier, C. Cerruti, C. K. Gelbke, J. Hubele, P. Kreuzer, S. Leray, R. Lucas, U. Lynen, U. Milkau, W. F. J. Müller, C. Ngô, C. H. Pinkenburg, G. Raciti, H. Sann, and W. Trautmann, *Phys. Lett. B* **272**, 202 (1991).
- [21] C. Bloch, W. Benenson, E. Kashy, D. J. Morrissey, R. A. Blue, R. Ronningen, and H. Utsunomiya, *Phys. Rev. C* **34**, 850 (1986).
- [22] C. Bloch, W. Benenson, A. I. Galonsky, E. Kashy, J. Heltsley, L. Heilbronn, M. Lowe, B. Remington, D. J. Morrissey, and J. Kasagi, *Phys. Rev. C* **36**, 203 (1987).
- [23] A. Galonsky, G. Caskey, L. Heilbronn, B. A. Remington, H. Schelin, F. Deák, A. Kiss, Z. Seres, and J. Kasagi, *Phys. Lett. B* **197**, 511 (1987).
- [24] F. Deák, A. Kiss, Z. Seres, A. Galonsky, C. K. Gelbke, L. Heilbronn, W. G. Lynch, T. Murakami, H. Schelin, M. B. Tsang, B. A. Remington, and J. Kasagi, *Phys. Rev. C* **39**, 733 (1989).
- [25] L. Heilbronn, A. Galonsky, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, T. Murakami, D. Sackett, H. Schelin, M. B. Tsang, F. Deák, A. Kiss, Z. Seres, J. Kasagi, and B. A. Remington, *Phys. Rev. C* **43**, 2318 (1991).
- [26] C. B. Chitwood, C. K. Gelbke, J. Pochodzalla, Z. Chen, D. J. Fields, W. G. Lynch, R. Morse, M. B. Tsang, D. H. Boal, and J. C. Shillcock, *Phys. Lett. B* **172**, 27 (1986).
- [27] H. Xi, W. Zhan, Y. Zhu, Z. Guo, X. Hu, G. Liu, J. Zhou, S. Yin, Y. Zhao, Z. Wei, and E. Fan, *Nucl. Phys.* **A552**, 281 (1993).
- [28] J. Galin, *Nucl. Phys.* **A488**, 297c (1988).
- [29] D. Jacquet, J. Galin, B. Borderie, D. Gardès, D. Guerreau, M. Lefort, F. Monnet, X. Tarrago, E. Duek, and J. M. Alexander, *Phys. Rev. C* **32**, 1594 (1985).
- [30] J. B. Natowitz, M. Gonin, K. Hagel, R. Wada, S. Shlomo, X. Bin, M. Gui, Y. Lou, D. Utley, T. Botting, R. K. Choudhury, L. Cooke, B. Hurst, D. O'Kelly, R. P. Schmitt, W. Turmel, H. Utsunomiya, G. Nebbia, D. Fabris, J. A. Ruiz, G. Nardelli, M. Poggi, R. Zanon, G. Viesti, R. H. Burch, F. Gramegna, G. Prete, D. Drain, B. Chambon, B. Cheynis, D. Guinet, X. Hu, A. Demeyer, C. Pastor, A. Giorni, A. Lleres, P. Stassi, B. Viano, A. M. Rocha, M. E. Brandan, and P. Gonthier, *Nucl. Phys.* **A538**, 263c (1992).
- [31] D. Fabris, K. Hagel, J. B. Natowitz, G. Nebbia, R. Wada, R. Billery, B. Cheynis, A. Demeyer, D. Drain, D. Guinet, C. Pastor, L. Vagneron, K. Zaid, J. Alarja, A. Giorni, D. Heuer, C. Morand, B. Viano, C. Mazur, C. Ngô, S. Leray, R. Lucas, M. Ribrag, and E. Tomasi, *Nucl. Phys.* **A471**, 351c (1987).
- [32] D. Fabris, K. Hagel, J. B. Natowitz, G. Nebbia, R. Wada, R. Billery, B. Cheynis, A. Demeyer, D. Drain, D. Guinet, C. Pastor, L. Vagneron, K. Zaid, J. Alarja, A. Giorni, D. Heuer, C. Morand, B. Viano, C. Mazur, C. Ngô, S. Leray, R. Lucas, M. Ribrag, and E. Tomasi, *Phys. Lett. B* **196**, 429 (1987).
- [33] M. Gonin, J. P. Coffin, G. Guillaume, F. Jundt, P. Wagner, P. Fintz, B. Heusch, A. Malki, A. Fahli, S. Knox, F. Merchez, and J. Mistretta, *Phys. Rev. C* **38**, 135 (1988).
- [34] K. Hagel, D. Fabris, P. Gonthier, H. Ho, Y. Lou, Z. Majka, G. Mouchaty, M. N. Nambodiri, J. B. Natowitz, G. Nebbia, R. P. Schmitt, G. Viesti, R. Wada, and B. Wilkins, *Nucl. Phys.* **A486**, 429 (1988).
- [35] M. Gonin, L. Cooke, K. Hagel, Y. Lou, J. B. Natowitz, R. P. Schmitt, B. Srivastava, W. Turmel, H. Utsunomiya, R. Wada, B. Fornal, G. Nardelli, G. Nebbia, G. Viesti, R. Zanon, G. Prete, P. Gonthier, and B. Wilkins, *Phys. Lett. B* **217**, 406 (1989).
- [36] M. Gonin, L. Cooke, K. Hagel, Y. Lou, J. B. Natowitz, R. P. Schmitt, S. Shlomo, B. Srivastava, W. Turmel, H. Utsunomiya, R. Wada, G. Nardelli, G. Nebbia, G. Viesti, R. Zanon, B. Fornal, G. Prete, K. Niita, S. Hannuschke, P. Gonthier, and B. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. C* **42**, 2125 (1990).
- [37] S. Song, M. F. Rivet, R. Bimbot, B. Borderie, I. Forest, J. Galin, D. Gardès, B. Gatty, M. Lefort, H. Oeschler, B. Tamain, and X. Tarrago, *Phys. Lett.* **130B**, 14 (1983).
- [38] D. Hilscher, H. Rossner, A. Gamp, U. Jahnke, B. Cheynis, B. Chambon, D. Drain, C. Pastor, G. Giorni, C. Morand, A. Dauchy, P. Stassi, and G. Pettit, *Phys. Rev. C* **36**, 208 (1987).
- [39] R. Wada, D. Fabris, K. Hagel, G. Nebbia, Y. Lou, M. Gonin, J. B. Natowitz, R. Billery, B. Cheynis, A. Demeyer, D. Drain, D. Guinet, C. Pastor, J. Alarja, A. Giorni, D. Heuer, C. Morand, B. Viano, C. Mazur, C. Ngô, S. Leray, R. Lucas, M. Ribrag, and E. Tomasi, *Phys. Rev. C* **39**, 497 (1989).
- [40] D. X. Jiang, H. Doubre, J. Galin, D. Guerreau, E. Piasecki, J. Pouthas, A. Sokolov, B. Cramer, G. Ingold, U. Jahnke, E. Schwinn, J. L. Charvet, J. Frehaut, B. Lott, C. Magnago, M. Morjean, Y. Patin, Y. Pranal, J. L. Uzureau, B. Gatty, and D. Jacquet, *Nucl. Phys.* **A503**, 560 (1989).
- [41] W. Bohne, H. Morgenstern, K. Grabisch, T. Nakagawa, and S. Proschitzki, *Phys. Rev. C* **41**, R5 (1990).
- [42] A. Chbihi, L. G. Sobotka, N. G. Nicolis, D. G. Sarantites, D. W. Stracener, Z. Majka, D. C. Hensley, J. R. Beene, and M. L. Halbert, *Phys. Rev. C* **43**, 666 (1991).

- [43] H. W. Barz, J. P. Bondorf, and H. Schulz, *Phys. Lett. B* **184**, 125 (1987).
- [44] W. A. Friedman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 2125 (1988).
- [45] H. M. Xu, P. Danielewicz, and W. G. Lynch, *Phys. Lett. B* **299**, 199 (1992).
- [46] D. H. Boal, N. Glosli, and C. Wicentowich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 737 (1989).
- [47] J. Bondorf, R. Donangelo, I. N. Mishustin, and H. Schulz, *Nucl. Phys.* **A444**, 460 (1985).
- [48] D. H. E. Gross and H. Massmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **A471**, 339c (1987).
- [49] H. Fuchs and H. Homeyer, in *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Particle Correlations and Interferometry in Nuclear Collisions*, Nantes, 1990, edited by D. Ardouin (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990), p. 305.
- [50] S. Ban-Hao and D. H. E. Gross, *Nucl. Phys.* **A437**, 643 (1985).
- [51] P. J. Siemens and J. O. Rasmussen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 880 (1979).
- [52] M. B. Tsang, C. B. Chitwood, D. J. Fields, C. K. Gelbke, D. R. Klesch, W. G. Lynch, K. Kwiatkowski, and V. E. Viola, Jr., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1967 (1984).
- [53] M. B. Tsang, R. M. Ronningen, G. Bertsch, Z. Chen, C. B. Chitwood, D. J. Fields, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, T. Nayak, J. Pochodzalla, T. Shea, and W. Trautmann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 559 (1986).
- [54] M. B. Tsang, W. G. Lynch, R. M. Ronningen, Z. Chen, C. K. Gelbke, T. Nayak, J. Pochodzalla, F. Zhu, M. Tohyama, W. Trautmann, and W. Dünneweber, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1479 (1988).
- [55] W. Terlau, M. Bürgel, A. Budzanowski, H. Fuchs, H. Homeyer, G. Röscher, J. Uckert, and R. Vogel, *Z. Phys. A* **330**, 303 (1988).
- [56] C. Schwarz, H. Fuchs, H. Homeyer, K. Möhring, T. Schmidt, A. Siwek, A. Sourell, W. Terlau, and A. Budzanowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **279**, 223 (1992).
- [57] K. Möhring, T. Srokowski, D. H. E. Gross, and H. Homeyer, *Phys. Lett. B* **203**, 210 (1988).
- [58] K. Möhring, T. Srokowski, and D. H. E. Gross, *Nucl. Phys.* **A533**, 333 (1991).
- [59] W. A. Friedman and W. G. Lynch, *Phys. Rev. C* **28**, 16 (1983).
- [60] D. J. Fields, W. G. Lynch, C. B. Chitwood, C. K. Gelbke, M. B. Tsang, H. Utsunomiya, and J. Aichelin, *Phys. Rev. C* **30**, 1912 (1984).
- [61] Z. Chen and C. K. Gelbke, *Phys. Rev. C* **38**, 2630 (1988).
- [62] W. G. Gong, Y. D. Kim, G. Poggi, Z. Chen, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, M. R. Maier, T. Murakami, M. B. Tsang, and H. M. Xu, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* **268**, 190 (1988).
- [63] W. G. Gong, Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1991.
- [64] D. J. Fields, W. G. Lynch, T. K. Nayak, M. B. Tsang, C. B. Chitwood, C. K. Gelbke, R. Morse, J. Wilczynski, T. C. Awes, R. L. Ferguson, F. Plasil, F. E. Obenshain, and G. R. Young, *Phys. Rev. C* **34**, 536 (1986).
- [65] W. G. Gong, C. K. Gelbke, W. Bauer, N. Carlin, R. T. de Souza, Y. D. Kim, W. G. Lynch, T. Murakami, G. Poggi, D. P. Sanderson, M. B. Tsang, H. M. Xu, D. J. Fields, K. Kwiatkowski, R. Planeta, V. E. Viola, S. J. Yennello, and S. Pratt, *Phys. Rev. C* **43**, 1804 (1991).
- [66] A. M. Lane and R. G. Thomas, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **30**, 257 (1958).
- [67] I. Y. Barit and V. A. Sergeev, *Yad. Fiz.* **13**, 1230 (1971) [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **13**, 708 (1971)].
- [68] T. Stammbach and R. L. Walter, *Nucl. Phys.* **A180**, 225 (1972).
- [69] W. E. Kunz, *Phys. Rev.* **97**, 456 (1955).
- [70] F. C. Barker and P. B. Treacy, *Nucl. Phys.* **38**, 33 (1962).
- [71] J. Pochodzalla, W. A. Friedman, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, M. Maier, D. Ardouin, H. Delagrange, H. Doubre, C. Grégoire, A. Kyanowski, W. Mittig, A. Péghaire, J. Péter, F. Saint-Laurent, Y. P. Viyogi, B. Zwieglinski, G. Bizard, F. Lefébvres, B. Tamain, and J. Québert, *Phys. Lett.* **161B**, 256 (1985).
- [72] F. Ajzenberg-Selove, *Nucl. Phys.* **A490**, 1 (1988).
- [73] D. R. Tilley, H. R. Weller, and G. M. Hale, *Nucl. Phys.* **A541**, 1 (1992).
- [74] P. E. Koehler, C. D. Bowman, F. J. Steinkruger, D. C. Moody, G. M. Hale, J. W. Starner, S. A. Wender, R. C. Haight, P. W. Lisowski, and W. L. Talbert, *Phys. Rev. C* **37**, 917 (1988).
- [75] H. Dabrowski, D. Goujdami, F. Guilbault, C. Lebrun, D. Ardouin, P. Lautridou, R. Boisgard, J. Québert, A. Péghaire, P. Eudes, F. Sébille, and B. Remaud, *Phys. Lett. B* **247**, 223 (1990).
- [76] D. H. Boal and J. N. Glosli, *Phys. Rev. C* **37**, 91 (1988).
- [77] D. H. Boal and J. N. Glosli, *Phys. Rev. C* **42**, R502 (1990).
- [78] V. E. Viola, *Nucl. Phys.* **A471**, 53c (1987).
- [79] M. Fatyga, K. Kwiatkowski, V. E. Viola, C. B. Chitwood, D. J. Fields, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, J. Pochodzalla, M. B. Tsang, and M. Blann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 1376 (1985).