## Bound states of the multichannel ( $n\alpha\alpha$ ) system

D. S. Chuu, \* C. S. Han, \* and D. L. Lin

Department of Physics and Astronomy, State University of New York, Buffalo, New York 14214

(Received 10 January 1974)

The multichannel three-body model is applied to the  $(n \alpha \alpha)$  system to study the bound states of  ${}^9\text{Be}$ . The  $\alpha$  particle involved in this system is assumed to be a two-level particle to take care of its internal structure. The energies of the ground state  $[\frac{3}{2}]$  and an excited state  $[\frac{1}{2}]$  are calculated to be -1.76 and +0.68 MeV, respectively.

NUCLEAR STRUCTURE Be; calculated levels. Multichannel three-body model.

Recently, calculations of the bound states of  $^6\mathrm{Li}$  and  $^{12}\mathrm{C}$  have been made on the multichannel three-body model. In such a model, the  $\alpha$  particle involved in the  $\alpha$ -nucleon three-body system is assumed to be a two-level particle to take care of its internal structure approximately. The  $N-\alpha$  and  $\alpha-\alpha$  two-body potentials are obtained phenomenologically by multichannel analyses of the low-energy scattering data. Thus the picture has effectively taken into account all the inelastic channel contributions except for breakup of the  $\alpha$  particle.

The multichannel Faddeev equations are generalized to allow spin and internal-structure quantum numbers of the particles and are solved in the separable t-matrix approximation for bound-state energies. The results calculated for both the nuclei agree very well with the experimental values. It seems therefore interesting to carry out the same model calculation for <sup>9</sup>Be. Since the formulation of this problem is essentially the same as that of <sup>6</sup>Li which has been described in detail in Ref. 1, we shall only give a brief outline of the procedures in this note. The general formulas given in Ref. 1 can be readily applied to the present case and will not be reproduced here.

To treat a system of three particles that may have different spin and internal-structure states, we introduce a set of quantum numbers  $(r, m_r)$  in addition to the usual spin quantum numbers  $(s, m_s)$ . These new quantum numbers can be treated in exactly the same manner as the spin quantum numbers except that they do not couple with the angular-momentum operators. Thus for an elementary particle, we have  $r = m_r = 0$  and for a two-level particle such as the  $\alpha$  particle in our model, we have  $r = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $m_r = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ . In a representation in which particles j and k form a subsystem with particle ileft free, the internal state of the subsystem is characterized by  $\vec{R}_i = \vec{r}_i + \vec{r}_k$ , while  $\vec{R} = \vec{R}_i + \vec{r}_i$  is the corresponding quantum number of the three-body system.

The three-body states in general involve three parts, the internal-structure part, the spin part, and the spatial part. Written in these three-body states, the Faddeev equations represent a set of coupled integral equations in two continuous variables, i.e., the magnitudes of the two relative momenta. The angular-momentum states involved in the kernel can be decomposed completely by a procedure similar to those given by Omnes<sup>3</sup> and by Ahmadzadeh and Tjon<sup>4</sup> for single-channel case. The details of the calculations are presented in a thesis by Chuu.5 One of the variables can be explicitly integrated after making the separable tmatrix approximation as described by Ball and Wong.6 For bound-state problems, the twobody t matrix can be expressed in terms of a complete set of eigenfunctions of the homogeneous Lippman-Schwinger equation. The eigenvalue problem can be solved for given two-body potentials and these solutions are then used to calculate all the matrix elements of the kernel as a function of the three-body energy for a state of definite spin and parity. The bound-state energy in question is given by that energy for which the eigenvalue of the kernel matrix is unity.

]

The  $N-\alpha$  potential is represented by a  $2\times 2$  matrix and the  $\alpha-\alpha$  potential by a  $3\times 3$  matrix because of symmetry considerations. They are both l-dependent with each matrix element represented by a square well. In Refs. 1 and 2 two sets of parameters are given for each of these potentials. They fit the two-body scattering data equally well but yield slightly different results in the three-body calculations. We only take the best sets in the present work.

For the  $(n\,\alpha\alpha)$  system under consideration, we can apply the formulas in Sec. II of Ref. 1 by labeling, for instance, the neutron as particle 1 and the two  $\alpha$ 's as particle 2 and particle 3. Then we have  $\mathbf{r}_1=0$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_1=\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\mathbf{r}_2=\mathbf{r}_3=\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_2=\mathbf{s}_3=0$ . We have calculated the binding energies for the  $\frac{3}{2}$ - state, the

ground state of  ${}^9\mathrm{Be}$ , and the  $\frac{1}{2}{}^+$  state. Since the higher partial-wave contributions are insignificant in the three-body system, we have included only s and d waves for  $\alpha$ - $\alpha$  interaction, and s and p waves for N- $\alpha$  interaction. All the angular-momentum states that are consistent with the correct  $J^\pi$  values are included. Thus there are nine partial three-body states in the  $\frac{3}{2}{}^-$  state calculation and six partial three-body states in the  $\frac{1}{2}{}^+$  state calculation.

After Coulomb-energy correction which is 1.84 MeV for  $(n \alpha \alpha)$  system, we obtain -1.76 MeV for the ground-state energy of <sup>9</sup>Be and +0.68 MeV for the excited  $\frac{1}{2}$  tate. The corresponding experimental values are -1.57 MeV and +0.18 MeV. The only existing work that we are aware of has been made by Grubman and Witten who obtained -1.22 MeV for the ground state from a single-channel calculation.

<sup>\*</sup>Present address: National Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, China.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>D. S. Chuu, C. S. Han, and D. L. Lin, Phys. Rev. C <u>7</u>, 1329 (1973).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>C. S. Han, D. S. Chuu, and D. L. Lin, Nucl. Phys. A212, 241 (1973).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>R. Omnes, Phys. Rev. <u>134</u>, B1358, (1964).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>A. Ahmadzadeh and J. A. Tjon, Phys. Rev. <u>139</u>, B1805 (1965).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>D. S. Chuu, Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1972 (unpublished).

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>J. S. Ball and D. Y. Wong, Phys. Rev. <u>169</u>, 1362 (1968).
 <sup>7</sup>R. Grubman and T. Witten, Jr., Nucl. <u>Phys. A158</u>, 289 (1970).