Decays of 15 **Be**($5/2^+$)

H. T. Fortune

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA

 \bigcirc (Received 2 October 2018; published 26 November 2018)

I have computed spectroscopic factors S and single-particle widths Γ_{sp} , and hence expected decay widths $\Gamma_{\text{calc}} = S \Gamma_{\text{sp}}$ for decay of the lowest $5/2^+$ state of ¹⁵Be to the ground state and first 2^+ state of ¹⁴Be. Results indicate that decay to the 2^+ state should be appreciable.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.98.054317](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.98.054317)

I. INTRODUCTION

The apparent ground state $(g.s.)$ of ¹⁵Be has been identified as a $5/2^+$ resonance that decays to ¹⁴Be + n with an energy of $1.8(1)$ MeV and a width of $0.58(20)$ MeV [\[1\]](#page-1-0). It was produced by neutron addition to 14 Be and observed by detecting ¹⁴Be and *n* in coincidence. Most calculations predict a $3/2^{+}$, and perhaps a $1/2^+$, state nearby, but they have never been observed. At present, it is unclear if the $5/2^+$ is the g.s., or if another state exists below it. The failure to observe any other states in ¹⁵Be remains a bit of a puzzle.

Earlier $[2]$, I examined the properties of the lowest $5/2^+$ state in 15 Be in a simple model [\[3\]](#page-1-0) that has been shown to work well for other core $+$ 3n nuclei. In ¹⁷C and ¹⁹O, the model reproduces the absolute energy of the lowest $5/2^+$ state to within 60 keV in 17 C and 100 keV in 19 O [\[2\]](#page-1-0). In these two cases, the s and d single-particle energies (spe's) are well known in ${}^{15}C$ and ${}^{17}O$. However, for ${}^{15}Be$, the spe's in ${}^{13}Be$ are poorly known. I thus used the observed $5/2^+$ energy of 1.8 MeV in ¹⁵Be [\[1\]](#page-1-0) to put constraints on the s and d spe's in 13 Be [\[2\]](#page-1-0). I discussed two separate solutions from the allowed continuous range of E_s vs E_d .

The reported width for ${}^{15}Be(5/2^+)$ of 0.58(20) MeV has a large uncertainty, but I pointed out that its central value was considerably larger than expected [\[2\]](#page-1-0). Earlier [\[4\]](#page-1-0), I suggested that several neutron-decay widths obtained from decay-inflight experiments appear to be too large by a factor of about 1.6. Another possibility is that some of the width comes from decay of the $5/2^+$ state to the first 2^+ state at 1.54 MeV in $¹⁴$ Be. Here, I explore that possibility further.</sup>

II. CALCULATIONS AND RESULTS

Relevant energies are depicted in Fig. 1. For $\ell = 2$ decay of the $5/2^+$ state to the 0^+ g.s., I have computed the single-particle (sp) width in a Woods-Saxon potential well, having geometric parameters of r_0 , $a = 1.26$, 0.60 fm. At an energy of 1.8 MeV, this sp width is 0.46 MeV. For $\ell = 0$ decay of the $5/2^+$ state to the 2^+ first-excited state, the absence of a barrier for s-wave neutron resonances is a complication. These widths should vary as $E^{1/2}$. With no barrier, a "sp width" can be approximated as \hbar divided by the fly-by time, so that $\Gamma_{sp} \sim \hbar v/D$, where v is the speed of the projectile and D is some measure of the diameter of the nucleus. With $E = mv^2/2$, $D = 2r_0A^{1/3}$, and $r_0 = 1.3$ fm, the result is

 $\Gamma_{\text{sp}} \sim (2E)^{1/2}$, where I have used the fact that $\hbar^2/(2m_n)$ = 20.7 in the Mev-fm-amu system of units. Thus, for present purposes, I have used $\Gamma_{\text{sp}}(\ell = 0) = (2E)^{1/2}$. Then, for the decay being considered, the sp width is 0.72 MeV. Because of the low energy of this decay, $\ell = 2$ decay can be ignored.

With these sp widths, the expected widths can be calculated with the expression $\Gamma_{\text{calc}} = S\Gamma_{\text{sp}}$, where S is the spectroscopic factor. For these, I have used the wave functions from my two solutions for the ¹²Be + 3*n* calculation [\[2\]](#page-1-0). Because those two solutions had different E_s and E_d in ¹³Be, the wave functions for 0^+ and 2^+ are also different. Results are listed in Tables [I](#page-1-0) and [II.](#page-1-0) An analysis [\[5\]](#page-1-0) of 2n decays [\[6\]](#page-1-0) of the first 2^+ state of ¹⁴Be implied that its structure was $0.84(sd)^2$ and $0.16(sd)^4$. I have used that result here.

Snyder *et al.* [\[1\]](#page-1-0) quote a spectroscopic factor of 0.44 and a sp width of 0.40 keV for the g.s. decay. My S is considerably larger for both sets of wave functions, but the calculated g.s. decay width is still smaller than the central value of the experimental width. It can be noted that decay to the 2^+ state cannot be ignored. With both sets of wave functions, it is calculated to be an appreciable fraction of the total. Comparison with the experimental value implies a slight preference for Solution 2, but not overwhelmingly so. A very recent paper on 13 Be [\[7\]](#page-1-0) reports an energy of 0.86(4) MeV and a width of 1.70(15) MeV for the $1/2^+$ resonance and an energy of 2.11(5) MeV for $5/2^+$.

Of course, because the 2^+ state is unbound with respect to ¹²Be + 2n, decay to it results in a ¹²Be + 3n final state. In a

FIG. 1. The $5/2^+$ state in ¹⁵Be and relevant states in ¹⁴Be and 12Be.

Quantity	Solution 1	Solution 2	
E_s (MeV)	~ 0	0.50	
E_d (MeV)	2.3	1.88	
¹⁴ Be(sd) ² 0 ⁺	$0.85s^2$, $0.15d^2$	$0.41s^2$, $0.59d^2$	
¹⁴ Be(sd) ² 2 ⁺	$0.92ds$, $0.08d^2$	$0.81ds, 0.19d^2$	
¹⁵ Be(sd) ³ 5/2 ⁺	$0.14d^3$, $0.01d^2s$, $0.85ds^2$	$0.59d^3$, \sim $0d^2s$, $0.41ds^2$	

TABLE I. Results of two solutions to the ¹⁵Be(5/2⁺) = ¹²Be + 3n problem [2].

search for the $3/2^+$ state of ¹⁵Be, Kuchera *et al.* [8] looked for $12Be + 3n$ coincidences following two-proton removal from $17¹⁷C$, but results were inconclusive. They reported that their data could be understood without invoking the participation of any ¹⁵Be states. However, 2p removal from the $3/2$ ⁺ g.s. of $17¹⁷C$ would not be expected to strongly populate the $5/2⁺$ state of 15Be, even though it might be the best candidate for making the $3/2^+$ state. It would be worthwhile to look for $^{12}Be + 3n$ decays following an experiment that strongly populates this state. Adding a neutron to 14 Be, as in the original work [7], is probably the most promising such reaction for making the $5/2$ ⁺ state. Those authors did not have the ability to examine $3n$ events at the time [9]. Another possibility might be ${}^{14}C({}^{16}C, {}^{15}O)$ ${}^{15}Be$. As a "stable" beam experiment, the reaction ${}^{14}C({}^{14}C, {}^{13}O)$ ${}^{15}Be$ might be worth a look. A smaller uncertainty on its width would also be welcome.

III. SUMMARY

Using wave functions from an earlier treatment of the lowest $5/2^+$ state of ¹⁵Be [2], I have computed spectroscopic factors and expected widths for decay of this state to the 0^+ g.s. and 2^+ first-excited state of 14 Be. The predicted width for decay to the 2^+ state turns out to be an appreciable fraction of the total.

TABLE II. Widths (MeV) and spectroscopic factors for decay of ¹⁵Be(5/2⁺) to lowest 0^+ and 2^+ states of ¹⁴Be.

Source	Decay to 0^+ via $\ell = 2$		Decay to 2^+ via $\ell = 0$			$\Gamma_{\rm calc}$ (tot)	$\Gamma_{\rm exp}$	
	\mathbf{I} sp		$\frac{1}{2}$ calc	\mathbf{I}_{SD}		$\frac{1}{2}$ calc		
Solution $1\,[2]$	0.46	0.94	0.43	0.72	0.55	0.39	0.82	0.58(20)
Solution $2 \lceil 2 \rceil$	0.46	0.80	0.37	0.72	0.23	0.17	0.54	
Reference $[1]$	0.40	0.44	0.18	NA	NA	NA	0.18	

- [1] J. Snyder *et al.*, [Phys. Rev. C](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.88.031303) **[88](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.88.031303)**, [031303\(R\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.88.031303) [\(2013\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.88.031303).
- [2] H. T. Fortune, [Phys. Rev. C](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.034314) **[91](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.034314)**, [034314](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.034314) [\(2015\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.034314).
- [3] R. D. Lawson, *Theory of the Nuclear Shell Model* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1980), p. 63ff.
- [4] H. T. Fortune, [Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.04.027) **[681](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.04.027)**, [7](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.04.027) [\(2012\)](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.04.027).
- [5] H.T. Fortune, [Phys. Rev. C](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.89.044312) **[89](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.89.044312)**, [044312](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.89.044312) [\(2014\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.89.044312).
- [6] Yu. Aksyutina *et al.*, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.242501) **[111](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.242501)**, [242501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.242501) [\(2013\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.242501).
- [7] G. Ribeiro *et al.*, [Phys. Rev. C](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.98.024603) **[98](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.98.024603)**, [024603](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.98.024603) [\(2018\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.98.024603).
- [8] A. N. Kuchera *et al.*, [Phys. Rev. C](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.017304) **[91](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.017304)**, [017304](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.017304) [\(2015\)](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.017304).
- [9] T. Baumann (private communication).