

Nuclear Radii from Alpha-Particle Scattering and Alpha-Radioactivity

JOHN O. RASMUSSEN

Radiation Laboratory and Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, California

INTRODUCTION

ONE of the high points of the Birmingham Nuclear Physics Conference of four years ago was the talk of Professor Hofstadter, who described the electron scattering experiments which established nuclear charge distributions smaller than the size values generally accepted then. One question raised was, "How can these radii be consistent with the larger radii inferred from alpha decay data?" This is one of the central questions I will discuss here. In the short time since Birmingham there have come many important measurements from inelastic and elastic cross sections for alpha-particle bombardments on complex nuclei, measurements which help to answer the question above.

We have reached a more sophisticated level in our concepts of nuclear size. We divide experimental measurements of size into two categories; first, those measuring the charge (or matter) density distribution, such as electron scattering, and, second, those measuring the form of some nuclear potential, such as measurements of nucleon or alpha-particle interactions with nuclei. The second type of measurements quite generally yields larger measures of size than the first. Another degree of sophistication comes from considering the diffuse nature and occasionally the nonsphericity of the nuclear surface.

RADIUS DETERMINATIONS WITH SHARP CUTOFF MODELS

Many interpretations of the measurements of size of the nuclear potential for alpha particles are based on "sharp-cutoff" models which ignore any diffuseness of the potential and yield an effective nuclear radius parameter, R . First we survey such interpretations. Some types of measurements have not been made over wide enough range of mass number A to establish the two parameters in the formula $R = aA^{\frac{1}{3}} + b$. We shall therefore compare the R values at the mass number 209. This mass number lies near the lower border of the principal region of alpha emitters and near the upper border of the heavy stable nuclei usable as targets in alpha bombardment experiments. Furthermore, the nucleus Bi^{209} is surely spherical, lying adjacent to doubly-magic Pb^{208} .

Alpha decay rate data for even-even nuclei may be interpreted in terms of sharp cutoff Coulombic barrier penetration theory, and we are provided with a set of R

values for various alpha emitters.¹ Unfortunately for the applicability of alpha decay rates to measuring nuclear size, there is uncertainty about the fundamental rate of formation of alpha particles by nuclei; that is, we are uncertain regarding the hypothetical "decay rate in the absence of the barrier," f , or reduced width for alpha emission, $\delta^2 (= hf)$. Various alpha decay models have been proposed with f ranging from $\sim 10^{21} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ in the one-body models to $\sim 10^{15} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ in the form of many-body model proposed by Bethe² in 1937. Various other models lead to intermediate predictions. Table I shows the R values (in units of fermis, 10^{-13} cm) indicated for $A=209$ by an analysis of even-even alpha emitters with more than 126 neutrons, using the two extreme models mentioned.

The measurement of cross sections for nuclear inelastic processes in alpha-particle bombardment of nuclei affords another source of radius values, R .

Uranium and other available heavy element targets have been used in radiochemical studies of total (fission plus spallation) reaction cross sections as a function of alpha energy. Figure 1 shows one such excitation function³ compared to theoretical values⁴ for two different assumed radii. The results of such studies would extrapolate to a value of R of 10.4 for mass 209. (Distances are all in units of 10^{-13} cm .)

A few years ago the total inelastic cross sections of carbon, copper, and tantalum for 240-Mev alpha

TABLE I. Sharp cutoff radii from various measurements.

General type	Particular model or experiment	Indicated radius at mass 209 (10^{-13} cm)	References
I. Alpha decay	One body model $f \sim 10^{21} \text{ sec}^{-1}$	9.3	1, 2
	Extreme many-body model $f \sim 10^{15} \text{ sec}^{-1}$	12.2	2
II. Alpha cross sections for inelastic processes	a. Reaction cross sections (fission + spallation) in heavy elements near threshold	10.4	3
	b. 240-Mev alpha reaction cross sections	11.3	5
	c. (α, α') angular distributions in light elements	~ 10.8 (extrap.)	6
III. Alpha elastic scattering	Sharp cutoff model	10.6	10

¹ I. Perlman and J. O. Rasmussen, "Alpha Radioactivity" *Handbuch der Physik* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1957), Vol. 42.

² H. A. Bethe, *Revs. Modern Phys.* **9**, 69 (1937).

³ Vandembosch, Thomas, Vandembosch, Glass, and Seaborg, *Phys. Rev.* (to be published).

⁴ J. M. Blatt and V. F. Weisskopf, *Theoretical Nuclear Physics* (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1952), p. 352.

particles were measured by a beam-attenuation technique.⁵ The resulting radius formula derived from these measurements gives, when extrapolated to mass 209, an R value of 11.3.

Measurements of angular distributions of inelastically scattered alpha-particle groups have been made⁶ for several light nuclei ($A \lesssim 30$). In many cases these show diffraction maxima and minima much like those observed in deuteron stripping. By fitting the distributions to the theoretical expressions of Austern, Butler, and McManus⁷ an effective nuclear interaction radius is obtained. It is a long extrapolation from these nuclei to mass 209, but we include in Table I an approximate extrapolated radius figure of ~ 10.8 .

Our most extensive knowledge of the nuclear radius for alpha particles and its variation with mass number comes from alpha elastic scattering cross-section measurements. Figure 2, from a paper by Igo and Thaler,⁸ shows the angular variation of elastic cross sections for 40.2-Mev alpha particles, plotted as the ratio to the point charge Coulomb scattering cross section. Diffraction structure appears for the lighter nuclei, but for Ta and heavier nuclei the falloff with angle is generally smooth, though a semblance of diffraction structure is evident at Pb.⁹ Figure 3, from the




FIG. 1. Total reaction cross section³ (fission plus spallation) vs energy for alpha-particle bombardment of U^{235} . The dashed curves are based on theoretical values of Blatt and Weisskopf⁴ for two different choices of radius.

⁵ Millburn, Birnbaum, Crandall, and Schecter, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1268 (1954).

⁶ See original references in Table II of paper by Kerlee, Blair, and Farwell, Phys. Rev. **107**, 1343 (1957).

⁷ Austern, Butler, and McManus, Phys. Rev. **92**, 350 (1953).

⁸ G. Igo and R. M. Thaler, Phys. Rev. **106**, 126 (1957).

⁹ R. E. Ellis and L. Schecter, Phys. Rev. **101**, 636 (1956).




FIG. 2. Experimental ratio⁸ of the elastic scattering cross section to the pure Rutherford scattering cross section for 40.2-Mev alpha particles.

work of Kerlee, Blair, and Farwell, shows¹⁰ the variation of cross section with energy at fixed angles. There is a significant rise above the Coulomb cross section before the drop in the case of Pb^{208} and Bi^{209} . The rise is less pronounced in Pb^{207} and Pb^{206} and is absent for several target elements not shown in Fig. 3. The studies of Kerlee *et al.*¹⁰ cover a wide range of elements and energies and are analyzed by a sharp cutoff model¹¹ in which a pure coulombic barrier is assumed beyond a cutoff radius, R , defining a surface which is totally absorbing. That is, the nucleus is assumed to be completely black to partial waves with angular momentum less than critical, and partial waves with $l > l_c$ are assumed to give their full Coulomb scattering contribution. This model fails to reproduce the data at large angles but gives reasonable fits at small angles. Figure 4, from the paper of Kerlee *et al.*¹⁰ shows R values deduced with this model. These radii are best fitted by the formula $R = 1.414A^{1/3} + 2.190$. Significant deviations away from the best fit are evident as well as considerable short-term variations among nearly neighboring nuclei.

SIZE INTERPRETATIONS WITH DIFFUSE POTENTIALS

Optical model analyses have given excellent fits of alpha-elastic scattering angular distributions. These have generally used a form factor for real and imaginary

¹⁰ Kerlee, Blair, and Farwell, Phys. Rev. **107**, 1343 (1957).

¹¹ J. S. Blair, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1218 (1954).




FIG. 3. Cross section¹⁰ vs energy for elastic scattering of alpha particles from Pb²⁰⁶, Pb²⁰⁷, Pb²⁰⁸, and Bi²⁰⁹ at 42° (in the laboratory system).

potential of the Woods-Saxon type,¹²

$$\frac{V+iW}{1+\exp[(r-r_0)/d]}$$

The parameter d measures the diffuseness, and r_0 is the radius at which the nuclear potential has fallen to half its central value. Igo and Thaler⁸ published the following parameters as best fitting 40-Mev alpha scattering data:

$$r_0 = 1.35A^{1/3} + 1.3, \quad d = 0.5, \quad V = -45 \text{ Mev}, \quad W = -10 \text{ Mev}.$$

These potentials imply a short mean free path (~ 2 fermis) for the alphas in nuclear matter. There now seems to be some question as to how unique these values of the parameters are. Cheston and Glassgold¹³ find good fits are obtainable with widely different values of V if the r_0 value is simultaneously adjusted; i.e., the effect of deepening the potential V can be compensated by decreasing r_0 .¹⁴ The depth of the real potential is less

¹² R. D. Woods and D. S. Saxon, Phys. Rev. **95**, 577 (1954).

¹³ W. B. Cheston and A. E. Glassgold, Phys. Rev. **106**, 1215 (1957).

¹⁴ In the discussion of this paper and in Dr. Igo's paper a few days later, he pointed out that studies subsequent to his and Thaler's original publication showed that almost equally good optical model fits can be secured with various combinations of V and r_0 that gave the same potential tail at large radius. That is, various combinations that kept $V \exp(r_0/d)$ constant gave almost equally good fits, although the best fits were secured with the parameters they originally published as unique.

It seems reasonable that the alpha scattering analysis can only probe the potential in the surface region, since the mean-free path for absorption is so short. An optical model exponential potential

for 22-Mev alphas than for 40 Mev,⁸ the reverse of the behavior of the real potential for neutron or proton scattering.

We may make some comparison between the optical model potential and the nuclear charge distribution, since both have been analyzed using the same form factor. At mass 209 we find that the Igo-Thaler potential falls to half its central value at $r=9.3$ and to one-tenth (i.e., $4.5+i 1.0$ Mev) at $r=10.4$. The real potential would have fallen to 1 Mev at $r=11.2$.

Electron scattering analysis¹⁵ on bismuth indicates that the nuclear charge density falls to half its central value at 6.47 and to one-tenth at 7.82. Electron scattering in helium by McAllister and Hofstadter¹⁶ showed the alpha particle to be diffuse with an rms radius of 1.6. This finite size of the alpha particle probably contributes to the extension of the alpha-nuclear potential beyond the matter distribution, but the finite range of nuclear forces and other details probably also contribute to the extension.

Can we now apply the concept of diffuseness of the potential toward understanding the various sharp cut-off radii summarized in Table I?

Blair¹⁷ has rather thoroughly analyzed the connection of his sharp cutoff radii deduced from alpha elastic scattering to the optical model potentials. Simply stated, the pure Coulombic barrier at the sharp cutoff




FIG. 4. Sharp cutoff radii from elastic scattering of alpha particles.¹⁰ The radii are plotted against the cube root of the mass number. The straight line represents a least squares best fit.

in the surface region might be defined by three parameters, instead of the four in the Woods-Saxon expression. The three parameters would be the diffuseness parameter d and magnitude parameters for real and imaginary potential. These three parameters are probably uniquely determinable, but it appears that variation of the diffuseness parameter has not yet been done systematically enough to say that its value is well determined.

¹⁵ Hahn, Ravenhall, and Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. **101**, 1131 (1957); K. W. Ford and D. L. Hill, Ann. Nucl. Sci. **5**, 25 (1955).

¹⁶ R. W. McAllister and R. Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. **102**, 851 (1956).

¹⁷ J. S. Blair, Phys. Rev. **108**, 827 (1957).

radius and the diffuse optical model potential giving the best fit to a given set of scattering data usually have in common the same critical l_c value for the partial wave that can just surmount the Coulombic plus centrifugal barrier. From this connection it is apparent that the indicated sharp cutoff radius will be just slightly larger (because of the diffuse tail) than the radius at the maximum of the optical model barrier. At the sharp cutoff radius of 10.66 in Table I the optical model potential has fallen to around 3 Mev.

The fission-spallation reaction determination gives the value of $R=10.4$, closely similar to the alpha elastic value for reasons similar to those above. The "black" nucleus will almost totally absorb partial waves which can surmount the barrier, and these absorbed waves make up the total reaction cross section. Again the analysis will yield a sharp cutoff radius which gives equivalent values of critical angular momentum to those given by the true diffuse potential in the energy range considered.

The 240-Mev alpha-inelastic processes, study of which indicates the large radius $R=11.3$, must be especially sensitive to the tail of the nuclear potential. Since the optical model potential is energy-dependent and is probably even stronger at this high energy than at 40 Mev, we are not justified in detailed comparison with the optical model potentials for 40- or 22-Mev alphas.

The alpha-inelastic scattering angular distributions in the light elements indicate an effective interaction distance just somewhat larger than the alpha-elastic sharp cutoff radii. The values seem plausible, but we do not attempt any detailed comparative analysis here.




FIG. 5. Alpha decay reduced widths, δ^2 , for ground-state transitions of all even-even alpha emitters are plotted against neutron number (of the parent nucleus). Barrier penetrabilities in the upper plot were calculated by the usual sharp cutoff of a pure coulombic potential, a cutoff radius of 9.3×10^{-13} cm being chosen to give δ^2 values in agreement with one-body theory. Barrier penetrabilities in the lower plot were calculated using a diffuse nuclear potential defined by the Igo-Thaler optical model parameters for 40-Mev alpha particles.⁸

How does the introduction of a diffuse nuclear potential affect the interpretation of alpha-decay rate data? I have programed and carried out computations on an IBM-650 computer giving barrier penetration factors (WKB approximation) for all even-even alpha emitters based on the Igo-Thaler optical model potential derived from the extensively analyzed 40-Mev alpha scattering. (Optical model analysis of scattering at energies more comparable to alpha decay energies would be useful in giving a more appropriate potential.) Using alpha decay half lives and the diffuse-potential barrier penetrabilities, the reduced widths¹⁸ for alpha emission, δ^2 , are derived in each case. The lower half of Fig. 5 shows these reduced widths vs neutron number, and the upper half gives corresponding values for a sharp cutoff radius of 9.3 fermis for all even-even alpha emitters. In the upper plot one sees (for $N > 126$) reduced widths averaging about one Mev as given theoretically by the Preston form¹⁹ of the one body model; this agreement, of course, is the criterion for selection of 9.3 as radius in the first place.

The reduced widths from the diffuse potential show similar trends, but the magnitudes (for $N > 126$) average about a factor of five lower than the one-body values. The break at 126 neutrons is less for the diffuse potential. The diffuse potential gives reasonable values of reduced widths, within the large (factor of 10^6) uncertainty in the theoretical values. Perhaps such applications of optical model potentials can stimulate further developments in fundamental alpha decay theory. From these exploratory calculations we can say already that reduced widths predicted by the one body model are much closer to the truth than those of most many-body models.

CONSEQUENCES OF NONSPHERICAL NUCLEAR SHAPES AND OF ZERO-POINT SURFACE OSCILLATIONS

Other details besides the intrinsic diffuseness of the nuclear surface should eventually be taken into account. First, there is abundant evidence that the large class of nuclei distant from closed shells take on stabilized spheroidal deformation²⁰ with eccentricities as high as 0.3. Second, there are surely zero-point oscillations of the nuclear surface.

In first approximation both these effects may be considered as simply giving extra contributions to the apparent diffuseness of the nuclear potential or matter distribution being considered. Some discussion of the special consequences of spheroidal deformation to the alpha-scattering problem is made by Kerlee *et al.*¹⁰ with reference given to work of Drozdov.²¹

¹⁸ R. G. Thomas, Progr. Theoret. Phys. **12**, 253 (1954); see also reference 1, p. 149.

¹⁹ M. A. Preston, Phys. Rev. **71**, 865 (1947).

²⁰ Alder, Bohr, Huus, Mottelson, and Winther, Revs. Modern Phys. **28**, 432 (1956).

²¹ S. I. Drozdov, Soviet Physics **1**, 588, 591 (1955) L.




FIG. 6. Alpha wave functions are plotted *vs* polar angle on the spheroidal nuclear surface of Cm^{242} defined in the work of Rasmussen and Hansen.²² Boundary conditions for the solutions at large distance are based on experimental relative intensities of alpha decay groups to 0, 2, 4, 6, and 8 spin states in the ground rotational band of the daughter. All cases represent a choice of $l=0, 2,$ and 4 waves in phase (+) in the barrier, and the relative phases of $l=6$ and 8 waves are indicated by signs in the upper right-hand corner of each of the four plots.

Spheroidal deformation has important special consequences for the detailed interpretation of alpha decay, especially as regards the significance of the relative intensities of decay to various members of a nuclear rotational band system. We have carried inward numerical integrations of the alpha decay wave equation for Cm^{242} up to the spheroidal nuclear surface,²² fixing the boundary conditions at large distance by use of experimental alpha group intensities to the ground rotational band ($l=0, 2, 4, 6, 8$ groups observed). The boundary conditions are not uniquely determined by this procedure, since there are two possible phase choices for each alpha group considered. By indirect arguments based on angular correlation and intensity studies of neighboring odd mass alpha emitters, we believe that the $l=0, l=2,$ and $l=4$ groups are all in phase within the barrier, although the arguments regarding the $l=4$ phase are not conclusive. Since we are completely uncertain regarding the relative phases of $l=6$ and $l=8$ groups, we are left with four possible solutions. Plots of the possible alpha wave functions over the spheroidal nuclear surface are shown in Fig. 6. Whichever case represents the true physical situation, we see evidence for there being especially preferred zones for alpha

emission on the spheroidal surface. Tentative explanations of such nonuniform alpha wave functions have been advanced as follows: Either the alpha maxima represent zones of preferred alpha formation, reflecting zones of greatest probability of finding the most lightly bound nucleons, or the alpha maxima imply higher order surface deformations extending the surface in the regions of the maxima. We may hope from such studies to gain information on surface deformations of order greater than two.

It seems possible that alpha decay can give us some clues regarding information on zero-point surface vibration amplitudes. In the Cm^{242} decay scheme shown in Fig. 7, in addition to decay groups to the ground rotational band, one notes, decay to a $1-$ level, probably associated with a first-excited octopole vibrational level, and decay to a high-lying $0+$ level, associated with a first excited quadrupole surface vibration of the type preserving cylindrical symmetry (β -vibration).²⁰ The intensities of alpha decay to these excited vibrational states should be a function of the amplitude of zero-point oscillation. Careful quantitative treatment of the problem has not been completed. Qualitatively because of the strong dependence of barrier penetrability on barrier thickness, alpha emission will preferentially occur from a surface element during its maximum outward excursions in vibration. This

²² J. O. Rasmussen and B. Segall, *Phys. Rev.* **103**, 1298 (1956); J. O. Rasmussen and E. R. Hansen, *Phys. Rev.* (to be published); E. Pennington and M. A. Preston (to be published).

preference will lead to a finite probability that the daughter nucleus is left in a vibrationally excited state following alpha emission.

CONCLUSION

Knowledge of the nuclear potential for alpha particles has been greatly increased in recent years, principally by alpha-elastic scattering studies. Extension of these studies and further careful optical model analysis is important, but the short mean-free path of alpha particles in nuclear matter limits such analysis mainly to exploration of the potential in the nuclear surface region. There is some problem of nonuniqueness of optical model fits. There is great need for theoretical aid of a fundamental sort, such as estimates in infinite nuclear matter of the real potential and effective mass for alpha particles at various matter densities and for various velocities. There is some evidence from optical model work that the real attractive potential becomes more attractive with increasing alpha energy, the reverse of the trend²³ for protons or neutrons. We might speculate that this behavior results from the special operation of the exclusion principle for complex particles in nuclear matter. The slower the alphas, the lower the effective mass or the less attractive the nuclear potential they would experience, since the Fermi momentum spheres of nucleons in the alpha particle and in the nuclear matter would overlap more for low velocities. Possibly

²³ A. E. Glassgold and P. J. Kellogg, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1291 (1958).




FIG. 7. Alpha decay scheme of Cm^{242} .

alpha particles might find a potential minimum in the surface region where the nuclear density is low yet where they are within range of attractive nuclear forces. Quantitative answers to these speculative questions could go a long way toward fixing a unique choice of optical model potential parameters and furthering the understanding of the fundamentals of alpha decay.