On the diffraction model approach to cluster stripping nuclear reactions
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Abstract In this study, the diffraction model is employed to study the cluster stripping nuclear reaction on the basis of the Regge-pole method. A formula for the angular distribution is derived. The angular distribution spectra for the cluster stripping nuclear reactions 56Ca ('He,p)32Sc, 40Ca (t,p)20Ca and 40Ca (t,3He)14N at various energies have been well reproduced with projectile energies varying between 10 MeV and 15 MeV. The predicted theoretical values for the cluster stripping reactions 40Ca (t,p)20Ca with 10 MeV, 12 MeV and 15 MeV incident 4He, 40Ca (t,3He)14N with 10 MeV incident triton, and 40Ca (t,3He)14N with 12 MeV incident triton were compared with the experimental data and good agreement was observed. Also a comparison between the diffraction model prediction of the angular distribution values for the cluster stripping reaction 40Ca ('He,p)32Sc at energy 12 MeV of 4He and that of the distorted-wave Born approximation (DWBA) is implemented and a satisfactory agreement between the two methods has been attained.
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Introduction
Nuclear reactions model have played a vital role in revealing the structure of nuclides and have contributed to a deeper understanding of nuclear forces [1-14]. Detailed theories of nuclear reactions are patterned after the two principal models of nuclear structure, namely: the liquid-drop model for the compound nucleus reaction and the shell-model for the direct reaction [13]. Theoretical considerations of nuclear reactions are aimed mostly on explaining the cross sections dependence on energies and angles in terms of certain nuclear parameters such as nuclear radius and diffuseness.

The optical model was developed to cope with the complexities of nuclear reaction processes and to give a broad understanding of nuclear reactions encountered at bombarding energies above 10 MeV, including compound elastic scattering. The complex term of the optical potential is introduced to take into account all possible reactions that fall in the absorption reaction categories and cause the removal of particles from the bombarding beam. This model has been particularly successful in explaining the total and the elastic cross sections of high energy nuclear reactions [3]. Besides, it predicts the broad resonances in cross sections as a function of energy.

The so-called plane-wave Born approximation (PWBA) was introduced to interpret the angular distribution of the cross section on a semi-quantitative basis. In the usual formulation of the PWBA calculations, the waves in the initial and final channels are generally generated by means of nuclear potential (optical potential) parameterization for elastic scattering. The deuteron stripping reactions, where the nucleon is supposed to be stripped off the incident deuteron by the nucleus at the nuclear radius, have been successfully studied in terms of this model [15,16]. However, the PWBA model calculation is usually sufficiently accurate to give the location of the first and perhaps the second maxima, it did not give a very accurate fit to the angular distribution and it was failed completely in predicting absolute cross-sections [17]. This is because the PWBA model ignores the effects of Coulomb potentials which, when a particle approaches close enough to have a reaction, leads to scattering and perhaps absorption of the particle [3]. This complication is taken into account in the distorted-wave Born approximation (DWBA), by treating the incident and emitted particles as particles moving under the influence of the nuclear potentials [17-19].
The first phenomenological model suggested for the interpretation of the experimental results concerning the angular distribution of the direct nuclear reactions was the diffraction model [15]. According to this model, the nucleus is viewed as a 'black sphere' that absorbs certain incident partial waves. The calculation of the reflection coefficient requires parameterization of specific functions (in the form of Regge-type descriptions) for the continuation in the complex \( \gamma \)-plane [15,16]. A convenient parameterization is the Woods-Saxon type where the nuclear absorption can be expressed in terms of the reflection coefficient \( \eta_j \), whose parameterization is based on some nuclear parameters, namely: the nuclear radius and the diffuseness. In this case, the Regge-pole method can be employed to evaluate the partial-wave summation in the transition amplitude assuming a finite range for the reaction interaction response [16].

In this study, we advocate the diffraction model for describing the most common observed features of the angular distributions of the cluster stripping nuclear reactions. The choice of this model is motivated by several considerations. Firstly, the range of the diffraction phenomenon is wider than the nuclear radius. Thus, measurement of diffraction pattern as scattering distributions is of great importance in obtaining information about nuclear sizes and shapes. Secondly, the diffraction model takes care of essentially 'model-independent' aspects of nuclear scattering and reaction process [15]. Thirdly, theoretical considerations of nuclear reactions can be achieved using fewer nuclear parameters such as nuclear radius and diffuseness. Fourthly, calculation of the scattering matrix elements is based on the phase shift parameterization of the reflection coefficient \( \eta_j \), [20-22]. This model will be employed for studying the \( T(\alpha,b)R \) cluster stripping nuclear reactions. The cornerstone based on obtaining a general formula for determining angular distributions starting from the transition matrix. The angular distributions of \( \alpha \)-Ca (He, p) \( 4^{4}\)Ca, \( \alpha \)-Ca (t, p) \( 4^{2}\)Ca and \( \alpha \)-Fe (t, p) \( 5^{8}\)Fe cluster stripping nuclear reactions at various energies of incident particles (helium-3 and triton) will be examined. A comparison between the predicted values of the angular distribution obtained on the basis of the DWBA model and the present results of the angular distribution for the cluster stripping nuclear reaction \( 4^{4}\)Ca (He, p) \( 4^{2}\)Sc at 12 MeV energy of \( ^3\)He is included.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we derive the angular distribution formula. In Section 3, we present and discuss the results together with a comparison with the experimental data for the reaction \( 4^{4}\)Ca (He, p) \( 4^{2}\)Sc with projectile energies 10 MeV, 12 MeV and 15 MeV for incident \( ^3\)He; \( 4^{4}\)Ca (t, p) \( 4^{2}\)Ca at 10.1 MeV of incident triton; and \( 4^{2}\)Fe (t, p) \( 5^{8}\)Fe at 12 MeV of incident triton. In section 4, we present our conclusion. Finally in the appendix, we give a derivation of the angular distribution as calculated with the diffraction model with the stress on some mathematical details. Extension of this work to include other types of nuclear reactions is possible.

2. Theoretical considerations

There are several types of stripping nuclear reactions that have been introduced for studying the structure of single-nucleon and multi-nucleon states. Among one-nucleon stripping reactions are (d, p), (d, n), (t, d), (\( ^3\)He, d), (\( \alpha \), \( ^7\)He), (\( \alpha \), t), (\( ^4\)T, \( ^7\)Li), etc. Many studies have been performed with two-nucleon stripping reactions like (t, p), (t, n), (\( ^3\)He, p), (\( ^9\)Li, \( ^6\)He), etc. Three-nucleon stripping reactions like (\( ^9\)Li, d) and (\( ^9\)Li, t), five-nucleon stripping like (\( ^9\)Li, d), etc. [9-14]. A different type of reaction, which has been explained through the direct nuclear reaction processes, the deuteron cluster stripping nuclear reaction. In this type of reactions, an incident deuteron (\( ^2\)H) is stripped off one of its component nucleons, which remain in the target nucleus, while the remaining nucleon escapes [12].

One common feature of all direct reactions is the relationship between the angular momentum transferred in the reaction and the angular distribution of the emitted particles. Since the angular distributions are resulted from the superposition of waves emanating from the nucleus, interference effects leading to a diffraction-like pattern are expected [14]. Measurements of the differential cross section provide us with valuable information on the angular distribution of the reaction products. Frequently, a beam of incident particles may produce several types of reaction processes with a given target nucleus, measuring the rate of each process separately, we can derive the partial cross section for each reaction process and the sum of all partial cross sections is equal to the total cross section. In principle, the angular distribution can be put on a semi-quantitative basis by making use of the diffraction model [15].

We begin the diffraction model development of the cluster stripping nuclear reaction angular distributions by considering the general case problem. Let us consider the problem of deriving a formula for the differential cross section (or the angular distribution) as a function of incident particle's energy when bombarding a target nucleus \( T \) by an incident particle \( \alpha \) in a nuclear reaction symbolized by the following reaction equation

\[ \alpha + T \rightarrow R + b \text{ or } T(\alpha,b)R. \]

In the above equation, we denote the lighter projectiles and fragments with \( \alpha \) and \( b \), and the target and final nucleus with \( T \) and \( R \), respectively. The incident nucleus \( \alpha \) will be assumed to form a bound state of \( b \) and \( c \) clusters, while \( R \) is assumed to form a bound state of the two clusters \( T \) and \( c \). Symbolically, this relation can be described as:

\[ T + (c + b) \rightarrow (T + c) + b, \]

where a cluster \( c \) is transferred to \( T \) and the parentheses denote a bound state. The initial and final states of such reaction are schematically shown in Figure 1 (a).

As the incident nucleus approaches the target nucleus \( T \), the target nucleus as seen by the incoming nucleus looks like...
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The interaction of a beam of particles with the quantum potential well can be handled by means of the scattering theory \[22\]. The entrance and exit channels can be described well in terms of potentials \(V_{bt}, V_{bt}\), respectively. The total Hamiltonians in the initial and final channels are given by:

\[
H_i = H'_i + V_{bt} + V_{iT},
\]

\[
H_f = H'_f + V_{bt} + V_{FT},
\]

where

\[
H'_i = K_{bt} + K_{br} + V_{bt},
\]

\[
H'_f = K_{rb} + K_{rT} + V_{FT}.
\]

Here, \(K_{ij}(V_{ij})\) is the relative kinetic energy (interaction potential) between the particles \(i\) and \(j\).

For the cluster stripping nuclear reaction \(T(\alpha,b)R\) in which a cluster \(c\) is transferred from \(\alpha\) to \(T\), the exact transition amplitude of the system when going from an initial state \((\alpha + T)\) at a given energy \(E_{\alpha + T}\) to a final state \((b + R)\) is governed by the usual quantum mechanical matrix element \[22\]

\[
T_R = \langle \varphi_f | V_f | \psi_i^* \rangle = \int \psi_i^* V_f \varphi_f \, dv,
\]

where \(T_R\) is the matrix element between initial and final states, \(\psi_i^*\) denotes a true stationary state of the complete Hamiltonian \(H'_i\) describing an incident wave on the target nucleus \(T\) plus an outgoing scattered wave. \(\Phi_f\) is the eigenstate of the Hamiltonian of the non-interacting states in the final channel \(i.e.\ H'_f\). The interaction potential in the exit channel \(V_f\) can be written as:

\[
V_f = V_{bt} + V_{FT}.
\]

Thus, the time-independent Schrödinger wave equation can be written as:

\[
H'_f \Phi_f = E_f \Phi_f, \Rightarrow \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla^2(\mathbf{r}_f) + V_{bt}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \Phi_f = E_f \Phi_f. \tag{9}
\]

If the relative kinetic energy in the final channel is supposed to be much greater than the interaction potential \(i.e.\ \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla^2(\mathbf{r}_f) \gg V_{bt}(\mathbf{r})\), which is the condition for the Born approximation, the wave function of the final channel \(\Phi_f\) can be written as:

\[
\Phi_f = \varphi_n(\xi) \varphi_r(\zeta) e^{i\mathbf{kr} \cdot \mathbf{r}}. \tag{10}
\]

Suppose that the cluster \(c\) position is closer to particle \(b\) than to the core of the cluster \(R\), then the cluster will be considered within the external region of the core of \(T\). By considering only the asymptotic behaviour of the outgoing spherical wave, which is given by a spherical Hankel function of the first kind \(h_{11}^{(1)}(kr)\) \[23, 24\], the wave function \(\psi'_i\) can be introduced as:

\[
\psi'_i = \varphi_i(\xi) \varphi_r(\zeta) \frac{2\pi}{\sin \theta} \sum_{\ell_m} \eta_{\ell_m} Y_{\ell_m}^{\ell_m}(\hat{k}_\ell) \times Y_{\ell_m}^{\ell_m}(\hat{k}_\ell) \left[ h_{11}^{(1)}(kr) \right], \tag{11}
\]

where \(\varphi_i\) is the internal wave function of the particle \(i\):

\[
\varphi_i = \varphi_i(\xi) \varphi_r(\zeta) \frac{2\pi}{\sin \theta} \sum_{\ell_m} \eta_{\ell_m} Y_{\ell_m}^{\ell_m}(\hat{k}_\ell) \times Y_{\ell_m}^{\ell_m}(\hat{k}_\ell)
\]

Here, \(K_{ij}(V_{ij})\) is the relative kinetic energy (interaction potential) between the particles \(i\) and \(j\). The reflection coefficients parameters \(\eta_{\ell_m}\) are expressed in terms of the convenient Wood-Saxon form as:

\[
\eta_\ell = \left\{ 1 + \exp \left( \frac{\ell - \ell_0}{\rho - \rho_0} \right) \right\}^{-1} \tag{12}
\]
where $\ell_0$ is the cut-off angular momentum and $\Delta$ is the diffuseness parameter. The form of reflection parameter as introduced in eq. (12) implies that the transition of $\eta_1$ from zero to unity is expected to take place gradually and is extended over a wide range of $\ell$ values of the transition width $\Delta$. This is illustrated in Figure 1(c) in the vicinity of $\ell_0$ in order to take into account the nuclear surface thickness.

Let us now expand the wave functions of the nuclei $\alpha$ and $R$ in terms of the different states of $b$ and $T$, respectively, times the wave function of the cluster $c$. The results are

$$
\varphi_\alpha = \sum \left\{ \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell_m, LM \\ J_r, M_r \end{array} \right\} S(\alpha, c, b) \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell m/J_r, M_r \end{array} \right) \times \left( \begin{array}{c} J_r, M_r, S_b \mu_b \end{array} \right) \right) \varphi_b(\xi) \varphi_r(\xi) R_{LM}(r),
$$

$$
\varphi_R = \sum \left\{ \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell M \\ J_r, m_r \end{array} \right\} S(R, T, c) \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell m/J_r, M_r \end{array} \right) \times \left( \begin{array}{c} J_r, m_r, S_b \mu_b \end{array} \right) \right) \varphi_b(\xi) \varphi_r(\xi) R_{LM}(\rho).
$$

Here, $S$ and $\mu$ are the spin and its projection, respectively; while $LM$ and $\ell m$ are the relative angular momentum and its projection in the incident and final channels. Both $J, M$ and $j, m$ represent the total angular momentum of the cluster $c$ in the projectile and the residual nuclides. The symbol $R$ is used to represent the relative wave function and the bracket denotes the relevant Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. Now, using eqs. (8), (10), (11), (13), and (14), the transition amplitude in eq. (7) becomes

$$
T_\beta = \sum \left\{ \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell m, LM \\ J_r, m_r, J_r, M_r \end{array} \right\} S(R, T, c) S(\alpha, c, b)
\times \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell m/J_r, M_r \end{array} \right) \times \left( \begin{array}{c} J_r, M_r, S_b \mu_b \end{array} \right) \right) \varphi_b(\xi) \varphi_r(\xi) R_{LM}(\rho).
$$

The vector diagrams of $k$, $k_f$, and $k'f$ are displayed in Figure 2 (a); while the complex plane for calculating the residues is shown in Figure 2 (b) (see Appendix). By making use of the normalization condition

$$
\left\langle \varphi_r(\xi) \varphi_T(\xi) \varphi_b(\xi) \varphi_r(\xi) \varphi_T(\xi) \right\rangle = 1.
$$

Therefore, the transition amplitude can be rewritten as:

$$
T_\beta = C \left[ I_1 + I_2 \right].
$$

where

$$
C = \sum \left\{ \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell m, LM \\ J_r, m_r, J_r, M_r \end{array} \right\} S(R, T, c) S(\alpha, c, b)
\times \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} S_r, \mu_r, \ell m/J_r, M_r \end{array} \right) \times \left( \begin{array}{c} J_r, M_r, S_b \mu_b \end{array} \right) \right) \varphi_b(\xi) \varphi_r(\xi) R_{LM}(\rho).
$$

and

$$
I_1 = R_{lm}(\rho) e^{\imath \ell \cdot f} V_f R_{LM}(r) e^{\imath \ell \cdot r},
$$

$$
I_2 = 2\pi e^{\imath \ell \cdot r} R_{lm}(\rho) V_f R_{LM}(r) \sum \eta_\lambda Y_{\lambda m}(r) \left( \begin{array}{c} \ell \cdot f \\ k \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} \ell \cdot f \\ k \end{array} \right).
$$

Since $V_{in}$ corresponds to a bound state in the entrance channel, one may expect that the contribution of $V_{in}$ to be much greater than that of $V_{nt}$, and hence the latter term in eq. (18) can be neglected with respect to the former [25]. Using eq (17), the angular distribution can be introduced as:

$$
\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \propto T_{\beta}^2 \propto I_1 + I_2^2.
$$

where $I_1$ and $I_2$ are given by the following expressions (see Appendix for derivation):

$$
I_1 = (4\pi)^2 N_0 V_{in} \sum \nu m (\nu') N_{in} V_{nt} \left( \begin{array}{c} 2Q' \Gamma'(\ell + 1) \\ Q^2 + \nu^2 \end{array} \right)^{\nu + 1} (q^2 + \beta^2)
$$

and

$$
I_2 = 16\pi^2 \Delta \sum \nu m (-1)^m N_0 V_{nt} \left( \begin{array}{c} \Gamma(\ell + 2) \\ \beta \end{array} \right) J_{\ell \nu}(k_j R_i).
$$
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The required angular distribution is generally proportional to the differential cross section of cluster stripping reactions. Thus

\[ J_{\alpha}(k, R) \cdot J_{\alpha}(k', R') \cdot \frac{m_c}{m_i + m_b} \cdot k_{R_n} \]

\[ \times \left( \frac{\lambda_0 + 1}{2} \right)^{\frac{\lambda_0}{2}} \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{5\pi A}{2\lambda_0} \right) e^{-\lambda A} \].

(23)

The above equation is the one to be used in the present study.

3. Results and discussion

Theoretically, the contribution of the stripping cluster nuclear reactions to the various cross sections spectra (or angular distributions) is presented by the functional form of eq. (24). In the calculations, only the case when the transferred cluster is in a relative s-state is considered. A careful choice of integration variables and nuclear reaction parameters facilitates the theoretical calculations. Two open parameters are involved in the calculations, namely, the nuclear radius \( R \) and surface diffuseness parameter \( A \). The corresponding angular distribution results for the cluster stripping reactions \( ^{40}\text{Ca} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Sc} \), \( ^{40}\text{Ca} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Ca} \), and \( ^{40}\text{Fe} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Fe} \) at different energies of incident particles and for different nuclear radii and diffuseness parameters are included. Accordingly, for each cluster stripping nuclear reaction, families of curves can be obtained by varying either the nuclear radius parameter or the diffuseness parameter. The obtained results are displayed as a function of the center-of-mass scattering angle ranges between \( \theta_0 < \theta_n < 160^\circ \). Plots of this type are useful for the comparison purposes of the experimental values with the calculated theoretical values, in order to test the success of the model.

The predicted theoretical results of angular distribution functions according to eq. (24) of the ground-state protons for the cluster stripping nuclear reaction \( ^{40}\text{Ca} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Sc} \) with projectile energies 10 MeV, 12 MeV and 15 MeV of incident \( ^{4}\text{He} \); \( ^{40}\text{Ca} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Ca} \) at 10.1 MeV of incident \( t \); and \( ^{40}\text{Fe} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Fe} \) at 12 MeV of incident \( t \) for certain selective best-fit parameters together with the experimental data are displayed in Figures 3-6. The calculated values of the angular distributions of the ground-state proton for the cluster stripping nuclear reaction \( ^{40}\text{Ca} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Sc} \) are exhibited in Figures, 3-5. In Figure 3(a), the predicted diffraction model results of the angular distribution for this reaction at energy of 10 MeV for incident \( ^{4}\text{He} \) and diffuseness parameter of 0.40 but using different radius parameters of 6.28, 7.18 and 8.08 fm together with experimental data taken from Ref. [26]. Shown in Figure 3(b) the predicted results for the reaction with the same energy for incident \( ^{4}\text{He} \) but using different radius parameter of 6.28 fm and different diffuseness parameters of 0.30, 0.40 and 0.50 together with the experimental data taken from Ref. [26]. Figure 3(c) displays the predicted results obtained using the best-fit parameters \( R = 6.28 \) fm and \( A = 0.4 \) together with the experimental data taken from Ref. [26] for the same reaction.

![Figure 3](image-url)

Figure 3. The results of angular distributions using the diffraction model together with the experimental data taken from Ref. [26] as a function of the scattering angle \( \theta_n \) of the ground-state protons for various cluster stripping processes in the reaction \( ^{40}\text{Ca} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Sc} \) at \( E_n = 10 \) and (a) \( R = 6.28, 7.18 \) and 8.08 fm and \( A = 0.4 \) (b) \( A = 0.30, 0.40 \) and 0.50 and \( R = 6.28 \) fm (c) best-fit parameters are \( R = 6.28 \) fm and \( A = 0.4 \)

Shown in Figure 4 the angular distribution of the ground-state protons for the same reaction \( ^{40}\text{Ca} \rightarrow ^{40}\text{Sc} \) with 12 MeV incident \( ^{4}\text{He} \) for different radius parameters and different diffuseness parameter together with the experimental data taken from Ref. [26] and the best-fit parameters (\( R = 6.80 \) fm and \( A = 0.4 \)) curves. In Figure 4(a), values of the angular distribution are obtained by making use of the radius parameter values of 6.80, 6.56, 5.20, and 4.91 fm together with the diffuseness parameter value of 0.40. In obtaining the results of the distribution function exhibited in Figure 4(b), we have taken the
radius parameter value to be 6.80 fm and the diffuseness parameter values are taken to be 0.35, 0.40, 0.45 and 0.50. In Figure 4(c) the results for best-fit parameters are plotted together with the experimental data. Similarly, in Figure 5 we have displayed the results of this reaction with 15 MeV incident $^3$He but with different parameters together with the experimental data taken from Ref. [26]. In Figure 5(a), we have plotted the angular distributions obtained using a diffuseness parameter of 0.40 and radius parameters of 4.41 and 5.15 fm together with the experimental data. Figure 5(b) displays the angular distributions for radius parameter of 4.41 fm and diffuseness parameters of 0.30, 0.40 and 0.50 together with the experimental data. Last, shown in Figure 5(c) are the angular distribution results attained by using the best-fit parameters $R = 4.41$ fm and $\Delta = 0.3$ together with the experimental data.

It can be seen from the Figures 3, 4 and 5 that the diffraction model approach can predict well the general behaviour of the angular distribution. Furthermore, the calculated angular distribution values using the best-fit parameters are similar to that of the experimental data. In particular, at small angles, it reveals that both experimental and theoretical values of angular distributions are too large. After that the angular distribution values continue to decrease in the center-of-mass angle range $0^\circ < \Theta_{cm} < 160^\circ$. An oscillation of maximum and minimum a persistence of the prominent feature of these curves has been observed. The diffraction-like behaviour starts to show up: large angles beyond 30$^\circ$. The observed diffraction pattern in the differential cross section plots may be attributed to interference from opposite sides of the nucleus [4]. The diffraction model interpretation of the observed general trend of the angular distribution is as follows: Interference between the diffracted waves resulted in the appearance of the maximum and minimum of the distribution functions. The corresponding
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resonating partial wave is large in the surrounding of potential dip region, consequently the overlapping probability of nuclides and their surface regions also increased. Therefore, an increased absorption at resonance energy, leads to the dip-peak structure of the reflection coefficient [26-28] indicating the presence of the Regge-pole in \(|\pi_A|\) [29]. Thus, a decrease in the distribution functions will be produced [14]. This approach might be applicable at high energies (> 100 MeV) where larger angular momenta are involved and the dips in the effective potential vanish [30]. One may notice in Figures, 3, 4 and 5 that the general drop-off trend of the angular distribution functions is dependent on the radius parameter. With a larger radius parameter, the angular distribution of diffraction patterns, the maximum as well as the minimum peaks, are shifted toward the small angles, while their shapes remain similar. These observed regular features are similar for all predicted angular distribution values using the diffraction model.

Similar angular distribution results were obtained for both \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Sc}\) and \(^{56}\text{Fe}(t,p)^{56}\text{Fe}\) nuclear stripping reactions with 10.1 MeV and 12 MeV incident triton, respectively. The angular distribution predicted results using the selected best-fit parameters for both reactions together with the experimental data taken from Ref. [26,30] were exhibited in Figure 6. The general remarks made for reaction \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Sc}\) still remain valid for the other reactions, that is, the angular distribution results follow the general trend of the experimental data.

After testing the validity of the diffraction model against the experimental data for the cluster stripping reactions \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Sc}\), \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Ca}\) and \(^{56}\text{Fe}(t,p)^{56}\text{Fe}\), a comparison between the present results of the angular distributions to those obtained in the DWBA calculations for the cluster stripping reaction \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Sc}\) has been made. For this purpose, the angular distributions for the reaction \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Sc}\) with 12 MeV incident \(^{3}\text{He}\) and of best-fit parameters \(R = 4.91 \text{ fm}\) and \(\Delta = 0.40\), as predicted by the diffraction model approach and that calculated by the DWBA approach taken from Ref. [25] are plotted in Figure 7. The dashed curve in Figure 7 corresponds to the predicted diffraction model results using the best-fit parameters \(R = 7.26 \text{ fm}\) and \(\Delta = 0.4\) and the solid curve represents the DWBA predicted results. It is clear from the figure that a satisfactory agreement between the predicted results of the two approaches has been attained.

Figure 6. The angular distribution for the ground-state reactions for various cluster stripping processes in the reaction, (a) \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Sc}\), at \(E_t = 10.1 \text{ MeV}\), using the best-fit parameters of \(R = 7.14 \text{ fm}\) and \(\Delta = 0.4\). The experimental points are taken from Ref. [31]. (b) \(^{56}\text{Fe}(t,p)^{56}\text{Fe}\) at \(E_t = 12 \text{ MeV}\), using the best-fit parameters of \(R = 7.26 \text{ fm}\) and \(\Delta = 0.4\). The experimental points are taken from Ref. [27].

4. Conclusion

The diffraction model has been employed successfully to obtain an expression of the angular distributions of the cluster stripping nuclear reaction \(T(a,b)R\). The experimental data of the angular distributions spectra for the reactions \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Sc}\), \(^{4}\text{Ca}(t,p)^{4}\text{Ca}\) and \(^{56}\text{Fe}(t,p)^{56}\text{Fe}\) at various energies have been well reproduced at an incident particle's energies varying between 10 MeV and 15 MeV. The predicted theoretical results were found to be in agreement with the experimental data. A comparison between the diffraction model predicted values of the angular
distribution for the reaction $^{40}\text{Ca}(^3\text{He},p)^{42}\text{Sc}$ with 12 MeV incident $^3\text{He}$ and the calculated values using DWBA reveals a satisfactory agreement between the two methods.

In conclusion, the low energy (0.1–50 MeV) cluster stripping nuclear reactions can be adequately explained in terms of the diffraction model. Besides, the diffraction model approach is capable of reproducing the main features of nuclear reactions differential cross sections properly. Extension of this work to include contributions other than s-state is recommended to test the validity of the diffraction model for attaining the general features of high energy (>100 MeV) nuclear reactions.

Appendix: Derivation of the angular distribution for cluster stripping nuclear reactions

In this appendix, we shall give a complete derivation of the angular distribution by evaluating both $I_1$ and $I_2$ terms. Let us first consider the first term in the transition amplitude expressed in eq. (19), i.e., $I_1$. Substituting the given values of $r_f$ and $r_i$, we obtain

$$I_1 = \int R_{fi}(\rho)e^{i\frac{m_f}{m_r+m_i}r}e^{-i\frac{m_i}{m_r+m_f}r}|V_{bc}|R_{LM}(r)e^{-i\frac{m_i}{m_r+m_f}r}\times e^{-i\frac{m_i}{m_r+m_f}r}\,dr \,dp.$$  

By introducing the following coordinates:

$$Q = k_f - \frac{m_f}{m_r+m_f}k_f,$n

$$q = k_f - \frac{m_f}{m_r+m_f}k_f,$n

eq. (A.1) can be rewritten as:

$$I_1 = \int u_f(\rho)e^{iQ\cdot\rho}R_{fi}(\rho)\,dp \int e^{iq\cdot\rho}V_{bc}(\rho)\mu_L(\rho)Y_{LM}(\hat{\rho})\,d\hat{\rho}. \quad (A.4)$$
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In eq. (A.4), we have expressed $R_{im}(\rho)$ and $R_{LM}(r)$ in terms of spherical harmonics using

$$R_{im}(\rho) = u_i(\rho) Y_{im}(\hat{\rho}), \quad (A.5)$$

$$R_{LM}(r) = U_L(r) Y_{LM}(\hat{r}). \quad (A.6)$$

Since the nuclear states are eigenstates of angular momentum, it is useful to expand the plane wave in spherical harmonics using the following expansions [22]:

$$Y_{im}(\hat{\rho}) = (-)^m Y_{-m} Y_{im}(\theta) Y_{im}(\phi). \quad (A.7)$$

The integral in eq. (A.12) have been evaluated using the following standard integral [32, 33]:

$$\int e^{-\mu J_1(\rho\rho)} \rho^\nu d\rho = (2Q^\nu) \Gamma\left[\nu + \frac{1}{2}\right] \left(Q^2 + \gamma^2\right)^{\nu + \frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\pi}. \quad (A.13)$$

The second part of the transition amplitude, i.e. $I_1$, can be evaluated as follows:

We shall first expand the spherical harmonics and the spherical Hankel function appearing in $I_1$ to obtain $r$ and $\rho$ in separate function as [36]:

$$Y_{\lambda m}(\hat{r}) h^{(1)}_{\lambda m}(k, r) = \sqrt{4\pi} \sum_{m_1} \lambda_1 \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2} \frac{1}{2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} \sum_{m_1} Y_{\lambda m}(\hat{r}) Y_{\lambda m}(\hat{r}). \quad (A.14)$$
we deduce that \( m_c = 0 \); further,

\[
Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) = Y^*_{\ell m_k}(0, \Phi) = \delta_{\ell 0},
\]

implies that \( m_c = 0 \). Therefore, \( I_z \) becomes

\[
I_z = 2\pi \sqrt{4\pi} \sum \left\{ \frac{\lambda_1}{m_{\lambda_1} m_{\lambda_2}} \left( 2 + \lambda_1, -\lambda_1 \right) \eta_{\lambda_1} Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) \times \eta_{\lambda_2} Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) \right\}
\]

where \( [x] = 2x + 1 \). Next, eqs. (A.5) and (A.6) together can be used with eq. (A.18) to put \( I_z \) in the following form

\[
I_z = 2\pi \sqrt{4\pi} \sum \left\{ \frac{\lambda_1}{m_{\lambda_1} m_{\lambda_2}} \left( 2 + \lambda_1, -\lambda_1 \right) \eta_{\lambda_1} Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) \times \eta_{\lambda_2} Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) \right\}
\]

where

\[
k_f' = \frac{m_r}{m_r + m_c} k_f.
\]

Using the following relations

\[
e^{-ik' \rho} = 4\pi \sum_{n_k} (i)^{x} j_{\ell} (k' \rho) Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f \hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k},
\]

we may set:

\[
I_z = 2\pi \sqrt{4\pi} \sum \left\{ \frac{\lambda_1}{m_{\lambda_1} m_{\lambda_2}} \left( 2 + \lambda_1, -\lambda_1 \right) \eta_{\lambda_1} Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) \times \eta_{\lambda_2} Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) \right\}
\]

we shall use the following relations for the spherical harmonics [36]:

\[
\int Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) d\Omega = \left( \frac{\ell + 1}{4\pi \ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \delta_{\ell 0}, \ell, 0, 0 \right\} m_1 + m_2 = m, |t_1 - \ell| \leq \ell_2 \leq |t_1 - \ell_2|.
\]

Now, we shall use the following relations for the spherical harmonics [36]:

\[
\int Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) d\Omega = (-\ell) \eta^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) d\Omega,
\]

and

\[
\int Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) d\Omega = (-\ell) \eta^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) Y_{\ell m_k}(\hat{\rho}) d\Omega,
\]

By taking \( k_f \) as an axis of quantization as shown in Figure 2(a), and knowing that [36]

\[
Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) = Y^*_{\ell m_k}(0, \Phi) = \delta_{\ell 0},
\]

and

\[
Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) = Y^*_{\ell m_k}(0, \Phi) = \delta_{\ell 0} \sqrt{\frac{\ell + 1}{4\pi}}.
\]

we obtain

\[
Y^*_{\ell m_k}(\hat{k}_f) = Y^*_{\ell m_k}(0, \Phi) = \delta_{\ell 0} \sqrt{\frac{\ell + 1}{4\pi}}.
\]
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Now by making use of the relations [36]

\[
\sum_m D_{mm'}(\alpha_2 \beta_2 \gamma_2) D_{mm''}(\alpha_1 \beta_1 \gamma_1) = D_{m'm''}(\alpha_3 \beta_3 \gamma_3),
\]

\[
\cos \beta \gamma = \cos \beta_1 \cos \beta_2 - \sin \beta_1 \sin \beta_2 \cos \delta_2,
\]

\[
\sin \beta \gamma = - \sin \beta_1 \sin \beta_2.
\]

\[
\delta_1 = \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + \pi, \quad \delta_2 = \gamma_1 - \gamma_2 - \pi, \quad \delta_3 = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2.
\]

(A.35)

eq. (A.34) can be rewritten as:

\[
\sum Z D_{mZ} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right) D_{m'0} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right) = D_{m'0} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right)
\]

(A.36)

where the following relation have been used

\[
D_{mZ}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{[\ell]}} Y_{mZ}(\beta, \alpha).
\]

(A.37)

In doing the summation, we have assumed \(\zeta'' = \lambda_1 = Z\) and \([g'' = [\lambda_2]\) for small Z. Now, consider the summation over \(\zeta\):

Assume that \(\zeta - \lambda_2 = Z\) and \([g] = [\lambda_2]\) for small Z: we then get:

\[
\sum (-)^Z \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right) D_{mZ}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \sum (-)^Z \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right) D_{mZ}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)
\]

(A.38)

By using eqs. (A.33), (A.35) and (A.37), we get

\[
\sum Z D_{mZ} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right) D_{m'0} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right) = \sum Z e^{-\frac{nZ}{2}} D_{mZ} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right) D_{m'0} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 2 \right)
\]

(A.39)

Substituting eqs. (A.37) and (A.40) into eq. (A.30), we get:

\[
I_2 = 2\pi(4\pi)^3 \sum \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3}{m_m m M} (-)^m (-)^3 \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3
\]

(A.41)
transformation [24], permits us to transform the summation over \( \lambda \) into a contour integration in the corresponding complex plane. According to this approach, the sum over \( \lambda \) in eq. (A.46) is transformed into an integral form as [37]:

\[
\sum_{\lambda} \lambda^3 \eta_{\lambda} P_{\lambda}(\mu) = \frac{1}{2\xi} \int \frac{d\lambda}{\sin(\lambda \pi)} \, \eta_{\lambda} P_{\lambda}(-\mu) \, d\lambda.
\]

Here \( \lambda \) represents a complex angular momentum. The pole of integration C1 is shown in Figure 2 (b). In the Regge-pole representation, eq. (A.48) reduces to a sum over Regge-poles, in the following manner:

\[
\sum_{\lambda} (-1)^{\lambda} \lambda^3 \eta_{\lambda} P_{\lambda}(\mu) = \pi \sum_{n} \frac{\lambda_n^4}{\sin(\lambda_n \pi)} R_{\lambda_n} P_{\lambda_n}(-\mu),
\]

where \( \lambda_n \) is the position of the \( n \)th pole and \( R_{\lambda_n} \) is the residue of the scattering coefficient \( \eta_{\lambda_n} \) at the pole \( n \). By introducing the Wood-Saxon form for \( \eta_{\lambda_n} \), the \( nth \) pole position is determined using

\[
\lambda_n = \lambda_0 + \pi \Delta, \quad (n = \pm1, \pm3, \pm5, \ldots).
\]

The residues of \( \eta_{\lambda_n} \) are all equal to \( \Delta \). In order to simplify eq. (A.49), the following approximation is being used [37]:

\[
P_{\lambda}(-\mu) \approx -i \xi \sqrt{2} \sin \theta \left[ R_{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}, P_{\lambda} \right] \eta_{\lambda} \Delta \Theta
\]

where \( \left| \frac{\lambda_n}{|\lambda_n\lambda|} \right| = \pm1 \).

Thus, eq. (A.49) becomes

\[
\sum (-1)^n (2\lambda + 1)^3 \eta_{\lambda} P_{\lambda}(\mu) = \pi \Delta \sum_{n} (2\lambda_n + 1)^3
\]

\[
\left[ 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\lambda_n \sin \theta}} (-i\xi \left[ R_{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}, P_{\lambda} \right] \eta_{\lambda} \Delta \Theta \right].
\]

If we consider only the poles corresponding to \( n = \pm \) where \( n \) is the integer appearing in eq. (A.51), then the right-hand side of eq. (A.53) can be rewritten as:

\[
\pi \Delta \left( 2\lambda + 1 \right)^3 \left[ 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\lambda \sin \theta}} (-i\xi \left[ R_{\lambda + \frac{1}{2}}, P_{\lambda} \right] \eta_{\lambda} \Delta \Theta \right].
\]
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(1)(2\lambda_i + 1)^3 \sqrt{\pi \lambda_i} \sin \theta \left(-\left[\frac{\lambda_i + \frac{1}{2}}{2}\right] - \pi \frac{A}{4}\right)^{-\Delta \phi} \cdot (A.54)

\lambda_0 > 1, \text{ and } \lambda_0 >> \Delta, \text{ the following approximation can be used}

\begin{equation}
\left[\lambda_i \right] = 2\lambda_i + 1 \equiv 2\lambda_i \equiv \frac{1}{2\lambda_0} \left(4\lambda_i^2 + 2\pi^2 \Delta^2\right) e^{\lambda_0}. \quad (A.55)
\end{equation}

Substituting eqs. (A.54) and (A.55) into eq. (A.46) we get:

\begin{equation}
l = 32\pi^2 \Delta \sum_m \left\{ \frac{L}{M} \left(-1\right)^{2M+m} Y_{m,1} \left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right] Y_{m,1} \left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right] \right\} \sin \left(\lambda_0 + 1\right) \frac{\phi - \pi}{4} + \frac{5\pi \Delta}{2\lambda_0} e^{-\Delta \phi} \times \tau_1.
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
(A.56)
\end{equation}

If the projectile is in a relative S-state, then \( L = M = 0 \); which gives a value of \( \pi / 2 \) for the angle \( \phi \) (the scattering angle) between \( k_i \) and \( k_p \) and the radial integral \( \tau_2 \), eq. (A.25), can be evaluated at the points defined by

\begin{equation}
\zeta - \lambda_2 = \ell_0 \equiv R, \text{ and } \zeta' - \lambda_1 = \ell_0 \equiv R. \quad (A.57)
\end{equation}

where \( \ell_0 \) is the grazing angular momentum, and \( R \) is the interaction radius.

This approximation is quite accurate for strongly absorbed particles at medium and high energies if \( |\zeta - \lambda_2| \) and \( |\zeta' - \lambda_1| \) are not too large. The main basis for its validity is the fact that in strong absorption situations, the DWBA radial integrals are sharply localized in the angular-momentum space in the vicinity of the cut-off angular momentum \( \ell_0 \) [38-40].

Now, the total bound state Morinigo wave functions are defined by [32,35]

\begin{equation}
\Phi_i^m(r) = A_i Y_m(\Omega) r^{-\beta_i} e^{-\beta_i r} \cdot (A.58)
\end{equation}

Using the Morinigo form given in the above equation for the wave function \( u_i(\rho) \), then the first integral of \( \tau_2 \) can be written as:

\begin{equation}
\int j_z(k_i, r) \mu_i(\rho) j_z(k, \rho) \rho^2 d\rho = N_i j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) \int e^{-\beta_i \rho} r^{\ell_i+1} \rho^2 d\rho
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= N_i j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) \Gamma(\ell_i+2) \cdot (A.59)
\end{equation}

where \( R_i \) is the interaction parameter given by [38]:

\begin{equation}
R_i = t_0 \left[ A_i^\lambda + A_i^\lambda \right]. \quad (A.60)
\end{equation}

Here, \( \Lambda \) is the mass number.

In obtaining eq. (A.59), we have considered the oscillatory functions outside the integral at \( \rho = R_i \) [12]. Following the same procedures, considering the Hulthen form for \( V_h(r) \) as in eq. (A.15) and taking the form of the wave function \( u_i(\rho) \) to be:

\begin{equation}
u_i(\rho) = e^{-\rho r} \left(1 - e^{-r_0} \right), \text{ in the interior region},
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}e^{-\rho r}, \quad \text{in the asymptotic region},
\end{equation}

the second integral of \( \tau_2 \) can be written as:

\begin{equation}
\int j_z(k_i, r) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) m_i m_r k r^2 dr = N_i V_0 \beta_i j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) h m_i m_r k R \cdot (A.61)
\end{equation}

where \( \gamma \) is the radius of the projectile particle and \( \alpha \) is the nuclear potential range. Using eqs. (A.59) and (A.62), the second integral of \( \tau_2 \) can be written as:

\begin{equation}
\tau_2 = N_i V_0 \beta_i \frac{\Gamma(\ell_i+2)}{\beta_i r_i} j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) \times j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) \frac{m_i}{m_i + m_r} k R \cdot (A.63)
\end{equation}

Substituting eq. (A.63) into (A.56), we obtain:

\begin{equation}I_2 = 16\pi^2 \Delta \sum_{m_i} (-1)^m N_i V_0 \beta_i \frac{\Gamma(\ell_i+2)}{\beta_i r_i} j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) \times j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) j_{\ell_0}(k_i, R) \frac{m_i}{m_i + m_r} k R \cdot (A.64)
\end{equation}

Using the expressions of \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) that are given by eqs. (A.17) and (A.64), the angular distribution can be put into its final form of eq. (24).