

Reexamination of the astrophysical S factor for the $\alpha+d \rightarrow {}^6\text{Li}+\gamma$ reaction

A. M. Mukhamedzhanov, L. D. Blokhintsev,¹ and B. F. Irgaziev²

¹*Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia*

²*GIK Institute of Engineering Sciences and Technology, Topi, Pakistan*

Recently a new measurement of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ (A 150 MeV) dissociation in the field of ${}^{208}\text{Pb}$ has been reported in [1] to study the radiative capture $\alpha+d \rightarrow {}^6\text{Li}+\gamma$ process. However, the dominance of the nuclear breakup over the Coulomb one prevented from obtaining the information about the $\alpha+d \rightarrow {}^6\text{Li}+\gamma$ process from the breakup data. The astrophysical $S_{24}(E)$ factor has been calculated within the α -d two-body potential model with potentials determined from the fits to the α -d elastic scattering phase shifts. However, the scattering phase shift itself, according to the theorem of the inverse scattering problem, doesn't provide a unique α -d bound state potential, which is the most crucial input when calculating the $S_{24}(E)$ astrophysical factor at astrophysical energies. In this work we emphasize an important role of the asymptotic normalization coefficient (ANC) for ${}^6\text{Li} \rightarrow \alpha+d$ which controls the overall normalization of the peripheral $\alpha+d \rightarrow {}^6\text{Li}+\gamma$ process and is determined by the adopted α -d bound state potential. Since the potential determined from the elastic scattering data fit is not unique, the same is true for the ANC generated by the adopted potential. However, a unique ANC can be found directly from the elastic scattering phase shift, without invoking intermediate potential, by extrapolation the scattering phase shift to the bound state pole [2].

We demonstrate that the ANC previously determined from the α -d elastic scattering s-wave phase shift in [2] and confirmed by the abinitio calculations [3], gives $S_{24}(E)$, which is at low energies about 38% lower than the one reported in [1]. We recalculate also the reaction rates, which are also lower than those obtained in [1]. This paper has been published in Phys. Rev. C.

[1] F. Hammache *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **82**, 065803 (2010).

[2] L.D. Blokhintsev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **48**, 2390 (1993).

[3] P. Navratil and Quaglioni, Phys. Rev. C **83**, 044609 (2011).