# Study symmetry energy by light-ion induced reactions

# Li Ou

# Guangxi Normal University, China

# Collaborator

Zhuxia Li, Xizhen Wu, Yingxun Zhang, Zhigang Xiao, Ning Wang, Min Liu, Junlong Tian



China-Japan cooperation workshop, Tsukuba University, 2017.6.26-28

# Motivation and background

# ImQMD model

3 Results and discussion





# Motivation and background

# ImQMD model

③ Results and discussion

# O Summary

#### Equation of State(EOS)

The energy of per nucleon in a nuclear matter  $E(\rho, \delta, T)$ .



# What & Why Symmetry Energy

#### Symmetry Energy





A. Steiner, M. Prakash, J. Lattimer and P. Ellis, Phys. Rep. 411, 325 (2005).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

### $E_{ m sym}$ vs ho is unclear



There is great uncertainty at super-high and sub-saturation density.

Need to be constrained by experiment!

### Current constraints on $E_{ m sym}( ho)$





< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □



Effect of isovector potential is very weak, and will be smeared by so many factors, such as NN collision, variety of system density  $\cdots$ . Isovector effects on the observables are only 20%.





Taken from presentation of Hermann Wolter

The uncertainty from various transport models is also about 20% even under controlled conditions.Jun Xu, et al, PRC93, 044609(2016)

Important to reduce the uncertainty, to reliably describe HIC.



# Another way: find observables more sensitive to $E_{sym}$ but unsensitive to transport model

《曰》 《圖》 《圖》 《圖》 []

### Reaction induced by intermediate energy light-ion

#### Advantage

- **①** There is not compression and expansion;
- less collision;
- Easy to model the reaction and reduce the model dependence.

# Motivation and background

# ImQMD model

③ Results and discussion

# O Summary

### ImQMD Model

$$egin{aligned} \dot{ec{r}}_i &= rac{\partial H}{\partial ec{p}_i}, \ \ \dot{ec{p}}_i &= -rac{\partial H}{\partial ec{r}_i} \ H &= T + U_{ ext{loc}} + U_{ ext{Coul}} \ U_{ ext{loc}} &= \int V_{ ext{loc}} dec{r} \end{aligned}$$



ImQMD model has been successfully applied to HICs at energies near Coulomb barries and intermediate energies and energies are and an energies are an energies and energies are an energies are an energies and energies are an energies are an energies are an energies are an energies and energies are an energies are an energies are an energies and energies are an energies are a

ImQMD+Statistical decay model

Production mass/charge/isotope distribution (GSI) 1 GeV  $p+^{208}$ Pb,  $^{238}$ U; 800 MeV  $p+^{197}$ Au; 500 MeV  $p+^{208}$ Pb; 300, 500, 750, 1000 MeV  $p+^{56}$ Fe

Double differential cross section (DDX) of emitted neutrons and protons (Los Alamos) 113, 256, 597, 800 MeV *p*+A

DDX of light charged particles 62, 200, 392, 1200 MeV p+A, 300-500 MeV p+Cu

Data are taken from https://www-nds.iaea.org/spallations

#### Some results



Production mass/charge distribution in 500, 800 MeV  $p+^{208}$ Pb, <sup>197</sup>Au



Li Ou, JPG36, 125104 (2009).







DDX of emitted neutron in 1 GeV  $p+^{208}$ Pb and DDX of emitted proton in 800 MeV  $p+^{208}$ Pb.

Li Ou, JPG35, 055101 (2008).



Dexian Wei, JPG41, 035104 (2014), NPA933, 114 (2015).

# Motivation and background

# ImQMD model

3 Results and discussion

# O Summary

$$V(
ho,\delta) = V(
ho,0) + V_{
m sym}(
ho)$$

Isoscalar potential  $V(\rho, 0)$ : attractive for proton and neutron

Isovector potential  $V_{sym}(\rho)$ : attractive for proton but repulsive for neutron (in neutron-rich environment)

All observables sensitive to symmetry energy are based on this character!

#### Nucleon scattering reaction





#### Nucleon scattering reaction



# $\overline{E_{ m sym}}$ in ImQMD



$$E_{
m sym}(
ho) = rac{C_{
m s,k}}{2} \left(rac{
ho}{
ho_0}
ight)^{2/3} + rac{C_{
m s,p}}{2} \left(rac{
ho}{
ho_0}
ight)^{\gamma}$$



Li Ou et.al PRC78, 044609 (2008)



Li Ou et.al PRC78, 044609 (2008)





Can possibly provide very clear constraint for  $E_{sym}(\rho)$ .

Li Ou et.al PRC78, 044609 (2008)



Can possibly provide very clear constraint for  $E_{sym}(\rho)$ .

Difficult to be proved by experiment. No good monochromatic neutron beam around 100 MeV!

Li Ou et.al PRC78, 044609 (2008)



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三日= のへで



• Deuteron rotates under torque.



- Deuteron rotates under torque.
- Proton and neutron move freely after deuteron breaks.



- Deuteron rotates under torque.
- Proton and neutron move freely after deuteron breaks.



- Deuteron rotates under torque.
- Proton and neutron move freely after deuteron breaks.
- Larger correlation angle with stronger isovector potential!























- Effect of the symmetry potential is largely smeared by the random initial orientation of the incident deuteron.
- Effect is more clear with polarized deuteron.



 $\ln\left[d\sigma/d\left(\cos\alpha\right)\right] = a_0 + \frac{a_1}{\cos\alpha}$ 

Slope coefficient  $a_1$  increases significantly with  $\gamma$ , can be a sensitive observable to constrain  $E_{\text{sym}}$ .

# Motivation and background

# ImQMD model

### ③ Results and discussion



▲ロト ▲御ト ▲画ト ▲画ト 画画 めんゆ

- Within ImQMD framework, the reorientation effect of deuteron attributed to isovector interaction in the nuclear field of heavy target nuclei has been investigated for the first time.
- The correlation angle of nucleons from breakup polarized deuteron, depends sensitively on the isovector potential but insensitively on the isoscaler potential.
- In terms of sensitivity and cleanness, the breakup reactions induced by polarized deuteron beam at about 100 MeV/u provide a more stringent constraint to the symmetry energy at subsaturation densities.



Skz series: same E(
ho,0), various  $E_{
m sym}(
ho)$ 

<ロ> (四)、(四)、(日)、(日)、

- 문 ( =



Skz series: same E(
ho,0), various  $E_{
m sym}(
ho)$ 

SkA, SkT5, SkT1, Skz-1: same  $E_{sym}(\rho)$ , various  $E(\rho, 0)$ 

・ロト ・ 日下・ ・ ヨト・・





Skz series: same E(
ho,0), various  $E_{
m sym}(
ho)$ 

SkA, SkT5, SkT1, Skz-1: same  $E_{sym}(\rho)$ , various  $E(\rho, 0)$ Sensitive to  $E_{sym}(\rho)$ , robust to  $E(\rho, 0)$ !

◆□▶ ◆舂▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣[日



To exclude events with small impact parameter.

### p,n elastic scattering angle









$$\Delta heta = heta_p - heta_n$$

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 + rac{A}{W\sqrt{\pi/2}}e^{-rac{2(\Delta heta-\Delta heta_c)^2}{W^2}}$$

 $\Delta heta_c$  and W are also good probe to study  $E_{
m sym}.$ 



(4日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

### Character



#### Experimental identification



• Nucleons from projectile or target can be distinguished by  $\theta\text{-}E_{\rm k}$  correlation. Two components are evidently separated.

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲필▶ ▲필▶ 필발

#### Experimental identification



- Nucleons from projectile or target can be distinguished by  $\theta$ - $E_{\rm k}$  correlation. Two components are evidently separated.
- $M_{
  m p}=M_{
  m n}=1.$  Most of spallation events can be excluded.

### Experimental identification



- Nucleons from projectile or target can be distinguished by  $\theta$ - $E_{\rm k}$  correlation. Two components are evidently separated.
- $M_{
  m p}=M_{
  m n}=1.$  Most of spallation events can be excluded.
- With energy cut  $E_{\rm k} \geqslant 50$  MeV, breakup events caused by collision can be excluded.



Scattering angle distributions for elastic scattering are close to each other in deuteron-induced and nucleon-induced.