

CHARGED ANTI-CLUSTER DECAY MODES OF ANTIMATTER NUCLEI

D. N. POENARU^{1,a}, R. A. GHERGHESCU¹, W. GREINER²

¹Horia Hulubei National Institute for R & D in Physics and Nuclear Engineering,
Str. Reactorului 30, RO-077125 Măgurele-Bucharest, Romania
Email:^a *poenaru@nipne.ro*

²Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies,
Ruth-Moufang-Str. 1, D-60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Received August 11, 2015

Abstract. A broad extension of periodic system into the sector of antimatter could be possible sometimes in a remote future. For the first time we study the anti-cluster and anti-alpha decay modes of an antimatter nucleus. We expect that it will have the same Q-value and half-life as alpha emission from the corresponding mirror nucleus – as a consequence of the CPT theorem. The phenomenological (LDM and Y+EM) as well as the single-particle shell models may be used just replacing the number of particles by the number of the corresponding antiparticles. This is the consequence of the invariance of binding energy as well as of the surface and Coulomb energy when passing from matter to antimatter nuclei with the same mass number and the same atomic number. The Q-values and half-lives of all measured up to now 27 cluster radioactivities are given together with Q-values and half-lives of the most important competitor – α decay. The lightest anti-alpha emitter, ${}^8\bar{B}e$, will have a very short half-life of about $81.9 \cdot 10^{-18}$ s.

Key words: Heavy-particle decay, Anti-cluster decay, Anti-Alpha decay, Alpha decay, Antimatter nuclei.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1928 Dirac predicted the existence of negative energy states of electrons [1] when he developed his famous relativistic wave equation for massive fermions. The antimatter character of these states became clear in 1933 after discovery of the positron (the antielectron) in cosmic radiation by Anderson [2].

Individual anti-particles are produced by particle accelerators and in some types of radioactive decay. Antiprotons (\bar{p}) [3] were observed in 1955 by Segrè and Chamberlain. The antineutron was discovered in proton-proton collisions at the Bevatron (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory) by Cork *et al.* in 1956 [4]. Antiprotons are produced at Fermilab for collider physics operations in the Tevatron. Other accelerators with complex projects for antimatter physics are the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory, LHC at CERN, and in the future Facility for Antiproton and Ion Research (FAIR)'s high-energy storage ring in

Darmstadt [5].

Until now it was established in all experiments that every antiparticle has the same mass with its particle counterpart; they differ essentially by the sign of electric charge. Also every antinucleus has the same mass or binding energy as its mirror nucleus [6].

Anti-atoms are difficult to produce; the simplest one – the antihydrogen (\bar{H}) was produced, cooled and confined [7] for about 1000 s [8–11]. At the beginning the Low Energy Antiproton Ring (LEAR) at CERN was used. This device decelerated the antiprotons and stored them in a ring. The antimatter helium-4 nucleus, ${}^4\bar{He}$, or anti- α , consists of two antiprotons and two antineutrons (baryon number $B = -4$) [12]. This is the heaviest observed antinucleus to date. It seems that the next one, antilithium, has an extremely low production rate.

It will be a long way to produce a rich diversity of more complex antinuclei justifying a broad extension of periodic system into the sector of antimatter and strangeness [13]. Nevertheless in this work we try to understand whether their decay modes by anti- α and anti-cluster spontaneous emission would differ from α decay and cluster radioactivity [14–16] of corresponding mirror nuclei. This is the first work dealing with such a topic.

2. POTENTIAL BARRIERS

Let us assume that a binary decay mode (*e.g.* anti-alpha decay, anti-cluster decay or spontaneous fission) of a parent anti-nucleus, ${}^A\bar{Z}$, leads to an emitted anti-cluster, ${}^{A_e}\bar{Z}_e$, and a daughter anti-nucleus, ${}^{A_d}\bar{Z}_d$:



with conservation of baryon numbers. Alternatively the subscript d may be denoted with 1 and e with 2. By definition, the number of antiprotons of an antinucleus is equal with the number of protons of the corresponding nucleus. The same is true for the number of antineutrons and of neutrons. Consequently, there is a good reason to assume that every anti-cluster, ${}^{A_e}\bar{Z}_e$, will have the same binding energy as the cluster ${}^{A_e}Z_e$, and similarly the binding energy of the daughter anti-nucleus, ${}^{A_d}\bar{Z}_d$, will be identical with that of the daughter, ${}^{A_d}Z_d$, and the binding energy of the parent anti-nucleus, ${}^A\bar{Z}$, is identical with that of the parent AZ . The released energy

$$Q = [M - (M_d + M_e)]c^2 \quad (2)$$

can be calculated using the last evaluation of experimental data for atomic masses [17]. In this eq. c is the light velocity, M, M_d, M_e are the masses of parent, daughter and emitted nucleus.

In general the ratio of $Z/A \neq Z_d/A_d \neq Z_e/A_e$ meaning that the three partners

have different charge densities. One can take into consideration the difference in charge densities [18] by assuming uniformity in each of the two fragments. In this way the nuclear volume $V = V_1 + V_2$ is divided in two parts, each of them being homogeneously charged with a density

$$\rho_e(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} \rho_{1e}, & \mathbf{r} \in V_1 \\ \rho_{2e}, & \mathbf{r} \in V_2 \end{cases}$$

During the decay process from one parent to two fragments there is a potential barrier which determines the metastability of any anti-nucleus. It is penetrated by quantum mechanical tunnelling as was shown by Gamow in 1928 for alpha decay of nuclides [19].

For cylindrical symmetry the simplest parametrization of the shape during this process, with only one deformation parameter (the volume and the radius of the emitted fragment are conserved), is that of two intersected spheres assumed in the two-center shell model [20]. The radius of the initial spherical anti-nucleus is $R_0 = r_0 A^{1/3}$ and the radii of the two fragments are $R_e = r_0 A_e^{1/3}$ and $R_d = r_0 A_d^{1/3}$. Within Myers-Swiatecki's liquid drop model (LDM) [21] the radius constant $r_0 = 1.2249$ fm and in the Yukawa-plus-Exponential model (Y+EM) [22] $r_0 = 1.16$ fm. During the overlapping stage the separation distance of the two fragments increases from an initial value $R_i = R_0 - R_e$ to the touching point value $R_t = R_e + R_d$. It is convenient to use the deformation parameter $\xi = (R - R_i)/(R_t - R_i)$ equal to unity at the touching point $R = R_t$.

We apply the macroscopic-microscopic method [23] to calculate the deformation energy, E_{def} , according to which a small shell and pairing correction δE is added to the macroscopic phenomenological model deformation energy obtained by summing the surface and Coulomb energy due to the strong and electrostatic forces:

$$E_{def} = (E_s - E_s^0) + (E_C - E_C^0) \quad (3)$$

where $E_s^0 = a_{20} A^{2/3} = a_s (1 - \kappa_s I^2) A^{2/3}$ and $E_C^0 = 3e^2 Z^2 / (5r_0 A^{1/3})$ correspond to the spherical parent with $a_s = 17.9439$ MeV, $I = (N - Z)/A$ and $\kappa_s = 1.7826$ within LDM.

The proton levels and neutron levels of a single particle shell model, *e.g.* two center shell model [24], allowing to calculate [23] the shell and pairing correction, δE , are different because protons are electrically charged. In the same way for anti-nuclei the antiproton levels should be different from antineutron levels but the antiproton levels would be identical with proton levels and antineutron levels identical with neutron levels.

2.1. STRONG INTERACTION

During the deformation from $R = R_i$ to $R = R_t$ the strong interaction is responsible for the surface energy. The strong force acts between antinucleons in the same manner it acts between nucleons; the electric charge doesn't play any role. For a number of antinucleons equal to that of nucleons it will have the same effect. The deformation dependent term is obtained by division with E_s^0 :

$$B_s = \frac{E_s}{E_s^0} = \frac{a_{21}}{a_{20}} B_{s1} + \frac{a_{22}}{a_{20}} B_{s2} \quad (4)$$

with $a_{21} \neq a_{22} \neq a_{20}$ taking into account the difference in charge densities. B_{s1} and B_{s2} are proportional with surface areas of the fragments:

$$B_{s1} = \frac{d^2}{2} \int_{-1}^{x_c} \left[y^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{dy^2}{dx} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} dx \quad (5)$$

$$B_{s2} = \frac{d^2}{2} \int_{x_c}^1 \left[y^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{dy^2}{dx} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} dx \quad (6)$$

where $d = (z'' - z')/2R_0$ is the length of the deformed antinucleus divided by the diameter of the spherical shape and x_c is the position of separation plane between fragments with $-1, +1$ intercepts on the symmetry axis (surface equation $y = y(x)$ or $y_1 = y(x')$).

2.2. COULOMB INTERACTION

We can see that not only the surface energy but also the Coulomb energy is invariant when passing from matter to antimatter because in the following general relationship [25] the charge density appears as a product of $\rho_e(\mathbf{r})\rho_e(\mathbf{r}_1)$:

$$E_c = \frac{1}{2} \int_{V_n} \int \frac{\rho_e(\mathbf{r})\rho_e(\mathbf{r}_1)d^3rd^3r_1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1|} \quad (7)$$

See also the expression of E_C^0 above.

For fragments with different charge densities by dividing with E_C^0 we obtain

$$B_c = \frac{E_c}{E_c^0} = \left(\frac{\rho_{1e}}{\rho_{0e}} \right)^2 B_{c1} + \frac{\rho_{1e}\rho_{2e}}{\rho_{0e}^2} B_{c12} + \left(\frac{\rho_{2e}}{\rho_{0e}} \right)^2 B_{c2} \quad (8)$$

explicitly showing the electrostatic self-energies and the interaction of two fragments. For binary systems with different charge densities and axially-symmetric shapes, we got

$$B_{c1} = b_c \int_{-1}^{x_c} dx \int_{-1}^{x_c} dx' F(x, x') \quad (9)$$




Fig. 1 – TOP: potential barrier for emission of $^{34}\bar{S}i$ from $^{242}\bar{C}m$ calculated within LDM (red) Y+EM (black). BOTTOM: two main terms of the LDM barrier: surface energy (dashed line cyan) and Coulomb energy (dotted line blue).

$$B_{c12} = b_c \int_{-1}^{x_c} dx \int_{x_c}^1 dx' F(x, x') \quad (10)$$

$$B_{c2} = b_c \int_{x_c}^1 dx \int_{x_c}^1 dx' F(x, x') \quad (11)$$

where $b_c = 5d^5/8\pi$ and d, x_c were defined in the previous subsection. The integrand is given by

$$F(x, x') = \left\{ yy_1 \frac{K - 2D}{3} \left[2(y^2 + y_1^2) - (x - x')^2 + \frac{3}{2}(x - x') \left(\frac{dy_1^2}{dx'} - \frac{dy^2}{dx} \right) \right] + K \left\{ \frac{y^2 y_1^2}{3} + \left[y^2 - \frac{x - x'}{2} \frac{dy^2}{dx} \right] \left[y_1^2 + \frac{x - x'}{2} \frac{dy_1^2}{dx'} \right] \right\} \right\} a_\rho^{-1} \quad (12)$$

where $D = (K - K')/k^2$; K and K' are the complete elliptic integrals of the first

and second kind, respectively:

$$K(k) = \int_0^{\pi/2} (1 - k^2 \sin^2 t)^{-1/2} dt; \quad K'(k) = \int_0^{\pi/2} (1 - k^2 \sin^2 t)^{1/2} dt \quad (13)$$

and $a_\rho^2 = (y + y_1)^2 + (x - x')^2$, $k^2 = 4yy_1/a_\rho^2$. The elliptic integrals are calculated by using the Chebyshev polynomial approximation. For $x = x'$ the function $F(x, x')$ is not determined. In this case, after removing the indetermination, we get $F(x, x') = 4y^3/3$.

2.3. EXAMPLE

In figure 1 (top panel) we present an example of potential barrier calculated within LDM and Y+EM for spontaneous emission of $^{34}\bar{S}i$ from $^{242}\bar{C}m$. It is clear that within Y+EM the strong interaction continues to act, as a proximity force even for separated fragments, $R > R_t$, as long as the tip separation distance remains small enough; the interaction energy is maximum at certain distance $R_m > R_t$. For spherical fragments there is an analytical relationships of interaction term:

$$E_{Y12} = -4 \left(\frac{a}{r_0} \right)^2 \sqrt{a_{21}a_{22}} \left[g_1 g_2 \left(4 + \frac{R}{a} \right) - g_2 f_1 - g_1 f_2 \right] \frac{\exp(-R/a)}{R/a} \quad (14)$$

$$g_k = \frac{R_k}{a} \cosh \left(\frac{R_k}{a} \right) - \sinh \left(\frac{R_k}{a} \right); \quad f_k = \left(\frac{R_k}{a} \right)^2 \sinh \left(\frac{R_k}{a} \right) \quad (15)$$

where $a = 0.68$ fm is the diffusivity parameter and $a_2 = a_s(1 - \kappa I^2)$, $a_s = 21.18466$ MeV, $\kappa = 2.345$.

The contribution of surface, E_s , and Coulomb energy, E_C , to the LDM potential barrier is plotted at the bottom of figure 1. The potential barrier height is the result of adding an increasing with separation distance surface energy up to the touching point with a decreasing electrostatic energy up to infinity.

3. HALF-LIVES

The experimental data on halflives against cluster radioactivity [26, 27], T_c , and α decay, T_α , are given in Table 1, together with Q -values, updated using the mass tables published in 2012 [17]. Up to now there was not observed any odd-odd cluster emitter.

It is clear that $T_c \gg T_\alpha$, hence cluster radioactivity of nuclei with atomic numbers $Z = 87 - 96$ is a rare phenomenon in a huge background of α particles. The measurements are in good agreement with predictions within analytical supersymmetric fission (ASAF) model [28]. Surprisingly, for some superheavy nuclei we found [16, 29] comparable half-lives or even shorter $T_c < T_\alpha$.

We expect that the same Q -values and half-lives will be observed in the future for anti-cluster decay and anti-alpha decay of antimatter nuclei. Perhaps the easiest way to observe the decay modes of antimatter nuclei would be to produce the lightest $\bar{\alpha}$ emitter, ${}^8\bar{B}e$, which will be split in two ${}^4\bar{H}e$ or two $\bar{\alpha}$ nuclei with a half-life of about $81.9 \cdot 10^{-18} \text{ s} = 81.9 \text{ as}$ — the same with that of ${}^8Be \rightarrow \alpha + \alpha$ [30].

4. CONCLUSIONS

For the first time we analyze the possibility of new phenomena: binary decay modes of antimatter nuclei by spontaneous emission of anti-alpha nuclei, spontaneous emission of anti-cluster nuclei and spontaneous fission into two antimatter fragments.

Experimentally it was established the identity of the antineutron with neutron masses, $m_{\bar{n}} = m_n$, and of the antiproton with proton masses, $m_{\bar{p}} = m_p$. On this basis we expect that the strong force term of a phenomenological LDM or Y+EM of an antimatter nucleus will be the same as for its matter nucleus mirror. The same is true for the Coulomb term because it depends on the square of the electric charge hence $(-e)^2 = (+e)^2$. The shell and pairing corrections will not change anything since the antiproton single-particle levels would be identical with proton levels and antineutron levels identical with neutron levels. As a consequence of CPT theorem, the potential barrier for anti-alpha decay will be identical with the potential barrier for alpha decay, the potential barrier for anti-cluster decay will be identical with the potential barrier for cluster decay and the potential barrier for fission of an antimatter nucleus will be identical with the potential barrier for fission of a matter nucleus. The measurable quantities, Q -values and half-lives, are expected to follow the same pattern.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported within the IDEI Programme under Contracts No. 43/05.10.2011 and No. 42/05.10.2011 with UEFISCDI, and NUCLEU Programme, Bucharest.

REFERENCES

1. P. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A 117**, 610 (1928).
2. C. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **43**, 491 (1933).
3. O. Chamberlain, E. Segrè, C. Wiegand, T. Ypsilantis, Phys. Rev. **100**, 947 (1955).
4. B. Cork, G. Lambertson, O. Piccioni, W. Wenzel, Phys. Rev. **104**, 1193 (1956).
5. A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, H. Stöcker, Phys. Lett. B **697**, 203 (2011).
6. F. Close, *Antimatter* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2009), ISBN 978-0-19-955016-6.
7. W. Quint, M. Vogel (eds.), *Fundamental Physics in Particle Traps (Springer Tracts in Modern Physics 256)* (Springer, Berlin, 2014), ISBN 978-3-642-45201-7.
8. G. Baur *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **368**, 251–258 (1996).

9. G. Gabrielse *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 213401 (2002).
10. G. Andresen *et al.*, Nature **468**, 673–676 (2010).
11. ALPHA Collaboration, Nature Physics **7**, 558564 (2011).
12. STAR Collaboration, Nature **473**, 353–356 (2011).
13. W. Greiner, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **403**, 012046 (2012).
14. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, 2011. Web <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/465998/>.
15. D. N. Poenaru, W. Greiner, in *Clusters in Nuclei Vol. 1. Lecture Notes in Physics vol. 818* (C. Beck, ed.), chap. 1, pp. 1–56 (Springer, Berlin, 2010) ISBN 978-3-642-13898-0.
16. D. N. Poenaru, R. A. Gherghescu, W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**(6), 062503 (2011).
17. M. Wang, G. Audi, A. H. Wapstra, F. Kondev, M. MacCormick, X. Xu, B. Pfeiffer, Chinese Physics, C **36**(12), 16032014 (2012).
18. D. N. Poenaru, M. Ivaşcu, D. Mazilu, Computer Physics Communications **19**, 205–214 (1980).
19. G. Gamow, Zeitschrift für Physik **51**, 204–212 (1928).
20. W. Greiner, J. A. Maruhn, *Nuclear Models* (Springer, Berlin, 1996).
21. W. D. Myers, W. J. Swiatecki, Nuclear Physics, A **81**, 1–60 (1966).
22. H. J. Krappe, J. R. Nix, A. J. Sierk, Physical Review, C **20**, 992–1013 (1979).
23. V. M. Strutinsky, Nuclear Physics, A **95**, 420–442 (1967).
24. R. A. Gherghescu, Physical Review C **67**, 014309 (2003).
25. K. T. R. Davies, A. J. Sierk, Journal of Computational Physics **18**, 311–325 (1975).
26. R. Bonetti, A. Guglielmetti, Rom. Rep. Phys. ISSN 1221-1451 **59**, 301–310 (2007).
27. A. Guglielmetti, D. Faccio, R. Bonetti, S. Shishkin, S. Tretyakova *et al.*, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **111**, 012050 (2008).
28. D. N. Poenaru, D. Schnabel, W. Greiner, D. Mazilu, R. Gherghescu, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **48**, 231–327 (1991).
29. D. N. Poenaru, R. A. Gherghescu, W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 034615 (2012).
30. G. Audi, F. Kondev, M. Wang, B. Pfeiffer, X. Sun, J. Blachot, M. MacCormick, Chinese Physics, C **36**(12), 11571286 (2012).

Table 1

Q -values in MeV and decimal logarithm of the half-lives in seconds for the most probable CR and α D of cluster emitters experimentally observed.

Parent	Emitted	Q_c	$\log_{10} T_c^{exp}(s)$	$\log_{10} T_c^{ASAF}(s)$	Q_α	$\log_{10} T_\alpha^{exp}(s)$
²²¹ Fr	¹⁴ C	31.291	14.52	14.27	6.458	2.55
²²¹ Ra	¹⁴ C	32.395	13.39	13.74	6.881	1.90
²²² Ra	¹⁴ C	33.049	11.01	11.15	6.679	1.58
²²³ Ra	¹⁴ C	31.828	15.19	14.72	5.979	5.99
²²⁴ Ra	¹⁴ C	30.534	15.86	15.93	5.789	5.50
²²⁶ Ra	¹⁴ C	28.196	21.19	20.98	4.870	10.70
²²³ Ac	¹⁴ C	33.064	12.96	12.68	6.783	2.48
²²⁵ Ac	¹⁴ C	30.476	17.28	17.69	5.935	6.23
²²⁸ Th	²⁰ O	44.724	20.72	21.72	5.520	7.78
²³¹ Pa	²³ F	51.860	26.02	25.52	5.149	11.47
²³⁰ U	²² Ne	61.386	19.57	20.12	5.992	6.26
²³⁰ Th	²⁴ Ne	57.760	24.61	24.86	4.770	12.38
²³¹ Pa	²⁴ Ne	60.409	23.23	23.01	5.149	11.47
²³² U	²⁴ Ne	62.309	20.42	20.37	5.413	9.34
²³³ U	²⁴ Ne	60.485	24.84	24.97	4.909	12.78
²³⁴ U	²⁴ Ne	58.824	25.92	25.72	4.857	13.04
²³⁵ U	²⁴ Ne	57.362	27.42	29.97	4.678	16.57
²³³ U	²⁵ Ne	60.727	24.84	25.48	4.909	12.78
²³⁵ U	²⁵ Ne	57.706	27.42	30.38	4.678	16.57
²³⁴ U	²⁶ Ne	59.415	25.92	26.59	4.857	13.04
²³⁴ U	²⁸ Mg	74.109	25.14	25.34	4.857	13.04
²³⁶ Pu	²⁸ Mg	79.668	21.52	20.55	5.867	7.95
²³⁸ Pu	²⁸ Mg	75.909	25.70	25.60	5.593	9.44
²³⁶ U	³⁰ Mg	72.274	27.58	29.54	4.573	14.99
²³⁸ Pu	³⁰ Mg	76.795	25.70	25.86	5.593	9.44
²³⁸ Pu	³² Si	91.186	25.27	25.33	5.593	9.44
²⁴² Cm	³⁴ Si	96.509	23.15	22.77	6.216	7.15