What Interferometry May Bring to the Study of High Density Symmetry Energy?

- The history of interferometry
- nn, np and pp correlations measured simultaneously
- Heavier particles
- What did we learn about the symmety term in experiments at energy < 100A MeV?
- Theory at these energies ,,,,,,and higher.
- A comment about chronology
- Perspectives for ASY-EOS







Interferometry has a long history

in optics, in astrophysics ..., in particle .. and nuclear physics



.... and then came simultaneous pp, np and nn correlation experiments

This experiment was outlined at the Jackson Hole meeting 1992



and he size of these experiments changed...



p: 20 CsI(Tl) [EMRIC] n: 48 liq. scint [EDEN] PF: 36 phoswich [ARGOS]

experiments perfrormed @ SARA, RIKEN, AGOR, LNS ... and proposed to the SARA PAC at ISN Grenoble, that rejected it with the argument that it should be more "safe to focus on pp correlations"!

After a convincing performance by Ö. Skeppstedt about our ability to handle liquid scintillators, the next PAC accepted it



and the result was

.... where we plot

$$C(q) = \frac{N_c(q)}{N_{nc}(q)}, \quad where \quad q = \mu \cdot \left| \overrightarrow{p_1} - \overrightarrow{p_2} \right|$$

and compare it to the two-particle correlation formalism of Koonin/Pratt including (anti)symmetrization of the two-particle wave function and final state interactions (attractve strong interaction and for pp Coulomb int.)

$$C(\vec{q},\vec{P}) = \int d^3r \cdot \frac{\int d^3\vec{R} \cdot f(\vec{P},\vec{r_1},t_e) \cdot f(\vec{P},\vec{r_2},t_e)}{\left| d^3r_1 \cdot f(\vec{P},\vec{r},t_e) \right|^2} \cdot \left| \Psi_{12}(\vec{q},\vec{R}) \right|^2$$

where $\vec{P} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\vec{p_1} + \vec{p_2})$, $\vec{r} = \vec{r_1} + \vec{r_2}$, $\vec{R} = \frac{r}{2}$ and t_e is the emission time for both particles at which the Wigner

functions in space and phase – space are introduced

$$f(\vec{P},\vec{R},t_e) = \int_{-\infty}^{t_e} dt \cdot g(\vec{P},\vec{R}-\vec{v_p}(t_e-t),t)$$

g is now the emission model of your choice

curves right: ∆t = 0, Gaussian in r and p (- - - -) Evaporative (____)





isospin effects - easier to observe for heavier particles?

Data: CHIC Collaboration + S. Kopecky, V. Kravchuk, H. Wilschut, KVI, Groningen

- anticorrelations in nd due to t formation
- * nt function contains ⁴H unbound states
- pd (and pt) are dominated by Coulomb
- * and pt shows also decay of exc. ⁴He
- isospin effects obvious for nd, nt, pt





Isospin effectsin $p_{tot} = p_1 + p_2$ gated correlations



Observations

- progressively weaker correlations from left to right -> longer emission times
- higher correlation peaks for the n-rich isotope

 \succ low P_{tot} $\triangleright \Theta = 54 - 120^{\circ}$



Interferometry - calculations

- 1. Comb. of Evaporation and $\Delta t = 0$ Gaussian in r and p (old data) [Jakobsson, Pratt]
- 2. Expanding fireball + Evaporation, Gaussian in space, Boltzmann in energy, succesive cooling (LNS and KVI data, see figure to the right) [Czörgö, Helgesson]
- 3. BUU (Bao-An Li), isospin dependent and momentum-independent, Skyrme potential U = Au + Bu^{σ} + C_zu^{γ} δ^2 NN collisions with Pauli blocking. Freeze-out density $\rho_0/8$ (so farKVI pp and np data) [Helgesson]

....all convoluted to the Koonin-Pratt twoparticle relative wave functions

- Data where singles spectra are used to set source velocities and version 2 then is introduced in the correlation plots are from:
- LNS Catania, 45A MeV ⁵⁸Ni + ²⁷Al, ^{nat}Ni, ¹⁹⁷Au [xxx]
- KVI Groningen, 61A MeV ³⁶Ar + ²⁷Al (see right), ^{112,124}Sn



Isospin effectscalculations vs data

Calculations, model 3, (J Helgesson, BUU – Bao-an Li)



The overall agreement is quite good (BUU stopped at 110 fm/c) Isospin dependent potential gives better agreement The stiff eos describes the differences better

pn data does not fit into this scheme!



As chronometer.....



.... The Lednicky prescription on how to utilize the asymmetry of the unlkie-particle wavefunction

Ar + Al, 61A MeV, velocity gated correlations



For dynamic (IE) sources : $t_n < t_d < t_p$ But IE source at 45A MeV : $t_p < t_d < t_n$

Neck formation \rightarrow

Perspectives for ASY-EOS

Detectors:

Some of those detector systems that are proposed for ASY-EOS are well suited as c.p. Interferometers (see next slides)

Neutron detectors (LAND, NEULAND, Liq. scint. Walls) must be carefully evaluated as nn and part of np intterferometers

Parts of CHIMERA well suited for PFs. What about time and energy resolution now for the use as interferometer?

Electronics: Trigger electronics well known (see last slide).

DAQ: No extreme requirements (slow count rates)

Physics: Extrapolations of BUU + evaporation

and QMD + evaporation to 400 – 800A MeV needed





B. JakobssonV. AvdeichikovJ. CederkällK. FissumP GolubevL. IsakssonD. di Julio

- Produced by Monocrystal, Kharkov
- Assembled and bench tested in Lund and Santiago de C.
- Tested in 180 MeV proton beams at TSL, Uppsala
- final choice of readout device to be made soon (normal PDs work very well for protons and light fragments but unfortunately not for photons at 100 keV, noise level too high)



*) USC design

TSL test with 179 MeV protons show small differences in the energy resolution between,



Trigger electronics in NIM/CAMAC standard for typical nn-np-pp interferometer



F. Merchez et al.,	Nucl. Instr. Meth. A 275 (1989) 133
M Cronqvist et al.,	Nucl. Instr. Meth. A 317 (1992) 273
	Phys. Lett. B317 (1993) 505
B. Jakobsson et al.,	Phys. Rev. C 44 (1991) R1238
	Proc. Jackson Hole 1992 (Ed. Back and Bauer) 246
	Nucl. Physics News Int. 17:1 (2007) 16
R. Ghetti et al.,	Nucl. Instr. Meth. A 335 (1993) 156
	Nucl. Instr. Meth. A 421 (1999) 542
	Nucl. Phys. A 660 (1999) 20
	Nucl. Phys. A 674 (2000) 277
	Phys. Rev. C 62, 037603 (2000)
	Phys. Rev. C 64, 037602 (2001)
	Phys. Rev. C 69 031605R (2004)
	Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 (2001) 102701
	Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 092701
R Ghetti and J. Helgesson,	Nucl. Phys. A 752 (2005) 480c
J. Pluta et al.,	Nucl. Instr. Meth, A 411 417
V. Adeichikov et al.,	Nucl. Phys. A 736 (2004) 22