

Science and Technology Facilities Council

Underground Measurements of LUNN the ¹⁶O(p,γ)¹⁷F Reaction at LUNA

Duncan Robb, University of Edinburgh Supervisors: Dr Carlo Bruno, Prof Marialuisa Aliotta





European Research Council Established by the European Commission

AGB Stars - Pre-Solar Grains and Hot Bottom Burning

- Group 2 pre-solar grains are predicted to have originated in AGB stars
- With the current ¹⁶O(p,γ)¹⁷F rate standard stellar models struggle to account for the observed ¹⁷O/¹⁶O ratios

Convective inter-shell

region

Hydrogen

burning ·

shell

• Hot Bottom Burning is a suggested additional mixing mechanism. Its success depends sensitively on the $^{16}O(p,\gamma)^{17}F$ rate





Prompt Gamma Method

- Directly measure the gamma rays from the $^{16}\text{O}(p,\gamma)^{17}\text{F}$ reaction
 - Measure **DC->0** and **DC->495** transitions separately
- Sensitive to angular distribution
 effects
 - Low efficiency, high resolution detectors

Activation Method

- Measure the decay of the daughter nucleus ¹⁷F
- Measure the **total cross section**, insensitive to individual transitions
 - No angular distribution effects
 - High efficiency, low resolution detectors

Targets

- Solid Ta₂O₅ targets
- Mostly created by anodic oxidation of tantalum backings in water
- Two created by **reactive sputtering**
- Different levels of enrichment in ¹⁸O
- Analysis by Nuclear Resonant Reaction Analysis (NRRA) on the E_p=151 keV resonance of ¹⁸O(p,γ)¹⁹F



See recent paper for details: Recent Results and Future Perspectives with Solid Targets at LUNA (Frontiers, 2024)

Prompt Gamma Ray Setup





Reaction Peak Areas

- DC->495 peaks are all below the 511 keV positron annihilation peak. In the lowest energy runs they are on the Compton edge of the annihilation peak
- For higher energies and all DC->0 peaks we can assume a linear background
- For peaks on the Compton edge the background was fit with an **error function** the Compton edge shape does not depend strongly on beam energy



Measured Angular Distributions



- 3 detectors is not enough to independently determine the angular distributions
- Instead, the yields (after correcting for efficiency, summing, and target effects) were compared to the **extrapolated distributions**
- Found **good agreement** with the extrapolated distributions

Activation Setup



$^{16}O(p,\gamma)^{17}F$ by the In Situ Activation Method at LUNA

- Positrons from the β⁺ emitters (¹⁷F in this case) annihilate in the target to produce two 511 keV gamma rays at 180°
- Counting only back-to-back coincidence events eliminates almost all background
- ¹⁷F β⁺ decays with a half-life of 64.4 s
- Major contaminants:
 - ¹⁵O from ¹⁴N(p, γ)¹⁵O: half-life = **122.3 s**
 - ¹³N from ¹²C(p, γ)¹³N: half-life = **598.0 s**



Constraining the Contaminants



• Contaminant yields were found by fitting the sum spectrum peaks from the two reactions ${}^{12}C(p,\gamma){}^{13}N$ and ${}^{14}N(p,\gamma){}^{15}O$

- The BGO can act as a **single high efficiency detector** by summing the signals across all 6 crystals
- From the sum spectra, constraints on the major contaminants could be found Sum Energy Spectrum



Production and Decay Fitting

• The annihilation rate spectra were fitted with the following differential equation:

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = KI(t) + \sum_{i} Y_{i}I(t) - \lambda_{i}N_{i}(t)$$

- *t* is time
- N_i is the number of nuclei of species i
- Y_i is the **yield** of species *i*
- λ_i is the decay constant of species i
- I(t) is the beam current
- *K* is the contribution from **prompt** gamma rays



Bayesian Fitting with MCMC

- Fits using **MINUIT** often hit parameter limits **unreliable uncertainties**
- Fits were re-done using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) to perform a maximum log-likelihood fit:

$$n(L) = \sum_{i} y_{i} \ln(\mu_{i}) - \mu_{i}$$

where y_i is the counts in time bin i, and μ_i is the model value at time bin i

• Contaminant constraints were implemented as gaussian priors

¹⁶O(p,γ)¹⁷F Total S-Factor



THANK YOU!

LUNA COLLABORATION:

Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso, INFN, Italy/GSSI, L'AQUILA, Italy R. Gesuè, F. Ferraro, M. Junker, T. Chillery, D. Basak Università degli Studi di Bari and INFN BARI, Italy G.F. Ciani Università degli Studi di Genova and INFN, GENOVA, Italy P. Corvisiero, S. Zavatarelli, M. Rossi Università degli Studi di Milano and INFN, MILANO, Italy A. Guglielmetti, R. Depalo, G. Gosta Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II" and INFN, NAPOLI, Italy A. Best, D. Dell'Aquila, A. Di Leva, G. Imbriani, D. Rapagnani, D. Mercogliano Università degli Studi di Padova and INFN, PADOVA, Italy C. Broggini, A. Caciolli, R. Menegazzo, D. Piatti, J. Skowronski, S. Turkat, R. Biasissi **INFN Roma, ROMA, Italy** A. Formicola, C. Gustavino, M. Vagnoni Laboratori Nazionali di Legnaro, Italy V. Rigato, M. Campostrini Osservatorio Astronomico di Collurania, TERAMO and INFN LNGS, Italy O. Straniero, U. Battino Università di Torino and INFN, TORINO, Italy F. Cavanna, P. Colombetti, R. Sariyal, G. Gervino Konkoly Observatory, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, BUDAPEST, Hungary M. Lugaro Institute of Nuclear Research (ATOMKI), DEBRECEN, Hungary L. Csedreki, Z. Elekes, Zs. Fülöp, Gy. Gyürky, T. Szücs Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, DRESDEN, Germany D. Bemmerer, A. Boeltzig, E. Masha University of Edinburgh, EDINBURGH, United Kingdom M. Aliotta, C.G. Bruno, T. Davinson, J. Marsh, A. Compagnucci, L.

Barbieri, R. Bonnell

Thanks for listening!





$^{16}O(p,\gamma)^{17}F$ Total S-Factor (Statistical Errors)



Typical Spectrum (HPGe)



Prompt Gamma Ray Target Degradation



Activation Target Degradation



Prompt Gamma Ray Simulated geometry



Prompt Gamma Ray Simulated Efficiency

Efficiency (%)



Efficiency Summing Corrections

- Simulated efficiency measurements with ¹³⁷Cs, ⁶⁰Co and ¹³³Ba sources
- Simulated runs with the individual gammas emitted separately
- Summing correction factor equals the ratio of the two yields
- Also calculated analytically using the total efficiency from the separate gamma sims (⁶⁰Co only)

$$C_{TCS} = \frac{n_1}{n_1'} = \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_{T2}}$$





Comparing Summing Correction Methods -⁶⁰Co Gamma 2 (1332 keV)



Angular Distribution

- The two primary gammas have an **intrinsic non-isotropic** angular distribution. We **extrapolated** from measurements made in the 1970s to our energies
- The distributions are described by the sum of Legendre polynomials, up to order 3 for DC->0 and order 4 for DC->495:

$$W(\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} A_n P_n(\cos\theta)$$

Legendre Order	$DC \rightarrow 0$ Coefficient	$DC \rightarrow 495$ Coefficient]
0	1	1	
1	0.02632	0.05856	
2	0.18635	-0.99931	
3	-0.01258	-0.05842	
4		-0.0006	

Extrapolated Angular Distributions for ¹⁶O(p, γ)¹⁷F Direct Capture to Ground State



Simulated Angular Distribution DC->495 for Legendre Polynomial of Order 1

Attenuation Factors

- Our detectors were quite close to the target holder (~1 - 5 cm), so subtended quite a large solid angle
- Can fully account for this by introducing an attenuation factor Q into the angular distribution equation (Rose 1953):

$$W(\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} A_n Q_n P_n(\cos\theta)$$

 The Qs can be calculated analytically for single detectors, or found from simulations



20

40

60

80

100

120

140

160

180 Angle (degrees)

Reaction Summing Corrections

- Simulated $^{16}\text{O}(p,\gamma)^{17}\text{F}$ reaction with extrapolated angular distribution
- Simulated runs with the individual gamma rays emitted separately, also with extrapolated angular distribution
- Summing correction factor equals the ratio of the two yields

Gamma	GeBochum C_{TCS}	CeBr0 C_{TCS}	CeBr90 C_{TCS}	Gamma	GeBochum C_{TCS}
$DC \rightarrow 495$	1.036 ± 0.002	1.040 ± 0.018	1.032 ± 0.001	$DC \rightarrow 495$	1.064 ± 0.001
$495 \rightarrow 0$	1.033 ± 0.012			$495 \rightarrow 0$	1.064 ± 0.001
$DC \rightarrow 0$	0.876 ± 0.001	0.890 ± 0.086	0.819 ± 0.008	$DC \rightarrow 0$	0.775 ± 0.003

