Neutrino induced transitions between the ground states of the A=12 triad

J. Engel[1], E. Kolbe[2], K. Langanke[3], and P. Vogel[4]
[1] *Department of Physics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599*
[2] *Physikalishes Institut, Universität Basel, Switzerland*
[3] *W.K. Kellogg Radiation Lab., California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125*
[4] *Physics Dep., California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125*
(November 26, 2013)

arXiv:nucl-th/9606031v1 17 Jun 1996

Abstract

Neutrino induced reactions on ^{12}C, an ingredient of liquid scintillators, have been studied in several experiments. We show that for currently available neutrino energies, $E_\nu \leq 300$ MeV, calculated exclusive cross sections $^{12}\mathrm{C}_{gs}(\nu,l)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ for both muon and electron neutrinos are essentially model independent, provided the calculations simultaneously describe the rates of several other reactions involving the same states or their isobar analogs. The calculations agree well with the measured cross sections, which can be therefore used to check the normalization of the incident neutrino spectrum and the efficiency of the detector.

PACS numbers: 13.15.Dk, 21.60.-n,23.40.Bw,25.30.Pt

Typeset using REVTEX

A solid theoretical understanding of cross sections in neutrino-induced reactions on light nuclei is becoming a necessity, in particular for ^{12}C, an ingredient of liquid scintillators, and for ^{16}O, the basic component of water Čerenkov detectors. Detectors containing these isotopes are used to measure fluxes of atmospheric and supernova neutrinos, and in searches for neutrino oscillations. These tasks to a large extent require knowledge of the corresponding cross sections, which often have not been measured. When experimental cross sections are available it is therefore important to compare them with calculations.

For ^{12}C a number of experimental results exist. These include measurements of charged-current reactions induced by both electron- [1] and muon-neutrinos [2–4], exciting both the ground and continuum states in ^{12}N. The inclusive cross section for $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_e, e)^{12}\mathrm{N}^*$, measured by Karmen [1], LAMPF (with large errors) [5], and recently by the LSND collaboration [4], agree well with calculations. [A previously reported measurement of both exclusive and inclusive neutrino cross sections on ^{12}C [2] appears to be inconsistently large [3]; we will not consider that measurement here.] By contrast, there is a disturbing discrepancy between calculations [6–8] and the LSND value of the cross section for the inclusive reaction $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_\mu, \mu)^{12}\mathrm{N}^*$, which uses higher energy neutrinos from pion-decay in flight [3,4,9]. The disagreement is disturbing[1] in light of the apparent simplicity of the reaction and in view of the fact that parameter-free calculations, such as those in [6,7] describe well other weak processes which are governed by the same weak-current nuclear matrix elements. Here we examine whether similar problems affect our understanding of the exclusive reactions $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_e, e)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ [1,3] and $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_\mu, \mu)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ [3,4,9]. The exclusive process is a useful monitor of the neutrino flux. If calculations are reliable and reproduce experiment, then the normalization of the experimental neutrino flux must have been correctly modeled.

A calculation of the exclusive cross section can be tested by computing rates of related processes and comparing to data. The 1^+ $T = 1$ ground state in ^{12}N is the analog of the 15.11 MeV state in ^{12}C and of the ground state of ^{12}B. This allows us to use β^+ decay from ^{12}N back to the 0^+ $T = 0$ ground state of ^{12}C, muon capture from ^{12}C to the ground state of ^{12}B, ineleastic electron scattering to the 15.11 MeV state in ^{12}C, and $M1$ decay from that state to the ground state to calibrate elements of the calculation. In what follows we calculate the exclusive neutrino cross sections in several ways to see whether when all the above data are reproduced, the different models can produce significantly different predictions.

Our first approach is a restricted shell-model calculation. Describing all the above reactions is straightforward in the shell model as long as we can neglect contributions of two-body operators (i.e. meson exchange). The reduced matrix element of an arbitrary operator $\hat{\mathrm{O}}$ is then given by

$$\langle 1^+, 1||\hat{O}||0^+, 0\rangle = \sum_{j,j'} \langle j||\hat{O}||j'\rangle OBD(j, j') \ , \tag{1}$$

where the one-body transition densities are defined by

$$OBD(j, j') = \langle 1^+, 1||[a_j^\dagger \tilde{a}_j]^{J^\pi, T=1^+, 1}||0^+, 0\rangle \ . \tag{2}$$

---

[1] The disagreement is not universal. In [10] a cross section that agrees with LSND is obtained using the elementary particle method. We discuss the applicability of the approximations used in [10] elsewhere [11].

If we further assume that all structure in the low-lying states with $J^\pi = 1^+, T = 1$ is generated by the eight "valence" nucleons moving in the p-shell, there are only 4 one-body densities and 4 single-particle matrix elements $\langle j||\hat{O}||j'\rangle$, which contain all the momentum-transfer dependence and that are simple to calculate. Futhermore, the Gamow-Teller (GT) matrix element for the β^+ decay of ^{12}N, the $M1$ radiative width of the state at 15.11 MeV in ^{12}C, and the form factor for the excitation of this state in electron scattering [12] depend only on *three* one-body densities; they are independent of the combination $OBD(p_{3/2}, p_{1/2}) + OBD(p_{1/2}, p_{3/2})$. (See the review [13] for a general discussion.)

The most straightforward way of obtaining the one-body densities is by diagonalizing a thoroughly tested residual interaction, such as the one given in Ref. [14]. It is well known, however, that the resulting p-shell one-body densities do not describe the reactions above very well. Typically, the calculated GT strength is too large (the origin of "GT quenching") and the electron scattering form factor is too high in the first lobe. In a number of papers [15–18] over the last twenty plus years, however, it has been shown that one can modify the one-body densities (ad hoc) in such a way that the three experiments are correctly reproduced, with the form factor adequately described up to the first minimum at $|\vec{q}| \approx 1.5$ fm^{-1}. This is the approach we follow here, adjusting the densities to reproduce the data. The so-far undetermined fourth combination of densities can be fixed (with some uncertainty) by the muon capture rate to the ground state of ^{12}B [13]. This process is the only one that tests the momentum dependence of the axial current, since it takes place at $q^2 = -0.74 m_\mu^2$. For our analysis we take an averaged experimental rate, $\omega(1^+) = 6200 \pm 200$ s^{-1} [19], and use the Goldberger-Treiman relation for the induced-pseudoscalar coupling constant.

Line 2 of Table I contains the resulting one-body densities, adjusted here to reproduce all the data discussed above. Lines 3-5 contain one-body densities used by other authors, and constrained to different subsets of the above data. To achieve an overall agreement with all the data, we renormalize, in addition, either the weak axial form factor F_A or the magnetic form factor F_M. Haxton [15] (line 3) required that the β^- decay of ^{12}B, rather than ^{12}N (but not the muon capture), be well described; because of isospin violation in the ft values, his densities require a renormalization factor of 0.873 for the axial current form factor F_A to fit the ^{12}N decay. The entries in line 4 are based on the extreme single particle model [16], in which ^{12}C is represented as a closed $p_{3/2}$ subshell, and ^{12}N or ^{12}B have one nucleon in $p_{1/2}$ subshell. Here a renormalization of 0.414 is required for F_A, and 0.484 for the magnetic form factor F_M. Finally, line 5 contains the one-body densities of Ref. [17], based on a minimally modified Cohen-Kurath interaction. They require only a small F_A renormalization of 0.925. In all cases harmonic oscillator wave functions are used, with slightly different values of the oscillator parameter b taken from the original references. The table clearly illustrates that the extraction of one-body densities from data is not a unique procedure; it depends on other assumptions about wave functions, etc. We discuss the effects of these differences on the exclusive neutrino cross sections shortly.

While two-body effects, i.e. meson exchange corrections, are expected to be relatively small (5-10 %) for the momentum transfer considered here [20], configurations beyond the p shell might explain the need for a drastic renormalization of the one-body densities produced by a reasonable p-shell Hamiltonian. We therefore calculate the rates of all the reactions above, including exclusive neutrino capture, in the Random Phase Approximation (RPA), which does include multishell correlations, while treating the configuration mixing within

the p shell only crudely. The same method, extended to the continuum, has been used in the calculation of the neutrino charged and neutral current inclusive scattering [6,7,21], (disagreeing disturbingly with one experiment, as noted above) and muon capture [22].

To compensate for the crude description of the p-shell dynamics we use an overall quenching factor of 0.258 by which we multiply the rates, respectively the cross sections of all processes under consideration, for all momentum transfers. With this multiplicative factor the β^+ decay, $M1$ width, electron scattering form factor and partial muon capture rate are all adequately described, and the exclusive cross sections, discussed below, are readily calculated. (It has been known for some time that the RPA is capable of describing the shape of the (e, e') form factor for the 15.11 MeV state [23].)

Our third approach is the "elementary-particle treatment" (EPT). Instead of describing nuclei in terms of nucleons or other constituents, the EPT considers them elementary and describes transition matrix elements in terms of *nuclear* form factors deduced from experimental data and constrained by transformation properties. The EPT was implemented in the $A = 12$ system in Refs. [24–26] for neutrino energies up to $E_\nu = 100$ MeV. Here we extend the approach to the higher neutrino energies relevant to the LSND decay-in-flight ν_μ's by appropriately including the lepton mass, which was ignored in Ref. [24], in the kinematics. A nonzero lepton mass requires, in turn, that the induced pseudoscalar term, also neglected in Ref. [24], must be included as well. Here we used a modified form of Eq. (16) in Ref. [24], kindly furnished to us by Professor Kubodera and for the $F_P(Q^2)$ we used the simple ansatz:

$$F_P(Q^2) = -\frac{m_\pi^2}{Q^2} F_A(0) \left[F_A(Q^2) - \frac{m_\pi^2}{Q^2 + m_\pi^2} \frac{1}{1 + Q^2/\xi^2} \right] , \tag{3}$$

where, as usual, $Q^2 = -q^2$, and the empirical parameter ξ has been fixed from muon capture.

We turn now to the evaluation of the exclusive cross sections in the three approaches. Within the shell model and the RPA the cross section is easily evaluated once the one-body densities and free-nucleon form factors (for which we use standard values) are specified; the general prescription can be found, e.g., in Ref. [27]. In the EPT the evaluation is even simpler since the nucleus is elementary. One complication often not considered is related to the Coulomb interaction of the outgoing charged lepton. The usual treatment, as in nuclear β decay, involves the Fermi function $F(Z, E)$, which is the ratio of the Coulomb continuum s-wave and the corresponding free s-wave wave. This approximation is valid, however, only for lepton momenta $pR \leq 1$, where R is the nuclear radius. For ^{12}C it can be used for electrons with up to about 50 MeV of kinetic energy, but it is justified only for muons of 10 MeV or less of kinetic energy. As energy increases, $F(Z, E)$ approaches a constant value, $\sim$ 1.17 ($Z = 7$) for ν reactions on ^{12}C, and ~ 0.90 ($Z = 5$) for $\bar{\nu}$-induced reactions on ^{12}C. On the other hand, it is intuitively clear that as the lepton energy becomes much larger than the Coulomb energy, the Coulomb correction should approach unity. In order to keep things simple, and since the correction is a relatively minor one, we scale at higher energies the lepton cross section by the ratio

$$\frac{p_{eff}(E + \langle V \rangle)}{pE} \text{ , where } p_{eff} = p(1 + \frac{\langle V \rangle}{E}),\ \langle V \rangle = \pm \frac{3Z\alpha}{2R} , \tag{4}$$

and $\langle V \rangle$ represents the average Coulomb potential. The two approximations are smoothly connected.

The results appear in Table II. For the ν_e-induced reaction with neutrinos from the muon decay-at-rest [1] the agreement between the experimental and calculated exclusive cross section is perfect in all the models. This cross section, corresponding to an average momentum transfer of only about 50 MeV, appears totally fixed by the requirements we impose on each of the calculations. For the ν_μ-induced reaction the average momentum transfer is about 150 MeV. But even in this case the different variants of the shell model, the RPA and the EPT give quite similar cross sections. Again, the agreement with the LSND experimental value is good.

In Figures 1 and 2 we show the exclusive cross sections for $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_e, e)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ and $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_\mu, \mu)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$, respectively, as a function of neutrino energy. For ν_e's the cross section is essentially the same in all the approaches we consider. The agreement between the various models is also quite good for ν_μ's. Moreover, after a very steep rise from the threshold, this cross section quickly saturates and becomes more or less independent on the neutrino energy. Thus, the exclusive cross section is simply proportional to the *total* number of ν_μ's above threshold. However, it is essentially independent of their energy distribution.

For completeness, Table III lists the cross sections for neutral-current excitation of the 15.11 MeV, $1^+, T = 1$ state in ^{12}C, which was measured by Karmen [1] for neutrinos from decay at rest. Once again all the models agree with one another and the data. The neutral-current cross section for ν_μ's from decay-in-flight and for $\bar{\nu}_\mu$'s are probably not measurable, but unsurprisingly the calculations continue to agree with one another.

In conclusion, we have shown that the exclusive cross sections for neutrino energies available now are calculable in a variety of ways, with results that are nearly identical, and agree very well with the data. These processes can therefore be used as a check of the neutrino flux normalization, and detector efficiency and indicate that the discrepancy between the measured and calculated inclusive $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_\mu, \mu)^{12}\mathrm{N}^*$ cross sections is not caused by an underestimate of the neutrino flux normalization. The source the disagreement must be found elsewhere.

We would like to thank Professor Kubodera for his help with the EPT. We also appreciate numerous discussions with the members of LSND collaboration. We were supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under grants DE-FG05-94ER40827 and DE-FG03-88ER-40397, by the U.S. National Science Foundation under grants PHY94-12818 and PHY94-20470, and by the Swiss Nationalfonds.

TABLES

TABLE I. Fitted one-body densities $OBD(j, j')$. The parameter b is the oscillator length. The range in line 2, column 4, reflects the uncertainty in the muon capture rate; in other lines only the most probable capture rate was used.

j, j'	1/2,1/2	1/2,3/2-3/2,1/2	1/2,3/2+3/2,1/2	3/2,3/2	b (fm)
present	-0.113	0.106	0.666±0.4	0.24	1.67
Ref. [15]	-0.111	0.337	0.875	0.086	1.76
Ref. [16]	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.77
Ref. [17]	-0.27	0.318	1.03	0.116	1.82

TABLE II. Comparison of calculated and measured cross sections, in units of $10^{-42}\mathrm{cm}^{-2}$ and averaged over the corresponding neutrino spectra, for the neutrino induced transitions $^{12}\mathrm{C}_{gs} \rightarrow ^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ and $^{12}\mathrm{C}_{gs} \rightarrow ^{12}\mathrm{B}_{gs}$. For the decay at rest the ν_e spectrum is normalized from $E_\nu = 0$ while for the decay in flight the ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ spectra are normalized from the corresponding threshold. The cross section for $\bar{\nu}_e$ is not quoted since the decay-at-rest neutrino source does not contain any $\bar{\nu}_e$'s.

	$^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_e, e^-)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ decay at rest	$^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_\mu, \mu^-)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ decay in flight	$^{12}\mathrm{C}(\bar{\nu}_\mu, \mu^+)^{12}\mathrm{B}_{gs}$ decay in flight
experiment	8.9±0.6 ± 0.75 [1]	-	-
experiment	9.1±0.4 ± 0.9 [4]	64±10 ± 10 [4]	-
OBD of this work	9.1 ± 0.1	63.5† ±5	24
OBD of Ref. [15]	8.8	60.4	23
OBD of Ref. [16]	9.4	65.4	22.6
OBD of Ref [17]	9.4	62.3	23.7
CRPA [6,7]	8.9	63.0	26
EPT†† [24]	9.2	62.9	21.5

† The uncertainty reflects the range corresponding to the uncertainty in the muon capture rate. A similar range is presumably valid for the other approaches in lines 4-6.
†† Extended to muon neutrinos, K. Kubodera, private communication.

TABLE III. Comparison of calculated and measured cross sections, in units of 10^{-42}cm^{-2} and averaged over the corresponding neutrino spectra, for the neutrino-induced neutral-current transitions $^{12}\mathrm{C}_{gs}(\nu,\nu')^{12}\mathrm{C}$ (15.11). In column 2 the contributions from ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ are added. All spectra are normalized "per neutrino" i.e. from E_ν=0.

	$^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_e/\bar{\nu}_\mu,\nu'_e/\bar{\nu}'_\mu)^{12}\mathrm{C}(15.11)$ decay at rest	$^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_\mu,\nu'_\mu)^{12}\mathrm{C}$ (15.11) decay in flight	$^{12}\mathrm{C}(\bar{\nu}_\mu,\bar{\nu}'_\mu)^{12}\mathrm{C}$ (15.11) decay in flight
experiment	$11\pm1.0\pm0.9$ [1]	-	-
OBD of this work	9.3	22.3	15.2
OBD of Ref. [15]	9.3	21.9	15.3
OBD of Ref. [16]	9.4	23.7	16.4
OBD of Ref [17]	9.6	22.9	15.9
CRPA [6,7]	10.5	27.2	17.5
EPT [24]	9.4	24.3	14.5

REFERENCES

[1] G. Drexlin et al., KARMEN Collaboration, Proc of Neutrino Workshop - Heidelberg 1987, p.147 ed. B. Povh and V. Klapdor, Springer Verlag.
G. Drexlin et al., KARMEN collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B267** (1991) 321.
B. Zeitnitz, KARMEN Collaboration, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **32**, (1994) 351-373.

[2] D.D. Koetke et al., Phys. Rev. **C46**, 2554 (1992).

[3] M. Albert et al., Phys. Rev. **C51**, 1065 (1995).

[4] H. J. Kim et al., talk at the PANIC96 conference; to be published in the Proceedings.

[5] D.A. Krakauer et al., Phys. Rev. **C45**, 2450 (1992).

[6] E. Kolbe, K. Langanke, and S. Krewald, Phys. Rev. **C49**, (1994) 1122.

[7] E. Kolbe, K. Langanke, F.-K. Thielemann, and P. Vogel, Phys. Rev. **C52**, 3437 (1995).

[8] T. S. Kosmas and E. Oset, Phys. Rev.C **53**, 1409 (1996).

[9] C. Athanassopoulos, PhD thesis, Temple University, May 1995, unpublished.

[10] S. L. Mintz and M. Pourkaviani, Nucl. Phys. **A594**, 346 (1995).

[11] E. Kolbe et al, in preparation.

[12] U. Deutschmann, G. Lahm, R. Neuhausen, and J. C. Bergstrom, Nucl. Phys. **A411**, 337 (1983); R. S. Hicks et al., Phys. Rev. C **36**, 485 (1987).

[13] T. W. Donnelly and R. D. Peccei, Phys. Rep. **50**, 1 (1979).

[14] E. K. Warburton and B. A. Brown, Phys. Rev. C **46**, 923 (1992).

[15] W. C. Haxton, Phys. Lett. **B76**, 165 (1978).

[16] J. S. O'Connell, T. W. Donnelly, and J. D. Walecka, Phys. Rev. C**6**, 719 (1972).

[17] F. P. Brady et al., Phys. Rev. C**43**, 2284 (1991).

[18] B. C. Doyle and N. C. Mukhopadhyay, Phys. Rev. C**52**, 1947 (1995).

[19] Y. G. Budyashov et al. , Sov. Phys. JETP **31**, 651 (1970); G. H. Miller et al., Phys. Lett. **B41**, 50 (1972); L. Ph. Roesch et al, Phys. Lett. **B107**, 31 (1981).

[20] Y. Umino and J. M. Udias, preprint nucl-th 9602003.

[21] E. Kolbe, K. Langanke, S. Krewald and F.-K. Thielemann, Nucl. Phys. **A540**, 599 (1992).

[22] E. Kolbe, K. Langanke and P. Vogel, Phys. Rev. **C50**, 2576 (1994).

[23] T. Suzuki, F. Osterfeld, and J. Speth, Phys. Lett. **100B**, 443 (1981).

[24] M. Fukugita, Y. Kohyama and K. Kubodera, Phys. Lett. **B212**, 139 (1988).

[25] K. Kubodera and S. Nozawa, Int. Journ. of Mod. Phys. **3**, 101 (1994).


[26] S. Nozawa, Y. Kohyama, K. Kubodera, Progr. Theor. Phys. **70**, 892 (1983).


[27] J. D. Walecka, in *Muon Physics, vol II*, p.113. V. W. Hughes and C. S. Wu, editors, Academic Press, New York, 1977.

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Cross section for $^{12}\mathrm{C}(\nu_e, e)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ as a function of the ν_e energy, in units of $10^{-42}\mathrm{cm}^2$. The full line is for the shell model with one-body densities from line 2, Table I, the dashed line is the modified Cohen-Kurath one body densities from line 5, Table I [17] (the curves for the other shell model variants are very similar and are not shown), the dot-and-dashed line is for the RPA [7], and the dotted line is for the EPT.

FIG. 2. Cross section for $^{12}\mathrm{C}\nu_\mu, \mu)^{12}\mathrm{N}_{gs}$ as a function of the ν_μ energy, in units of $10^{-42}\mathrm{cm}^2$. The notation is as in Fig. 1.


100
80
60
40
20
0
0
50
100
150
200
250
σ (10^-42 cm^2)
E_ν (MeV)


100
80
60
40
20
0
120
140
160
180
200
220
240
σ (10^-42 cm^2)
E_ν (MeV)