## Outline

Nuclear astrophysics and low-energy experiments
C-burning: astrophysical motivations and state-of-the-art measurements
The THM ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left({ }^{12} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{a}\right){ }^{20} \mathrm{Ne}$ and ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left({ }^{12} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{p}\right){ }^{23} \mathrm{Na}$ experiment
Results and conclusions
... Everything starts from the $B^{2}$ FH review paper of 1957 ,
the basis of the modern nuclear astrophysics


## REVIEWS OF

## Modern Physics

Synthesis of the Elements in Stars*
e. Mamanex Bunutdae, G. R. Bunidge, Whlian A. Fowlzh, and F. Hoyle

The first complete review of nuclear reactions explaining: $H$ and He quiescent and hot burning, and of the nucleosynthesis beyond Fe.


Nuclear reactions in stars are responsible for both ENERGY PRODUCTION and NUCLEOSYNTHESIS

## Nuclear Astrophysics

Nuclear Astrophysics to measure relevant two body cross sections at astrophysical energies

Astrophysical energies are determined by the Gamow peak: the most effective energy region for thermonuclear reactions


The Gamow energy $E_{0}=f\left(Z_{1}, Z_{2}, T\right)$ varies depending on the reaction and/or the temperature, usually from tens to hundreds of keV, but also MeV.

## Charged particle cross section measurements at astrophysical energies

- Cross section ~ picobarn due to the Coulomb barrier between the interacting nuclei
$\Rightarrow$ Low signal-to-noise ratio
$\Rightarrow$ access to low energy usually via extrapolation from higher energies using the

ASTROPHYSICAL FACTOR

$$
S(E)=\sigma(E) E \exp (2 \pi \eta)
$$

$S(E)$ is a smoothly varying function of the energy than the cross section $\sigma(E)$
...but large uncertainties in the extrapolation

- Electron screening that enhances the behaviour of the bare $S(E)$

$\rightarrow$ Direct measurement straightforward but challenging at low energy and altered by electron screening


## $12 C+12 \mathrm{C}$ fusion

Great interest in a wide range of stellar burning scenarios in carbon-rich environments such as late evolutionary stages of stars with more than $8 \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$ superbursts from accreting neutron stars ignition conditions of Sne Ia

Carbon burning temperature from 0.4 to $1.2 \mathrm{GK} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{cm}}$ from 1 to 2 MeV
Principal reactions:
$\left.\begin{array}{ll}{ }^{12} C\left({ }^{12} C, \alpha\right)^{20} \mathrm{Ne} & +4.617 \mathrm{MeV} \\ { }^{12} C\left({ }^{12} C, p\right)^{23} \mathrm{Na} & +2.241 \mathrm{MeV}\end{array}\right]$ The most frequent results of the interaction

Considerable efforts to measure the ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}+{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}$ cross section at astrophysical energies M.G. Mazarakis \& W.E. Stephensen, Phys. Rev. C 71280 (1973)
K. U. Kettner et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 337 (1977)
H.W. Becker et al., Z. Phys. A 303, 305 (1981)
L. Barron-Palos et al., Nucl. Phys. A 779, 318 (2006) E.F. Aguleira et al.,Phys. Rev. C 73, 064601 (2006)
T. Spillane et al., Phys. Rev. C 73, 064601 (2006)
T. Spillane et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 122501 (2007)
B. Bucher et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 251102 (2015) C.L. Jiang et al., Phys. Rev. C 97012801 (2018) J. Zickefoose et al., Phys. Rev. C 97, 065806 (2018)

## C-burning: State-of-the-art

Resonances at nearly every 300 keV down to $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{cm}}=2.14 \mathrm{MeV}$. They would increase the present nonresonant reaction rate of the alpha(proton) channel by a factor of 5(2).
extrapolations differ by 3 orders of magnitude of stellar evolution and nucleosynthesis

No definite conclusion!


$\rightarrow$ Thus, further measurements extending down to at least 1 MeV would be extremely important.

## Indirect Methods for-Nuclear Astrophysics

Quite straightforward experiment, no Coulomb suppression, no electron screening but ...


The reaction theory is needed to select only one reaction mechanism. However, nowadays powerful techniques and observables for careful data analysis and theoretical investigation.

In particular the Trojan Horse Method already successfully applied to more than 30 astrophysical relevant reactions

For review see:
R. Tribble et al., Rep. Prog. Phys. 77 (2014) 106901
C. Spitaleri et al., EpJ 2016

## Our Experiment with theTHM

 ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left({ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}, \alpha^{20} \mathrm{Ne}\right){ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left({ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{p}^{23} \mathrm{Na}\right){ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ three-body processes
${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ from the ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}$ as spectator s
Observation of ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}$ cluster transfer in the ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left({ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{~d}\right){ }^{24} \mathrm{Mg}^{*}$ reaction
(R.H. Zurmûhle et al. PRC 49(1994) 5)

## QUASI-FREE MECHANISM

$\checkmark$ only ${ }^{12} C-{ }^{12} C$ interaction
$\checkmark d=$ spectator
$E_{14 \mathrm{~N}}=30 \mathrm{MeV}>\mathrm{E}_{\text {Coul }}$
NO Coulomb suppression

$\Rightarrow$
NO electron screening

$$
\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{QF}}=\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{1 4 N}} \frac{\boldsymbol{m}_{12} C}{\boldsymbol{m}_{14} N} \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{m}_{12} C}{m_{12}+\boldsymbol{m}_{12} C} \mathbf{- 1 0 . 2 7} \mathrm{MeV}
$$

C. Spitaleri et al., Phys. Rev. C 63, 005801 (2001)
R. Tribble et al. Rep. Prog. Phys. 77106901 (2014)

## Theoretical approach to the THM

$$
A+a \rightarrow c+C+s \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow A+x \rightarrow c+C
$$

PWIA hypotheses:

- beam energy > $a=x \oplus s$ breakup $Q$-value
- projectile wavelength $\mathrm{k}^{-1} \ll x-\mathrm{s}$ intercluster distance
$\rightarrow$ the 3-body cross section factorizes:
$\frac{d^{3} \sigma}{d \Omega_{c} d \Omega_{C} d E_{c}} \propto K F \cdot\left|\Phi\left(p_{s}\right)\right|^{2} \frac{d \sigma^{\text {off }}}{d \Omega}$
KF kinematical factors
$|\Phi|^{2}$ momentum distribution of $s$ inside a
dooff/d $\Omega$ Nuclear cross section for the $A+x \rightarrow C+c$ reaction
A. Tumino et al., PRL 98, 252502 (2007)
$\mathrm{d} \sigma^{\text {off }} / \mathrm{d} \Omega \rightarrow \mathrm{d} \sigma / \mathrm{d} \Omega$ (on shell)
the penetration factor $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{l}}$ has to be introduced: $\quad \frac{d \sigma}{d \Omega}=\sum_{l} P_{l} \frac{d \sigma_{l}^{N}}{d \Omega}$
but No absolute value of the cross section $\rightarrow$ normalization to direct data available at higher energies


## ...for resonant reactions

The $A+a(x+s) \rightarrow F^{*}(c+C)+s$ process is a transfer to the continuum where particle $x$ is the transferred particle


Standard R-Matrix approach cannot be applied to extract the resonance parameters $\rightarrow$ Modified R-Matrix is introduced instead

In the case of a resonant THM reaction the cross section takes the form

$$
\frac{d^{2} \sigma}{d E_{C c} d \Omega_{s}} \propto \frac{\Gamma_{(C c)_{i}}(E)\left|M_{i}(E)\right|^{2}}{\left(E-E_{R_{i}}\right)^{2}+\Gamma_{i}^{2}(E) / 4}
$$

$M_{i}(E)$ is the amplitude of the transfer reaction (upper vertex) that can be easily calculated $\rightarrow$ The resonance parameters can be extracted

Advantages:

- possibility to measure down to zero energy
- No electron screening
- HOES reduced widths are the same entering the OES S(E) factor (New!)


## The $14 N+12 \mathrm{C}$ experiment at LNS

## $\mathrm{E}_{14 \mathrm{~N}}=30 \mathrm{MeV}$

Particle identification supplied by silicon telescopes: $38 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ silicon detector as $\Delta \mathrm{E}$ - and $1000 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ Position Sensitive Detector (PSD) as E-detector

${ }^{20} \mathrm{Ne}+\alpha+\mathrm{d}$ and ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Na}+\mathrm{p}+\mathrm{d}$ reaction channels reconstructed when detecting the ejectile of the two-body reactions (either $\alpha$ (black dots) or $p$ (green dots)) in coincidence with the spectator $d$ particle. No detection of ${ }^{20} \mathrm{Ne}$ or ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Na}$ quite low energy $\rightarrow$ too high detection threshold


## Selection of the 3-body channels





## Selection of the cuasidree mechanism

Comparison between the experimental momentum distribution and the theoretical one

$$
\left.I \Phi\left(\overrightarrow{p_{d}}\right)\right|^{2} \propto \frac{\frac{d^{3} \sigma}{d \Omega_{d} d \Omega_{p, \alpha} d E_{d}}}{(K F)\left(\frac{d \sigma_{12 C 12 C}}{d \Omega}\right)^{N}}
$$

On-the-energy-shell bound state wave number ((see I.S. Shapiro, Soviet Physics Uspekhi Vol. 10, n. 4 (1968) and earlier works): $\left(2 \mu_{\mathrm{d} 12 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d} 12 c}\right)^{1 / 2}=181 \mathrm{MeV} / \mathrm{c}$.
Staying within this value is the condition for the QF mechanism to be dominant

Solid line: momentum distribution of $d$ inside ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}$ from the Wood-Saxon ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{d}$ bound state potential with standard geometrical parameters
$r_{0}=1.25 \mathrm{fm}, a=0.65 \mathrm{fm}$ and $V_{0}=54.427 \mathrm{MeV}$


Plane Waves reliable also because:

- $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{d}}<\left(2 \mu_{\mathrm{d} 12 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d} 12 \mathrm{C}}\right)^{1 / 2}=181 \mathrm{MeV} / \mathrm{c} \rightarrow$ Proved that the shape of the momentum distribution is insensitive to the theoretical framework used for its derivation (agreement between PWA and DWBA)
- the ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}$ beam energy of 30 MeV corresponds to a quite high momentum transfer $q_{t}=500 \mathrm{MeV} / \mathrm{c}$ giving an associate de Broglie wavelenght of 0.4 fm ( $3 \mathrm{fm}={ }^{12} \mathrm{C}+\mathrm{d}$ )


## Extraction of the two-body cross section



Red lines and bands: R-matrix fits for all channels at the same time
Reduced widths for known levels are used as free parameters to reproduce their total and partial widths as in Abegg \& Davis, PRC $1991 \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow$

## Comparison between two-body cross sections

## in the astronthysical region

Red lines: R-matrix fits on all channels at the same time in the full energy range of interest $\rightarrow$

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} \sigma}{\mathrm{~d} E_{x A} \mathrm{~d} \Omega_{s}}=\mathrm{NF} \sum_{i}\left(2 \mathrm{~J}_{i}+1\right) \times\left|\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{f}}\left(E_{x A}\right)}{\mu_{c C}}} \frac{\sqrt{2 P_{l_{i}}\left(k_{c C} R_{c C}\right)} M_{i}\left(p_{x A} R_{x A}\right) \gamma_{c C}^{i} \gamma_{x A}^{i}}{D_{i}\left(E_{x A}\right)}\right|^{2}
$$

$$
\mathrm{k}_{f}\left(E_{x A}\right)=\sqrt{2 \mu_{c C}\left(E_{x A}+Q\right)} / \hbar
$$

$$
D_{i}\left(E_{x A}\right)=\text { Standard R-matrix denominator of four-channel }
$$ formulas

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }^{12} \mathrm{C}+{ }^{12} \mathrm{C} \rightarrow \alpha_{0}+{ }^{20} \mathrm{Ne} \\
& { }^{12} \mathrm{C}+{ }^{12} \mathrm{C} \rightarrow \alpha_{1}+{ }^{20} \mathrm{Ne}^{*} \\
& { }^{12} \mathrm{C}+{ }^{12} \mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{p}_{0}+{ }^{23} \mathrm{Na} \\
& { }^{12} \mathrm{C}+{ }^{12} \mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{p}_{1}+{ }^{23} \mathrm{Na}^{*}
\end{aligned}
$$

34 levels enter the R-matrix fit with energy and spin taken from the literature. Total and $\alpha_{0}$-reduced widths are known for almost all levels, while the other widths are taken as free parameters.

IMPORTANT: reduced widths are the same for the extraction of the S(E) factors $\rightarrow$ From the fitting of the experimental THM cross section they can be obtained and used to deduce the OES S(E) factor.

Normalization to direct data done in the $E_{c m}$ window 2.50-2.63 MeV of the ${ }^{20} \mathrm{Ne}+\mathrm{a}_{1}$

A. Tumino et al., Nature 557 , 687 (2018)


Agreement between THM and direct data within the experimental errors except around 2.14 MeV , where THM data do not confirm the claim of a strong resonance; nearby one at 2.095 MeV about one order of magnitude less intense in the ${ }^{20} \mathrm{Ne}+\mathrm{a}_{1}$ channel and with similar intensity in the ${ }^{23} \mathrm{Na}+p_{1}$ one

## LETTER

A. Tumino et al., Nature 557, 687 (2018)

## An increase in the ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}+{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}$ fusion rate from resonances at astrophysical energies

A. Tumin $0^{1,2 *}$, C. Spitaleri ${ }^{2,3}$, M. La Cognata ${ }^{2}$, S. Cherubini ${ }^{2,3}$, G. L. Guardo ${ }^{2,4}$, M. Gulin $0^{1,2}$, S. Hayakawa ${ }^{2,5}$, I. Indelicato ${ }^{2}$,
L. Lamia ${ }^{2,3}$, H. Petrascu ${ }^{4}$, R. G. Pizzone ${ }^{2}$, S. M. R. Puglia ${ }^{2}$, G. G. Rapisarda ${ }^{2}$, S. Romano ${ }^{2,3}$, M. L. Sergi ${ }^{2}$, R. Spartá ${ }^{2} \&$ L. Trache ${ }^{4}$


Compared to CF88, the present rate increases from a factor of 1.18 at 1.2 GK to a factor of more than 25 at 0.5 GK

## Conclusions

First measurement of the $\left.{ }^{12} C\left({ }^{12} \mathrm{C}, \alpha\right)\right)^{20} \mathrm{Ne}$ and ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left({ }^{12} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{p}\right)^{23} \mathrm{Na}$ via the Trojan Horse Method with ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ from ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~N}$ as spectator s
 energies

Clear evidence of resonant behaviour, also around 1.5 MeV , with a stronger contribution around 900 keV . This behaviour dominates the reaction rate from 0.4 to 1.2 GK.

Need to rerun the astrophysical codes for hydrostatic C-burning C-burning missing heat source for superbursts?
What about M_up?
Ignition conditions of Sne Ia?
From nuclear side: try o find the missing low-lying states of the ${ }^{12} C+{ }^{12} C$ molecular rotational band

A lot of application to do in the near future ...
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