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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Electron Scattering

Two fundamental reasons have made electron scattering an important and powerful tool in studying nuclear structure. For the first, in contrast to the situation with strongly interacting projectiles, where the scattering mechanism cannot be clearly separated from structure effects in the target, the interaction between the electron and the target nucleons in electron scattering is completely known. Also, the electron interaction with the electromagnetic charge and current density of the nucleus is relatively weak, of order $\alpha = 1/137$, so that one can immediately relate the cross section to the transition matrix elements of the local charge and current density operators and thus directly to the structure of the target itself. Though the same considerations also apply to processes involving real photons, the second reason offers electrons the other great advantage which real photons do not have. That is, for a fixed energy loss $w$ of the electron, one can vary the three-momentum transferred to the nucleus, $q$, with the only restriction that the four momentum transfer be space-like, i.e.,

$$q^2 = q^2 - w^2 > 0 \quad (1.1)$$

for electrons. For a given energy transfer in the case of real
photons, there is only a single possible momentum transfer,
\[ q_t^2 = q^2 - w^2 = 0, \]  
(1.2)
since the mass of a real photon is zero. Thus with electrons, one can study the complete \( q^2 \) behavior of the transition matrix elements and map out the Fourier transforms of the transition charge and current densities. Therefore, one knows the spatial distribution of the transition charge and current densities themselves, and this is certainly a source of tremendously rich and unique information on the structure of nuclei.

Five regions can be identified in the electron scattering spectrum illustrated in figure 1 (DeForest & Walecka, 1966). Here the ordinate stands for double differential cross section of electron scattering, which is a function of the other two variables, \( w \) the energy loss,
\[ w = E_1 - E_2, \]  
(1.3)
and \( q \) the three-momentum transfer,
\[ q^2 = q_t^2. \]  
(1.4)
Figure 1 is really a "theorist's" spectrum for a fixed \( \theta \), the scattering angle.

The first region is related to elastic scattering, the situation where (except for nuclear recoil) \( w = 0 \). The electrons are scattered from the nucleus, leaving the nucleus in its ground state. Many experiments on elastic scattering have been carried out, and the best information so far on nuclear size comes from elastic electron scattering. The next region of the spectrum, \( w > 0 \), corresponds to inelastic scattering. One can see spikes
coresponding to the excitation of nuclear levels. In this region, since \( w > 0 \), the electrons leave the nucleus with lower energy than that of the incident electrons, leading the nucleus to its excited states. Therefore the electro-excitation provides a fairly sensitive test for theories which attempt to describe such levels and can also help to give other nuclear structure information.

Figure 1. A Typical Double Differential Electron Scattering Cross Section.

The third region is giant resonance region characterized by collective motion. The fourth region of the spectrum is a broad peak which is referred to as the quasi-elastic peak. It corresponds to direct collisions with the individual nucleons in the nucleus and occurs at \( w = q^2/2M^* \), with the total width given roughly by

\[
q\cdot k_F/M^* + q^2/2M^* \geq W \geq -q\cdot k_F/M^* + q^2/2M^*.
\]

Here, \( M^* \) is an effective mass for the nucleon and takes the
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binding energy into account, and \( k_F \) is the Fermi momentum \( (k_F \approx 250 \text{ MeV}) \). One can hopefully obtain information about two-particle correlations from this region. Last, the fifth region belongs to meson production, which starts at \( w = m_T \). Meson production gives different information on nuclear structure and nucleon structure.

Figure 2 indicates the general electron scattering process through a single photon exchange. The initial and final four-momenta of the target are \( P_p \) and \( P'_p \) and of the electron are \( k_{1p} \) and \( k_{2p} \).

\[
\begin{align*}
q_\mu &= k_{2\mu} - k_{1\mu}, \\
\eta &= (P - P')(\cdot) \mu,
\end{align*}
\]

For the process, the double differential cross section in the laboratory frame (neglecting the mass of the electron) can be written as (DeForest & Walecka, 1966):

\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\eta dE_2} = \frac{(4Z^2\alpha^2/q_\mu^4)(E_2^2/M_T)}{\cos^2(\theta/2)} \left\{ W_2(q_p^2, q \cdot P) + 2W_1(q_p^2, q \cdot P) \tan^2(\theta/2) \right\},
\]

\[
q_p^2 = 4E_1E_2\sin^2(\theta/2),
\]

\[
M_T^2 = -P_p^2.
\]

where \( W_{1,2}(q_p^2, q \cdot P) \) are two form factors and can be separated experimentally by doing experiments at fixed \( q_p^2 \) and \( q \cdot P \), then
varying the angle $\theta$.

$W_{1,2}(q_p^2, q \cdot P)$ can be related to the structure of the nucleus. Briefly, one writes the interaction of the electron with the nucleus as

$$\hat{H}_1(x) = -e_p \hat{\psi}(x) A_p^\text{ext}(x), \quad (1.8)$$

where

$$\hat{\psi}(x) = i \hat{\psi}(x) \tau_p \psi(x) \quad (1.9)$$

for the point-like electron. The external potential is due to the nucleus and is related to the nuclear current by

$$\Box A_p^\text{ext}(x) = -e_p J_p(x) = -e_p < \int \hat{J}_p(x) >. \quad (1.10)$$

Matrix elements of the interaction, $\hat{H}_1(x)$, can be put in terms of the nuclear current by the Fourier transform

$$q_p^2 \int \exp{-i q \cdot x} A_p^\text{ext}(x) d^4x = e_p \int \exp{-i q \cdot x} J_p(x) d^4x = e_p J_p(q).$$

The customary multipole expansion of the nuclear current $J_p(q)$ leads to

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \{ \frac{8\pi \alpha^2 E_2/q_p^4 \cdot E_1}{1 + (E_2 - E_1 \cos \theta)/E'} \} \cdot \{ V_L(\theta) \sum_{J=0}^{\infty} \left[ \left( \langle J_f \parallel \hat{M}_c^\text{coul}(q) \parallel J_i \rangle \right)^2 / (2J_i + 1) \right] \\
+ V_T(\theta) \sum_{J=0}^{\infty} \left[ \left( \langle J_f \parallel \hat{M}_m^\text{mag}(q) \parallel J_i \rangle \right)^2 / (2J_i + 1) \right] \}, \quad (1.11)$$

where

$$V_L(\theta) = 2(q_p^4/q^4)E_1E_2^2 \cos^2(\theta/2), \quad (1.12)$$

$$V_T(\theta) = (2E_1E_2/q^2) \sin^2(\theta/2) \left[ (E_1 + E_2)^2 - 2E_1E_2 \cos^2(\theta/2) \right]. \quad (1.13)$$

Therefore the electron scattering problem reduces to calculation of conventional multipole operators between initial and final nuclear
Inelastic electron scattering is considered very important and useful in nuclear structure studies, especially on the structure of nuclear excitations. Since the nucleus is led to its higher energy levels while electrons are scattered from it with energy loss, $W > 0$, the cross section can give information on form factors and therefore the structure of the excited states. Also, one can theoretically predict the energy levels of a nucleus and the form factors by using nuclear structure models, and then compare the theoretical results with experimental data for the same system in order to examine whether the models adequately describe that system.

The Recoil Corrected Continuum Shell Model

Since a detailed knowledge of nuclear forces within a nucleus as a many-body system is unknown, the method of nuclear models has been used to investigate the structure of nuclei. This method consists of constructing a physical system, the model, with which we can perform calculations and whose properties resemble a nucleus. The physics of the model are studied and it is hoped that any properties thus discovered will also be properties of the nucleus. Then the structure of the model will stand for the structure of the nucleus. No single model can account for all the known facts about nuclei. So far, several models have successfully approached different aspects of the physics of nuclei. One of the models is the shell model, which has explained
not only the main features of the shell structure phenomena, but also more detailed properties such as the spins, magnetic moments, and level spectra of many nuclei.

The shell model is based on the experimental evidence that some certain numbers of neutrons or protons such as,

2, 8, 20, 28, 50, 82, 126,

lead to particular stability of nuclei (for examples of the experiments, see the article by Flowers in 1952). These numbers are called magic numbers, and the phenomena have been interpreted as an indication that neutrons and protons within the nucleus are arranged into shells within the nucleus, like electrons in atoms. Each shell is limited to a certain maximum number of nucleon of a given sort. When a shell is filled, the resulting configuration is particularly stable and therefore of low energy. The shell model is built up under the following two assumptions:

1. The "central" potential is really an average potential, and the addition of an extra nucleon modifies this potential far more than the addition of an extra electron modifies the central potential in the atomic case.

2. Because of the Coulomb repulsion of the protons, the numbers of neutrons and protons in a nucleus are not even approximately the same in all but the lightest nuclides. It is therefore most unlikely that a nuclide with a closed shell number of neutrons can also have a closed shell number of protons and conversely. The stability characteristics of closed shells will therefore be less marked than in the atomic case.
For general consideration, a non-relativistic system of \( A \) nucleons is characterized by a Hamiltonian \( H = H (1, \ldots, A) \). The numbers 1, \( \ldots \), \( A \) stand for the space, spin and isospin coordinates of the \( A \) nucleons. \( H \) can be decomposed into two parts,

\[
H = H_0 + B, 
\]

where \( H_0 \) is a shell-model Hamiltonian, a sum of single particle operators

\[
H_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{A} h_0(i) = \sum_{i=1}^{A} [t(i) + v_0(i)]. 
\]

Here \( t(i) \) is the kinetic energy operator, while \( v_0(i) \) is the shell model potential. The residual interaction \( B \) is a sum over one- and two-body potentials. To describe a scattering problem, \( v_0(i) \) must be a potential of finite depth. In the usual bound-state calculations, \( v_0(i) \) is chosen to be a potential of infinite depth, usually a harmonic oscillator potential.

In the conventional shell model, the basic ansatz is an expansion of the wave function in terms of products of single-particle functions. This ansatz is very flexible and is also very convenient for such operations as the calculation of matrix elements and the proper treatment of the Pauli principle. But because of the presence of unbound states, the conventional shell model cannot be applied to the nuclear reactions involving one particle in the continuum. The separability of the c.m. coordinate can be conveniently imposed in the model only if harmonic oscillator expansion functions are employed, but this leads to an infinite number of discrete bound states, and no continuous set of eigenstates. To solve this problem, Fano (1961) introduced
originally and many researchers developed the continuum shell model. One continuum shell model employs R-matrix techniques (Lane & Tomas, 1958; Land & Robson, 1966, 1969; Philpott & George, 1974) so that the physical content of the model, for which the interaction region is of relatively small extent, can be expressed within a finite basis of oscillator functions. This enables the c.m. coordinate to be completely eliminated from the problems.

The continuum shell model has been applied to a wide variety of nuclear problems including all those involving a particle in the continuum. However, when the conventional continuum shell model is applied to light nuclei, the calculations contain errors of unknown magnitude which are attributable to unphysical excitation of the c.m. coordinate. Philpott then introduced the recoil corrected continuum shell model (RCCSM) in 1977, with an application to elastic scattering of a nucleon from a closed-shell target nucleus. In the RCCSM, the effects of the target nucleus recoil are considered. In 1979 Halderson and Philpott (Halderson & Philpott, 1979) extended the RCCSM to the 1p-1h states of light systems of four nucleons, and excellent agreement was obtained between the calculated and observed cross sections and polarization variables. Figure 3 shows the observed (Fiarman & Meyerhoff, 1973) and calculated positions of bound states and resonances below $E_p(c.m.) = 10$ MeV with and without the recoil correction.

The RCCSM calculation reproduce the first three excited
states very well. The importance of the c.m. corrections was made amply evident by a comparison with the corresponding uncorrected results.

Figure 3. Observed and RCCSM Calculated Positions of Bound States and Resonances Below $E_p(c.m.) = 10$ MeV.

The First Excited State of $^4$He Structure Investigation

The first excited state of $^4$He is a $0^+$ state or the breathing mode of the nucleus. Figure 4 shows (a) the double-differential cross section of the break-up continuum with its peak at an incident energy $E_0 = 320$ Mev and a scattering angle $\theta = 44.96^\circ$;
Figure 4. (a) Double-Differential Cross Section of The Break-Up Continuum With The Quasi-Bound-State Peak at an Incident Energy $E_0 = 320$ MeV and a Scattering Angle $\theta = 44.96^\circ$.
(b) Spectrum After Subtracting The Continuum Contribution.
(b) the spectrum after subtracting the continuum contribution (Kobschall et al., 1983).

The $0^+$ state has been of interest for some time because inelastic electron scattering experiments (Kobschall et al., 1983; Frosch, Rand, Yearian, Crannell & Suelzle, 1968; Watcher, 1970) have shown that it accounts for a very small percentage of the energy weighted sum rule. The shell-model calculations which assume a $1s0s^{-1}$ ($J = 0, \ T = 0$) configuration have been demonstrated to over-predict the strength by a factor of 20 (Lui & Zamick, 1986). The inclusion of higher order shell model configurations can only reduce this factor to between 5 and 10. The exact nature of the $0^+$ state is therefore considered to be somewhat puzzling and this has led to speculations that the shell model is inappropriate for describing this light system.

Two other types of calculations have been performed for this state. One is a resonating group calculation with a central interaction and bound state approximation (Furutani, Horiuchi, & Tamagaki, 1978). The resulting form factor was approximately three times larger than that observed. The other is a calculation employing hyperspherical harmonics (Samyal & Mukherjee, 1987). Here good agreement with the experiment form factor was obtained. Since the calculated state turned out to be a pure hyperradial excitation, the authors concluded that it was a collective excitation of the ground state.

The RCCSM in the $1p$-$1h$ approximations has been very successful in describing low energy nucleon scattering phenomena.
for the four-nucleon systems (Halderson & Philpott, 1979). Previous attempts to describe inelastic scattering of pions and electrons in the context of the recoil corrected continuum shell model have considered only the coordinate $r'_4$ in figure 5 (Blilie et al., 1986), because the wave function for the coordinate $x_3$ is readily available. However, one sees that if the coordinate $r'_4$ is excited, the coordinates $r'_1$, $r'_2$, and $r'_3$ will also move slightly with respect to the center of mass. This constitutes a target recoil or center of mass correction which was omitted from previous work.

![Figure 5. Internal Coordinates Within 4He System.](image)

Therefore, it is expected that 1p-1h RCCSM with full center of mass correction may provide an adequate description of the $^4$He $0^+$ state in a shell model context even for this light system.

In this work, the charge form factor of the $0^+$ state of $^4$He is calculated with RCCSM wave functions and with consideration of all the coordinate corrections. The result is compared with that obtained from experiments. It is found to be possible to describe the $0^+$ state in a 1p-1h shell model context and a further work to improve the calculation is suggested.

Inelastic scattering cross section of $0^+-0^+$ states in Born
approximation has a particularly simple form \( \left( \frac{q_p^2}{2M_T^2} \right)^2 \ll 1, \ m = 0 \). From equation (1.11) one has
\[
\frac{d\sigma}{d\omega} = \left\{ \frac{4\pi \sigma_m}{\left[ 1 + 2E_1 \sin^2(\theta/2)/M_T \right]} \right\} \cdot \left\{ \langle Y_f \mid \hat{M}_o^{\text{coul}}(q) \mid Y_i \rangle^2 \right\} (q_p^4/q^4),
\] (1.16)
where
\[
\sigma_M = \alpha^2 \cos^2(\theta/2)/4E_1^2 \sin^4(\theta/2).
\] (1.17)
The form factor is defined as
\[
F(q^2) = \frac{(d\sigma/d\omega)}{4\pi Z^2 \sigma_M}.
\] (1.18)
The matrix elements \( \langle Y_f \mid \hat{M}_o^{\text{coul}}(q) \mid Y_i \rangle \) is calculated here by the recoil corrected continuum shell model.
CHAPTER II

DERIVATION OF CHARGE FORM FACTORS FOR $^4\text{He}$

The recoil corrected continuum shell model employs the translationally invariant Hamiltonian

$$T + V = \left(\frac{2m}{\hbar^2}\right)^{1/2} P^2 - T_{c.m.} + \sum_{ij} V_{ij}, \quad (2.1)$$

where the two-body interaction is the Coulomb potential plus the g-matrix interaction, M3Y (Bertsch, Borysowicz, McManus & Love, 1977), which includes noncentral forces. The basis consists of one-particle excitations in the harmonic oscillator wave functions for the internal coordinate $\mathcal{F}_3$ in figure 6. Proper boundary conditions are imposed by R-matrix techniques at a matching radius of $a_c = 7.2$ fm. A smooth joining to Coulomb functions is accomplished by allowing particle excitations up to $2n + 1 = 14$, where $n$ begins at zero. The core states of $^3\text{H}$ and $^3\text{He}$ are taken as pure $0s^3$. The oscillator constant, $v_0 = \hbar$ $m w / h$, is chosen as 0.36 fm$^{-2}$ to reproduce the mean-squared-radius of $^3\text{H}$.

The great advantage of the RCCSM was its ability to provide matrix elements of translationally invariant operators in the internal coordinates by calculating matrix elements in normal shell model coordinates, $r_i$, with a fixed origin. This was very convenient for operators such as the two-body interaction, the kinetic energy, and transition operators for which a long wave-length approximation could be made. However, at high
momentum transfer, \( q \), operators such as \( j_1(qr'_1) = j_1(q|r_1-R|) \) do not lend themselves to a simple decomposition in terms of the shell model coordinates, \( r_i \). Therefore the matrix element of interest for the present problem,

\[
M_0 = < Y_f \parallel Y_0 (r'_i) j_0 (qr'_i) \parallel Y_i >
\]  

must be done explicitly in the relative coordinates.

Cross sections for excitation of states above particle emission threshold are given by the expression (Halderson, Philpott, Carr, and Petrovich, 1981)

\[
d^2\sigma/d\Omega dE = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\hbar^2}{t_t} \right)^2 \sum_{c} \left( \frac{\mu c}{K_c} \right)^2 \left( \frac{d\sigma_c}{J_B/\hbar} \right),
\]

where \( \mu \) is the nucleon reduced mass, \( K_c \) is the nucleon asymptotic relative momentum in the channel \( c \), and \( d\sigma_c/J_B/\hbar \) is a fictitious Born cross section, calculated for nucleon wave functions with flux \( V_c \) in channel \( c \). The index \( c \) stands for \( \alpha J_c \) with \( J_c \) and \( j \) coupled to \( J_B \), where \( J_c \) is the angular momentum of \( ^3H \) or \( ^3He \), \( l \) and \( j \) are the nucleon orbital and total angular momentum, and \( \alpha \) distinguishes between \( ^3H \) and \( ^3He \).

The form factor is calculated by equation (1.16) and (1.18). The Mott cross section, \( \sigma_M \) is given by (1.17).

To calculate the reduced matrix elements in equation (1.16), one needs the wave functions of the initial and final states. The ground state of \(^4He \) here is still approximated by a pure \( 0s^4 \),

\[
Y_i = a_o \mid 0s^4 > | s = 0 >,
\]

where \( a_o = 1 \), but all coordinates are considered. The final is a linear combination of states of the form

\[
Y_f = A_\tau \{ [0s_{1/2}^3 \zeta_1 \cdot nlj \zeta_3 ] \tilde{T}_f \tilde{O}_s(R) \},
\]
where \( A = [2(1+d)]^{-1/2} \) (1- \( P_{ij} \)), and \( \xi_i \) is the internal coordinates.

Consider the initial state \( Y \) first, it can be decomposed into space and spin parts:

\[
Y = Y_{\text{space}} \cdot Y_{\text{spin}}. 
\]

(2.6)

For \( Y_{\text{space}} \), it is taken as

\[
Y_{\text{space}} = (\frac{v_0}{\pi})^3 \exp\left\{ (-\frac{v_0}{2}) (r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_4^2) \right\}
\]

or

\[
Y_{\text{space}} = (\frac{v_0}{\pi})^3 \exp\left\{ (-\frac{v_0}{2}) (4R^2 + r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_4^2) \right\}. 
\]

(2.7)

To convert \( Y_{\text{space}} \) into the internal coordinates \( \xi_i \), one uses the transformation

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_1^2 &= 3\xi_3^2/16 + 3\xi_2^2/9 + \xi_1^2/4 + \xi_3^2/6 + \xi_3^2/4 + \xi_2^2/6 + \xi_1^2/4 + \xi_3^2/6 + \xi_1^2/3 \\
    r_2^2 &= 3\xi_3^2/16 + 3\xi_2^2/9 + \xi_1^2/4 + \xi_3^2/6 + \xi_3^2/4 + \xi_2^2/6 + \xi_1^2/4 + \xi_3^2/6 + \xi_1^2/3 \\
    r_3^2 &= 3\xi_3^2/16 + \xi_3^2/9 - \xi_3^2/16 + \xi_3^2/16 + \xi_3^2/3 \\
    r_4^2 &= 9\xi_3^2/16.
\end{align*}
\]

Since

\[
r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2 + r_4^2 = 3\xi_3^2/4 + 2\xi_2^2/3 + \xi_1^2/2
\]

(2.8)

Then
\[ Y_{\text{isp}} = \left( \frac{v_0}{\pi} \right)^3 \exp \left\{ -(v_0/2)\left(4R^2 + 3\zeta_3^2/4 + 2\zeta_2^2/3 + \zeta_1^2/2 \right) \right\} \]

\[
= (4v_0/\pi)^{3/4} \exp \left\{ -(1/2)(4v_0)R^2 \right\} 
\cdot (3v_0/4\pi)^{3/4} \exp \left\{ -(1/2)(3v_0/4)\zeta_3^2 \right\} 
\cdot (2v_0/3\pi)^{3/4} \exp \left\{ -(1/2)(2v_0/3)\zeta_2^2 \right\} 
\cdot (v_0/2\pi)^{3/4} \exp \left\{ -(1/2)(v_0/2)\zeta_1^2 \right\} 
\]

\[ = O_s^{4v_0}(R)O_s^{3v_0/4}(\zeta_3)O_s^{2v_0/3}(\zeta_2)O_s^{v_0/2}(\zeta_1). \]  

(2.9)

Since both neutron and proton are spin 1/2 particles, which have only two eigen-functions \( X_+(1/2) \) and \( X_-(1/2) \), the function \( X_{\text{isp}} \) is antisymmetric between neutrons or between protons. Therefore it has the form

\[ X = 2^{-1/2}(X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)} - X_-(^{1)}X_+^{(2)}) \]  

for neutrons and protons. So, \( X_{\text{isp}} \) is written as

\[ X_{\text{isp}} = [2^{-1/2}(X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)} - X_-(^{1)}X_+^{(2)})]_p 
\cdot [2^{-1/2}(X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)} - X_-(^{1)}X_+^{(2)})]_n. \]  

(2.11)

For final state \( Y_f \), one of the nucleons is excited so that \( Y_f \) now is expressed as a linear combination of \( 1p-1h \) states,

\[ Y_f = Y_{\text{f\text{space}}} \cdot X_{\text{f\text{spin}}}. \]  

(2.12)

where

\[ Y_{\text{f\text{space}}} = A\bar{\zeta}O_s^{4v}(R)\gamma(\zeta_3)O_s^{2v/3}(\zeta_2)O_s^{v/2}(\zeta_1). \]  

(2.13)

Here, \( \gamma(\zeta_3) \) is the final spatial wave function of excited nucleon.

To determine the normalization of this \( 1p-1h \) state, it is the best to choose LS coupling for \( Y_{\text{f\text{space}}} \). Referring on to figure 7, one has all the core orbital numbers zero and total spin \([2^{-1} \otimes 2^{-1}] \otimes 2^{-1}(2^{-1})\), while the excited neutron or proton's numbers are 1, S \( =1/2, j \). Here
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\[ O_{S_1/2}^3 \text{ms} = O_s(\mathcal{Z}_1)O_s(\mathcal{Z}_2)[\, 2^{-1/2} \left( X_+^{(1)}X_+^{(2)} - X_-^{(1)}X_+^{(2)} \right) \] for \( n \cdot X m_{s \text{ or } p} \) \]

and

\[ Y_f = A_{\mathcal{Z}} (-1)^{1/2+J_f} \sum_{\lambda} (-1)^{l+1/2+1/2+J_f} \frac{\hat{s}}{2} \left\{ \left\{ l \begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right\} \right. \left. \cdot \{ nl_{n_{\mathcal{Z}}}^l(1/2,1/2)^0(J_f)O_s(R) \} \right\} \] (2.15)

where \( \hat{s} = (2s +1)^{1/2} \), \( \sum_{\mathcal{Z}} \) is the summation over \( s = 0 \) and \( 1 \),

\[ [1/2, 1/2]^0 = [2^{-1/2}(X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)} - X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)})_p] \]

\[ \cdot [2^{-1/2}(X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)} - X_-^{(1)}X_+^{(2)})_n], \] (2.16)

and

\[ [1/2, 1/2]^{s=1}_{M_S=0} = [2^{-1/2}(X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)} - X_-^{(1)}X_+^{(2)})_p] \]

\[ \cdot [2^{-1/2}(X_+^{(1)}X_-^{(2)} + X_-^{(1)}X_+^{(2)})_n]. \] (2.17)

Figure 7. Spin Coupling For The Core of \(^4\text{He}(0^+)\).

The state \( Y_f \) becomes

\[ A_{\mathcal{Z}} \{ nl_{n_{\mathcal{Z}}}^l(1/2,1/2)^0(1) \} O_s(R) \]

\[ = [2(1+d)]^{-1/2} \{ (1 - P_{34}) \right. \cdot \gamma_n l(3v/4 ; \mathcal{Z}_3)O_s(2v/3 ; \mathcal{Z}_2)O_s(v/2 ; \mathcal{Z}_1)\right. \left| S = 0 > \right\} O_s(R) \]

\[ = [2(1+d)]^{-1/2} \{ \gamma_n l(\mathcal{Z}_3)O_s(\mathcal{Z}_2)O_s(\mathcal{Z}_1) \]

\[ + \gamma_n l(4r'_{3/3})O_s(3r'_4/2 + r'_{3/2})O_s(\mathcal{Z}_3)\} \right. \left| S = 0 > O_s(R) \right\} (2.18) \]

Let

\[ D = \gamma_n l(\mathcal{Z}_3)O_s(\mathcal{Z}_2)O_s(\mathcal{Z}_1) \] (2.19)

\[ E = \gamma_n l(4r'_{3/3})O_s(3r'_4/2 + r'_{3/2})O_s(\mathcal{Z}_3) \] (2.20)

then

\[ < Y_f | Y_f >= 1 = [2(1+d)]^{-1} \{ 1+1+2<DE> \} \] (2.21)
and
\[ d = \langle \text{DIE} \rangle \]
\[ = \int \psi_{n_1}^* (\mathbb{Z}_3) O_s (\mathbb{Z}_2) O_s (\mathbb{Z}_1) \]
\[ \cdot \psi_{n_1} (4r_{3/3}^1) O_s (3r_{4/2}^1 + r_{3/2}^1) O_s (\mathbb{Z}_1) d\mathbb{Z}_1 d\mathbb{Z}_2 d\mathbb{Z}_3 \]
\[ = \int \psi_{n_1}^* (4r_{3/3}^1) O_s (3r_{4/2}^1 + r_{3/2}^1) \]
\[ \cdot \psi_{n_1} (4r_{3/3}^1) O_s (3r_{4/2}^1 + r_{3/2}^1) d\mathbb{Z}_2 d\mathbb{Z}_3 \]
\[ = \int \psi_{n_1}^* (\mathbb{Z}_3) O_s (\mathbb{Z}_2) \psi_{n_1} (-\mathbb{Z}_3/3 + 8\mathbb{Z}_2/9) O_s (\mathbb{Z}_3 + \mathbb{Z}_2/3) d\mathbb{Z}_2 d\mathbb{Z}_3 \]
\[ (2.22) \]

Let
\[ y = \mathbb{Z}_3, \]
\[ x = 8\mathbb{Z}_2/9 - \mathbb{Z}_3/3, \]
then
\[ \mathbb{Z}_3 = y, \]
\[ \mathbb{Z}_2 = 9(x + y/3)/8, \]
and
\[ J = \mathcal{O} (\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_3) / \mathcal{O} (x, y) = \left| \begin{array}{cc} \mathbb{Z}_3/9 & 0 \\ \mathbb{Z}_2/8 & 1 \end{array} \right| = 9/8, \]
therefore
\[ \langle \text{DIE} \rangle = (9/8)^3 \int \psi_{n_1}^* (y) O_s (3y/8 + 9x/8) \]
\[ \cdot \psi_{n_1} (x) O_s [y + (3y/8 + 9x/8)/3] dx dy \]
\[ = (9/8)^3 \int \psi_{n_1}^* (y) O_s (3y/8 + 9x/8) \]
\[ \cdot \psi_{n_1} (x) O_s (9y/8 + 3x/8) dx dy \]
\[ = (9/8)^3 (2v/3\pi)^{3/2} \int \psi_{n_1}^* (y) \exp \{-(v/3)(3y/8 + 9x/8)^2 \}
\[ \cdot \psi_{n_1} (x) \exp \{-(v/3)(9y/8 + 3x/8)^2 \} dx dy \]
\[ = (9/8)^3 (2v/3\pi)^{3/2} \int \psi_{n_1}^* (y) \exp \{-(3v/64)(y + 3x)^2 \}
\[ \cdot \psi_{n_1} (x) \exp \{(3v/64)(3y + x)^2 \} dx dy \]

Let \( z = -x, \ dz = |J| dx, \) then
\[
<\psi | E | \psi> = (9/8)^3 (2v/3\pi)^{3/2} \int \psi_{nl}^*(y) \exp \{- (3v/64)(4y^2+4z^2-12y\cdot z) \} \\
\cdot \psi_{nl}(x) dy \\
= (9/8)^3 (2v/3\pi)^{3/2} \int \psi_{nl}^*(y) \exp \{- (9v/32)(y^2+z^2-2y\cdot z) + (y^2+z^2)/4 \} \psi_{nl}(x) dy \\
= (-1)^l (9/8)^3 (2v/3\pi)^{3/2} \int \psi_{nl}^*(y) \exp \{- (9v/32)(y^2+z^2)/32 \} \psi_{nl}(z) dz \\
\cdot \exp \{3v(y^2+z^2)/32\} \psi_{nl}(z) dz \\
(2.23)
\]

Expansion of \(\exp\{-r(a-b)\}\) is:

\[
\exp\{-r(a-b)\} = \sum_l (i)^l (2l+1) \exp \{-r(a^2+b^2)j_l(i2rab) \} \\
\cdot C_l(O_a Y_a)C_l(O_b X_b)
\]

where, \(C_{lm} = [4\pi/(2l+1)]Y_{lm}\).

Then

\[
\exp\{-r(a-b)\} = \sum_l (i)^l (2l+1) \exp \{-r(a^2+b^2)j_l(i2rab) \} \\
\cdot [4\pi/(2l+1)] Y_{lm}^* Y_{lm}.
\]

Therefore

\[
\exp\{-9v(y-z)^2/32\} = \sum_l (i)^l 4\pi \cdot \exp \{-9v(y^2+z^2)/32\} \\
\cdot j_l(i9vyz/16)Y_{lm}^*(z)Y_{lm}(y). \quad (2.24)
\]

Substituting equation (2.24) into equation (2.23), one has

\[
<\psi | E | \psi> = (-1)^l (9/8)^3 (2v/3\pi)^{3/2}(4\pi) \int R_{nl}(y) i^{-1} \\
\cdot \exp \{-15v(y^2+z^2)/32\} j_l(9ivyz/16)R_{nl}(z)z^2y^2 dz dy. \quad (2.25)
\]

Once the norm of the excited state is determined one can calculate matrix elements of operators connecting to the ground state. For reduced matrix elements of operators not a function of spin, one may discard the \(s = 1\) component of the excited state. We take
\[ \varphi_{Mf} = (-1)^{l+1/2} \sum_{s} \left\{ \pm j \pm \frac{l}{2} \varphi_{f} \right\} A_{\xi} \{ n l (\xi_{3}) [1/2,1/2] \left( j_{f} \right) O_{s}(R) \} \]
\[ = (-1)^{l+1/2+j+1/2+l+1} (j_{f}/2!1/2) A_{\xi} \{ n l (\xi_{3}) [1/2,1/2] \left( j_{f} \right) M_{f} \} O_{s}(R) \]
\[ = -i^{1/2} \left\{ \langle \psi_{nl}(\xi_{3}) O_{s}(\xi_{3}) O_{s}(\xi_{1}) \rangle \right\} \left\{ \langle \psi_{nl}(3r_{3}/4) O_{s}(3r_{3}/4+2+r_{3}/2) O_{s}(\xi_{1}) \rangle \right\} \mid S=0 \rangle \langle O_{s}(R) \rangle. \]

Here, \( \hat{\mathbf{j}} = (2j + 1)^{1/2} \).

The charge form factor must now be calculated as the transition matrix element between the initial and final states. The matrix elements have the form \( \langle Y_{f} \mid O^{k} \mid Y_{i} \rangle = \langle D+E \mid O^{k} \mid 0 \rangle \), where

\[ O^{k} = O_{1}^{k}(r_{1},\alpha) + O_{2}^{k}(r_{2},\alpha) + O_{3}^{k}(r_{3},\beta) + O_{4}^{k}(r_{4},\beta), \quad (2.26) \]

\( \alpha \sim \text{proton} \),

\( \beta \sim \text{neutron} \),

and for Coulomb form factor here, \( O_{i}^{k}(r_{i},z_{j}) = c_{i,j,k}(q r_{i}) Y_{k Q}(r_{i}) \).

Since \( Y_{f} \) and \( 0 \rangle \) are antisymmetric in exchanging the neutrons or exchanging the protons, then

\[ \langle Y_{f} \mid O_{1} + O_{2} \mid 0 \rangle = 2 \langle Y_{f} \mid O_{1} \mid 0 \rangle, \]

and

\[ \langle Y_{f} \mid O_{3} + O_{4} \mid 0 \rangle = 2 \langle Y_{f} \mid O_{4} \mid 0 \rangle. \]

First look at (with \( v \rightarrow 3v/4 \) for the state \( \langle \psi_{nl} \rangle \))

\[ \langle D \mid O_{4} \mid 0 \rangle = \int \langle \psi_{nl}^{*} (z_{3}) O_{s}(z_{2}) O_{s}(z_{1}) O_{s}(R) O_{4}^{k}(3z_{3}/4) \right) \cdot O_{s}(z_{3}) O_{s}(z_{2}) O_{s}(z_{1}) O_{s}(R) d z_{1} d z_{2} d z_{3} = \int \langle \psi_{nl}^{*} (z_{3}) O_{4}^{k}(3z_{3}/4) O_{s}(z_{3}) d z_{3} \]

(2.27)

Second look at

\[ \langle E \mid O_{4} \mid 0 \rangle = \int \langle \psi_{nl}^{*} (3z_{3}/3+8z_{2}/9) O_{s}(z_{3}+z_{2}/3) \right) \cdot O_{4}^{k}(3z_{3}/4) O_{s}(z_{3}) O_{s}(z_{2}) d z_{2} d z_{3}. \]

(2.28)
\[
y = \mathcal{Z}_3 ,
\]
\[
x = 8 \mathcal{Z}_2 / 9 - \mathcal{Z}_3 / 3 ,
\]
then
\[
\mathcal{Z}_3 = y ,
\]
\[
\mathcal{Z}_2 = 9(x + y/3)/8 ,
\]
and
\[
J = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{Z}_2, \mathcal{Z}_3) \mathcal{J}_2(x, y) = \left| \begin{array}{c}
y / 3 \\
0 \\
\end{array} \right| = 9/8
\]
Therefore
\[
< E | O_4 | 0 > \sim (9/8)^3 \int \psi_{nl}^* (x) O_s [y + (3y/8 + 9x/8)/3] 
\]
\[
 \cdot O_4^k (3y/4) O_s (3y/4) O_s (3y/8 + 9x/8) dx dy 
\]
\[
= (9/8)^3 \int \psi_{nl}^* (x) O_s (9y/8 + 3x/8) 
\]
\[
 \cdot O_4^k (3y/4) O_s (3y/4) O_s (3y/8 + 9x/8) dx dy 
\]
\[
= (9/8)^3 \int \psi_{nl}^* (x) (2\nu/3\pi)^{3/2} 
\]
\[
 \cdot \exp \left\{ -(3\nu/64)(4y^2 + 4x^2 - 12y \cdot x) \right\} 
\]
\[
 \cdot O_4^k (3y/4) O_s (3y/4) dx dy 
\]
\[
= (9/8)^3 \int \psi_{nl}^* (x) (2\nu/3\pi)^{3/2} 
\]
\[
 \cdot \exp \left\{ -(18\nu/64)(y^2 + x^2 + 2y \cdot x) \right\} 
\]
\[
 \cdot \exp \left\{ (3\nu/32)(y^2 + x^2) \right\} 
\]
\[
 \cdot O_4^k (3y/4) O_s (3y/4) dx dy 
\]
\[
= (9/8)^3 \int \psi_{nl}^* (x) (2\nu/3\pi)^{3/2} \exp \left\{ -(9\nu/32)(y + x)^2 \right\} 
\]
\[
 \cdot \exp \left\{ (3\nu/32)(y^2 + x^2) O_4^k (3y/4) O_s (3y/4) dx dy \right\} 
\]
\[
= (-1)^{(9/8)^3 (2\nu/3\pi)^{3/2}(4\pi)} \int R_{nl}(x) i^{1.} 
\]
\[
 \cdot \exp \left\{ -3\nu(y^2 + x^2)/16 \right\} 
\]
\[
 \cdot j_j(9i\nu yx/16) O_4 (3y/4) O_s (3y/4) x^2 y^2 dx dy 
\]
where

\[
(2.29)
\]
Therefore
\[ \langle Y_f | O_4 | 0 \rangle = \langle Y_{Mf} | O_4 | 0 \rangle \]
\[ = -\left( \frac{1}{2^{1/2}} \right) \left[ (2(1+d))^{-1/2} \right] \]
\[ \int R_{nl}^{3v/4} (3 \vec{z}_3/4) O_4(3 \vec{z}_3/4) O_s(\vec{z}_3) \vec{z}_3^2 d \vec{z}_3 \]
\[ + (-1)^{(9/8)} (2v/3\pi)^{3/2} (4\pi) \int R_{nl}(x) i^{-1} \]
\[ \cdot \exp[-3v(y^2+x^2)/16j_1(9ivyx/16)] \]
\[ \cdot O_4(3y/4) O_s(3y/4) x^2 y^2 dxdy \}
\[ (2.31) \]

Therefore
\[ \langle D | O_4 | 0 \rangle \sim \]
\[ \int \Psi_{nl}^*(\vec{z}_3) O_s(\vec{z}_2) O_s(\vec{z}_1) O_1(r_1') O_s(\vec{z}_3) O_s(\vec{z}_2) O_s(\vec{z}_1) d\vec{z}_1 d\vec{z}_2 d\vec{z}_3 \]

Therefore
\[ \langle D | O_1(r_1') | 0 \rangle = \langle D | O_1(r_3') | 0 \rangle \]
\[ \langle E | O_1 | 0 \rangle \sim \{ P_{3d} \Psi_{nl}^*(\vec{z}_3) O_s(\vec{z}_2) O_s(\vec{z}_1) O_s(\vec{z}_1) \} \]
\[ O_1(r_1') O_s(\vec{z}_3) O_s(\vec{z}_2) O_s(\vec{z}_1) d\vec{z}_1 d\vec{z}_2 d\vec{z}_3 \]
\[ \langle E | O_1 | 0 \rangle = \langle E | O_1(r_4') | 0 \rangle = (\text{in fact}) \langle D | O_1(r_3') | 0 \rangle . \]

Therefore
\[ \langle D + E | O_1 | 0 \rangle = 2\langle D | O_1(r_3') | 0 \rangle \sim \]
\[ \int \Psi_{1}^*(4r_4'/3) O_s(3r_3'/2+r_4'/2) \]
\[ O_1(r_3') O_s(4r_4'/3) O_s(3r_3'/2+r_4'/2) d\vec{z}_2 d\vec{z}_3 \]
\[ (2.32) \]

Let
\[ \vec{z}_3' = 4r_4'/3 , \]
\[ \vec{z}_2 = 3r_3'/2+r_4'/2 , \]
then
\[ \mathcal{Q}(\vec{z}_2\vec{z}_3)/\mathcal{Q}(r_3'r_4') = \begin{vmatrix} \vec{z}/2 & 0 \\ \vec{Q}/2 & 4/3 \end{vmatrix} = 2 . \]
Therefore
\[
<\text{D+E} | \text{O}_1 | 0 > = 2 <\text{D} | \text{O}_1(r'_3) | 0 >
\]
\[
\sim 8 \int \psi_{nl}^*(4r'_4/3)(2v/3 \pi)^{3/2} \cdot \exp\{-v(3r'_3^2 + r'_4^2)/2\}O_1(r'_3)O_s(4r'_4/3)dr'_3dr'_4
\]
\[
= 8 \int \psi_{nl}^*(4r'_4/3)(2v/3 \pi)^{3/2} \cdot \exp\{-v(3r'_3^2 + r'_4^2)/2\}O_1(r'_3)O_s(4r'_4/3)dr'_3dr'_4
\]
\[
= 8 (2v/3 \pi)^{3/2} \int \psi_{nl}^*(4\pi) \cdot \exp\{-v(9r'_3^2 + r'_4^2)/2\} j_1(ivr'_3 r'_4) \cdot Y_{lm}^*(r'_3)Y_{lm}^*(r'_4)O_1(r'_3)O_s(4r'_4/3)dr'_3dr'_4
\]
\[
= 32 \pi (2v/3 \pi)^{3/2} i \int R_{nl}(4r'_4/3) \exp\{-v(9r'_3^2 + r'_4^2)/2\} \cdot (-1)^{l-1}j_1(ivr'_3 r'_4)O(r'_3)O_s(4r'_4/3)r'_3^2r'_4^2dr'_3dr'_4.
\]

(2.33)

Therefore
\[
< Y_{l1} | \text{O}_1 | 0 > = -2^{(1/2)^1/2}[2(1+d)]^{-1/2} \cdot \{ 32 \pi (2v/3 \pi)^{3/2} i \int R_{nl}(4r'_4/3) \cdot \exp\{-v(9r'_3^2 + r'_4^2)/2\} \cdot j_1(ivr'_3 r'_4)O(r'_3)O_s(4r'_4/3)r'_3^2r'_4^2dr'_3dr'_4 \}.
\]

(2.34)

And
\[
< Y_{l1} | \text{O}_1 + O_2 + O_3 + O_4 | 0 >
\]
\[
= -2^{(1/2)^1/2}[2(1+d)]^{-1/2} \cdot \{ \int R_{nl}^{(3/4)}(3/4)O_4(3/4)O_5(3/4)3^2d3 \cdot (+4 \pi (2v/3 \pi)^{3/2}(-1)^{1} \cdot (9/8) \int R_{nl}(x) i \cdot \exp\{-15v(y^2 + x^2)/32\} j_1(9ivyx/16)O_4(y)O_5(y/4)x^2y^2dx\cdot dy \cdot (+16 \int R_{nl}(4r'_4/3)\exp\{-v(9r'_3^2 + r'_4^2)/2\} \cdot (-1)^{l-1}j_1(ivr'_3 r'_4)O(r'_3)O_s(4r'_4/3)r'_3^2r'_4^2dr'_3dr'_4 \}.
\]

(2.35)

where
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\[ ME(1) = \int R_n l^{3\nu/4}(\bar{z_3})O_4(3\bar{z_3}/4)O_8(\bar{z_3})\bar{z_3}^2d\bar{z_3} , \] (2.36)

\[ ME(2) = 4\pi(2v/3\pi)^{3/2}(-1)^{1}(9/8)^{3/2} \cdot \int R_n l(x) i^l \exp\{-15v(y^2+x^2)/32\} \]
\[ \cdot j_l(9ivyx/16)O_4(y)O_8(3y/4)x^2y^2dxdy , \] (2.37)

\[ ME(3) = 4\pi(2v/3\pi)^{3/2}(-1)^{1} \cdot 16 \]
\[ \cdot \int R_n l(4r^4/3)\exp[-v(9r^2_3+r^4_2)/2] \]
\[ \cdot i^l j_l(ivr^4_3 r^4_4)O(r^4_3)O_8(4r^4_4/3)r^2_3 r^2_4 dr^3_3 dr^4_4 . \] (2.38)

And

\[ d = \langle \text{DIE} \rangle \]
\[ = (-1)^l(9/8)^{3}(2v/3\pi)^{3/2}(4\pi)\int R_n l(y) i^l \exp\{-15v(y^2+z^2)/32\} \]
\[ \cdot j_l(9ivyz/16)R_n l(z)z^2y^2dzdy . \] (2.39)

Equation (2.35) is the transition matrix element between the initial and final states of the nucleus. Here, if the all coordinates had not been considered, equations (2.37) and (2.38) would not have appeared in (2.35).
CHAPTER III

THE CALCULATION AND THE RESULTS

As mentioned in Chapter II, the calculation of charge form factor has been deduced as determining the transition matrix elements between the initial and final states by equation (2.33), or

\[
< Y_f^k | O_1 + O_2 + O_3 + O_4 | 0 > = -2(j/2i/2l)[(1+d)]^{-1/2} \cdot \left\{ \int R_{nl}^{3v/4}(X_3) O_4(3X_3/4) O_s(X_3) X_3^2 dX_3 \\
+ 4\pi (2v/3\pi)^{3/2}(-1)^1 \cdot [(9/8)\int R_{nl}(X) i^{-1} \exp\{-15v(y^2 + x^2)/32\} \\
\cdot j_l(9ivy/16)O_4(y)O_s(3y/4)x^2y^2dxdy \\
+ 16\int R_{nl}(4r^\prime_4/3) \exp\{-v(9r^\prime_3^2 + r^\prime_4^2)/6\} i^{-1} \\
j_l(ivr^\prime_3 r^\prime_4)O(r^\prime_3)O_s(4r^\prime_4/3)r^\prime_3^2r^\prime_4^2dr^\prime_3dr^\prime_4 \right\} \\
= -2(j/2i/2l)[(1+d)]^{-1/2} \{ ME(1) + ME(2) + ME(3) \} ,
\]

(3.1)

where ME(1) is given by equation (2.36), ME(2) is by (2.37), ME(3) is by (2.38), and \( d = < DlE > \) is by (2.39). In the calculating,

\[
O_4(3X_3/4) = j_0(3X_3q/4)/(4\pi)^{-1/2}, \\
O_s(X_3) = R_{os}(3/4)(X_3)/(4\pi)^{-1/2}, \\
O_4(3y/4) = j_0(3yq/4)/(4\pi)^{-1/2}, \\
O_s^{3/4}(y) = R_{os}(3/4)(y)/(4\pi)^{-1/2}, \\
O(r_3^1) = j_0(r_3^1q)/(4\pi)^{-1/2}, \\
O_s^{3/4}(4r^1_4/3) = R_{os}(3/4)(4r^1_4/3)/(4\pi)^{-1/2}.
\]

All the calculations are done by computer. First of all, the
evaluation of $d = <D|E>$ is carried out. In actual calculating of the present problem, $l = 0$, $n = 1, \ldots, 7$,

$$j_i(9ivyz/16) = j_0(9ivyz/16)$$

$$= (16/i9vyz) \cdot \sin(i9xyz/16)$$

$$= (16/i9vyz) \cdot (\exp{-9vyz/16} - \exp{9vyz/16})/2i,$$

$$= -(8/9vxz) \cdot (\exp{-9vyz/16} - \exp{9vyz/16})$$

(3.2)

while $v_0 = mv/h = 0.36\text{fm}^2$, and $q$ ranges from 0.0 to 3.0 fm$^{-1}$. The two-dimensional integrals are evaluated by Simpson's rule in each dimension. The integration over $y$ and $z$ from 0.0 to 8.0 fm, 0.0 to 10.0 fm, and 0.0 to 12.0 fm are performed respectively, with total 170 integral subintervals. Since the integral value of $<D|E>$ does not change significantly from an upper limit of 10.0 fm to one of 12.0 fm, the actual computing is then carried out by setting the up limit of 12.0 fm for both $y$ and $z$.

Second, ME(1), ME(2) and ME(3) are computed for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7$, respectively. Figure 8 shows the results of ME(1). Here one can see that for values of $q < 2$ fm$^{-1}$, one need only consider particle excitations with $n \leq 5$. The results of ME(3) are shown in figures 9, 10, and 11. ME(3) along with ME(2) are the terms contributing to the target recoil correction. As one can see in the figure 9 to 11, strength of ME(3) contribution for $n = 2$ drops to very weak, and for $n \geq 3$, ME(3) becomes negligible. Therefore convergence in $n$ is very fast for ME(3). Similar results are obtained for ME(2).

Next, the equation (3.1) is taken into equations (1.13) and
Figure 8. ME(1) vs. q for n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Figure 9. 0.5 ME(3) vs. q for n = 1, 2
Figure 10. $0.5 \text{ ME}(3)$ vs. $q$ for $n = 2, 3, 4$

Figure 11. $0.5 \text{ ME}(3)$ vs. $q$ for $n = 4, 5, 6$
(1.15) for computing form factors as a function of $q$ and $E_p$. The excitation energy range of interest is $E_p = 0.0 - 1.20$ MeV. Coefficients in the expansion $\psi_f = \sum a_n Y_f(n)$ are taken from the work of Halderson and Philpott, 1976; and are a function of the excitation energy. The $n = 0$ terms are eliminated from the final wave function to maintain orthogonality with the $0s^4$ ground state.

The reason for choosing $E_p = 0.0 - 1.20$ MeV is for convenience sake of comparing the final result with experimental data (Frosch, Rand, Yearian, Crannell & Suelzle, 1965; Walcher, 1970; Kobschall et al. 1983). There, the data was integrated from around 19.8 to about 21.0 MeV. (See figure 4.)

Figure 12 shows the form factors as a function of $q$ and $E_p$. Here one sees that part of the resonance appears to be cut away, and the resonance is placed at a slightly higher location ($19.8 + 0.7 = 20.5$ MeV) than that of observed. The beginning of the resonance cut coincides with the opening of the neutron threshold. With no Coulomb barrier the s-wave neutron escapes easily and produces a very broad resonance. This asymmetric shape was predicted from the work of Crone and Werntz (1967). The latter is caused by the slightly higher location prediction of the M3Y interaction for the $0^+$ resonance, and the neutron threshold is calculated to be 0.69 MeV instead of 0.76 MeV as observed experimentally.

Lastly, figure 13 shows two calculated form factors $F(q^2)$ with the form factor extracted from experiments (Frosch, Rand, Yearian, Crannell & Suelzle, 1965; Walcher, 1970; Kobschall et al., 1983).
Figure 12. The Calculated RCCSM Form Factors $F(q, E_p)$. 
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Figure 13. The Calculated RCCSM Charge Form Factors $F(q^2)$. 

$10^4 \times F(q^2)$ vs. $q^2$ (fm$^{-2}$)
Curve A is the form factor with no finite proton size correction. It is obtained by integrating $F(q)$ in figure 12 over the energy region, $E_p = 0.0 - 1.1$ MeV. This may include an error, since some of the $0^+$ might have been assumed to be background in the experimental papers. This effect would be difficult to estimate since the different experimental papers showed different shapes and ranges for the background. The experimental form factors in figure 13, which are marked as "o", "+", and "x", are from Frosch, Rand, Yearian, Crannell & Suelzle(1965), Walcher(1970) and Kobschall et al.(1983). The original data, which are attached in appendices, are differential cross sections $d\sigma /d\omega$. The form factors are obtained by equation (1.18). As one can see, curve A is too large and the shape is not quite correct.

If curve A is multiplied by the finite proton size correction factor,

$$\frac{1}{1 + 0.0533q^2}^4,$$

the final RCCSM $0^+$ form factor (curve B) is then produced. As one can see now in figure 13, the calculated recoil corrected continuum shell model form factors, with all coordinate consideration and assuming a pure $0s^4$ ground state and discarding $0s^4$ components in the excited state, agree with experiment very well. The shape is correct, so is the strength of the form factor.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND A SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The major task of this paper was to calculate the electro-excitation charge form factors of \( ^4\text{He} \), \( 0^+ \) state within the context of the recoil corrected continuum shell model. Inelastic electron scattering experiments (Kobschall et al., 1983; Watcher, 1970; Forsch, Rand, Yearian, Crannell & Suelzle, 1965) have shown that the \( 0^+ \) state accounts for a very small percentage of the energy weighted sum rule and previous shell-model calculations, which assume a \( 1s0s^{-1} (J = 0, J = 0) \) configuration, over-predicted the strength by a factor of 20 (Lui & Zamick, 1986). This has led to speculations that the shell model is inappropriate for describing this light system. The present calculation, employed the recoil corrected continuum shell model with full target internal coordinate considerations, showed that the shell model does describe the \( ^4\text{He} \) system. The crucial ingredients of the recoil corrected continuum shell model were a realistic interaction, translationally invariant wave functions and proper boundary conditions. Also, the full center of mass correction to the form factor was taken into account.

The result was then compared with the experimental data. Excellent agreement between the calculated and experimental form factors was achieved.
However, one must remember that it is not correct to treat the $^4$He ground state as a pure $0s^4$. Halderson and Philpott (Halderson & Philpott, 1979) have included ns0s$^{-1}$ correlations as a correction into the ground state wave function for the $^4$He($\gamma$, p)$^3$H reaction in 1979. Figure 14 shows their calculated cross section while comparing with experiment for the reaction. The ground state correlations did a good job in correcting the ground state structure here. So for future research, it is suggested that the ground state correlations ns0s$^{-1}$ should be taken into account in calculating $^4$He(e, $e'$)$^4$He(0$^+$) form factors.

Figure 14. Cross Section For The $^4$He($\gamma$, p)$^3$H Reaction. Curve I is for a pure $0s_{1/2}$, $^4$He ground state; curve II is an estimate of including ground state correlations; curve III is the uncorrected cross section.
APPENDICES A

Experimental Data From Kobschall et al., 1983
Table 1

Differential cross sections of the quasi-bound state in $^4\text{He}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$q^2$ (fm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$E_0$ (MeV)</th>
<th>$\theta$ (deg)</th>
<th>$d\sigma/d\Omega$ ($10^{-6}$fm$^2$/sr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>319.95</td>
<td>34.28</td>
<td>4.96±1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>319.95</td>
<td>39.89</td>
<td>3.05±0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>179.94</td>
<td>86.70</td>
<td>0.39±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>229.94</td>
<td>64.63</td>
<td>0.93±0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>319.95</td>
<td>44.96</td>
<td>1.74±0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.641</td>
<td>229.94</td>
<td>71.98</td>
<td>0.51±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.687</td>
<td>319.95</td>
<td>49.65</td>
<td>1.35±0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>179.94</td>
<td>128.29</td>
<td>0.07±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.279</td>
<td>229.94</td>
<td>88.59</td>
<td>0.17±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.342</td>
<td>319.95</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>0.46±0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES B

Experimental Data From Walcher, 1970
### Table 2

Results for the 20.5 MeV level of the α particle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E_0$ (MeV)</th>
<th>$\theta$ (deg)</th>
<th>$q^2$ (fm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}$ $(10^{-33}$cm$^2$/ster)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>22 ±5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>15 ±3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.8±1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.4±0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES C

Experimental Data From Frosch, Rand, Yearian, Crannell & Suelzle, 1965
### Table 3

Results for the 20 MeV level of the $\alpha$ particle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E_0$ (MeV)</th>
<th>$\theta$ (deg)</th>
<th>$q^2$ (fm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$d\sigma/d\Omega$ (nb/sr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>80.6 ± 38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>12.5 ± 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>106 ± 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>67.8 ± 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>48.6 ± 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>15.1 ± 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>7.75 ± 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>94.6 ± 27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>31.5 ± 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>47.0 ± 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>30.7 ± 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>14.1 ± 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.90 ± 1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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