

OPTICAL AND COUPLED-CHANNELS DESCRIPTION OF $^{20}\text{Ne}+^{16}\text{O}$ ELASTIC SCATTERING

A. Duisebayev¹, N. Burtebayev¹, M. Nassurlla^{1;4}, D. Alimov^{1;4}, I. Boztosun^{2;3},
J. Burtebayeva¹, A. K. Morzabayev⁵, S. K. Sakhiev⁵, S. V. Artemov⁶,
J. M. Mussaev⁷

1 Institute of Nuclear Physics, 050032, Almaty, Kazakhstan,

2 Akdeniz University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, 07058, Antalya, Turkey,

3 Akdeniz University, Nuclear Sciences Application and Research Center - NUBA, 07058
Antalya, Turkey,

4 Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan,

5 Eurasia National University, Astana, Kazakhstan,

6 Institute of Nuclear Physics, Tashkent, Uzbekistan,

7 South Kazakhstan State University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.

Abstract. The elastic scattering of the $^{20}\text{Ne}+^{16}\text{O}$ system has been analyzed with a phenomenological potential approach within the framework of the optical and coupled-channels models at $E_{\text{Lab}}=50.0$ MeV[1-15]. The striking feature of the experimental data is the oscillatory structure at the intermediate angles and a rapid increase at large angles. Optical potentials have difficulty in describing such structures and predict a fall of experimental data around the intermediate angles. In order to explain this structure, we have used a deep real potential with a sum of Woods-Saxon typed surface and volume imaginary potentials. We present that deep real potential with these imaginary potentials explain the oscillatory structure and backward rise observed in the elastic scattering data within both models. It should be pointed out that there is a magnitude problem of the inelastic 2^+ data for the deformed ^{20}Ne nucleus that the standard coupled-channels model is unable to predict correctly.

References

1. I. Boztosun and W.D.M. Rae, Phys. Lett. 518B (2001) 229.
2. C. Bremner *et al.* Phys. Rev. C 66 (2002) 034605.
3. M. Freer *et al.* Phys. Rev. C 70 (2004) 064311.
4. M. Karakoc and I. Boztosun, Phys. Rev. C 73 (2006) 047601; Int. J. of Mod. Phys. E 15 (2006) 1317.
5. M. Freer *et al.* Phys. Rev. C 71 (2005) 047305.
6. Y. Kucuk and I. Boztosun, Nucl. Phys. A 764 (2006) 160.
7. M. Freer *et al.* Phys. Rev. C 76 (2007) 034320.
8. N. Burtebaev *et al.*, Phys. of Atom. Nucl. 68 (2005) 1303.
9. N. Burtebayev *et al.*, Phys. of Atom. Nucl. 73 (2010) 746.
10. N. Burtebayev *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A 909 (2013) 1303.
11. Sh. Hamada, N. Burtebayev and N. Amangeldi, Int. J. of Mod. Phys. E 23 (2014) 145061.
12. Sh. Hamada, N. Burtebayev, K. A. Gridnev and N. Amangeldi, Nucl. Phys. A. 859 (2011) 29.
13. A. Amar *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E-Nucl. Phys. 20 (2011) 980.
14. R. Stock *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C 14 (1976) 1824.
15. Yong-Xu Yang and Qing-Run Li, Phys. Rev. C 84 (2011) 014602.