

# RATE AND UNCERTAINTY OF THE $^{18}\text{Ne}(\alpha,p)^{21}\text{Na}$ REACTION FROM MONTE-CARLO SIMULATIONS

P. Mohr<sup>1,2</sup>, R. Longland<sup>3,4</sup>, C. Iliadis<sup>3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Diakonie-Klinikum, D-74523 Schwaebisch Hall, Germany*

<sup>2</sup> *Institute of Nuclear Research (ATOMKI), H-4001 Debrecen, Hungary*

<sup>3</sup> *Dep. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA*

<sup>4</sup> *Triangle Universities Nuclear Laboratory, Durham, NC, USA*

The  $^{18}\text{Ne}(\alpha,p)^{21}\text{Na}$  reaction is a key for the break-out from the hot CNO-cycles to the rp-process [1]. Here we present an updated reaction rate, which is based on the latest experimental data of transfer experiments to the compound  $^{22}\text{Mg}$  nucleus [2,3] and resonant  $^{21}\text{Na}(p,p)^{21}\text{Na}$  elastic scattering [4,5]. The new rate is calculated within the narrow-resonance formalism using experimental resonance energies  $E_R$  and calculated resonance strengths  $\omega\gamma = \omega\Gamma_\alpha$ . The widths  $\Gamma_\alpha$  have been estimated from the mirror nucleus  $^{22}\text{Ne}$  (when reduced widths are available) or from a Porter-Thomas distribution for the remaining states without spectroscopic information [6]. A Monte-Carlo simulation is used for the calculation of the new rate, taking into account uncertainties of all nuclear physics ingredients, including uncertain spin assignments; thus, an improved estimate of the uncertainty of the rate can be provided in a consistent way [7]. The new recommended rate is slightly lower, but close to previous recommendations [3,5]. We find improved consistency between the present approach using experimental resonance energies and calculated resonance strengths and an alternative approach using experimental data of the inverse  $^{21}\text{Na}(p,\alpha)^{18}\text{Ne}$  reaction with theoretical corrections for the contributions of excited states in  $^{21}\text{Na}$  [8,9]. An earlier direct approach [10] is inconsistent with the present result and with the inverse reaction data [8,9] and is thus neglected in the determination of  $N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle$ .

This work was supported by OTKA (K101328 and K108459) and in part by the US Department of Energy under contract no. DE-FG02-97ER41041 and by the National Science Foundation under award number AST-1008355.

[1] H. Schatz and K. E. Rehm, *Nucl. Phys. A* 777, 601 (2006).

[2] A. Matic et al., *Phys. Rev. C* 80, 055804 (2009).

[3] P. Mohr and A. Matic, *Phys. Rev. C* 87, 035801 (2013).

[4] J. J. He et al., *Phys. Rev. C* 88, 012801(R) (2013).

[5] L. Y. Zhang et al., *Phys. Rev. C* 89, 015804 (2014).

[6] I. Pogrebnyak et al., *Phys. Rev. C* 88, 015808 (2013).

[7] R. Longland et al., *Nucl. Phys. A* 841, 1 (2010).

[8] P. J. C. Salter et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 242701 (2012).

[9] S. Sinha et al., *ANL Annual Report 2005*, p.6-7.

[10] D. Groombridge et al., *Phys. Rev. C* 66, 055802 (2002).