

Determination of Cross Section for Different Fusion Reactions in Terms of Lattice Effects in Solid State Internal Conversion for Different metallic Crystalline Environments

S.N.Hosseini-motlagh¹, M.Shahamiri²

¹ Department of Physics, Shiraz branch Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

² Sama technical and vocational college, Islamic Azad University, Kazeroon Branch, Kazeroon , Iran

Abstract

In the present paper, the cross section of the $D(d,p)T$, $D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$, $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$ and $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ fusion reactions in terms of the lattice effect in solid state internal conversion for different structures and different metallic crystalline environments in comparison with palladium environment has been determined. Elements that we used in this article are Ni, Ru, Rh, Pt, Ta, Ti, Zr, which are contained FCC, BCC and HCP lattice structures. Fusionable particles are solved as a sublattice in mentioned crystalline metals. Fusion reactions are generated by the flux of incoming fusionable particles. We took lattice effect part in our calculations with regard the Bloch functions for the initial and final state of a three body system. Three-body system involved the host lattice, sublattice and incident particles. The cross section to perform each fusion reaction inside different metal is computed using the state of initial and final system. Then our results for cross section of different metal are compared with palladium metal. Finally, the solid state internal conversion coefficient is obtained by considering the lattice effect.

Key words: internal conversion, fusion cross section, lattice effect in solid state internal conversion

1. Introduction

Nowadays using nuclear energy is very important as a clean source of energy. There are two kinds of nuclear reactions, fusion and fission. Since the fusion reaction has less radioactive radiation and the fusion fuels required for these reactions are more sufficiently available in the nature, therefore fusion reactions are important to study.

In 1995, many experimental works are done on gaseous metals for determining screening effect [1]. From 1998 to 2001, these experiments continued on metallic environments [2-4]. In 2000, the electron screening effect on the cold fusion reaction was studied for $D + D$ in the metallic environment [5]. In 2002, they released a report, "Thermal and nuclear aspects of the $\text{Pd}/\text{D}_2\text{O}$ system," with a plea for funding [6]. In 2002, the enhancement of cold fusion and solid state effect were studied in deuterated metal for $D+D$ [7]. From 2002 to 2004, the screening effect on 50 metals and insulators is checked by a series of experiments [8-10]. In 2003, the enhancement of deuteron-fusion reactions in metals and experimental implications were studied for electron screening effect [11]. In 2004, the subject of solid state internal conversion came up [12]. In 2005, many efforts were cleared to create an apparatus according to the Fleischmann and Pons' works; finally, Cold fusion apparatus was made in San Diego Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center. They used other names instead of cold fusion to reduce the effect of previous failures. Often they prefer to name their field Low Energy Nuclear Reactions (LENR) or Chemically Assisted Nuclear Reactions (CANR), also Lattice Assisted Nuclear Reactions

(LANR), Condensed Matter Nuclear Science (CMNS) and Lattice Enabled Nuclear Reactions [13-16].

In 2002, Peter Kalman and Thomas Keszthelyi studied this problem (enhancing cross section) on different metals. They studied many different factors to explain the enhancement of cross section. For example, the electron screening was checked for 29 deuterated metals and 5 deuterated insulators/semiconductors from periodic tables. Among them, metals were most convenient. Some of the other factors that they considered were: stopping power, thermal motion, channeling, diffusion, conductivity, and crystal structure and electron configuration. None of them could explain the observed enhanced cross section [7, 9, 11, 17-19]. In 2004, they found a reason to explain the enhancement of cross section that was called solid state internal conversion [12]. In 2008, screening effect is studied for the first time on metals by considering solid state; actually solid state of metals is expressed in experiments [20]. Finally, in 2009, they considered a metal with its lattice structure and entered the lattice shape of the solid in their internal conversion calculations [21]. Their calculations were just for $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ reaction.

In this paper, different metals are considered. We choose such metals that show the best results in term of screening effect and the density of deuterium [22]. In this article, in order to compare internal conversion(IC)with lattice effect in solid state internal conversion(LEISSIC), we calculate cross section for different seven particles plus palladium for $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$, $D(d,p)\text{T}$, $D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$, $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$.

The objective of this study is to determinate fusion cross section (FCS) for above reactions in different metallic environments regarding LEISSIC in order to find the reason of enhanced FCS in these metallic media then recommend the best metal. To come on this aim, following steps are studied: First, right after introduction, the aspects of IC, SSIC and LEISSIC are explained. Second, different special lattice such as Face Cubic Centered (FCC), Body Cubic Centered (BCC) and Hexagonal close Packed (HCP) is introduced in details. Third, LEISSIC and other required quantities to determinate FCS and LEISSIC coefficient for Pd environment are computed. Fourth, all calculations in the third step are repeated for Ni, Ru, Rh, Pt, Ta, Ti, Zr. Fifth, microscopic FCS for all elements are determined in different reaction in the case that these metals are considered as a host particle in lattice. Finally, we can suggest the best kind of lattice, fusion reaction and metallic environment which have high value LEISSIC when cold fusion happening.

2. Internal Conversion (IC) and Solid State Internal Conversion (SSIC)

Internal conversion is a radioactive decay process where an excited nucleus interacts with an electron in one of the lower atomic orbitals, causing the electron to be emitted from the atom. Thus, in an internal conversion process, a high-energy electron is emitted from the radioactive atom, but without beta decay taking place. Since no beta decay takes place in internal conversion, the element atomic number does not change, and thus (as is the case with gamma decay) no transmutation of one element to another is seen. Also, no neutrino is emitted in internal conversion. Most internal conversion electrons come from the K shell (1s state, see

electron shell), as these two electrons have the highest probability of being found inside the nucleus. After the electron has been emitted, the atom is left with a vacancy in one of the inner electron shells. This hole will be filled with an electron from one of the higher shells and subsequently a characteristic x-ray or Auger electron will be emitted [23, 24]




Figure 1: Internal conversion (Internal Conversion, Laboratory Exercise in Nuclear Physics, autumn 2005, K. S. Krane, *Introductory Nuclear Physics*)

The enhancement in the fusion rate, which is observed in solid metallic environments, is attributed to the presence of solid state material but up to now the theoretical explanation of the phenomenon is still missing [25-27]. In what follows, we suggest a possible mechanism called solid state internal conversion process that should be considered when trying to understand the extra fusion events. [28].

A similar process to IC can take place on a solid between fusible nuclei and any charged particle in the crystal. The solid state internal conversion process, e.g. $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ nuclear reaction, can be processes consisting of (a) a bound-free electron transition $p + d + (e) \rightarrow ^3\text{He} + e$ and (b) a bound-free deuteron transition $p + d + (d) \rightarrow ^3\text{He} + d$. Therefore, an internal conversion happened in a solid environment in addition of electron channel, we have deuterium channel too [12]. Increasing absorption is expressed that in a solid material, nuclear fusion reactions (NFR) can happen in solid state internal conversion that creates transit for every charged particle by electromagnetic reaction [12].

3. Describing mentioned lattice structure in this article: FCC, BCC, HCP

In this paper, these elements are studied: Ni, Ru, Rh, Pt, Ta, Ti, Zr. Which, Ni, Pt, Rh have an FCC lattice such as Pd. Ru, Ti, Zr have an HCP lattice and the lattice of Ta is BCC.

After investigating prior experimental work, finally in 2008 solids are considered without their lattice crystal [20]. Then, in 2009, calculations are continued for Pd and with regard the

crystalline lattice [21]. Before studyingfor solid state internal conversion the scientists examined screening effect on metals, tofind the reasons of the enhancement FCS of metals which was observed[22]. In this article chosen elements are significant in screening effect or deuterium density. For example, Ti and Zr showed the most screening potential in the experiments [11]. Ta and Zr had the most solved deuterium density [22]. Whereas having a maximum deuterium density in Ti depends on having high temperature [12].

The most important quantities that change during calculations are unit cell volume and the number of atoms that belongs to each kind of lattice. Those quantities are explained for each lattice that is following.

In each unit cell of FCC and BCC lattice, eight atoms stand on the corner of cubic that are collaborations between eight other closed cubic (Fig 2, a_1 and a_2), thus, each unit cell has one atom from corners ($8 \times \frac{1}{8} = 1$). For FCC there is one atom which belongs to two closed cubic but for BCC one atom locates in the center of each unit cell. So, FCC and BCC lattice have respectively 3 atoms from all 6 sites ($6 \times \frac{1}{2} = 3$) and one atom from its center. Therefore, FCC and BCC have four ($1 + 3 = 4$) and two ($1 + 1 = 2$) atoms in each unit cell respectively.

HCP lattice: In each unit cell of HCP (see fig.2, a_3), there are two atoms at the top and down sides that are shared between two closed unit cells ($2 \times \frac{1}{2} = 1$), on the other sides of the unit cell there are six atoms. Each atom belongs, two closed unit cells ($6 \times \frac{1}{2} = 3$). There are twelve atoms in the corners that are collaborating between three closed unit cells ($12 \times \frac{1}{3} = 4$). Consequently, there are eight atoms that are completely belonged to one unit cell. In this lattice there are two lattice constants: c height of unit cell and a , the face of hexagonal.




Figure 2: Shape of unit cell; a_1 : FCC unit cell, a_2 : BCC unit cell, a_3 : HCP unit cell.

The volume of unit cell for each lattice is defined by equation 1[30].

$$v_{cell} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \frac{a^3}{4} & FCC \\ \frac{a^3}{2} & BCC \\ \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{16} a^2 c & HCP \end{array} \right\}, (a, c: \text{lattice constant}) (1)$$

4. Lattice Effect in Solid State Internal Conversion

4.1. Cross section theory of LEISSIC

In this case to insert LEISSIC into the cross section formula, we break through the procedure that is mentioned at ref 20 completely. So, only those important formulas that are really needed here are written. For comparison the fusion cross section with and without LEISSIC we have to determine the macroscopic cross section[20].

$$\Sigma = N\sigma_2 \quad (2)$$

In previous equation, σ_2 the cross section of fusion reaction between host and target fusible particles is obtained at the following[20],

$$\sigma_2 = C_0 \frac{\exp(-2\pi\eta)}{E} \quad (3)$$

E is the energy of incoming particle and C_0 contains all the properties of the lattice that is determined by[20],

$$C_0 = |F_{cb}|^2 A_0 k_\mu \left(\frac{\beta_2}{K_Q}\right)^3 \langle |\tilde{\chi}|_{K=K_Q}^2 \rangle_{\Omega_K} \quad (4)$$

All parts of equation 4 and the way that it obtained are presented in ref 20. m_n , nucleons mass, ω_n angular frequency of binding energy are calculated for each reaction separately (table 3)[20].

$$\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{m_n \omega_n}}{\hbar} \quad (5)$$

$$m_n = m_i + m_{He}, i = d \text{ or } t \quad (6)$$

$$\omega_n = \frac{\text{binding energy of He (MeV)}}{\hbar} \quad (7)$$

Here, C_0 is calculated for one d or one Pd. In order to compare C_0 with astrophysical factor (S(0)) in ordinary state, it must be calculated considering the density of these particles. So, we use the Eq.8[20],

$$NC_0 = A\Delta R_h C_1, N(Pd) = V_{eff}/v_{cell} \text{ and } N(d) = u V_{eff}/v_{cell} \quad (8)$$

Where $v_{cell} = d^3/4$, $V_{eff} = A\Delta R_h$ and $d = 3.89 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}$ is the lattice constant. In Eq.8, u is the ratio of deuteron to palladium number density. For electron $u = 10$ which is the number of electron valence in palladium.

4.2. Results of numerical calculations for each reaction

There are two tables for all reactions that can aid in plotting the cross section and compared with the ordinary state. The suppositions of hosts, sublattice and incoming particles are expressed for all reactions in this way: the host particles are Pd, d, e for Palladium. The sublattice is deuterium for all reactions. The incoming particles are proton (p) in $D(p, \gamma)^3\text{He}$, deuterium (d) in $D(d, p)\text{T}$ and $D(d, \gamma)^4\text{He}$ and tritium (t) in $T(d, n)^4\text{He}$. In order to get to the equation 4 and obtain fusion cross section, all our calculation and requirements for all three kinds of host particles are summarized in tables 1, 2 and 3 to according to the formulas in ref 20.

Table 1: our numerical calculation of necessary quantities for obtaining C_0 for all chosen reactions

Type of Reactions	host particles	$A_0(\text{MeV})$	$\mu(\text{gr})$	$K_Q(\text{cm}^{-1})$	$ \tilde{\chi} _{K=K_Q}^2 (\text{cm}^3)$	ξ
D(p,γ)3He	Pd	175	5.013×10^{-24}	8.91×10^{12}	3.95×10^{-38}	10.755
	d	0.0827	2.005×10^{-24}	5.64×10^{12}	5.13×10^{-38}	0.1477
	e	0.0103	-----	2.78×10^{11}	6.11×10^{-38}	-560382
D(d,p)T	Pd	349	6.686×10^{-24}	8.82×10^{12}	3.15×10^{-38}	14.462
	d	0.165	2.229×10^{-24}	5.09×10^{12}	3.97×10^{-38}	0.181
	e	0.021	-----	2.05×10^{11}	4.45×10^{-38}	-0.0011
D(d,γ)4He	Pd	349	6.686×10^{-24}	7.93×10^{12}	3.69×10^{-38}	16.075
	d	0.165	2.229×10^{-24}	4.58×10^{12}	4.51×10^{-38}	0.202
	e	0.021	-----	1.65×10^{11}	4.98×10^{-38}	-0.0022
T(d,n)4He	Pd	524	8.35×10^{-24}	2.05×10^{13}	2.89×10^{-39}	5.863
	d	0.248	2.387×10^{-24}	1.10×10^{13}	4.24×10^{-39}	0.09
	e	0.031	-----	8.90×10^{11}	4.30×10^{-38}	-4.228

162

163 We can calculate the required parameters such as C_0 and C_1 which are important for estimating
 164 cross section of the fusion reactions.

165

Table 2: our numerical calculation C_0 and C_1 for different host particle and different reactions

Type of Reactions	host particles	$k_\mu (\text{cm}^{-1})$	$ F_{cb} ^2$	$C_0 (\text{MeV b})$	$C_1 (\text{MeV b})$
D(p,γ)3He	Pd	1.42×10^{14}	3.14×10^{-28}	4.92×10^{-38}	3.36×10^{-24}
	d	0.57×10^{14}	0.61	2.30×10^{-13}	$u \times 15.6$
	e	-----	1	9.10×10^{-13}	6.18×10^2
D(d,p)T	Pd	1.90×10^{14}	3.27×10^{-38}	1.11×10^{-47}	7.53×10^{-34}
	d	0.63×10^{14}	0.5371	1.88×10^{-13}	$u \times 12.78$
	e	-----	1	2.48×10^{-12}	1.687×10^3
D(d,γ)4He	Pd	1.90×10^{14}	7.02×10^{-41}	3.83×10^{-50}	0.26×10^{-35}
	d	0.63×10^{14}	0.4964	2.70×10^{-13}	$u \times 18.35$
	e	-----	1	4.31×10^{-36}	2.93×10^{-21}
T(d,n)4He	Pd	2.37×10^{14}	4.44×10^{-15}	2.05×10^{-25}	1.39×10^{-12}
	d	0.68×10^{14}	0.7438	4.45×10^{-15}	$u \times 0.3024$
	e	-----	1	1.87×10^{-13}	127.1

166

167 Since each palladium unit cell has 4 Pd atoms purely and since we suppose that the number of
 168 host and sublattice particles are equal, then we have

$$N_{Pd} = \frac{1}{4} \times 4.22 \times 10^{22} \quad (9)$$

169

170

171

172

173

174

Table 3: our obtaining required quantities which are calculated for determination of different fusion

Type of Reactions	λ (cm ⁻¹)	β_2 (cm ⁻¹)	Q (MeV)	Binding Energy (MeV)
D(p, γ) ³ He	9×10^{12}	4.81×10^{14}	5.49	7.718
D(d,p)T	10×10^{12}	4.81×10^{14}	4.04	8.482
D(d, γ) ⁴ He	9.63×10^{12}	4.81×10^{14}	3.27	28.3
T(d,n) ⁴ He	21.8×10^{12}	4.81×10^{14}	17.59	28.3

4.3. Calculations the solid state internal conversion coefficient for different fusion reactions in Palladium crystal environment

With regarding to definition that exists in Ref.11, we can write $v_{eff} = A\Delta R_h$, where A is the cross section of the beam, ΔR_h is the “differential” range, that is, the distance within which the energy of the incoming particle can be considered unchanged. The $\Delta R_h \ll R_h$ condition helps in an order of magnitude estimate of ΔR_h , where R_h is the stopping range of a proton which is about $8 \times 10^{-2} \mu m$ at $E = 0.01 MeV$ in Pd [22]. The quantities A and R_h were measured in mm^2 and $10^{-3} \mu m$ units. The solid state internal conversion coefficient is introduced as [20],

$$\alpha_{SSIC} = A\Delta R_h C_1 / S(0) \quad (10)$$

S(0) is the astrophysical factor and the amounts of S(0) were calculated completely in the ref 27. Here since the issue is studied on the low energy (5-30 eV), the amounts of S(0) for each reaction is a constant that are shown in table 4.

Table 4: the amounts of astrophysical S-factor for different reactions in ordinary state in low energy

Reactions	D(p, γ) ³ He	D(d,p)T	D(d, γ) ⁴ He	T(d,n) ⁴ He
Astrophysical factor				
S(0) MeV barn	0.2×10^{-6}	0.056	0.054	10

By using the amounts exist in tables 2, 4 and replacing them into Eq.9 the solid state internal conversion coefficient for different reactions can be found. This coefficient indicates the internal conversion rate in different reactions. The result of the calculations summarized in table 5.

Type of reactions	$\alpha_{\text{SSIC,d}} A\Delta R_h$	$\alpha_{\text{SSIC,e,4d}} A\Delta R_h$
D(p, γ) ³ He	$u \times 7.8 \times 10^5$	3.1×10^9
D(d,p)T	$u \times 3.03 \times 10^4$	3.2×10^6
D(d, γ) ⁴ He	$u \times 3.398 \times 10^2$	5.42×10^{-20}
T(d,n) ⁴ He	$u \times 0.03$	12.7

205

206 We find out the solid state internal conversion happens in D(p, γ)³He and D(d,p)T reactions with
 207 more rates. All calculations in this part are shown for palladium. In the next part we show the
 208 results for other elements in detailed.

209 5. Calculations of LEISSIC for other elements

210 5.1. Tables of Calculation for Different Elements and Reactions

211 By using all formulas in section 3, such as what we have done for palladium, all required
 212 quantities can be computed for mentioning elements. Because other host particles (deuterium and
 213 electron) don't change in these calculations and the only thing that changes is the first row of the
 214 Table.1. Meanwhile, C_1 and C_0 which changes only for the elements are respectively shown in
 215 Table 6 and 7.

216 Table 6: Our numerical calculations of C_0 for different elements and reactions with FCC, BCC and HCP lattice

Quantity elements	$C_{0,D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}}$ (MeV barn)	$C_{0,D(d,p)\text{T}}$ (MeV barn)	$C_{0,D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}}$ (MeV barn)	$C_{0,T(d,n)^4\text{He}}$ (MeV barn)
Pd (FCC)	4.92×10^{-38}	1.11×10^{-47}	3.83×10^{-50}	2.05×10^{-25}
Ni (FCC)	3.44×10^{-27}	6.79×10^{-33}	2.56×10^{-35}	6.98×10^{-23}
Pt (FCC)	1.34×10^{-57}	1.95×10^{-74}	1.21×10^{-81}	1.63×10^{-45}
Rh (FCC)	1.08×10^{-36}	7.43×10^{-47}	6.61×10^{-51}	1.38×10^{-24}
Ru (HCP)	8.49×10^{-37}	5.07×10^{-46}	5.56×10^{-50}	1.21×10^{-30}
Ti (HCP)	1.10×10^{-23}	4.63×10^{-28}	6.49×10^{-30}	1.93×10^{-21}
Zr (HCP)	2.25×10^{-34}	1.01×10^{-42}	2.69×10^{-46}	6.27×10^{-29}
Ta (BCC)	1.30×10^{-54}	3.10×10^{-70}	5.79×10^{-77}	2.64×10^{-43}

217

218

219

220

quantity elements				
Pd (FCC)	Pd	3	7	
	d			
	e			
Ni (FCC)	Ni	3	6	
	d			
	e			
Pt (FCC)	Pt	6	7	
	d			
	e			
Rh (FCC)	Rh	7	4	
	d			
	e			
Ru (HCP)	Ru	5	3	
	d			
	e			
Ti (HCP)	Ti	5	2	
	d			
	e			
Zr (HCP)	Zr	8	3	
	d			
	e			
Ta (BCC)	Ta	7	3	
	d			
	e			

222

223 For comparing C_0 , the microscopic FCS of these metallic environments for all elements,

224 numerical values from Table.6 can be useful. For studying the comparison of the C_1 quantity see

225 table 7.

226 According to table 7, we find out that: wherever elements themselves are considered as host

227 particles, the results of C_1 from large to small values for all reactions are: Ti, Ni, Zr, Ru, Rh, Pd,

228 Ta and Pt. For cases that deuterium and electron are host particles, our comparing values lead to

229 Ru, Ni, Ti, Rh, Pd, Pt, Zr, Ta and Ni, Ru, Pd, Pt, Rh, Ti, Ta, Zr respectively. In case that electron

230 is host the number of electrons in capacity layer is too important indeed whatever the numbers of

231 electrons increases the screening effect is enhanced. Between all reactions, $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$, $D(d,p)\text{T}$

232 and $D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$ have larger values of C_1 than $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$.

233 (According Table.7 the result of comparing C_1 for different host particles in different metallic

234 environments are: element host particle, $C_{1,Ti} > C_{1,Ni} > C_{1,Zr} > C_{1,Ru} > C_{1,Rh} > C_{1,Pd} > C_{1,Ta} >$

235 $C_{1,Pt}$; deuterium host particle, $C_{1,Ru} > C_{1,Ni} > C_{1,Ti} > C_{1,Rh} > C_{1,Pd} > C_{1,Pt} > C_{1,Zr} > C_{1,Ta}$;

236 electron host particle, $C_{1,Ni} > C_{1,Ru} > C_{1,Pd} > C_{1,Pt} > C_{1,Rh} > C_{1,Ti} > C_{1,Ta} > C_{1,Zr}$)

quantity elements				
Pd (FCC)	d			
	e			
Ni (FCC)	d			
	e			
Pt (FCC)	d			
	e			
Rh (FCC)	d			
	e			
Ru (HCP)	d			
	e			
Ti (HCP)	d			
	e			
Zr (HCP)	d			
	e			
Ta (BCC)	d			
	e			

238

239 In the each environment, IC coefficient shows internal conversion rate and determined the cross
 240 section enhancement in each environment. By studying table 8, we find out that the internal
 241 conversion coefficient of deuterium for $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ is the largest one. The IC coefficient for
 242 $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ for different reactions from larger to smaller value is: Ru, Ni, Rh, Pt, Zr, Ta, Ti and
 243 Pd. As you see in this reaction Pd has the last rank. In $D(d,p)\text{T}$, the arrangement of the elements
 244 is: Pd, Ru, Ni, Ti, Rh, Pt, Zr and Ta.

245 **Electronic internal conversion coefficient arrangement for** different elements is: Ni, Ru, Pd, Rh, Ti,
 246 Ta, Zr, Pt. ($\alpha_{e,Ni} > \alpha_{e,Ru} > \alpha_{e,Pd} > \alpha_{e,Rh} > \alpha_{e,Ti} > \alpha_{e,Ta} > \alpha_{e,Zr} > \alpha_{e,Pt}$)

247 **(According** to Table.8, comparing ICC values of deuterium host particle for the two largest
 248 reactions $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ and $D(d,p)\text{T}$ are respectively: $\alpha_{d,Ru} > \alpha_{d,Ni} > \alpha_{d,Rh} > \alpha_{d,Pt} > \alpha_{d,Zr} > \alpha_{d,Ta} >$
 249 $\alpha_{d,Ti} > \alpha_{d,Pd}$ and $\alpha_{d,Pd} > \alpha_{d,Ru} > \alpha_{d,Ni} > \alpha_{d,Ti} > \alpha_{d,Rh} > \alpha_{d,Pt} > \alpha_{d,Zr} > \alpha_{d,Ta}$)

250 6. Microscopic cross section for all elements in different reactions

251 **Microscopic FCS** for all metallic environments when metal **considers as a host** particle are plotted
 252 by replacing numerical values from Table 6 in **Eq.3**. All FCS are divided into two groups in order
 253 to show changes clearly: 16 maximum and 16 minimum which are respectively shown in Fig 3.
 254 Numbers 1 to 4 besides the name of the elements shows $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$, $D(d,p)\text{T}$, $D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$ and
 255 $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$.





Figure 3: 16 maximum and minimum measurements of microscopic FCS in terms of incoming energy for all reactions are represented.

In the above graph, different colors shows kinds of elements and the styles of shape introduce kinds of reactions. $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ by “dash”, $D(d,p)T$ by “dashdot”, $D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$ by “longdash” and $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$ by “dot” are shown. The color of Pd, Ni, Pt, Rh, Ru, Ti, Zr, and Ta are respectively: Green, red, navy, cyan, dark pink, coral, aquamarine and brown. As you see Ti and Ni have the larger cross section. After them palladium shows up just in the $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$ reaction. To realize the best kinds of lattice structure, microscopic FCS related to element host particles are plotted for each fusion reactions separately. Here in these graphs, colors shows kinds of elements and the styles of the graph indicate the kind of the lattice. BCC shows by “dot”, FCC by “long dash” and HCP by “dash dot”.



269 Figure 4: **Microscopic**FCS of all elements for different fusion reaction are presented

270 For $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$, $D(d,p)\text{T}$, $D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$ (Fig.4), Ti with HCP lattice has the largest **microscopic**FCS
 271 and Pd with FCC lattice is respectively in the sixth, second and fifth place. Ni with FCC lattice is
 272 in the first place of **microscopic**FCS and Pd is the fifth for $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$. Now the data that are
 273 correspond to figures 3 are summarized in table 9.

274 Table 9: numerical microscopic cross sectioned values in special energy (0.025MeV) for different elements in
 275 different reactions
 276

quantity elements	$D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ (MeV)	$D(d,p)\text{T}$ (MeV)	$D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$	$T(d,n)^4\text{He}$ (MeV)
Pd (FCC)	1	8	2	8
Ni (FCC)	4	5	1	2
Pt (FCC)	3	1	9	6
Rh (FCC)	2	5	5	5
Ru (HCP)	2	3	4	5
Ti (HCP)	2	3	4	7
Zr (HCP)	3	7	2	2
Ta (BCC)	2	2	4	1

7. Discussion and Conclusion

288 According to table.7, the result of comparing C_1 for different host particles in different metallic
 289 environments are: when the metals are considered as host particle, $C_{1,Ti} > C_{1,Ni} > C_{1,Zr} >$
 290 $C_{1,Ru} > C_{1,Rh} > C_{1,Pd} > C_{1,Ta} > C_{1,Pt}$; whenever deuterium considered a host particle, $C_{1,Ru} >$
 291 $C_{1,Ni} > C_{1,Ti} > C_{1,Rh} > C_{1,Pd} > C_{1,Pt} > C_{1,Zr} > C_{1,Ta}$; electron host particle, $C_{1,Ni} > C_{1,Ru} >$
 292 $C_{1,Pd} > C_{1,Pt} > C_{1,Rh} > C_{1,Ti} > C_{1,Ta} > C_{1,Zr}$.

293 Asone can see in table.9 the best cross sections belong to $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ and $D(d,p)\text{T}$ reactions. In
 294 order to achieve our goals we need to look back to our data about internal conversion coefficient
 295 by considering lattice effect.

296 In table 8, we find out that the internal conversion coefficient of deuterium for $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ is the
 297 largest one. The IC coefficient for $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ for different reactions from larger to smaller value
 298 is: Ru, Ni, Rh, Pt, Zr, Ta, Ti and Pd. As you see in this reaction Pd has the last ICC. In $D(d,p)\text{T}$,
 299 the arrangement of the elements is: Pd, Ru, Ni, Ti, Rh, Pt, Zr and Ta.

Electronic internal conversion coefficient arrangement for different elements is: Ni, Ru, Pd, Rh, Ti, Ta, Zr, Pt. ($\alpha_{e,Ni} > \alpha_{e,Ru} > \alpha_{e,Pd} > \alpha_{e,Rh} > \alpha_{e,Ti} > \alpha_{e,Ta} > \alpha_{e,Zr} > \alpha_{e,Pt}$)

According to Table.8, comparing ICC values of deuterium host particle for the two largest reactions $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ and $D(d,p)\text{T}$ are respectively: $\alpha_{d,Ru} > \alpha_{d,Ni} > \alpha_{d,Rh} > \alpha_{d,Pt} > \alpha_{d,Zr} > \alpha_{d,Ta} > \alpha_{d,Ti} > \alpha_{d,Pd}$ and $\alpha_{d,Pd} > \alpha_{d,Ru} > \alpha_{d,Ni} > \alpha_{d,Ti} > \alpha_{d,Rh} > \alpha_{d,Pt} > \alpha_{d,Zr} > \alpha_{d,Ta}$)

As one can see Ti and Ni have the larger cross section. After them palladium shows up just in the $T(d,n)^4\text{He}$ reaction.

Looking at Fig 4, can show that what the best lattice, kinds of environment and kinds of reactions are. Ti with HCP lattice has the largest micFCS and Pd with FCC lattice is respectively in the sixth, second and fifth place. From Fig.4d we can understand that Ni with FCC lattice is in the first place of micFCS and Pd is the fifth. FCC and HCP are the best lattice structures and Ti and Ni are best elements, Ru has a largest ICC In the case that deuterium is the host particle.

By comparing FCS in term of LEISSIC, Ti and Ni show maximum data. By comparing internal conversion coefficient in term of LEISSIC, the best results belong to Ni and Ru. So Ni can be the best option for the next experimental works.

The other investigations show that: FCC and HCP lattice have a much closed results. Palladium shows good results just in the $D(p,\gamma)^3\text{He}$ and $D(d,\gamma)^4\text{He}$.

References

317

- 318 [1] C. Rolfs and E. Somorjai, Nucl. Instrum. Methods B **99**, 297 (1995).
- 319 [2] K. Czerski, A. Huke, P. Heide, M. Hoefl, and G. Ruprecht in *Nuclei in the Cosmos V, Proceedings of*
- 320 *the International Symposium on Nuclear Astrophysics*, edited by N. Prantzos and S. Harissopulos
- 321 (Editions Frontieres, Volos, Greece, 1998) p. 152.
- 322 [3] K. Czerski, A. Huke, A. Biller, P. Heide, M. Hoefl, and G. Ruprecht, Europhys. Lett. **54**, 449 (2001).
- 323 [4] A. Huke, *Die Deuteronen-fusionsreaktionen in Metallen*, PhD Thesis, Technische Universität, Berlin,
- 324 (2002).
- 325 [5] H. Hora and G.H. Miley, "Heavy nuclide synthesis by neutrons in astrophysics and by screened
- 326 protons in host metals", *CZEC J PHYS*, 50(3), pp. 433-439, 2000.
- 327 [6] S. Szpak and P. A. Mosier-Boss: Thermal and nuclear aspects of the Pd/D₂O system, Feb 2002.
- 328 [7] F. Raiola et al., Eur. Phys. J. A **13**, 377 (2002).
- [8] F. Raiola et al., Phys. Lett. **B547**, 193 (2002). 329
- 330 [9] C. Bonomo et al., Nucl. Phys. **A719**, 37c (2003).
- 331 [10] F. Raiola et al., Eur. Phys. J. A **19**, 283 (2004).
- 332 [11] A. Huke, K. Czerski, and P. Heide, Nucl. Phys. **A719**, 279c (2003).
- 333 [12] P. Kalman and T. Keszthelyi, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 031606(R) (2004).
- 334 [13] Broad 1989b, Voss 1999, Platt 1998, Goodstein 1994, Van Noorden 2007, Beaudette 2002, Feder
- 335 2005, Adam 2005, Kruglinksi 2006, Adam 2005, Alfred 2009.
- [14] B. Simon, *Undead Science: Science Studies and the Afterlife of Cold Fusion*, Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers
- University Press, 2002. 337
- [15] C. Seife, *Sun in a Bottle: The Strange History of Fusion and the Science of Wishful Thinking*, New
- York University Press, Oct, 2008, pp. 154–155. 339

340 [16] Hubler, G. Anomalous Effects in Hydrogen-Charged Palladium – A Review. *J. of Surface &*
341 *Coatings Technology* 2007 (10.1016/j.surfcoat.2006.03.062)
342 [17] K. Czerski *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. Lett.* **54**, 449 (2001); *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. B* **193**, 183 (2002).
343 [18] A. Huke *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **78**, 015803 (2008).
344 [19] A. Huke, K. Czerski, S. M. Chun, A. Biller, and P. Heide, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **35**, 243 (2008).
345 [20] P. Kalman and T. Keszthelyi, *Phys. Rev. C* **79**, 031602(R) (2009).
346 [21] K. Hagino and A. B. Balantekin, *Phys. Rev. C* **66**, 055801 (2002).
347 [22] S. Kimura *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **67**, 022801 (2003).
348 [23] D. L. Walter and J. Wiley, *Modern Nuclear Chemistry*, p. 232, ISBN 0471115320, (2005).
349 [24] S. K. Kenneth and J. Wiley & Sons, *Introductory Nuclear Physics*. ISBN 0-471-80553-X, (1988).
350 [25] G. Fiorentini *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **67**, 014603 (2003).
351 [26] J. H. Hamilton, *Internal Conversion Processes* (Academic, New York, 1966).
352 [27] C. Angulo *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. A* **656**, 3 (1999).
353 [28] J. M. Ziman, *Principles of the Theory of Solids* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1964), pp.
354 148-150 .
355 [29] K. Alder *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **28**, 432 (1956).
356 [30] C. Kittel, *Introduction of Solid State Physics*, 7th Edition, John Wiley & Sons, 1996

357