

Comparative study of the direct $\alpha + d \rightarrow {}^6\text{Li} + \gamma$ astrophysical capture reaction in few-body models

E.M. Tursunov,¹ S.A. Turakulov,² and A.S. Kadyrov³

¹*Institute of Nuclear Physics, Academy of Sciences,
100214, Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
tursune@inp.uz*

²*Institute of Nuclear Physics, Academy of Sciences,
100214, Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
turakulov@inp.uz*

³*Curtin Institute for Computation and Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia
a.kadyrov@curtin.edu.au*

Abstract

The astrophysical S factor, the reaction rates of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma)^6\text{Li}$ capture reaction, and the primordial abundance of the ^6Li element are compared within two-body, three-body and combined cluster models. It is shown that the two-body model, based on the exact mass prescription, can not correctly describe the energy dependence of the isospin forbidden E1 S factor and does not reproduce the temperature dependence of the reaction rate from the direct LUNA data. It is found that the isospin forbidden E1 astrophysical S factor is very sensitive to the orthogonalization method of Pauli forbidden states in the three-body model, at the same time the E2 S factor does not depend on the orthogonalization procedure. As a result, the OPP method yields a very good description of the direct data from the LUNA collaboration at low energies, while the SUSY transformation significantly underestimates the LUNA data. On the other hand, both methods show the same energy dependence for the E1 S factor. The best description of the LUNA data for the astrophysical S factor and the reaction rates is obtained within the combined E1(three-body OPP)+E2(two-body) model. It yields a value of $(0.72 \pm 0.01) \times 10^{-14}$ for the $^6\text{Li}/\text{H}$ primordial abundance ratio, consistent with the estimation $(0.80 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-14}$ of the LUNA collaboration. For the $^6\text{Li}/^7\text{Li}$ abundance ratio an estimation $(1.40 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-5}$ is obtained in good agreement with the Standard Model prediction.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

A consistent and realistic estimation of the primordial abundance ratio ${}^6\text{Li}/{}^7\text{Li}$ of the lithium isotopes is one of the long standing problems in nuclear astrophysics. Astrophysical data [1] yield a value for this ratio that is three orders of magnitude larger than the big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) model prediction [2]. Although the abundance ratio ${}^7\text{Li}/\text{H} = 5.13 \times 10^{-10}$ of the Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) collaboration [3] is well reproduced by the theory [4], the origin of the strong difference in the theoretical results and the astronomical data for the ${}^6\text{Li}/{}^7\text{Li}$ abundance ratio is not established yet.

The most important input parameter in the BBN model for the estimation of the abundance ratio of the lithium isotopes is the reaction rates of the direct radiative capture process



at low energies within the range $30 \leq E \leq 400$ keV [2], where E is the energy in the center of mass frame. The reaction rates are estimated through straightforward calculations on the basis of theoretical astrophysical S factor.

After multiple attempts by researchers around the world, first direct experimental results for the astrophysical S factor were obtained by the LUNA collaboration at an underground facility. The original data set of the LUNA collaboration at energies $E=94$ keV and $E=134$ keV [5] was recently renewed with additional data at $E=80$ keV and $E=120$ keV [6]. The results of the LUNA collaboration for the reaction rates turn out to be even lower than previously reported in Ref.[7]. This further increases the discrepancy between prediction of the BBN model and the astronomical observations for the primordial abundance of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ element [6].

From a theoretical point of view, fully microscopic calculations of the above process are still not available, although there are several works devoted to this problem. Some microscopic models deal with the so-called exact mass prescription for the estimation of the isospin forbidden E1 transition matrix elements [8, 9]. Other microscopic studies were limited with only E2 transition neglecting the important contribution of the E1 transition at low astrophysical energies. As argued in Ref.[10], the exact mass prescription which uses the experimental mass values of nuclei, does not have a microscopic background and is not applicable to the astrophysical processes like $d(d, \gamma)\alpha$ and ${}^{12}\text{C}(\alpha, \gamma){}^{16}\text{O}$. Further

improvement of the microscopic models is expected which should include the isospin mixing in the final state [11].

The same exact mass prescription was used in the two-body potential models [8, 9, 12–15]. In Ref. [15] a detailed comparative analysis was given for the astrophysical S factor of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ formation process with different $\alpha - d$ potential models and corresponding estimations for the ${}^6\text{Li}$ abundance were obtained. The two-body models are able to describe the E2 S factor pretty well [14] based on the correct asymptotic behaviour of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ bound state wave function adjusted to the empirical value $C_{exp} = 2.30 \pm 0.12 \text{ fm}^{-1/2}$ of the S-wave asymptotic normalization constant (ANC) [16]. However, since the exact mass prescription does not have a microscopic background, it is natural to question how realistic are the results for the isospin forbidden E1 transition matrix elements, as well as for the astrophysical S factor and reaction rates, obtained in the two-body models.

An important step toward the solution of the lithium abundance problem beyond the two-body approaches has been taken within the three-body models [10, 17, 18]. These models include an important contribution of the isospin mixing which plays a decisive role in the description of the astrophysical S factor at low energies. Recent study of the isospin forbidden E1 S factor of the radiative α capture on the ${}^{12}\text{C}$ nucleus within the cluster effective field theory [19] confirms this finding.

As shown within the framework of three-body model based on the hyperspherical Lagrange mesh method [10, 18], the E1 S factor is dominant in the region $E < 100 \text{ keV}$, while the E2 S factor is mostly important at higher energies. The final three-body $\alpha + p + n$ hyperspherical wave function of ${}^6\text{Li}$ was calculated with the $\alpha - N$ potential [20] including a forbidden state in the S wave. The forbidden states in the three-body system have been treated within the method of orthogonalising pseudopotentials (OPP) [21]. The wave function has a small isotriplet component of about 0.5 percent. This important isotriplet part of the three-body wave function [10, 17, 18] enables one to estimate the forbidden E1 S factor in a consistent way without using any exact mass prescription. The new data of the LUNA collaboration for the astrophysical S factor at low energies and the reaction rates have been reproduced within the experimental error bars. The estimated ${}^6\text{Li}/\text{H}$ abundance ratio of $(0.67 \pm 0.01) \times 10^{-14}$ was in a good agreement with the experimental value of $(0.80 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-14}$ from the LUNA collaboration [6]. The obtained estimate for the ${}^6\text{Li}/{}^7\text{Li}$ abundance ratio of $(1.30 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-5}$ [18] agrees well with the results of the BBN model

[2], however it is smaller than the data of the astronomical observations of $(8.0 \pm 4.4)\%$ [22] and of $(0-2)\%$ [23] by 3 order of magnitude.

On the other hand, a value $C = 2.12 \text{ fm}^{-1/2}$ of ANC of the S-wave $\alpha + d$ configuration calculated from the $\alpha + p + n$ three-body bound state wave function [10, 18] is quite smaller than the above mentioned empirical value $C_{exp} = 2.30 \pm 0.12 \text{ fm}^{-1/2}$ [16] which was reproduced in the two-body model. Owing to the fact that the E2 S factor at low astrophysical energies is mostly defined by the ANC, one can conclude that the three-body model is still not optimal for the estimation of the astrophysical S factor and reaction rates as well as the abundance of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ element.

The aim of present work is a comparative study of the astrophysical S factor of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma){}^6\text{Li}$ capture reaction, as well as the reaction rates and the primordial abundance of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ element within few-body cluster models. While the astrophysical S factors and reaction rates have been studied separately in two-body [14] and three-body models [10, 17, 18], an optimal description of the direct experimental data of the LUNA collaboration has not been obtained. Here we examine a combined E1(three-body)+E2(two-body) model for the description of the direct experimental data, based on the viewpoint that the E2 S factor should be better described within the two-body framework due to almost exact reproduction of the empirical value of the ANC. Another interest is to see, how close the both absolute values and energy dependence of the E1 and E2 astrophysical S factors in two-body (within the exact mass prescription) and three-body models to the direct data of the LUNA collaboration. Also important is a behavior of the reaction rate and its temperature dependence. Next important question is how sensitive are the results for the estimated astrophysical S factor to the projecting method used in the variational calculations of the three-body wave function. To this end we additionally estimate the astrophysical S factor with the three-body wave function of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ ground state, calculated using the supersymmetric transformation (SUSY) method [24] and compare with the results of the OPP approach [21]. The OPP method yields a nodal behavior for the $\alpha + N$ relative motion wave function due to a Pauli forbidden state in the S-wave, while the SUSY transformation does not keep this microscopic property, producing a two-body phase-equivalent shallow potential with a core.

II. THEORETICAL MODEL

The cross sections of the radiative capture process reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_E(\lambda) = & \sum_{J_i T_i \pi_i} \sum_{J_f T_f \pi_f} \sum_{\Omega \lambda} \frac{(2J_f + 1) 32\pi^2(\lambda + 1)}{[I_1][I_2] \hbar \lambda ([\lambda]!!)^2} k_\gamma^{2\lambda+1} \\ & \times \sum_{l_\omega I_\omega} \frac{1}{k_\omega^2 v_\omega} |\langle \Psi^{J_f T_f \pi_f} \| M_\lambda^\Omega \| \Psi_{l_\omega I_\omega}^{J_i T_i \pi_i} \rangle|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\Omega = E$ or M (electric or magnetic transition), ω denotes the entrance channel, k_ω , v_ω , I_ω are the wave number, velocity of the $\alpha - d$ relative motion and the spin of the entrance channel, respectively, J_f, T_f, π_f (J_i, T_i, π_i) are the spin, isospin and parity of the final (initial) state, I_1, I_2 are channel spins, $k_\gamma = E_\gamma/\hbar c$ is the wave number of the photon corresponding to the energy $E_\gamma = E_{\text{th}} + E$ with the threshold energy $E_{\text{th}} = 1.474$ MeV. The wave functions $\Psi_{l_\omega I_\omega}^{J_i T_i \pi_i}$ and $\Psi^{J_f T_f \pi_f}$ represent the initial and final states, respectively.

In the three-body model the initial state wave function $\Psi_{l_\omega I_\omega}^{J_i T_i \pi_i}$ is factorised into the deuteron wave function and the $\alpha + d$ two-body scattering wave function. The final $\alpha + p + n$ three-body bound state wave function of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ ground state was calculated within the hyperspherical Lagrange-mesh method [25]. In the two-body model the initial and final state wave functions contain a pointlike deuteron. They are obtained as a solution of the two-body Schrödinger equation for the $\alpha + d$ bound and scattering states [14].

The reduced matrix elements of the transition operators are evaluated between the initial and final states. We also use short-hand notations $[I] = 2I + 1$ and $[\lambda]!! = (2\lambda + 1)!!$. Details of the matrix-element calculations have been given in Refs.[14, 17].

The astrophysical S factor of the process is expressed in terms of the cross section as [26]

$$S(E) = E \sigma_E(\lambda) \exp(2\pi\eta), \quad (3)$$

where η is the Coulomb parameter.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

A. Details of calculations

Calculations of the cross section and astrophysical S factor have been performed under the same conditions as in Refs. [10, 18]. The radial wave function of the deuteron is the

solution of the bound-state Schrödinger equation with the central Minnesota potential V_{NN} [27, 28] with $\hbar^2/2m_N = 20.7343$ MeV fm². The Schrödinger equation is solved using a highly accurate Lagrange-Laguerre mesh method [29]. It yields $E_d = -2.202$ MeV for the deuteron ground-state energy with the number of mesh points $N = 40$ and a scaling parameter $h_d = 0.40$.

The bound and scattering wave functions of the $\alpha - d$ relative motion are calculated with a deep potential of Dubovichenko [30] with a small modification in the S wave [14]: $V_d^{(S)}(R) = -92.44 \exp(-0.25R^2)$ MeV. The potential parameters in the 3P_0 , 3P_1 , 3P_2 and 3D_1 , 3D_2 , 3D_3 partial waves are the same as in Ref. [30]. The potential contains additional states in the S and P waves forbidden by the Pauli principle. The above modification of the S -wave potential allows one to reproduce the empirical value $C_{\alpha d} = 2.31$ fm^{-1/2} of the asymptotic normalization coefficient (ANC) of the ${}^6\text{Li}(1^+)$ ground state derived from $\alpha - d$ elastic scattering data [16].

The final three-body $\alpha + p + n$ wave function of the ${}^6\text{Li}(1^+)$ ground-state is calculated using the hyperspherical Lagrange-mesh method [25, 29, 31] with the same Minnesota NN-potential.

For the $\alpha - N$ nuclear interaction the potential of Voronchev *et al.* [20] is employed, which contains a deep Pauli-forbidden state in the S -wave. The potential was slightly renormalized by a scaling factors 1.014 to reproduce the experimental binding energy of $E_b = 3.70$ MeV. The Coulomb interaction between α and proton is taken as $2e^2 \text{erf}(0.83 R)/R$ [28]. The coupled hyperradial equations are solved with the Lagrange-mesh method [29]. The hypermomentum expansion includes terms up to a large value of K_{max} , which ensures a good convergence of the energy and of the $T = 1$ component of ${}^6\text{Li}$ ground state.

In Refs.[10, 18] the OPP method was used for the treatment of the Pauli forbidden states in the three-body model. Here we also examine the SUSY transformation [24] of the initial $\alpha - N$ nuclear interaction potential. This operation yields a shallow potential which gives the same phase shift, but removes unphysical forbidden state from the S wave $\alpha + N$ spectrum. The inputs in the OPP and SUSY methods are identical. A comparison of the theoretical astrophysical S factors obtained within these two methods allows one to conclude about the sensitivity of the reaction cross section to the orthogonalization procedure.

B. Astrophysical S factors

To start with we note that the energy convergence in the three-body $\alpha + p + n$ system for the SUSY and OPP methods shows the same behavior. The energy of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ ground state $E = -3.70$ MeV converges already at a maximum value of hypermomentum $K_{max} = 24$ in both cases. However, the structure of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ g.s. wave function in these two versions of the projection yields different pictures. The important isotriplet ($T = 1$) component of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ g.s. wave function used in the OPP method has a norm square of about 5.27×10^{-3} , while in the case of the SUSY method the latter is 1.10×10^{-4} . As we noted above, the important isotriplet component of the final ${}^6\text{Li}$ ground state is responsible for the E1 astrophysical S factor in the $\alpha(d, \gamma){}^6\text{Li}$ direct capture reaction. Therefore, the above difference should yield the same effect for the E1 S factor. Additionally, it is important to check, whether or not the energy dependence of the E1 S factor is the same in both cases.




FIG. 1: Astrophysical E1 S factor of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma){}^6\text{Li}$ capture process. The line for the three-body OPP model is from Ref. [18], and the line for the two-body model is from Ref. [14].

In Fig. 1 we show the E1 astrophysical S factor of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma){}^6\text{Li}$ capture process estimated within the two-body model and with the OPP and SUSY three-body wave functions. As we can see from the figure, the three-body models yield the same behavior but the two-body model gives different energy dependence. On the other hand, the SUSY method yields too small S factor in the entire energy region, more than one order of magnitude smaller than the OPP method. This result indicates that the E1 astrophysical S factor is




FIG. 2: Astrophysical E2 S factor of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma)^6\text{Li}$ capture process. The line for the three-body OPP model is from Ref. [18], and the line for the two-body model is from Ref. [14].




FIG. 3: Astrophysical S factor of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma)^6\text{Li}$ capture process. The line for the three-body OPP model is from Refs. [10, 18], and the line for the two-body model is from Ref. [14].

highly sensitive to the orthogonalization method when solving the three-body Schrödinger equation. A similar effect was found in the beta decay of the ${}^6\text{He}$ halo nucleus [32, 33] and M1 transition of the ${}^6\text{Li}(0^+)$ isobar-analog state to the $\alpha + d$ continuum [31]. In fact, the OPP method yields scattering and bound state wave functions with a node at short distances, while this nodal behavior disappears in the SUSY method. In the present study, a nodal behavior of the S wave $\alpha + N$ wave function yields a strong contribution to the

important isotriplet component of the total ${}^6\text{Li}$ ground state wave function. The two-body model as was indicated above is based on the so-called exact mass prescription and does not contain any isospin transition term unlike the three-body models. This is why the two-body model fails to reproduce the energy dependence of the E1 astrophysical S factor.

The E2 astrophysical S factors calculated in the two-body and three-body models are displayed in Fig. 2. As can be seen, the three-body OPP and SUSY methods give almost the same theoretical estimations. This means that the E2 S factor is not sensitive to the orthogonalization procedure in the wave function of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ ground state. On the other hand the two-body E2 S factor is larger than the three-body result. Indeed, the S wave ANC of the $\alpha + d$ configuration within the two-body model $C_2 = 2.31 \text{ fm}^{-1/2}$ [14] is closer to its empirical value $C_{exp} = 2.30 \pm 0.12 \text{ fm}^{-1/2}$ [16] than the values $C_3 = 2.12 \text{ fm}^{-1/2}$ (OPP) and $C_3 = 2.05 \text{ fm}^{-1/2}$ (SUSY), calculated from the overlap integral of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ g.s. and deuteron wave functions within the three-body models [10, 18]. Since the asymptotic behavior of the bound state wave function of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ nucleus is decisive for the description of the E2 S factor at low astrophysical energies, the corresponding two-body results for the E2 S factor describe the experimental data better than the three-body models.

The total theoretical astrophysical S factors for the process are shown in Fig. 3 in comparison with the direct data of the LUNA collaboration [5, 6] and old data from Refs. [34–36]. Due to a strong influence of the orthogonalization method we have a big difference in the SUSY and OPP results. While the OPP method yields a good description of the direct data of the LUNA collaboration, the SUSY transformation leads to a substantial underestimation. On the other hand the two-body model yields larger estimates for the S factor especially at low energies although they are still within the experimental error bars of the LUNA data. The best description of the LUNA data is obtained within the combined E1(three-body OPP)+E2(two-body) model. The last combination is more preferable, since it is based on the best descriptions of the E1 and E2 S factors within the cluster model.

C. Reaction rates and abundance of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ element

For the estimation of the reaction rates we use the formalism which was described in details in Ref.[18]. When a variable $k_B T$ is expressed in units of MeV, where k_B is the Boltzmann coefficient, it is convenient to use a variable T_9 for the temperature in units of

10^9 K according to the equation $k_B T = T_9/11.605$ MeV. In our calculations T_9 varies within the interval $0.001 \leq T_9 \leq 10$.

In Fig. 4 we display the theoretical reaction rates of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma)^6\text{Li}$ capture process in the temperature interval $10^6 \text{ K} \leq T \leq 10^{10} \text{ K}$ ($0.001 \leq T_9 \leq 10$) calculated within two-body and three-body models in comparison with the LUNA 2017 analysis [6] and the results of the NACRE II collaboration [7] normalized to the standard NACRE 1999 data [37]. As can be seen from the figure, the three-body OPP method yields a good description of the direct LUNA data, while the three-body SUSY model goes much below the error bar. In addition, the OPP model reproduces the temperature dependence of the reaction rates. Although the two-body model results lie within the experimental error bars of the LUNA data, the temperature dependence of the data is not reproduced. Again, the best description of the direct LUNA data for the absolute values and temperature dependence of the reaction rates is obtained within the combined E1(three-body OPP)+E2(two-body) model.

For the estimation of the abundance of the ^6Li element, the theoretical reaction rate is approximated within 1.40% (the two-body model), 1.89% (the three-body OPP model) and 1.88% (the combined model) by the following analytical formula:

$$N_{24}(\sigma v) = p_0 T_9^{-2/3} \exp(-7.423 T_9^{-1/3}) \times (1 + p_1 T_9^{1/3} + p_2 T_9^{2/3} + p_3 T_9 + p_4 T_9^{4/3} + p_5 T_9^{5/3} + p_6 T_9^2 + p_7 T_9^{7/3}) + p_8 T_9^{-3/2} \exp(-7.889 T_9^{-1}). \quad (4)$$

The coefficients of the analytical polynomial approximation of the $d(\alpha, \gamma)^6\text{Li}$ reaction rates estimated within the two-body and three-body OPP models are given in Table 1 in the temperature interval $0.001 \leq T_9 \leq 10$.

On the base of the theoretical reaction rates and with the help of the PARthENoPE [38] public code we have estimated the primordial abundance of the ^6Li element. If we adopt the Planck 2015 best fit for the baryon density parameter $\Omega_b h^2 = 0.02229^{+0.00029}_{-0.00027}$ [39] and the neutron life time $\tau_n = 880.3 \pm 1.1$ s [40], for the $^6\text{Li}/\text{H}$ abundance ratio we have an estimation $(0.89-0.92) \times 10^{-14}$, $(0.66 - 0.68) \times 10^{-14}$, and $(0.71-73) \times 10^{-14}$ within the two-body, three-body OPP, and combined E1(three-body OPP)+E2(two-body) models, respectively. These numbers are consistent with the new estimation $^6\text{Li}/\text{H} = (0.80 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-14}$ of the LUNA collaboration [6]. However, as shown above, the two-body model does not reproduce the temperature dependence of the experimental reaction rates, hence the corresponding




FIG. 4: Reaction rates of the direct $\alpha + d \rightarrow {}^6\text{Li} + \gamma$ capture process within the two-body and three-body models normalized to the NACRE 1999 experimental data [37]. The line for the three-body OPP model is from Ref. [18]. The shaded area is for the error bar of the LUNA 2017 data [6].

estimation for the ${}^6\text{Li}/\text{H}$ abundance ratio is not realistic. If we adopt a value of $(5.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-10}$ [4] for the ${}^7\text{Li}/\text{H}$ abundance ratio, then within the combined model we have an estimation $(1.40 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-5}$ for the ${}^6\text{Li}/{}^7\text{Li}$ abundance ratio, which agrees well with the Standard Model estimation [2].

IV. CONCLUSION

The astrophysical S factor and the reaction rates of the direct $\alpha(d, \gamma){}^6\text{Li}$ capture reaction, as well as the primordial abundance of the ${}^6\text{Li}$ element have been estimated within two-body, three-body and combined cluster models. It is shown that although the two-body model, which is based on the exact mass prescription, can describe the astrophysical S factor of the LUNA collaboration within the experimental error bars, it does not reproduce the temperature dependence of the reaction rate. This is a consequence of the fact the exact mass prescription for the estimation of the isospin forbidden E1 transition matrix elements is invalid. Within the three-body model a sensitivity of the theoretical astrophysical S factor to the orthogonalization procedure has been examined. It is found that the isospin forbidden E1 astrophysical S factor is very sensitive to the orthogonalization method. At the same time the E2 S factor does not depend on the orthogonalization procedure. As a result, the

OPP method yields a very good description of the direct data of the LUNA collaboration at low energies, while the SUSY transformation significantly underestimates the LUNA data. On the other hand, both methods show the same energy dependence for the E1 S factor. The best description of the LUNA data for the astrophysical S factor and the reaction rates is obtained within the combined E1(three-body OPP)+E2(two-body) model. It yields a value of $(0.72 \pm 0.01) \times 10^{-14}$ for the ${}^6\text{Li}/\text{H}$ primordial abundance ratio, consistent with the estimation of $(0.80 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-14}$ of the LUNA collaboration. And for the ${}^6\text{Li}/{}^7\text{Li}$ abundance ratio an estimation of $(1.40 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-5}$ was obtained in the agreement with the Standard Model prediction.

The authors thank D. Baye and P. Descouvemont for useful discussions of the presented results.

-
- [1] M. Asplund, *et al.* *Astrophys. J.*, **644**, 229 (2006).
 - [2] P.D. Serpico, *et al.*, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **12**, 010 (2004).
 - [3] G. Hinshaw *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **208** 19 (2013).
 - [4] A. Kontos, E. Uberseder, R. de Boer *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C87** 065804 (2013).
 - [5] LUNA Collaboration (M. Anders, *et al.*) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 042501 (2014).
 - [6] LUNA Collaboration (D. Trezzi, *et al.*) *Astropart. Phys.* **89** 57 (2017).
 - [7] Y. Xu, K. Takahashi, S. Goriely, *et al.* (NACRE II), *Nuclear Physics* **A918** 61 (2013).
 - [8] K.M. Nollett, R.B. Wiringa and R. Schiavilla, *Phys. Rev. C* **63** 024003 (2001).
 - [9] S. Typel, G. Blüge and K. Langanke, *Z. Phys. A* **339** 335 (1991).
 - [10] D. Baye and E. M. Tursunov, *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.* **45** 085102 (2018).
 - [11] S. Mickevicius, A. Stepsys, D. Germanas, and R.K. Kalinauskas, *Phys. Atom. Nuclei* **81** 899 (2018)
 - [12] S. Typel, H. Wolter and G. Baur, *Nucl. Phys. A* **613** 147 (1997).
 - [13] A.M. Mukhamedzhanov, L.D. Blokhintsev and B.F. Irgaziev, *Phys. Rev. C* **83** 055805 (2011).
 - [14] E.M. Tursunov, S.A. Turakulov and P. Descouvemont, *Phys. At. Nucl.* **78** 193 (2015).
 - [15] A. Grassi, G. Mangano, L.E. Marcucci, and O. Pisanti, *Phys. Rev. C* **96** 045807 (2017)
 - [16] L.D. Blokhintsev *et al.* *Phys. Rev. C* **48** 2390 (1993).
 - [17] E. M. Tursunov, A. S. Kadyrov, S. A. Turakulov and I. Bray, *Phys. Rev. C* **94** 015801 (2016).

- [18] E. M. Tursunov, S. A. Turakulov, A. S. Kadyrov and I. Bray, *Phys. Rev. C* **98** 055803 (2018).
- [19] Shung-Ichi Ando, *Phys. Rev. C* **100**, 015807 (2019)
- [20] V.T. Voronchev, V.I. Kukulin, V.N. Pomerantsev and G. Ryzhikh, *Few-Body Syst.* **18** 191 (1995).
- [21] V.I. Kukulin, V.N. Pomerantsev and E.M. Tursunov, *Phys. At. Nucl.* **59** 757 (1996)
- [22] A. Mott, M. Steffen, E. Caffau, F. Spada and K. G. Strassmeier, *Astron. Astrophys.* **604** A44 (2017).
- [23] R. Cayrel, M. Steen, H. Chand *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **473** L37 (2007))
- [24] D. Baye, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58** 2738 (1987)
- [25] P. Descouvemont, C. Daniel, and D. Baye, *Phys. Rev. C* **67** 044309 (2003).
- [26] W.A. Fowler, G.R. Gaughlan and B.A. Zimmerman, *Ann. Rev. Astronom. Astrophys.* **13** 69 (1975).
- [27] D. Thompson, M. Lemere and Y. Tang, *Nucl. Phys. A* **286** 53 (1977)
- [28] I. Reichstein and Y. C. Tang, *Nucl. Phys. A* **158** 529 (1970).
- [29] D. Baye, *Phys. Rep.* **565** 1 (2015)
- [30] S.B. Dubovichenko and A.V. Dzhazairov-Kakhramanov, *Phys. At. Nucl.* **57** 733 (1994)
- [31] E. M. Tursunov, P. Descouvemont and D. Baye, *Nucl. Phys. A* **793** 52 (2007).
- [32] E.M. Tursunov, D. Baye and P. Descouvemont, *Phys. Rev. C* **73** 014303 (2006).
- [33] E.M. Tursunov, D. Baye and P. Descouvemont, *Phys. Rev. C* **74** 069904 (2006).
- [34] R.G.H. Robertson *et al.* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47** 1867 (1981).
- [35] J. Kiener *et al.* *Phys. Rev. C* **44** 2195 (1991).
- [36] P. Mohr *et al.* *Phys. Rev. C* **50** 1543 (1994).
- [37] C. Angulo *et al.* (NACRE), *Nuclear Physics* **A656** 3 (1999).
- [38] O. Pisanti, A. Cirillo, S. Esposito, F. Iocco, G. Mangano, G. Miele, and P.D. Serpico, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 956.
- [39] P.A.R. Ade *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A13
- [40] K.A. Olive, K. Agashe, C. Amsler, *et al.* *Chin. Phys.*, **C38** (2014) 090001

TABLE I: Fitted values of the coefficients of analytical approximation for the reaction rates of the direct capture process $\alpha(d, \gamma)^6\text{Li}$

Model	p_0	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4	p_5	p_6	p_7	p_8
two-body	9.659	-2.223	29.296	-96.733	169.841	-140.218	57.705	-9.152	61.663
three-body OPP	6.004	-2.558	34.730	-115.482	205.801	-169.456	71.428	-11.614	42.354
E1(three-body OPP)+E2(two-body)	6.741	-3.731	41.646	-137.035	242.156	-201.509	85.095	-13.814	61.752