# $0^+(T=1)$ State and the Residual Interaction in Odd-Odd Deformed Nuclei\*

I. Kelson

Department of Nuclear Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovoth, Israel

and

Israel Atomic Energy Commission, Soreg Research Establishment, Yavne, Israel

(Received 15 November 1963)

The  $0^+(T=1)$  low-lying states in the nuclei F<sup>18</sup>, Na<sup>22</sup>, and Al<sup>26</sup> show a regularity that is readily explained when each of these nuclei is described as an even-even core rotator with two odd nucleons coupled to it. It is shown that an acceptable short-range residual interaction between the two nucleons, together with the observed moments of inertia in this region, quantitatively reproduce that regularity.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**N** UCLEI in the mass region  $18 \le A \le 27$  have rotational production tional properties, and are believed to be strongly deformed. The spherical j - j coupling orbits are mixed in a spheroidal field, and only k, the z component of single-particle angular momentum, is a good quantum number. It was shown<sup>1</sup> that a small number of nucleons outside the O<sup>16</sup> core is sufficient to cause the large deformation, and at A = 18 the nuclei are already strongly deformed. We are thus provided with a set of single-particle orbitals, each fourfold degenerate, which are filled in order: First a  $k=\frac{1}{2}$  orbit, completed at Ne<sup>20</sup>, then a  $k=\frac{3}{2}$  at Mg<sup>24</sup>, followed by a  $k=\frac{5}{2}$  completed at Si<sup>28</sup>, etc. The ground-state spins of odd-even nuclei in the first half of the s-d shell, are practically all correctly predicted by that picture.

#### II. THE ROTATIONAL MODEL FOR THE **ODD-ODD NUCLEI**

The odd-odd nuclei F18, Na<sup>22</sup>, Al<sup>26</sup> have ground-state spins of  $1^+$ ,  $3^+$ ,  $5^+$ , respectively, with T=0, indicating that the odd proton and odd neutron in the k orbit have their angular momenta aligned to produce a state of spin I = 2k. In all these odd-odd nuclei there is a lowlying excited state with  $I=0^+$ ; T=1, in which the two odd nucleons have their angular momenta antiparallel. The energy difference between the lowest T=1 state and the ground state may be computed using a simple rotational picture. The odd-odd nucleus is described as an even-even core, a rotator with parameter A with two odd nucleons coupled to it, the Hamiltonian is

$$H = A \mathbf{R}^2 + h_1 + h_2 + V^{\text{Res}}_{12}, \qquad (1)$$

where **R** is the angular momentum of the core;  $h_1$  and  $h_2$ the single-particle deformed Hamiltonians;  $V^{\text{Res}_{12}}$  the residual two-body interaction between the two odd nucleons after a certain part of the total two-body interaction has been taken care of, by producing the deformed field. The angular momentum of the core is not a constant of the motion and is more conveniently

written as

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{j}_1 - \mathbf{j}_2, \qquad (2)$$

where **I** is the total angular momentum. Therefore,

$$H = A (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{j}_{1} - \mathbf{j}_{2})^{2} + h_{1} + h_{2} + V^{\text{Res}}_{12}$$
  
=  $A \mathbf{I}^{2} + A \mathbf{j}_{1}^{2} + A \mathbf{j}_{2}^{2} - 2A \{ (\mathbf{j}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{I}) + (\mathbf{j}_{2} \cdot \mathbf{I}) \}$   
+  $2A (\mathbf{j}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{j}_{2}) + h_{1} + h_{2} + V^{\text{Res}}_{12}.$  (3)

The ground state is described in an analogous way to the rotator particle treatment<sup>2</sup> as

$$\begin{split} \Psi^{\text{G.S.}} \sim & D_{M \ 2k}{}^{2k}(\theta_i) \chi_k(1) \chi_k(2) \\ &+ (-1)^{2k-j_1-j_2} D_{M \ -2k}{}^{2k}(\theta_i) \chi_{-k}(1) \chi_{-k}(2) , \quad (4) \end{split}$$

where  $\chi_k$  are eigenfunctions of h and  $\theta_i$  are the angle variables in the laboratory fixed system. The T=1excited state is described by

$$\Psi^{\text{E.S.}} \sim \chi_k(1) \chi_{-k}(2) - \chi_{-k}(1) \chi_k(2).$$
 (5)

The energy difference may be readily computed from

$$\Delta_{k} = \langle \Psi^{\text{E.S.}} | H | \Psi^{\text{E.S.}} \rangle - \langle \Psi^{\text{G.S.}} | H | \Psi^{\text{G.S.}} \rangle.$$
(6)

All the terms involving **I** vanish in the I=0 state; the  $\mathbf{j}^2$  and the *h* terms contribute nothing to the difference, since

 $\langle \chi_k | \mathbf{j}^2 | \chi_k \rangle = \langle \chi_{-k} | \mathbf{j}^2 | \chi_{-k} \rangle$ 

$$\langle \chi_k | h | \chi_k \rangle = \langle \chi_{-k} | h | \chi_{-k} \rangle.$$

We therefore have

$$\Delta_{k} = 2A \langle \Psi^{\text{E.S.}} | (\mathbf{j}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{j}_{2}) | \Psi^{\text{E.S.}} \rangle - A \langle \Psi^{\text{G.S.}} | \mathbf{I}^{2} - 2(\mathbf{I} \cdot j_{1}) \\ - 2(\mathbf{I} \cdot j_{2}) + 2(j_{1} \cdot j_{2}) | \Psi^{\text{G.S.}} \rangle + \delta_{k}, \quad (7)$$

where

and

$$\delta_{k} = \langle \Psi^{\text{E.S.}} | V^{\text{Res}}_{12} | \Psi^{\text{E.S.}} \rangle - \langle \Psi^{\text{G.S.}} | V^{\text{Res}}_{12} | \Psi^{\text{G.S.}} \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Finally, evaluating explicitly, we obtain

$$\Delta_k = \delta_k - 2Ak. \tag{9}$$

A decoupling Coriolis term correction  $-a^2A$  is neglected in (9) in the  $k=\frac{1}{2}$  case. (A detailed calculation shows the Coriolis term for this case to be of the order of 0.05 MeV.)

<sup>\*</sup> The research reported in this document has been sponsored in part by, the Office of Scientific Research, OAR through the European Office, Aerospace Research, U. S. Air Force. <sup>1</sup> M. G. Redlich, Phys. Rev. **110**, 468 (1958).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> S. A. Moszkowski, in Handbuch der Physik, edited by S. Flügge (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1957), p. 411.

where



FIG. 1.  $\delta_{1/2}$ ,  $\delta_{3/2}$ , and  $\delta_{5/2}$  in MeV as a function of the dimensionless range parameter  $\eta$ .  $V_0\eta^{3/2}$  is unity.  $\eta = 0$ corresponds to the short-range limit.

The collective parameter A for the nuclei in the first half of the *s*-*d* shell is fairly constant. The  $0^{+}-4^{+}$  energy differences in the rotational bands are:

4.31 MeV for O<sup>16</sup> (excited state band),

4.25 MeV for Ne<sup>20</sup> (ground state band),

4.12 MeV for Mg<sup>24</sup> (ground state band).

(The 2<sup>+</sup> states are probably more strongly perturbed.) Thus, a value of  $A \cong 0.2$ , which is approximately obtained by various theoretical approaches as well,<sup>3</sup> should be inserted in (9).

The experimental  $\Delta_k$  are as follows:

Nucleus	k	$\Delta_k$ (in MeV)
$F^{18}$	1/2	1.043
$Na^{22}$	3/2	0.660
A 126	5/2	0.229

 $\Delta_k$  behaves as an arithmetic series in k with decrement  $2A \cong 0.4$  MeV. This is in complete accordance with the observed A and with (9) if we assume that  $\delta_k$  is independent of k. It should be noted that the derivation of (9) involves only the general assumptions of the rotational picture.

### III. THE RESIDUAL INTERACTION

It will now be shown that a typical residual interaction,  $V_{TS}V(|r_{12}|)$ , of a very short range gives  $\delta_k$ , practically a constant  $\delta$ , independent of k.

Since the exact radial dependence of the force hardly effects calculations, a Gaussian

$$V(|r_{12}|) = V_0 \exp(-|r_{12}|/a)^2$$
(10)

is being chosen for convenience. The spin-isospin dependence is taken as the Rosenfeld mixture.<sup>4</sup>  $V_{TS}$ therefore has the following eigenvalues:

$$V_{00} = 9/5$$
  $V_{01} = -1$   $V_{10} = -\frac{3}{5}$   $V_{11} = \frac{1}{3}$ . (11)

In the harmonic oscillator representation of range b, the interaction (10) is expandable<sup>5</sup> in Laguerre polynomials of order  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; thus,

$$V(|\mathbf{r}_{12}|) = \sum V_0 \eta^{3/2} (1-\eta)^n L_n^{(1/2)}(\rho), \qquad (12)$$

$$\rho = |r_{12}|^2 / 2b^2 \tag{13}$$

$$\eta = \frac{a^2}{(a^2 + 2b^2)}.$$
 (14)

[For the matrix elements of  $L_n^{(1/2)}(\rho)$  in the s-d shell, see, for example, Ref. 5.7

The states  $\chi_k$  in Eqs. (4) and (5) should, in principle, be taken as eigenfunctions of a self-consistent singleparticle Hamiltonian.<sup>6</sup> For the nuclei in question, the results of the self-consistent calculations7 show that for the present purpose one could take

$$\chi_k = d_k^{5/2}.$$
 (15)

 $\delta_k$  would then become

$$\delta_{k} = \langle d_{k}^{5/2} d_{-k}^{5/2} | V^{\text{Res}}_{12}(T=1) | d_{k}^{5/2} d_{-k}^{5/2} \rangle - \langle d_{k}^{5/2} d_{k}^{5/2} | V^{\text{Res}}_{12}(T=0) | d_{k}^{5/2} d_{k}^{5/2} \rangle.$$
(16)

Figure 1 shows the dependence of  $\delta_{1/2}$ ,  $\delta_{3/2}$ , and  $\delta_{5/2}$ on the parameter  $\eta$ , the short-range limit corresponding to  $\eta = 0$ .  $V_0 \eta^{3/2}$  is kept unity for all values of  $\eta$  in the graph. The figure shows that at the short-range limit  $\delta_k$  is independent of k.

The fact that  $V_0\eta^{3/2}$  is held constant means, in the short-range limit, that the strength  $\times$  volume  $V_0a^3$  is held constant. If we take in that limit the same value of  $V_0\eta^{3/2}$ , which is being successfully used for the finiterange two-body interaction in other works<sup>6</sup> ( $V_0 = 40$ MeV;  $\delta \simeq 5.2$  MeV), the constant  $\delta \simeq 1.3$  MeV fits Eq. (9) in its absolute value as well. There is, however, no independent justification for this particular choice.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

The physical interpretation of those fits is still debatable. It could be argued that it is the long-range behavior of the two-body force that is responsible for the deformation of the nuclear shape and the occurrence of rotational phenomena. (This is indeed the reason why model forces of  $P_2 + \delta$  force have been extensively used.)<sup>8</sup> In that case, a short-range interaction between the two odd particles would mean that  $A \mathbf{R}^2 + h_1 + h_2$ self-consistently represents the actual Hamiltonian for both the T=0 and T=1 states. Then the use of shortrange force in the present calculation is justified.

Finally, we should add that the regularity of the  $0^+(T=1)$  states in those odd-odd nuclei may have a significance independent of the particular assumptions of the model presented above.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> C. A. Levinson, Phys. Rev. 132, 2184 (1963).
<sup>4</sup> L. Rosenfeld, *Nuclear Forces* (North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1948), p. 233.
<sup>5</sup> M. Kugler, Phys. Rev. 129, 307 (1963).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> I. Kelson and C. A. Levinson, this issue, Phys. Rev. 134, B269 (1964).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(1)</sup> I. Kelson, Phys. Rev. **132**, 2189 (1963). <sup>8</sup> L. S. Kisslinger and R. A. Sorenson, Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskab, Mat. Fys. Medd. **32**, No. 9 (1960).