# Mass and Energy Dependence of the Spin Cutoff Parameter

S. M. Grimes

Ohio University

19 May 2015

Fifth Workshop on Level Densities and Gamma Ray Strength Functions, Oslo, Norway, May 18-22, 2015





## Bethe(1936)

$$\rho(U,J) = \frac{n_s(U)}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma}} \exp\left(\frac{-J^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$\sigma = \langle J_z^2 \rangle^{1/2} \text{ spin cutoff parameter}$$

$$\rho_L(U,J) = \rho_s(U,J) - \rho_s(U,J+1)$$

$$= \left(\frac{d\rho_s}{dJ}\right)_{J=J+1/2}$$

▶ Used to convert

$$\rho(U, 1/2) \ to \ \sum_{I} \rho(U, J)$$

▶ at the binding energy

# Bethe (1936) cont.

$$ho_{ ext{total}}(U) = 2\sigma^2 \rho(U, 1/2)$$

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{I\theta}{\hbar^2}$$

$$I = \frac{2}{5}mR^2$$

$$\theta = \sqrt{\frac{U}{a}}$$

 $\sigma^2 = \frac{2mR^2}{5\pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{U}{g}}$  Rigid Body Model (RBM)

# Ericson (1960)

$$\sigma^2 = n < m^2 > = \frac{6}{\pi^2} a \sqrt{\frac{U}{a}} < m^2 > 0$$

▶ where n is the particle-hole number

$$=\frac{6}{\pi^2}\sqrt{U a} < m^2 > \text{Microscopic Model (MM)}$$

► Note:

$$\sigma^2(RBM) \propto a^{-1/2}$$
  
 $\sigma^2(MM) \propto a^{1/2}$ 

▶ At closed shells, a drops, RBM  $\sigma^2$  increases at magic number, while MM  $\sigma^2$  is lower at magic number.

with 
$$\sigma$$
 is lower at magic number: 
$$\sigma^2(RBM) \propto \sqrt{(U/a)}A^{5/3}$$
 
$$\sigma^2(MM) \propto \sqrt{Ua} < m^2 >$$

#### Reconcile RBM and MM

ightharpoonup If  $a = \alpha A$ 

$$\sigma^2(RBM) \propto \sqrt{(U/\alpha)}A^{7/6}$$
  
$$\sigma^2(MM) \propto \sqrt{U\alpha}A^{1/2} < m^2 >$$

If  $\langle m^2 \rangle \propto A^{\frac{2}{3}}$  the A dependence agrees.

▶ If we assume a = A/8 ( $\alpha = 1/8$ ) then

$$\langle m^2 \rangle = 0.1985 A^{\frac{2}{3}}$$
 makes MM equivalent to RBM

- ightharpoonup p shell  $< m^2 > /A^{2/3} = 0.144$
- ightharpoonup sd shell  $< m^2 > /A^{2/3} = 0.164$
- fp shell  $< m^2 > /A^{2/3} = 0.175$
- $ightharpoonup ext{sdg shell} < m^2 > /A^{2/3} = 0.1824$
- ▶ This is close to the estimate above.

## Experimental Compilations

Fits to spins of known low-energy levels:

▶ Von Egidy-Bucurescu (2009)

$$\sigma^2 > \sigma^2(RBM)A < 50$$
 
$$\sigma^2 \le 0.6\sigma^2(RBM) \quad A > 120$$

Does not approach  $\sigma^2(RBM)$  as  $U \to 20$  MeV.

▶ Al-Quraishi et al. (2003)  $20 \le A \le 110$ 

$$\sigma^2 \approx 0.6\sigma^2(RBM) \quad A \sim 20$$
 
$$\sigma^2 \approx 0.4\sigma^2(RBM) \quad A \sim 110$$
 
$$\sigma^2_{even-even} < \sigma^2_{odd-A} < \sigma^2_{odd-odd}$$

Does not appproach  $\sigma^2(RBM)$  as  $U \to 20$  MeV.

► Capote et al (2009)

$$\sigma^2 = 0.5\sigma^2(RBM)A < 50$$

Does not appproach  $\sigma^2(RBM)$  as  $U \to 20$  MeV.

## Expermental Summary

- ▶ Three compilations indicate  $\sigma^2 \approx 0.5\sigma^2(RBM)$ .
- ▶ Poor consistency.
- $\blacktriangleright$  No clear indication of shell effects in A or U.

# Angular distributions of Hauser-Feshbach Processes

- $\triangleright$  (p,p'),(n,n'),(p,n) nearly isotropic.
- $\blacktriangleright$   $(\alpha, \alpha'), (\alpha, p), (\alpha, n), (p, alpha)$  can yield  $\sigma^2$  values.
- ▶ Measurements from 1972-1978
  - ► Grimes et al. 1978: 28 < A < 30
    - ▶ Hille et al. 1974, Lu et al. 1972, Grimes et al. 1974: 48 < A < 65
    - ightharpoonup Hille et al. 1974: A = 93, 95 96, and 118
    - $\sigma^2 at A = 30 \sim 0.6 \sigma^2 (RBM)$
    - $\sigma^2 at A = 50 \sim 1.2 \sigma^2 (RBM)$
    - $\sigma^2 at A = 60 \sim 0.8 \sigma^2 (RBM)$
- ▶ For A ~ 50  $\sigma^2$  at U = 4 MeV nearly equal to  $\sigma^2$  at U = 8 MeV.
- $\sigma^2$  at  $A = 90 \sim 0.7 \ \sigma^2(RBM)$
- ▶ Data not comprehensive, but show oscillations of  $\sigma^2$  against  $\sigma^2(RBM)$  as a function of U and A.

#### Calculations

- ▶ BCS Hamiltonian used with Statistical Mechanics by Sano and Yamasaki (1963) and L. Moretto (1972).
- ➤ Single particle energies Nilsson (1955), Seeger Perisho (1967), Seeger Howard (1975).
- ▶ Results show average  $\sigma^2$  Values for U and A averaged over the single particle basis.

#### Calculations cont.

- ▶ Find  $\sigma_{even-even}^2 < \sigma_{odd-A}^2 < \sigma_{odd-odd}^2$  at a given U in a narrow A range.
- ▶ Generally have  $\sigma^2$  between 0.2 an 0.5 of  $\sigma^2(RBM)$  at 3-4 MeV.
- $\bullet$   $\sigma^2$  as  $U \to 20$  MeV is usually within 10 % of  $\sigma^2(RPM)$ .
- ▶ In range of binding energy significant shell effects.
  - From A = 20 to A = 30  $\sigma^2$  drops by 20% although  $\sigma^2(RBM)$  increases 60%. Apparent reason is moving from filling the  $d_{5/2}$  orbital to filling the  $s_{1/2}$  and  $d_{3/2}$  orbitals.
    - A maximum is found at A = 50 with  $\sigma^2 = 1.3\sigma^2(RBM)$
    - A minimum at A = 60 with  $\sigma^2 = 0.8\sigma^2(RBM)$
    - A maximum at A = 80 with  $\sigma^2 = 1.2\sigma^2(RBM)$
    - A minimum at A = 90, 140, 200
    - ► A maximum at A = 90, 140, 200 ► A maximum at A = 120, 180
    - ▶ Note: Magic numbers are close to minima A = 90, 190, 200, but also one maximum at A=120.

# Calculation Compilation

Table: Calculated spin cutoff  $\sigma^2$  parameters

A	U (MeV)	$\sigma^2$	$\sigma^2/\sigma^2(RBM)$	A	U (MeV)	$\sigma^2$	$\sigma^2/\sigma^2(RBM)$
20	2	1.2	0.6	60	2	2.1	0.3
	4	2.4	0.85		4	7.43	0.7
	6	5.9	1.7		6	11.14	0.9
	8	7.8	1.96		8	12.86	0.9
	10	8.1	1.81		10	13.65	0.85
	20	6.96	1.11		20	23.02	1.02
30	2	0.97	0.3	70	2	2.96	0.33
	4.0	2.6	0.58		4	9.71	0.8
	6	4.2	0.76		6	19.32	1.3
	8	5.43	0.85		8	24.32	1.42
	10	7.52	1.05		10	25.41	0.32
	20	11.0	1.1		20	30.11	1.11
40	2	1.36	0.31	80	2	5.0	0.5
	4	5.49	0.87		4	12.47	0.88
	6	11.29	1.46		6	22.58	1.3
	8	14.1	1.6		8	30.55	1.52
	10	16.1	1.7		10	32.6	1.45
	20	15.9	1.13		20	36.3	1.14
50	2	2.44	0.42	90	2	4.04	0.35
	4	8.04	0.98		4	10.58	0.65
	6	16.0	1.6		6	18.9	0.94
	8	16.1	1.38		8	20.7	0.9
	10	16.25	1.25		10	24.43	0.95
	20	17.4	0.95		20	38.2	1.05

## Calculation Compilation cont.

Table: Calculated spin cutoff  $\sigma^2$  parameters cont.

			9, 9,			. 9	9, 9,
A	U (MeV)	$\sigma^2$	$\sigma^2/\sigma^2(RBM)$	A	U (MeV)	$\sigma^2$	$\sigma^2/\sigma^2(RBM)$
100	2	3.9	0.3	180	2	13.43	0.52
	4	15.1	1.0		4	33.14	0.91
	6	31.9	1.42		6	58.61	1.31
	8	23.66	1.29		8	78.3	1.52
	10	35.1	1.21		10	83.8	1.45
	20	47.3	1.15		20	94.75	1.16
120	2	10.5	0.65	200	2	8.8	0.3
	4	19.57	0.86		4	20.9	0.5
	6	28.98	1.04		6	27.2	0.54
	8	34.4	1.07		8	37.4	0.64
	10	39.22	1.09		10	46.7	0.72
	20	53.94	1.06		20	79.4	0.86
140	2	5.9	0.31	220	2	13.3	0.41
	4	19.1	0.7		4	34.3	0.74
	6	28.03	0.84		6	61.1	1.08
	8	34.68	0.85		8	73.0	1.12
	10	40.93	0.95		10	84.8	1.16
	20	66.8	1.1		20	119.0	1.15
160	2	9.0	0.40	240	2	17.0	0.53
	4	27.9	0.88		4	43.8	0.86
	6	44.8	1.15		6	80.3	1.29
	8	58.97	1.31		8	88.9	1.23
	10	64.94	1.29		10	93.2	1.15
	20	77.6	1.09		20	126.16	1.09

## Rigid Body Model

- ▶ Rigid Body Model has  $\sigma^2 \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}$  gives the maximum value of  $\sigma^2$  at closed shell.
- ► Microscopic Model
  - $\sigma^2 \propto \sqrt{a} < m^2 >$
  - $ightharpoonup \sqrt{a}$  causes drop in  $\sigma^2$
  - $ightharpoonup < m^2 >$ could enhance drop, not change it, or could cancel it.

#### General Conclusions

- ▶ Microscopic Model goes to the rigid body model if  $< m^2 > \propto A^{\frac{2}{3}}$  and  $a \propto A$
- ► Convergence ~ 20 MeV to Rigid Body Model.
- ▶ Not yet converged at 6-8 MeV.

#### Other Issues

- ▶ Parity Ratio
  - Is  $\rho^+(U) = \rho^-(U)$  at the binding energy?
  - ▶ Al-Quarishi et al. (2003) produced empirical fit based on known levels.
  - ▶ Found deviations > 10% at the binding energy for  $A \leq 90$ .
- ► Additional Questions
  - ▶ Is  $\sigma^2$ (Positive parity) =  $\sigma^2$ (Negative parity) at the binding energy?
  - ▶ Gorieli et al. (2008) find  $\sigma_+^2$  and  $\sigma_-^2$  can differ by 20-25% as the binding energy is approached.

#### Deformed Nuclei

▶ Bohr and Mottelson Proposed

$$\rho_{\text{deformed}}(U,J) = \sigma_{\perp}^2 \rho_{\text{spherical}}(U,J)$$

- ► Acknowledge not valid for all J.
- ▶ If this is used at the binding energy then,

$$\rho_{\text{total}}(U) = 2\sigma^2 \rho(U, \frac{1}{2})$$

▶ This can be shown to be incorrect.

Spherical Basis	Deformed Basis
J = 0	J = 0, K = 0
J=2	J = 2, K = 0
	J = 2, K = 1
	J=2,K=2

#### Deformed Nuclei cont.

- ▶ Get multiplier of J + 1.
- ▶ Bands also have higher multipliers for large J.
- ▶ New Rotational Enhancement Factor Grimes (2013).

$$R(J,K) = \frac{(J+1)^2 - K^2}{(2J+1)}$$

- ightharpoonup This factor has dependence on K as well as J.
- ▶ When summed over J and K the deformed level density is about  $\sigma_{\perp}^2/2$  larger than the sum of the sphereical level density.
- ightharpoonup Since the enhancement factor is small for small J, the corrected level density for resonance counting is increased

#### Conclusions

- ▶ Have compared Rigid Body and Microscopic Model predictions for  $\sigma^2$
- ▶ Find A and U dependence similar if  $a \propto A$  and  $< m^2 > \propto A^{2/3}$
- ▶ Data base limited: low  $U \to \sigma^2 \sim \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(RBM)$
- ▶ Some evidence for shell modulations in calculations with microscopic model for  $U \le 10 \, \mathrm{MeV}$ .
- Goes to  $\sigma^2(RBM)$  as  $U \to 20 \text{ MeV}$
- ► Two body model calcualtions agree with data and generally with Microscopic Model.
- ▶ Need reanalysis of level densities for deformed nuclei.
- ▶ Need more measurements of  $\sigma^2$  in a variety of A ranges.