

Non-localised clustering: A new concept in nuclear cluster structure physics

Bo Zhou,^{1,2,*} Y. Funaki,^{3,†} H. Horiuchi,^{2,4} Zhongzhou Ren,^{1,5} G.
Röpke,⁶ P. Schuck,^{7,8} A. Tohsaki,² Chang Xu,¹ and T. Yamada⁹

¹*Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China*

²*Research Center for Nuclear Physics (RCNP), Osaka University, Osaka 567-0047, Japan*

³*Nishina Center for Accelerator-Based Science, The institute of
Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Wako 351-0198, Japan*

⁴*International Institute for Advanced Studies, Kizugawa 619-0225, Japan*

⁵*Center of Theoretical Nuclear Physics, National Laboratory of Heavy-Ion Accelerator, Lanzhou 730000, China*

⁶*Institut für Physik, Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany*

⁷*Institut de Physique Nucléaire, Université Paris-Sud,
IN2P3-CNRS, UMR 8608, F-91406, Orsay, France*

⁸*Laboratoire de Physique et Modélisation des Milieux Condensés,
CNRS- UMR 5493, F-38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*

⁹*Laboratory of Physics, Kanto Gakuin University, Yokohama 236-8501, Japan*

(Dated: November 27, 2018)

It is shown that an angular momentum projected version of the THSR wave function, successful in its original form for the description of, e.g., the famous Hoyle state, has astounding properties also for the explanation of more compact cluster states like ^{20}Ne in its ground state and corresponding rotational bands. It is shown that these *single* angular momentum projected THSR wave functions can accurately describe the famous inversion doublet bands in ^{20}Ne , especially the $K^\pi = 0^-$ band. For instance, they have 99.98 % and 99.87 % squared overlaps, for 1^- and 3^- states, respectively, with the corresponding exact solutions of $\alpha + ^{16}\text{O}$ RGM (Resonating Group Method). This finding sheds a completely new light on the physics of low energy nuclear cluster states in general: the clusters are non-localised filling the whole nuclear volume besides the one of mutual overlap where their probability of presence is strongly reduced.

PACS numbers: 21.60.Gx, 27.30.+t

The formation of clusters is one of the most important features in light nuclei. Strongly correlated nucleons can compose a cluster subunit, typically, the alpha cluster. Then the relative motion between clusters becomes a fundamental degree of freedom, as is the single-nucleon motion in the shell model [1]. This relative motion of clusters displays a complex feature due to the character of the nuclear interaction and the action of the Pauli principle, i.e. antisymmetrisation. Refs. [2–5] contain recent reviews on nuclear cluster physics.

The concept of localised clustering is a traditional understanding for the cluster structure in nuclei, which has a long history. In 1937, Wefelmeier [6] proposed a cluster model in which the α nuclei could be considered as structure-less rigid alpha particles undergoing localised motion. Subsequently, Brink developed this idea and proposed a microscopic cluster wave function [7] for the cluster structure in nuclei. The geometrical cluster structure was obtained by the energy variational method without any priori assumptions [7–9]. However, only the superposition of Brink wave functions, that is the GCM (generator coordinate method) Brink wave function, can lead to the exact RGM solution of the cluster system rather than a single Brink wave function [2–4]. This indicates already that a single Brink wave function which is characterized by the localised cluster correlation cannot describe the cluster structure sufficiently well.

Recently, the proposed THSR wave function [10, 11], based on the concept of non-localised clustering, has brought a new perspective to the Hoyle state. The Hoyle state is now considered to be an alpha condensate state, in which the three alpha clusters occupy the same (0S) orbit and make a non-localised motion [12]. On the other hand, also the 3 α RGM/GCM wave function of the ground state of ^{12}C was found to have about 93% squared overlap with a *single* THSR wave function [11]. Therefore, there arises the following question: Is this non-localised clustering the essential feature of general cluster states in nuclei? Recently, we demonstrated by using a deformed THSR type of wave function [13] that the concept of non-localised clustering can be extended to the more compact cluster structures of the positive parity ground-state band in ^{20}Ne [14]. The technique used angular momentum projection, already successfully applied in the cases of non-zero angular momentum states in ^8Be and ^{12}C [13]. However, in the case of ^{20}Ne , where there exist negative-parity cluster states, the latter could not be included in that framework. It is, thus, necessary to find a new cluster wave function, inheriting the THSR spirit, for describing completely general cluster states in nuclei with positive and negative parity. This was the initial objective of the present work. On our way to the solution of this problem it turned out that we very nicely could answer in this way in addition the old and important question whether the cluster structure of lighter nuclei involves a more localised, crystalline picture, or whether the clusters are non-localised in a more fluid or gas like way. Our study will lead us to the unambiguous conclusion that the latter case is realised in nuclear cluster physics.

For our purpose, we first propose a hybrid wave function which includes the Brink wave function and the THSR wave function as special cases. As an example, we apply this new wave function to the study of the inversion doublet bands in ^{20}Ne , especially the $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ band.

The hybrid wave function shall be written in the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\text{cluster}}(\beta, \mathbf{S}) &= \int d^3R_1 \dots d^3R_n \exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{R_i^2}{\beta_i^2}\right)\right\} \\ &\times \Psi_{\text{cluster}}^B(\mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n + \mathbf{S}_n) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\propto \mathcal{A} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left\{-A_i \left(\frac{(\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{S}_i)^2}{B_i^2}\right)\right\} \phi(C_i) \right], \quad (2)$$

where

$$B_i^2 = 2b^2 + A_i\beta^2. \quad (3)$$

Here \mathbf{X}_i , A_i , and $\phi(C_i)$ are the center-of-mass coordinate, the mass number, and the internal wave function of the cluster C_i , respectively. $\Psi_{\text{cluster}}^B(\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n)$ is the Brink wave function [7].

Compared with the previous THSR wave function [14], we here introduce another generator coordinate \mathbf{S}_i in this new function Eq. (1). In this simple way, we can find that this hybrid wave function Eq. (2) combines the important traits of the Brink model and the THSR model. When $\mathbf{S}=0$, Eq. (2) corresponds to the THSR wave function and β becomes the size parameter of the nucleus. When $\beta = 0$, this equation is nothing more but the original Brink wave function and \mathbf{S} represents the inter-cluster distance in nuclei. It should be noted that the calculation is difficult directly using the form of the Eq. (2). The equivalent Eq. (1) adopts an integral form of the Brink wave function

and the usual techniques for the matrix elements of the Slater determinants can be utilized, which is very useful for our calculations.

Now, based on the above Eq. (1) and Eq. (14) in Ref. [14], the following cluster wave function of ^{20}Ne can be obtained,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\text{Ne}}(\beta, \mathbf{S}) \propto & \exp\left(-\frac{10X_G^2}{b^2}\right) \\ & \times \mathcal{A}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{8(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{S})^2}{5B^2}\right)\phi(\alpha)\phi(^{16}\text{O})\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here $B^2 = b^2 + 2\beta^2$, $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{X}_2$, $\mathbf{X}_G = (4\mathbf{X}_1 + 16\mathbf{X}_2)/20$. \mathbf{X}_1 and \mathbf{X}_2 represent the center-of-mass coordinates of the α and ^{16}O clusters, respectively. All calculations here are performed with restriction to axially symmetric deformation, that is, $\mathbf{S} \equiv (0, 0, S_z)$. Spin and parity eigenfunctions are obtained by angular momentum projection technique, see below and Ref. [14].




FIG. 1. Contour map of the energy surface of the $J^\pi = 0^+$ state in the two-parameter space, S_z and $\beta_x = \beta_y = \beta_z$.

TABLE I. $E_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Brink}}(R)$ are the minimum energies at the corresponding α - ^{16}O distance R in the Brink cluster model. $E_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Hyb}}(\beta_x, \beta_z)$ are the minimum energies at the corresponding values of $\beta_x = \beta_y$ and β_z in the hybrid model. $E_{\text{GCM}}^{\text{Hyb}}$ are the GCM energies obtained by the hybrid model. We also show the squared overlaps between our single normalized hybrid wave functions $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Hyb}}$ corresponding to the minimum energies and the normalized GCM Brink wave functions. The squared overlaps between $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Hyb}}$ and the single normalized Brink wave functions corresponding to their minimum energies are also listed. For the resonant state $J^\pi = 5^-$, we don't list the related GCM results. Units of energies are MeV.

State	$E_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Brink}}(R)$	$E_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Hyb}}(\beta_x, \beta_z)$	$E_{\text{GCM}}^{\text{Hyb}}(\text{Excited})$	Experiment	$ \langle \hat{\Phi}_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Hyb}} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Brink}} \rangle ^2$	$ \langle \hat{\Phi}_{\text{Min}}^{\text{Hyb}} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{GCM}}^{\text{Brink}} \rangle ^2$
1^-	-153.87(3.9)	-155.38(3.7, 1.4)	-155.38(4.67)	-154.85(5.79)	0.9048	0.9998
3^-	-151.40(3.8)	-153.07(3.7, 0.0)	-153.08(6.99)	-153.49(7.16)	0.8863	0.9987
5^-	-146.81(3.6)	-148.72(3.3, 0.0)	—	-150.38(10.26)	—	—

We now will calculate the energy as a function of the two parameters β and S_z . In this work, we adopt the same parameters as used in the previous work [14], that is, b is fixed at 1.46 fm and the nuclear interaction is the Volkov No.1 force [15]. Figure 1 shows the contour map of the energy surface of the $J^\pi = 0^+$ state in the two-parameter space, S_z and $\beta_x = \beta_y = \beta_z$. The minimum energy, -159.66 MeV, appears at $S_z = 0$ and $\beta_x = \beta_y = \beta_z = 1.8$ fm. For the other positive-parity states of the ground-state band in ^{20}Ne , the minimum-energy points also appear at $S_z = 0$. Thus the hybrid wave functions are equal to the THSR wave functions in the description of these positive-parity states.




FIG. 2. Contour map of the energy surface of the $J^\pi = 1^-$ state in the two-parameter space, S_z and $\beta_x = \beta_y = \beta_z$.




FIG. 3. (Color online). Energy curves of $J^\pi = 0^+, 1^-$ states with different widths of Gaussian relative wave functions in the hybrid model.

Figure 2 shows the contour map of the energy surface of the $J^\pi = 1^-$ state in the two-parameter space, S_z and $\beta_x = \beta_y = \beta_z$. We can see that the minimum energy, -155.33 MeV appears at $\beta_x = \beta_y = \beta_z = 2.4$ fm and $S_z = 0$. For the $J^\pi = 3^-, 5^-$ states, the minimum-energy points also appear at $S_z = 0$ with different β . As we mentioned, the hybrid wave function without angular momentum projection is equal to the THSR wave function at the limit of $S_z = 0$, which is of positive parity. However, the hybrid wave function with odd angular momentum maintains its negative parity even in the limit of $S_z = 0$, if it is normalized. This point can be explained as follows: The angular-momentum projection of $\Psi_{Ne}(\beta, \mathbf{S}) / \exp(-10X_G^2/b^2)$ gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{A} \left[j_L(2i\gamma S_z r) Y_{LM}(\hat{r}) e^{-\gamma r^2} \phi(\alpha) \phi(^{16}\text{O}) \right] \\ & \propto S_z^L \Phi_{LM}^0 + \mathcal{O}(S_z^{L+2}), \quad \gamma = \frac{8}{5B^2}, \\ & \Phi_{LM}^0 = \mathcal{A} \left[r^L e^{-\gamma r^2} Y_{LM}(\hat{r}) \phi(\alpha) \phi(^{16}\text{O}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$




FIG. 4. The energy levels of the inversion doublet bands in ^{20}Ne reproduced by the hybrid wave function compared with the experimental levels.

In Eq.(5), the wave function is proportional to the parameter S_z^L . After normalisation, this parameter drops out and the limit $S_z = 0$ can be taken analytically. We, thus, obtain via the detour over the hybrid ansatz, Φ_{LM}^0 as the THSR wave function having definite spin L and parity independent of the localisation parameter S_z .

Of course, in practical calculations it is much more convenient for the reason given above, to take for the parameter S_z just a very small value close to zero just within the limits of numerical accuracy. We, therefore, see that the introduction of the parameter S_z is just a very convenient way to introduce an angular momentum projected form of the THSR wave function of even *and* odd parity.

On the other hand, this parameter now allows us to discuss more deeply the important issue of localisation or non-localisation of the clusters. The competition between the two parameters β and S_z leads to $S_z = 0$. This is relevant to clarify the concept of non-localised clustering in the typical case of ^{20}Ne . Figure 3 shows the energy curves of the $J^\pi = 0^+, 1^-$ states with different values for the widths of the Gaussian wave functions in the hybrid model. If β is fixed at 0, then the hybrid wave function becomes the Brink wave function. In this case, S_z is the inter-cluster distance parameter. For the ground state of ^{20}Ne , the minimum energy appears at $S_z = 3.0$ fm. For the $J^\pi = 1^-$ state, the optimum position appears at $S_z = 3.9$ fm. The non-zero values of S_z seem to indicate that the $\alpha+^{16}\text{O}$ structure of ^{20}Ne favours localised clustering. This is just the traditional concept of localised clustering. However, now we think this argument is misleading. The non-zero minimum point S_z simply occurs because the width of the Gaussian wave function of the relative motion in the Brink model is fixed to a narrow wave packet. If β is adopted as 1.8 fm and 2.4 fm for $J^\pi = 0^+, 1^-$ respectively according to the minimum positions in Fig. (1) and (2), namely, if we use a broad enough width of Gaussian wave packet for describing the relative motion, then, we find that the minimum points appear at $S_z = 0$ in Fig. 3. It means there appears non-localised clustering.

In Ref. [14], we have demonstrated for the ground-state band in ^{20}Ne that the THSR wave functions at the minimum-energy points are almost 100% equivalent to the superposed Brink wave functions obtained by GCM calculations. The most prominent result in this Letter is that also for the $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ band states the hybrid wave functions at the minimum-energy points are almost 100% equivalent to the superposed Brink wave functions obtained by GCM calculations. We give in Table I the squared overlap values between them, which are 99.98% and 99.87% for 1^- and 3^- states, respectively.

Figure 4 shows the energy levels of the $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ band reproduced by the hybrid wave function, together with the ground-state band $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ in ^{20}Ne . Since it is well known that the calculation with GCM Brink wave function reproduced the two bands with $K^\pi = 0_1^\pm$, it is then natural that we have good reproduction of experiments also with our *single* angular momentum projected THSR wave functions. It should be noted that the results are obtained without any adjustable parameter. So, the good agreement with the experimental values means that this THSR-type wave function grasps very well the character of the relative motion of the system.

But how shall we understand the rotational band based on the concept of non-localised clustering? In the Brink model, because the $\alpha-^{16}\text{O}$ Brink wave functions are deformed and parity-violating wave functions, it is easy to understand the reason why they can describe the inversion doublet rotational bands with $K^\pi = 0_1^\pm$. On the other hand, in the case of the THSR wave function with $S_z = 0$, i.e. with good symmetry, that is a wave function in the

laboratory frame, the α and ^{16}O clusters undergo a non-localised relative motion characterised by the large parameter β and, hence, it seems that the angular momentum projected wave function, i.e. with $S_z = 0$, are not directly related with the $K^\pi = 0_1^\pm$ inversion doublet bands. In fact, the strongly anisotropic $\beta_x = \beta_y \neq \beta_z$ values shown in Table I indicate oblate shape. On the other hand, in Ref. [14], we showed that for the ground-state band, the $\beta_x = \beta_y \neq \beta_z$ values giving the minimum energies indicate the prolately deformed shape. However, for example, the oblately deformed hybrid THSR wave function with $\beta_x = \beta_y = 3.7$ fm, $\beta_z = 1.4$ fm, and $S_z = 0$ fm giving the minimum energy for the 1^- state, has 99.98% squared overlap with the 1^- wave function projected from the prolately deformed THSR wave function with $\beta_x = \beta_y = 0.1$ fm, $\beta_z = 3.2$ fm, and $S_z = 0$ fm. This means that it is then possible to consider the prolately deformed THSR wave function as the intrinsic wave function, which can generate the $K^\pi = 0_1^\pm$ inversion doublet bands. A deeper discussion concerning the intrinsic state via the THSR-type wave function will be presented in a more elaborate version of this work.

In summary, we treated the inversion doublet bands in ^{20}Ne by proposing a hybrid Brink-THSR wave function. From minimisation of the energy we, however, found that the spin and parity projected hybrid wave function reduces to a pure spin and parity projected THSR wave function, i.e. the one with $S_z = 0$, which indicates that this separation parameter S_z only serves in an intermediate step to produce negative parity states. We further found the surprising fact that these single THSR wave functions are nearly 100% equivalent to the exact RGM solution of the $\alpha + ^{16}\text{O}$ cluster system, which has been utilized for a long time to discuss the inversion doublet bands in ^{20}Ne . These results mean that the concept of non-localised clustering proposed by the THSR-type wave function is essential in understanding the cluster structures in nuclei, which is much different from the picture of separating the clusters by the localisation parameter in the Brink model. These astounding properties revealed by the THSR-type wave function lead to a new understanding of nuclear cluster physics highlighting its salient features.

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 11035001, 10975072, 11175085), by the 973 Program of China (2013CB834400), and by the Project Funded by the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PAPD)

* zhoubo@rcnp.osaka-u.ac.jp.

† funaki@riken.jp.

- [1] K. Wildermuth and Y. C. Tang, *A Unified Theory of the Nucleus* (Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1977).
- [2] W. von Oertzen, M. Freer, and Y. Kanada-En'yo, Phys. Rep. **432**, 43 (2006).
- [3] M. Freer, Rep. Prog. Phys. **70**, 2149 (2007).
- [4] H. Horiuchi, K. Ikeda and K. Katō, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **192**, 1 (2012).
- [5] T. Yamada *et al.*, in Clusters in Nuclei, Lecture Notes in Physics 2, edited by, C. Beck (Springer, Berlin, 2012), Vol. 848, Chap. 5, p. 229.
- [6] W. Wefelmeier, Naturwiss. **25**, 525 (1937); Z. Physik **107**, 332 (1937).
- [7] D. M. Brink, *Proc. Intern. School of Physics "Enrico Fermi", course 36* (Academic Press, 1966).
- [8] Y. Fujiwara *et al.*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **68**, 29 (1980).
- [9] W. D. M. Rae, A. C. Merchant, and J. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **321**, 1 (1994).
- [10] A. Tohsaki *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 192501 (2001).
- [11] Y. Funaki *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **67**, 051306(R) (2003).
- [12] Y. Funaki *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 064326 (2009).
- [13] Y. Funaki *et al.*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108**, 297 (2002).
- [14] Bo Zhou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 014301(2012).
- [15] A. B. Volkov, Nucl. Phys. **74**, 33 (1965).