

Description of the odd $^{249-253}\text{No}$ nuclei using Skyrme functionals with modified spin-spin interaction.

N. Lyutorovich

*St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia**

(Dated: March 12, 2024)

The Skyrme energy-density functionals with modified spin-spin interaction and pairing strength are used for description of the ^{249}No , ^{251}No , and ^{253}No excited states. The results of the HFB and cranked HFB calculations taking into account the blocking effect are in reasonable agreement with the available data. For many states, including rotational and three-quasiparticle states, the results of self-consistent calculations were obtained for the first time.

I. INTRODUCTION

Self-consistent methods based on the energy-density functional (EDF) theory are very important and, to some extent, are the only ones available for the microscopic description of both various nuclei, including nuclei far from the stability valley, and the properties of nuclear matter in astrophysical problems. The Skyrme EDFs used in the nonrelativistic self-consistent approaches contain terms that are bilinear both in time-even (T-even) and in time-odd (T-odd) densities and currents: see Refs. [1, 2]. The T-odd densities and currents are equal to zero in the ground states of the even-even nuclei; therefore, the T-odd EDF terms do not affect the ground-state properties of these nuclei. The words "time-odd" mean, as usual, that the EDF terms are constructed from odd densities and currents, while the EDFs themselves are T-even. The T-odd EDF terms impact on the characteristics of the excited states of the even-even nuclei and on the ground- and excited-state properties of the odd- and odd-odd nuclei.

Recently, the Skyrme functionals SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ and UNEDF1 containing T-odd spin terms were obtained in Refs. [3] and [4], respectively. The functional SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ obtained on the base of the SV-bas parameter set [5] had the spin-spin terms constructed from the Landau-Migdal interaction with the parameters g and g' . The g, g' and new spin-orbit parameters were fitted to reproduce the basic experimental characteristics of the M1 excitations in ^{208}Pb within the renormalized time-blocking approximation and, at the same time, to describe the nuclear ground-state properties with approximately the same accuracy as the original SV-bas set.

The modified functional UNEDF1 was obtained in Ref. [4] (see, also, [6] and references therein). The EDF differs from the original one [7] by the spin-spin interaction implemented in terms of the Landau-Migdal parameters g and g' that were adjusted to describe the magnetic moments of the odd nuclei. Later, in Ref. [8], it was assigned as "UNEDF1 with T-odd".

The predictive power of the SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ was tested in the description of excited states in ^{40}Ca , ^{90}Zr , and

^{208}Pb excited states: see Ref. [9]. The modified UNEDF1 functional was employed and tested in calculations of the electromagnetic moments in states of the odd neighbors of doubly magic nuclei and of the deformed odd nuclei with $63 \leq Z \leq 82$ and $82 \leq N \leq 126$: see Refs. [4, 6, 8]. At the same time, both the modified functionals were not used for superheavy nuclei.

The purpose of this article is to describe the excited states of odd $^{249-253}\text{No}$ nuclei within the framework of the Skyrme-Hartree-Fock-Bogolyubov (SHFB) and cranking SHFB approaches and to employ the modified UNEDF1 and SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ functionals in the calculations. We choose $^{249,251,253}\text{No}$ because new experimental data have been obtained for these nuclei in recent years. In addition, ^{253}No is one of the heaviest nuclei for which rather detailed experimental information is available.

There are numerous theoretical studies for $^{249,251,253}\text{No}$, but most of them are based on phenomenological versions of the mean field and the residual interaction and are thus not self-consistent. In particular, the microscopic-macroscopic model with the Woods-Saxon potential and the monopole pairing were used in Refs. [10, 11]. Calculations in the framework of the quasiparticle-phonon model (QPM) were performed in Refs. [12–14] and, in addition, in Ref. [12] results were obtained within the framework of the microscopic-macroscopic two-center shell model.

There are few self-consistent calculations for these nuclei, but their results are not entirely consistent with each other. The SHFB method combined with Lipkin-Nogami approximation (SHFB+LN) were used in Refs. [12, 15]. Calculations in the framework of SHFB for several EDFs and the relativistic Hartree-Bogolyubov calculations were performed in Refs. [16]. The relativistic mean-field approach was also used in Ref. [17] to investigate ground-state properties of many transfermium nuclei, including nobelium isotopes.

Comparing the results of the self-consistent calculations, it can be noted that the energies (E) of the ^{253}No levels calculated with the SLy4 Skyrme interaction in Ref. [12, 18] are by 600–700 keV less than similar values in Ref. [16] and approximately two times less the values in Ref. [15]. The difference between values [16] and [15] is not very significant and may be explained by the approximations used. At the same time, the low

* n_lyutor@mail.ru

E values [12, 18] may be explained by incorrect pairing strength in the SHFB calculations. In this work, the SHFB+LN approximation was used for the SLy4 and SkP parameter sets but the original (for these sets) pairing strength was adjusted without the LN method. The fact is that the pairing parameters for the SHFB and SHFB+LN are significantly different: see, for example, Refs. [19], p. 3 and [6], p. 3. Using the latest version [20] of the code HFODD used in Ref. [12], one can check that the E values Refs. [12, 18] for SLy4 and SkP parameter sets are not correct while these EDFs with correct pairing strengths give results that are in agreement with Refs [16] and [15]. This, of course, does not reduce the value of other results of Refs. [12, 18] that were obtained in the framework of the models based on the phenomenological mean and pairing fields, i.e., the QPM approach and mic-mac two-center shell model.

Thus, to date, most calculations for $^{249,251,253}\text{No}$ were based on the phenomenological mean fields. There are only few self-consistent calculations for the excited states in ^{253}No however their results differ significantly from experimental data. The given paper presents the investigation of the ^{249}No , ^{251}No , and ^{253}No excited states performed in the framework of the SHFB and cranked SHFB methods with implementation of the modified SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ and UNEDF1 Skyrme functionals. Calculations were performed using a slightly modified version of the code HFODD [20].

The paper is organized as follows. Calculation details are given in Section II. The neutron and proton pairing strengths for the modified functionals are adjusted to reproduce the experimental odd-even mass differences for actinide nuclei in Subsec. III A. The results of calculations for ^{253}No , ^{251}No , and ^{249}No are presented in Subsections III B, III C, and III D. Conclusions are given in Sec. IV.

To distinguish the modified SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ and UNEDF1 functionals from the original ones, we will denote them as bas44 and UDF1m, keeping in mind that in addition to the T-odd terms they have also new pairing parameters.

II. CALCULATION DETAILS

The Skyrme EDF theory was described in many publications: see, for example, the reviews [1, 21]. In the given paper, the equations of the theory are solved using the version 3.18j (see Ref. [6]) of the code HFODD with slight modifications. The code has been developed over many years and has been described in a number of publications, which also provide detailed formulas: see Ref. [20] and references therein.

It is known (see, for example, Ref. [7], p. 10), that the single-particle levels close to the Fermi surface affect the pairing correlations, therefore, when changing EDFs, it is necessary to modify the pairing terms. The pairing interaction was not used for the SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ and modified UNEDF1 [4] functionals. In Ref. [6], the pairing strength

of the modified UNEDF1 functional was determined approximately: the neutron and proton pairing parameters were increased by 20% with respect to the original EDF to compensate for the effects of the LN method that was not used in the calculations [6] (the original EDF UNEDF1 was fitted in the framework of the LN method). Since correct determination of pairing forces is very important for a self-consistent description of excited states in deformed nuclei, new pairing forces are obtained below for both the modified functionals.

The pairing terms in the EDFs have the form

$$E^{pair} = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (1)$$

The pairing energy density $\tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{r})$ is derived from the mixed pairing force in which the volume and surface components of density-dependent delta interaction are mixed in the equal proportions (see Ref. [7]):

$$\tilde{\chi}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{q=n,p} \frac{V_q}{2} \left[1 - \frac{\rho_0(\mathbf{r})}{2\rho_c} \right] \tilde{\rho}_q^2(\mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_c$ is the local pairing density, $\tilde{\rho}_c = 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$. The neutron and proton pairing strengths were adjusted to match the experimental odd-even mass differences, for which the three-point parameters $\Delta_n^{(3)}$ and $\Delta_p^{(3)}$ centered at odd particle numbers were used. The equation for the neutron $\Delta_n^{(3)}$ value reads

$$\Delta_n^{(3)}(N) = 1/2[B(Z, N-1) + B(Z, N+1) - 2B(Z, N)], \quad (3)$$

where $B(Z, N)$ value is the binding energy of the nucleus with the even number of protons Z and odd number of neutrons N . The equation for the proton value $\Delta_p^{(3)}(N)$ has the similar form.

The rotational symmetry is taken into account approximately, within the framework of the cranking HFB method: see Ref. [22]. In this approximation, the EDF contains the term with the constraint

$$\langle J_y \rangle = \sqrt{I(I+1) - \langle J_y^2 \rangle}, \quad (4)$$

where, I is the spin of the nucleus, the J_y and J_z are the operators of the nuclear angular momentum in the intrinsic frame of reference. Using the method we calculate the rotational energy and take into the effect of the rotation on the mean field and pairing.

The methodology of the calculations is similar to one described in Ref. [6] but with some modifications. The SHFB equations were solved by expanding the mean-field wave functions on spherical harmonic-oscillator (HO) basis states including $N = 16$ quanta in either of the Cartesian directions that gave 969 states. To study any possible effect of the HO space on the convergence of the iteration procedure and on the final results, calculations were also performed using the deformed HO basis of 959 states and the HO deformation close to the final deformation of the nucleus ground state. The HFB calculations

were performed with the cutoff of $E_{\text{cut}} = 60$ MeV used to truncate the quasiparticle space.

First, the SHFB calculations for the given nucleus were performed constraining the axial mass quadrupole moment to $Q_{20} = 34$ b and, then, the calculations were performed without the constraint. In the second step, the HFB properties of the nucleus states, including total energies, deformations, pairing characteristics and others, were obtained by blocking the relevant quasiparticle levels. The diabatic blocking and the Broyden method were used to ensure the convergence of the iteration procedure. In the third step, the total HFB states obtained in the second stage were used to take into account the nuclear rotation in the framework of the cranking HFB approximation. The excitation energies were calculated as differences of the total energies of the states with different blocked quasiparticle states.

III. RESULTS

A. Pairing strength

The pairing force parameters V_n and V_p were determined by fitting the calculated 3-point odd-even mass differences $\Delta^{(3)}$, defined by Eq. 3, to experimental values for nuclei of the actinides region. In the fitting, the theoretical binding energies $B(Z, N)$ were calculated in the HFB approximation taking into account the blocking effect and the experimental $B(Z, N)$ values were taken from Ref. [23]. The $\Delta_p^{(3)}$ values centered at odd-proton numbers were used for the ^{237}Np , ^{243}Am , and ^{249}Bk nuclei. The V_p parameter was fitted for each of these nuclei and, after that, a weighted mean value was obtained taking into account experimental uncertainties. The $\Delta_n^{(3)}$ values centered at odd-neutron numbers were used for the ^{233}Th , ^{251}Cf , and ^{253}No , but the ^{253}No value has too much experimental uncertainty so its input to the weighted mean V_n value was very small. As a result of the fittings, the following pairing parameters were obtained:

$$(V_n, V_p) = (-228.4, -270) \text{ MeV, for UDF1m,}$$

$$(V_n, V_p) = (-252.9, -306) \text{ MeV, for bas44.}$$

B. ^{253}No

All the results of the calculations for ^{253}No using the UDF1m functional and available experimental data are presented in Table I. Here, I^π , and E denote the level spin, parity, and energy (in keV), respectively. The configurations of the nucleus states are determined by the structure of blocked one- and three-quasiparticle (1qp and 3qp) states for which the dominant component in the wave function is labeled by the asymptotic quantum numbers $\Omega[Nn_z\Lambda]$ of the blocked qp state. The K value is a projection of the nucleus spin on the symme-

TABLE I. ^{253}No states obtained in the HFB and CHFB calculations for the Skyrme EDF UDF1m in comparison with experimental data. Here, I^π and E denote spin, parity and energy (in keV) of the levels. Configurations of the blocked 1qp and 3qp states are shown by dominant components in the wave functions where the asymptotic quantum numbers $\Omega[Nn_z\Lambda]$ label the blocked qp state. The K value is a projection of the nucleus spin on the symmetry axis: $K = \Omega$ for 1qp state and $K = \sum \Omega$ for 3qp state. The experimental data were taken from Refs. [24–26]

Exp.		UDF1m	
I^π	E	I^π $K[Nn_z\Lambda]$	E
(9/2 ⁻)	0	9/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	0
(11/2 ⁻)	64.0(10)	11/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	63
(13/2 ⁻)	132.8? (16)	13/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	138
5/2 ⁺	167.5(5)	5/2 ⁺ 5/2[622]	525
(15/2 ⁻)	220.0(15)	15/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	226
	258.2(12)	3/2 ⁺ 3/2[622]	471
(17/2 ⁻)	317.5(16)	17/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	325
(7/2 ⁺)	355 [26]	7/2 ⁺ 7/2[624]	220
(19/2 ⁻)	427.7(16)	19/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	435
(1/2 ⁺)	450.9(12)	1/2 ⁺ 1/2[620]	342
(21/2 ⁻)	551.2(17)	21/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	557
		7/2 ⁺ 7/2[613]	671
(1/2 ⁺)	670	1/2 ⁺ 1/2[631]	934
(23/2 ⁻)	686.7(18)	23/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	692
11/2 ⁻	750 [27]	11/2 ⁻ 11/2[725]	1039
(25/2 ⁻)	834.2(18)	25/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	839
		7/2 ⁻ 7/2[743]	847
(27/2 ⁻)	994.2(19)	27/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	992
(29/2 ⁻)	1165.2(19)	29/2 ⁻ 9/2[734]	1156
3qp states			
(15/2 ⁻)	934.5(15)	15/2 ⁻ $K = 15/2$ B1 ^a	1198
(17/2 ⁻)	1022.6(16)	17/2 ⁻ $K = 15/2$ B1 ^{a b}	
		3/2 ⁻ $K = 3/2$ B2 ^a	1205
		17/2 ⁻ $K = 17/2$ B3 ^a	1357
		23/2 ⁺ $K = 23/2$ C1 ^c	1341
		17/2 ⁺ $K = 17/2$ D1 ^d	1347
		9/2 ⁺ $K = 9/2$ C2 ^c	1411
		15/2 ⁺ $K = 15/2$ D1 ^d	1437

^a B1, B2, B3: members of the $\pi 7/2[514] \otimes \pi 1/2[521] \otimes \nu 9/2[734]$ multiplet

^b a member of the rotational band built on the B1 state

^c C1, C2: members of the $\pi 7/2[514] \otimes \pi 7/2[633] \otimes \nu 9/2[734]$ multiplet

^d D1, D2: members of the $\pi 1/2[521] \otimes \pi 7/2[633] \otimes \nu 9/2[734]$ multiplet

try axis: $K = \Omega$ for a 1qp state and $K = \sum_i \Omega_i$ for a 3qp state. The experimental data were taken from Refs. [24–26]. The calculations show that the UDF1m and bas44 functionals give rather similar results but the results for UDF1m are in some better agreement with the data therefore the table presents only the UDF1m results. A comparison of the EDFs will be given below, in the table for ^{251}No .

The results presented in the table make it possible to draw the following conclusions about the states of

^{253}No . The level with $I^\pi = 7/2^+$ was found at the energy $E = 355$ keV in the experimental work [26] that agrees, within uncertainties, with the value $E = 379$ keV experimentally obtained for this level in Ref [28]. Though this level is not mentioned in the latter experimental papers, the $I^\pi = 7/2^+$ state should exist in the energy region corresponding to values [26, 28]: our calculations predict the $7/2^+ 7/2[624]$ state in ^{253}No at $E = 220$ and 513 keV for the parameter sets UDF1m and SV-bas $_{-0.44}$, respectively. The calculations with phenomenological mean fields also predict this state at low energy: 24 [10], 200 [11], and 50 keV [12, 13, 18].

The presented calculations give the position of the $1/2[631]$ state essentially higher than $1/2[620]$ state: by 590 and 840 keV for UDF1m and ba44 EDFs, respectively. Similar results were obtained in Refs. [12–14, 18] using the QPM model with phenomenological mean fields. Taking all this into account, one can assign the experimental levels at 450.9 and 670 keV as the states with the dominant $1/2[620]$ and $1/2[631]$ components, respectively.

Experimental data for 3qp states are still scarce: there are only data for two states of the 3qp band in ^{253}No (see the table). The given calculations predict many 3qp states at $E \gtrsim 1$ MeV that are members of the 3qp multiplets. Only some of them are shown in Table I. It should be noted that proton pairing in these 3qp states is weakened compared to 1qp states: for example, the UDF1m functional gives the average proton gap parameter $\Delta(p) = 0.26$ MeV, so taking into account the particle-number conservation is more important in such cases than for 1qp states. Using a method that takes into account the particle-number conservation, e.g. the LN method, will give a negative contribution to the total 3qp energies and make the excitation energy of the states slightly lower.

C. ^{251}No

The results of the calculations for ^{251}No using the UDF1m and SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ parameter sets and available experimental data [25, 29] are presented in Table II. The UDF1m and bas44 functionals give very close results for the ^{251}No states. The theoretical values are in good agreement with the experimental data excluding the lowest $1/2^+$ state. In particular, both of the EDFs predict close energies for the $1/2^+ 1/2[620]$ and $1/2^+ 1/2[631]$ levels that exceed the experimental value by 0.5 MeV. However, the assignment of the level 106 keV is given in Refs. [25, 29] as preliminary and the calculations predict other lowlying states, therefore a more accurate determination of the spin and parity of the level 206 keV is desirable.

The calculation results remove the uncertainty in identifying the experimental level of $60.3(3)$ keV and clearly indicate that this is a rotational state with the dominant $9/2^+ 7/2[624]$ component.

TABLE II. The ^{251}No states obtained in the HFB and CHFB calculations for the Skyrme EDFs UDF1m and SV-bas $_{-0.44}$ in comparison with experimental data [29, 30]. Denotations are the same as in Table I.

Exp.		Theory		
I^π	E	$I^\pi K[Nn_z\Lambda]$	$E(\text{UDF1m})$	$E(\text{bas44})$
$7/2^+$	0	$7/2^+ 7/2[624]$	0	0
$(9/2^+)$	$(60.3(3))$	$9/2^+ 7/2[624]$	63	58
$(1/2^+)$	$106(6)$	$1/2^+ 1/2[631]$	566	685
$(9/2^-)$	$203.6(2)$	$9/2^- 9/2[734]$	140	269
		$5/2^+ 5/2[622]$	180	116
		$7/2^- 7/2[743]$	486	299
		$1/2^+ 1/2[620]$	685	719
		$1/2^- 1/2[501]$	737	
$(7/2^+)$	$917.2(5)?$	$7/2^+ 7/2[613]$	980	1105
		$1/2^- 1/2[761]$	1169	
		$11/2^- 11/2[725]$	1399	

TABLE III. ^{249}No states obtained in the HFB calculations for the Skyrme EDF UDF1m in comparison with experimental data. Denotations are the same as in Table I.

Exp.		UDF1m	
I^π	E	$I^\pi K[Nn_z\Lambda]$	E
$5/2^+$	0	$5/2^+ 5/2[622]$	0
$1/2^+$	125	$1/2^+ 1/2[631]$	254
		$7/2^+ 7/2[624]$	143
		$7/2^- 7/2[743]$	229
		$9/2^- 9/2[734]$	424
		$1/2^- 1/2[501]$	509
		$5/2^- 5/2[503]$	929
		$3/2^- 3/2[501]$	982
		$1/2^+ 1/2[620]$	1023

D. ^{249}No

The results of the HFB calculations for the excited states in ^{249}No and available experimental data [31] are given in Table III where denotations are the same as in Table I. Comparing the results presented in Tables I – III, one can notice that the energy of the state having a dominant component $1/2^+ 1/2[631]$ is significantly less in ^{249}No than in ^{251}No and ^{253}No . At the same time, the energy of the $1/2^+ 1/2[620]$ state is significantly greater in ^{249}No than in ^{251}No and ^{253}No . These results make it possible to determine that the experimental level $1/2^+$, $E \sim 125$ keV, is a state with a dominant component $1/2^+ 1/2[631]$, since there are no other theoretical levels $1/2^+$ below 1 MeV.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Fully self-consistent cranked HFB calculations have been performed for ^{249}No , ^{251}No , and ^{253}No nuclei with

modified versions the Skyrme energy-density functionals UNEDF1 and SV-bas_{-0.44} in which the T-odd terms were constructed from the Landau-Migdal spin-spin interaction with the parameters g and g' . The new neutron and proton pairing strengths were adjusted for both the functionals to reproduce the experimental odd-even mass differences for a number of actinide nuclei. To distinguish these functionals from the original ones, they were designated as UDF1m and bas44. The calculations performed within the HFB and cranking HFB approximations for 1qp and 3qp states and rotational bands, give comparable results for the UDF1m and bas44 functionals. The results are in reasonable agreement with

available experimental data but the agreement is some better for UDF1m. For many states, including the rotational and three-quasiparticle states, the results of self-consistent calculations were obtained for the first time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project number 21-52-12035. The research was carried out using computational resources provided by the Computer Center of St. Petersburg State University.

-
- [1] M. Bender, P.-H. Heenen, and P.-G. Reinhard, *Rev.Mod.Phys.* **75**, 121 (2003).
- [2] Y. M. Engel, D. M. Brink, K. Goeke, S. J. Krieger, and D. Vautherin, *Nucl. Phys. A* **249**, 215 (1975).
- [3] V. Tselyaev, N. Lyutorovich, J. Speth, and P.-G. Reinhard, *Phys. Rev. C* **102**, 064319 (2020).
- [4] P. L. Sassarini, J. Dobaczewski, J. Bonnard, and R. F. G. Ruiz, *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics* **49**, 11LT01 (2022).
- [5] P. Klüpfel, P. G. Reinhard, T. J. Bürvenich, and J. A. Maruhn, *Phys. Rev. C* **79**, 034310 (2009).
- [6] J. Bonnard, J. Dobaczewski, G. Danneaux, and M. Kortelainen, *Physics Letters B* **843**, 138014 (2023).
- [7] M. Kortelainen, J. McDonnell, W. Nazarewicz, P.-G. Reinhard, J. Sarich, N. Schunck, M. V. Stoitsov, and S. M. Wild, *Phys. Rev. C* **85**, 024304 (2012).
- [8] T. J. Gray, A. E. Stuchbery, J. Dobaczewski, A. Blazhev, H. A. Alshammari, L. J. Bignell, J. Bonnard, B. J. Coombes, J. T. H. Dowie, M. S. M. Gerathy, T. Kibédi, G. J. Lane, B. P. McCormick, A. J. Mitchell, C. Nicholls, J. G. Pope, P. G. Reinhard, N. J. Spinks, and Y. Zhong, Shape polarization in the tin isotopes near $n = 60$ from precision g -factor measurements on short-lived $11/2^-$ isomers (2023), arXiv:2310.11980 [nucl-ex].
- [9] N. Lyutorovich and V. Tselyaev, *International Journal of Modern Physics E* **32**, 2350025 (2023).
- [10] S. Ówiok and S. Hofmann, *Nuclear Physics A* **573**, 356 (1994).
- [11] A. Parkhomenko and A. Sobiczewski, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **36**, 3115 (2005).
- [12] G. G. Adamian, N. V. Antonenko, S. N. Kuklin, B. N. Lu, L. A. Malov, and S. G. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. C* **84**, 024324 (2011).
- [13] N. Y. Shirikova, A. V. Sushkov, L. A. Malov, and R. V. Jolos, *The European Physical Journal A* **51**, 21 (2015).
- [14] G. G. Adamian, L. A. Malov, N. V. Antonenko, and R. V. Jolos, *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 034308 (2018).
- [15] M. Bender, P. Bonche, T. Duguet, and P.-H. Heenen, *Nuclear Physics A* **723**, 354 (2003).
- [16] J. Dobaczewski, A. Afanasjev, M. Bender, L. Robledo, and Y. Shi, *Nuclear Physics A* **944**, 388 (2015), special Issue on Superheavy Elements.
- [17] U. Singh, R. Sharma, P. Sharma, M. Kaushik, S. Jain, and G. Saxena, *Nuclear Physics A* **1006**, 122066 (2021).
- [18] G. G. Adamian, N. V. Antonenko, H. Lenske, and S.-G. Malov, L. A. Zhou, *The European Physical Journal A* **57**, 89 (2021).
- [19] Y. Shi, J. Dobaczewski, and P. T. Greenlees, *Phys. Rev. C* **89**, 034309 (2014).
- [20] J. Dobaczewski, P. Bączyk, P. Becker, M. Bender, K. Bennaceur, J. Bonnard, Y. Gao, A. Idini, M. Konieczka, M. Kortelainen, L. Próchniak, A. M. Moro, W. Satuła, Y. Shi, T. R. Werner, and L. F. Yu, *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics* **48**, 102001 (2021).
- [21] N. Schunck, ed., *Energy Density Functional Methods for Atomic Nuclei* 2053-2563 (IOP Publishing, 2019).
- [22] P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem* (Springer-Verl., New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1980).
- [23] <https://www.nndc.bnl.gov/nudat3>.
- [24] E. Browne and J. Tuli, *Nuclear Data Sheets* **114**, 1041 (2013).
- [25] <https://www.nndc.bnl.gov/ensdf>.
- [26] A. Lopez-Martens, K. Hauschild, A. Yeremin, O. Dorvaux, A. Belozarov, C. Briançon, M. Chelnokov, V. Chepigin, D. Curien, P. Désesquelles, B. Gall, V. Gorschkov, M. Guttormsen, F. Hanappe, A. Kabachenko, F. Khalfallah, A. Korichi, A. Larsen, O. Malyshev, A. Minkova, Y. Oganessian, A. Popeko, M. Rousseau, N. Rowley, R. Sagaidak, S. Sharov, A. Shutov, S. Siem, L. Stuttgé, A. Svirikhin, N. Syed, and C. Theisen, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **32**, 245 (2007).
- [27] K. Hauschild, A. Lopez-Martens, R. Chakma, M. L. Chelnokov, V. I. Chepigin, A. V. Isaev, I. N. Izosimov, D. E. Katrasev, A. A. Kuznetsova, O. N. Malyshev, A. G. Popeko, Y. A. Popov, E. A. Sokol, A. I. Svirikhin, M. S. Tezekbayeva, A. V. Yeremin, Z. Asfari, O. Dorvaux, B. J. P. Gall, K. Kessaci, D. Ackermann, J. Piot, P. Mosat, and B. Andel, *The European Physical Journal A* **58**, 10.1140/epja/s10050-021-00657-8 (2022).
- [28] F.P.Heßberger, S.Hofmann, V.Ninov, P.Armbruster, H.Folger, G.Münzenberg, H.J.Schött, A.G.Popeko, A.V.Yeremin, A.N.Andreyev, and S.Saro, *Z. Phys. A* **359**, 415 (1997).
- [29] C. Morse, *Nuclear Data Sheets* **189**, 111 (2023).
- [30] A. Lopez-Martens, K. Hauschild, A. I. Svirikhin, Z. Asfari, M. L. Chelnokov, V. I. Chepigin, O. Dorvaux, M. Forge, B. Gall, A. V. Isaev, I. N. Izosimov, K. Kessaci, A. A. Kuznetsova, O. N. Malyshev, R. S. Mukhin, A. G. Popeko, Y. A. Popov, B. Sailaubekov,

- E. A. Sokol, M. S. Tezekbayeva, and A. V. Yerebin, *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, L021306 (2022).
- [31] M. S. Tezekbayeva, A. V. Yerebin, A. I. Svirikhin, A. Lopez-Martens, M. L. Chelnokov, V. I. Chepigin, A. V. Isaev, I. N. Izosimov, A. V. Karpov, A. A. Kuznetsova, O. N. Malyshev, R. S. Mukhin, A. G. Popeko, Y. A. Popov, V. A. Rachkov, B. S. Sailaubekov, E. A. Sokol, K. Hauschild, H. Jacob, R. Chakma, O. Dorvaux, M. Forge, B. Gall, K. Kessaci, B. Andel, S. Antalic, A. Bronis, and P. Mosat, *The European Physical Journal A* **58**, 10.1140/epja/s10050-022-00707-9 (2022).