

Symplectic symmetry approach to clustering in atomic nuclei: The case of ^{24}Mg

H. G. Ganev^{1,2}

¹*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia*

²*Institute of Mechanics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria*

Symplectic symmetry approach to clustering (SSAC) in atomic nuclei, recently proposed, is modified and further developed in more detail. It is firstly applied to the light two-cluster $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha$ system of ^{24}Mg , the latter exhibiting well developed low-energy $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ rotational bands in its spectrum. A simple algebraic Hamiltonian, consisting of dynamical symmetry, residual and vertical mixing parts is used to describe these three lowest rotational bands of positive and negative parity in ^{24}Mg . A good description of the excitation energies is obtained by considering only the $SU(3)$ cluster states restricted to the stretched many-particle Hilbert subspace, built on the leading Pauli allowed $SU(3)$ multiplet for the positive- and negative-parity states, respectively. The coupling to the higher cluster-model configurations allows to describe the known low-lying experimentally observed $B(E2)$ transition probabilities within and between the cluster states of the three bands under consideration without the use of an effective charge.

PACS number(s): 21.10.Re, 21.60.Gx, 21.60.Fw, 23.20.Lv, 23.20.-g, 27.30.+t

I. INTRODUCTION

It is known that in nuclear structure physics there are three fundamental models [1–7] describing nuclear states, which are based on different physical ideas about the structure of the nucleus. These models, in their simplest formulation, are the shell model [8], the cluster model [3, 4, 9] and the collective model [5]. The shell model suggests that the atomic nucleus is something like a small atom, the cluster model suggests that it is like a molecule, and the collective model says that it is like a microscopic liquid drop. Decay properties and nuclear reactions are most naturally interpreted within the framework of different cluster models based on the molecular picture of the structure of atomic nucleus. The most fundamental of these three models is, however, the nuclear shell model representing the atomic nucleus as a proton-neutron nuclear system endowed with microscopic antisymmetric wave functions and described within the framework of standard multifermion quantum mechanics. The shell model, in a wider sense, provides a general microscopic framework, in which other models of nuclear structure can be founded and microscopically interpreted.

The main connections between the three types of nuclear structure models were discovered already in the 1950's. Elliott [10] has showed how quadrupole deformation and collective rotation can be derived from the spherical shell model, in which the collective states of the rotational band are determined by their $SU(3)$ symmetry. Wildermuth and Kanellopoulos [11], in turn, have established a connection between the cluster and shell models based on the Hamiltonian of a three-dimensional harmonic oscillator. In this case, the wave function of the one model is expressed as a linear combination of the wave functions of the another model. This connection has been interpreted by Bayman and Bohr [12] in terms of the $SU(3)$ symmetry. As a consequence of this, the cluster

states are also selected from the model space of the shell model by their specific $SU(3)$ symmetry. In this way, the mutual relationship between the three fundamental models of nuclear structure has been established in terms of the $SU(3)$ symmetry for the case of a single shell. Recently, such a connection between the shell, cluster and collective models has been established for the multi-shell case using the $U_x(3) \otimes U_y(3) \supset U(3)$ dynamical symmetry chain [13, 14], which appears to be a common intersection. All this demonstrates the crucial role played by the $U(3)$ (or $SU(3)$) symmetry of the three-dimensional harmonic oscillator.

There are various types of cluster models, which can be separated into two types – phenomenological and microscopic. In different cluster models the corresponding degrees of freedom can be divided into two categories, related to: 1) the relative motion of the clusters; and 2) their internal structure. Especially powerful are the algebraic models, based on the use of spectrum generating algebras (SGA) and dynamical groups [15]. Further we will restrict our consideration only to the algebraic nuclear models.

In algebraic models all model observables, such as Hamiltonian and transition operators, are expressed in terms of the elements of a Lie algebra of observables. Moreover, the symmetry approach appears as an unifying concept of different nuclear structure models by exploiting their algebraic structures. As was mentioned, the most fundamental model of nuclear structure is the nuclear shell model (see, e.g., [8]). Then, a certain nuclear structure model becomes a submodel of the shell model if its dynamical group is expressed as a subgroup of a dynamical group of the shell model. The full Lie algebra of observables of the shell model is huge (actually, infinite), which is the reason for making the shell model (with major-shell mixing) an unsolvable problem and for seeking of its tractable approximations. Fortunately, it has a subalgebra which is easier to manage – the Lie algebra of all one-body operators. The corresponding dynamical group is then the group of one-body unitary transformations. An example of a complete al-

gebraic model that is a submodel of the shell model is provided by the Elliott $SU(3)$ model [10] of nuclear rotations for the light sd -shell nuclei. Another example is provided by the embedding of the Bohr-Mottelson collective model [5] into the one- [16, 17] or two-component proton-neutron [18, 19] microscopic shell model nuclear theory.

Symmetry, particularly the permutational symmetry, allows also to distinguish the phenomenological nuclear structure models from the microscopic ones. It is well known that a characteristic feature that distinguishes between the two groups (phenomenological and microscopic) is provided by the Pauli principle. The models are referred to as microscopic if they fulfil the Pauli principle, which originates from the fermion nature of atomic nucleus. For phenomenological models the situation is opposite – they do not respect the Pauli principle, i.e. the composite fermion structure of the nucleus is not taken into account. The important role of the Pauli principle in the cluster models of nuclei has well been demonstrated recently in Ref. [20]. Examples of algebraic phenomenological cluster models are provided by the nuclear vibron model (NVM) [21–25], the algebraic cluster model (ACM) [26–29], whereas the microscopic cluster models are represented by the semimicroscopic algebraic cluster model (SACM) [30, 31], the semimicroscopic algebraic quartet model (SAQM) [32].

Recently, a microscopic algebraic cluster model based on the symplectic symmetry has been proposed [33]. In the latter work, considering the $^{16}\text{O} + \alpha \rightarrow ^{20}\text{Ne}$ two-cluster system, the equivalence of the new approach to the SACM has been demonstrated. The approach of Ref.[33] has not been, however, yet practically applied to the description of cluster states in specific nuclear system. Thus, it is the purpose of the present work to test the new approach, which we term the symplectic symmetry approach to clustering (SSAC), to a real nuclear system. As a such system, we choose the two-cluster system $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha \rightarrow ^{24}\text{Mg}$. In contrast to the case of $^{16}\text{O} + \alpha \rightarrow ^{20}\text{Ne}$ considered in [33], one of the clusters here is characterized by a non-scalar $U_C(3)$ representation. In addition, ^{24}Mg exhibits in the experimentally observed low-lying spectrum well developed $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ rotational bands. The nucleus ^{24}Mg has been studied within the framework of different algebraic nuclear structure models. For instance, it has been studied long time ago within the nuclear $SU(3)$ shell model [34]. In Refs.[35, 36] the low-lying structure of the ground and γ rotational bands in ^{24}Mg has been investigated within the framework of the microscopic $Sp(6, R)$ symplectic model (sometimes referred to as a microscopic collective model), whereas in Ref.[37] this nucleus has been studied within the SACM considering the single $^{12}\text{C} + ^{12}\text{C} \rightarrow ^{24}\text{Mg}$ channel, including both the low-lying and the high-energy quasi-molecular resonance states. For different cluster model approaches to ^{24}Mg see, e.g., the detailed list of relevant references given in [37]. In the present work we consider only the low-energy excited states of the lowest $K^\pi = 0_1^+$,

$K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands, observed in the experimental spectrum of ^{24}Mg .

II. THEORETICAL APPROACH

Consider an A -body (one-component) nuclear system, which can be described in terms of $m = A - 1$ translationally invariant relative Jacobi coordinates q_{is} . This allows us to avoid the problem of the center-of-mass motion from the very beginning. All bilinear Hermitian combinations of the Jacobi position q_{is} and momentum p_{is} ($i = 1, 2, 3$; $s = 1, 2, \dots, m$) coordinates generate $Sp(6m, R)$ – the full dynamical group of the whole nuclear system. The $Sp(6m, R)$ group contains different kinds of possible motions – collective, internal, cluster, etc., which can be obtained by reducing it in different ways. By doing this, one performs a separation of the $3m$ nuclear many-particle fermion variables $\{q\}$ into kinematical (internal) and dynamical (collective) ones, i.e. $\{q\} = \{q_D, q_K\}$. According to this, the many-particle nuclear wave functions can be represented, respectively, as consisting of collective and internal components [33]

$$\Psi(q) = \sum_{\eta} \Theta_{\eta}(q_D) \chi_{\eta}(q_K). \quad (1)$$

For example, the (one-component) symplectic symmetry approach to clustering in atomic nuclei for a two-cluster nuclear system was firstly introduced by considering the chain [33]:

$$\begin{aligned} & Sp(6(A-1), R) \\ & \supset Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6(A_1-1), R) \otimes Sp(6(A_2-1), R) \\ & \supset Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_{A_1-1} \otimes O(A_1-1) \\ & \quad \otimes Sp(6, R)_{A_2-1} \otimes O(A_2-1) \\ & \supset U_R(3) \otimes U_{A_1-1}(3) \otimes U_{A_2-1}(3) \otimes S_{A_1} \otimes S_{A_2} \\ & \quad [n_R, 0, 0] [n_1^{C_1}, n_2^{C_1}, n_3^{C_1}] [n_1^{C_2}, n_2^{C_2}, n_3^{C_2}] \quad f_1 \quad f_2 \\ & \supset U_R(3) \otimes U_C(3) \\ & \quad [n_R, 0, 0] [n_1^C, n_2^C, n_3^C] \\ & \supset U(3) \supset SU(3) \supset SO(3). \quad (2) \\ & [N_1, N_2, N_3] \quad (\lambda, \mu) \quad \kappa \quad L \end{aligned}$$

The groups $Sp(6, R)_R$, $Sp(6(A_1-1), R)$ and $Sp(6(A_2-1), R)$ are related to the intercluster, first and second cluster system degrees of freedom, respectively. The intercluster relative motion of the two clusters is described by one of the $(A-1)$ relative Jacobi vectors, denote it by \mathbf{q}^R , whereas the rest $(A-2)$ Jacobi vectors are related

to the internal states of the two clusters. $Sp(6, R)_{A_\alpha-1}$ subgroups with $\alpha = 1, 2$ in $Sp(6, R)_{A_\alpha-1} \otimes O(A_\alpha - 1) \subset Sp(6(A_\alpha - 1), R)$ are the dynamical groups of collective excitations of the two clusters (referred also to as internal cluster excitations), while the groups $O(A_\alpha - 1)$ allow to ensure the proper permutational symmetries of both clusters.

According to the reduction chain (2), corresponding to the case of two-cluster nuclear system ($A = A_1 + A_2$), the well-known resonating group method (RGM) ansatz [3]

$$\Psi(q) = \mathcal{A}\{\phi_1(A_1 - 1)\phi_2(A_2 - 1)f(\mathbf{q}^R)\}, \quad (3)$$

can be related to Eq.(1) by making the following identifications: $\chi_\eta(q_K) = \phi_1(A_1 - 1)\phi_2(A_2 - 1)$ and $\Theta_\eta(q_D) = f(\mathbf{q}^R)$. In the present work, however, we consider the following modified coupling scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} & Sp(6(A-1), R) \\ & \supset Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6(A_1 - 1), R) \otimes Sp(6(A_2 - 1), R) \\ & \supset Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C \otimes O(A-2) \\ & \quad \langle \sigma^R \rangle \quad \langle \sigma^C \rangle \\ & \quad \cup n_{R\rho R} \quad \cup n_{C\rho C} \\ & \quad U_R(3) \otimes U_C(3) \supset \\ & \quad [E_1^R, 0, 0] \quad [E_1^C, E_2^C, E_3^C] \\ & \supset U(3) \quad \supset \quad SO(3), \quad (4) \\ & [E_1, E_2, E_3] \quad \kappa \quad L \end{aligned}$$

which turns out to be more convenient for our further considerations and is directly related to the symplectic symmetry associated with the cluster effects in atomic nuclei. We note that $Sp(6, R)_C \equiv Sp(6, R)_{C_1} \otimes Sp(6, R)_{C_2}$ and $O(A-2) \equiv O(A_1 - 1) \otimes O(A_2 - 1)$ are direct-product groups. If we consider the $(A-1)$ system as a whole, not separated into clusters, then the relevant reduction of the full dynamical group $Sp(6(A-1), R)$ is provided by the chain $Sp(6(A-1), R) \supset Sp(6, R) \otimes O(A-1)$, which defines the (one-component) $Sp(6, R)$ symplectic collective model [38] with six microscopic collective (dynamical) and $3(A-1)-6$ internal (kinematical) degrees of freedom [39-42]. Then the permutational symmetry is ensured by the symmetric group S_A through the reduction $O(A-1) \supset S_A$. Similarly, the permutational symmetry of the two clusters is ensured by the chains $O(A_1 - 1) \supset S_{A_1}$ and $O(A_2 - 1) \supset S_{A_2}$, respectively.

Introducing the standard creation and annihilation operators of three-dimensional harmonic oscillator quanta

$$\begin{aligned} b_i^{\dagger R} &= \sqrt{\frac{\mu\omega_R}{2\hbar}} \left(q_i^R - \frac{i}{\mu\omega_R} p_i^R \right), \\ b_i^R &= \sqrt{\frac{\mu\omega_R}{2\hbar}} \left(q_i^R + \frac{i}{\mu\omega_R} p_i^R \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

the group of intercluster excitations $Sp(6, R)_R$ can be represented by means of the following set of generators

$$\begin{aligned} F_{ij}^R &= b_i^{\dagger R} b_j^{\dagger R}, \quad G_{ij}^R = b_i^R b_j^R, \quad (6) \\ A_{ij}^R &= \frac{1}{2} (b_i^{\dagger R} b_j^R + b_i^R b_j^{\dagger R}) \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

in the form $Sp(6, R)_R = \{F_{ij}^R, G_{ij}^R, A_{ij}^R\}$. In Eq.(5) $\mu = \left(\frac{A_1 A_2}{A_1 + A_2}\right)M$ is the reduced mass and we chose $\omega_R = \left(\frac{A_1 + A_2}{A_1 A_2}\right)\omega$, so that for the oscillator length parameter we obtain $b_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{\mu\omega_R}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{M\omega}}$. As can be seen, the operators (6) create or annihilate a pair of oscillator quanta, whereas the operators (7) preserve the number of quanta and generate the subgroup $U_R(3) \subset Sp(6, R)_R$. In this way, the $Sp(6, R)_R$ generators of intercluster excitations can change the number of oscillator quanta by either 0 or 2. Thus, acting on the ground state by the $Sp(6, R)_R$ generators one can produce only the positive-parity $SU(3)$ cluster-model states of even oscillator quanta only. The negative-parity cluster-model states, in turn, consist of odd number of oscillator quanta and are associated with the $SU(3)$ basis states of the odd irreps of the group $Sp(6, R)_R$. Alternatively, one may consider the slightly extended semi-direct product group $[HW(3)_R]Sp(6, R)_R = \{F_{ij}^R, G_{ij}^R, A_{ij}^R, b_i^{\dagger R}, b_i^R, I\}$, consisting of the $Sp(6, R)_R$ and $HW(3)_R = \{b_i^{\dagger R}, b_i^R, I\}$ generators. In this way, by acting on the ground state by the $WSp(6, R)_R = [HW(3)_R]Sp(6, R)_R$ generators one generates the cluster-model states of both even and odd number of oscillator quanta by changing the number of oscillator quanta by 0, 1 and 2. The latter considerations can be made rigorous by replacing the group $Sp(6(A-1), R)$ in (2) by $[HW(3(A-1))]Sp(6(A-1), R)$, which will be the maximal dynamical group for the whole A -nucleon nuclear system. We note also that the $WSp(6, R)_R = [HW(3)_R]Sp(6, R)_R$ group contains, in contrast to the group $Sp(6, R)_R$, the $E1$ dipole operator among its generators, which actually couples the even and odd $Sp(6, R)_R$ irreps.

Similarly one obtains the oscillator realizations for the dynamical group of collective (internal cluster or major shell) excitations of the two clusters $Sp(6, R)_C = \{F_{ij}^C = \sum_{s=1}^{A-2} b_{is}^{\dagger} b_{js}^{\dagger}, G_{ij}^C = \sum_{s=1}^{A-2} b_{is} b_{js}, A_{ij}^C = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{A-2} (b_{is}^{\dagger} b_{js} + b_{is} b_{js}^{\dagger})\}$ in terms of the harmonic oscillator creation and annihilation operators

$$\begin{aligned} b_{is}^{\dagger} &= \sqrt{\frac{M\omega}{2\hbar}} \left(q_{is} - \frac{i}{M\omega} p_{is} \right), \\ b_{is} &= \sqrt{\frac{M\omega}{2\hbar}} \left(q_{is} + \frac{i}{M\omega} p_{is} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $i, j = 1, 2, 3$, $s = 1, 2, \dots, A-2$ and M is the nucleon mass. Actually, this realization of the $Sp(6, R)_C \equiv Sp(6, R)_{C_1} \otimes Sp(6, R)_{C_2}$ group corresponds to the case when its $C_1 X_{C_1} + C_2 X_{C_2}$ generators (with $X_1 \in Sp(6, R)_{C_1}$ and $X_2 \in Sp(6, R)_{C_2}$) are taken in the form

$X_{C_1} + X_{C_2}$, i.e. when $C_1 = C_2 = 1$. This particular case corresponds to the reduction $Sp(6, R)_{C_1} \otimes Sp(6, R)_{C_2} \supset Sp(6, R)_{C_1+C_2}$. If required, one can consider the symplectic groups related separately to each cluster, i.e. $Sp(6, R)_{C_\alpha} = \{F_{ij}^{C_\alpha} = \sum_{s=1}^{A_\alpha-1} b_{is}^\dagger b_{js}^\dagger, G_{ij}^{C_\alpha} = \sum_{s=1}^{A_\alpha-1} b_{is} b_{js}, A_{ij}^{C_\alpha} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{A_\alpha-1} (b_{is}^\dagger b_{js} + b_{is} b_{js}^\dagger)\}$ with $\alpha = 1, 2$.

The symplectic basis states of the R - or C -subsystems are determined by the $Sp(6, R)_\alpha$ ($\alpha = R, C$) lowest-weight state $|\sigma^\alpha\rangle$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij}^\alpha |\sigma^\alpha\rangle &= 0, \\ A_{ij}^\alpha |\sigma^\alpha\rangle &= 0, \quad i < j \\ A_{ii}^\alpha |\sigma^\alpha\rangle &= \left(\sigma_i^\alpha + \frac{m_\alpha}{2}\right) |\sigma^\alpha\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and are classified by the following reduction chain

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Sp(6, R)_\alpha & \supset & U_\alpha(3). \\ \langle \sigma^\alpha \rangle & n_\alpha \rho_\alpha & [E_1^\alpha, E_2^\alpha, E_3^\alpha]_3 \end{array} \quad (10)$$

For the R -subsystem $n_R = \rho_R = m_R = 1$ and the allowed $U_R(3)$ irreps are only fully symmetric, i.e. of the type $[E^R, 0, 0]_3$. Similarly, for the C -subsystem $m_C = A - 2$ and the $U_C(3)$ irreps are of general type $[E_1^C, E_2^C, E_3^C]_3$. The $Sp(6, R)_\alpha$ basis states can then be represented in the following coupled form

$$|\Psi(\sigma^\alpha n_\alpha \rho_\alpha E^\alpha \eta_\alpha)\rangle = [P^{(n_\alpha)}(F^\alpha) \times |\sigma^\alpha\rangle]_{n_\alpha}^{\rho E^\alpha}, \quad (11)$$

where $E^\alpha = [E_1^\alpha, E_2^\alpha, E_3^\alpha]_3$ denotes the coupled $U_\alpha(3)$ irrep and ρ_α is a multiplicity label of its appearance in the product $n \otimes \sigma^\alpha$ with $n^\alpha = [n_1^\alpha, n_2^\alpha, n_3^\alpha]_3$ and $\sigma^\alpha = [\sigma_1^\alpha, \sigma_2^\alpha, \sigma_3^\alpha]_3$. Finally, the symbol η_α labels basis states of the group $U_\alpha(3)$. Hence, the total wave functions of the whole two-cluster system with respect to the whole chain (4) can be written in an $U(3)$ -coupled form as $\Psi = [\Psi_R \times \Psi_C]_{kLM}^{\rho E}$ with the identifications: $\Psi_R = f(\mathbf{q}^R)$, $\Psi_C = \phi(A - 2)$ and $\phi(A - 2) = \phi_1(A_1 - 1)\phi_2(A_2 - 1)$.

Generally, the physical operators of interest (e.g., Hamiltonian and transition operators) within the fully algebraic approach should be expressed through the generators of different subgroups in (4). For instance, the quadrupole generators of the groups $Sp(6, R)_R$ and $Sp(6, R)_C$ can be written in the form

$$Q_{ij}^R = q_i^R q_j^R = A_{ij}^R + \frac{1}{2}(F_{ij}^R + G_{ij}^R), \quad (12)$$

$$Q_{ij}^C = \sum_{s=1}^{A-2} q_{is} q_{js} = A_{ij}^C + \frac{1}{2}(F_{ij}^C + G_{ij}^C). \quad (13)$$

Additionally, to obtain the charge quadrupole operators, the cluster subsystem quadrupole operators Q_{ij}^C must be multiplied by the factor $e_{eff}(Z - 1)/(A - 2)$. The total charge quadrupole operator of the whole system, according to the group part $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ of (4), can be represented as

$$Q_{ij} = \alpha_1 Q_{ij}^R + \alpha_2 Q_{ij}^C. \quad (14)$$

The equal strengths $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$ would correspond to the chain $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C \supset Sp(6, R)$, which differs from the chain (4) with obvious identifications $\alpha_1 = e_{eff}$ and $\alpha_2 = e_{eff}(Z - 1)/(A - 2)$ (i.e. $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$). Alternatively, according to the group part $U_R(3) \otimes U_C(3)$ of (4), one could consider as a transition operator only the $SU(3)$ components of the charge quadrupole operator

$$\tilde{Q}_{ij} = e_{eff} A_{ij}^R + e_{eff} \left(\frac{Z - 1}{A - 2}\right) A_{ij}^C. \quad (15)$$

In spherical coordinates the latter operators become

$$\tilde{Q}_{2m} = \sqrt{3} \left(e_{eff} A_{2m}^R + e_{eff} \left(\frac{Z - 1}{A - 2}\right) A_{2m}^C \right). \quad (16)$$

At this point we want to make a comment, concerning the other approaches to clustering in atomic nuclei that are more or less *related* to the symplectic symmetry. The relation of the $Sp(6, R)$ and α -cluster model states has been done in Refs.[43–45], using complicated overlap integrals between the symplectic and cluster bases. In Refs.[43, 44] it has been demonstrated that the α -cluster and $Sp(6, R)$ states are essentially complementary with decreasing overlap with the increase of the oscillator quanta excitations $2n\hbar\omega$. Sometimes, subsets of the full set of the $SU(3)$ basis states, contained in the $Sp(6, R)$ irreducible spaces, are used in the practical applications. In this respect, the $Sp(2, R) \subset Sp(6, R)$ [46] and $Sp(4, R) \subset Sp(6, R)$ submodels [47] represent the giant resonance collective excitations along the z -direction or the z and x directions, respectively. The connection of the α -cluster and $Sp(2, R)$ states has been investigated in Refs.[48, 49] for the case of ^8Be , again confirming their complementary nature. The $Sp(2, R)$ and $Sp(4, R)$ symplectic models of nuclear structure, however, don't contain an $SO(3)$ subgroup, which requires the usage of sophisticated angular-momentum projection techniques (often combined with the complicated generator coordinate method (GCM) [50] calculation of the Hamiltonian and norm overlap kernels). Recently, the no-core symplectic model (NCSpM) [51, 52] with the $Sp(6, R)$ symmetry has been used to study the many-body dynamics that gives rise to the ground state rotational band together with phenomena tied to alpha-clustering substructures in the low-lying states in ^{12}C [51, 53, 54]. Actually, the approach of Refs.[51, 53, 54] exploits the symplectic symmetry, related to clustering, indirectly by using the complicated technique of Y. Suzuki [44] for computing, just as in Refs.[43–45], the overlaps between the complementary symplectic shell model and cluster model bases to project the cluster wave functions out of the NCSpM [51, 52] (or *ab initio* symmetry-adapted no-core shell model (SA-NCSM) [53, 55]) microscopic wave functions. The NCSpM differs from the standard $Sp(6, R)$ symplectic model of Rosensteel and Rowe [38], proposed for description of the quadrupole collectivity of atomic nuclei, only by the type of nuclear interactions exploited in the calculations. Thus, using the overlap technique [44], the

cluster wave functions can be projected out of the standard $Sp(6, R)$ model instead of those of the NCSpM. In this way the symplectic symmetry of Refs. [51, 53, 54] is actually related to the standard $Sp(6, R)$ model [38] of quadrupole collectivity and the cluster effects in atomic nuclei are implicitly included by considering sufficiently large model symplectic spaces able to describe spatially expanded nuclear configurations (high-lying np-nh excitations). In contrast, the microscopic cluster-model type wave functions within the present SSAC are computed directly, using the symplectic symmetry (even for the 0p-0h valence subspace). As can be seen from Eq.(4), the symplectic symmetry appears at many levels within the present approach and is associated with both the intercluster and intracluster (internal) nuclear excitations. We note also that the $SU_R(3) \otimes SU_C(3) \supset SU(3)$ underlying substructure of various cluster models, i.e. the $SU(3)$ -based RGM, has first been considered in [56].

The $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ group structure exploited in a full account in the present paper, to our knowledge, has never been used in the literature. In this way, in contrast to the Refs. [43–45, 51, 53, 54] in which the overlaps between the cluster model and the $Sp(6, R)$ model wave functions have been calculated in the attempt to "unify" these two models of nuclear excitations (and revealing their complementary character), the present work introduces a fully algebraic *cluster model* that is directly based on the symplectic symmetry. Through the $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ group substructure, the conventional $Sp(6, R)$ (associated now with the group $Sp(6, R)_C$) symplectic excitations, related to the quadrupole collectivity in atomic nuclei, are also naturally incorporated in a purely algebraic and self-consistent way within the present SSAC. In the limiting case of no clustering, the group of the whole system $Sp(6(A-1), R)$ reduces to $Sp(6, R) \otimes O(A-1)$, i.e. we obtain the $Sp(6(A-1), R) \supset Sp(6, R) \otimes O(A-1)$ group structure, by means of which the standard $Sp(6, R)$ symplectic model of quadrupole collectivity is recovered.

III. PHYSICAL OPERATORS AND BASIS STATES

A. Hamiltonian

A typical shell-model Hamiltonian within the fully algebraic symplectic symmetry approach can be represented in the form

$$H = H_0 + V(F, G, A) + H_{res}, \quad (17)$$

where H_0 is the three-dimensional harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian and $V(F, G, A)$ is a potential, which can be expressed by mean of the symplectic generators F, G, A of the $Sp(6, R)_R$ and $Sp(6, R)_C$ groups. In particular, the interaction, related to the intercluster relative motion, can be represented by means of the $Sp(6, R)_R$ generators only as $V = V(F_{ij}^R, G_{ij}^R, A_{ij}^R)$. H_0 corresponds to the mean

field and determines the shell structure of the nuclear system. It orders the shell-model states with respect to the number of oscillator quanta. Within a given oscillator shell the oscillator states are degenerated, but the introduction of the potential $V(F, G, A)$ splits them in energy. H_{res} is a residual part, not included in $V(F, G, A)$. We note also that a large class of microscopic cluster-model Hamiltonians of the type

$$H = H_{C_1} + H_{C_2} + T(q_R) + V(q_{C_1}, q_{C_2}, q_R), \quad (18)$$

with $q_{C_1} = (q_1, \dots, q_{A_1-1})$ and $q_{C_2} = (q_1, \dots, q_{A_2-1})$, can be expressed in the algebraic form (17) by means of the elements of the corresponding symplectic dynamical groups.

B. E2 transition operator

As E2 transition operators we chose

$$T_{2M}^{E2} = \sqrt{\frac{5}{16\pi}} \left[e_{eff} Q_{2M}^R + e_{eff} \left(\frac{Z-1}{A-2} \right) Q_{2M}^C \right], \quad (19)$$

which generally have both (internal) cluster and intercluster excitation components. $Q_{2M}^R = \sqrt{3} \left[A_{2M}^R + \frac{1}{2} (F_{2M}^R + G_{2M}^R) \right]$ and $Q_{2M}^C = \sqrt{3} \left[A_{2M}^C + \frac{1}{2} (F_{2M}^C + G_{2M}^C) \right]$ are the quadrupole generators of the groups $Sp(6, R)_R$ and $Sp(6, R)_C$, respectively. We recall that $Sp(6, R)_R$ represents the intercluster excitations, whereas $Sp(6, R)_C$ is associated with the internal cluster excitations. In the case of unchanged internal cluster structure, only the in-shell $SU(3)$ components $\tilde{Q}_{2M}^C = \sqrt{3} A_{2M}^C$ of Q_{2M}^C , which does not affect the internal structure, will contribute to the $B(E2)$ transition probabilities. In present approach, we use the bare electric charge, i.e. $e_{eff} = e$. We point out that within the cluster models the full quadrupole operators associated with the intercluster excitations, i.e. the symplectic $Sp(6, R)_R$ generators Q_{2M}^R only (without the Q_{2M}^C components; cf. Eq.(19)), were used as E2 transition operators in Refs. [58, 59] in contrast to the widely exploited in-shell or $SU(3)$ components [14, 32, 60, 61]. We note also that in Ref.[57] the in-shell $SU_R(3)$ quadrupole operators \tilde{Q}_{2M}^R are multiplied by the factor $\left(\frac{e_{eff}Z}{A} \right)$, which in our opinion is redundant since the intercluster motion is associated with the single relative Jacobi vector \mathbf{q}^R (hence the related charge factor of the R -subsystem is simply e_{eff} since $A_R = Z_R = 1$).

We stress that for light nuclei the quadrupole moment Q_{2M} usually is multiplied by the numerical factor $\sqrt{\frac{5}{16\pi}}$ [10, 34–36, 57], i.e. one uses $T_{2M}^{E2} = \sqrt{\frac{5}{16\pi}} \left(\frac{e_{eff}Z}{A} \right) Q_{2M}$. This factor distinguishes the form of the quadrupole operator from that which is commonly used in the shell model, in which $T_{2M}^{E2} = \left(\frac{e_{eff}Z}{A} \right) Q_{2M}$ [2, 8, 62, 63]. We recall that the units of Q_{2M} are in b_0^2 , where $b_0 = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{M\omega}}$




FIG. 1: (Color online) Function $WU[A] = (1.010A^{1/6})^4 \frac{1}{(5.940 \times 10^{-2})A^{4/3}}$, representing the Weisskopf units, as a function of the even values of the mass number A in the range 2 – 200.

is the standard oscillator length parameter. Then, using the bare electric charge $e_{eff} = e$, one obtains the charge quadrupole moments $\left(\frac{eZ}{A}\right)Q_{2M}$ in units of eb_0^2 . Making use of the expression for the harmonic oscillator length $b_0 = 1.010A^{1/6} \text{ fm}$ [2], the units of charge quadrupole moments become efm^2 . To obtain the $B(E2)$ transition strengths in Weisskopf units, one thus must multiply the corresponding expression by the numerical factor $WU = (1.010A^{1/6})^4 \frac{1}{(5.940 \times 10^{-2})A^{4/3}}$. This factor as a function of even A values in the range 2 – 200 is shown in Fig. 1, from which it can be seen that for light nuclei it produces too huge values. In this respect, the factor $\frac{5}{16\pi}$ entering in the expression for the $B(E2)$ values will reduce the latter approximately 10 times. When an effective charge is used, the numerical factor $\sqrt{\frac{5}{16\pi}}$ is irrelevant. But it is crucial in obtaining the proper experimentally observed $B(E2)$ values when no effective charge is used. Otherwise, too huge values are obtained for the light nuclei due to the large values of the WU factor given above. For instance, for $A = 20 - 24$, $WU[A] \simeq 2.2$, while for $A \approx 100$, $WU[A] \simeq 0.8$. This means that the $B(E2)$ values for light sd -shell nuclei with $A = 20 - 24$ will be about three times larger compared to the $B(E2)$ values for heavy nuclei with $A \approx 100$. For example, assuming a pure $SU(3)$ structure $(8, 4)$, the $B(E2)$ transition probability produced by the transition operator (19) without the factor $\sqrt{\frac{5}{16\pi}}$ is 124.7 W.u., which is too huge compared to the experimental value 20.3 W.u. Using a vertical mixing of different $SU(3)$ states, corresponding to the relative motion cluster excitations, will increase the $B(E2)$ values even more dramatically. The same kind of dramatic difference will be obtained for lighter nuclei from the s and p major shells without the factor $\sqrt{\frac{5}{16\pi}}$ in the definition of the $E2$ transition operator (19).

C. Basis states

The basis along the reduction chain (4) can be written in the form

$$[\Gamma; [E_R, 0, 0]_3, [E_1^C, E_2^C, E_3^C]_3; [E_1, E_2, E_3]_3; \kappa L], \quad (20)$$

where $[E_R, 0, 0]_3$, $[E_1^C, E_2^C, E_3^C]_3$, $[E_1, E_2, E_3]_3$, and L denote the irreducible representations of the $U_R(3)$, $U_C(3)$, $U(3)$, and $SO(3)$ groups, respectively. The symbol Γ labels the set of remaining quantum numbers of other subgroups in (4), and κ is a multiplicity label in the reduction $U(3) \supset SO(3)$. Using the standard Elliott's notations $(\lambda_R, \mu_R) = (E_R, 0)$, $(\lambda_C = E_1^C - E_2^C, \mu_C = E_2^C - E_3^C)$, and $(\lambda = E_1 - E_2, \mu = E_2 - E_3)$ for the various $SU(3)$ subgroups and the relation $N = (E_1 + E_2 + E_3) + 3(A - 1)/2$ for the number of oscillator quanta (including the zero-point motion), the basis (20) can alternatively be presented as

$$[\Gamma N; (E_R, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda, \mu); \kappa L], \quad (21)$$

which turns to be more convenient and will be used in what follows. The matrix elements of different physical operators then can be represented in this basis in terms of the $U(3)$ coupling and recoupling coefficients. The required computational technique for performing a realistic microscopic calculations is shortly presented in the Appendix.

IV. APPLICATION

In the present application, we consider only the $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha \rightarrow ^{24}\text{Mg}$ channel and the ground state configurations of the two clusters, the latter being unchanged as it is assumed in the RGM [3]. The α particle represents a closed-shell nucleus and hence is characterized by the scalar $SU(3)$ irrep $(0, 0)$. The ^{20}Ne cluster has two protons and two neutrons in the valence sd shell. Using the supermultiplet spin-isospin coupling scheme and the codes [64, 65] one easily obtains the following Pauli allowed $SU(3)$ states $(8, 0)$, $(4, 2)$, $(0, 4)$, $(2, 0)$. A common practice is to choose the leading, i.e. maximally deformed $SU(3)$ state, especially for the strongly deformed nuclei. Hence, for the ground-state cluster $SU_C(3)$ irrep (λ_C, μ_C) we obtain $(\lambda_{C1}, \mu_{C1}) \otimes (\lambda_{C2}, \mu_{C2}) = (8, 0) \otimes (0, 0) = (8, 0)$. The Wildermuth condition [3] requires for the minimum Pauli allowed number of oscillator quanta $E_R = 8$ of the intercluster excitations. We note that nonzero values for the minimal value of E_R , in contrast to the case of phenomenological cluster models, in the present microscopic approach means that we have deformed two-cluster nuclear system that can rotate, which crucially changes the traditional interpretation of the $U(3)$ (or, equivalently, $SU(3)$) excitations as being of a pure vibrational nature. Then the $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha$ model space is obtained by the outer product $(E_R, 0) \otimes (\lambda_C, \mu_C)$,

which produces the following set of $SU(3)$ cluster states:

$$(8, 0) \otimes (8, 0) = (16, 0), (14, 1), (12, 2), (10, 3), \\ (8, 4), (6, 5), (4, 6), (2, 7), (0, 8). \quad (22)$$

To obtain the Pauli allowed cluster states, however, one needs to compare them to the standard shell-model $SU(3)$ states of the combined two-cluster system ^{24}Mg . Using again the supermultiplet spin-isospin scheme, the codes [64, 65] for 8 valence nucleons in the sd shell produce the following set: $(8, 4), (7, 3), (8, 1), (4, 6), (5, 4), (6, 2), (3, 5), (4, 3), (5, 1), (0, 8), (2, 4), (3, 2), (4, 0), (1, 3), (0, 2)$. The matching $SU(3)$ condition between the latter and the set (22) defines the Pauli allowed $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha$ cluster model space for the lowest value $E_R = 8$: $(8, 4), (4, 6), (0, 8)$. The relevant $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha$ cluster model space for the lowest values of E_R is given in Table I. The members of each $SU(3)$ multiplet form a rotational-like sequence of levels, which can be interpreted as a "cluster band". Similar considerations, for instance, produce the following Pauli allowed sets of $SU(3)$ states: a) $3(8, 4), 3(7, 3), (8, 1), 2(6, 2), (5, 1), (4, 0)$ and b) $(8, 4)$ for the $^{12}\text{C} + ^{12}\text{C} \rightarrow ^{24}\text{Mg}$ and $^{16}\text{O} + ^8\text{Be} \rightarrow ^{24}\text{Mg}$ channels, respectively.

TABLE I: $SU(3)$ basis states (λ, μ) of the $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha$ cluster model space for ^{24}Mg , classified according to the chain (4), for the lowest values E_R of the intercluster excitations. The multiple appearance is denoted by ϱ .

E_R	$\hbar\omega$	$SU(3)$ IR's $\varrho(\lambda, \mu)$
\vdots	\vdots	\dots
10	2	$(10, 4), (8, 5), 2(6, 6), (9, 3), (7, 4), (8, 2),$ $(4, 7), 2(2, 8), (5, 5), (3, 6), (4, 4),$ $(1, 7), (0, 6),$
9	1	$(9, 4), (7, 5), (8, 3),$ $(5, 6), (3, 7), (4, 5),$ $(1, 8), (0, 7)$
8	0	$(8, 4), (4, 6), (0, 8)$

In the present application we use the following model Hamiltonian of algebraic form

$$H = H_{DS} + H_{res} + H_{vmix}, \quad (23)$$

where the dynamical symmetry Hamiltonian

$$H_{DS} = H_0 + \xi C_2[Sp(6, R)_R] + BC_2[SU(3)] \\ + C(C_2[SU(3)])^2 + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{J}} C_2[SO(3)] \quad (24)$$

is expressed by means of the Casimir operators of different subgroups in the chain (4). The $SU(3)$ Casimir operators in the Hamiltonian (24) will arrange the $0\hbar\omega$ $SU(3)$ irreps in energy with the $(8, 4)$ multiplet becoming the lowest. In order to account for the experimentally

observed bandhead energies of the lowest $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ bands contained in the $(8, 4)$ multiplet, we introduce also a K^2 term, i.e. $H_{res} = bK^2$, which is a common practice. In addition, to take into account the different experimental moments of inertia of various bands we take them energy dependent, i.e. $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_0(1 + \alpha_i E_i)$, where E_i is the excitation energy of the corresponding bandhead. Such energy- and/or spin-dependent moments of inertia of the type $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_0(1 + \alpha_i E_i + \beta L)$ are often used in the literature, e.g. [66–68]. Related to ^{24}Mg , e.g., energy-dependent moments of inertia were used in [37], whereas in [36] the third- and fourth-order $SU(3)$ symmetry-breaking interactions X_3 and X_4 were used to split the degeneracy of the $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ bands, instead of the simpler K^2 operator (which is a special linear combination of the operators X_3, X_4 and L^2) used in the present work and in Ref.[37].




FIG. 2: (Color online) Comparison of the excitation energies of the lowest $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg with experiment [69]. The values of the model parameters are: $\xi = 0.314$, $B = -1.203$, $C = 0.0017$, $b = 0.841$, $v_{mix} = -0.0022$ (in MeV), and $\mathcal{J}_0 = 2.6$, $\alpha_{2_1^+} = 0.076$, and $\alpha_{0_1^-} = 0.145$ (in MeV^{-1}).

The second-order $Sp(6, R)_R$ Casimir operator splits in energy different $Sp(6, R)_R$ irreducible representations. In particular it distinguishes between the even and odd $Sp(6, R)_R$ irreps $\langle \sigma^R \rangle = \langle \sigma_1^R + \frac{1}{2}, \sigma_2^R + \frac{1}{2}, \sigma_3^R + \frac{1}{2} \rangle$, determined by the $Sp(6, R)_R$ lowest-weight state labels $\sigma^R \equiv (\sigma_1^R = E_R, 0, 0)$ or $(\sigma_1^R = E_R + 1, 0, 0)$, which in the present approach correspond to the positive- and negative-parity cluster-model states. The lowest even and odd $Sp(6, R)_R$ irreps can conveniently be denoted simply as $0p-0h [E_R]_3$ and $1p-1h [E'_R]_3$, respectively. They consist respectively of the following $SU(3)$ shell-model states: $E_R, E_R + 2, E_R + 4, \dots$ and $E'_R, E'_R + 2, E'_R + 4, \dots$ with $E'_R = E_R + 1$. These two $Sp(6, R)_R$ irreps can be considered as comprising a single irreducible representation of the semi-direct product group $WSp(6, R)_R = [HW(3)_R]Sp(6, R)_R$ with the set of $SU(3)$ states: $E_R, E_R + 1, E_R + 2, E_R + 3, \dots$. The $Sp(6, R)_R$ Casimir operator within the symplectic representation $\langle \sigma^R \rangle = \langle \sigma_1^R + 1/2, \sigma_2^R + 1/2, \sigma_3^R + 1/2 \rangle$ takes the following eigenvalue [70]:

$$\langle C_2[Sp(6, R)_R] \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^3 \sigma_i(\sigma_i + 8 - 2i). \quad (25)$$

The diagonal part of the Hamiltonian (23), i.e. neglecting the mixing term, thus has the following eigenvalues

$$E = N\hbar\omega + \xi \langle C_2[Sp(6, R)_R] \rangle + B \langle C_2[SU(3)] \rangle + C (\langle C_2[SU(3)] \rangle)^2 + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{J}} L(L+1) + bK^2, \quad (26)$$

where $\langle C_2[SU(3)] \rangle = 2(\lambda^2 + \mu^2 + \lambda\mu + 3\lambda + 3\mu)/3$ is the eigenvalue of the second-order Casimir operator of $SU(3)$ group.

Finally, we introduce a simple vertical mixing term of the algebraic form

$$H_{vmix} = v_{mix} (A_2^R \cdot F_2^R + h.c.), \quad (27)$$

which mixes the $SU_R(3)$ and, hence, the $SU(3)$ irreducible representations only vertically. The vertical mixing interaction (27) corresponds directly to the intercluster excitations. In this way, we diagonalize the model Hamiltonian (23) in the space of stretched $SU(3)$ cluster states only, built on the (8, 4) multiplet (see Table I), up to energy $20\hbar\omega$. The stretched states are the $SU(3)$ cluster states of the type $(\lambda_0 + 2n, \mu_0)$ [16] with $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The results of the diagonalization for the excitation energies of the lowest $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg are compared with experiment [69] in Fig. 2. The values of the model parameters, obtained by fitting to the excitation energies and the $B(E2; 2_1^+ \rightarrow 0_1^+)$ transition strength, are: $\xi = 0.314$, $B = -1.203$, $C = 0.0017$, $b = 0.841$, $v_{mix} = -0.0022$ (in MeV), and $\mathcal{J}_0 = 2.6$, $\alpha_{2_1^+} = 0.076$, and $\alpha_{0_1^-} = 0.145$ (in MeV^{-1}). From the figure one sees a good description of the excitation energies for the three bands under consideration in ^{24}Mg . The description of energy levels of the ground $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ band can be, for instance, improved further by introducing a spin-dependence of the ground-state moment of inertia at the price of introducing one more extra parameter. For instance, in Refs. [35, 36] an L^4 -term has been used, which is known to mimics the effect of a spin-dependent moment of inertia (stretching effect). At first sight, it may seem that too many parameters are used in the present microscopic calculations. In this respect, we point out that the two $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ (ground) and $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ (gamma) bands are described in Refs. [36] and [35] by using 5 and 6 parameters, respectively, which is comparable with the 6 parameters used in the present approach. The extra two parameters in our calculations are used for the description of the additional $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ band of negative parity, determining its experimentally observed excitation band-head energy and moment of inertia, respectively.

In Fig. 3 we show the intraband $B(E2)$ transition probabilities in Weisskopf units between the states of the ground band, compared with the experimental data [69] and the predictions of $Sp(6, R)$ collective model calculations [35, 36] (denoted by $Sp(6, R)$ I and $Sp(6, R)$ II, respectively). From the figure we see practically identical results for the three symplectic approaches, in which no effective charge is used (i.e., $e_{eff} = e$). In addition,




FIG. 3: (Color online) Comparison of the experimental [36, 37, 69] and theoretical intraband $B(E2)$ values in Weisskopf units between the states of the $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ band in ^{24}Mg . For comparison, the theoretical predictions of Refs.[35] ($Sp(6, R)$ I) and [36] ($Sp(6, R)$ II) are given as well.

TABLE II: Comparison of the theoretical interband or intraband $B(E2)$ transition probabilities (in Weisskopf units) for the lowest states of the $K^\pi = 2_1^+$, and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg with the known experimental data [36, 37, 69] and the predictions of Refs.[35, 36] ($Sp(6, R)$ I and $Sp(6, R)$ II), and those of SACM [37]. No effective charge is used in the symplectic based calculations, where for SACM the adopted values $q_R = 1.272$ and $q_C = 1.066$ are used for the transition operator $T_{2M}^{E2} = q_R \tilde{Q}_{2M}^R + q_C \tilde{Q}_{2M}^C$. \tilde{Q}_{2M}^R and \tilde{Q}_{2M}^C are the quadrupole operators of the $SU_R(3)$ and $SU_C(3)$ groups, respectively.

i	f	Exp	Th	$Sp(6, R)$ I	$Sp(6, R)$ II	SACM
2_2^+	0_1^+	1.4(0.3)	2.0	1.3	1.3	1.6
2_2^+	2_1^+	2.7(0.4)	4.3	1.9	2.0	3.2
3_1^+	2_1^+	2.1(0.3)	3.6	2.3	2.2	2.9
4_2^+	2_1^+	1.0(0.2)	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.6
4_2^+	4_1^+	1.0(1.0)	5.1	2.3	2.4	3.9
5_1^+	4_1^+	3.9(0.8)	2.3	2.0	1.9	2.0
6_2^+	4_1^+	0.8($^{+0.8}_{-0.3}$)	0.2	1.0	0.8	0.3
3_1^+	2_2^+	34(6)	34.8	35.3	34.7	37.5
4_2^+	2_2^+	16(3)	11.4	11.0	10.8	11.4
5_1^+	3_1^+	28(5)	17.3	16.6	16.3	17.5
5_1^+	4_2^+	14(6)	17.4	17.7	17.5	19.5
6_2^+	4_2^+	23($^{+23}_{-8}$)	17.6	18.3	17.7	18.1
7_1^+	5_1^+		18.8			19.7
8_2^+	6_2^+	≥ 3	17.9	15.9	14.8	13.7
3_1^-	1_1^-	< 200	23.4			32.0
5_1^-	3_1^-	20($^{+8}_{-5}$)	25.8			34.7
7_1^-	5_1^-	51(10)	24.3			32.3

in Table II we compare the known experimental $B(E2)$ values [36, 37, 69] with the theory for the nonyrast states of the $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg and the predictions of the $Sp(6, R)$ collective model calculations done in Refs.[35, 36] and the SACM calculations of [37].

We specially compare our present symplectic based results with those of the $Sp(6, R)$ collective model. For the quadrupole moment of the excited 2_1^+ state we obtain $Q(2_1^+) = -0.56 eb$, to be compared with the experimental value $-0.29(3) eb$ [71], respectively. From Fig. 3 and Table II one sees practically equal description of the $B(E2)$ transition strengths from the states of the $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg within the different theoretical approaches. In the present and the $Sp(6, R)$ collective-model results, no effective charge has been used, in contrast to those of the SACM approach.




FIG. 4: $SU(3)$ decomposition of the wave functions for the cluster states of the lowest $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg for different angular momentum values.

In Fig. 4 we give the $SU(3)$ decomposition of the wave functions for the cluster-model states of the $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg for different angular momentum values. From the figure, we see a similar structure for the cluster states of the three bands with predominant contribution of the $0\hbar\omega/1\hbar\omega$ $SU(3)$ multiplet $(8, 4)/(9, 4)$ and some admixtures due to the mixing to the excited cluster $SU(3)$ configurations. A similar microscopic structure for the wave functions for the states of the $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ bands is obtained in Refs.[35, 36] within the $Sp(6, R)$ collective model. From the figure, one can see also that the $SU(3)$ decomposition coefficients are approximately angular-momentum independent (especially for the states of the $K^\pi = 2_1^+$, and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands). The latter indicates the presence of a new type of symmetry, referred to as a quasi-dynamical symmetry in the sense of Refs.[72, 73]. Hence, despite of the mixing of the $SU(3)$ cluster-model basis states, the microscopic structure of the experimentally observed cluster states of the three bands under consideration shows the presence of an approximate $SU(3)$ quasi-dynamical symmetry.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In the present paper, the recently proposed SSAC has been modified and applied for the first time to a specific two-cluster nuclear system, namely to ^{24}Mg . We have considered the single channel $^{20}\text{Ne} + \alpha \rightarrow ^{24}\text{Mg}$ for the microscopic description of the low-lying cluster states of the lowest $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg . According to the RGM [3], the internal structure of the two clusters is considered unchanged. This situation closely resembles the case of different rotational bands within the framework of different models of nuclear collective motion, in which the intrinsic structure within the rotational bands in many cases is considered unchanged. Of course, if needed in the specific practical applications of the SSAC, one may relax the requirement of unchanged internal cluster structure as a next approximation to the nuclear many-body problem.

The purpose of this work was not so to obtain a full and detailed microscopic description of the low-lying excitation spectrum in ^{24}Mg , but to illustrate and test the newly proposed microscopic SSAC to real nuclear system, consisting of clusters with nonscalar internal structure that involves more general representations (in contrast, e.g., to the case of ^{20}Ne proposed initially in Ref.[33]). This allows to illustrate the more general non-trivial mathematical structures that appear in the construction of the microscopic Pauli allowed model space of the $SU(3)$ cluster states within the present approach.

A good description of the low-lying energy levels for the lowest $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg , as well as for the low-energy intra- and inter-band $B(E2)$ transition probabilities is obtained within the SSAC by using a simple dynamical symmetry Hamil-

tonian to which residual and vertical mixing terms are also added. This Hamiltonian is diagonalized within the subspace of stretched $SU(3)$ cluster states, built on the leading $(8,4)/(9,4)$ multiplet for the positive/negative-parity states up to energy $20\hbar\omega$. The microscopic structure of the cluster states of the three bands under consideration shows a similar picture (cf. Fig.4) with a predominant contribution of the $0\hbar\omega$ (for $K^\pi = 0_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ bands) and $1\hbar\omega$ (for $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ band) $SU(3)$ irreps, respectively, with the presence of some admixtures due to the higher cluster $SU(3)$ oscillator configurations. Similarly to the other symplectic based approaches to nuclear structure, no effective charge is used in the calculation of the $B(E2)$ transition strengths.

The results obtained in the present paper are shown to be of the same quality, as those obtained in the microscopic $Sp(6, R)$ collective model calculations performed in Refs.[35, 36]. At algebraic level, the present SSAC is to large extent mathematically equivalent to the $Sp(6, R)$ microscopic collective model, but physics behind it is different. The latter results in a different, microscopic cluster interpretation of the observed low-lying states of the $K^\pi = 0_1^+$, $K^\pi = 2_1^+$ and $K^\pi = 0_1^-$ bands in ^{24}Mg . Besides the different interpretation, i.e. the different underlying physics, however, we want to point one difference between the $Sp(6, R)$ collective model and the present SSAC that concerns their mathematical structures and the physical interactions involved in the practical applications of the two symplectic based approaches. The intrinsic bandhead structure of the $Sp(6, R)$ collective model in the irreducible collective subspace of the many-particle Hilbert space contains only a single $SU(3)$ irrep. This, as we have seen for the case of ^{24}Mg , is in contrast to the present SSAC, which for the general non-scalar internal structure of the clusters naturally leads to a set of several $SU(3)$ irreducible representations in the $0\hbar\omega$ subspace. Of course, one can involve different irreducible $Sp(6, R)$ collective-model spaces but this will require mixed $Sp(6, R)$ calculations. In order to mix various $Sp(6, R)$ collective-model irreps, one needs to consider components of the nuclear interaction (e.g., spin-orbit or pairing), which can not be expressed by the $Sp(6, R)$ generators. In other words, one needs to involve symplectic symmetry breaking nuclear interactions in order to obtain a set of $SU(3)$ multiplets in the $0\hbar\omega$ subspace. In contrast, the various $SU(3)$ irreducible representations in the $0\hbar\omega$ subspace of SSAC can be horizontally mixed by using an interaction that is expressible, e.g., in terms of the $Sp(6, R)_R$ generators. Additionally, the matrix elements of the symplectic raising and lowering (pair creation and annihilation of oscillator quanta) generators in the SSAC differ from the $Sp(6, R)$ collective-model matrix elements due to the presence of two symplectic groups, $Sp(6, R)_R$ and $Sp(6, R)_C$, i.e. the $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ subgroup structure, requiring the $SU(3)$ $9 - (\lambda, \mu)$ recoupling coefficients. Due to the $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ group, these SSAC matrix elements in the present formulation differ and from those

in the SACM, in which the $U_R(3) \otimes U_C(3) \supset U(3)$ subgroup structure of $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ is exploited. This within the SACM leads, however, also to different form of the $E2$ transition operator (an $SU_R(3) \otimes SU_C(3)$ generator) and the use of an effective charge. In this respect, using the latter $SU_R(3) \otimes SU_C(3)$ generator form for the $E2$ transition operator, the present SSAC (model space and matrix elements) will coincide exactly with the SACM in its $SU(3)$ limit only, when Eq.(2), i.e. that of Ref. [33], is exploited.

In short, a new symplectic symmetry approach to clustering in atomic nuclei is proposed by reducing the dynamical group $Sp(6(A-1), R)$ of the whole many-nucleon system. The new $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ substructure allows to describe simultaneously the inter-cluster and intracluster excitations on equal footing by exploiting the extended $Sp(6, R)$ symplectic symmetry. The $U_R(3) \otimes U_C(3) \supset U(3)$ subgroup structure of the $Sp(6, R)_R \otimes Sp(6, R)_C$ group further allows to establish close relationships to the other algebraic cluster models (both microscopic or phenomenological). Particularly, the relation of the present SSAC to the SACM has been emphasized here. We note also that the proper permutational symmetry and the related spin or spin-isospin content within the present approach, in contrast to the SACM, for instance, is ensured by the complementary orthogonal group structure $O(A_\alpha - 1) \supset S_{A_\alpha}$, which together with the other relevant groups is contained in the $Sp(6(A-1), R)$ dynamical symmetry group of the whole nuclear system. This is another characteristic feature of the SSAC that distinguishes it from the SACM, which is known to be a hybrid model of the Elliott's $SU(3)$ shell model [10] and the $U(4)$ vibron model of Iachello [74], in which the spin-isospin symmetry is determined by the complementary Wigner $U_{ST, \alpha}(4)$ ($\alpha = 1, 2$) symmetry group [75]. Finally, the corresponding computational technique required for performing the practical applications of the present SSAC to concrete two-cluster nuclear system is also presented.

The present work opens the path for the further applications of the SSAC to other two-cluster nuclear systems from different mass regions. Generally, a horizontal mixing of different $SU(3)$ cluster states can also be added to the model Hamiltonian, together with the vertical mixing, in order to perform more sophisticated microscopic cluster-model calculations within the SSAC. The SSAC can also be extended to three- and four-cluster nuclear systems. Note that in the limiting case, the group $Sp(6(A-1), R)$ can be decomposed into $Sp(6, R)_1 \otimes Sp(6, R)_2 \otimes \dots \otimes Sp(6, R)_{A-1}$, in which the $Sp(6, R)_s$ symplectic excitations are associated with each relative Jacobi vector \mathbf{q}_s with $s = 1, 2, \dots, A-1$.

Appendix: The SSAC matrix elements

Generally, if we have a tensor operator $T^{(l_R, m_R)} L_R M_M$ acting on the R -subsystem and a tensor operator $S^{(l_C, m_C)} L_C M_C$ acting on the C -subsystem, then the $SO(3)$ -reduced matrix elements of the coupled tensor operator $[T^{(l_R, m_R)} L_R \times S^{(l_C, m_C)} L_C]^{\sigma(l, m)} L'' M''$ can be expressed in the form [76, 77]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Gamma; N'; (E'_R, 0), (\lambda'_C, \mu'_C); (\lambda', \mu'); \kappa' L' \| [T^{(l_R, m_R)} L_R \times S^{(l_C, m_C)} L_C]^{\sigma(l, m)} L'' M'' \| \Gamma; N; (E_R, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda, \mu); \kappa L \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\rho_R, \rho_C, \rho_f} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} (E_R, 0) & (l_R, m_R) & (E'_R, 0) & \rho_R \\ (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & (l_C, m_C) & (\lambda'_C, \mu'_C) & \rho_C \\ (\lambda, \mu) & (l, m) & (\lambda', \mu') & \rho_f \\ 1 & \sigma & 1 & \end{array} \right\} \langle (E'_R, 0) \| T^{(l_R, m_R)} \| (E_R, 0) \rangle_{\rho_R} \langle (\lambda'_C, \mu'_C) \| S^{(l_C, m_C)} \| (\lambda_C, \mu_C) \rangle_{\rho_C} \\ & \quad \times \langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (l, m) \kappa L'' \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L' \rangle_{\rho_f}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\{ \dots \}$ and $\langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (l, m) \kappa L'' \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L' \rangle$ are the $SU(3)$ recoupling and coupling coefficients, respectively. In Eq.(A.1), the equivalence of the $U(3)$ and $SU(3)$ recoupling coefficients is used. If the tensor operator acts only in the one subsystem subspace (R or C), then the $SU(3)$ 9- (λ, μ) recoupling coefficients reduce to the 6- (λ, μ) U coefficients.

As an example consider first the matrix elements with respect to the whole chain (4) of the tensors $A_{2M}^R \equiv A_{(1,1) (0,0) (1,1)}^{2M}$ and $F_{2M}^R \equiv F_{(2,0) (0,0) (2,0)}^{2M}$, entering in Q_{2M}^R . For the $SO(3)$ -reduced matrix elements of A_{2M}^R we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Gamma; N; (E_R, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda, \mu); \kappa' L' \| A_{2M}^R \| \Gamma; N; (E_R, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda, \mu); \kappa L \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\rho_f} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} (E_R, 0) & (1, 1) & (E_R, 0) & 1 \\ (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & (0, 0) & (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & 1 \\ (\lambda, \mu) & (1, 1) & (\lambda, \mu) & \rho_f \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \end{array} \right\} \langle (E_R, 0) \| A_{2M}^R \| (E_R, 0) \rangle \langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (1, 1) 1 2 \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L' \rangle_{\rho_f} \\ &= \sqrt{2C_2[SU_R(3)](E_R, 0)} \sum_{\rho_f} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} (E_R, 0) & (1, 1) & (E_R, 0) & 1 \\ (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & (0, 0) & (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & 1 \\ (\lambda, \mu) & (1, 1) & (\lambda, \mu) & \rho_f \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \end{array} \right\} \langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (1, 1) 1 2 \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L' \rangle_{\rho_f}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

whereas for the matrix elements of the raising symplectic generators F_{2M}^R we get

$$\langle \Gamma; N+2; (E_R+2, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda', \mu'); \kappa' L' \| F_{2M}^R \| \Gamma; N; (E_R, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda, \mu); \kappa L \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} (E_R, 0) & (2, 0) & (E_R+2, 0) & 1 \\ (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & (0, 0) & (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & 1 \\ (\lambda, \mu) & (2, 0) & (\lambda', \mu') & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \end{array} \right\} \langle (E_R+2, 0) \| F_{2M}^R \| (E_R, 0) \rangle \langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (2, 0) 2 \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L' \rangle \\ &= \sqrt{(n_R+1)(n_R+2)} \sqrt{\Delta\Omega(\sigma_R n'_R E'_R; n_R E_R)} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} (E_R, 0) & (2, 0) & (E_R+2, 0) & 1 \\ (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & (0, 0) & (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & 1 \\ (\lambda, \mu) & (2, 0) & (\lambda', \mu') & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \end{array} \right\} \langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (2, 0) 2 \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L' \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\sqrt{\Delta\Omega(\sigma_R n'_R E'_R; n_R E_R)} = \sqrt{\Omega(\sigma_R n'_R E'_R) - \Omega(\sigma_R n_R E_R)}$ and $\Omega(\sigma_R n_R E_R) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^3 [2(E_i^R)^2 - (n_i^R)^2 + 8(E_i^R - n_i^R) - 2i(2E_i^R - n_i^R)]$ [78-80]. We note that the matrix elements of the raising and lowering symplectic generators are

modified, compared to those with respect to the standard $U_R(3) \otimes U_C(3) \supset U(3)$ chain, because the $U_R(3)$ and $U_C(3)$ groups according to (4) are embedded in $Sp(6, R)_R$ and $Sp(6, R)_C$, respectively. In obtaining the expression (A.3) the standard symplectic computational technique is used. The $SO(3)$ -reduced matrix elements of the lowering symplectic generators $G_{2M}^R \equiv G_{(0,2) (0,0) (0,2)}^{2M}$ can be obtained from those of the F_{2M}^R by conjugate operation. Similarly, one can obtain the matrix elements of the quadrupole operators Q_{2m}^C , acting in the C -space.

Finally, we give the $SO(3)$ -reduced matrix elements of the tensor operator $[A_2^R \times F_2^R]_{(2,0) (0,0) (2,0)}^{l=0, m=0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Gamma; N+2; (E_R+2, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda', \mu'); \kappa' L \| [A_2^R \times F_2^R]_{(2,0) (0,0) (2,0)}^{l=0, m=0} \| \Gamma; N; (E_R, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda, \mu); \kappa L \rangle \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (E_R, 0) & (2, 0) & (E_R+2, 0) & 1 \\ (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & (0, 0) & (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & 1 \\ (\lambda, \mu) & (2, 0) & (\lambda', \mu') & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \langle (E_R+2, 0) \| [A_2^R \times F_2^R]_{(2,0) (0,0) (2,0)}^{l=0, m=0} \| (E_R, 0) \rangle \langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (2, 0) 0 \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the triple-bared $SU_R(3)$ matrix elements can be obtained by means of the $6 - (\lambda, \mu)$ Racah recoupling coefficients: $\langle (E_R+2, 0) \| [A_2^R \times F_2^R]_{(2,0) (0,0) (2,0)}^{l=0, m=0} \| (E_R, 0) \rangle = U\left((E_R, 0); (2, 0); (E_R+2, 0); (1, 1) \middle\| (E_R+2, 0); (2, 0)\right) \times \langle (E_R+2, 0) \| A_{2M}^R \| (E_R+2, 0) \rangle \langle (E_R+2, 0) \| F_{2M}^R \| (E_R, 0) \rangle$. Using the latter, one finally obtains for the $SO(3)$ -reduced matrix elements of the tensor operator $[A_2^R \times F_2^R]_{(2,0) (0,0) (2,0)}^{l=0, m=0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Gamma; N+2; (E_R+2, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda', \mu'); \kappa' L \| [A_2^R \times F_2^R]_{(2,0) (0,0) (2,0)}^{l=0, m=0} \| \Gamma; N; (E_R, 0), (\lambda_C, \mu_C); (\lambda, \mu); \kappa L \rangle \\ &= \sqrt{2C_2[SU_R(3)](n_R+2, 0)} \sqrt{(n_R+1)(n_R+2)} \sqrt{\Delta\Omega(\sigma_R n'_R E'_R; n_R E_R)} \begin{pmatrix} (E_R, 0) & (2, 0) & (E_R+2, 0) & 1 \\ (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & (0, 0) & (\lambda_C, \mu_C) & 1 \\ (\lambda, \mu) & (2, 0) & (\lambda', \mu') & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times U\left((E_R, 0); (2, 0); (E_R+2, 0); (1, 1) \middle\| (E_R+2, 0); (2, 0)\right) \langle (\lambda, \mu) \kappa L, (2, 0) 0 \| (\lambda', \mu') \kappa' L \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The latter matrix elements allow to perform a numerical diagonalization of the Hamiltonian (17), containing a simple vertical mixing term that couples cluster states of different oscillator quanta. The other matrix elements of interest can be obtained in a similar way. We recall that computer codes [81–83] exist for the numerical calculation of the required $SU(3)$ coupling and recoupling coefficients.

-
- [1] D. J. Rowe and J. L. Wood, *Fundamentals of Nuclear Models: Foundational Models* (World Scientific Publisher Press, Singapore, 2010).
- [2] P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem*, (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980).
- [3] K. Wildermuth and Y. C. Tang, *A Unified Theory of the Nucleus* (Academic Press, New York, 1977).
- [4] W. Greiner, J. Y. Park, W. Scheid, *Nuclear Molecules*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995).
- [5] A. Bohr and B. R. Mottelson, *Nuclear Structure* (W.A. Benjamin Inc., New York, 1975), Vol. II.
- [6] A. Obertelli and H. Sagawa, *Modern Nuclear Physics: From Fundamentals to Frontiers*, (Springer, Singapore, 2021).
- [7] V. K. B. Kota, *SU(3) Symmetry in Atomic Nuclei* (Springer, Singapore, 2020).
- [8] K. L.G. Heyde, *The Nuclear Shell Model* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1994).
- [9] C. Beck (Ed.) *Clusters in Nuclei*, Vol. 1, Lecture Notes in Physics **818**, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2010).
- [10] J. P. Elliott, Proc. R. Soc. **A 245**, 128 (1958); **245**, 562 (1958).
- [11] K. Wildermuth and T. Kanellopoulos, Nucl. Phys. **7**, 150 (1958).
- [12] B. F. Bayman and A. Bohr, Nucl. Phys. **9**, 596 (1958/59).
- [13] J. Cseh, J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **580**, 012046 (2015).
- [14] J. Cseh, Phys. Rev. **C 103**, 064322 (2021).
- [15] *Dynamical Groups and Spectrum Generating Algebras* (in 2 Volumes) by A. Bohm, Y. Ne'eman, A.O. Barut and others, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988).
- [16] D. J. Rowe, Rep. Prog. Phys. **48**, 1419 (1985).
- [17] D. J. Rowe, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **37**, 265 (1996).
- [18] H. G. Ganev, Eur. Phys. J. **A 57**, 181 (2021).
- [19] H. G. Ganev, Chin. Phys. **C 47**, 104101 (2023).
- [20] J. R. M. Berriel-Aguayo and P. O. Hess, Symmetry **12**, 738 (2020).
- [21] F. Iachello and A. D. Jackson, Phys. Lett. **B108**, 151 (1982).

- [22] F. Iachello, Nucl. Phys. **A396**, 233c (1983).
- [23] H. Daley and F. Iachello, Phys. Lett. **B131**, 281 (1983).
- [24] H. J. Daley and F. Iachello, Ann. Phys. **167**, 73 (1986).
- [25] H. Daley and B. Barrett, Nucl. Phys. **A 449**, 256 (1986).
- [26] R. Bijker and F. Iachello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 152501 (2014).
- [27] D. J. Marin-Lambarri *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 012502 (2014).
- [28] R. Bijker and F. Iachello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 162501 (2019).
- [29] R. Bijker and F. Iachello, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **110**, 103735 (2020).
- [30] J. Cseh, Phys. Lett. **B 281**, 173 (1992).
- [31] J. Cseh and G. Levai, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **230**, 165 (1994).
- [32] J. Cseh, Phys. Lett. **B 743**, 213 (2015).
- [33] H. G. Ganev, Int. J. At. Nucl. Phys. **6**, 027 (2021); see also arXiv:2212.04337 [nucl-th].
- [34] M. Harvey, Adv. Nucl. Phys. **1**, 67 (1968).
- [35] G. Rosensteel, J. P. Draayer, and K. J. Weeks, Nucl. Phys. **A 419**, 1 (1984).
- [36] J. Escher, A. Leviatan, Phys. Rev. **C 65**, 054309 (2002).
- [37] J. Cseh, G. Levai, and W. Scheid, Phys. Rev. **C 48**, 1724 (1993).
- [38] G. Rosensteel and D. J. Rowe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 10 (1977).
- [39] V. V. Vanagas, *Methods of the theory of group representations and separation of collective degrees of freedom in the nucleus*, Lecture notes at the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute (MIFI, Moscow, 1974) (in Russian).
- [40] G. F. Filippov, V. I. Ovcharenko, and Yu. F. Smirnov, *Microscopic Theory of Collective Excitations in Nuclei* (Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1981) (in Russian).
- [41] M. Moshinsky, J. Math. Phys. **25**, 1555 (1984).
- [42] H. G. Ganev, Eur. Phys. J. **A 50**, 183 (2014).
- [43] K. T. Hecht and D. Braunschweig, Nucl. Phys. **A 295**, 34 (1978).
- [44] Y. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. **A 448**, 395 (1986).
- [45] Y. Suzuki and K. T. Hecht, Nucl. Phys. **A 455**, 315 (1986).
- [46] F. Arickx, Nucl. Phys. **A 268**, 347 (1976).
- [47] D. R. Peterson and K. T. Hecht, Nucl. Phys. **A 344**, 361 (1980).
- [48] F. Arickx, Nucl. Phys. **A 284**, 264 (1977).
- [49] F. Arickx, J. Broeckhove, and E. Deumens, Nucl. Phys. **A 318**, 269 (1979).
- [50] J. J. Griffin and J. A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **108**, 311 (1957).
- [51] A. C. Dreyfuss *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 727**, 511 (2013).
- [52] A. C. Dreyfuss *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C 95**, 044312 (2017).
- [53] K.D.Launey, T.Dytrych, and J.P.Draayer, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **89**, 101 (2016).
- [54] K. D. Launey, A. Mercenne, and T. Dytrych, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **71**, 253 (2021).
- [55] T. Dytrych *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 252501 (2013).
- [56] K. T. Hecht, Nucl. Phys. **A 283**, 223 (1977).
- [57] H. Yepezh-Martinez, M. J. Ermamatov, P. R. Fraser, and P. O. Hess, Phys. Rev. **C 86**, 034309 (2012).
- [58] P. O. Hess, Eur. Phys. J. **A 54**, 32 (2018).
- [59] P. O. Hess, J. R. M. Berriel-Aguayo, and L. J. Chavez-Nunez, Eur. Phys. J. **A 55**, 71 (2019).
- [60] J. Cseh and G. Riczu, Phys. Lett. **B 757**, 312 (2016).
- [61] J. Cseh, Phys. Rev. **C 101**, 054306 (2020).
- [62] A. de-Shalit and I. Talmi, *Nuclear Shell Theory*, (Academic Press, New York, 1963).
- [63] P. J. Brussaard and P. M. Glaudemans, *Shell-Model Applications in Nuclear Spectroscopy*, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977).
- [64] J. P. Draayer, Y. Leschber, S. C. Park, R. Lopez, Comput. Phys. Commun. **56**, 279 (1989).
- [65] D. Langr, T. Dytrych, J. P. Draayer, K. D. Launey, and P. Tvrdik, Comput. Phys. Commun. **244**, 442 (2019).
- [66] P. von Brentano, N. V. Zamfir, R. F. Casten, W. G. Rellergert, and E. A. McCutchan Phys. Rev. **C 69**, 044314 (2004).
- [67] S. Frauendorf, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **E 24**, 1541001 (2015).
- [68] H. G. Ganev, Chin. Phys. **C 48**, 014102 (2024).
- [69] National Nuclear Data Center (NNDC), <http://www.nndc.bnl.gov/>
- [70] V. V. Vanagas, *Algebraic Methods in Nuclear Theory* (Mintis, Vilnius, 1971) (in Russian).
- [71] N. J. Stone, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **111-112**, 1 (2016).
- [72] C. Bahri and D. Rowe, Nucl. Phys. **A 662**, 125 (2000).
- [73] D. J. Rowe, in *Computational and Group-Theoretical Methods in Nuclear Physics*, edited by J. Escher, O. Castanos, J. Hirsch, S. Pittel, and G. Stoitcheva (World Scientific, Singapore, 2004), pp. 165–173.
- [74] F. Iachello, Phys. Rev. **C 23**, 2778 (1981).
- [75] E. P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **51**, 106 (1937).
- [76] D. J. Millener, J. Math. Phys. **19**, 1513 (1978).
- [77] G. Rosensteel, Phys. Rev. **C 41**, 730 (1990).
- [78] D. J. Rowe, J. Math. Phys. **25**, 2662 (1984).
- [79] D. J. Rowe, G. Rosensteel, and R. Carr, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **17**, L399 (1984).
- [80] D. J. Rowe, B. G. Wybourne, and P. H. Butler, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **18**, 939 (1984).
- [81] J. P. Draayer and Y. Akiyama, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1904 (1973); Y. Akiyama and J. P. Draayer, Comput. Phys. Commun. **5**, 405 (1973).
- [82] C. Bahri, D. J. Rowe, and J. P. Draayer, Comput. Phys. Commun. **159**, 121 (2004).
- [83] T. Dytrych *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **269**, 108137 (2021).