

Extended Generator Coordinate Method: eGCM

Aurel Bulgac¹

¹*Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195–1560, USA*

(Dated: August 13, 2024)

The generator coordinate method (GCM) was introduced in nuclear physics by Wheeler and his collaborators in 1950's and it is still one of the mostly used approximations for treating nuclear large amplitude collective motion (LACM). GCM was inspired by similar methods introduced in molecular and condensed matter physics in the late 1920's, after the Schrödinger equation became the tool of choice to describe quantum phenomena. The interest in the 1983 extension of GCM by Reinhard, Cusson and Goeke, which includes internal excitations, was revived in recent years, but unfortunately this new time-dependent GCM (TDGCM) framework has a serious flaw, which prevents it from describing correctly many anticipated features in a properly formulated TDGCM framework, such as interference and entanglement. I present here an alternative formulation, the extended GCM (eGCM), which is free of difficulties encountered in previous TDGCM implementations.

The early attempts to describe molecular spectra by W. Heitler, F. London, J. C. Slater, L. Pauling, and others used hybridized localized atomic orbitals, centered on atoms. Later F. Hund, R. S. Mulliken, and J. Lennard-Jones introduced delocalized molecular orbitals, which proved more flexible in practice. The atomic orbitals describe electrons in various states centered at atom positions, e.g. the σ - and π -orbitals used to describe the valence electrons in a carbon atom. At each atomic site this set of orbitals is not complete and higher energy excitations of the system are thus not included. In the case of carbon atoms the excitation of the deep lying electrons with principal quantum numbers $n = 1$ and $l = 0$ or to levels with $n \geq 3$ are not allowed. Whether this is a good approximation naturally depends on the specific problem considered, which typically encompasses relatively low energy local excitations of the quantum system under consideration. These ideas propagated further in condensed matter theory in order to describe the band structure of solids [1] and lately in the high-temperature superconductivity in the Hubbard model [2]. Localized or delocalized orbitals describe electrons in various quantum states, including the spin degrees of freedom.

These ideas also inspired J. A. Wheeler and his students D. A. Hill and J. J. Griffin [3, 4] to introduce a description of nuclear LACM, nuclear fission in particular, for which they coined the term GCM. Wheeler and collaborators considered however a simplified version of the molecular and condensed matter frameworks, by using at “each site,” in that case for a particular nuclear shape typically characterized by a quadrupole Q_{20} and an octupole deformation Q_{30} , only the ground states of a nucleus with that shape, and the wave function of the nucleus was represented as a linear superposition of these fixed shape ground states. In nuclear literature the GCM was considered over the years in two flavors, with time-independent “generator wave function” function $f(Q)$ and with a time-dependent “generator wave

function” $f(Q, t)$ respectively

$$\Psi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A) = \int_Q f(Q) \Phi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A | Q), \quad (1)$$

$$\Psi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A, t) = \int_Q f(Q, t) \Phi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A | Q), \quad (2)$$

but in both cases with static (generalized) Slater determinants $\Phi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A | Q)$ [5–8], as solutions of chosen by “educated guesses” of a restricted set of nuclear shape constraint Hartree-Fock (HF) or Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) solutions. These two choices are neither well nor uniquely defined and consequently the “sum” over “nuclear shapes” parametrized by the multidimensional variable Q lead to a uncontrolled approximation of the many-fermion wave function $\Psi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A)$ or $\Psi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A, t)$. A correct expansion in terms of either static or time-dependent (generalized) Slater determinants should include all possible many-fermion excitations at a “given shape,” not only the “ground state” at a given “shape.” At the same time by including all excited states at all “nuclear shapes” will make the entire set overcomplete. In the literature, as far as I know, there is no study of the accuracy of the GCM or of the accuracy of the similar framework based on molecular orbitals. At best, studies demonstrate that there is “agreement” with observations when a reasonable basis set of wave functions, chosen by educated guesses, is used.

Over the many decades of GCM use in nuclear physics, the belief, or rather the hope, has been that the total wave functions will follow an adiabatic evolution from one instantaneous “ground state shape” to the next neighboring instantaneous “ground state shape,” which led to the development of the adiabatic time-dependent Hartree-Fock theory [5]. In chemistry it has been known for decades that this naive Born-Oppenheimer approximation [9] is violated [10]. There are also other possible theoretical frameworks [11–15]. In the case of nuclear LACM the nuclear shape has to evolve typically in low energy nuclear dynamics in such a manner that the local Fermi momentum distribution remains approximately spherical [16–20]. Otherwise the volume contribution to the energy of the nucleus will change. Nuclear systems

are saturating many fermion systems and in the low energy dynamics the contribution to the volume energy and the average density should remain essentially constant [3, 16, 21]. Only the Coulomb and surface isoscalar and isovector contributions to the total nucleus energy can vary considerably, in agreement with the brilliant insight Meitner and Frisch [21] had in the case of nuclear fission. The energy contribution due to the emergence of pairing correlations is always a small contribution. In the Bethe-Weiszäcker mass formula the odd-even correction term is about 3 times smaller than the root mean square error of the binding energy of any nucleus with an atomic mass larger than $A = 16$. At a well defined “nuclear shape” a many nucleon system has a very rich spectrum of excited states, qualitatively similar to the various states of electron systems, or similar to the full spectrum of a nucleus described in a large shell model basis. While changing its shape a nucleus does not have to hop from one ground state of a given shape to another ground state of a different shape only. This “conspicuous” deficiency was attempted to be “fixed” in Ref. [22], in an approach where only a patently insufficient number of excited states was taken into account. As far as I am aware this (uncontrollable) extension of GCM [22] was never shown to lead to a satisfactory description of LACM, and moreover, it is not clear whether such an extension is numerically feasible or practically meaningful if all relevant quasiparticle excitations are taken into account.

It is widely recognized that LACM of a fissioning nucleus beyond the outer fission barrier is a strongly dissipative non-equilibrium process [23–26] and the adiabaticity invoked by Wheeler and collaborators [3, 4] is an unphysical assumption, which however is still widely used in GCM “microscopic” approaches to nuclear fission up to the scission configuration [6–8]. In theoretical studies of LACM in the first and second potential well, and in particular in the case of spontaneous fission [27, 28] the attitude is that the collective motion is adiabatic. The argument brought forward in the case of spontaneous fission, which is to a large extent an under the barrier penetration process, is that due to pairing effects the adiabatic approximation is valid. This goes against the solid theoretical arguments presented by Caldeira and Leggett [29] and widely accepted in condensed matter physics, that the coupling to internal excitations (in nuclear language parlance, coupling to excitations above “the instantaneous ground shape” and when “polarization effects” are neglected) leads to longer tunneling times. This is in qualitative agreement with experimental observations of the spontaneous life-times of odd-mass and odd-odd nuclei [30], and also with our recent findings [14], where in particular we demonstrate that the Pauli blocking approximation is not valid in non-equilibrium processes and therefore Cooper pairs are broken during LACM.

In 1983 Reinhard *et al.* [31] suggested to replace the static fixed set of ground states a nucleus evolves through during a LACM with the solutions of a time-dependent

HF problem. In this framework the total time dependent nuclear wave function of the nucleus acquires a more complex structure, it is in general an infinite sum/integral over many (generalized) time-dependent Slater determinants $\Phi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A|Q, t)$. Allegedly, this prescription may describe a dissipative non-equilibrium process such as nuclear fission. Reinhard *et al.* [31] implicitly assumed that various TDHF trajectories $\Phi_Q(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_A, t)$ are started simultaneously and span a sufficiently large set of initial nuclear shapes, described by the shape (multidimensional) parameter Q . It is straightforward to show that the “generator wave functions” $f(Q, t)$ are solutions of the time-dependent Hill-Wheeler equation

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \int_{Q'} \langle \Phi(Q, t) | \Phi(Q', t) \rangle \partial_t f(Q', t) \\ = \int_{Q'} \langle \Phi(Q, t) | H - H_{MF} | \Phi(Q', t) \rangle f(Q', t), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the nucleon coordinates ξ_1, \dots, ξ_A have been suppressed and the matrix elements $\langle \Phi(Q, t) | \Phi(Q', t) \rangle$ and $\langle \Phi(Q, t) | H - H_{MF} | \Phi(Q', t) \rangle$ are evaluated by integrating over the nucleon degrees of freedom ξ_1, \dots, ξ_A . Here H and H_{MF} stand for the many-body and mean field Hamiltonians, and $i\hbar \partial_t \Phi(Q, t) = H_{MF} \Phi(Q, t)$.

In order to understand the incompleteness of the arguments presented by Reinhard *et al.* [31] I have to make a detour to introducing in quantum many-body theory collective and intrinsic degrees of freedom, a process described a long time ago by Feynman and Vernon [32], from which either a classical [33, 34] or quantum Fokker-Planck equation [35–37] for the “collective degrees of freedom” can be derived. In the GCM framework one typically interprets the (generalized) Slater determinants labels Q as a set of collective variables, thus practically introducing a poor man’s Feynman-Vernon separation between the “collective degrees of freedom Q ”, which need to be requantized, and the “intrinsic degrees of freedom $\xi_{1, \dots, A}$.” In GCM this is achieved by adopting the Gaussian overlap approximation (GOA) [5–8] of the norm and Hamiltonian overlaps and “deriving” a Schrödinger-like equation for the “collective degrees of freedom Q .” In the most theoretically advanced implementation of the TDDFT extended to superfluid systems [23–25], as in any previous time-dependent mean field approach the “collective degrees of freedom Q ” are simply labels, and mixing different TDDFT trajectories for each specific Q requires knowledge of the function either $f(Q)$ or $f(Q, t)$, which can be obtained only by solving the corresponding static or time-dependent GCM equations or using other phenomenological or microscopic approaches [38–47].

A very instructive example of a GCM-like application, though it was never considered as one, is the treatment of pairing correlations, and specifically the treatment of a bound electron pair by Cooper [48]. The pairing Hamiltonian in second quantization is

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{k=1}^{\Omega} \varepsilon_k [a_k^\dagger a_{\bar{k}} + a_{\bar{k}}^\dagger a_k] + g \sum_{k,l} a_k^\dagger a_{\bar{k}}^\dagger a_l a_{\bar{l}}, \quad (4)$$

and the electron pair wave function is $|\phi\rangle = \sum_k C_k a_k^\dagger a_{\bar{k}}^\dagger |0\rangle$, with a sum over two-fermion Hartree-Fock states in time reversed states k and \bar{k} , and here the coefficients C_k are obtained as solution of a GCM-like equation, in which the norm overlap is diagonal, while the Hamiltonian overlap is not. As in GCM, this Hamiltonian \hat{H} leads to hops between different “generator coordinate” states $a_k^\dagger a_{\bar{k}}^\dagger |0\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum state. In GCM calculations the basis states are not typically orthogonal to each other and the norm overlap as a result is non-diagonal, which leads to the usual technical problems. One can extend trivially Cooper [48]’s treatment of a single pair to several pairs, with the complication that the number of components in the corresponding many-pair wave is very large $\frac{\Omega!}{N!(\Omega-N)!}$, where N is the number of pairs. One should switch to the treatment of the pairing correlations within the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) approximation when $N \geq 5$, and then the many-fermion wave function describes a canonical ensemble of particles when $N \geq 5$ and the particle-number fluctuations are relatively small.

There were a few attempts in recent literature [49–54] to implement the framework suggested by Reinhard *et al.* [31], but the results obtained so far have not shown how to obtain the expected mass and charge distributions of fission fragments (FFs) or how to describe an expected effective mixing between different trajectories [54], or with a better accuracy than in a quite wide variety of other approaches [38–47].

There are several reasons why the framework outlined by Reinhard *et al.* [31] is not going to succeed in describing the non-equilibrium dynamics of a many-fermion systems, since the initial conditions are not well defined. As shown in Refs. [24, 25], fission trajectories started along the rim of the outer fission barrier, after a very short time appear to focus into a rather narrow bundle. Unfortunately these trajectories reach a particular set of FF separations at different times, as the saddle-to-scission times vary quite a bit, depending on the initial values of Q , and as a result the norm and Hamiltonian overlaps evaluated of a given time t , counted from the time each specific trajectory was started, leads to practically vanishing values of the Hamiltonian overlaps and therefore to no “expected quantum mixing” between different trajectories parametrized by the “classical variables Q ” [54]. The situation in this case is very similar to the old two-slit experiment, with either light waves or quantum objects. In this experiments it is always assumed that the wave front of incoming plane wave is parallel to the two-slit screen, which in its turn is parallel to the screen where the interference pattern is observed. In this case the position of a minimum or maximum interference is given by the difference in paths from the two slits to the point on the screen. By design the two slits emit spherical waves, according to Huygens’s principle. If the angle between the normals to the initial wave front and the two-slit screen is non-zero, the phase difference has to be evaluated in a different manner than in textbooks.

The same happens in case of induced fission. An incident low energy neutron beam excites the system in its ground state potential well and different “classical trajectories,” described by the “collective variables Q ,” reach the rim of the outer fission barrier at different times.

The solution to this apparently complicated problem is rather simple. Instead of the norm and Hamiltonian overlap matrix elements in Eq. (3) one should now evaluate the generalized norm and Hamiltonian overlap matrix elements and solve the enhanced GCM (eGCM) equations

$$\begin{aligned} E \int_{Q',t'} \langle \Phi(Q,t) | \Phi(Q',t') \rangle f(Q',t') \\ = \int_{Q',t'} \langle \Phi(Q,t) | H | \Phi(Q',t') \rangle f(Q',t'). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

using the standard GCM approach and without resorting to GOA. In this case the number of “important” configurations is much larger, since in general $t \neq t'$ and not only $Q \neq Q'$ as in typical GCM calculations. In the case of generalized Slater determinants, which have to be considered in the case of induced fission, as was amply demonstrated in Ref. [55], one has to include all allowed quasiparticle states in constructing a time-dependent “trajectory,” which for a typical situation in a box $30^2 \times 60 \text{ fm}^3$, which is a very large number $4 \times 30^2 \times 60 = 216,000$, unlike in all known to us real-time numerical simulations of fission used by other authors in literature so far. Fortunately, there is a rather simple solution to this problem, at each specific set of values (Q,t) one should introduce the canonical wave functions and in that case the size of the needed number of quasiparticle wave functions dramatically drops to a several hundreds, see Fig. 1 and Refs. [55, 56], and the needed norm and Hamiltonian overlaps can be evaluated rather rapidly.

It is instructive to develop an intuition concerning the meaning and importance of the parameters (Q,t) . In an analogy with the two-slit experiment, or more appropriately with a non-uniform diffraction grating with a finite number of slits, one can associate Q with the label of a specific slit, in this case including not only the (Q_{20}, Q_{30}) position of the initial point on the rim of the outer barrier, but also the Euler angle specifying the orientation of the nucleus, if one performs also an angular momentum projection. The parameter t can be linked to the distance from the “slit” to the point where the trajectory “hits” the “screen,” and where the interference is finally “observed.”

I will assume that one performs induced fission simulations in a typical $(64 \text{ fm})^3$ box, if angular momentum projection is considered. Otherwise a $32^2 \times 64 \text{ fm}^3$ simulation box is appropriate. For evaluating the first and second spatial derivatives the use of FFT, which leads to machine precision and using powers of 2 is the best choice for spatial dimensions [57, 58]. The lattice constant $l = 1 \text{ fm}$ corresponds to a maximum momentum cutoff in one cartesian direction $p_{max} = \hbar\pi/l \approx 600 \text{ MeV}/c$, which is of the order of the maximum momentum cutoff considered in chiral effective field theory of nucleon interactions. It

would be sufficient to use a number $N_Q \leq 15$ for the set of quadrupole and octupole deformations (Q_{20}, Q_{30}) for an axially symmetric even-even compound nucleus along the rim of the outer fission barrier, as was done in Refs. [23–25]. It is also convenient to parameterize a given trajectory in terms of the separation between FFs, starting with a separation $s \approx 7$ fm, when the neck is emerging, until $s \approx 22$ fm, when the FF shapes are relaxed and spatially rather well separated, and use the relation between the time t along the trajectory and the FFs separation $s(t)$, where t is the running time along a given trajectory. Retaining for the eGCM a $\Delta s = 0.25$ fm one would need $N_s = 60$ different FFs separations along a given trajectory. As it was amply demonstrated recently, see again Fig. 1 and Refs. [56, 59, 60], it is sufficient to use not more than hopefully $N_{\text{cwfs}} < 200, \dots, 300$ canonical wave functions with the highest occupation probabilities, for the proton and neutron subsystems respectively.

If one might try instead to eschew the determination of the canonical wave functions and use instead quasiparticle wave functions with the highest occupation probabilities at each FF separation s , or use a static or time-dependent Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer approximation, the errors are large, essentially irrespective of how many states are included. A further simplification of the eGCM framework can be achieved by adopting an appropriate generalized Gaussian overlap approximation (GOA) for the norm kernel $\langle \Phi(Q, t) | \Phi(Q', t') \rangle$ and derive a Schrödinger-like equation for $f(Q, t)$. The GOA is however a further approximation, the accuracy of which was not ever quantified, verified, and validated in any previous studies, as far as I am aware, and it was prompted only to find a simple simulacrum to a “collective Hamiltonian quadratic in collective coordinates” to the Feynman-Vernon influence functional, which emerges from a path integral formulation of the many-body problem. As it was shown in Ref. [61], in the case of nonlocal equations a reduction to a second order partial differential equation is not often possible, as the system has a behavior similar to a birefringent medium.

In the case of fissioning even-even nuclei with axial symmetry one can build a rather simple angular momentum projection procedure of the nucleus as only the Euler angles γ and β are needed and one can use the icosahedral group with only 60 different angles to project on the total spin $J = 0$ and 2, using the positions of the 60 carbon atoms in a C_{60} buckyball for different orientations of the “collective” variables (Q, Q'). This approach is orders of magnitude more economic than the usual angular momentum projecting techniques [5, 56, 62]. This leads to a conservative estimate of the dimension of the norm overlap matrices (separately for protons and neutrons) $N_{eGCM} = N_{\text{angles}} \times N_{\text{cwfs}} \times N_s \times N_Q = 60 \times 200 \times 60 \times 15 = 7,200,000$, which is a number significantly smaller than the largest dimensions of the shell-model calculations [63, 64]. If an angular momentum projection is not performed the dimension of norm overlap matrices is significantly smaller $N_{eGCM} = N_{\text{cwfs}} \times N_s \times N_Q =$




FIG. 1. The proton (solid lines) and neutron (dashed lines) absolute error in particle numbers if only a reduced number of canonical quasi-particle wave functions are used at different times, along a induced fission trajectory of ^{238}U , to evaluate the total nucleon numbers.

$200 \times 60 \times 15 = 180,000$. Since only the largest eigenvalues of the norm overlap matrices are needed, full diagonalization is not necessary. As it was recently shown in Ref. [59], the differences between the number-projected and number-unprojected number densities as a function of time at any point in space are at most at the level $1\% \approx 1/\sqrt{N}$ as expected, in the case of induced fission treated in TDDFT with pairing correlations included, during the entire time-evolution from the top of the outer fission barrier to complete fission fragments (FFs) separation. Naturally, this new eGCM framework is equally applicable to other cases of nuclear LACM, in particular to collisions of heavy ions. Since the emergence of powerful supercomputers during the last two decades or so, the numerical implementation of eGCM appears to be doable with many existing and rather modest computer platforms.

The most contentious and difficult issue in using GCM in nuclear LACM is the fact that, in DFT and in TDDFT in particular, a true Hamiltonian does not exist and the evaluation of the Hamiltonian overlap within GCM is not well defined, and only various *ad hoc* recipes have been used over time. The energy density functional depends on powers of the number densities for proton, neutrons, and corresponding spin-number densities as well and the anomalous densities as well, and there is no meaningful prescription suggesting what densities to use in the "TDDFT Hamiltonian" overlap $\langle \Phi(Q, t) | H | \Phi(Q', t') \rangle$. None of the suggested “fixes” suggested by various authors, see recent reviews [6, 7, 65], are satisfactory. After scission hoping might occur between different trajectories only if the trajectories are in the same spatial region, when $|s(t) - s(t')|$ is relatively small for the Hamiltonian to lead to hoping, even if $t \neq t'$. The norm over-

lap kernel could be either diagonal or non-diagonal, but hoping occurs only if the Hamiltonian overlap kernel is non-diagonal, as it was the case for the Cooper pair.

The Hamiltonian overlaps $\langle \Phi(Q, t) | H | \Phi(Q', t') \rangle$ in Eq. (5) should be evaluated using the true many-body Hamiltonian, thus not following the typical GCM approach [5–8] and without resorting to the GOA. If the true many-body Hamiltonian has two- and three-body interactions, the evaluation of the norm and Hamiltonian overlaps with generalized mean field many-body wave functions is a well defined procedure [5, 66, 67], which has no ambiguity and eGCM can be used. One can use the approach used in Ref. [68] in a Quantum Monte Carlo evaluation of the equation of state of neutron matter to evaluate the Hamiltonian overlap $\langle \Phi(Q, t) | H | \Phi(Q', t') \rangle$, with chiral effective field theory for 2- and 3-body contributions with a local density dependence as described there and TDDFT many-body wave functions $|\Phi(Q', t')\rangle$. Alternatively, one can adapt the method used in Ref. [69], where the long-range pion contributions, arising from chiral effective field theory, to the a nucleus energy were evaluated. In the eGCM both the norm and the Hamiltonian overlaps are expected to have non-diagonal terms.

In conclusion, I have outlined an enhanced GCM framework, dubbed eGCM, which is free of a number of undefined steps in previous formulations, which is expected to correctly describe interference and entanglement between different “classical” fission trajectories, parametrized by the initial shapes (Q_{20}, Q_{30}) on the rim of the outer fission barrier and different Euler angles γ and β . Since rather soon after scission many TDDFT fission trajectories follow a very similar path [24, 25], dif-

ferent trajectories originating at different initial points Q will find themselves in relatively close proximity of each other, albeit each parametrized with a different “time” t , which translates into to an actual FFs separation $s(t)$. Having many different trajectories in close proximity of each other will result into a strong mixing, a fact which seemed almost impossible to realize until now [54]. Since LACM dissipation is now organically incorporated in TDDFT extended to pairing correlations, there seem to be no other limitation to a full microscopic approach to fission. The only nagging element is that by construction GCM and equally the method of delocalized orbitals in chemistry and condensed matter physics are still uncontrollable approximations, even though the framework is based on sound physical assumptions.

Acknowledgements

I thank I. Stetcu, I. Abdurrahman, and M. Kalker for discussions, L. Troy, I. Abdurrahman, and M. Kalker for reading and suggesting a number of improvements, I. Abdurrahman for preparing the data for Fig. 1, and also D. Vretenar for raising number of questions on an earlier version of the manuscript. The funding from the Office of Science, Grant No. DE-FG02-97ER41014 and also the partial support provided by NNSA cooperative Agreement DE-NA0003841 is greatly appreciated. This research used resources of the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility, which is a U.S. DOE Office of Science User Facility supported under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725.

-
- [1] N. W. Aschroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics* (Saunders College, 1976).
 - [2] X. Dong, L. Del Re, A. Toschi, and E. Gull, “Mechanism of superconductivity in the Hubbard model at intermediate interaction strength,” *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci* **119** (33), e2205048119 (2022).
 - [3] D. L. Hill and J. A. Wheeler, “Nuclear Constitution and the Interpretation of Fission Phenomena,” *Phys. Rev.* **89**, 1102 (1953).
 - [4] J. J. Griffin and J. A. Wheeler, “Collective Motions in Nuclei by the Method of Generator Coordinates,” *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 311 (1957).
 - [5] P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem*, 1st ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2004).
 - [6] M. Verriere and D. Regnier, “The Time-Dependent Generator Coordinate Method in Nuclear Physics,” *Front. Phys.* **8**, 233 (2020).
 - [7] N. Schunck and D. Regnier, “Theory of nuclear fission,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **125**, 103963 (2022).
 - [8] N. Schunck, “Microscopic Theory of Nuclear Fission,” (2022), [arXiv:2201.02716 \[nucl-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.02716).
 - [9] M. Born and R. Oppenheimer, “Zur Quantentheorie der Molekeln,” *Annalen der Physik* **389**, 457 (1927).
 - [10] J. C. Tully, “Molecular dynamics with electronic transitions,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **93**, 1061 (1990).
 - [11] F. Agostini and E. K. U. Gross, “Exact Factorization of the Electron–Nuclear Wave Function: Theory and Applications,” in *Quantum Chemistry and Dynamics of Excited States* (John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, 2020) Chap. 17, p. 531.
 - [12] A. Bulgac, S. Jin, and I. Stetcu, “Unitary evolution with fluctuations and dissipation,” *Phys. Rev. C* **100**, 014615 (2019).
 - [13] A. Bulgac, “Pure quantum extension of the semiclassical Boltzmann-Uehling-Uhlenbeck equation,” *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, L021601 (2022).
 - [14] A. Bulgac, “Non-Equilibrium Aspects of Fission Dynamics within the Time Dependent Density Functional Theory, // <https://conferences.iaea.org/event/368/>, to be submitted,” (2024).
 - [15] A. Bulgac, “Talk at Frontiers of Quantum and Mesoscopic Thermodynamics, Prague, Czechia, July 21-27, 2024,” (2024).
 - [16] G. Bertsch, “The nuclear density of states in the space of nuclear shapes,” *Phys. Lett. B* **95**, 157 (1980).
 - [17] F. Barranco, R. A. Broglia, and G. F. Bertsch, “Exotic radioactivity as a superfluid tunneling phenomenon,”

- Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 50 (1988).
- [18] F. Barranco, G.F. Bertsch, R.A. Broglia, and E. Vigezzi, “Large-amplitude motion in superfluid Fermi droplets,” *Nucl. Data Sheets Phys. A* **512**, 253 (1990).
- [19] G. Bertsch and H. Flocard, “Pairing effects in nuclear collective motion: Generator coordinate method,” *Phys. Rev. C* **43**, 2200 (1991).
- [20] G. F. Bertsch and A. Bulgac, “Comment on “spontaneous fission: A kinetic approach,”” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3539 (1997).
- [21] L. Meitner, L. and O. R. Frisch, “Disintegration of Uranium by Neutrons: a New Type of Nuclear Reaction,” *Nature* **143**, 239 (1939).
- [22] R. Bernard, H. Goutte, D. Gogny, and W. Younes, “Microscopic and nonadiabatic Schrödinger equation derived from the generator coordinate method based on zero- and two-quasiparticle states,” *Phys. Rev. C* **84**, 044308 (2011).
- [23] A. Bulgac, P. Magierski, K. J. Roche, and I. Stetcu, “Induced Fission of ^{240}Pu within a Real-Time Microscopic Framework,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 122504 (2016).
- [24] A. Bulgac, S. Jin, K. J. Roche, N. Schunck, and I. Stetcu, “Fission dynamics of ^{240}Pu from saddle to scission and beyond,” *Phys. Rev. C* **100**, 034615 (2019).
- [25] A. Bulgac, S. Jin, and I. Stetcu, “Nuclear Fission Dynamics: Past, Present, Needs, and Future,” *Frontiers in Physics* **8**, 63 (2020).
- [26] M. Bender and *et al.*, “Future of nuclear fission theory,” *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.* **47**, 113002 (2020).
- [27] A. B. Balantekin and N. Takigawa, “Quantum tunneling in nuclear fusion,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 77 (1998).
- [28] J. Sadhukahn, “Microscopic Theory of Nuclear Fission,” *Frontiers in Physics* **8**, 567171 (2020).
- [29] A.O Caldeira and A.J Leggett, “Quantum tunnelling in a dissipative system,” *Ann. Phys.* **149**, 374 (1983).
- [30] R. Vandenbosch and J. R. Huizenga, “Nuclear Fission,” Academic Press, New York (1973).
- [31] P.-G. Reinhard, R.Y. Cusson, and K. Goeke, “Time evolution of coherent ground-state correlations and the TDHF approach,” *Nucl. Phys. A* **398**, 141 (1983).
- [32] R.P Feynman and F.L Vernon, “The theory of a general quantum system interacting with a linear dissipative system,” *Ann. of Phys.* **24**, 118 (1963).
- [33] P. Grangé, Li Jun-Qing, and H. A. Weidenmüller, “Induced nuclear fission viewed as a diffusion process: Transients,” *Phys. Rev. C* **27**, 206 (1983).
- [34] H. A. Weidenmüller and J.-S. Zhang, “Nuclear fission viewed as a diffusion process: Case of very large friction,” *Phys. Rev. C* **29**, 879 (1984).
- [35] A. Bulgac, G. Do Dang, and D. Kusnezov, “Random matrix approach to quantum dissipation,” *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 3468 (1996).
- [36] A. Bulgac, G. Do Dang, and D. Kusnezov, “Dynamics of a simple quantum system in a complex environment,” *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 196 (1998).
- [37] D. Kusnezov, A. Bulgac, and Do Dang, “Quantum Lévy Processes and Fractional Kinetics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1136 (1999).
- [38] B. D. Wilkins, E. P. Steinberg, and R. R. Chasman, “Scission-point model of nuclear fission based on deformed-shell effects,” *Phys. Rev. C* **14**, 1832 (1976).
- [39] U. Brosa, S. Grossmann, and A. Müller, “Nuclear scission,” *Physics Reports* **197**, 167 (1990).
- [40] J.-F. Lemaître, S. Panebianco, J.-L. Sida, S. Hilaire, and S. Heinrich, “New statistical scission-point model to predict fission fragment observables,” *Phys. Rev. C* **92**, 034617 (2015).
- [41] C. Ishizuka, M. D. Usang, F. A. Ivanyuk, J. A. Maruhn, K. Nishio, and S. Chiba, “Four-dimensional Langevin approach to low-energy nuclear fission of ^{236}U ,” *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 064616 (2017).
- [42] A. J. Sierk, “Langevin model of low-energy fission,” *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 034603 (2017).
- [43] M. Albertsson, B.G. Carlsson, T. Døssing, P. Möller, J. Randrup, and S. Åberg, “Excitation energy partition in fission,” *Phys. Lett. B* **803**, 135276 (2020).
- [44] F. A. Ivanyuk, C. Ishizuka, and S. Chiba, “Five-dimensional Langevin approach to fission of atomic nuclei,” *Phys. Rev. C* **109**, 034602 (2024).
- [45] J. Sadhukhan, W. Nazarewicz, and N. Schunck, “Microscopic modeling of mass and charge distributions in the spontaneous fission of ^{240}Pu ,” *Phys. Rev. C* **93**, 011304 (2016).
- [46] J. Sadhukhan, C. Zhang, W. Nazarewicz, and N. Schunck, “Formation and distribution of fragments in the spontaneous fission of ^{240}Pu ,” *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 061301 (2017).
- [47] J. Sadhukhan, “Microscopic Theory for Spontaneous Fission,” *Front. Phys.* **8**, 567171 (2020).
- [48] L. N. Cooper, “Bound Electron Pairs in a Degenerate Fermi Gas,” *Phys. Rev.* **104**, 1189 (1956).
- [49] D. Regnier and D. Lacroix, “Microscopic description of pair transfer between two superfluid Fermi systems. II. Quantum mixing of time-dependent Hartree-Fock-Bogolyubov trajectories,” *Phys. Rev. C* **99**, 064615 (2019).
- [50] N. Hasegawa, K. Hagino, and Y. Tanimura, “Time-dependent generator coordinate method for many-particle tunneling,” *Phys. Lett. B* **808**, 135693 (2020).
- [51] P. Marević, D. Regnier, and D. Lacroix, “Quantum fluctuations induce collective multiphonons in finite fermi liquids,” *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 014620 (2023).
- [52] P. Marević, D. Regnier, and D. Lacroix, “Multiconfigurational time-dependent density functional theory for atomic nuclei: technical and numerical aspects,” *Eur. Phys. A* **60**, 10 (2024).
- [53] B. Li, D. Vretenar, T. Nikšić, P. W. Zhao, and J. Meng, “Generalized time-dependent generator coordinate method for small- and large-amplitude collective motion,” *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 014321 (2023).
- [54] B. Li, D. Vretenar, T. Nikšić, J. Zhao, P. W. Zhao, and J. Meng, “Generalized time-dependent generator coordinate method for induced fission dynamics,” *Front. Phys.* **19**, 44201 (2024).
- [55] A. Bulgac, M. Kafker, I. Abdurrahman, and I. Stetcu, “Non-Markovian character and irreversibility of real-time quantum many-body dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. C* **109**, 064617 (2024).
- [56] G. Scamps, I. Abdurrahman, M. Kafker, A. Bulgac, and I. Stetcu, “Spatial orientation of the fission fragment intrinsic spins and their correlations,” *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, L061602 (2023).
- [57] S. Jin, K. J. Roche, I. Stetcu, I. Abdurrahman, and A. Bulgac, “The LISE package: solvers for static and time-dependent superfluid local density approximation equations in three dimensions,” *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **269**, 108130 (2020).
- [58] A. Bulgac, Y.-L. Luo, P. Magierski, K. J. Roche, and

- Y. Yu, “Real-Time Dynamics of Quantized Vortices in a Unitary Fermi Superfluid,” *Science* **332**, 1288 (2011).
- [59] A. Bulgac, M. Kafker, I. Abdurrahman, and I. Stetcu, “Non-Markovian character and irreversibility of real-time quantum many-body dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. C* **109**, 064617 (2024).
- [60] A. Bulgac, M. Kafker, I. Abdurrahman, and G. Wlazłowski, “Quantum turbulence, superfluidity, non-markovian dynamics, and wave function thermalization,” (2024), [arXiv:2406.00926](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00926).
- [61] A. Bulgac, “Semilocal approach to nonlocal equations,” *Nucl. Phys. A* **487**, 251 (1988).
- [62] Y. Lu, Y. Lei, C. W. Johnson, and Jia J. Shen, “Nuclear states projected from a pair condensate,” *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, 034317 (2022).
- [63] C. W. Johnson, “Current Status of Very-Large-Basis Hamiltonian Diagonalizations for Nuclear Physics,” (2018), [arXiv:1809.07869](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.07869).
- [64] R. M. Zbikowski and C. W. Johnson, “Bootstrapped block Lanczos for large-dimension eigenvalue problems,” *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **291**, 108835 (2023).
- [65] N. Schunck, M. Verriere, G. Potel Aguilar, R. C. Malone, J. A. Silano, A. P. D. Ramirez, and A. P. Tonchev, “Microscopic calculation of fission product yields for odd-mass nuclei,” *Phys. Rev. C* **107**, 044312 (2023).
- [66] G. F. Bertsch and L. M. Robledo, “Symmetry Restoration in Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov Based Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 042505 (2012).
- [67] B. G. Carlsson and J. Rotureau, “New and Practical Formulation for Overlaps of Bogoliubov Vacua,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 172501 (2021).
- [68] G. Wlazłowski, J. W. Holt, S. Moroz, A. Bulgac, and K. J. Roche, “Auxiliary-Field Quantum Monte Carlo Simulations of Neutron Matter in Chiral Effective Field Theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 182503 (2014).
- [69] L. Zurek, S. K. Bogner, R. J. Furnstahl, R. Navarro Pérez, N. Schunck, and A. Schwenk, “Optimized nuclear energy density functionals including long-range pion contributions,” *Phys. Rev. C* **109**, 014319 (2024).