

New Possible Properties of Atomic Nuclei Investigated by Non Linear Methods, Fractal and Recurrence Quantification Analysis.

Elio Conte^(*)

^(*) Department of Pharmacology and Human Physiology – Tires – Center for Innovative Technologies for Signal Detection and Processing, University of Bari , Italy;
International Center for Studies on Radioactivity, Bari, Italy.

Andrei Yu. Khrennikov⁽⁺⁾

⁽⁺⁾ International Center for Mathematical Modeling in Physics and Cognitive Sciences, University of Växjö, S-35195 Sweden

and

Joseph P. Zbilut^(°)

^(°) Department of Molecular Biophysics and Physiology, Rush University, 1653 W. Congress, Chicago, IL60612, USA.

Abstract: For the first time we apply the methodologies of non linear analysis to investigate atomic matter. The sense is that we use such methods in analysis of Atomic Weights and of Mass Number of atomic nuclei. Using AutoCorrelation Function and Mutual Information we establish the presence of non linear effects in the mechanism of increasing mass of atomic nuclei considered as function of the Z atomic number. We also operate reconstruction in phase space and we obtain values for Lyapunov spectrum and D_2 - correlation dimension. We find that such mechanism of increasing mass is divergent, possibly chaotic. Non integer values of D_2 are found. According to previous studies of V. Paar et al. [5] we also investigate the possible existence of a Power Law for atomic nuclei and , using also the technique of the variogram, we arrive to conclude that a fractal regime could superintend to the mechanism of increasing mass for nuclei. Finally , using Hurst exponent, evidence is obtained that the mechanism of increasing mass in atomic nuclei is fractional Brownian regime with long range correlations. The most interesting results are obtained by using the Recurrence Quantification Analysis (RQA). We estimate % Recurrences, % Determinism, Entropy and Max Line one time in an embedded phase space with dimension $D=2$ and the other time in embedding dimension $D=1$. New recurrences, psudoperiodicities, self-resemblance and class of self-similarities are identified with values of determinism showing oscillating values indicating the presence of more or less stability during the process of increasing mass of atomic nuclei All the data were analyzed using shuffled data for comparison.

In brief, new regimes of regularities are identified for atomic nuclei that deserve to be deepened by future researches. In particular an accurate analysis of binding energy values by non linear methods is further required.

Introduction

It is well known that the mass represents one of the most basic properties of an atomic nucleus. It is also a complex and non trivial quantity whose basic properties still must be investigated deeply and properly understood.

The celebrated Einstein's mass law is known

$$m = \frac{E}{c^2} \quad (1)$$

On this basis some different contributions of energy are stored inside a nucleus, and contribute to its mass.

During nucleus formation in its ground state, a certain amount of energy B will be released in the process so that

$$Mc^2 = \sum_j m_j c^2 - B . \quad (2)$$

There are different sources of such energy B . It contributes the strong attractive interaction of nucleons . However, despite the immense amount of data about nuclear properties, the basic understanding of the nuclear strong interaction, as example, still lacks. We have a basic model of meson exchange that of course works at a qualitative level but it does not provide a satisfactory approach to the description of such basic interaction. Still it contributes Coulomb repulsion between protons, and in addition we have also surface effects and still many other contributions that in a phenomenological picture are tentatively taken into account invoking some models as example the liquid drop elaboration as von Weizsacker [1].

It is known some other nuclear mass models may be considered and, despite the numerous parameters that are contained in these different models and the intrinsic conceptual differences adopted in their formulation, some common features arise from these calculations. All such models, [2], give similar results for the known masses, their calculations yield a typical accuracy that results about 5×10^{-4} for a medium-heavy nucleus having binding energy of the order of 1000 MeV , but the predictions of such different mass models strongly give a net divergence when applied to unknown regions.

One consequence of such two indications seems rather evident. According to [2], there is the possibility that a basic underlying mechanism oversees the process of mass formation of atomic nuclei, and it is not presently incorporated and considered in the present nuclear models of the traditional nuclear physics.

In fact, some astonishing results are not lacking as far as this problem is concerned.

Owing to the presence of Pauli's exclusion principle, when nucleons are put together to form a bound state, there are not at rest and thus their kinetic energy also contributes to B given in (2) and thus to the mass of the nucleus. Still according to [2], a part of this energy, that is to say, that one that varies smoothly with the number of the nucleons, is taken into account in the liquid drop model but the remaining part of this energy fluctuates with the number of nucleons.

The proper nature of such fluctuations should be more investigated.

P. Leboeuf [2] has extensively analyzed this problem and his conclusion is that the motion of the nucleons inside the nucleus has a regular plus a chaotic component. We will not enter into details here [2] but we only remember here that traditionally in nuclear physics dynamical effects in the structure of nuclei have been referred to as shell effects with the pioneer studies of A. Bohr and B.R. Mottelson [3] and V.M. Strutinsky [4]. The experience here derives from atomic physics where the symmetries of the Hamiltonian generates strong degeneracy of the electronic levels and such degeneracy produce oscillations in the electronic binding energy. Shell effects should be due to deviations of the single particle levels with respect to their average properties.

According to the different approaches that have been introduced to reproduce the systematics of the observed nuclear masses that in part are inspired to liquid drop models or Thomas Fermi approximations, the total energy may be expressed as the sum of two contributions:

$$U(N, Z, x) = \bar{U}(N, Z, x) + \hat{U}(N, Z, x) \quad (3)$$

with x a parameter set defining the shape of the nucleus. \bar{U} is describing the bulk or macroscopic properties of the nucleus and \hat{U} instead describes shell effects. This term could be splitted in two components [2], the first representing the regular component and the second representing instead the chaotic contribution. The same thing we should have for the mass

$$Mc^2 = \sum_j m_j c^2 - B$$

with

$$B(E, x) = \bar{B}(E, x) - \hat{B}(E, x) \quad (4)$$

There is now another important but independent contribution that deserves to be mentioned here.

Rather recently V. Paar et al [5] introduced a power law for description of the line of stability of atomic nuclei, and in particular for the description of atomic weights. They compared the found power law with the semi-empirical formula of the liquid drop model, and showed that the power law corresponds to a reduction of neutron excess in superheavy nuclei with respect to the semi-empirical formula. Some fractal features of the nuclear valley of stability were analyzed and the value of fractal dimension was determined.

It is well known that a power law may be often connected with an underlying fractal geometry of the considered system. If confirmed for atomic nuclei, according to [5], it could be proposed a new approach to the problem of stability of atomic nuclei. In this case the aim should be to identify the basic features in underlying dynamics giving rise to the structure of the atomic nuclei. Of course, it was pointed out the

role of fractal geometry in quantum physics and quark dynamics [6] and in particular it was analyzed the self-similarity of paths of the Feynman path integral.

Finally, M. Pitkanen repeatedly outlined that his TGD model predicts that universe is 4-D spin glass and this kind of fractal energy landscape might be present in some geometric degrees of freedom such as shape of nuclear outer surface or, if nuclear string picture is accepted, in the folding dynamics of the nuclear string [7].

Still examining the problem under a different point of view, we must outline here the results that recently were obtained in [8].

These authors found non linear dynamical properties of giant monopole resonances in atomic nuclei investigated within the time-dependent relativistic mean field model.

Finally, in ref [9], the statistics of the radioactive decay of heavy nuclei was the subject of experimental interest. It was considered that, owing to the intrinsic fluctuations of the decay rate, the counting statistics could depart from the simple Poissonian behaviour. Several experiments carried out with alfa and beta sources have found that the counting variance for long counting periods, is higher than the Poissonian value by more than one order of magnitude. This anomalous large variance has been taken as an experimental indication that the power spectrum of the decay rate fluctuations has a contribution that grows as the inverse of the frequency f at low frequencies.

In conclusion, also considered the problem from several and different view points, there are some different arising evidences that it deserves to be analyzed by the methods of non linear dynamics in order to obtain some detailed result.


This was precisely the aim of the present paper. We analyzed the Atomic Weights, $W_a(Z)$ and the Mass Number $A(Z)$ as function of the atomic number Z for stable atomic nuclei and we applied to such data our non linear test methods, Fractal and Recurrence Quantification Analysis. The results are reported and discussed in detail in the following section.

2. Preparation of the Experimental Data.

It is known that the trends of nuclear stability may be represented in a well known N, Z chart of nuclides where each nucleus with Z protons and N neutrons has mass Number $A = Z + N$. A line of stability may be realized by taking for each atomic number Z , the stable nucleus of the isotope having the largest relative abundance.

The atomic weights of a naturally occurring element are given by averaging the corresponding isotope weights, weighted so to take into account the relative isotopic abundances. In this paper the data for stable nuclei with Z values until $Z = 83$ were considered. The data were taken using the IUPAC 1997, standard atomic weights, at www.webelements.com. $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$ are given in Fig.1.

Fig.1



Atomic Weights: $W_a(Z)$

Mass Number $A(Z)$


3. Tests by using Mutual Information.

Autocorrelation Function. The autocorrelation $\rho(\tau)$ is given by the correlation of a time series with itself using $x(t)$ and $x(t+\tau)$ two time series in the correlation formula. For time series it measures as well correlated values of the given time series result under different delays. A choice for the delay time to use when embedding time series data should be the first time the autocorrelation crosses zero. It represents the lowest value of delay for which the values are uncorrelated. The important thing here is that the autocorrelation function is a linear measure and thus it should not provide accurate results in all the situations in which important non linear contributions are expected.


In the present case we examine two series that are $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$. Here we have not a time variable respect to which the delay must be characterized but instead it is the atomic number Z that takes the place of time t . Therefore we will speak here of Z -shift instead of time-lags in our embedding procedure.

In Fig.2 we report the results of our calculations for autocorrelation function (ACF) in the case of Atomic Weights and Mass Number respectively. Both the ACF for $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$ were calculated for Z -shift ranging from 1 to 80. The first value of Z the ACF crosses the zero was obtained for $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$, and it resulted Z -shift = 30. A typical behaviour was obtained for ACF, in the cases of $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$ respectively, resulting in progressively, positive but decreasing values of ACF until the value Z -shift = 30, and a subsequent negative half-wave for Z -shift values greater than 30. This seems an interesting result that deserves in some manner a careful interpretation.

Fig.2



ACF for Z -shift values ranging from 1 to 80 in the case of $W_a(Z)$.




ACF for Z -shift values ranging from 1 to 80 in the case of $A(Z)$.

The Mutual Information. It is usually used to determine a useful time delay for attractor reconstruction of a given time series. Generally speaking, we may observe only a variable from a system, $x(t)$, and we wish to reconstruct a higher dimensional attractor. We have to consider $[x(t), x(t+\tau), x(t+2\tau), \dots, x(t+n\tau)]$ to produce a $(n+1)$ dimensional representation. Consequently, the problem is to choose a proper value for the delay τ . If the delay is chosen too short, then $x(t)$ is very similar to $x(t+\tau)$. Of course, for a too large delay, then the corresponding coordinates result essentially independent and no information can be gained. The method of Mutual Information [10] involves the idea that a good choice for τ is one that, given $x(t)$ provides new information with measurement $x(t+\tau)$. In other terms, given a measurement of $x(t)$, how many bits on the average can be predicted about $x(t+\tau)$? In the general case, as τ is increased, Mutual Information decreases and then usually rises again. The first minimum in Mutual Information is used to select a proper τ . The important thing is here that the Mutual Information function takes non linear correlations into account.

Before to consider the results that we have obtained, it is important to take into account that they change in some manner our traditional manner to approach the discussion on atomic weights and mass numbers of atomic nuclei. In fact, we do not consider here values obtained for a single atomic weight or for a single mass number. Instead, using M.I., we evaluate M.I. values computed for pairs of Atomic Weights, i.e. $W_a(Z)$ and $W_a(Z + Z - shift)$, for any possible Z and for each considered $Z - shift$. The same thing happens for pairs of atomic nuclei with Mass Numbers $A(Z)$ and $A(Z + Z - shift)$.


In Fig.3 we give our results for analysis of $W_a(Z)$. The calculated $Z - shift$ resulted $Z = 3$. In Fig.4 we give instead the results for $A(Z)$. In this case the calculated $Z - shift$ resulted to be $Z = 2$. To complete our results, in Fig.5 we give also the results of M.I computed for $N(Z)$, being this time N the number of neutrons considered as $N(Z)$. Finally, Fig. 6 compares Mutual Information of $W_a(Z)$, $A(Z)$, $N(Z)$.

Fig. 3: Mutual Information



Z-shift	M. I.
0	2.75572
1	2.29477
2	2.12415
3	2.11128
4	2.29507
5	2.30601
6	2.32549
7	2.15915
8	2.11995
9	2.19359
10	2.34003
11	2.21110
12	2.05087
13	2.09827
14	2.16302
15	2.19951
16	2.09898
17	2.03026
18	2.07486
19	2.15473
20	2.07256

Fig. 4: Mutual Information



Z-shift	M. I.
0	2.75025
1	2.24680
2	2.12359
3	2.12379
4	2.24418
5	2.25447
6	2.21247
7	2.15885
8	2.11560
9	2.19567
10	2.25399
11	2.09334
12	2.02933
13	2.08003
14	2.13427
15	2.07279
16	2.09985
17	1.98171
18	2.08486
19	2.11095
20	2.09009

Fig. 5: Mutual Information





Fig.6 : Mutual Information.



We are now in the condition to reassume some results.


Using autocorrelation function, ACF (Linear Analysis), a $Z - shift$ value of $Z = 30$ is obtained for both $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$.

Using Mutual Information (Non Linear Analysis) it is obtained instead $Z - shift = 3$ for $W_a(Z)$ and $Z - shift = 2$ for $A(Z)$. Also $N(Z)$ gave $Z - shift = 3$.

We have a preliminary indication that the mechanism of increasing mass in atomic nuclei is a non linear mechanism. Of course, this could be an important indication in understanding of the basic features of nuclear matter. Therefore it becomes of relevant importance to attempt to confirm such conclusion on the


basis of a more deepened control. The test that in such cases one uses in analysis of non linear dynamics of time series data is that one of surrogate data. Here we used shuffled data. The results are given in Fig.7 for $W_a(Z)$ and in Fig.8 for $A(Z)$.

Fig.7 : Surrogate Data Analysis



Z-lags	M.I.-Surrogate Data
0	2.76156
1	1.48621
2	1.44105
3	1.44755
4	1.38917
5	1.36923
6	1.54505
7	1.38976
8	1.38138
9	1.48849
10	1.36547
11	1.34689
12	1.37347
13	1.42643
14	1.34143
15	1.29609
16	1.25763
17	1.40470
18	1.43727
19	1.41390
20	1.36288

Fig. 8 : Surrogate Data Analysis



Z-lags	M.I.-Surrogate Data
0	2.73606
1	1.61453
2	1.39896
3	1.37041
4	1.33673
5	1.30566
6	1.41145
7	1.34616
8	1.35618
9	1.34365
10	1.37382
11	1.25994
12	1.30270
13	1.41078
14	1.47545
15	1.21417
16	1.31047
17	1.27582
18	1.38925
19	1.35851
20	1.41464

The results obtained by using shuffled data clearly confirm that we are in presence of a on linear mechanism in the process of increasing mass of atomic nuclei.

We also tested statistically the obtained differences between M.I. for original and surrogate data for the case of Atomic Weights as well as for the case of Mass Numbers. In the case of M.I for Atomic Weights vs M.I. Atomic Weights – Surrogate Data , using Unpaired t test we obtained a P value $P < 0.0001$ and the same value was found in the case of M.I. Mass Number vs M.I. Mass Number – Surrogate Data.

In conclusion, by accepting the presence of non linearity, we have reached the first relevant conclusion of the present paper.

Looking now to Figures 3, 4, 5, 6 one may identify now new properties for atomic nuclei. Remember that we are considering each time, pairs of Atomic Weights or pairs of Mass Numbers or still pairs of Neutron Numbers for atomic nuclei with *Z-shifted* values ranging from 1 to 20. What one should expect in this case is to find a minimum of Mutual Information followed soon after by a rather constant behaviour for M.I. Examination of the results reveals instead that we have some definite maxima and some definite minima at given values of *Z-shift* that are quite different in the two and three cases that we have examined.

In detail the maxima for Atomic Weights are given at Z-shift values = 6,10,15,19,... . Minima instead are given at Z-shift values =3,8,12,17,..... .

The maxima for Mass Numbers are given at Z-shift values=5,10,14,16(19) while the minima are given at Z-shift values =2,8,12,15,17. For Neutrons we have Z-shift values = 3,9,12,17 for the minima and 6,10,14,18 for the maxima. In conclusion: Still repeating here that each time we are exploring the M.I value for pairs of atomic weights, or of mass number or of neutrons, shifted in the *Z-value* by some given values ranging between 1 and 20, we find that some pairs of nuclei show maxima MI values while other pairs of nuclei show minima MI value. Therefore we have new and interesting properties identified in atomic nuclei when analyzed by pairs as in the present methodology. We may call such new identified regularities for atomic nuclei as pseudo periodicities in pairs of atomic nuclei.

For Mass Numbers we may write as example that

$$\Delta A = \Delta N + Z - shift$$

Fixed a value of *Z*, we have consequently $A_1 = Z + N_1$. For an atomic nucleus with mass number A_2 and *Z*-shifted, we will have $A_2 = Z + Z - shift + N_2$.

Consequently, $\Delta A = A_2 - A_1 = \Delta N + Z - shift$ with $\Delta N = N_2 - N_1$. For *Z*-shift values=5,10,14,16(19), the considered pairs of atomic nuclei will show maxima of M.I.. Instead for *Z*-shift values =2,8,12,15,17, such M.I. values will reach a minimum value.

Let us go in more detail in the analysis.

First of all we have also to note that the values of MI, calculated for each *Z-shift* ranging from 1 to 20, result to be quite different in $W_a(Z)$ respect to $A(Z)$, and $N(Z)$. In addition, as previously said, Mutual Information measures how much, given two random variables, and knowing one of these two variables, is reduced our uncertainty about the other. Mutual Information must thus be intended essentially as estimation of mutual dependence of two variables. In our case we find that the pairs of atomic weights, or of mass number or of neutrons in atomic nuclei that are shifted by some definite values of the atomic number *Z*, show strong dependence (maxima values of M.I.) or, respectively, they show very low dependence (minima values of M.I.). We have some new pseudoperiodicities that in some manner recall a new kind of pseudo isotopies. All that seems to be realized in a full regime of non linearity.

4. Phase Space Reconstruction of $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$.

We may now attempt to obtain for the first time a phase space reconstruction of Atomic Weights and Mass Number of atomic nuclei.

To reach this objective one must estimate Embedding Dimension using the False Nearest Neighbors Criterion (FFN). We applied it using a *Z-shift* = 3 for $W_a(Z)$ and a *Z-shift*=2 for $A(Z)$ as previously found. A false criterion distance was considered to be 4.42 for both the cases of the analysis. The results are reported in Fig.9 for atomic weights, $W_a(Z)$, and in Fig.10 for Mass Number, $A(Z)$.

Fig. 9 :False Nearest Neighbors for Atomic Weights





Fig.10 : False Nearest Neighbors for Mass Number




The evaluation of the results given in Figures 9, 10 enables us to conclude that the phase space reconstruction for atomic weights and mass number requires an estimated embedding dimension, that results to be included between 1 and 2. We may assume to consider $D=2$. Atomic weights and mass number of atomic nuclei may be approximately represented in a bi dimensional phase space. Consequently, according to the general framework of the theory on non linear dynamics of systems, we may conclude that a very few number of independent variables is required in order to describe the mechanism of increasing mass of atomic nuclei. We may accept to consider that they are two variables that, with greatest prudence, we may accept to identify as being the proton and the neutron numbers, respectively. The phase space description of atomic weights $W_a(Z)$ and of Mass Number $A(Z)$ requires with approximation, the use of such two variables.

Since this result has been obtained in a closed form, we may now attempt to analyze if the two given $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$ exhibit or not properties of divergence.

To this purpose we may calculate Lyapunov spectrum in the embedded phase space. The results that we obtained, are reported in Fig. 11 and in Fig.12 for $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$, respectively.


Fig.11 : Lyapunov spectrum of atomic weights



iteration,	exponents		iteration,	exponents	
1	-0.139132	-1.767928	5	-0.015293	-1.891767
2	-0.054642	-1.852418	6	-0.011169	-1.895891
3	-0.032002	-1.875058	7	-0.008224	-1.898835
4	-0.021497	-1.885562	8	-0.006016	-1.901043

iteration,	exponents		iteration,	exponents	
9	-0.004299	-1.902761	45	0.003833	-1.043353
10	-0.002925	-1.904134	46	0.003724	-1.022886
11	-0.001801	-1.905258	47	0.003713	-1.008188
12	-0.000864	-1.906195	48	0.003649	-0.995043
13	-0.000946	-1.854474	49	0.003576	-0.982424
14	-0.000219	-1.810264	50	0.003419	-0.970124
15	0.000026	-1.779827	51	0.003116	-0.958012
16	0.000273	-1.753227	52	0.002781	-0.948094
17	0.000425	-1.705629	53	0.002434	-0.938526
18	0.000914	-1.667297	54	0.002281	-0.929092
19	0.001349	-1.632997	55	0.002133	-0.920000
20	0.001738	-1.602124	56	0.001982	-0.911222
21	0.002186	-1.585933	57	0.001851	-0.902767
22	0.002567	-1.570617	58	0.001885	-0.897098
23	0.002785	-1.552573	59	0.001945	-0.891648
24	0.003007	-1.536054	60	0.002004	-0.886751
25	0.003233	-1.508474	61	0.002097	-0.882050
26	0.003433	-1.483006	62	0.002113	-0.877724
27	0.003304	-1.450959	63	0.002311	-0.872891
28	0.003100	-1.421118	64	0.002398	-0.865438
29	0.003155	-1.394447	65	0.002469	-0.858201
30	0.002734	-1.365179	66	0.002539	-0.854135
31	0.002481	-1.336786	67	0.002586	-0.850170
32	0.002367	-1.309490	68	0.002372	-0.850370
33	0.002297	-1.283733	69	0.002156	-0.850555
34	0.002104	-1.261030	70	0.001942	-0.850731
35	0.002071	-1.235585	71	0.001733	-0.850900
36	0.002229	-1.208038	72	0.001529	-0.851065
37	0.002491	-1.182091	73	0.001330	-0.851224
38	0.002558	-1.161598	74	0.001136	-0.851379
39	0.002648	-1.143582	75	0.000947	-0.851530
40	0.002781	-1.125369	76	0.000763	-0.851676
41	0.002912	-1.108048	77	0.000585	-0.851819
42	0.003353	-1.094097	78	0.000410	-0.851958
43	0.003464	-1.078832			
44	0.003659	-1.064133			

Fig.12 : Lyapunov spectrum of mass number



iteration,	exponents		iteration,	exponents	
1	-0.063750	-1.815136	4	-0.000940	-1.877946
2	-0.013655	-1.865231	5	0.001067	-1.879953
3	-0.004496	-1.874390	6	0.002390	-1.881276

iteration,	exponents		iteration,	exponents	
7	0.003333	-1.882218	44	0.008790	-1.889480
8	0.004039	-1.882925	45	0.010447	-1.876392
9	0.004589	-1.883475	46	0.010388	-1.871786
10	0.005029	-1.883914	47	0.009970	-1.869670
11	0.005907	-2.030549	48	0.009374	-1.855670
12	0.005902	-2.152007	49	0.008541	-1.841986
13	0.007184	-2.344940	50	0.007498	-1.829730
14	0.007900	-2.508600	51	0.006726	-1.821934
15	0.008538	-2.585360	52	0.005940	-1.808215
16	0.008446	-2.593648	53	0.005215	-1.795046
17	0.008353	-2.600949	54	0.004497	-1.783516
18	0.007751	-2.585976	55	0.004030	-1.771905
19	0.008750	-2.554168	56	0.003596	-1.760725
20	0.008150	-2.531907	57	0.002953	-1.750916
21	0.008186	-2.482481	58	0.002916	-1.743006
22	0.007894	-2.450329	59	0.002961	-1.735446
23	0.008806	-2.420931	60	0.003004	-1.728808
24	0.009633	-2.393973	61	0.003032	-1.722373
25	0.009816	-2.350399	62	0.003108	-1.713120
26	0.009954	-2.310147	63	0.003229	-1.704206
27	0.009880	-2.258690	64	0.003291	-1.693598
28	0.009662	-2.210759	65	0.003299	-1.689223
29	0.009018	-2.163469	66	0.003127	-1.691107
30	0.008250	-2.119600	67	0.002824	-1.702828
31	0.007832	-2.082773	68	0.002620	-1.700615
32	0.007498	-2.052309	69	0.002292	-1.708755
33	0.007109	-2.023616	70	0.002307	-1.709571
34	0.006523	-2.013469	71	0.002341	-1.710383
35	0.005691	-2.003623	72	0.002445	-1.714966
36	0.005143	-1.995782	73	0.002536	-1.719414
37	0.004718	-1.988460	74	0.002212	-1.719409
38	0.003966	-1.963859	75	0.001877	-1.719385
39	0.004116	-1.946858	76	0.001547	-1.719358
40	0.004339	-1.930786	77	0.001225	-1.719332
41	0.004649	-1.922343	78	0.000912	-1.719306
42	0.005367	-1.917894	79	0.000606	-1.719280
43	0.007274	-1.903393	80	0.000308	-1.719255

To calculate the Lyapunov spectrum in the case of the Atomic Weights, $W_a(Z)$, we used a number of 22 fitted points in the embedded phase space.

These are the following results for the calculated Lyapunov exponents:

$\lambda_1 = 0.000410$ and $\lambda_2 = -0.851958$. It is seen that we have $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 < 0$ with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < 0$ as required.

In conclusion we are in presence of a divergent system and such divergence may be indicative a pure chaotic regime for Atomic Weights.

In the case of the Mass Number, $A(Z)$, we utilized a number of 17 fitted points in the embedded phase space. These are the results we obtained for the calculated Lyapunov exponents: $\lambda_1 = 0.000308$, $\lambda_2 = -1.719255$ with $\lambda_1 > 0$, $\lambda_2 < 0$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 < 0$. Also in the case of Mass Number, $A(Z)$, we are in presence of a divergent system and it could be indicative of a pure chaotic regime.

In brief, we have reached the following conclusions:

- 1) In the process of increasing mass of atomic nuclei we are in presence of a non linear mechanism. Remember that the presence of non linear contributions in the dynamic of a system gives often origin to chaotic regimes.
- 2) The mechanism of increasing mass in Atomic Weights and in Mass Number for pairs of atomic nuclei also exhibits some pseudo periodicities at some definite Z - *shifts* of atomic nuclei.

Therefore, we could be in presence of an ordered regime of increasing mass but in the complex of a whole structure that is divergent and possibly chaotic.

- 3) A phase space reconstruction has been realized for Atomic Weights and Mass Number of atomic nuclei, respectively. In our opinion this is a relevant result that is obtained here. In fact, from the analysis performed by using F.F.N, it does not result in a so clear manner that the reconstructed phase space has dimension $D=2$. We have F.F.N. values that suspend embedding dimension between 1 and 2. In this case in the analysis it is adopted the greatest value. In conclusion we may accept an embedding dimension $D=2$, and only in this condition we have that only few, two variables, are required in order to describe the mechanism of increasing mass of atomic nuclei in phase space with respect to atomic weights and mass number. The first variable should be the atomic number, Z , and the other variable should be the Neutron Number, $N = A - Z$.
- 4) The analysis of $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$ reveals a new important features when we analyze such two systems by calculation of Lyapunov spectrum. It results that we are in presence of divergent systems in both case of stable nuclei analyzed by $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$. Such divergent property, linked to the previously found on non linearity, could be indicative that we are in presence of a chaotic regime in the mechanism of the increasing mass of atomic nuclei when seen as function of Z .

We may go on by a further step calculating the Correlation Dimension in the reconstructed phase space for both $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$. In Fig.13 we report the results for $W_a(Z)$. In Fig. 14 we give instead the results for $A(Z)$. Finally in Figures 15 and 16 we have the results using surrogate (shuffled) data.

Fig.13 : Atomic Weights.





Fig.14 : Mass Number.



For the atomic weights it is obtained $D_2 = 1.955 \pm 0.296$ as value for Correlation Dimension. For Mass Number it results instead $D_2 = 2.120 \pm 0.084$.

It is important to observe that in both case we obtain non integer values of such topological dimension in phase space reconstruction.

We may now consider the results for surrogate data.

Fig.15 : Results on Correlation Dimension, Atomic Weights (surrogate data).





Fig.16 : Results on Correlation Dimension, Mass Number (surrogate data).



In the case of $W_a(Z)$ we obtain $D_2 = 5.130 \pm 0.624$ while instead in the case of $A(Z)$ we have $D_2 = 5.193 \pm 0.810$

As seen through the results, a net difference is obtained in comparison of original with surrogate data. They may be quantified in the following manner:

$$S = \frac{|D_{2,original} - D_{2,surrogate}|}{\sigma_{surrogate}} = 3.678(\text{Atomic Weights } Z - \text{lag} = 2), 5.088(\text{Atomic Weights } Z - \text{lag} = 4), \\ 3.793(\text{Mass Number } Z - \text{lag} = 2)$$

The null hypothesis may be rejected. In conclusion we have a non integer topological dimension for both $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$.

Therefore it has a sense to attempt to ascertain if we are in presence of a fractal behaviour for both the system of data that we have in examination.

5. On a Possible Existing Power Law to Represent Increasing Mass in Atomic Weights and Mass Number of Atomic Nuclei.

As we indicated in the introduction in the present paper, rather recently V. Paar et al [6] introduced a power law for description of the line of stability of atomic nuclei, and in particular for the description of atomic weights. They compared the found power law with the semi-empirical formula of the liquid drop model, and showed that the power law corresponds to a reduction of neutron excess in superheavy nuclei with respect to the semi-empirical formula. Some fractal features of the nuclear valley of stability were analyzed and the value of fractal dimension was determined.

It is well known that a power law may be often connected with an underlying fractal geometry of the considered system. If confirmed for atomic nuclei, according to [5], it could be proposed a new approach to the problem of stability of atomic nuclei. In this case the aim should be to identify the basic features in underlying dynamics giving rise to the structure of the atomic nuclei.

The aim is to perform here such kind of analysis for $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$.

For atomic weights let us introduce the following Power Law :

$$W_a(Z) = aZ^\beta \quad (5)$$

while instead for the Mass Number let us introduce the following power law

$$A(Z) = cZ^\gamma \quad (6)$$

The problem is now to estimate (a, β) and (c, γ) by a fitting procedure.

We give here the obtained results for the Atomic Weights.

Curve Fit Report


Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1. Model Fit: $A * X^B$

Parameter Estimates for All Groups

Groups	Count	Iter's	R2	A	B
All	83	24	0.99954	1.47335	1.12133

Combined Plot Section

Fig. 17



Model Estimation Section

Parameter Name	Parameter Estimate	Asymptotic Standard Error	Lower 95% C.L.	Upper 95% C.L.
A	1.47335	0.02448	1.42464	1.52206
B	1.12133	0.00399	1.11338	1.12927
Iterations	24	Rows Read	83	
R-Squared	0.999538	Rows Used	83	
Random Seed	9839	Total Count	83	


Estimated Model

Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.

Plot Section

Fig.18



In conclusion, for the (5) we obtained $a = 1.47335$ and $\beta = 1.12133$.

V. Paar et al. [5] obtained instead that $a = 1.44 \pm 0.02$ and $\beta = 1.120 \pm 0.004$ and $\beta = 1.19 \pm 0.01$ by using the Box Counting method. There is an excellent agreement.

As it may be seen the obtained values significantly differ from the line. In addition, the obtained values strongly give evidence for a possible fractal regime.

Let us see now the results that we obtained for the (6) concerning Mass Number.

Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.


Model Fit: $A \cdot X^B$

Parameter Estimates for All Groups

Groups	Count	Iter's	R2	A	B
All	83	23	0.99929	1.46185	1.12389

Combined Plot Section

Fig.19



Model Estimation Section

Parameter Name	Parameter Estimate	Asymptotic Standard Error	Lower 95% C.L.	Upper 95% C.L.
A	1.46185	0.03010	1.40195	1.52174
B	1.12389	0.00495	1.11404	1.13373
Iterations	23	Rows Read	83	
R-Squared	0.999294	Rows Used	83	
Random Seed	10007	Total Count	83	


Estimated Model

Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.

Plot Section

Fig.20



In conclusion, for the (6) we obtained: $c=1.46185$, $\gamma=1.12389$.

V. Paar et al. obtained [6] $c=1.47\pm 0.02$ and $\gamma=1.123\pm 0.005$ in excellent agreement.

Again we may conclude for values that significantly differ from line. In addition, the obtained values strongly give evidence for a possible fractal regime.

The possible existence of a fractal regime in the mechanism of increasing mass in atomic weights and mass number of atomic nuclei changes radically our traditional manner to conceive nuclear matter. Consequently, it becomes of relevant importance to attempt to deepen such result so to reach the highest possible level of certainty on it. A way to deepen such kind of analysis is to follow the way of variogram method. Variograms usually give powerful indications on the variability of the examined data, on their self-similarity and self-affine behaviour. In particular, they enable us to calculate the Generalized Fractal Dimension [for details see ref.11].

The semivariogram is given in the following manner

$$\gamma(h) = \frac{E(R(x) - R(x+h))^2}{2} \quad (7)$$

For Atomic Weights it is:

$$\gamma(h) = \frac{E(W_a(Z) - W_a(Z+h))^2}{2} \quad (8)$$

and for Mass Number it is

$$\gamma(h) = \frac{E(M_n(Z) - M_n(Z+h))^2}{2} \quad . \quad Z - \text{shift is indicated here by } h=1,2,\dots \quad (9)$$

Still, in the general case we may write

$$\gamma(h) = \frac{1}{2(N-h)} \sum_{i=1}^{N-h} (R(x_i+h) - R(x_i))^2 \quad (10)$$

For a self-affine series the semivariogram scales according to

$$\gamma(h) = C h^D \quad (11)$$

being D the Generalized Fractal Dimension. It is linked to H_a by $D=2H_a$ being H_a the Hausdorff dimension.

We may also estimate the corresponding Probability Density Function that is given in the following manner


$$P(h) = \frac{a}{k^a} h^{a-1} \quad (12)$$

being $D = a - 1$ and k is a scale parameter.

Let us introduce now the results that we obtained for Atomic Weights.

RESULTS

Fig. 21: Variogram of atomic weights



Z-shift	value	Z-shift	value	Z-shift	value
1	4.1038233	28	2583.4415	55	9936.2738
2	13.890723	29	2774.3962	56	10263.722
3	30.73476	30	2974.6827	57	10614.884
4	53.281165	31	3177.0212	58	10974.746
5	82.706811	32	3391.3496	59	11360.41
6	118.39056	33	3607.1587	60	11745.812
7	161.00905	34	3826.8629	61	12160.26
8	209.83439	35	4053.0824	62	12559.606
9	265.1562	36	4283.8682	63	12969.082
10	326.91086	37	4517.609	64	13342.27
11	395.38036	38	4760.8117	65	13738.976
12	470.35989	39	5010.0734	66	14163.507
13	551.85195	40	5268.4938	67	14573.838
14	640.44287	41	5533.4834	68	14979.658
15	735.22246	42	5805.6797	69	15415.604
16	837.44107	43	6083.8624	70	15830.968
17	946.67776	44	6370.1678	71	16277.052
18	1060.8571	45	6665.5819	72	16709.305
19	1183.535	46	6969.6876	73	17165.872
20	1314.6237	47	7285.3773	74	17613.299
21	1448.8492	48	7605.9824	75	18096.431
22	1590.1856	49	7928.8907	76	18533.473
23	1734.6391	50	8261.1897	77	18994.677
24	1888.6115	51	8592.0056	78	19457.937
25	2047.654	52	8917.3226	79	20009.547
26	2217.1471	53	9259.8625	80	20578.44
27	2394.576	54	9591.9184		

Using the (11) in a Ln-Ln representation, we may now estimate the Generalized Fractal Dimension. We obtained the following results.

Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.


Model Fit: C2=A+B*(C1) Simple Linear

Parameter Estimates for All Groups

Groups	Count	Iter's	R2	A	B
All	81	6	0.99986	1.25542	1.98086

Combined Plot Section: Ln-Ln variogram fitting

Fig.22



Model Estimation Section

Parameter Name	Parameter Estimate	Asymptotic Standard Error	Lower 95% C.L.	Upper 95% C.L.
A	1.25542	0.00939	1.23674	1.27410
B	1.98086	0.00264	1.97560	1.98612
Iterations	6	Rows Read	81	
R-Squared	0.999859	Rows Used	81	
Random Seed	7364	Total Count	81	

Estimated Model

$$(1.25542232430747)+(1.98086225009967)*(C1)$$


Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.

Model Fit: C2=A+B*(C1) Simple Linear

Plot Section

Fig.23



In conclusion, we obtain for Atomic Weights the following results:

Generalized Fractal Dimension $D = 1.98086$


Hausdorff dimension $H_a = 0.99043$.

By using the (12) we may now calculate the Probability Density Function. For atomic weights it results that

$$P(Z) = 5.673 \times 10^{-6} Z^{1.98086} \quad (13)$$

that is given in Fig.24.

Fig. 24



In order to deepen our analysis we may also employ a modified version of standard variogram analysis, using this time a light modification of its usual form in the following way

$$\gamma_{2N}(h) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-h} (R(x_i) - R(x_i + h))^2 \quad (14)$$

where we calculate now by $(1/2N)$ instead of $1/2(N-h)$ being $2(N-1)$ the number of degrees of freedom for the whole system taken in consideration.

We have the results in the case of the variogram γ_{2N} for atomic weights in Figures 25, 26, 27.

Fig. 25




Fig.26





Fig.27



As see, passing from variogram in Fig.25 to variogram in Fig.26 and, finally, in variogram in Fig.27 we have used each time a different factor of scale and, in spite of such different factors of scale, the behaviour of the correspondent variograms, remain unchanged. This result may be taken as further indication that we are in presence of a fractal regime.

In addition, by the γ_{2N} variogram, we may now re-calculate the Generalized Fractal Dimension using a Ln-Ln scale.

The results are given in the following scheme.

Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.


Model Fit: C2=A+B*(C1) Simple Linear

Parameter Estimates for All Groups

Groups	Count	Iter's	R2	A	B
All	52	6	0.99288	1.65610	1.70683

Combined Plot Section

Fig.28



Model Estimation Section

Parameter Name	Parameter Estimate	Asymptotic Standard Error	Lower 95% C.L.	Upper 95% C.L.
A	1.65610	0.06408	1.52739	1.78481
B	1.70683	0.02045	1.66576	1.74790
Iterations	6	Rows Read	52	
R-Squared	0.992875	Rows Used	52	
Random Seed	10882	Total Count	52	

Estimated Model

$$(1.65609637745411)+(1.70683194557246)*(C1)$$


Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.

Model Fit: $C2=A+B*(C1)$ Simple Linear

Plot Section


Fig.29



In conclusion, also in this case a non integer value of the Generalized Fractal Dimension is obtained. It results $D=1.70683$ with Hausdorff dimension $H_a = 0.853415$. Such values result in satisfactory accord with those previously had in the case of the standard variogram.

We may now consider the results that we obtained in the corresponding analysis for Mass Number.

Fig. 30: Variogram of Mass Number



Variogram values:

Z-lags	Variogram- value	Z-lags	Variogram- value
1	5.243902	42	5867.11
2	14.7284	43	6145.663
3	32.275	44	6428.603
4	54.56329	45	6726.934
5	84.44231	46	7036.689
6	119.9221	47	7356.458
7	163.0592	48	7675.757
8	212.2067	49	7997.926
9	268.1824	50	8333.5
10	329.637	51	8671.016
11	399.0625	52	8996.565
12	474.9789	53	9339.117
13	557.2214	54	9664.879
14	646.1667	55	10009.8
15	741.9779	56	10334.06
16	843.4851	57	10688.52
17	953.9318	58	11053.98
18	1068.915	59	11444.02
19	1192.695	60	11836.33
20	1324.532	61	12256.52
21	1460.766	62	12651.02
22	1604.451	63	13058.83
23	1749.508	64	13431.24
24	1903.856	65	13832.53
25	2063.957	66	14249.85
26	2234.096	67	14660.66
27	2412.473	68	15086.9
28	2603.482	69	15531.39
29	2796.472	70	15943.19
30	3000.292	71	16399.63
31	3205.394	72	16814.68
32	3423.01	73	17282.35
33	3639.03	74	17737.39
34	3860.969	75	18219.06
35	4091.052	76	18626.5
36	4326.67	77	19078.67
37	4561.033	78	19562.9
38	4804.122	79	20150.38
39	5055.284	80	20672.67
40	5320.965	81	21218.5
41	5591.036		

We may now give the estimation of the Generalized Fractal Dimension.

Curve Fit Report (Ln-Ln plot)

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.


Model Fit: $C2=A+B*(C1)$ Simple Linear

Parameter Estimates for All Groups

Groups	Count	Iter's	R2	A	B
All	81	4	0.99943	1.32691	1.96370

Combined Plot Section

Fig.31



Model Estimation Section

Parameter Name	Parameter Estimate	Asymptotic Standard Error	Lower 95% C.L.	Upper 95% C.L.
A	1.32691	0.01877	1.28955	1.36427
B	1.96370	0.00528	1.95318	1.97422
Iterations	4	Rows Read	81	
R-Squared	0.999428	Rows Used	81	
Random Seed	2960	Total Count	81	

Estimated Model

$$(1.32690928509202)+(1.96369892532774)*(C1)$$


Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.

Model Fit: $C2=A+B*(C1)$ Simple Linear

Plot Section

Fig.32



The analysis enables us to give the following results:


Generalized Fractal Dimension $D = 1.96370$

Hausdorff dimension $H_a = 0.98185$

We may now calculate the Probability Density Function. It assumes the following form

$$P(Z) = 6.786 \times 10^{-6} Z^{1.9637}$$

Fig. 33



Let us proceed estimating γ_{2N} at different scale factors.

Fig. 34




Fig. 35a





Fig. 35b



By the γ_{2N} variogram we may now re-calculate the Generalized Fractal Dimension using a Ln-Ln scale. The results are given in the following scheme.

Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.


Model Fit: C2=A+B*(C1) Simple Linear

Parameter Estimates for All Groups

Groups	Count	Iter's	R2	A	B
All	49	4	0.99538	6.81261	1.70270

Combined Plot Section

Fig.36



Model Estimation Section

Parameter Name	Parameter Estimate	Asymptotic Standard Error	Lower 95% C.L.	Upper 95% C.L.
A	6.81261	0.05209	6.70783	6.91739
B	1.70270	0.01692	1.66867	1.73674
Iterations	4	Rows Read	49	
R-Squared	0.995381	Rows Used	49	
Random Seed	11153	Total Count	49	

Estimated Model


$$(6.81260680697216)+(1.70270493930648)*(C1)$$

Curve Fit Report

Y Variable: C2. X Variable: C1.
 Model Fit: $C2=A+B*(C1)$ Simple Linear

Plot Section

Fig.37



Conclusion: also in this case a non integer value of the Generalized Fractal Dimension is obtained. It results $D=1.70270$ with Hausdorff dimension $H_a = 0.85135$. Such values result in satisfactory accord with those previously obtained in the case of the standard variogram.

In conclusion, until here we have used the standard methodologies that generally one utilizes with the aim to ascertain the presence of non linear contributions in the investigated dynamics as well as to

reconstruct phase space dynamics and to evaluate the possible presence of divergent features in the system, possibly of chaotic nature, and still the probable presence of a fractal regime in such dynamics. On the basis of the results that we have obtained, it seems very difficult to escape the conclusion that the process of increasing mass, regarding Atomic Weights and Mass Number in atomic nuclei, concerns all the basic features of non linearity, divergence, possible chaoticity and fractality that we have only just indicated for systems with non linear dynamics. This is a conclusion that in some manner overthrows our traditional manner to approach nuclear matter. For this reason it requires still more detailed deepening. In the following sections we will support our conclusion by other detailed results.

6. Calculation of Hurst Exponent and Possible Presence of Fractional Brownian Behaviour In Atomic Weights and Mass Number of Atomic Nuclei

It is known that time series arise often from a random walk usually called Brownian motion. The Hurst exponent [12] in such cases is calculated to be 0.5.

This concept may be generalized introducing the Fractional Brownian Motion (fBM) which arises from integrating correlated –coloured noise.

The value of Hurst exponent helps us to identify the nature of the regime we have under examination. In detail, if the H exponent results greater than 0.5, we are in presence of persistence, that is to say, past trends also persist into the future. On the other hand, in presence of H exponent values less than 0.5 we conclude for anti persistence, indicating it in this case that past trends tend to reverse in the future.

In the present case the analysis is not performed having a time series but instead we consider the atomic number Z in $W_a(Z)$, the atomic weights, and in $A(Z)$, the Mass Number of atomic nuclei.

Our analysis gave the following results.

For atomic weights, $W_a(Z)$, we obtained the subsequent value:

Hurst exponent $H = 0.9485604$; $SDH = 0.00625887$; $r^2 = 0.999645$

Instead for Mass Number , $A(Z)$, we had the next value:

Hurst exponent $H = 0.8953571$; $SDH = 0.0057648$; $r^2 = 0.999753$.

Both the results obtained respectively for Atomic Weights and for Mass Number, enable us to conclude that:

- 1) we are in presence of a Fractional Brownian Regime in both the cases;
- 2) in both $W_a(Z)$ and $A(Z)$ the tendency is for the persistence that results more marked in $W_a(Z)$ respect to $A(Z)$;
- 3) in the case of the Atomic Weights, $W_a(Z)$, the value of Fractal Dimension results to be
 $D = 2 - H = 1.0514396$
while in the case of Mass Number, $A(Z)$, the value of Fractal Dimension is
 $D = 2 - H = 1.1046429$.

7. Recurrence Quantification Analysis – RQA

Further important information on the nature of the processes presiding over the mechanism of increasing mass in Atomic Weights and Mass Number of atomic nuclei may be obtained by using RQA, the Recurrence Quantification Analysis.

This is a kind of analysis that, as it is well known, was introduced by J.P Zbilut and C.L. Webber [13].

Such investigation offers a new opportunity to us. By it we may give a look to the process of increasing mass of atomic nuclei analyzing in detail the kind of dynamics that governs such mechanism. Therefore, the results of such investigation must be considered with particular attention owing to their relevance.


The features that we may investigate in detail are the following: first of all we may evaluate the level of recurrence, that is to say of “periodicity”, that such process exhibits. This is obtained by estimating the % Rec in RQA. Soon after we may also calculate the Determinism that is involved in such process. This is to say that we evaluate the level of predictability that it has. We estimate such features by %Det. in RQA. As third RQA variable we may also estimate the entropy and than the Max Line that is a measure linked

proportionally to the inverse of the Lyapunov exponent. In brief, such measure enables us to evaluate still again the possible divergence involved in such mechanism.

Usually, when using RQA, one starts with an embedding procedure of the given time series and thus providing with a given reconstruction of the given time series in phase space. In our case such reconstruction was previously performed in previous sections and we obtained that we should use an embedding dimension $D=2$ with a Z -shift=3 in the case of Atomic Weights and a Z -shift=2 in the case of Mass Numbers. However, in the present analysis our purpose is slightly different in the sense that we aim to preserve the embedded dimension $D=2$ but we yearn for analyzing the behaviour of the basic RQA variables as %Rec., %Det., ENT., and Max Line shifting step by step the value of the atomic number Z so to explore the mechanism as well as Z increases step by step. In order to perform such kind of analysis a value of the distance R should be correctly selected. Usually, the distance R in RQA may be fixed rather empirically selecting a proper value so that %Rec. remain about 1%. However Zbilut and Webber [13] in their RQA software package introduced RQS that estimates recurrences at various distances and the cut off that one has at a particular distance respect to a flat behaviour. In this manner one selects the best optimized distance R to use in the analysis. We applied RQS software to select the proper distance and it was obtained that such value should be taken $R = 4$

We also ascertained that such selected value remained rather constant when increasing Z step by step. In Fig. 38 we give some of the results that were obtained.

Fig. 38



In conclusion we selected $R=4$ for the distance to use in RQA. The embedding dimension was chosen to be $D=2$ as it resulted by using FNN criterion and verifying this choice also for different Z values. Finally, we decided to use the value $L=3$ for the Line Length.

We have obtained the following results.

Recurrence Quantification Analysis applied to Atomic Weights, $W_a(Z)$, for increasing values of $Z - shift$. The results obtained for %Rec., %Det., ENT., and MaxLine are reported in the following Table 1

Table 1


Z-shift	%Rec.	%Det.	Entropy	Max-Line
1	1.36	73.33	2.00	14
2	1.39	44.44	1.50	7
3	1.33	52.38	1.59	13
4	1.36	28.57	1.00	7
5	1.30	38.46	1.00	11
6	1.37	27.50	0.92	5
7	1.16	24.24	0.00	8
8	1.33	13.51	0.00	5
9	1.04	32.14	1.00	5
10	1.33	17.14	0.00	3
11	0.94	25.00	0.00	6
12	1.33	12.12	0.00	4
13	1.04	24.00	0.00	6
14	1.28	20.00	0.00	3
15	0.92	14.29	0.00	3
16	1.31	20.69	0.00	3
17	0.89	15.79	0.00	3
18	1.06	13.64	0.00	3
19	0.84	17.65	0.00	3
20	1.13	13.69	0.00	3
21	0.95	0.00	-	-

There are some results that deserve to be outlined .

%Rec. remains rather constant in correspondence of the different $Z - shift$ values with some fluctuations taking minima values mainly at $Z - shift = 11, 15, 19, 21$.


A graph is given in Fig.39.

Fig. 39



%Det. assumes rather low values also with a length Line L=3. It oscillates among maxima and minima for increasing values of $Z - shift$ as it is pictured in Fig.40 (a, b, c). Significantly, %Det. goes definitively to zero starting with $Z - shift = 21$.

Fig. 40a



Rather interesting appear also the value we obtain for Entropy and Max Line as reported in the following figures.

Fig. 40b





Fig. 40c



We may now pass to consider Recurrence Quantification Analysis in the case of Mass Numbers, $A(Z)$. The results for %Rec., %Det., ENT., and Max Line are given in Table2.

Table 2

Z-shift	%Rec.	%Det.	Entropy	Max-Line
1	1.20	77.50	1.37	14
2	1.33	30.23	0.92	7
3	1.23	41.03	1.00	13
4	1.43	36.36	0.81	7
5	1.23	37.84	1.00	11
6	1.30	21.05	1.00	5
7	1.09	38.71	1.00	8
8	1.44	20.00	1.00	5
9	1.19	31.25	1.00	6
10	1.41	8.11	0.00	3
11	1.25	18.75	0.00	6
12	1.33	21.21	1.00	4
13	1.28	41.94	1.59	6
14	1.58	27.03	0.92	4
15	1.14	46.15	1.59	6
16	1.45	9.38	0.00	3
17	1.31	21.43	0.00	3
18	1.59	21.21	1.00	4
19	1.19	25.00	0.00	3
20	0.92	16.67	0.00	3
21	0.79	0.00	-	-

%Rec. remains rather constant in correspondence of the different $Z - shift$ values with some fluctuations taking minima values mainly at $Z - shift = 7,9,11,13,15,\dots,19$.

A graph is given in Fig.41 (a, b, c, d)

Fig.41a




Fig. 41b




Fig. 41c






Fig. 41d



%Det. assumes rather low values also with a length Line $L=3$. It oscillates among maxima and minima for increasing values of $Z - shift$ as it is pictured in Fig.41b. Significantly, %Det. goes definitively to zero starting with $Z - shift = 21$.

In Fig.42 we have the comparison of %Det of Atomic Weights respect to %Det of Mass Numbers.

Fig.42



Looking at the results given in Tables 1 and 2 and linked figures, we deduce that for different values of $Z - shift$, the corresponding values of %Rec tend to show fluctuations. As it is well known, %Rec indicates in some manner presence of pseudoperiodicities. Therefore the rather small fluctuations of %Rec indicate that we are in presence of a mechanism of increasing mass that tends to preserve some kind of periodicity and self-resemblance with rather modest fluctuations. The more interesting datum is given by %Det. In this case we have more marked oscillations showing that in the process of increasing mass of stable atomic nuclei we have phase of increasing stability as opposed to phases of decrease stability. Here the law is the mechanism of addition of nucleons that is realized at each step between the given nucleus and its subsequent as considered in our phase space representation. %Det oscillations indicate that the process of progressively addition of nucleons in nuclei happens on the basis of a complex non linear mechanism in which the determinism and thus the same predictability of subsequent Mass Number and /or Atomic Weights is very complex and so distant from a simple and linear regime of addition of matter that we have expected to hold for a very long time. Looking at the values of Entropy, expressed in bits, one finds that also in this case oscillations are dominant for increasing values of Z -shift. The same happens for MaxLine whose inverse gives estimation of the divergence of the system in consideration giving direct indication of a possible chaotic regime.

In conclusion, by using RQA we conclude that the mechanism of increasing mass in atomic nuclei is rather periodical and self-resemblance. We have obtained marked oscillations for the values of RQA variables. The important thing to remember here is that we are operating in a reconstructed phase space that takes into account more an isolated nucleus as in the classical nuclear physics discussions, but each time pairs of nuclei in the embedded space with dimension $D=2$. The deriving behaviour of the mechanism of increasing mass of atomic nuclei evidences in this case all its complexity. We have now set

of nuclei that evidence their oscillatory behaviour for % Rec, %Det, Entropy and Max Line. Such oscillatory behaviours of classes of nuclei result obviously connected to “periodicities” and mainly to classes of similarities that also stable nuclei seem to exhibit. The marked variations in the values of determinism indicate that the whole process results rather complex and it is regulated from phases of more stability and subsequent phases of increased instability.

In order to conclude such kind of research, and to confirm the new results that we have here indicated, we have performed the last kind analysis. In this last case we have in some manner overturned the scheme of the previous analysis in the sense that we have selected an embedding dimension $D=1$. The reader will remember that results by FFN gave same uncertainty in selecting the values $D=1$ or $D=2$. Our previous RQA was performed by using $D=2$. In this final exploration we use $D=1$. In this condition of analysis a given value of delay and thus, in our case of $Z - shift$, has no more sense. Each point in phase space is given by a value of $W_a(Z)$ or of $A(Z)$. To use RQA we have to select a distance, that is to say a Radius R . Using Euclidean distance, R will result to be the difference ΔA between two values of Mass Numbers in the case one utilizes $A(Z)$ for the analysis. In conclusion we have

$$A_1 = Z_1 + N_1, A_2 = Z_2 + N_2.$$

The distance, R , to use in RQA will result to be given

$$\Delta A = \Delta Z + \Delta N$$

We decided to use RQA considering $L=3$ as Line Length and R increasing step by step from 1 to 209. In this manner we calculated %Rec, %Det, Entropy and Max Line, for increasing values of $Z=1,2,3,\dots$. Note that in such kind of analysis we used also shuffled data in order to ascertain the validity of the obtained results. In addition, on the obtained data, we used also a Wald-Wolfowitz run test that we executed on %Det and on %Det / %Rec, and the probability that the results were obtained by chance, was found to be <0.001 .

The results are now given in Tables 3, 4 and in Figures 43, 44, 45, 46, 47.

Table 3: Results of Recurrences quantification analysis of Mass Number with embedding $D=1$ and distance R ranging from 1 to 209

R-distance	% Rec.	% Det.	%Det./%Rec.	R-distance	% Rec.	% Det.	%Det./%Rec.	R-distance	% Rec.	% Det.	%Det./%Rec.
1	0.029	0.000	0.000	71	42.051	98.742	2.348	141	71.907	99.55	1.384
2	1.029	8.571	8.329	72	42.051	98.742	2.348	142	72.436	99.513	1.374
3	1.381	23.404	16.947	73	42.786	98.283	2.297	143	72.436	99.513	1.374
4	1.381	23.404	16.947	74	43.432	98.241	2.262	144	72.877	99.395	1.364
5	2.204	66.667	30.248	75	43.432	98.241	2.262	145	73.288	99.399	1.356
6	3.115	75.472	24.229	76	44.167	99.069	2.243	146	73.288	99.399	1.356
7	4.29	82.192	19.159	77	44.902	98.822	2.201	147	73.817	99.602	1.349
8	4.29	82.192	19.159	78	45.519	98.773	2.170	148	74.376	99.526	1.338
9	5.172	86.364	16.698	79	45.519	98.773	2.170	149	74.904	99.451	1.328
10	6.024	89.268	14.819	80	46.195	98.885	2.141	150	74.904	99.451	1.328
11	6.024	89.269	14.819	81	46.812	98.87	2.112	151	75.316	99.532	1.322
12	7.082	90.45	12.772	82	46.812	98.87	2.112	152	75.727	99.728	1.317
13	7.875	88.806	11.277	83	47.458	98.885	2.084	153	75.725	99.728	1.317
14	8.639	91.156	10.552	84	48.193	98.963	2.053	154	76.197	99.691	1.308
15	8.639	91.156	10.552	85	48.78	98.675	2.023	155	76.609	99.501	1.299
16	9.58	94.785	9.894	86	48.78	98.675	2.023	156	77.05	99.657	1.293
17	10.638	94.475	8.881	87	49.398	98.989	2.004	157	77.05	99.657	1.293
18	10.638	94.475	8.881	88	50.132	99.062	1.976	158	77.667	99.659	1.283
19	11.666	93.703	8.032	89	50.132	99.062	1.976	159	78.078	99.511	1.275
20	12.401	95.261	7.682	90	50.779	99.016	1.950	160	78.078	99.511	1.275
21	13.282	95.575	7.196	91	51.455	99.029	1.925	161	78.343	99.4	1.269
22	13.282	95.575	7.196	92	52.16	99.155	1.901	162	78.754	99.664	1.266
23	14.252	94.433	6.626	93	52.16	99.155	1.901	163	79.224	99.703	1.258
24	15.046	95.508	6.348	94	52.806	98.998	1.875	164	79.224	99.703	1.258
25	15.046	95.508	6.348	95	53.425	99.065	1.854	165	79.783	99.595	1.248
26	16.927	97.232	5.744	96	53.425	99.065	1.854	166	80.194	99.45	1.240
27	18.513	96.508	5.213	97	54.041	99.402	1.839	167	80.635	99.745	1.237
28	17.602	95.993	5.454	98	54.687	99.087	1.812	168	80.635	99.745	1.237

29	17.602	95.993	5.454	99	55.245	98.83	1.789	169	81.105	99.565	1.228
30	18.513	96.508	5.213	100	55.245	98.83	1.789	170	81.399	99.458	1.222
31	19.16	96.626	5.043	101	55.804	99.052	1.775	171	81.399	99.458	1.222
32	19.16	96.625	5.043	102	56.303	98.904	1.757	172	81.781	99.748	1.220
33	19.982	96.176	4.813	103	56.92	99.019	1.740	173	82.222	99.607	1.211
34	21.04	97.067	4.613	104	56.92	99.019	1.740	174	82.662	99.523	1.204
35	21.863	97.312	4.451	105	57.743	99.237	1.719	175	82.662	99.573	1.205
36	21.863	97.312	4.451	106	58.419	98.994	1.695	176	83.133	99.611	1.198
37	22.656	97.017	4.282	107	58.419	98.994	1.695	177	83.368	99.612	1.195
38	23.45	97.243	4.147	108	58.919	99.202	1.684	178	83.368	99.612	1.195
39	24.42	96.51	3.952	109	59.536	99.112	1.665	179	83.75	99.684	1.190
40	24.42	96.51	3.952	110	60.182	99.121	1.647	180	84.337	99.617	1.181
41	25.272	96.86	3.833	111	60.182	99.121	1.647	181	84.69	99.722	1.177
42	25.918	96.485	3.723	112	60.711	99.177	1.634	182	84.69	99.722	1.177
43	25.918	96.485	3.723	113	61.387	99.234	1.617	183	84.984	99.654	1.173
44	26.8	96.82	3.613	114	61.387	99.234	1.617	184	85.307	99.724	1.169
45	27.593	97.551	3.535	115	62.033	99.337	1.601	185	85.307	99.724	1.169
46	28.299	98.027	3.464	116	62.504	99.436	1.591	186	85.688	99.863	1.165
47	28.299	98.027	3.464	117	63.033	99.441	1.578	187	86.13	99.693	1.157
48	29.151	97.984	3.361	118	63.033	99.441	1.578	188	86.483	99.728	1.153
49	29.944	97.544	3.258	119	63.562	99.353	1.563	189	86.483	99.728	1.153
50	29.944	97.547	3.258	120	64.091	99.358	1.550	190	86.835	99.763	1.149
51	30.767	98.376	3.197	121	64.091	99.358	1.550	191	87.129	99.865	1.146
52	31.472	98.039	3.115	122	64.678	99.5	1.538	192	87.129	99.865	1.146
53	32.119	98.079	3.054	123	65.207	99.459	1.525	193	87.423	99.832	1.142
54	32.119	98.079	3.054	124	65.795	99.285	1.509	194	87.775	99.766	1.137
55	30.059	98.489	3.277	125	65.795	99.285	1.509	195	88.099	99.666	1.131
56	33.911	98.44	2.903	126	66.441	99.513	1.498	196	88.099	99.666	1.131
57	33.911	98.44	2.903	127	66.941	99.517	1.487	197	88.481	99.801	1.128
58	34.558	98.469	2.849	128	66.941	99.517	1.487	198	88.804	99.735	1.123
59	35.292	98.751	2.798	129	67.382	99.477	1.476	199	89.039	99.736	1.120
60	36.086	98.616	2.733	130	67.852	99.524	1.467	200	89.039	99.736	1.120
61	36.086	98.616	2.733	131	68.44	99.614	1.455	201	89.362	99.704	1.116
62	36.938	98.329	2.662	132	68.44	99.614	1.455	202	89.686	99.803	1.113
63	37.702	98.051	2.601	133	69.486	99.49	1.432	203	89.686	99.803	1.113
64	37.702	98.051	2.601	134	69.556	99.493	1.430	204	90.009	99.739	1.108
65	38.29	98.388	2.570	135	69.909	99.496	1.423	205	90.332	99.707	1.104
66	39.024	98.494	2.524	136	69.906	99.496	1.423	206	90.538	99.838	1.103
67	39.788	98.523	2.476	137	70.291	99.373	1.414	207	90.538	99.838	1.103
68	39.788	98.523	2.476	138	70.79	99.377	1.404	208	90.831	99.871	1.100
69	40.406	98.545	2.439	139	70.79	99.377	1.404	209	91.155	99.742	1.094
70	41.17	98.787	2.399	140	71.378	99.506	1.394				

Fig. 43




Fig. 44




Fig. 45




Fig. 46





Fig. 47



The obtained results may be considered of valuable interest since they indicate possible new properties for Mass Number of atomic nuclei.

At increasing values of Radius R, % Rec and % Det increase, as it is trivially expected in some general case, but the interesting new thing is that, after some regular increasing values of %Rec and %Det, occurring every two or three step, soon after the values of RQA variables reach values of stability that so

remain for two steps in the increasing values of R. In other terms, in presence of increasing R, we have corresponding increasing values of % Rec, %Det, Entropy, followed by a phase in which, still for increasing R, the values of RQA variables remain instead constant.

This is certainly a new mechanism of increasing mass of atomic nuclei that deserves to be carefully explained.

Table 4

d=2	Z	N	Z	N	ΔZ	ΔN		d=3	Z	N	Z	N	ΔZ	ΔN		d=4	Z	N	Z	N	ΔZ	ΔN
3	4	4	5	5	1	1		1	0	2	2	1	2		3	4	5	6	2	2		
4	5	5	6	6	1	1		2	2	3	4	1	2		6	6	8	8	2	2		
6	6	7	7	7	1	1		4	5	6	6	2	1		8	8	10	10	2	2		
7	7	8	8	8	1	1		5	6	7	7	2	1		9	10	11	12	2	2		
26	30	28	30	2	0			8	8	9	10	1	2		10	10	12	12	2	2		
38	50	40	50	2	0			10	10	11	12	1	2		11	12	13	14	2	2		
52	78	54	78	2	0			12	12	13	14	1	2		12	12	14	14	2	2		
56	82	58	82	2	0			14	14	15	16	1	2		13	14	15	16	2	2		
57	82	59	82	2	0			16	16	17	18	1	2		14	14	16	16	2	2		
66	98	68	98	2	0			21	24	22	26	1	2		15	16	17	18	2	2		
77	116	78	117	1	1			22	26	23	28	1	2		17	18	19	20	2	2		
78	117	79	118	1	1			24	28	25	30	1	2		22	26	24	28	2	2		
								25	30	28	30	3	0		23	28	25	30	2	2		
								26	30	27	32	1	2		24	28	26	30	2	2		
								37	48	38	50	1	2		25	30	27	32	2	2		
								40	50	41	52	1	2		27	32	29	34	2	2		
								43	56	44	58	1	2		33	42	35	44	2	2		
								45	58	46	60	1	2		34	46	36	48	2	2		
								52	78	55	78	3	0		36	48	38	50	2	2		
								56	82	59	82	3	0		37	48	39	50	2	2		
								59	82	60	84	1	2		39	50	41	52	2	2		
								68	98	69	100	1	2		42	56	44	58	2	2		
								73	108	74	110	1	2		43	56	45	58	2	2		
								74	110	75	112	1	2		44	58	46	60	2	2		
								76	116	78	117	2	1		45	58	47	60	2	2		
								80	122	81	124	1	2		58	82	60	84	2	2		
								81	124	82	126	1	2		59	82	61	84	2	2		
															67	98	69	100	2	2		
															72	108	74	110	2	2		
															77	116	79	118	2	2		
															81	124	83	126	2	2		
d=6	Z	N	Z	N	ΔZ	ΔN		d=7	Z	N	Z	N	ΔZ	ΔN		d=8	Z	N	Z	N	ΔZ	ΔN
	1	0	3	4	2	4			2	2	5	6	3	4			1	0	4	5	3	5
	7	7	10	10	3	3			3	4	7	7	4	3			2	2	6	6	4	4
	19	20	21	24	2	4			4	5	8	8	4	3			5	6	9	10	4	4
	21	24	23	28	2	4			6	6	9	10	3	4			6	6	10	10	4	4
	24	28	28	30	4	2			8	8	11	12	3	4			8	8	12	12	4	4
	28	30	30	34	2	4			10	10	13	14	3	4			9	10	13	14	4	4
	29	34	31	38	2	4			12	12	15	16	3	4			10	10	14	14	4	4
	31	38	33	42	2	4			14	14	17	18	3	4			11	12	15	16	4	4
	32	42	34	46	2	4			16	16	19	20	3	4			12	12	16	16	4	4
	35	44	37	48	2	4			21	24	24	28	3	4			13	14	17	18	4	4
	36	48	40	50	4	2			22	26	25	30	3	4			15	16	19	20	4	4
	41	52	43	56	2	4			23	28	28	30	5	2			16	16	18	22	2	6
	48	66	50	70	2	4			24	28	27	32	3	4			16	16	20	20	4	4
	49	66	51	70	2	4			26	30	29	34	3	4			18	22	22	26	4	4
	51	70	53	74	2	4			43	56	46	60	3	4			20	20	22	26	2	6
	53	74	55	78	2	4			47	60	48	66	1	6			22	26	26	30	4	4
	54	78	56	82	2	4			48	66	51	70	3	4			23	28	27	32	4	4
	55	78	57	82	2	4			50	70	53	74	3	4			25	30	29	34	4	4
	56	82	60	84	4	2			54	78	57	82	3	4			26	30	30	34	4	4
	57	82	61	84	4	2			55	78	58	82	3	4			34	46	38	50	4	4
	62	90	64	94	2	4			56	82	61	84	5	2			37	48	41	52	4	4
	63	90	65	94	2	4			61	84	62	90	1	6			40	50	42	56	2	6
	64	94	66	98	2	4			62	90	65	94	3	4			42	56	46	60	4	4
	65	94	67	98	2	4			64	94	67	98	3	4			43	56	47	60	4	4
	69	100	71	104	2	4			65	94	68	98	3	4			46	60	48	66	2	6
	70	104	72	108	2	4			70	104	73	108	3	4			47	60	49	66	2	6
	71	104	73	108	2	4			72	108	75	112	3	4			52	78	56	82	4	4
	73	108	75	112	2	4			78	117	80	122	2	5			54	78	58	82	4	4
	75	112	77	116	2	4			80	122	83	126	3	4			55	78	59	82	4	4
	80	122	82	126	2	4											60	84	62	90	2	6
																	61	84	63	90	2	6
																	64	94	68	98	4	4
																	68	98	70	104	2	6
																	74	110	76	116	2	6
																	75	112	78	117	3	5
																	79	118	81	124	2	6

unstable but followed from stable $\Delta A=14$ and $\Delta A=15$. The same thing happens for $\Delta A=16$ or 20 or 23 or 27 or 30 or 34 or 38.....or 80 oror 119 or.....or 180 or..... To each given unstable ΔA value, will correspond two subsequent stable values that respectively will be given at $\Delta A=17$ and $\Delta A=18$; at $\Delta A=21$ and $\Delta A=22$, at $\Delta A=120$ and $\Delta A=121$, at $\Delta A=181$ and $\Delta A=182$.

Instabilities are present every three or four increasing values of ΔA . Systematically, each of them is followed by stable values at the two subsequent increments of ΔA .

In conclusion the law seems as it follows: for each pair of nuclei, fixed the value of ΔA with unstable value of the RQA variables, the addition of one nucleon by two subsequent steps stabilizes the values of such variables. Obviously, for each selected value of ΔA we have a class of pair of nuclei as indicated as example in Table 4.

In conclusion, the use of RQA variables has cleared that we are in presence of new features for atomic nuclei that deserve to be properly explained. We intend to say that the next step of the present research should be now to link the different results that have been obtained with concrete evidences expressible in terms of basic concepts of nuclear physics. If on one hand some of such new findings are just evident by itself on the other hand we cannot ignore that in this paper we have moved more on the line of the notions as they are contained in the methods that we have used. More concretely: referring as example to the basic results that we have obtained by using RQA, and, in particular, to the last results as given by using embedding dimension $D=1$ and reported in Tables 3 and 4 and in Figures 43-47, we cannot ignore that we have to consider now pairs of nuclei with given ΔA and thus to identify pairs of subsequent stable nuclei and, following this way, to find some new regularities in Z , N and to give new classifications of nuclei to different groups using such regularities. In short, the results that we have obtained should reveal new regularities about ground states of nuclei not found so easily by other methods. Consequently, this new approach might be very useful and important. The aim is to pursue such research work in our future investigations.

8. Conclusions

In the present paper we have introduced a preliminary but complete analysis of Atomic Weights and Mass Number using the methods of non linear analysis.

We have obtained some results that appear to be of some interest in understanding the basic foundations of nuclear matter. As methodology, we have applied the tests of autocorrelation function and of Mutual Information. We have also provided to a reconstruction of the experimental data in phase space giving results on Lyapunov spectrum and Correlation Dimension. We have performed an analysis to establish the presence of a power law in data on Atomic Weights and Mass Number and such kind of analysis has been completed by using the technique of the variogram. The results seem to confirm the presence of a fractal regime in the process of increasing mass of atomic nuclei. The estimation of Hurst exponent has enabled us to indicate that we would be in presence of a fractional Brownian regime with long range correlations.

To summarize: Some preliminary results have been obtained. The mechanism of increasing mass in atomic nuclei reveals itself to be a nonlinear mechanism marked by a non integer value of Correlation dimension in phase space reconstruction. The presence of positive Lyapunov exponents indicate that the system of mass increasing is divergent and thus possibly chaotic. By using an identified Power Law and the variogram technique we may conclude that we are in presence of a fractal regime, a fractional Brownian regime.

The most relevant results have been obtained by using RQA. The process under our investigation results to be not fully deterministic when considering an embedding dimension $D=2$. We are in presence of self-resemblance and pseudo periodicities that show small fluctuations at increasing value of Z - *shift* while instead Determinism shows consistent variations at increasing values of such parameter. Also Entropy and Max Line reveal the same tendency. Therefore, in the same framework of stable nuclei we have phase of increasing stability or increasing instability, depending on the mechanism of composition of the considered atomic nuclei and on the differences that they exhibit in the values of their Atomic Weights

and of Mass Number. A final important result is obtained by using RQA in phase space reconstruction using embedding dimension $D=1$ and increasing Radius R corresponding to net differences in Mass number of the considered atomic nuclei. In this case, in phase space reconstruction, RQA involves pairs of nuclei in our analysis. New properties are identified at the increasing values of ΔA . In particular, determinism oscillates but at some regular distances it also shows definite constant values as well as the other RQA variables. This confirms that we are in presence of a mechanism of increasing mass of atomic nuclei in which phases of stability result subsequent to phases of instability possibly marked from conditions of order-disorder like transitions. We have to consider pairs of nuclei with fixed ΔA and to identify pairs of subsequent stable nuclei that indicate new regularities in Z, N that we need to indicate in detail. We have to classify nuclei pertaining to different groups using these new regularities. This approach might be of valuable interest and it will constitute the object of our future work.

In this framework, the next step of the present investigation will be also to analyze data corresponding to values of binding energies for atomic nuclei. Possibly the complex of such results will give the possibility to indicate new perspectives in the elaboration of more accurate nuclear models of nuclear matter.

Acknowledgement

Many thanks are due to M. Pitkanen for his continuous and stimulating interest, suggestions and encouragement through this work.

Software NDT by J. Reiss and VRA by E. Kononov were also used for general non linear analysis.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.F. von Weizsacher, Z. Phys., 96, 431-458, 1935
- [2] P. Leboeuf, Regularity and Chaos in the nuclear masses, arXiv:nucl-th/0406064; see also H.Olofsson, S. Alberg, O. Bohigas, P. Leboeuf, Correlations in Nuclear Masses, arXiv:nucl-th (0602041 v1 13 Feb.2006 and O. Bohigas, P. Leboeuf, Nuclear Masses: evidence of order-chaos coexistence, arXiv:nucl-th/0110025v2 28 Nov. 2001 and references therein.
- [3] A. Bohr and B.R. Mottelson, Nuclear Structure vol. I, Benjamin Reading, 1969.
- [4] V.M. Strutinsky, Nucl. Phys. A95, 420-442, 1967).
- [5] V. Paar, N. Parvin, A. Rubcic, J. Rubcic, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals, 14, 901-916, 2002
- [6] H. Kroger, Fractal geometry in quantum mechanics, Phys. Rep.323, 81-181, 2000.
- [7] M. Pitkanen, TGD and Nuclear Physics in book p-adic length scale hypothesis and dark matter hierarchy, www.helsinki.fi/~matpitka/paddark/paddark.html#padnucl.
- [8] G.A. Lalazissis, D. Vrtenar, N. Paar, P. Ring, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals, 17, 585-590, 2003.
- [9] M.A. Azar, K. Gopala, Phys.Rev.A39, 5311-5318, 1989 and Phys. Rev. A37, 2173-2180, 1988.
- [10] A.M. Fraser, H.L. Swinney, Independent Coordinates for strange attractors from mutual Information, Phys. Rev. A33, 1134-1137, 1986
- [11] For details see as example: BB. Mandelbrot et al. SIAM Review, 10, 422-437, 1968; SHEN Wei, Zhao Pengda, Multidimensional self-affine distribution with application in geochemistry, Math. Geology, 34, 2, 109-123, 2002, E. Conte, J.P Zbilut et al., Chaos, Solitons and Fractals, 29, 701-730, 2006;
- [12] J. Feder, Fractals, Plenum, New York, 1988.
- [13] C.L Webber, Jr, J.P. Zbilut, Dynamical Assessment of physiological systems and states using recurrence plot strategies, J. Appl. Physiol. 76, 965-973, 1994. The package of RQA software may be free downloaded at <http://homepages.luc.edu/~CWebber/>.