

Why is Pb^{208} the heaviest stable nuclide?

B. P. Kosyakov^a, E. Yu. Popov^a, and M. A. Vronskii^{a,b}

^aRussian Federal Nuclear Center–VNIIEF, Sarov, 607188 Nizhniĭ Novgorod Region, Russia;

^bSarov Institute of Physics & Technology, Sarov, 607190 Nizhniĭ Novgorod Region, Russia

Abstract

In an effort to understand nuclei in terms of quarks we develop an effective theory to low-energy quantum chromodynamics in which a single quark contained in a nucleus is driven by a mean field due to other constituents of the nucleus. We analyze the reason why the number of d quarks in light stable nuclei is much the same as that of u quarks, while for heavier nuclei beginning with Ca^{40} , the number of d quarks is greater than the number of u quarks. To account for the finiteness of the periodic table, we invoke a version of gauge/gravity duality between the dynamical affair in stable nuclei and that in extremal black holes. With the assumption that the end of stability for heavy nuclei is dual to the occurrence of a naked singularity, we find that the maximal number of protons in stable nuclei is $Z_{\text{max}}^{\text{H}} \approx 82$.

Keywords: nuclei in terms of quarks, finiteness of the periodic table, gauge/gravity duality, extremal black holes, naked singularity

1 Introduction

In the early 1930s, the view of a nucleus as a bound system of neutrons and protons [1], [2], held together by meson exchanges [3], became well-accepted. This view, with several innovations, such as spontaneously broken chiral symmetry, effective Lagrangians, and derivative expansions [4], remains a pillar of modern nuclear physics [5], [6]. With the advent of quantum chromodynamics (QCD) a serious effort was mounted to describe nuclei in terms of quarks. The reason for this is twofold. Firstly, we are still far from understanding the structure of the periodic table. Why do stable light nuclei contain equal parts of protons and neutrons? Why are all nuclei heavier than Ca^{40} neutron-rich? Why are stable nuclei composed of only neutrons unfeasible under terrestrial conditions? Why is every nucleus with the number of protons Z above $Z = 82$ unstable¹? Secondly, there is direct evidence that a quark confined to a nucleus is not forced to live in a triple room. Indeed, a free neutron, when combined with a proton to form a deuteron, loses the responsibility for the fate of its own quarks. This is clear from the fact that the d -quark lifetime relative to β -decay increases from $T \approx 15$ minutes to $T = \infty$.

The simplest way for introducing quarks into nuclear physics is to conceive of a nucleus with mass number A as a bound system of $\mathcal{N} = 3A$ quarks enclosed in a ‘bag’ of size R [7]. However, the stability of the bag stipulates [8] that \mathcal{N} and R must be related by $R \sim \mathcal{N}^{1/4}$, contrary to the firmly established [9] phenomenological relation

$$R = R_0 A^{1/3}, \quad (1)$$

¹The term ‘stability’ is taken here to mean ‘absolute stability’. A nuclide with very long lifetime T , say $T \sim 10^{20}$ years, is regarded as unstable. We think of free protons as stable particles.

and the discord is particularly noticeable for heavy nuclei. Furthermore, the magnetic moments of such bags differ from the experimentally measured magnetic moments of nuclei [10], [11]. An effort to account for the properties of nuclei by eliminating gluon degrees of freedom was reasonably successful [12] but never progressed beyond small nuclei.

Another way of looking at stable nuclei [13], [14] is to integrate out irrelevant degrees of freedom, and consider only field variables Ψ of a single quark contained in a studied nucleus. This quark, driven by a mean field generated by all other constituents of the nucleus, is to be responsible for the static properties of the nucleus. The dynamics of the quark is assumed to be encoded in the action

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x \{ \Psi^\dagger [\gamma^\alpha (i\partial_\alpha + g_V A_\alpha) - m] \Psi + g_S \Psi^\dagger \Psi \Phi \}, \quad (2)$$

where $A_\alpha = (A_0, -\mathbf{A})$ and Φ are respectively the Lorentz vector and Lorentz scalar potentials of the mean field, g_V and g_S their associated couplings, and m the current quark mass. We augment the dynamical description by the addition of the so-called ‘pseudospin symmetry condition’ [15], [16]. The findings of these studies are briefly outlined in Sec. 2.

The use of ‘gauge/gravity duality’, aka ‘correspondence between a theory of quantum gravity in anti-de Sitter space and conformal field theory in Minkowski space’, ‘AdS/CFT’, and ‘holography’ [17]–[19] (for a full coverage of ideas and methods of gauge/gravity duality see [20], [21]), opens a new avenue of attack on the problem. Loosely speaking, the gauge/gravity duality is a doctrine which states that a good part of subnuclear physics in 4-dimensional Minkowski spacetime $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$ is modelled on physics of black holes (BHs) and similar black objects ² in 5-dimensional anti-de Sitter space, AdS_5 , whose boundary is just this $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$.

The mainstream develops the idea that a BH in AdS_5 is holographically mapped onto a quark-gluon plasma lump in $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$ [24]. In an alternative approach, Dp-branes are mapped onto subnuclear entities in the confinement phase [25], [26]. As to the present context, suitable objects here are extremal BHs in AdS_5 which are mapped onto microscopic stable systems in $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$, say stable nuclei [27]. This selection of dual objects substantiates the pseudospin symmetry condition [27].

In the present paper, we address the question of the quark content in stable nuclei. It will be seen in Sect. 2 that the idea of ‘quantum minimalism’ furnishes insight into the problem of stability. We argue that a sequence of stable nuclei of increasing Z cannot be extended above some Z_{\max} because this would contravene the line of demarcation between the quantum and the classical. Section 3 is devoted to calculation of Z_{\max} on the assumption that Z_{\max} is attained with the occurrence of a naked singularity in AdS_5 . The rationale behind this maneuver is the statement [28] that if the classical and quantum regimes of evolution coexist, then their interface is feasible at the event horizons of BHs. The disappearance of the event horizon and outcrop of a naked singularity imply that the classical-quantum arrangement is violated not only in AdS_5 but—through the gauge/gravity duality—also in $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$.

²A variety of such objects (black rings, black branes, etc.) has been detailed in [22], [23].

Natural units, $\hbar = 1, c = 1$, are adopted throughout the text. We use the conversion formula $m_p = 0.938 \text{ GeV} = (0.210 \text{ fm})^{-1}$.

2 Nuclei as bound systems of quarks

We first conceive of a nucleus containing Z protons and $N = A - Z$ neutrons as a mixture of two Fermi gases. The degeneracy pressure in this system is

$$P = \frac{(3\pi^2)^{2/3}}{5V^{5/3}} \left[Z^{5/3} \frac{1}{m_p} + (A - Z)^{5/3} \frac{1}{m_n} \right], \quad (3)$$

where $V = \frac{4}{3}\pi R^3$ is the volume of the nucleus, and m_p and m_n the respective masses of protons and neutrons. In fact, P is proportional to the energy density, $\mathcal{E} = \zeta P$, where ζ is the coefficient of proportionality of order 1. \mathcal{E} is minimal for $Z = A m_p^{3/2} (m_n^{3/2} + m_p^{3/2})^{-1}$. Since $m_p \approx m_n$, this results in $Z \approx 0.5A$. The rule that stable nuclei are half-filled with protons holds for light elements of the periodic table up to $A = 40$. More precisely, among stable isotopes of a given light element there is always that with $Z = N$, except for beryllium represented by a single stable nuclide with $N/Z = 1.25$. It is as if Nature inclines to spare its quantum mechanical strength, and assigns some part of responsibility for the force balance to the inter-proton Coulomb repulsion. A strong objection to this conjecture is that a deuteron is stable even though there is nothing to be affected by the Coulomb repulsion and degeneracy pressure because the nucleus consists of a proton and a neutron, while a triton, for which the Coulomb repulsion is also inoperative, is an unstable system, and the same is true for a dineutron.

However, this argument reiterated in terms of u and d quarks available in the nucleus shows that the number of u quarks, n_u , which minimizes \mathcal{E} is

$$n_u = (n_u + n_d) m_u^{3/2} (m_u^{3/2} + m_d^{3/2})^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

If it is granted that $m_u \approx m_d$, as it is for the constituent quark masses, then (4) becomes

$$n_u \approx n_d. \quad (5)$$

Such is the case for a deuteron containing $n_u = 3$ and $n_d = 3$. But (5) is no longer valid for a triton involving $n_u = 4$ and $n_d = 5$, and all the more for a dineutron because it has $n_u = 2$ and $n_d = 4$. The beryllium stability might be fitted reasonably well with (5) when one takes into account that $n_u = 13$ is not too far removed from $n_d = 14$, $n_d/n_u \approx 1.08$. This prompts us to describe the nuclear layout in terms of quarks rather than nucleons.

For $Z > 20$, the rule that the number of d quarks in stable nuclei is much the same as that of u quarks is violated. The excess of n_d becomes progressively larger, until the stability of nuclei ruins at $Z = 82$, as shown in the Segrè chart, Figure 1, where the so-called ‘drip line’ of stable nuclei terminates. What is the reason for the departure from the rule (5)? And then, why does Nature fail to preserve the nuclear stability above $Z = 82$?




Figure 1: Plot of stable nuclides composed of Z protons and N neutrons

Let us return to Eq. (1). It agrees well with the Pauli exclusion principle: identical fermions tend to move apart until the overlap of their wave functions becomes negligible, so that identical quarks occupy the volume proportional to their number. Here is just what Eq. (1) manifests.

Based on the Yukawa idea that the strong nuclear forces between nucleons have their origin in meson exchanges, it is difficult if not impossible to realize the stability of heavy nuclei. Indeed, the Yukawa potential $-g^2 e^{-m_\pi r}/r$ can only bind adjacent nucleons, and hence bulky aggregates of nucleons tend to decay under the action of the long-range inter-proton Coulomb repulsion. Furthermore, the heavier is the nucleus, the greater is the excess of neutrons, and with it the added degeneracy pressure, causing the balance of forces problematic. And yet stable isotopes are abundant up to $A = 208$.

In contrast, the existence of stable heavy nuclei is explicable in the context of an effective theory to low-energy QCD in which any quark contained in a nucleus is an object individually roaming around the interior of the nucleus. What counts is that widely separated quarks are subject to an infrared QCD effect steeply enhancing their mutual attractions. This is the major distinction between the treatment of nuclear structure in terms of quarks and that in terms of nucleons.

We then take a closer look at the effective theory based on the action (2). With the quantum minimalism in mind, we assume that the least action contribution dominates the path integral. This is the same as saying the wave function of a single quark Ψ is described by a solution to the Dirac equation in which A_α and Φ act as background fields.

We restrict our attention to spherically symmetric interactions, taking the Lorentz vector potential contribution to the mean field to be given by only $A_0(r)$. The arguments in support of the assumption that the interaction of the quark with the mean field is spherically symmetric closely resemble those in the usual single-particle shell model of atomic nuclei [14]. We thus proceed from the Dirac Hamiltonian

$$H = -i\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \nabla + \mathbb{I}U_V(r) + \beta[m + U_S(r)], \quad (6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and β are the standard Dirac matrices, \mathbb{I} an identity matrix, $U_V = g_V A_0$, $U_S = g_S \Phi$. For completing the definition of the eigenvalue problem

$$H\Psi = \varepsilon\Psi, \quad (7)$$

two conditions are essential to add:

(i) U_V and U_S are subject to the pseudospin symmetry condition [15, 16],

$$U_S(r) = -U_V(r) + \mathcal{C}, \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{C} is a positive constant defined for each particular kind of nuclei;

(ii) $|U_V|$ and $|U_S|$ grow in space, *e. g.*, as the Cornell potential [29]

$$V_C(r) = -\frac{\alpha_s}{r} + \sigma r. \quad (9)$$

With (8), the Dirac Hamiltonian (6) becomes

$$H = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + U_V(r)(\mathbb{I} - \beta) + \beta(m + \mathcal{C}), \quad (10)$$

implying that m is shifted,

$$m \rightarrow m_{\mathcal{C}} = m + \mathcal{C}. \quad (11)$$

This can be interpreted as a phenomenological mechanism which converts the current quark mass to the corresponding constituent quark mass. Henceforth $m_{\mathcal{C}}$ is regarded as the constituent quark mass, and the mark \mathcal{C} of $m_{\mathcal{C}}$ is omitted.

To solve (7), one separates variables in the usual way [15]. The radial part of (7) is

$$f' + \frac{1 + \kappa}{r} f - \xi g = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$g' + \frac{1 - \kappa}{r} g + \eta f = 0, \quad (13)$$

where the prime stands for the derivative with respect to r , $\kappa = \pm(j + \frac{1}{2})$ are eigenstates of the operator $K = -\beta(\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{L} + 1)$ which commutes with the spherically symmetric Dirac Hamiltonian (6), and

$$\xi(r) = \varepsilon + m + U_S(r) - U_V(r), \quad (14)$$

$$\eta(r) = \varepsilon - m - U_S(r) - U_V(r). \quad (15)$$

Equation (12) is used to express g in terms of f . We then substitute the result into (13). If the first derivative of f is eliminated from the obtained second-order differential equation, we come to the Schrödinger-like equation

$$F'' + k^2 F = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$k^2 = \varepsilon^2 - m^2 - 2U(r; \varepsilon). \quad (17)$$

Taking $U_V = \frac{1}{2}V_C$ and using (8) in (14) and (15), we find the effective potential

$$U(r; \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2r^2} \left\{ \kappa(\kappa + 1) + (\varepsilon - m) \left(-\frac{\alpha_s}{r} + \sigma r \right) r^2 + \frac{3(\alpha_s + \sigma r^2)^2}{4[\sigma r^2 - (\varepsilon + m)r - \alpha_s]^2} + \frac{\alpha_s(\kappa + 1) + \kappa\sigma r^2}{\sigma r^2 - (\varepsilon + m)r - \alpha_s} \right\}. \quad (18)$$

The last two terms of (18) are singular at $r = r_*$ which is the positive root of the equation $\sigma r^2 - (\varepsilon + m)r - \alpha_s = 0$,

$$r_* = \frac{(\varepsilon + m) + \sqrt{(\varepsilon + m)^2 + 4\sigma\alpha_s}}{2\sigma}. \quad (19)$$

The form of $U(r; \varepsilon)$ with particular values of m , ε , α_s , and σ is depicted in Figure 2.

From (18) we notice that $U(r; \varepsilon)$ develops a singularity

$$U(r; \varepsilon) \sim \gamma (r - r_*)^{-2}, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad (20)$$

at a finite point r_* . Therefore, the pseudospin symmetry condition (8) vastly enhances the interaction between the mean field and spin degrees of freedom of the quark to yield a cavity bounded by a spherical shell of radius r_* on which $U(r_*; \varepsilon) = \infty$. It is reasonable to identify the cavity with the interior of the nucleus, and equate r_* to R appearing in (1) and (3). With this identification, the idea that the quark is confined to the nucleus is stated as follows: the probability amplitude of being somewhere in the cavity is given by solutions of the Schrödinger-like equation (16), while that outside the cavity is 0. A rigorous mathematical justification of this statement is the theorem [30] which asserts that the tunneling of a nonrelativistic particle through the one-dimensional barrier (20) is forbidden iff $\gamma \geq \frac{3}{4}$. This condition is fulfilled in (18).

An infinitely deep potential well similar to that shown in Figure 2 arises whenever the mean field potential grows indefinitely with r [14]. We thus take the liberty of varying the form of the mean field potential in a wide range to attain the best fit to experiment. The Cornell potential is particularly well suited to this end.

Equation (16) was solved numerically using the parameters $\alpha_s = 0.7$, $\sigma = 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$, borrowed from the description of quarkonia, and $m = 0.33 \text{ GeV}$ [14]. The energy levels ε_{n_r} were found, to a good approximation, to be proportional to $\sqrt{n_r}$, where n_r is the radial quantum number (which is equal to the number of nodes in the radial part of the eigenfunction). If it is granted that n_r equals the integral part of $A^{2/3}$, then the cavity




Figure 2: The effective potential $U(r; \varepsilon)$

size r_* scales as $\rho_0 A^{1/3}$ with $\rho_0 \approx 1$ fm. The assumption that $n_r = [A^{2/3}]$ proves to be consistent with the basics of nuclear physics. For instance, the comparison between the calculated magnetic moment of a single quark representing a particular nucleus and the observed magnetic moment of the nucleus itself shows the agreement within $\sim 20\%$ for a rich variety of stable isotopes [14].

A further issue is the meaning of ε_{n_r} . Although ε_{n_r} stems from the eigenvalue problem for a single quark, it seems natural to regard this quantity as the mass of the nucleus associated with n_r . The contribution of other quarks to ε_{n_r} shows up in $U(r; \varepsilon_{n_r})$.

We next turn to the experimental fact that the excess of n_d in stable nuclei, beginning with Ca^{40} , increases with Z . To evaluate the infrared enhancement of the inter-quark attraction in nuclei with $Z \geq 20$ we consider a sequence of stable nuclei from Ca^{40} to Pb^{208} . Their mass number A runs from 40 to 208, which corresponds to $12 \leq n_r \leq 35$. Let $F_{n_r}(r)$ be the normalized solutions of (16) for such n_r (the explicit form of $F_{n_r}(r)$ can be found in [14]). The average energy density of the mean field

$$\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle = \frac{3}{4\pi (\rho_0 \sqrt{n_r})^3} \int_0^{r_*} dr U(r; \varepsilon_{n_r}) |F_{n_r}(r)|^2 \quad (21)$$

must be compared with the energy density \mathcal{E} related to the degeneracy pressure. To make the comparison we invoke the phenomenological fact, apparent in Figure 1, that the excess of neutrons ΔN which increases along the drip line in the range $20 \leq Z \leq 82$ is

approximately linear in Z :

$$\Delta N = 0.71 (Z - 20) = 0.71 (0.5A - \Delta N - 20). \quad (22)$$

Combining (22) with (3), in which $V = \frac{4}{3}\pi\rho_0^3 A = \frac{4}{3}\pi\rho_0^3 n_r^{3/2}$, gives

$$P \propto \left[\left(0.29 + \frac{8.3}{n_r^{3/2}} \right)^{5/3} \frac{1}{m_p} + \left(0.71 - \frac{8.3}{n_r^{3/2}} \right)^{5/3} \frac{1}{m_n} \right]. \quad (23)$$

The results of numerical evaluations of $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E} = \zeta P$, together with the difference in the magnitudes of $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ and \mathcal{E} , $\Delta = \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle - \mathcal{E}$, are plotted in Figure 3. We take, as the starting point, the coinciding values of $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ and \mathcal{E} at $A = 40$, and represent only their further developments.




Figure 3: Average energy density of the mean field $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$, energy density \mathcal{E} related to the degeneracy pressure, and the difference in the magnitudes of $\langle \mathbf{u} \rangle$ and \mathcal{E} , $\Delta = \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle - \mathcal{E}$

There are good grounds to believe that the inter-quark color attraction and degeneracy pressure play the defining roles in the force balance. It is seen, however, that the infrared enhancement of the inter-quark attraction does not completely neutralize the increment of degeneracy pressure. In fact, the behavior of $\Delta(A)$ has much in common with the run of the curve representing the average binding energy per nucleon, B/A , in the region $B/A \geq 8$ MeV³, Figure 4.

³ $\Delta(A)$ peaks at $A \approx 68$, whereas the maximum of B/A falls on $A \approx 62$. The difference is apt to be attributable to the neglect of the inter-quark Coulomb interactions.




Figure 4: Average binding energy per nucleon in stable nuclei

We thus see that switching between the model assigning the responsibility for the static properties of a nucleus to a single quark which resides in this nucleus and is propelled by the mean field generated by all other constituents of the nucleus and the model of a Fermi gas as applied to quarks confined in an infinitely deep potential well of size r_* is a self-consistent and phenomenologically justified procedure.

If the view of a nucleus as a collection of nucleons is abandoned, the usual concept of binding energy per nucleon loses its meaning. Instead, it seems reasonable to refer to B/A as the deficit of the constituent quark mass in nuclei as opposed to that in free nucleons. In going from one element of the periodic table to the next, the increase (decrease) of B/A is suggestive of the decrease (increase) of the constituent quark mass $\sqrt{p^2}$: the greater is B/A , the lower is $\sqrt{p^2}$. Recall that a classical self-interacting particle in the $SU(\mathcal{N})$ Yang–Mills–Wong theory [31], [32] has the four-momentum squared

$$p^2 = m^2 (1 + \ell^2 a^2), \quad (24)$$

where m is the renormalized mass (which is appropriate to define as the constituent quark mass in a free nucleon, $m \approx 330$ MeV), a^2 the four-acceleration squared, and ℓ a length characteristic of this dressed particle in the ‘cold phase’,

$$\ell = \frac{8}{3mg_{\text{YM}}^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\right), \quad (25)$$

with g_{YM} being the Yang–Mills coupling constant. Figure 4 shows that the dynamics of dressed quarks in light nuclei is so much whimsical that $\sqrt{p^2}$ may take an abrupt leap in

passing to adjacent nuclides. However, for $A > 40$, the variation of $\sqrt{p^2}$ becomes gentle, which is to say that the changes of dynamical regimes are regular.

A noticeable implication of this interpretation is that the properties of self-interacting quarks in nuclei depend on their QCD environment. What this means is an u quark in a deuteron is not identical to an u quark in a lead nucleus. Nevertheless, all u quarks in a given stable nucleus are identical and indistinguishable, and the same is true of d quarks.

We are coming now to the discussion of the fact that stable elements of the periodic table are limited in number. The mechanism of stability goes wrong in a bulky nucleus when the wave functions of the most widely separated identical quarks in this nucleus no longer overlap, which releases these quarks from control of the Pauli exclusion principle. Accordingly, the degeneracy pressure does not increase in proportion to the number of quarks. To gain an impression of how the quark wave function is distributed around a stable nucleus we estimate the maximum allowable separation of quarks in stable heavy nuclei at about 7 fm by applying Eq. (1) to Pb^{208} , and take into account that the standard deviation of this wave function for the constituent quark mass $m \approx 330$ MeV is ≈ 0.6 fm. However, there are too many phenomenological aspects and empirical parameters of the developed model to mount a frontal attack on the problem of Z_{max} , which sends us in search of more sophisticated approaches.

3 Holographic nuclear physics

The basic prescription for the holographic mapping is to identify the generating functional for 4-dimensional Green's functions in the gauge theory W_{gauge} with its 5-dimensional dual Z_{gravity} at the boundary of AdS_5 [18], [19],

$$Z_{\text{gravity}}[\Psi] = W_{\text{gauge}}[\Psi]. \quad (26)$$

Here, Ψ can be taken to be a Dirac field. In the gauge side, we will regard Ψ as the quark field appearing in an effective theory to low-energy QCD.

To adapt this prescription to the semiclassical, feeble-quantum dynamics that governs a Dirac particle driven by gravitational and electromagnetic fields of an extremal BH ⁴ in AdS_5 , we require that the least action contribution dominates the path integral for the generating functional,

$$Z_{\text{gravity}} \sim e^{-\bar{I}[\Psi]}, \quad (27)$$

where $\bar{I}[\Psi]$ is the Euclideanized least action of the Einstein–Maxwell–Chern–Simons–Dirac

⁴The regime of evolution of an extremal BH is not only semiclassical—which yet allows creations and annihilations of particles near the event horizon of an ordinary BH amenable to Hawking radiation—but also feeble-quantum, that is, immune of such processes.

theory ⁵, the simplest nontrivial descendant of the type II superstring theory,

$$I = \int d^5x \left\{ \frac{1}{16\pi} \left[\sqrt{-g} \left(R + \frac{12}{l^2} - F^{AB} F_{AB} \right) - \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \epsilon^{ABCDE} F_{AB} F_{CD} A_E \right] + \Psi^\dagger \left[\gamma^A e_A^\alpha (\partial_\alpha + \Gamma_\alpha - iqA_\alpha) + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{3}} \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu F_{\mu\nu} + \mu \right] \Psi \right\}. \quad (28)$$

This is the same as saying the wave function $\Psi(x)$ of the Dirac particle is described by a solution to the Dirac equation

$$\left[\gamma^A e_A^\alpha (\partial_\alpha + \Gamma_\alpha - iqA_\alpha) + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{3}} \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu F_{\mu\nu} + \mu \right] \Psi(x) = 0, \quad (29)$$

where Γ_α and A_α represent the gravitational and electromagnetic background fields of a BH, q and μ are, respectively, the charge and the mass of the Dirac particle. The presence of the Pauli term with the anomalous magnetic moment equal to $1/4\sqrt{3}$ is necessary [33] for a separation of variables in the Dirac equation (29).

Just as the least action contribution, $\exp(-\bar{I}[\Psi])$, dominates the path integral for the partition function in AdS₅, so does its dual in $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$,

$$W_{\text{gauge}} \sim e^{-\bar{S}[\Psi]}. \quad (30)$$

Here, $\bar{S}[\Psi]$ is the Euclideanized least action (2).

This treatment of gauge/gravity correspondence is greatly simplified as against that in the general case [27]. Now, the duality implies that stationary solutions to (29) exhibit characteristic features similar to those of the corresponding solutions to (12)–(13).

Our strategy is as follows. We consider a Dirac particle moving in the gravitational and electromagnetic background generated by a charged, rotating, extremal BH in AdS₅. The parameters of the BH are to be such that the effective potential $\mathcal{U}(r)$ stemming from this background be an infinitely deep potential well similar to that depicted in Figure 2. The parameter flow may lead to a naked singularity forbidden by the weak cosmic censorship [34]. If one strips the BH naked by shrinking its event horizon to a point, then the classical-quantum setup of this BH [28] is violated, the quantum mechanical status quo of the dual nucleus is disturbed, and the nuclear persistence ruins. This may hopefully be a suitable method for tackling the problem of Z_{max} .

⁵We take the notations and conventions that were adopted in [33]. The metric signature in (28) is $(+1, -1, -1, -1, -1)$. The curvature radius l of AdS₅ will be further put equal to 1. Latin letters A, B, \dots denote local orthonormal Lorentz frame indices $0, \dots, 5$, while Greek letters α, \dots run over five indices of spacetime coordinates $\{t, r, \theta, \phi, \psi\}$. Ψ is a four-component Dirac spinor, e_A^α a pentad, Γ_α the spinor connection. A_α denotes the 5-dimensional vector potential. The set of matrices γ^A is spanned by the quartet of Dirac 4×4 -matrices and γ^5 , which realize the 5-dimensional Clifford algebra, $\{\gamma^A, \gamma^B\} = 2\eta^{AB}$. The 5-dimensional Clifford algebra has two reducible representations, so that the Dirac field in (28) can be treated in the 4-dimensional context, with γ^5 being the fifth basis vector component, and the spinor connection is given by a $\text{so}(1, 4)$ -valued 1-form $\Gamma_A = e_A^\alpha \Gamma_\alpha = \frac{1}{4} \gamma^B \gamma^C f_{BCA}$, where f_{BCA} is the structure constants of $\text{so}(1, 4)$.

We proceed from the general solution of the Einstein–Maxwell–Chern–Simons theory describing the gravitational and electromagnetic fields of a charged, rotating BH in AdS₅ [35]. The radial part of the metric, expressed in terms of the Boyer–Lindquist coordinates, is

$$g_{rr} = r^2 (r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta + b^2 \sin^2 \theta) \Delta_r^{-1}, \quad (31)$$

$$\Delta_r = (r^2 + a^2) (r^2 + b^2) (r^2 + 1) - 2Mr^2 + (Q + ab)^2 - a^2 b^2, \quad (32)$$

where the parameters M, Q, a, b are related to the mass, charge, and two independent angular momenta of the BH. Our interest is with the unique positive root (two merged positive roots) of $\Delta_r = 0$ which defines the event horizon of an extremal BH. We thus solve the equation

$$r^6 + \mathbf{a}r^4 + \mathbf{b}r^2 + \mathbf{c} = 0, \quad (33)$$

where

$$\mathbf{a} = a^2 + b^2 + 1, \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{b} = a^2 + b^2 - 2M + a^2 b^2, \quad (35)$$

$$\mathbf{c} = (Q + ab)^2, \quad (36)$$

to give the unique positive solution $r = r_0$,

$$3r_0^2 = \sqrt{\mathbf{a}^2 - 3\mathbf{b}} - \mathbf{a}. \quad (37)$$

The condition that r_0 is a real double root,

$$(2\mathbf{a}^2 - 9\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} + 27\mathbf{c})^2 = 4(\mathbf{a}^2 - 3\mathbf{b})^3, \quad (38)$$

combined with (37) results in

$$Q + ab = r_0^2 \sqrt{2r_0^2 + \mathbf{a}}. \quad (39)$$

The Dirac equation (29) in the metric found in [35] can be decoupled [33] into temporal, radial and angular parts using the ansatz

$$\sqrt{r + ip\gamma^5} \Psi = e^{i(m\phi + k\psi - Et)} \begin{pmatrix} R_2(r) S_1(p) \\ R_1(r) S_2(p) \\ R_1(r) S_1(p) \\ R_2(r) S_2(p) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

$p = \sqrt{a^2 \cos^2 \theta + b^2 \sin^2 \theta}$, m and k are constants (analogous to the magnetic quantum numbers) which are associated with two independent angular momenta a and b . The ordinary differential equations for the radial part read

$$\sqrt{\Delta_r} \mathcal{D}_r^- R_1 = r \left\{ \lambda + i\mu r - \frac{Q + ab}{2r^2} - \frac{i}{r} [abE - mb(1 - a^2) - ka(1 - b^2)] \right\} R_2, \quad (41)$$

$$\sqrt{\Delta_r} \mathcal{D}_r^+ R_2 = r \left\{ \lambda - i\mu r - \frac{Q + ab}{2r^2} + \frac{i}{r} [abE - mb(1 - a^2) - ka(1 - b^2)] \right\} R_1. \quad (42)$$

Here,

$$\mathcal{D}_r^\pm = \frac{d}{dr} + \frac{\Delta'_r}{4\Delta_r} \pm \frac{iD}{\Delta_r}, \quad (43)$$

λ is a separation constant, and

$$D = Er^4 + \left[(a^2 + b^2)E - ma(1 - a^2) - kb(1 - b^2) - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}qQ \right] r^2 \\ + (Q + ab) [abE - mb(1 - a^2) - ka(1 - b^2)]. \quad (44)$$

The transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ i & -i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} R_1 \\ R_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (45)$$

converts (41) and (42) into real-valued equations.

Let $r = r_0$ be the unique positive root of the set of equations $\Delta_r(r) = 0$, $\Delta'_r(r) = 0$, and $D(r) = 0$. Then the behavior of the Dirac particle in the immediate vicinity of the event horizon, inside the extremal BH, is governed by

$$\frac{d}{dr} \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{r - r_0} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{A_0}{\sqrt{c_0}} & \frac{D_0}{c_0} - \frac{B_0}{\sqrt{c_0}} \\ -\frac{D_0}{c_0} - \frac{B_0}{\sqrt{c_0}} & -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{A_0}{\sqrt{c_0}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f \\ g \end{pmatrix} + O(1), \quad (46)$$

where

$$A_0 = \lambda r_0 - \frac{Q + ab}{2r_0} = \frac{r_0}{2} \left(2\lambda - \sqrt{2r_0^2 + \mathbf{a}} \right), \quad (47)$$

$$c_0 = 15r_0^4 + 6\mathbf{a}r_0^2 + \mathbf{b} = 4r_0^2 (3r_0^2 + \mathbf{a}), \quad (48)$$

$$D_0 = 4Er_0^3 + 2r_0 \left[E(\mathbf{a} - 1) - ma(1 - a^2) - kb(1 - b^2) - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}qQ \right], \quad (49)$$

$$B_0 = \mu r_0^2 - abE + mb(1 - a^2) + ka(1 - b^2). \quad (50)$$

The next steps are similar to those described in the previous section. One of the two equations for f and g is used to express g in terms of f , and the result is substituted into the other equation. If the first derivative of f is eliminated from the resulting second-order differential equation, we obtain a one-dimensional Schrödinger-like equation

$$F'' + \frac{\mathcal{U}_0}{(r - r_0)^2} F = 0, \quad (51)$$

where

$$\mathcal{U}_0 = \left(\frac{D_0}{c_0} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{A_0^2 + B_0^2}{c_0}. \quad (52)$$

The condition that the Dirac particles are unable to tunnel through the barrier at $r = r_0$ refers to $\mathcal{U}_0 \leq -\frac{3}{4}$. Because our concern is with the end of the nuclear stability,

we take the upper limit of this inequality, $\mathcal{U}_0 = -\frac{3}{4}$. The sole exception to the lack of tunneling is provided by the occurrence of a naked singularity, which is realized in the limit $r_0 \rightarrow 0$. It follows from (37) and (35) that the parameters of the BH in this case are related by

$$2M = a^2 + b^2 + a^2b^2, \quad (53)$$

and (39) becomes

$$Q = -ab. \quad (54)$$

We consider Q to be dual to Z , which, in view of (54), implies that a is opposite in sign to b . Since $c_0 \sim 4r_0^2\mathbf{a}$ as $r_0 \rightarrow 0$, the expression (52) diverges in this limit. To avoid the divergency, we require that the divergent terms of $(D_0/c_0)^2$ and B_0^2/c_0 cancel each other,

$$\left[E(\mathbf{a} - 1) - ma(1 - a^2) - kb(1 - b^2) - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}qQ \right]^2 = \mathbf{a} [abE - mb(1 - a^2) - ka(1 - b^2)]^2. \quad (55)$$

The condition $\mathcal{U}_0 = -\frac{3}{4}$ is met when

$$16E \left[E(\mathbf{a} - 1) - ma(1 - a^2) - kb(1 - b^2) - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}qQ \right] + 16\mathbf{a}^2 - \mathbf{a} (2\lambda - \sqrt{\mathbf{a}})^2 + 8\mu\mathbf{a} [abE - mb(1 - a^2) - ka(1 - b^2)] = 0. \quad (56)$$

The consistency between the dynamical affairs in the bulk and in the screen can be attained if the energy E of the Dirac particle is taken to be comparable to the mass M of the BH, much as the energy ε_{n_r} of a single quark is likened to the mass of the nucleus involving this quark. We just equate E and M ,

$$2E = a^2 + b^2 + a^2b^2. \quad (57)$$

To simplify matters we assume that the regime of orbiting of the Dirac particle exhibits the maximal possible symmetry, that is, $a = -b$, and $m = k$. Since μ is dual to the constituent quark mass of a quark belonging to a nucleus under study, we should set $\mu = E/3Q$. Equations (55), (56), and (57) become

$$2 \left[(\mathbf{a} - 1)E - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}qQ \right] = \sqrt{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a} - 1)E, \quad (58)$$

$$48E \left[(\mathbf{a} - 1)E - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}qQ \right] + 48\mathbf{a}^2 - 3\mathbf{a} (2\lambda - \sqrt{\mathbf{a}})^2 - 8\mathbf{a}E^2 = 0, \quad (59)$$

$$8E = (\mathbf{a} - 1)(\mathbf{a} + 3). \quad (60)$$

Combining (58), (59), and (60) gives

$$24\sqrt{\mathbf{a}} \left[(2\lambda - \sqrt{\mathbf{a}})^2 - 16\mathbf{a} \right] = (\mathbf{a} - 1)^2(\mathbf{a} + 3)^2 [3(\mathbf{a} - 1) - \sqrt{\mathbf{a}}]. \quad (61)$$

There is clear evidence that λ is a trifle over four. Indeed, at the semiclassical level, we have to do with the Dirac equation (29) which can be decoupled into the radial and angular parts [33]. The latter is invariant under $\text{SO}(4)$ equivalent to $\text{SO}(3) \times \text{SO}(3)$. Therefore, the classical separation constant λ_{class} is given by the sum of eigenfunctions of the corresponding Casimir operators, $l_1(l_1 + 1) + l_2(l_2 + 1)$. To take account of the minimal rotation effect, pertaining equally to both $\text{SO}(3)$ rotation groups, we should put $l_1 = l_2 = 1$, so that $\lambda_{\text{class}} = 4$. Since the feeble-quantum correction is inversely related to λ_{class} , the final result ends up with $\lambda = \lambda_{\text{class}} + 1/\lambda_{\text{class}} = 4.25$. With this value of λ , the unique positive solution of (61) is $\mathbf{a} \approx 2.58$.

From (58) and (60), we have

$$qQ = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{3}} (\mathbf{a} - 1)^2 (2 - \sqrt{\mathbf{a}}) (\mathbf{a} + 3). \quad (62)$$

Substituting $\mathbf{a} \approx 2.58$ in (62) gives $qQ \approx 0.396$.

We now reenter the 4-dimensional Minkowski realm $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$ where an u quark plays the role of the Dirac particle ⁶, and regain the usual natural units. We identify the projection of qQ on $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$ with the charge of the u quark times the charge of the nucleus involving this u quark, $Z_{\text{max}}^{\text{H}}$ (H for holographic), less the charge of the quark,

$$qQ = \frac{2}{3} \left(Z_{\text{max}}^{\text{H}} - \frac{2}{3} \right) \alpha, \quad (63)$$

where $\alpha \approx 1/137$ stands for the fine structure constant, to yield

$$Z_{\text{max}}^{\text{H}} \approx 0.667 + 137 \cdot 1.5 \cdot 0.396 \approx 82. \quad (64)$$

4 Concluding remarks

The treatment of nuclei in terms of quarks enables us to inquire into problems that defy solutions when nuclei are taken as bound systems of nucleons. Let us sum up our results.

The first issue of our concern was gaining insight into the quark content of stable light nuclei—from H^2 to Ca^{40} . With the idea of quantum minimalism ⁷, we came to the rule $n_u \approx n_d$ underlying the stability of nuclei in this part of the periodic table.

The next point was to explain the quark content of stable nuclei in the remaining part of the periodic table where the stability condition is inconsistent with the rule $n_u \approx n_d$. As A increases above $A = 40$, the ratio n_d/n_u becomes ever growing. A plausible explanation of this fact is as follows. In view of the phenomenological formula $R = R_0 A^{1/3}$, the volume of a nucleus is proportional to the number of quarks involved. The excess of n_d is required to compensate the infrared QCD enhancement of the color attraction force between widely

⁶Out of two species of quarks, u and d , we must choose u because $qQ > 0$, as indicated by (62).

⁷Manifestations of the quantum minimalism in microscopic realm are numerous. For example, if the center-of-mass energy in a scattering process is of order of the Planck energy $E_{\text{P1}} \approx 10^{19}$ GeV but the momentum transfer is small compared to E_{P1} , all physical modes of the gravitational field are classical, except for two longitudinal modes [36]. We restricted our examination of this idea to nuclear physics.

separated quarks in any roomy nucleus by strengthening their quantum repulsion, that is, by departing from the minimum of \mathcal{E} . We compared this infrared attraction effect with the increment of \mathcal{E} , Figure 3. The run of their interplay Δ bears a general resemblance to that of the binding energy per nucleon B/A in the region $B/A \geq 8$ MeV, Figure 4.

This observation persuaded us to relate B/A to the deficit of mass of a quark in nuclei with respect to its mass in free nucleons. What this means is dressed quarks in a deuteron are not identical to dressed quarks in a lead. This is scarcely surprising if it is remembered that an u quark in a proton is much heavier than that in a π_0 . However, all dressed quarks of the same species in a given nucleus are identical and indistinguishable.

The last issue was the finiteness of the periodic table. To grasp the reason for instability of any nucleus heavier than Pb^{208} , it is worth noting that if the wave functions of the most widely separated quarks in a given nucleus do not overlap, these quarks get out of control of the Pauli exclusion principle, and the degeneracy pressure fails to behave appropriately to maintain the balance of forces. Put very simply, heavy nuclei are found to be unstable because the line of demarcation between the quantum and the classical is exceeded.

We specified Z_{\max} through the use of gauge/gravity duality between the dynamical affair of stable nuclei in $\mathbb{R}_{1,3}$ and that of extremal BHs ⁸ in AdS_5 . If one strips the BH naked by shrinking its event horizon to a point, the classical-quantum arrangement of this BH [28] fails. The occurrence of the naked singularity is the holographic counterpart of the situation that the Pauli exclusion principle becomes inconsistent in the dual nucleus, and hence the nuclear persistence ruins. On this grounds we deduced the maximum allowable electric charge for heavy nuclei compatible with nuclear stability, $Z_{\max}^H \approx 82$.

Our line of reasoning was based on several risky assumptions. The value of Z_{\max}^H is acutely sensitive to most of them. The reader may be especially sceptical about our choice of the separation constant λ , and think of it as an adjustable parameter (one may even consider 2λ as something inspired by the famous Fellini movie “ $8\frac{1}{2}$ ”). However, it is fair to say that the holographic principle shows considerable promise as a means for tackling ‘eternal’ problems in nuclear physics.

References

- [1] D. Iwanenko. The neutron hypothesis. *Nature* **129**, 312 (1932).
- [2] W. Heisenberg. Über den Bau der Atomkerne. I. *Z. Phys.* **77**, 1-11 (1932).

⁸Why is our concern with extremal BHs? Recall that extremal BHs are free of Hawking evaporation. Therefore, extremal BHs and stable nuclei share a common trait, that of defying spontaneous ejection of their constituents. Can an ordinary BH amenable to Hawking evaporation be dual to an unstable nucleus? No. Firstly, nuclear reactions are reversible, whereas Hawking evaporation is irreversible. Secondly, quantum mechanical systems of the same species are identical and indiscernible. It is expected that their gravitational duals exhibit similar properties. Let two Lorentz frames, \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , meet at some instant. Let the \mathcal{F} carry a Schwarzschild BH whose mass at this instant equals that of another Schwarzschild BH attached to the \mathcal{F}' . Are their masses always equal? The rate of evaporation as measured on the proper time is common for both BHs. Therefore, at a later time, simultaneous measurements of masses of the BHs attached to the \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' will give different results. The relativistic effect of time dilation keeps evaporating BHs from being regarded as identical entities.

- [3] H. Yukawa. On the interaction of elementary particles. I. Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan **17**, 48-57 (1935).
- [4] S. Weinberg. Nuclear forces from chiral lagrangians. Phys. Lett. B **251**, 288-292 (1990).
- [5] E. Epelbaum, H.-W. Hammer, and U.-G. Meißner. Modern theory of nuclear forces. Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1773-1825 (2009); arXiv: nucl-th/0811.1338.
- [6] R. Machleidt and D. R. Entem. Chiral effective field theory and nuclear forces. Phys. Rep. **503**, 1-75 (2011); arXiv: nucl-th/1105.2919.
- [7] H. R. Petry, *et al.* An application of QCD in nuclear structure. Phys. Lett. B **159**, 363-368 (1985).
- [8] F. E. Close. *An Introduction to Quarks and Partons* (New York: Academic, 1979).
- [9] I. Angeli and K. P. Marinova. Table of experimental nuclear ground state charge radii: An update. Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **99**, 69-95 (2013).
- [10] A. Arima, K. Yazaki, and H. Bohr. A quark shell model calculation of nuclear magnetic moments. Phys. Lett. B **183**, 131-134 (1987).
- [11] I. Talmi. The nuclear shell model – of nucleons or quarks? Phys. Lett. B **205**, 140-144 (1988).
- [12] K. Maltman, G. J. Stephenson Jr., and T. Goldman. A relativistic quark model of nuclear substructure in the $A = 3$ system. Phys. Lett. B **324**, 1-4 (1994).
- [13] B. P. Kosyakov, E. Yu. Popov, and M. A. Vronskiĭ. The bag and the string: Are they opposed? Phys. Lett. B **744**, 28-33 (2015).
- [14] B. P. Kosyakov, E. Yu. Popov, and M. A. Vronskiĭ. Could the static properties of nuclei be deduced from the dynamics of a single quark? Eur. Phys. J. A **53**: 82 (2017); arXiv: nucl-th/1604.06613.
- [15] J. N. Ginocchio. Relativistic symmetries in nuclei and hadrons. Phys. Rep. **414**, 165-261 (2005).
- [16] H. Liang, J. Meng, and S.-G. Zhou. Hidden pseudospin and spin symmmetries and their origins in atomic nuclei. Phys. Rep. **570**, 1-84 (2015); arXiv: nucl-th/1411.6774.
- [17] J. Maldacena. The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231-252 (1998); arXiv: hep-th/9711200.
- [18] E. Witten. Anti-de Sitter space and holography. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253-291 (1998); arXiv: hep-th/9802150.
- [19] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov, and A. M. Polyakov. Gauge theory correlators from noncritical string theory. Phys. Lett. B **428**, 105-114 (1998); arXiv: hep-th/9802109.

- [20] M. Ammon and J. Erdmenger. *Gauge/Gravity Duality* (Cambridge: CUP, 2015).
- [21] H. Năstase. *Introduction to the AdS/CFT Correspondence* (Cambridge: CUP, 2015).
- [22] R. Emparan and H. S. Reall. Black holes in higher dimensions. *Living Rev. Rel.* **11**: 6 (2008); arXiv: gr-qc/0801.3471.
- [23] G. T. Horowitz (ed.). *Black Holes in Higher Dimensions*. (Cambridge: CUP, 2012).
- [24] C. P. Herzog. A holographic prediction of the deconfinement temperature. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**: 091601 (2007); arXiv: hep-ph/0608151.
- [25] E. Witten. Anti-de Sitter space, thermal phase transition, and confinement in gauge theories. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 505-532 (1998); arXiv: hep-th/9803131.
- [26] T. Sakai and S. Sugimoto. Low energy hadron physics in holographic QCD. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **113**, 843-882 (2005); arXiv: hep-th/0412141.
- [27] B. P. Kosyakov, E. Yu. Popov, and M. A. Vronskii. Correspondence between the physics of extremal black holes and that of stable heavy atomic nuclei. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **36**: 135001 (2019); arXiv: hep-th/1802.03545.
- [28] B. P. Kosyakov. Black holes: interfacing the classical and the quantum. *Found. Phys.* **38**, 678-694 (2008); arXiv: gr-qc/0707.2749.
- [29] E. Eichten *et al.* Spectrum of charmed quark-antiquark bound states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 369-372 (1975).
- [30] J. Dittrich and P. Exner. Tunnelling through a singular potential barrier. *J. Math. Phys.* **26**, 2000-2008 (1985).
- [31] B. P. Kosyakov. *Introduction to the Classical Theory of Particles and Fields* (Berlin: Springer, 2007).
- [32] B. P. Kosyakov. Self-interaction in classical gauge theories and gravitation. *Phys. Rep.* **812**, 1-55 (2019); arXiv: hep-th/1812.03290.
- [33] S.-Q. Wu. Separability of massive field equations for spin-0 and spin-1/2 charged particles in the general non-extremal rotating charged black holes in minimal five-dimensional gauged supergravity. *Phys. Rev. D* **80**: 084009 (2009); arXiv: hep-th/0906.2049.
- [34] R. Penrose. Gravitational collapse: The role of general relativity. *Rivista del Nuovo Cimento* **1**, 252-276 (1969).
- [35] Z.-W. Chong, M. Cvetič, H. Lü, and C. N. Pope. General non-extremal rotating black holes in minimal five-dimensional gauged supergravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**: 161301 (2005); arXiv: hep-th/0506029.
- [36] H. Verlinde and E. Verlinde. Scattering at Planckian energies. *Nucl. Phys. B* **371**, 246-268 (1992).