

Electric dipole polarizability of low-lying excited states in atomic nuclei

José Nicolás Orce^{1,2,*} and Cebo Ngwetsheni¹

¹*Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of the Western Cape, P/B X17, Bellville 7535, South Africa*

²*National Institute for Theoretical and Computational Sciences (NITheCS), South Africa*

(Dated: March 12, 2024)

Novel equations for the electric dipole polarizability α_{E1} of low-lying excited states in atomic nuclei — and the related (-2) moment of the total photo-absorption cross section, σ_{-2} — are inferred in terms of electric dipole and quadrupole matrix elements. These equations are valid for arbitrary angular momenta of the initial/ground and final/excited states and have been exploited in fully converged $1\hbar\omega$ shell-model calculations of selected p - and sd -shell nuclei that consider configuration mixing; advancing previous knowledge from ^{17}O to ^{36}Ar , where thousands of electric dipole matrix elements are computed from isovector excitations which include the giant dipole resonance region. Our results are in reasonable agreement with previous shell-model calculations and follow — except for $^{6,7}\text{Li}$ and $^{17,18}\text{O}$ — Migdal's global trend provided by the combination of the hydrodynamic model and second-order non-degenerate perturbation theory. Discrepancies in $^{6,7}\text{Li}$ and ^{17}O arise as a result of the presence of α -cluster configurations in odd-mass nuclei, whereas the disagreement in ^{18}O comes from the mixing of intruder states, which is lacking in the shell-model interactions. More advanced *ab initio* calculations of the dipole polarizability for low-lying excited states covering all the isovector states within the giant dipole resonance region are missing and could be very valuable to benchmark the results presented here and shed further light on how atomic nuclei polarize away from the ground state

PACS numbers: 21.10.Ky, 25.70.De, 25.20.-x, 25.20.Dc, 24.30.Cz

Keywords: photo-absorption cross section, Coulomb excitation, electric dipole polarizability, hydrodynamic model, perturbation theory

MOTIVATION

The bulk of knowledge on the nuclear electric dipole (E1) polarizability, α_{E1} , concerns the ground states of nuclei and arises from photo-absorption cross-section data [1–3], where most of the absorption (and emission) of photons is provided by the giant dipole resonance (GDR) [4]. The latter is understood macroscopically as the collective motion of inter-penetrating proton and neutron fluids out of phase [5–7], whereas is described microscopically by the shell-model (SM) interpretation of a system of independent nucleons or particle-hole excitations plus configuration mixing [8–10]. Data predominantly involve photo-neutron cross sections, although photo-proton contributions are relevant for light and $N = Z$ self-conjugate nuclei [11]. To a much lesser extend, α_{E1} has been determined from several experiments using radioactive ion beams [12], inelastic proton scattering [13–17] and virtual photons [18]. The latter are also responsible for the polarization of atoms and molecules [19].

The understanding of how α_{E1} evolves as a function of excitation energy is relevant for nuclear structure physics [18] and nuclear astrophysics [20]. Average properties can be extracted from GDRs built on excited states by fitting the GDR energy and width parameters to data [20], using the second-sound hydrodynamic

model [21] and assuming the validity of the Brink-Axel hypothesis [22, 23]. The latter seems validated below critical temperatures of $T \lesssim T_c = 0.7 + 37.5/A$ MeV and angular momenta $J \lesssim J_c = 0.6A^{5/6}$ [24], where excited GDRs present similar parameters to their ground-state counterparts [25, 26]. There is bountiful information for $T \gg 1$ MeV from heavy-ion fusion-evaporation reactions [25–28], some in the range $0.7 \lesssim T \lesssim 1$ MeV [29–35], and hardly anything for $0 \lesssim T < 0.7$ MeV. At $T \approx 0$ MeV, α_{E1} has been determined from Coulomb-excitation reactions for only a couple of favorable cases with excited states $J = 1/2$ — ^7Li [36–38] and ^{17}O [39] — where the spectroscopic or static quadrupole moment is zero, $Q_s(J = 1/2) = 0^1$. Inasmuch as α_{E1} , $Q_s(J)$ is a second-order effect in Coulomb-excitation perturbation theory [40, 43–45] that provides a measure of the extent to which the nuclear charge distribution in the laboratory frame acquires an ellipsoidal deformation. The empirical disentanglement of α_{E1} and Q_s values for excited states with $J \neq 1/2$ requires increasing experimental accuracy and has never been done.

For ground states, α_{E1} can be deduced using non-degenerate perturbation theory by means of the energy-shift of nuclear levels arising from the quadratic Stark effect [46], and has been investigated with SM calcula-

* Email: coulex@gmail.com; <https://github.com/UWCNuclear/>;
<http://nuclear.uwc.ac.za>

¹From the vanishing $3j$ Wigner symbol $\propto J(2J - 1)$ [40–42].

tions [47–52] using,

$$\alpha_{E1} = \frac{2e^2}{2J_i + 1} \sum_n \frac{|\langle i \| \hat{E}1 \| n \rangle|^2}{E_n - E_i} = \frac{9\hbar c}{8\pi^3} \sigma_{-2}, \quad (1)$$

where the sum extend over $|n\rangle$ intermediate states connecting the initial/ground state $|i\rangle$ with isovector $E1$ transitions [53], $2J_i + 1$ is the normalization constant arising from the Wigner-Eckart theorem [54, 55] — validating Eq. 1 for arbitrary J_i ground states — and σ_{-2} the (-2) moment of the total photo-absorption cross section, $\sigma_{total}(E_\gamma)$, defined by [56, 57],

$$\sigma_{-2} = \int_{S_n}^{E_\gamma^{max}} \frac{\sigma_{total}(E_\gamma)}{E_\gamma^2} dE_\gamma, \quad (2)$$

which is generally integrated between neutron threshold S_n and the experimentally available upper limit for monochromatic photons, $E_\gamma^{max} \approx 20 - 50$ MeV [1]. An upper limit of $E_\gamma^{max} \approx 50$ MeV approximates the σ_{-2} asymptotic value for light and medium-mass nuclei [58]. For heavy nuclei with atomic mass number $A = N + Z \gtrsim 50$, σ_{-2} values generally follow the empirical power-law formula [59, 60],

$$\sigma_{-2}(A) = 2.38\kappa A^{5/3} \mu\text{b}/\text{MeV}, \quad (3)$$

in agreement with Migdal’s original calculation [5], where κ is the dipole polarizability parameter that accounts for deviations ($\kappa \neq 1$) of the hydrodynamic model from the actual GDR effects. Calculations can be benchmarked with available photo-absorption cross-section data [61, 62].

In this work, we further explore how the $E1$ polarizability evolves from the ground state to the first excitation of selected p - and sd -shell nuclides. Where possible, we perform $1\hbar\omega$ SM calculations, compare with available data and explore deviations from the hydrodynamic model [59, 60, 63–65]. Similar SM calculations of the $E1$ polarizability for ground states have already been published in Ref. [52].

SHELL-MODEL CALCULATIONS

Firstly, we deduce new polarization equations for excited states on the same footing as ground states. Applying second-order non-degenerate perturbation theory to the Coulomb-excitation process shown in Fig. 1, the second-order transition amplitude $b_{i \rightarrow f}^{(2)}$ from $|i\rangle$ — again, the ground state — to a final excited state $|f\rangle$ is given by [44]

$$b_{i \rightarrow f}^{(2)} = b_{i \rightarrow f}^{(1)} + \sum_n b_{in f}, \quad (4)$$

where $b_{i \rightarrow f}^{(1)}$ is proportional to the $\langle i \| \hat{E}2 \| f \rangle$ transitional matrix element and $\sum_n b_{in f}$ is the sum over intermediate




FIG. 1. Sketch of $E1$ virtual excitations around the GDR polarizing the final state $|f\rangle$. The energy of the GDR built on excited states is parametrized as $18A^{-1/3} + 25A^{-1/6}$ MeV [26].

states of the interference term between first-order and second-order transitions, which is proportional to

$$\mathcal{S}(E1) = \frac{1}{2J_i + 1} \sum_{J_n, \Delta T} W \frac{\langle i \| \hat{E}1 \| n \rangle \langle n \| \hat{E}1 \| f \rangle}{E_n - E_i} \quad (5)$$

where $W = W(\lambda_{in} \lambda_{nf} J_i J_f, \lambda J_n)$ are the corresponding Racah W -coefficients [66] — with $\lambda_{in} = \lambda_{nf} = 1$ for $E1$ multipolarity and $\lambda = \lambda_{in} + \lambda_{nf}^2$ — and the sum extends over the intermediate J_n states connecting both $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ states with isovector $E1$ transitions following the general isospin selection rule for electromagnetic transitions: $\Delta T = 0, \pm 1$ [53]. Particularly, for self-conjugate $N = Z$ nuclei the isovector contribution arises only from $\Delta T = 1$ transitions³, while both $\Delta T = 0$ and $\Delta T = 1$ have to be considered otherwise.

Furthermore, $\mathcal{S}(E1)$ is connected to Eq. 1 through the reference parameter η_0 [36, 43, 44, 67–69],

$$\eta_0 = \sqrt{2/5} \frac{\sum_n \frac{\langle i \| \hat{E}1 \| n \rangle \langle n \| \hat{E}1 \| f \rangle}{E_n - E_i}}{\sum_n \frac{|\langle i \| \hat{E}1 \| n \rangle|^2}{E_n - E_i}}, \quad (6)$$

where the relation

$$\eta_0 = \frac{4\sqrt{\pi}}{3} \frac{\langle i \| \hat{E}2 \| f \rangle}{ZeR^2} \quad (7)$$

²Racah (and Wigner) coefficients are zero if the triangle inequalities $J_i + J_f \geq J_n$ and $\lambda_{in} + \lambda_{nf} \geq \lambda$ are not satisfied.

³Again, because of a vanishing $3j$ symbol for $\Delta T = 0$.

is defined by association with the excitation amplitude $\sum_n b_{inf}$ [44]. For simplicity, Eichler originally assumed the closure approximation [43] — i.e. $\eta_0 = 1$ for closed-shell nuclei — but smaller $\eta_0 < 1$ values are expected because of the random phase of the off-diagonal matrix elements in the numerator of Eq. 6. For instance, $\eta_0 \simeq 1/12$ is determined assuming a 2_1^+ rotational state and the characteristic energy relation of the GDR double peak for a strongly-deformed prolate nucleus [67], reaching smaller $\eta_0 \leq 1/12$ values when considering the triaxial degree of freedom. A slightly larger value of $\eta_0 \approx 0.3$ is determined using the dynamic collective model for a strongly-deformed nucleus [68]. Generally, the dynamic collective model by Danos and Greiner [70], later extended to spherical nuclei by Weber [71, 72], can be used to calculate η_0 values, which allows for rotations, surface quadrupole vibrations and higher-energy giant resonance oscillations. As stated by de Boer and Eichler, *Eq. 7 may also provide a useful estimate for the more general case, since the polarization is essentially a nuclear-size effect.* Moreover, the electric quadrupole $\langle i \| \hat{E}2 \| f \rangle$ matrix element in Eq. 7 naturally arises from the interference between first-order (E2) and second-order (E1) transitions [44].

Now using Eqs. 1, 5, 6 and 7, new relations for α_{E1} and σ_{-2} values can be deduced for excited states with arbitrary J ,

$$\alpha_{E1} = 1.11 \frac{ZA^{2/3}}{\langle i \| \hat{E}2 \| f \rangle} \sum_{J_n, \Delta T} \frac{S(E1)}{W(\lambda_{in} \lambda_{nf} J_i J_f, \lambda J_n)} \quad (8)$$

$$\sigma_{-2} = 0.155 \frac{ZA^{2/3}}{\langle i \| \hat{E}2 \| f \rangle} \sum_{J_n, \Delta T} \frac{S(E1)}{W(\lambda_{in} \lambda_{nf} J_i J_f, \lambda J_n)} \quad (9)$$

in units of fm^3 and fm^2/MeV , respectively. For instance, assuming a two-step processes of the type $0_1^+ \rightarrow 1_{GDR}^- \rightarrow 2_1^+$ in even-even nuclei, $W(1\ 1\ 0\ 2, 2\ 1) = \sqrt{1/3}\sqrt{1/5}$, yielding

$$\sigma_{-2} = 0.6 \frac{ZA^{2/3}S(E1)}{\langle 0_1^+ \| \hat{E}2 \| 2_1^+ \rangle}. \quad (10)$$

Further, the polarizability parameter κ can also be determined in terms of E1 and E2 matrix elements, as originally done by Häusser and collaborators [36],

$$\kappa = \frac{\sigma_{-2}}{2.38 \times 10^{-4} A^{5/3}} \quad (11)$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{J_n, \Delta T} \frac{S(E1)}{W(1,1, J_i, J_f, 2, J_n)}}{0.0015 \frac{A}{Z} \langle i \| \hat{E}2 \| f \rangle}. \quad (12)$$

For the usual case of a final 2_1^+ state following $0_1^+ \rightarrow$

$$1_{GDR}^- \rightarrow 2_1^+,$$

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{0.00039 \frac{A}{Z} \langle 0_1^+ \| \hat{E}2 \| 2_1^+ \rangle} S(E1). \quad (13)$$

Additional Racah coefficients of

$$W(1\ 1\ 1\ 3, 2\ 2) = 1/5, \quad (14)$$

$$W(1\ 1\ 3/2\ 1/2, 2\ 1/2) = 15\sqrt{1/3}\sqrt{1/5}\sqrt{1/6}\sqrt{1/30}, \quad (15)$$

$$W(1\ 1\ 3/2\ 1/2, 2\ 3/2) = 15/2\sqrt{1/3}\sqrt{1/5}\sqrt{1/15}\sqrt{1/30}, \quad (16)$$

$$W(1\ 1\ 5/2\ 1/2, 2\ 3/2) = 3/2\sqrt{1/3}\sqrt{1/15}, \quad (17)$$

were used for ${}^6\text{Li}$ ($1_1^+ \rightarrow 2_{GDR}^- \rightarrow 3_1^+$), ${}^7\text{Li}$ ($3/2_1^- \rightarrow 1/2_{GDR}^+ \rightarrow 1/2_1^-$ and $3/2_1^- \rightarrow 3/2_{GDR}^+ \rightarrow 1/2_1^-$) and ${}^{17}\text{O}$ ($5/2_1^+ \rightarrow 3/2_{GDR}^- \rightarrow 1/2_1^+$).

Accordingly, Eqs. 8, 9 and 12 allow the general calculation of α_{E1} , σ_{-2} and κ values for excited states using E1 and E2 matrix elements computed by various theoretical models, comparison with sum rules and Coulomb-excitation measurements. Here, accurate Coulomb-excitation measurements of second-order contributions to the inelastic cross sections could be used to benchmark the polarizability of excited states [43].

Shell-model calculations of σ_{-2} and κ values for first low-lying excitations were previously performed in light nuclei [47–51, 74] — as shown in Fig. 2 — and used in the analysis of Coulomb-excitation studies in order to treat adequately the GDR effect [36–39, 51, 74, 77–80]. Large $\kappa > 1$ values were predicted for the $J = 1/2_1$ excited state in ${}^7\text{Li}$ and ${}^{17}\text{O}$ [47, 48, 50], in agreement with Coulomb-excitation measurements [36–39, 77]. In more detail, the first SM calculations in *osd*-shell nuclei [47] performed for ${}^{17}\text{O}$ [48] and ${}^{18}\text{O}$ [49] assumed the closure approximation (up triangles in Fig. 2), in which all the E1 strength is concentrated at the GDR energy. A more exhaustive approach considered a realistic Hamiltonian with harmonic-oscillator and Woods-Saxon (squares in Fig. 2) single-particle wave functions restricted to the lowest configuration [50], which included configuration mixing only for the simpler case of ${}^{17}\text{O}$ and presented a better correlation with experimental values.

Recently, no-core shell model (NCSM) calculations of κ values for excited states in ${}^{10}\text{Be}$ [74] and ${}^{12}\text{C}$ [51] (left triangles in Fig. 2) were performed using $2N$ and $2N + 3N$ forces [81–86] with $N_{max} = 4$ basis sizes for natural and $N_{max} = 5$ for unnatural parity states. These *ab initio* calculations included E1 matrix elements connecting about 30 1^- states up to 30 MeV. More advanced *ab initio* calculations involve the Lanczos-continued-fraction algorithm [87, 88] applied to Eq. 5 by

⁴This is an equivalent relation to the one deduced by Häusser [36, 45] and Barker [47–49], but using $\sigma_{-2} = 2.38 \times 10^{-4} \kappa A^{5/3} \text{ fm}^2/\text{MeV}$ instead of Levinger's $\sigma_{-2} = 3.5 \times 10^{-4} \kappa A^{5/3} \text{ fm}^2/\text{MeV}$ [73], which yields a factor of 0.00058 in the denominator [48].




FIG. 2. Experimental and calculated σ_{-2} (left) and κ (right) values for the first excitation of selected p and sd -shell nuclei. The experimental points (diamonds) are taken from Coulomb-excitation data [36–39]. The SM calculations consider the closure approximation (up triangles) [47–49], Woods-Saxon wave functions (squares) [50], NCSM (left triangles) [51, 74] and current work (circles). For comparison, the hydrodynamic-model prediction for $\kappa = 1$ in Eq. 3 is shown by dotted lines together with the leptodermous trend provided by the finite-range droplet model (FRDM) with symmetry energy coefficients $S_v = 30.8$ MeV and $S_s/S_v = 1.62$ [75] (dashed lines).

TABLE I. Calculated σ_{-2}^{SM} (column 5) and κ^{SM} (column 10) values of first-excited states in selected $p - sd$ shell nuclei together with their corresponding $S(E1)^{SM}$ and $\langle i || \hat{E}2 || f \rangle^{SM}$ (columns 6 and 7). Experimental $\langle i || \hat{E}2 || f \rangle^{exp}$ [76] and κ^{exp} values (columns 8 and 9, respectively) as well as previous SM calculations (column 11) are listed for comparison.

| Nucleus | J_i^π | J_f^π | E_{ex} | σ_{-2}^{SM} | $S(E1)^{SM}$ | $\langle i \hat{E}2 f \rangle^{SM}$ | $\langle i \hat{E}2 f \rangle^{exp}$ | κ^{exp} | κ^{SM} | $\kappa^{previous SM}$ |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | MeV | $\mu\text{b}/\text{MeV}$ | $\text{e}^2\text{fm}^2/\text{MeV}$ | $\text{e}^2\text{fm}^2/\text{MeV}$ | e fm^2 | | | |
| ${}^6\text{Li}$ | 1_1^+ | 3^+ | 2.19 | 131 | 0.0135 | 7.88 | 8.65(48) | – | 2.2 | 1.3, 3.7 [50], 2.8 [47] |
| ${}^7\text{Li}$ | $3/2_1^-$ | $1/2_1^-$ | 0.48 | 20 | 0.0007 | 6.57 | 5.60(56) | 4.0(3) [37, 38], 5.3(7) [36] | 0.3 | 1.5, 3.1 [50], 3.3 [47] |
| ${}^{12}\text{C}$ | 0_1^+ | 2_1^+ | 4.44 | 131 | 0.0045 | 6.52 | 6.30(16) | – | 0.9 | 0.9, 1.0 [50], 1.1 [47], 2.1(2)* [51] |
| ${}^{17}\text{O}$ | $5/2_1^+$ | $1/2_1^+$ | 0.87 | 1109 | 0.0103 | 3.40 | 3.55(3) | 8.4(6) [39] | 4.2 | 3.8 [48], 2.3, 5.7, 7.8** [50] |
| ${}^{18}\text{O}$ | 0_1^+ | 2_1^+ | 1.98 | 718 | 0.0088 | 4.05 | 6.56(29) | – | 2.5 | 6.5 [49] |
| ${}^{20}\text{Ne}$ | 0_1^+ | 2_1^+ | 1.63 | 205 | –0.0089 | –19.25 | 18.25(44) | – | 0.6 | 3.4 [49] |
| ${}^{24}\text{Mg}$ | 0_1^+ | 2_1^+ | 1.37 | 401 | –0.0146 | –21.80 | 20.91(22) | – | 0.9 | – |
| ${}^{36}\text{Ar}$ | 0_1^+ | 2_1^+ | 1.97 | 964 | –0.0151 | –18.48 | 17.35(46) | – | 1.1 | – |

* The quoted value of $\kappa(2_1^+) = 2.1(2)$ in Ref. [51] was determined by NCSM calculations using the $NN + 3N350 - srg2.0$ χEFT interaction with a basis size of $N_{max} = 4$. A similar value of $\kappa(2_1^+) = 2.2(2)$ is also provided in Ref. [51] using the $NN N^4NLO500 - srg2.4$ interaction.

** Only result that includes configuration mixing in Refs. [47–50].

All quoted σ_{-2} and κ values presented in this work are related to Eq. 3.

Navrátil, which sum up contributions of all the excited states [89]. For the ground states of ${}^9\text{Be}$ and ${}^{12}\text{C}$, values of $\kappa(g.s.) = 3.4(8)$ and $\kappa(g.s.) = 1.6(2)$ were predicted, respectively, in agreement with photo-absorption cross-section data [73, 90, 91]. Values of $\kappa(2_1^+) = 1.2(3)$ and $\kappa(2_1^+) = 2.1(2)$ were calculated for the first excited states in ${}^{10}\text{Be}$ and ${}^{12}\text{C}$, respectively.

In the present work, full $1\hbar\omega$ SM calculations of the dipole polarizability for the first excitation in selected

p - and sd -shell nuclei have been performed with the OXBASH code [92] using the WBP [93] and FSU [94–96] Hamiltonians and the $spsdpf$ model space. Shell model calculations for $A \leq 12$ nuclides arise from the WBP interaction whereas for $A \geq 17$ we quote results using the FSU interaction. Indeed, the FSU Hamiltonian starts with the WBP Hamiltonian, fitting over 270 experimental levels from ${}^{13}\text{C}$ to ${}^{51}\text{Ti}$, and additionally includes particle-hole states originating from cross-shell excitations that give rise to intruder states. In essence,

both Hamiltonians are the same near ^{16}O , with the WBP interaction presenting — as for ground states [52] — slightly smaller polarizability values in the middle and end of the sd shell.

The general procedure involves the calculation of all the E1 and E2 matrix elements following Eqs. 9 and 12. Similar SM calculations were performed for ground states and are explained in detail in Ref. [52]. For self-conjugate nuclei, we calculate E1 matrix elements connecting all the intermediate GDR states with $\Delta T = 1$; for instance, a total of 6770 $\langle 0_1^+ \parallel \hat{E}1 \parallel 1_n^- \rangle$ and $\langle 1_n^- \parallel \hat{E}1 \parallel 2_1^+ \rangle$ matrix elements in ^{36}Ar . Similarly, we calculate all possible E1 matrix elements from the various GDR intermediate states for other nuclei, including $\Delta T = 0, 1$ isovector transitions. For consistency, all $\langle i \parallel \hat{E}2 \parallel f \rangle^{SM}$ matrix elements required in the $0\hbar\omega$ calculation of σ_{-2}^{SM} and κ^{SM} values are also computed using OXBASH with isoscalar E2 effective charges of $e_{eff}^p + e_{eff}^n = 1.55$ and $e_{eff}^p + e_{eff}^n = 1.81$ for the p [97] and sd [98] shells, respectively.

Results arising from the WBP interaction have been benchmarked for compatibility with available NCSM calculations in ^{12}C [51] using the $NN + 3N350 - srg2.0$ [81–83, 86] and $NN N^4NLO500 - srg2.4$ [84–86] χEFT interactions, yielding a difference of $\approx 27\%$ for the product of E1 matrix elements in Eq. 5. Nevertheless, the highest 1^- state calculated with OXBASH is at ≈ 65 MeV, whereas for the NCSM it corresponds to ≈ 30 MeV. Below 30 MeV, the sum of E1 strengths reach converging values of $\approx 1.3 \text{ e}^2\text{fm}^2$ and $\approx 0.16 \text{ e}^2\text{fm}^2$ for $0_1^+ \rightarrow 1_n^-$ and $1_n^- \rightarrow 2_1^+$ transitions, respectively, with $\mathcal{S}(E1)$ differing only by $\approx 8\%$.

Further, SM calculations generally underestimate collective E2 properties [50, 99–102], which may result in artificially large κ values. Therefore, the calculated $\langle i \parallel \hat{E}2 \parallel f \rangle^{SM}$ matrix elements should also be compared with NCSM calculations and data. Considering the ^{12}C testing ground, NCSM calculations with the $NN + 3N350 - srg2.0$ interaction at $N_{max} = 4$ underestimates by 23%, $\langle 0_1^+ \parallel \hat{E}2 \parallel 2_1^+ \rangle^{NCSM} = 0.04786$ eb, the well-known $\langle 0_1^+ \parallel \hat{E}2 \parallel 2_1^+ \rangle^{exp} = 0.06247(63)$ eb [103], whereas OXBASH calculations with the WBP interaction slightly overestimates it by 4%, $\langle 0_1^+ \parallel \hat{E}2 \parallel 2_1^+ \rangle^{WBP} = 0.06522$ eb. This discrepancy encourages further NCSM calculations using a new generation of χEFT interactions, the Lanczos-continued-fraction algorithm and reaching higher excitation energies and larger N_{max} basis sizes [102]. As shown in Table I, experimental $\langle i \parallel \hat{E}2 \parallel f \rangle^{exp}$ and calculated $\langle i \parallel \hat{E}2 \parallel f \rangle^{SM}$ matrix elements are in overall agreement with the exception of ^{18}O , where mixing with the intruder states is not included [104–107]. Table I also lists σ_{-2}^{SM} and κ^{SM} values for the first excitation of selected p and sd -shell nuclei with their corresponding $\mathcal{S}(E1)^{SM}$ value. For

comparison, theoretical results are also shown in Fig. 2 together with available measurements of σ_{-2}^{exp} (left) and κ^{exp} (right) values.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall, σ_{-2}^{SM} and κ^{SM} values calculated for the first excited states in selected light nuclei align with the smooth, global trend predicted by Eq. 3 (dotted $\kappa = 1$ lines in Fig. 2), in agreement with Migdal’s original calculation arising from the combination of the hydrodynamic model and second-order non-degenerate perturbation theory [5]; hence, validating modern Coulomb-excitation codes [108] used to extract collective properties of p - and sd -shell nuclei [109].

Deviations from simple hydrodynamic-model estimates are, nonetheless, observed at the beginning of the p - and sd -shells, where anomalously large σ_{-2} and κ values are calculated for the excited states of $^{6,7}\text{Li}$ and $^{17,18}\text{O}$. For the odd-mass nuclei, this may be associated with the slightly unbound particle [50, 110] — whose wave function extends far apart from the α -cluster configurations, i.e. $\alpha + d$, $\alpha + t$, $4\alpha + n$ in ^6Li , ^7Li and ^{17}O , respectively — as inferred from the dipole resonances observed at relatively low excitation energies [111, 112]. Such cluster structures were avoided in the $1\hbar\omega$ cross-shell fits to the WBP and FSU interactions because of potential distortion in the $A = 5 - 9$ region. These deviations from the GDR effect are not surprising considering the fragmentation of the GDR spectrum into different $1p$ - $1h$ states [113], which include the possibility of α -cluster configurations [114, 115] and the virtual breakup into the continuum [116, 117]; the latter supporting the breakup into the α - t continuum as the the main contribution to the polarizability in ^7Li .

The reasons behind the large σ_{-2}^{SM} and κ^{SM} values computed in $^{17,18}\text{O}$ deserve further investigation. For ^{18}O , this is probably related to the aforementioned mixing of intruder states lacking in the sd -shell wave functions. However, the anomalously large κ value measured for the first excitation of ^{17}O [39] suggests an alternative physical origin. As suggested by Kuehner *et al.* [39] and Ball *et al.* [118], a value slightly larger than $\kappa = 1$ attributed to the first 2_1^+ excitation at 1.982 MeV in ^{18}O could explain the long-standing $\approx 10\%$ discrepancy between the smaller $B(E2; 0_1^+ \rightarrow 2_1^+) = 0.00421(9) \text{ e}^2\text{b}^2$ determined from seven Coulomb-excitation measurements [119] and the larger one, $0.00476(11) \text{ e}^2\text{b}^2$, extracted from a high-precision lifetime measurement [118]. The overall lack of high-sensitive measurements of the nuclear polarizability of excited states prevent further conclusions.

In conclusion, we present novel equations of σ_{-2} and α_{E1} values for excited states on equal footing to ground states by calculating E1 and E2 matrix elements. We apply this framework and perform full $1\hbar\omega$ SM calculations of σ_{-2}^{SM} and κ^{SM} values up to ^{36}Ar , with

reasonable agreement with previous SM calculations done up to ^{20}Ne . Except the anomalous cases of $^{17,18}\text{O}$, results follow the global trend predicted by Migdal [5]. Dedicated Coulomb-excitation measurements with increasing sensitivity are relevant in order to elucidate the reasons behind large dipole polarizabilities that may affect quadrupole collective properties [18, 40, 120]. These measurements could be done with the new GAMKA array at iThemba LABS in South Africa and elsewhere. More detailed *ab initio* calculations with uncertainty quantification above ^{12}C — the heaviest nucleus where the dipole polarizability for excited states has been computed from first principles — are needed to benchmark our results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge B. A. Brown for physics discussion and supplying the OXBASH code to determine E1 and E2 matrix elements. We also thank the handling Editors and all the anonymous Referees of the Journal of Physics G for their constructive comments and suggestions.

-
- [1] S. S. Dietrich and B. L. Berman, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **38**, 199 (1988).
- [2] V. A. Plujko, O. M. Gorbachenko, R. Capote, and P. Dimitriou, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **123**, 1 (2018).
- [3] T. Kawano, Y. Cho, P. Dimitriou, D. Filipescu, N. Iwamoto, V. Plujko, X. Tao, H. Utsunomiya, V. Varlamov, R. Xu, *et al.*, Nuclear Data Sheets **163**, 109 (2020).
- [4] B. S. Ishkhanov and I. M. Kapitonov, Physics-Uspekhi **64**, 141 (2021).
- [5] A. Migdal, Zhurnal Eksperimentalnoi i Teoreticheskoi Fiziki **15**, 81 (1945).
- [6] M. Goldhaber and E. Teller, Physical Review **74**, 1046 (1948).
- [7] H. Steinwedel, J. H. D. Jensen, and P. Jensen, Physical Review **79**, 1019 (1950).
- [8] J. S. Levinger and D. C. Kent, Physical Review **95**, 418 (1954).
- [9] V. V. Balashov, Zhurnal Èksperimental'noi i Teoreticheskoi Fiziki **42**, 275 (1962).
- [10] M. Danos and E. G. Fuller, Annual Review of Nuclear Science **15**, 29 (1965).
- [11] J. N. Orce, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **145**, 101511 (2022).
- [12] D. M. Rossi, P. Adrich, F. Aksouh, H. Alvarez-Pol, T. Aumann, J. Benlliure, M. Böhmer, K. Boretzky, E. Casarejos, M. Chartier, *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **111**, 242503 (2013).
- [13] A. Tamii, I. Poltoratska, P. von Neumann-Cosel, Y. Fujita, T. Adachi, C. Bertulani, J. Carter, M. Dozono, H. Fujita, K. Fujita, *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **107**, 062502 (2011).
- [14] X. Roca-Maza, X. Viñas, M. Centelles, B. K. Agrawal, G. Colo, N. Paar, J. Piekarewicz, and D. Vretenar, Physical Review C **92**, 064304 (2015).
- [15] T. Hashimoto, A. M. Krumbholz, P. G. Reinhard, A. Tamii, P. von Neumann-Cosel, T. Adachi, N. Aoi, C. A. Bertulani, H. Fujita, Y. Fujita, *et al.*, Physical Review C **92**, 031305 (2015).
- [16] X. Roca-Maza and N. Paar, Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics **101**, 96 (2018).
- [17] S. Bassauer, P. von Neumann-Cosel, P.-G. Reinhard, A. Tamii, S. Adachi, C. A. Bertulani, P. Chan, G. Colò, A. D'Alessio, H. Fujioka, *et al.*, Physics Letters B **810**, 135804 (2020).
- [18] J. N. Orce, International Journal of Modern Physics E **29**, 2030002 (2020).
- [19] N. F. Mott and T. N. Sneddon, *Wave Mechanics and its Applications* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1948).
- [20] J. N. Orce, B. Dey, C. Ngwetsheni, S. Bhattacharya, D. Pandit, B. Lesch, and A. Zulu, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **525**, 6249 (2023).
- [21] M. Danos, Nuclear Physics **5**, 23 (1958).
- [22] D. Brink, *Some Aspects of the Interaction of Light with Matter* (University of Oxford, 1955).
- [23] P. Axel, Physical Review **126**, 671 (1962).
- [24] D. Kusnezov, Y. Alhassid, and K. A. Snover, Physical review letters **81**, 542 (1998).
- [25] K. A. Snover, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science **36**, 545 (1986).
- [26] J. Gaardhoje, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science **42**, 483 (1992).
- [27] A. Schiller and M. Thoennessen, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables **93**, 549 (2007).
- [28] A. Bracco and F. Camera, Il Nuovo Cimento A (1971-1996) **111**, 607 (1998).
- [29] D. Mondal, D. Pandit, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Pal, S. Bhattacharya, A. De, N. D. Dang, N. Q. Hung, S. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharyya, *et al.*, Physics Letters B **784**, 423 (2018).
- [30] M. Kicińska-Habior, K. Snover, C. Gossett, J. Behr, G. Feldman, H. Glatzel, J. Gundlach, and E. Garman, Physical Review C **36**, 612 (1987).
- [31] B. Dey, D. Mondal, D. Pandit, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Pal, S. Bhattacharya, A. De, K. Banerjee, N. D. Dang, N. Q. Hung, *et al.*, Physics Letters B **731**, 92 (2014).
- [32] P. Heckman, D. Bazin, J. Beene, Y. Blumenfeld, M. Chromik, M. Halbert, J. Liang, E. Mohrmann, T. Nakamura, A. Navin, *et al.*, Physics Letters B **555**, 43 (2003).
- [33] D. Pandit, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Pal, A. De, and S. Banerjee, Physics Letters B **713**, 434 (2012).
- [34] C. Gossett, K. Snover, J. Behr, G. Feldman, and J. Osborne, Physical Review Letters **54**, 1486 (1985).
- [35] D. Pandit, B. Dey, S. Bhattacharya, T. Rana, D. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Pal, A. De, P. Roy, K. Banerjee, *et al.*, Physics Letters B **816**, 136173 (2021).
- [36] O. Häusser, A. B. McDonald, T. K. Alexander, A. J. Ferguson, and R. E. Warner, Nuclear Physics A **212**, 613 (1973).
- [37] W. J. Vermeer, A. M. Baxter, S. M. Burnett, M. T. Esat, M. P. Fewell, and R. H. Spear, Australian Journal of Physics **37**, 273 (1984).

- [38] W. J. Vermeer, M. T. Esat, M. P. Fewell, R. H. Spear, A. M. Baxter, and S. M. Burnett, *Physics Letters B* **138**, 365 (1984).
- [39] J. A. Kuehner, R. H. Spear, W. J. Vermeer, M. T. Esat, A. M. Baxter, and S. Hinds, *Physics Letters B* **115**, 437 (1982).
- [40] K. Alder and A. Winther, *Electromagnetic Excitation* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975).
- [41] A. DeShalit and H. Feshbach, *Theoretical nuclear physics. Volume I. Nuclear structure* (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1974).
- [42] J. Suhonen, *From nucleons to nucleus: concepts of microscopic nuclear theory* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2007).
- [43] J. Eichler, *Physical Review* **133** (1964).
- [44] J. de Boer and J. Eichler, *Advances in Nuclear Physics* **1**, 1 (1968).
- [45] O. Häusser, *Nuclear Spectroscopy and Reactions* **C**, 55 (1974).
- [46] V. V. Flambaum, I. B. Samsonov, H. B. T. Tan, and A. V. Viatkina, *Physical Review A* **103**, 032811 (2021).
- [47] F. C. Barker, *Australian Journal of Physics* **35**, 291 (1982).
- [48] F. C. Barker, *Australian Journal of Physics* **35**, 301 (1982).
- [49] F. C. Barker, *Australian Journal of Physics* **35**, 377 (1982).
- [50] F. C. Barker and C. L. Woods, *Australian Journal of Physics* **42**, 233 (1989).
- [51] M. Kumar-Raju, J. N. Orce, P. Navrátil, G. C. Ball, T. E. Drake, S. Triambak, G. Hackman, C. J. Pearson, K. J. Abrahams, E. H. Akakpo, *et al.*, *Physics Letters B* **777**, 250 (2018).
- [52] J. N. Orce, C. Ngwetsheni, and B. A. Brown, *Physical Review C* **108**, 044309 (2023).
- [53] E. K. Warburton and J. Weneser, *Isospin in Nuclear Physics*, ed D. H. Wilkinson, North-Holland, Amsterdam **4**, 10 (1969).
- [54] M. E. Rose, New York (1957).
- [55] A. Messiah, *Quantum mechanics vol 1 & 2 tr. gm temmer* (1961).
- [56] J. S. Levinger, *Nuclear Photo-Disintegration* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1960).
- [57] A. Migdal, A. Lushnikov, and D. Zaretsky, *Nuclear Physics* **66**, 193 (1965).
- [58] J. Ahrens, H. Gimm, A. Zieger, and B. Ziegler, *Il Nuovo Cimento A (1965-1970)* **32**, 364 (1976).
- [59] J. N. Orce, *Physical Review C* **91**, 064602 (2015).
- [60] J. N. Orce, *Physical Review C* **93**, 049802 (2016).
- [61] EXFOR: Experimental nuclear reaction data, <https://www-nds.iaea.org/exfor/exfor.htm>, accessed: 2022-05-21.
- [62] ENDF: Evaluated nuclear data file, <https://www-nds.iaea.org/exfor/endl.htm>, accessed: 2022-05-21.
- [63] C. Ngwetsheni and J. N. Orce, *Physics Letters B* **792**, 335 (2019).
- [64] C. Ngwetsheni and J. N. Orce, *Hyperfine Interactions* **240**, 94 (2019).
- [65] C. Ngwetsheni and J. N. Orce, *EPJ Web Conf.* **223**, 01045 (2019).
- [66] G. Racah, *Physical Review* **62**, 438 (1942).
- [67] N. MacDonald, *Physics Letters* **10**, 334 (1964).
- [68] H. Nebel and D. L. Lin, *Physical Review* **156**, 1133 (1967).
- [69] A. C. Douglas and N. MacDonald, *Physics Letters B* **24**, 447 (1967).
- [70] M. Danos and W. Greiner, *Physical Review* **134**, B284 (1964).
- [71] H. J. Weber, M. G. Huber, and W. Greiner, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **192**, 182 (1966).
- [72] M. Huber, M. Danos, H. Weber, and W. Greiner, *Physical Review* **155**, 1073 (1967).
- [73] J. Levinger, *Physical Review* **107**, 554 (1957).
- [74] J. N. Orce, T. E. Drake, M. K. Djongolov, P. Navrátil, and *et al.*, *Physical Review C* **86**, 041303 (2012).
- [75] P. Möller, J. R. Nix, *et al.*, *Atomic Data Nuclear Data Tables* **66**, 131 (1995).
- [76] A. Sonzogni, in *International Conference on Nuclear Data for Science and Technology* (EDP Sciences, 2007) pp. 105–106.
- [77] O. Häusser, A. B. McDonald, T. K. Alexander, A. J. Ferguson, and R. E. Warner, *Physics Letters B* **38**, 75 (1972).
- [78] D. L. Disdier, G. C. Ball, O. Häusser, and R. E. Warner, *Physical Review Letters* **27**, 1391 (1971).
- [79] W. J. Vermeer, T. H. Zabel, M. T. Esat, J. A. Kuehner, R. H. Spear, and A. M. Baxter, *Australian Journal of Physics* **35**, 283 (1982).
- [80] W. J. Vermeer, M. T. Esat, J. A. Kuehner, R. H. Spear, A. M. Baxter, and S. Hinds, *Physics Letters B* **122**, 23 (1983).
- [81] P. Navrátil, *Few-Body Systems* **41**, 117 (2007).
- [82] R. Roth, A. Calci, J. Langhammer, and S. Binder, *Physical Review C* **90**, 024325 (2014).
- [83] D. R. Entem and R. Machleidt, *Physical Review C* **68**, 041001 (2003).
- [84] D. R. Entem, R. Machleidt, and Y. Nosyk, *Physical Review C* **96**, 024004 (2017).
- [85] D. R. Entem, N. Kaiser, R. Machleidt, and Y. Nosyk, *Physical Review C* **91**, 014002 (2015).
- [86] S. K. Bogner, R. J. Furnstahl, and R. J. Perry, *Physical Review C* **75**, 061001 (2007).
- [87] R. Haydock, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical, Nuclear and General* **7**, 2120 (1974).
- [88] M. A. Marchisio, N. Barnea, W. Leidemann, and G. Orlandini, *Few-Body Systems* **33**, 259 (2003).
- [89] C. *et al.*, Ngwetsheni, *Physical Review*, in preparation (2023).
- [90] R. Nathans and J. Halpern, *Physical Review* **92**, 940 (1953).
- [91] E. G. Fuller, *Physics Reports* **127**, 185 (1985).
- [92] B. A. Brown, A. Etchegoyen, W. D. M. Rae, and N. S. Godwin, *MSU-NSCL Report* **524** (1988).
- [93] E. K. Warburton and B. A. Brown, *Physical Review C* **46**, 923 (1992).
- [94] R. S. Lubna, K. Kravvaris, S. L. Tabor, V. Tripathi, A. Volya, E. Rubino, J. Allmond, B. Abromeit, L. Baby, and T. Hensley, *Physical Review C* **100**, 034308 (2019).
- [95] R. S. Lubna, K. Kravvaris, S. L. Tabor, V. Tripathi, E. Rubino, and A. Volya, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 043342 (2020).
- [96] B. A. Brown, *Physics* **4**, 525 (2022).
- [97] R. H. Bassel, B. A. Brown, R. Lindsay, and N. Rowley, *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear Physics* **8**, 1215 (1982).
- [98] W. Richter, S. Mkhize, and B. A. Brown, *Physical Review C* **78**, 064302 (2008).
- [99] E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs, T. A. Lähde, D. Lee, and U.-G. Meißner, *Physical Review Letters* **109**, 252501 (2012).

- [100] S. R. Stroberg, J. Henderson, G. Hackman, P. Ruotsalainen, G. Hagen, and J. D. Holt, *Physical Review C* **105**, 034333 (2022).
- [101] J. Henderson, G. Hackman, P. Ruotsalainen, J. D. Holt, S. R. Stroberg, C. Andreoiu, G. C. Ball, N. Bernier, M. Bowry, R. Caballero-Folch, *et al.*, *Physical Review C* **105**, 034332 (2022).
- [102] C. Sarma and P. C. Srivastava, *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics* **50**, 045105 (2023).
- [103] B. Pritychenko, M. Birch, B. Singh, and M. Horoi, *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* **107**, 1 (2016).
- [104] B. A. Brown, *International Journal of Modern Physics E* **26**, 1740003 (2017).
- [105] R. L. Lawson, F. J. D. Serduke, and H. T. Fortune, *Physical Review C* **14**, 1245 (1976).
- [106] P. J. Ellis and T. Engeland, *Nuclear Physics A* **144**, 161 (1970).
- [107] T. Engeland and P. J. Ellis, *Nuclear Physics A* **181**, 368 (1972).
- [108] D. Cline, T. Czosnyka, A. B. Hayes, P. Napiorkowski, N. Warr, and C. Y. Wu, *Gosia Steering Committee* **18**, 19 (2012).
- [109] R. H. Spear, *Physics Reports* **73**, 369 (1981).
- [110] F. C. Barker, *Australian Journal of Physics* **37**, 267 (1984).
- [111] S. Nakayama, T. Yamagata, H. Akimune, I. Daito, H. Fujimura, Y. Fujita, M. Fujiwara, K. Fushimi, M. B. Greenfield, H. Kohri, *et al.*, *Physical Review Letters* **87**, 122502 (2001).
- [112] O. Burda, P. von Neumann-Cosel, A. Richter, C. Forssén, and B. A. Brown, *Physical Review C* **82**, 015808 (2010).
- [113] R. A. Eramzhyan, B. S. Ishkhanov, I. M. Kapitonov, and V. G. Neudatchin, *Physics Reports* **136**, 229 (1986).
- [114] V. G. Neudatchin, Y. F. Smirnov, and N. F. Golovanova, *Adv. Nucl. Phys.:(United States)* **11** (1979).
- [115] W. B. He, Y. G. Ma, X. G. Cao, X. Z. Cai, G. Q. Zhang, *et al.*, *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 032506 (2014).
- [116] U. Smilansky, B. Povh, and K. Traxel, *Physics Letters B* **38**, 293 (1972).
- [117] A. Weller, P. Egelhof, R. Čaplar, O. Karban, D. Krämer, K.-H. Möbius, Z. Moroz, K. Rusek, E. Steffens, G. Tungate, *et al.*, *Physical Review Letters* **55**, 480 (1985).
- [118] G. C. Ball, T. K. Alexander, W. G. Davies, J. S. Forster, and I. V. Mitchell, *Nuclear Physics A* **377**, 268 (1982).
- [119] S. Raman, C. H. Malarkey, W. Milner, C. Nestor Jr, and P. Stelson, *Atomic Data and Nuclear data tables* **36**, 1 (1987).
- [120] J. N. Orce, E. J. Martin-Montes, K. J. Abrahams, C. Ngwetsheni, B. A. Brown, M. Kumar-Raju, C. V. Mehl, M. J. Mokgolobotho, E. H. Akakpo, D. L. Mavela, *et al.*, *Physical Review C* **104**, L061305 (2021).