

$(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay: a possible test of the nuclear matrix element calculations

S. M. Bilenky

IFAE, Facultat de Ciències, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193, Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, R-141980, Russia

J. A. Grifols

IFAE, Facultat de Ciències, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193, Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

The existing calculations of the nuclear matrix elements of the neutrinoless double β -decay differ by about a factor three. This uncertainty prevents quantitative interpretation of the results of experiments searching for this process. We suggest here that the observation of the neutrinoless double β -decay of *several* nuclei in future experiments could allow to test different calculations of the nuclear matrix elements through the direct comparison of them with the experimental data.

The compelling evidences in favor of neutrino oscillations, driven by small neutrino masses and mixing, were obtained recently in the atmospheric [1, 2] and in the solar [3, 4, 5, 6, 7] neutrino experiments. The small neutrino masses are generally considered as a signature of a new scale in physics. There are no doubts that the recent experiments are only the beginning of a long period of investigations in this new field.

The investigation of neutrino oscillations, in which flavor lepton numbers are not conserved, can not answer the question of the *nature* of neutrinos with definite masses (*Dirac* or *Majorana?*). The answer to this fundamental question can be obtained by the study of processes in which the total lepton number L is not conserved.

The most sensitive process to the violation of L and to the small Majorana neutrino masses is the neutrinoless double β -decay ($(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay).

At present, data of the several experiments on the search for $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay are available (see [8]). In these experiments no indications on favor of $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay were obtained. ¹

We will discuss $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay in the minimal scheme of three-neutrino mixing ²

$$\nu_{lL} = \sum_{i=1}^3 U_{li} \nu_{iL}. \quad (1)$$

Here U is the unitary mixing matrix, and ν_i is the field of the Majorana neutrino with mass m_i . The field ν_i satisfies the Majorana condition

$$\nu_i = \nu_i^c = C \bar{\nu}_i^T,$$

where C is the charge conjugation matrix.

The matrix element of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay is proportional to the effective Majorana mass

$$\langle m \rangle = \sum_i^3 U_{ei}^2 m_i. \quad (2)$$

The elements U_{ei} are complex. Let us write down

$$U_{ei} = |U_{ei}| e^{i\alpha_i}. \quad (3)$$

In the case of the CP-invariance in the lepton sector, we have [13]

$$U_{ei}^* = \eta_i^* U_{ei}, \quad (4)$$

where $\eta_i = i \rho_i$ is the CP-parity of the neutrino ν_i ($\rho_i = \pm 1$). From (3) and (4) we find that in the case of the CP-invariance

$$2\alpha_i = \frac{\pi}{2} \rho_i$$

The strongest limits on $|\langle m \rangle|$ were obtained from the Heidelberg-Moscow [14] and IGEX [15] experiments. In the Heidelberg-Moscow experiment the following bound for the lifetime of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay of ^{76}Ge was found

¹ The recent claim [9] of some evidence of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay, obtained from the reanalysis of the data of the Heidelberg-Moscow experiment, was strongly criticized in [10].

² We will not consider the data of the LSND experiment [11]. The LSND result will be checked by the MiniBooNE experiment [12], started recently.

$$T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{76}\text{Ge}) \geq 1.9 \cdot 10^{25} \text{ y} \quad (90\% \text{ CL}). \quad (5)$$

Taking into account the results of the different calculations of the nuclear matrix elements, from (5) it was obtained

$$| \langle m \rangle | \leq (0.35 - 1.24) \text{ eV}.$$

Similar bounds were obtained in the IGEX experiment

$$T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{76}\text{Ge}) \geq 1.57 \cdot 10^{25} \text{ y} \quad (90\% \text{ CL}); | \langle m \rangle | \leq (0.33 - 1.35) \text{ eV}. \quad (6)$$

Several new experiments on the search for $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay are in preparation and under development at present [8]. In the experiments CUORE [16], GENIUS [17], MAJORANA [18], EXO [19] and MOON [20] the sensitivities $| \langle m \rangle | \simeq 2.7 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$, $1.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$, $2.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$, $5.2 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$ and $3.6 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$, respectively, are planned to be reached. ³

We will label neutrino masses in such a way that

$$m_1 < m_2 < m_3$$

and denote neutrino mass squared differences as follows:

$$\Delta m_{ik}^2 = m_i^2 - m_k^2.$$

In the framework of the three-neutrino mixing all existing solar and atmospheric neutrino data are described in the leading approximation by two decoupled two-neutrino oscillations, which are characterized by the parameters Δm_{sol}^2 , $\tan^2 \theta_{\text{sol}}$ and Δm_{atm}^2 , $\sin^2 2\theta_{\text{atm}}$ (see [22]).

From the analysis of the Super-Kamiokande atmospheric neutrino data it was found [1]

$$1.6 \cdot 10^{-3} \leq \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 \leq 3.9 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2 \quad (90\% \text{ CL}) \quad (7)$$

The best fit value of Δm_{atm}^2 is equal to

$$\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2 \quad (\chi_{\text{min}}^2 = 163/170 \text{ dof}). \quad (8)$$

³ In the calculation of these sensitivities the nuclear matrix elements, given in [21], were used.

From the analysis of all solar neutrino data, including the data of the Super-Kamiokande [4] and SNO [5, 6, 7] experiments, it was found that the most plausible solution of the solar neutrino problem is the MSW LMA solution. In [6] the following ranges were found for the oscillation parameters:

$$2.2 \cdot 10^{-5} \leq \Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 \leq 2.0 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{eV}^2 \quad 0.22 \leq \tan^2 \theta_{\text{sol}} \leq 0.59 \quad (99.7\% \text{CL}). \quad (9)$$

The best fit values of the parameters are equal to

$$\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 = 5.0 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2; \quad \tan^2 \theta_{\text{sol}} = 0.34 \quad (\chi_{\text{min}}^2 = 57/72 \text{ dof}). \quad (10)$$

The neutrino oscillation experiments do not allow to distinguish two possibilities:

$$\Delta m_{21}^2 \simeq \Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2; \quad \Delta m_{32}^2 \simeq \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2,$$

which corresponds to the normal hierarchy of neutrino mass-squared differences ($\Delta m_{21}^2 \ll \Delta m_{32}^2$) or

$$\Delta m_{21}^2 \simeq \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2; \quad \Delta m_{32}^2 \simeq \Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2,$$

which corresponds to the inverted hierarchy of neutrino mass-squared differences ($\Delta m_{21}^2 \gg \Delta m_{32}^2$).

The effective Majorana mass $| \langle m \rangle |$ depends on the type of the neutrino mass spectrum and on the values of parameters m_1 , Δm_{atm}^2 , Δm_{sol}^2 , $\tan^2 \theta_{\text{sol}}$, $|U_{e3}|^2$ and on Majorana phase differences. The element $|U_{e3}|^2$ is small as can be inferred from the reactor long baseline experiments CHOOZ [23] and Palo Verde [24]. At the Super-Kamiokande best fit value $\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$ we have from the CHOOZ exclusion curve

$$|U_{e3}|^2 \leq 4 \cdot 10^{-2} \quad (95\% \text{CL}) \quad (11)$$

The effective Majorana mass $| \langle m \rangle |$ was calculated under different assumptions about the neutrino mass spectrum in many papers (see [25] and references therein). Below we will discuss some important implications of the measurement of the quantity $| \langle m \rangle |$ for the neutrino mixing.

1. The plausible mechanism of the neutrino mass generation is the see-saw mechanism [26]. If neutrino masses are of the see-saw origin, they satisfy the hierarchy

$$m_1 \ll m_2 \ll m_3. \quad (12)$$

Hence for the effective Majorana neutrino mass we have in the see-saw case

$$| \langle m \rangle | \leq \sin^2 \theta_{\text{sol}} \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2} + |U_{e3}|^2 \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2},$$

Using the best-fit values of the solar neutrino oscillation parameters and the CHOOZ bound (11) for the effective Majorana mass we obtain the upper bound

$$| \langle m \rangle | \leq 3.8 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ eV},$$

which is significantly smaller than the expected sensitivity of the future experiments. Thus, if $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay is observed in the experiments of the next generation it could be an argument against the neutrino mass hierarchy (12) and the standard see-saw mechanism.

Let us notice that in the case of the inverted mass hierarchy

$$m_1 \ll m_2 < m_3$$

we have the range

$$\sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} |\cos 2\theta_{\text{sol}}| \leq | \langle m \rangle | \leq \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} \quad (13)$$

for the effective Majorana mass.

Using the best fit values of the oscillation parameters, from (13) we obtain

$$2.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV} \leq | \langle m \rangle | \leq 5 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV}.$$

Thus, in the case of the inverted mass hierarchy the predicted value of $| \langle m \rangle |$ is in the range of the sensitivity of the future neutrinoless double β -decay experiments. This is connected with the fact that the size of $| \langle m \rangle |$ is determined in this case by the “large” $\sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$. In the case of the normal mass hierarchy the contribution of $\sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$ to the effective Majorana mass is suppressed by the smallness of $|U_{e3}|^2$.

2. The best laboratory upper bound ⁴ on the absolute value of the neutrino mass was obtained from the tritium β -decay experiments Mainz [27] and Troitsk [28]:

$$m_\beta < 2.2 \text{ eV} \quad (95\% \text{ CL}).$$

A new tritium experiment on the measurement of the neutrino mass KATRIN [30] is currently in preparation. In this experiment one expects to reach the sensitivity

$$m_\beta < 0.35 \text{ eV}.$$

If the neutrino mass m_β is measured in the KATRIN experiment, it would mean that neutrino masses are practically degenerate and due to the unitarity of the mixing matrix

$$m_\beta \simeq m_1.$$

For the effective Majorana mass, independently of the type of the mass spectrum, we will have in this case

$$| \langle m \rangle | \simeq m_\beta \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 U_{ei}^2 \right|.$$

Neglecting small contribution of $|U_{e3}|^2$ ($|U_{e1}|^2$ in the case of the inverted hierarchy), we can connect the parameter $\sin^2 2\alpha$ ($\alpha = \alpha_2 - \alpha_1$ or $\alpha = \alpha_3 - \alpha_2$) with measurable quantities. We have [31]

$$\sin^2 \alpha \simeq \left(1 - \frac{|\langle m \rangle|^2}{m_\beta^2} \right) \frac{1}{\sin^2 2 \theta_{\text{sol}}}. \quad (14)$$

If CP is conserved $\sin^2 \alpha = 0$ ($\sin^2 \alpha = 1$) for the case of the same (opposite) CP parities of ν_1 and ν_2 (or ν_2 and ν_3). Thus, the measurement of the effective Majorana mass in the future $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ experiments and the neutrino mass m_β in the tritium KATRIN experiment could allow to obtain an information on the CP violation in the lepton sector.

⁴At this point we should remark that existing large scale structure surveys combined with CMB data give [29] : $\sum m_i \leq (1.8 - 2) \text{ eV}$ (95% CL).

3. We have discussed the cases of small and large m_1 . Now we will consider the case of the intermediate m_1 :

$$m_1 \sim \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}.$$

The investigation of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay could be an important source of information about the minimal mass m_1 in this case. In fact, in the case of the normal hierarchy we have

$$| \langle m \rangle | \simeq m_1 (1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{\text{sol}} \sin^2 \alpha)^{1/2}, \quad (15)$$

From this expression for m_1 we obtain the range

$$| \langle m \rangle | \leq m_1 \leq \frac{| \langle m \rangle |}{|\cos 2\theta_{\text{sol}}|}, \quad (16)$$

In the inverted hierarchy case we have

$$| \langle m \rangle | \simeq \sqrt{m_1^2 + \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} (1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{\text{sol}} \sin^2 \alpha)^{1/2}, \quad (17)$$

For the minimal mass we obtain from (17)

$$\sqrt{|| \langle m \rangle |^2 - \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} \leq m_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{| \langle m \rangle |^2}{\cos^2 2\theta_{\text{sol}}} - \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} \quad (18)$$

Thus, the measurement of the effective Majorana mass $| \langle m \rangle |$ could reveal those properties of the neutrino masses and mixing that can not be investigated in the neutrino oscillation experiments or in the tritium experiments.

There is, however, a problem with the determination of $| \langle m \rangle |$ from the experimental data. The total probability of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay has the following general form

$$\Gamma^{0\nu}(A, Z) = | \langle m \rangle |^2 |M(A, Z)|^2 G^{0\nu}(E_0, Z), \quad (19)$$

where $M(A, Z)$ is the nuclear matrix element and $G^{0\nu}(E_0, Z)$ is a known phase space factor (E_0 is the energy release). In order to determine $| \langle m \rangle |$

from the experimental data we need to know the nuclear matrix element. This last quantity must be calculated.

There exist at present two basic approaches to the calculation of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ nuclear matrix elements: the quasiparticle random phase approximation and the nuclear shell model (see [32] and references therein). The results of different calculations of the lifetime of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay differ by about one order of magnitude. For example, if we assume that $|\langle m \rangle| = 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ eV, from the results of different calculations of the nuclear matrix element for the lifetime of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ - decay of ^{76}Ge we will obtain the values in the interval [32]:

$$6.8 \cdot 10^{26} \leq T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{76}\text{Ge}) \leq 70.8 \cdot 10^{26} \text{ years}$$

The problem of the calculation of the nuclear matrix elements of the neutrinoless double β -decay is a real theoretical challenge. Without its solving the effective Majorana neutrino mass can not be determined with reliable accuracy from the results of $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ experiments.

Uncertainties of the nuclear matrix elements of $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay were discussed recently by the authors of ref. [33] in their discussion of the possibility to study CP violation in $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay.

We would like to propose here a possible method which allows to test the results of the calculation of the nuclear matrix elements of the neutrinoless double β -decay. We will take into account the following

1. A few eV sensitivity is planned to be reached in experiments searching for neutrinoless double β -decay of *different* nuclei: ^{76}Ge , ^{136}Xe , ^{130}Te , ^{100}Mo and others;
2. The effective Majorana mass $|\langle m \rangle|$ is determined only by the Majorana neutrino masses and elements of the neutrino mixing matrix. For small neutrino masses ($m_i \lesssim 10$ MeV) the nuclear matrix elements do not depend on neutrino masses [34].

Thus, the ratio of the lifetimes of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay of different nuclei depend only on nuclear matrix elements and known phase space factors. If the neutrinoless double β -decay of different nuclei is observed, the calculated ratios of the corresponding lifetimes can be be confronted with the experimental values. For illustration we present in the Table I the ratios of lifetimes of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay of different nuclei, calculated in six models. For

the lifetimes we used the values given in [32]. As it is seen from Table I, the calculated ratios vary by about one order of magnitude.

Table I

The results of the calculation of the ratios of the lifetime of $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay for different nucleus. The references to the corresponding papers are given.

Lifetime ratios	[35]	[36]	[37]	[21]	[38]	[39]
$T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{76}\text{Ge})/T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{130}\text{Te})$	11.3	3	20	4.6	3.6	4.2
$T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{76}\text{Ge})/T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{136}\text{Xe})$		1.5	4.2	1.1	0.6	2
$T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{76}\text{Ge})/T_{1/2}^{0\nu}(^{100}\text{Mo})$			14	1.8	10.7	0.9

In conclusion, we have shown here that the observation of the neutrinoless double β - decay of ^{76}Ge , ^{136}Xe , ^{130}Te and other nuclei in experiments of the next generation will allow to confront the results of the different calculations of nuclear matrix elements of the $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -decay directly with experimental data.

S.M.B. acknowledges the support of the “Programa de Profesores Visitantes de IBERDROLA de Ciencia y Tecnologia”.

References

- [1] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, S. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998); S. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2644 (1999); S. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3999-4003 (2000).
- [2] Soudan 2 Collaboration, W.W.M.Allison *et al.*, Physics Letters **B 449** (1999) 137; MACRO Collaboration, M.Ambrosio et al. hep-ex/0106049; Phys. Lett. B517 (2001) 59 M. Ambrosio et al. NATO Advanced Research Workshop on Cosmic Radiations, Oujda (Morocco), 21-23 March, 2001.
- [3] Homestake Collaboration B. T. Cleveland *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **496**, 505 (1998); Kamiokande Collaboration, Y. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1683 (1996); GALLEX Collaboration, W. Hampel *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 447**, 127 (1999); GNO Collaboration, M. Altmann *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 490**, 16 (2000); SAGE Collaboration, J. N. Abdurashitov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C 60**, 055801 (1999).

- [4] Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, S. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5651 (2001).
- [5] SNO collaboration, Q.R. Ahmad *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 071301 (2001).
- [6] SNO collaboration Q.R. Ahmad *et al.*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **89**, 011301 (2002); nucl-ex/0204008.
- [7] SNO collaboration, Q.R. Ahmad *et al.*, Phys.Rev.Lett **89**, 011302 (2002); nucl-ex/0204009.
- [8] O. Cremonesi, Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, *Neutrino 2002* (Munich, Germany) May 25-30, 2002.
- [9] H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus *et al.*, Mod. Phys. Lett. **16** (2001) 2409.
- [10] F. Feruglio, A. Strumia and F. Vissani, hep-ph/0201291. C.E. Aalseth *et al.*, hep-ex/0202018.
- [11] LSND Collaboration, G. Mills, Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, *Neutrino 2000* (Sudbury, Canada) June 16-21, 2000.
- [12] MiniBooNE Collaboration, R. Tayloe, Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, *Neutrino 2002* (Munich, Germany) May 25-30, 2002.
- [13] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Lett. **B107** (1981) 77; S. M. Bilenky, N. P. Nedelcheva and S. T. Petcov, Nucl. Phys. **B247** (1984) 589; B. Kayser, Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984) 1023.
- [14] HEIDELBERG-MOSCOW collaboration, H. V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **A 12**, 147 (2001).
- [15] IGEX Collaboration, C. E. Aalseth *et al.*, Physics of Atomic Nuclei **63** (2000) 1225, hep-ex/0202026.
- [16] E. Fiorini, Phys. Rep. **307** (1998) 309.
- [17] H. V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus *et al.*, J. Phys. **G 24** (1998) 483.

- [18] L. De Braekeleer *et al.*, Proceedings of the Carolina Conference on Neutrino Physics, (Columbia (SC), USA) March 2000; C.E. Aalseth *et al.*, hep-ex/0201021.
- [19] M. Danilov *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B480** (2000) 12.
- [20] H. Ejiri *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 2917.
- [21] A. Staudt, K. Muto, H. V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus, Europhys. Lett. **13** (1990) 31.
- [22] S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti and W. Grimus, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **43** (1999) 1; hep-ph/9812360.
- [23] CHOOZ Collaboration, M. Apollonio *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 466** 415 (1999).
- [24] F. Boehm, J. Busenitz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3764 (2000); Phys. Rev. **D 62** (2000) 072002.
- [25] S.M. Bilenky, S. Pascoli and S.T. Petcov, Phys. Rev. **D 64** (2001) 113003. S. Pascoli and S.T. Petcov, hep-ph/0205022.
- [26] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, p. 315, edited by F. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979; T. Yanagida, Proc. of the *Workshop on Unified Theory and the Baryon Number of the Universe*, KEK, Japan, 1979; R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
- [27] Ch. Weinheimer, Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, *Neutrino 2002* (Munich, Germany) May 25-30, 2002.
- [28] V. Lobashev *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **91** (2001) 280.
- [29] O. Elgaroy *et al.*, astro-ph/ 0204152.
- [30] KATRIN collaboration, A.Osipowicz *et al.*, hep-ex/0109033.
- [31] S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti and S. T. Petcov, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 4432.
- [32] S. R. Elliott and P. Vogel, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **52** (2002), hep-ph/0202264.

- [33] V. Barger, S. L. Glashow, P. Langacker and D. Marfatia, hep-ph/0205290.
- [34] M. Doi, T. Kotani and E. Takasugi, Progr. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **53** (1985) 1.
- [35] W. C. Haxton and G. J. Jr. Stephenson, Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys. **12** (1984) 409.
- [36] E. Caurier, F. Nowacki, A. Poves, J. Retamosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**(1996) 1954 ; E. Caurier, F. Nowacki, A. Poves, J. Retamosa, Nucl. Phys. A **A 654** (1999) 973.
- [37] J. Engel, P. Vogel, M. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rev. C **37** (1988) 731.
- [38] J. Toivanen and J. Suhonen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 410.
- [39] G. Pantis, F. Šimkovic, J. D. Vergados, A. Faessler, Phys. Rev. C **53** (1996) 695.