

**Report by N. Dinh Dang, V. Kim Au, T. Suzuki, and A. Arima
on the Comment by V. Yu. Ponomarev***

(October 24, 2001)

In our recent work [1], we calculated the E1 resonances in neutron-rich oxygen and calcium isotopes within a quasiparticle representation of the phonon damping model (PDM) in its PDM-1 version [2,3] including the superfluid pairing interaction. It is claimed in the Comment [4] that “the physical content of the PDM calculations is very doubtful” and the description of the pygmy dipole resonance (PDR) is “not justified” on “the quantitative level”. However, as seen below, the arguments, which the author of the Comment presents to prove his case, are either wrong or irrelevant.

The same Appendix 2D of Ref. [2] in the Comment [4] states that the assumption of the equal particle-phonon coupling strength $F_{ph}^{(q)} = f_1$ “may be employed if the width of the strength function is small compared to the characteristic energies associated with systematic variation in the coupling matrix elements.” This condition is satisfied in the region of E1 resonances considered in [1]. However, this does not mean that the matrix elements of the interaction part $V_{q_1 s_1} \equiv \langle q_1 | \sum_{ss'q} F_{ss'}^{(q)} a_s^\dagger a_{s'} (Q_q^\dagger + Q_q) | s_1 \rangle$ are the same, as claimed in the Comment [4].

Equation (1) of the Comment [4] is not the second moment for the phonon distribution within the PDM. The k -th moment for the phonon distribution within the PDM is calculated (See, e.g., Eq. (2.21) of [5]) as

$$m_q^{(k)} = \int_{E_1}^{E_2} S_q(\omega) \omega^k d\omega, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (1)$$

where $S_q(\omega)$ is the PDM strength function

$$S_q(\omega) = \frac{\gamma_q(\omega)}{(\omega - \bar{\omega})^2 + \gamma_q^2(\omega)}. \quad (2)$$

The energy $\bar{\omega}$ of the giant dipole resonance (GDR) is found as the solution of Eq. (2.39) in [3]:

$$\bar{\omega} - \omega_q - P_q(\omega) = 0, \quad (3)$$

where ω_q is the unperturbed phonon energy (before the ph -phonon coupling is switched on), and $P_q(\omega)$ is the polarization operator. The damping $\gamma_q(\omega)$ is calculated microscopically within PDM as the imaginary part of the analytic continuation of $P_q(E)$ into the complex energy plane $E = \omega \pm i\varepsilon$. Its explicit expression within PDM-1 is given by Eq. (5) of [2] (pairing not included) or Eq. (15) of [1] (pairing included). There is no way to equalize $m_q^{(2)}$ from (1) ($k = 2$) with Eq. (1) of the Comment [4]. Therefore, all discussions using Eq. (1) of the Comment [4] with the aim of attaching it to the PDM are irrelevant.

The strength function (2) is not a Breit-Wigner (BW) distribution because the damping $\gamma_q(\omega)$ depends on the energy ω . Such form has been derived, for the first time, in [6] using the analytic properties of the double-time Green function independently of any assumption on the coupling matrix elements. Consequently, the photoabsorption cross section of GDR within the PDM is not a Lorentzian either. The claim in [4] that a Breit-Wigner (Lorentzian) form is assumed or an ad hoc input for the strength function (photoabsorption cross section) of GDR within the PDM is simply wrong.

One of the crucial features of the PDM is the use of realistic single-particle energies to construct the ph configurations (at zero temperature) together with the pp and hh configurations (at nonzero temperature) to which the GDR is coupled. Therefore a replacement of the realistic single-particle spectra with any other ones, such as the random values of E_s used in the Comment [4], no longer corresponds to the PDM. So the attempt in [4] to imitate the results of the PDM using random values of E_s , and an GDR energy E_0 , which is not defined from (3), is incorrect.

*The Comment has been later rejected by PRC on January 31, 2002

It is by no mean obvious that the coupling constant should increase as the configuration space gets larger in the same nucleus. How the coupling changes is a problem to be discussed microscopically. Within the PDM, an increase of the space of ph pairs leads to a decrease of the parameter f_1 to preserve the same value for the GDR width.

The aim of [1] is to use for the calculations of E1 resonances in neutron-rich isotopes the same set of two parameters (ω_q, f_1) , whose values are chosen to reproduce the GDR in the corresponding double closed-shell nuclei. Therefore, the E1 resonances in the chains $^{16-24}\text{O}$, $^{40-46}\text{Ca}$, and $^{48-60}\text{Ca}$ were calculated using the parameters chosen for ^{16}O , ^{40}Ca , and ^{48}Ca , respectively. There is no reason why the values of f_1 for ^{40}Ca and ^{48}Ca should be the same. The results for GDR in ^{16}O have been obtained already within the enlarged space with $f_1 = 0.6982$ MeV. This value is kept unchanged throughout the chain of oxygen isotopes as has been mentioned above and in [1]. No change of the parameter occurs between ^{16}O and ^{18}O as incorrectly stated in the Comment [4].

The PDM-1 with its two phenomenologically selected parameters allows the comparison with the experimental data for only the average characteristics of the E1 resonances, such as the overall shape of the cross section, width, energy, and energy-weighted sum (EWS) of strength. It cannot describe such fine structure as the individual low-lying E1 states measured in [7]. The EWS of E1 strength below 5 MeV for ^{40}Ca and ^{48}Ca are around 0.25 % and 0.52 % of the Thomas-Reich-Kuhn sum rule (TRK), respectively. They should be compared to the experimental values of (0.025 ± 0.004) % of TRK for ^{40}Ca , and (0.29 ± 0.04) % of TRK for ^{48}Ca reported in [7]. The enhancement of strength at low energies in doubly closed-shell nuclei due to the spreading of GDR has been discussed in [1]. There is no such setting of $B(E1)$ to zero for PDR within the PDM as claimed in [4]. The problem of double counting arises only when the structure of phonon is calculated microscopically within the random-phase approximation. The use of the structureless phonon and the parameters, which are selected so that the calculated GDR energy reproduces its experimental value, excludes any possibility for double counting within the PDM.

Pairing is not included in the calculations of PDR in Ref. [5] of [4]. The aim of Ref. [5] of [4] is to see if the PDM is able to predict the existence of the PDR in neutron-rich nuclei, but not to reproduce the experimental data. Because of the absence of pairing, the parameter f_1 in Ref. [5] of [4] was increased significantly in the region near the Fermi surface in neutron-rich isotopes. It is natural that such an increase overestimates the EWS of E1 strength in this region. This is not the case in the present work [1], where pairing is included, and the parameters of the model have been chosen to reproduce the GDR in double closed-shell nuclei.

In conclusion, none of the statements of the Comment [4] is relevant. The discussions in the Comment [4] are fruitless, and its conclusions are false. The Comment should not be published. If, nevertheless, the Editor will accept this Comment for publication, we would like to submit this report as our Reply to be published together with the Comment.

N. Dinh Dang

RI-beam factory project office, RIKEN, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, 351-0198 Saitama, Japan

V. Kim Au

Cyclotron Institute, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3366, USA

T. Suzuki

Department of Physics, Nihon University, Sakurajosui 3-25-40, Setagayaku, Tokyo 156, Japan

A. Arima

House of Councillors, Nagatacho 2-1-1, Chiyodaku, Tokyo 100-8962, Japan

-
- [1] N.D. Dang, V.K. Au, T. Suzuki, and A. Arima, Phys. Rev. C **63**, 044302 (2001).
[2] N.D. Dang, and A. Arima, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4145 (1998).
[3] N.D. Dang, and A. Arima, Nucl. Phys. **A 636**, 427 (1998).
[4] V. Yu. Ponomarev, On “the authentic damping mechanism” of the phonon damping model, submitted to Phys. Rev. C.
[5] N.D. Dang, K. Tanabe, and A. Arima, Nucl. Phys. **A 675**, 531 (2000).
[6] N.N. Bogolyubov, and S. Tyablikov, Sov. Phys. Doklady **4**, 6 (1959); D.N. Zubarev, Sov. Phys. Uspekhi **3**, 320 (1960).
[7] T. Hartmann *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **85**, 274 (2000).