

Study of ^{44}Ti in a Mixed–Symmetry Basis

V. G. Gueorguiev* , J. P. Draayer,

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University,

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

W. E. Ormand

Physics Directorate, L-414, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory,

P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94551

C. W. Johnson

Department of Physics, San Diego State University,

San Diego, CA 92182-1233

(October 8, 2018)

The structure of ^{44}Ti is studied in an oblique-basis that includes spherical and $\text{SU}(3)$ shell-model basis states. The results show that the oblique-basis concept is applicable, even though the strong spin-orbit interaction, which breaks the $\text{SU}(3)$ symmetry, generates significant splitting of the single-particle levels. Specifically, a model space that includes a few $\text{SU}(3)$ irreducible representations (irreps), namely, the leading $(12,0)$ and next to the leading $(10,1)$ irreps – including spin $S = 0$ and 1 configurations of the latter, plus spherical shell-model configurations (SSMC) that have at least two valence nucleons confined to the $f_{7/2}$ orbit – the $\text{SM}(2)$ case, yield results that are comparable to SSMC with at least one valence nucleon confined to the $f_{7/2}$ orbit – the $\text{SM}(3)$ case.

PACS numbers: 21.60.Cs, 21.60.Ev, 21.60.Fw, 27.40.+z

*Corresponding author. Email address: vesselin@phys.lsu.edu

Keywords: mixed-mode, symmetry-mixing, non-orthogonal basis, generalized eigenvalue problem, Elliott's SU(3) model, spherical shell model.

Introduction – In a previous paper we introduced the mixed-symmetry, oblique-basis concept and demonstrated its applicability in the *sd*-shell using ^{24}Mg as an example [1]. The successful description of ^{24}Mg can be understood in terms of the comparable importance of single-particle excitations that are described most naturally in terms of spherical shell-model configurations (SSMC), and collective quadrupole excitations that are best described by the SU(3) shell model. An important element to the success of the theory for lower *sd*-shell nuclei is the fact that SU(3) is a reasonably good symmetry [2]; that is, for lower *sd*-shell nuclei SU(3) is the dominant symmetry while the spherical shell-model (SSM) scheme plays an important but clearly more recessive role.

In contrast with the *sd*-shell situation, for lower *pf*-shell nuclei the strong spin-orbit splitting dominates the landscape and SU(3) symmetry is badly broken [3]. Therefore, one might anticipate that adding the leading and next to the leading SU(3) irreps to the dominate SSM configurations for lower *pf*-shell nuclei might not add much value to the analysis. Nevertheless, our calculations for ^{44}Ti show that the addition of leading SU(3) irreps speeds the convergence; that is, whereas in this case the spherical shell-model (SSM) is clearly dominant and SU(3) is recessive, the latter remains important and signals that the oblique-basis remains an important concept even in situations where one of the symmetries is rather badly broken.

Here we consider oblique-basis calculations for ^{44}Ti using the KB3 interaction [4]. We confirm that the spherical shell model (SSM) provides a significant part of the low-energy wave functions within a relatively small number of SSMC while an SU(3) shell-model scheme with only few SU(3) irreps is unsatisfactory. This is the opposite of the situation in the *sd*-shell. Since the SSM yields relatively good results with SM(2), which includes SSMC of up to two valence nucleons free to move in any of *pf*-shell orbitals, combining the two basis sets yields even better results with only a very small increase in the overall size of the model

space. In particular, results in a SM(2)+SU(3) model space (47.7% + 2.1% of the full pf -shell space) are comparable with SM(3) results (84% of the full pf -shell space). Therefore, as for the sd -shell, combining a few SU(3) irreps with SM(2) configurations yields excellent results, such as correct spectral structure, good ground-state energy, and an overall improved structure of the wave functions.

Model Space – ^{44}Ti consists of 2 valence protons and 2 valence neutrons in the pf -shell. The SU(3) basis includes the leading irrep (12,0) with $M_J = 0$ dimensionality 7, and the next to the leading irrep (10,1). The (10,1) occurs three times, once with $S = 0$ (dimensionality 11) and twice with $S = 1$ (dimensionality $2 \times 33 = 66$). All three (10,1) irreps have a total dimensionality of 77. The total $M_J = 0$ dimensionality of (12,0) and (10,1) is therefore 84. In Table I we summarize the dimensionalities involved in our calculation.

Within oblique bases type calculations one expects some linearly dependent vectors [1]. In our example, there is one redundant vector in the SM(2)+(12,0) space, two in SM(3)+(12,0) and SM(1)+(12,0)&(10,1) spaces, twelve in SM(2)+(12,0)&(10,1) space, and thirty-three in the SM(3)+(12,0)&(10,1) space. Each linearly dependent vector is handled as discussed previously [1]. The structure of the oblique-basis model space is shown in Fig. 1.

Model space	(12,0)	&(10,1)	SM(0)	SM(1)	SM(2)	SM(3)	FULL
dimension	7	84	72	580	1908	3360	4000
dimension %	0.18	2.1	1.8	14.5	47.7	84	100

TABLE I. Labels and $M_J=0$ dimensions of various model spaces for ^{44}Ti . The leading SU(3) irrep is (12,0); &(10,1) implies that the three (10,1) irreps (one with $S = 0$ and $M_J=0$ dimensionality 11 and two with $S = 1$ and $M_J=0$ dimensionality 33 each) are included along with the leading irrep (12,0). SM(n) is a spherical shell-model basis with n valence particles anywhere within the full pf -shell when the remaining valence particles are being confined to the $f_{7/2}$ orbit.




FIG. 1. Orthogonality of the basis vectors in the oblique geometry. The SU(3) space consist of (12,0)&(10,1) basis vectors. The shell-model spaces (SM(n) with $n = 1$ and 2) is indicated by a horizontal line. (a) SM(1) and the leading SU(3) basis vectors; there are two SU(3) vectors that lie in the SM(1) space. (b) SM(2) and the leading SU(3) basis vectors; there are twelve SU(3) vectors that lie in the SM(2) space.

Ground-State Energy – The convergence of the ground-state energy as function of the model space dimension is shown in Fig. 2. The oblique-basis calculation of the ground-state energy for ^{44}Ti does not appear to be as impressive as for ^{24}Mg [1], especially when we compare SM(2) with SM(1) plus SU(3). The calculated ground-state energy for the SM(1)+(12,0)&(10,1) space is 0.85 MeV below the calculated energy for the SM(1) space. In contrast, the ground-state energy for SM(2) is 2.2 MeV below the SM(1) result. Adding the two SU(3) irreps to the SM(1) basis increases the size of the space from 14.5% to 16.6% of the full space. This is a 2.1% increase, while going from the SM(1) to SM(2) involves an increase of 33.2%. However, adding the SU(3) irreps to the SM(2) basis gives ground-state

energy of -13.76 MeV which is compatible to the SM(3) result of -13.74 MeV. Therefore, adding the SU(3) to the SM(2) increases the model space from 47.7% to 49.8% and gives results that are slightly better than the results for SM(3) model space that is 84% of the full space.




FIG. 2. Ground-state energy for ^{44}Ti as a function of the various model spaces. The SU(3) irreps used in the calculations are (12,0) and (10,1).

Low-Lying Energy Spectrum – For ^{24}Mg the position of the K=2 band head is correct for SU(3)-type calculations but not for the low-dimensional SM(n) calculations [1]. For ^{44}Ti we find the opposite scenario which is shown in Fig. 3. In this case the SM(n)-type calculations reproduce the position of the K=2 band head while SU(3)-type calculations put the K=2 band head too high. Furthermore, the low-energy levels for the SU(3) case are higher than the SM(n) case, which is a scenario that may not produce the necessary mixing of the levels that would lead to a better spectral structure. It is important to note that basis states with spin other than zero are essential to achieve a proper description of the low energy spectrum.

This can be seen very clearly for ^{44}Ti in Fig. 3 where the addition of the $S = 1$ (10,1) irreps to the (12,0) and (10,1) $S = 0$ pair increases the binding energy by 2 MeV.




FIG. 3. Structure of the energy levels for ^{44}Ti for different calculations. Pure m -scheme spherical-basis calculations are on the left-hand side while pure SU(3)-basis calculations are on the right-hand side. The spectrum from the FULL space calculation is in the center.

Overall, the spectral structure in the oblique-basis calculation is good with the SM(2)+(12,0)&(10,1) spectrum ($\approx 50\%$ of the full space) delivering results that are comparable to the SM(3) case (84%). Additional details are shown in Fig. 4.




FIG. 4. Structure of energy levels for ^{44}Ti for different oblique-basis calculations using leading and next to the leading irreps with spin $S = 0$ and 1. Pure m -scheme spherical-basis calculations are included for comparison.

Overlaps with Exact States – The overlap of the SU(3)-type eigenstates with the exact (full pf -shell model space) results are not as large as in the sd -shell, often running less than 40%. This result was also reported in a comparative study of SU(3) and projected Hartree-Fock [5] calculations. The SM(n) results are considerably better with SM(2)-type calculations yielding on average more than an 85% overlap with the exact states while the results for SM(3) show overlaps greater than 97%, which is consistent with the fact that SM(3) covers 84% of the full space. This situation is shown in Fig. 5.




FIG. 5. Wave function overlaps of the FULL pf -shell states of ^{44}Ti with pure spherical shell model and $\text{SU}(3)$ type calculations. The first four bars represent the $\text{SM}(0)$, $\text{SM}(1)$, $\text{SM}(2)$, and $\text{SM}(3)$ calculations, the next two bars represent the $\text{SU}(3)$ calculations.

On the other hand, as shown in Fig. 6, $\text{SM}(2)$ plus $(12,0)\&(10,1)$ -type calculations yield results in about 50% of the full-space that are as good as those for $\text{SM}(3)$ which is 84% of the full pf -shell model space. Notice that the $\text{SM}(1)+(12,0)\&(10,1)$ overlaps are often bigger than the $\text{SM}(2)$ overlaps as shown in Fig. 6.




FIG. 6. Selected overlaps of SM(n), SU(3), and oblique-basis results with the exact full pf -shell eigenstates for ^{44}Ti . Here SU(3)+ denotes the (12,0)&(10,1) SU(3) irreps.

Conclusion – For ^{44}Ti , combining a few SU(3) irreps with SM(2) configurations increases the model space only by a small ($\approx 2.3\%$) amount but results in better overall results: a lower ground-state energy, the correct spectral structure (particularly the position of the $K=2^+$ band head), and wave functions with a larger overlap with the exact results. The oblique-bases SM(2)+(12,0)&(10,1) for ^{44}Ti ($\approx 50\%$ of the full space) yields results that are comparable with SM(3) results ($\approx 84\%$ of the full space). In short, the oblique-basis scheme works well for ^{44}Ti but in contrast with ^{24}Mg , the SSM configurations are dominant when SU(3) is recessive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge support provided by the U.S. Department of Energy under Grant No.

DE-FG02-96ER40985, and the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. PHY-9970769 and PHY-0140300.

- [1] V. G. Gueorguiev, W. E. Ormand, C. W. Johnson, and J. P. Draayer, *Phys. Rev.* **C65**, 024314 (2002).
- [2] J. P. Elliott and H. Harvey, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London* **A272**, 557 (1963).
- [3] V. G. Gueorguiev, J. P. Draayer, and C. W. Johnson, *Phys. Rev.* **C63**, 014318 (2001).
- [4] T. Kuo and G. E. Brown, *Nucl. Phys.* **A114**, 241 (1968); A. Poves and A. P. Zuker, *Phys. Rep.* **70**, 235 (1981).
- [5] C. W. Johnson, I. Stetcu, and J. P. Draayer, “SU(3) versus deformed Hartree-Fock”, *Phys. Rev.* **C 66**, 034312 (2002).