

Interaction-dependence and independence

in low-energy E1 excitations of neutron-rich nuclei

H. Nakada & T. Inakura (Chiba U., Japan)

@ NuSYM14 (Liverpool; July 7-9, 2014)

Contents:

- I. Introduction
- II. L parameter vs. dipole polarizability α_D
- III. L parameter vs. PDR, revisited
- IV. Summary

I. Introduction

"L parameter" — a key to nuclear symmetry energy

 \leftarrow nuclear structure?

- *n*-skin thickness
 (low-energy) *E*1 strength
 how good ?
- \leftarrow EDF approach ("MFA", "RPA")

 \cdots naturally connected to infinite matter

- reference to droplet picture? \rightarrow numerically testable
- empirical law?

{ model-dependence? (many-body effects?)
interaction (functional)-dependence?
nucleus-dependence?

 \rightarrow careful assessment needed !

II. L parameter vs. dipole polarizability α_D

• L vs. Δr_{np}



A. Carbone et al., P.R.C 81, 041301(R) ('10)

• Δr_{np} vs. α_D



$$\mathbf{if} \quad \begin{array}{c} L \leftrightarrow \Delta r_{np} \\ \Delta r_{np} \leftrightarrow \alpha_D \end{array} \right\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad L \leftrightarrow \alpha_D$$

 $\begin{array}{ll} \cdots & \mbox{fully empirical} \\ & \rightarrow \mbox{foundation} ? \ \mbox{model-dep.} ? \end{array}$

cf. L vs. PDR



A. Carbone *et al.*, P.R.C 81, 041301(R) ('10)



Further test of interaction- and nucleus-dependence

T. Inakura & H.N., in preparation

For interaction-dep.

$$\hat{H}_{Sky} \rightarrow \hat{H}_{Sky} + \hat{V}_{add}; \quad \hat{V}_{add} = -t'_{3} \left[\rho(\mathbf{r}_{1})^{\alpha} - \rho_{0}^{\alpha} \right] P_{\sigma} \, \delta(\mathbf{r}_{1} - \mathbf{r}_{2}) \\ \text{Ref.: A. Ono et al., P.R.C 68, 051601(R) ('03)} \\ i.e. \ E_{Sky} [\rho(\mathbf{r}), \cdots] \rightarrow E_{Sky} + E_{add}; \\ E_{add} = \frac{1}{2} t'_{3} \left[\rho(\mathbf{r})^{\alpha} - \rho_{0}^{\alpha} \right] \cdot \left[\rho_{n}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_{p}(\mathbf{r}) \right]^{2} \quad (t'_{3} = 0, \pm 1000, \pm 2000) \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{no influence on sym. matter} \ (E/A)(\rho, \eta_{t} = 0); \quad \eta_{t} := (\rho_{n} - \rho_{p})/\rho \\ \text{no influence on sym. energy} \ S_{0} \left(:= \frac{1}{2} (\partial^{2}/\partial \eta_{t}^{2}) [(E/A)(\rho_{0}, \eta_{t})]|_{\eta_{t}=0} \right) \\ \end{array} \right.$$



★ L vs. S_{PDR} , α_D , $S_0\alpha_D$ S_{PDR} :





- $S_0 \alpha_D$ as well as Δr_{np} correlates to L with less interaction-dep. than S_{PDR} and α_D , though not always good enough.
- Heavy mass & well-developed PDR make their correlation more conspicuous, and therefore better in constraining L from Δr_{np} or $S_0 \alpha_D$. ⁶⁸Ni, ¹³²Sn (, ²⁰⁸Pb) ··· not good enough !? \rightarrow better candidates ? (under investigation)

• Halo nuclei (e.g. ⁸⁴Ni) are not welcome;

 \therefore) strongly influenced by loosely bound orbitals.

\bigstar Comparison to droplet-model estimate

(preliminary)





not necessarily $x_A \ll 1$ nor $S_0 \alpha_D / (S_0 \alpha_D)_{\text{DM}} \approx 1!$

III. L parameter vs. PDR, revisited



phase of p/n transition densities at each r

 \rightarrow decomposition into *pn* & skin modes

$$\langle f|\mathcal{O}^{(E1)}|i\rangle = \langle f|\mathcal{O}^{(E1)}|i\rangle_{pn} + \langle f|\mathcal{O}^{(E1)}|i\rangle_{skin} \quad \rightarrow \quad R_{skin}(\omega) = \frac{S_{skin}^{(E1)}(\omega)}{S_{tot}^{(E1)}(\omega)}$$



IV. Summary

To constrain the L parameter from nuclear structure information, interaction-dependence is checked within the EDF approach.

- $S_0 \alpha_D$ as well as Δr_{np} in heavy nuclei with well-developed PDR seem to be useful.
- Character of PDR deserves being examined further.

 \rightarrow possibility of alternative & more transparent connection?