V.O. Nesterenko<sup>1,2</sup>, M.A. Mardyban<sup>1,2</sup>, P.-G. Reinhard<sup>3</sup>, A. Repko<sup>4</sup> and J. Kvasil<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research. 141980, Dubna, Moscow region, Russia

<sup>2</sup> Dubna State University. 141982, Dubna, Moscow region, Russia

<sup>3</sup> Institute for Theoretical Physics II, University of Erlangen, D-91058, Erlangen, Germany

<sup>4</sup> Institute of Physics, Slovak Academy of Sciences, 84511 Bratislava, Slovakia

<sup>5</sup> Institute of Particle and Nuclear Physics, Charles University, CZ-18000, Praha 8, Czech Republic

> Received (received date) Revised (revised date)

The dependence of the moment of inertia  $\mathcal{J}$  on the pairing and axial quadrupole deformation  $\beta$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne was investigated. The study is based on quadrupole-constrained calculations with three cranking approaches for  $\mathcal{J}$  (Inglis-Belyaev, Thouless-Valatin, adiabatic time-dependent Hartree-Fock) and a representative set of Skyrme forces (SVbas, SkM\*, SLy6). At variance with macroscopic collective models, the calculations predict the specific regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  at  $\beta \ge 0.5$  (<sup>24</sup>Mg) and  $\beta \ge 0.6$  (<sup>20</sup>Ne), where the pairing breaks down. This regime is explained by two effects: full break up of the pairing and specific evolution of a *single* dominant particle-hole (1ph) configuration with  $\beta$ . The analysis of experimental data for the ground-state rotational bands in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne shows that such regime is possible at low spins.

#### 1. Introduction

The moment of inertia is one of the most important characteristics of deformed atomic nuclei 1,2,3,4. As was shown by extensive theoretical and experimental studies for medium and heavy nuclei, moments of inertia  $\mathcal{J}$  generally grow with nuclear quadrupole deformation  $\beta$  (regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta > 0$ ) and decrease with a development of pairing. The first feature is demonstrated by familiar macroscopic rigid-body (RB) and hydrodynamical (HD) estimations for  $\mathcal{J}$  1,2,3,4. The regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta > 0$ is mainly relevant for the collective nuclear flow realized in medium and heavy nuclei. Light nuclei with their extreme deformations and strong shell effects suggest additional interesting opportunities for investigation of dependence of  $\mathcal{J}$  on the deformation, shell structure and pairing.

In this study, we show that the usual trend that  $\mathcal{J}$  grows with  $\beta$  can be reverted in light deformed nuclei <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne, i.e., we can get in these nuclei the regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ . This regime can be governed by a *single* 1ph configuration and realized at zero pairing.

There are many cases when interplay of a collective motion and 1ph or twoquasiparticle (2qp) excitations essentially affects moments of inertia. These cases include various shell-corrections <sup>5</sup>, backbending <sup>2,6</sup>, onset of nuclear triaxiality 1,7,8,9,10, etc. The effects were mainly explored within various versions of the unified collective rotor model of Bohr and Mottelson <sup>1,2</sup> and cranking model (CM) originally proposed by D.R. Inglis <sup>11,12</sup> (see <sup>2,9</sup> for extensive CM reviews). In some CM studies, one can find cases with  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ , see early <sup>13</sup> and more recent <sup>10</sup> examples. However, these cases mainly concern medium/heavy nuclei and high-spin regimes. At the same time, it would be interesting to find mean-field effect in  $\mathcal{J}$ beyond the cases mentioned above, e.g. for low spins, without band crossing and even without pairing impact. Light deformed nuclei look promising for this aim.

Various properties of light nuclei <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne, including their moments of inertia, were explored already for many decades, see e.g. review <sup>1</sup> for the early work. In particular, the thorough analysis (CM with Nilsson-Strutinsky formalism) of the spectra, axial/triaxial deformation paths and moments of inertia in rotating sd-shell nuclei was performed by Lund group in 1980s <sup>14</sup>. The effect of pairing in rotating <sup>24</sup>Mg was investigated <sup>15,16</sup>. Nevertheless, despite an impressive previous effort, low-energy spectroscopy of <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne remains to be a hot topic. For example, during last years, the impact of triaxiality and shape coexistence was revisited within various methods: Skyrme quasiparticle random-phase-approximation (QRPA) <sup>17,18</sup>, the constrained Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov + local QRPA (CHFB+LQRPA) method<sup>19</sup>, generator coordinate method with angular-momentum-projected triaxial relativistic mean-field wave functions (3DAMP+GCM) <sup>20</sup>, GCM with full triaxial angular momentum and particle number projection using Skyrme <sup>21</sup> and Gogny <sup>22</sup> forces, triaxial CM <sup>23</sup>, Antisymmetrized Molecular Dynamics (AMD) <sup>24,25,26</sup>, etc. It was shown that rotational bands built on even-parity excited states in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne can exhibit some triaxility, and this effect is most strong in the soft nucleus <sup>20</sup>Ne. Further, the influence of clustering was inspected  $^{24,25,26,27}$ . The low-energy spectrum of  $^{24}Mg$ was recently measured in a nuclear-resonance-fluorescence (NRF) experiment <sup>28</sup>. To our knowledge, the regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  was actually found only in one study <sup>19</sup> (as a part of a local  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$ -maximum caused by a pairing collapse) but a possible mean-field origin of this feature was not explored.

In this paper, we consider deformed nuclei <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne as promising candidates where the regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  can be apparently realized. The fully selfconsistent approaches with Skyrme forces are employed to analyze a mean-field origin of  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  effect in terms of single-particle spectra. Our results suggest a simple microscopic interpretation of the effect, which can be useful for understanding and treatment of more involved explorations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, various methods for calculation of moments of inertia are sketched. In Sec. III, the calculation details are outlined. In Sec. IV, the main results are presented and analyzed, the experimental status is discussed. In Sec. V, the conclusions are drawn. In Appendix A, the case of a weak pairing is illustrated. In Appendix B, properties of dominant 2qp excitations are exhibited.

## 2. Models for moments of inertia

The moment of inertia  $\mathcal{J}$  is usually defined through the expression for the rotational energy 1,2,3,4

$$E_I = \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mathcal{J}}I(I+1),\tag{1}$$

where I is the angular momentum of the rotational state.

The  $\mathcal{J}$  can be modeled in several ways. Familiar *macroscopic* approaches 1,2,3,4 suggest the rigid-body (RB)

$$\mathcal{J}_{\rm RB} = \frac{2}{5} M R^2 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{5}{4\pi}} \beta + \frac{25}{32\pi} \beta^2 \right)$$
(2)

and hydrodynamical (HD)

$$\mathcal{J}_{\rm HD} = \frac{9}{4\pi} M R^2 \frac{\beta^2 (1 + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{5}{4\pi}} \beta)^2}{2 + \sqrt{\frac{5}{4\pi}} \beta + \frac{25}{16\pi} \beta^2} , \qquad (3)$$

expressions. Here, M and R are the nuclear mass and radius,  $\beta$  is the dimensionless axial quadrupole deformation. Pairing in these formulas is absent. At a low deformation  $\beta < 0.4$ , we get the relation

$$\mathcal{J}_{\rm HD} = \mathcal{J}_{\rm RB} \frac{45}{16\pi} \beta^2,\tag{4}$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_{RB} > \mathcal{J}_{HD}$ . For rare-earth and actinide nuclei, experimental values of  $\mathcal{J}$  usually lie between the RB and HD estimations. Both RB and HD expressions predict a growth of  $\mathcal{J}$  with deformation. Macroscopic RB and HD models describe moment of inertia for a collective rotation. If we are interested in mean field effects for  $\mathcal{J}$ , we should consider microscopic models.

A microscopic expression for  $\mathcal{J}$  is given by the Inglis cranking formula  $^{2,11,12}$ 

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{Ing}} = 2\sum_{i} \frac{|\langle i|I_x|0\rangle|^2}{E_i},\tag{5}$$

where  $I_x$  is x-component of the operator of the total angular moment I,  $|0\rangle$  is the ground state (g.s.), and  $|i\rangle$  is an excited state with energy  $E_i$  and quantum numbers  $K^{\pi} = 1^+$  (K is projection of I onto the nuclear symmetry axis,  $\pi$  is the parity.)

Expression (5) can be used at different levels of complexity. In the simplest mean-field case, we deal with mere particle-hole (ph) excitations. Then  $|i\rangle = |ph\rangle$ 

and  $E_i = e_p - e_h$ , where  $e_p$  and  $e_h$  are energies of the particle and hole singleparticle levels. This yields the original Inglis cranking formula <sup>11,12</sup>. If the pairing is included, we obtain the Inglis-Belyaev (IB) formula <sup>29,30</sup>

$$\mathcal{J}_{\rm IB} = 2 \sum_{q,q'>0} \frac{|\langle qq'|I_x|\tilde{0}\rangle|^2}{\epsilon_q + \epsilon_{q'}},\tag{6}$$

where  $|\tilde{0}\rangle$  is the quasiparticle vacuum. Here we deal with 2qp states  $|i\rangle = |qq'\rangle$  with q, q' > 0 and excitation energy  $E_i = \epsilon_q + \epsilon_{q'}$ . The 2qp matrix element  $\langle qq' | I_x | \tilde{0} \rangle$  includes the pairing weight factor  $u_{qq'} = u_q v_{q'} - u_{q'} v_q$  with Bogoliubov coefficients  $u_q$  and  $v_q$ .

A further improvement is QRPA which takes also the residual interaction into account. Then we get the Thouless-Valatin (TV) expression  $^{31}$ 

$$\mathcal{J}_{\rm TV} = 2 \sum_{\nu} \frac{|\langle \nu | I_x | \tilde{0} \rangle|^2}{E_{\nu}},\tag{7}$$

where  $|\tilde{0}\rangle$  is the QRPA vacuum,  $|\nu\rangle$  is the excited QRPA state with the energy  $E_{\nu}$ .

It is easy to see that Eqs. (5)-(7) allow various trends of  $\mathcal{J}$  with deformation. For example, if deformation  $\beta$  only slightly affects squared matrix elements  $|\langle i|I_x|0\rangle|^2$ but leads to a large change of the energy  $E_i$ , then one can get any sign for  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta$ . We will show below that a negative sign can occur in <sup>20</sup>Ne and <sup>24</sup>Mg.

Note that matrix QRPA can be unstable and not sufficiently accurate at deformations far from the equilibrium values. So Eq. (7) which uses the QRPA output is not always a reliable tool to estimate  $\mathcal{J}$  at all points of the deformation path. To circumvent this limitation, we also use in our analysis the linear adiabatic timedependent Hartree-Fock (ATDHF) approach  $^{2,32,42}$  where  $\mathcal{J}$  is calculated directly through the 2qp operator  $\Theta_x(\beta)$  of the linear response to the perturbation  $I_x(\beta)$ :

$$[\Theta_x(\beta), H(\beta)] = -i\hbar \frac{I_x(\beta)}{\mathcal{J}_{\text{ATDHF}}(\beta)},\tag{8}$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{ATDHF}}(\beta) = \frac{\hbar^2}{\langle \Phi_\beta | [[\Theta_x, H], \Theta_x] | \Phi_\beta \rangle},\tag{9}$$

where  $H(\beta)$  and  $\Phi_{\beta}$  are Hamiltonian and ground state of the system at a given  $\beta$ .

Formally, the ATDHF and TV definitions should result in the same  $\mathcal{J}$ . However, in our study, these two models use different numerical realizations. In particular, ATDHF evaluates the linear response iteratively in a two-dimensional coordinate grid <sup>42</sup>, which is more robust than the matrix QRPA technique exploiting a finite expansion basis. In our analysis, we mainly use ATDHF. The application of TV is limited to a few deformation points where QRPA has stable solutions just to show that TV and ATDHF give very similar results.

#### 3. Calculation details

The calculations are performed with Skyrme parametrizations SVbas  $^{34}$ , SkM\*  $^{35}$  and SLy6  $^{36}$ , which have different isoscalar effective masses  $m^*/m$  (0.90, 0.79

		-			
Nucleus		exper 46	SVbas	$\mathrm{SkM}^*$	SLy6
$^{24}Mg$	$eta_{ m eq}$	0.61	0.52	0.49	0.54
	$\Delta_p  [\text{MeV}]$		0.59	0.01	0.01
	$\Delta_n  [\text{MeV}]$		0.02	0.01	0.01
	$\mathcal{J} \; [\hbar^2/\mathrm{MeV}]$	2.2	3.6	4.1	3.5
$^{20}$ Ne	$eta_{ m eq}$	0.72	0.31	0.37	0.56
	$\Delta_p  [\text{MeV}]$		1.87	1.15	0.02
	$\Delta_n  [\text{MeV}]$		1.63	1.07	0.16
	$\mathcal{J} \; [\hbar^2/{ m MeV}]$	1.8	0.7	2.0	5.8

Moments of inertia in light deformed nuclei: pairing and mean-field impacts 5

Table 1. Calculated equilibrium deformations  $\beta_{eq}$ , proton  $\Delta_p$  and neutron  $\Delta_n$  pairing gaps, and ATDHF moments of inertia  $\mathcal{J}$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne.

and 0.69, respectively). It is known that the smaller  $m^*/m$ , the more stretched the single-particle spectrum. Thus  $\mathcal{J}$  can depend on  $m^*/m$ . Besides, these parametrizations use different prescriptions for pairing <sup>37</sup>: surface (density-dependent) pairing for SVbas and volume (density-independent) pairing for SkM\* and SLy6. Pairing is treated within Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) scheme <sup>37,38</sup>. The center-of-mass corrections are computed following the prescriptions for the ground <sup>39</sup> and excited <sup>40</sup> states.

The equilibrium deformations  $\beta_{eq}$  are obtained by minimization of the total nuclear energy. Following Table 1, the calculated  $\beta_{eq}$  underestimate the experimental values. This is explained by shallow potential energy surfaces (PES) in these nuclei, especially in very soft <sup>20</sup>Ne. Underestimation of  $\beta_{eq}$  in light nuclei also takes place in other calculation schemes, e.g. CHFB+LQRPA model with SkM\* gives  $\beta_{eq}=0.41$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg <sup>19</sup>. Similar values for  $\beta_{eq}$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg are also obtained in some density functional theories <sup>17,18,20,21</sup>. For <sup>20</sup>Ne, the value  $\beta_{eq} \sim 0.41$  is obtained in AMD scheme <sup>24</sup>. Note that present calculations of PES do not take into account the rotational and vibrational zero-point energy (ZPE) corrections <sup>41</sup>. Following our estimations, these corrections could strengthen the deformed minima and significantly improve agreement of  $\beta_{eq}$  with  $\beta_{exp}$ . However, a thorough analysis of  $\beta_{eq}$  is beyond the present study where we are mainly interested in the constrained calculations over a wide  $\beta$ -range. Note also that  $\beta_{exp}$  are obtained from the B(E2) values for ground-state (g.s.) rotational bands. In soft nuclei, B(E2) include additional large dynamical correlations <sup>42</sup> leading to overestimation of extracted  $\beta_{exp}$ .

In the IB and ATDHF models, we calculate  $\mathcal{J}$  using the code SKYAX <sup>44</sup>. A two-dimensional (2D) grid in cylindrical coordinates with grid step 0.7 fm and calculation box up to 3 nuclear radii is employed. All proton and neutron single-particle (s-p) levels from the bottom of the potential well up to +40 MeV are included. For example, SkM\* calculations at equilibrium deformations in <sup>24</sup>Mg employ 1050/1050 proton/neutron s-p levels. All 2qp  $K^{\pi} = 1^+$  states until 60 MeV are included, e.g. in <sup>24</sup>Mg we use 1770/1770 proton/neutron 2qp configurations. To make sure that



6 M.A. Mardyban, V.O. Nesterenko, P.-G. Reinhard, A. Repko and J. Kvasil

Fig. 1. Moments of inertia in  $^{24}$ Mg and  $^{20}$ Ne, calculated within RB, HD and SkM\* ATDFT models. The equilibrium and experimental deformations are marked by the filled rectangles and arrows, respectively.

the size of the expansion basis suffices, we check the full (lm=20,21,22) quadrupole energy-weighted sum rule EWSR(E2) =  $\hbar^2 e^2/(8\pi m)50Z\langle r^2\rangle_Z$  (where *m* is the nucleon mass, *Z* is the nuclear charge and  $\langle r^2\rangle_Z$  is  $r^2$ -averaged proton density). The EWSR is exhausted by 92-100%.

In TV cranking, we employ fully self-consistent 2D matrix QRPA method  $^{45}$  using s-p spectra and pairing values from SKYAX code. The spurious admixtures in QRPA spectra are additionally extracted  $^{40}$ .

The experimental  $\mathcal{J}$ -values are obtained from Eq. (1) using energies of 2<sup>+</sup> states in the g.s. rotational band <sup>46</sup>.

### 4. Results and discussion

# 4.1. Trends with deformation

Fig. 1 exhibits evolution  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne, calculated within RB, HD and SkM\* ATDHF models. We see that, in both nuclei, RB and HD predict a gradual increase of  $\mathcal{J}$  with  $\beta$ . Instead, ATDHF produces an maximum in  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$  at  $\beta \sim 0.4$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg and  $\beta \sim 0.6$  in <sup>20</sup>Ne with a subsequent dramatic decrease of  $\mathcal{J}$  at larger  $\beta$  (regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ ). To understand this counterintuitive behavior, we present below a detailed microscopic analysis.

Fig. 2 shows  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg, calculated within the IB, TV, and ATDHF microscopic models for different Skyrme forces. TV results are given only for a few



Fig. 2. Moments of inertia  $\mathcal{J}$  (upper panels), neutron and proton pairing energies  $E_{\text{pair}}$  (middle panels) and potential energy surfaces PES (bottom panels) for <sup>24</sup>Mg, calculated with the forces SVbas, SkM\* and SLy6.  $\mathcal{J}$ -values are obtained within IB, TV and ATDHF models.

deformation points of our main interest. Besides, we demonstrate neutron and proton pairing energies  $E_{\text{pair}}$  (defined in Refs. <sup>37,38</sup>) and PES. The values of  $E_{\text{pair}}$  and PES are the same for IB, TV and ATDHF.

The upper panels of Fig. 2 show that all three microscopic models give similar results for  $\mathcal{J}$ . This means that QRPA correlations provided by TV and ATDHF are not important. At low deformations, we see a gradual growth of  $\mathcal{J}$ , which is mainly caused by decrease of the pairing. The pairing impact overrides another factor - a change of 2qp energies  $\epsilon_q + \epsilon_{q'}$  in the denominator of  $\mathcal{J}_{RB}$ . At  $\beta > 0.5$  (SVbas) and  $\beta > 0.4$  (SkM\*, SLy6), the pairing fully disappears (in accordance with calculations 18,19,20 where a collapse of pairing is found at similar  $\beta$ -values), which makes the energy factor decisive. At these deformations, the energy denominator increases with  $\beta$  (see discussion below) and thus we get a gradual decrease of  $\mathcal{J}$ . The effect becomes fully of the mean field origin. The regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  is more pronounced for SkM\* and SLy6 (parametrization with a small  $m^*/m$ ), where  $\mathcal{J}$  falls down almost twice. For even larger deformations, the trend turns back to a usual growth of  $\mathcal{J}$  with  $\beta$ .

Fig.3 shows the same trends for <sup>20</sup>Ne. In both <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne, the effect is less pronounced for SVbas, i.e. for the force with a more developed pairing. The pairing smooths the  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$ -maximum. A particle-number projection (as an improvement of BCS method) could lead in our cases to some onset of pairing <sup>21,22,?</sup>.

As mentioned above, the maximum in  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$  at  $\beta=0.4-0.5$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg was also found in CHFB+LQRPA calculations taking into account the triaxiality and rotation <sup>19</sup>.



8 M.A. Mardyban, V.O. Nesterenko, P.-G. Reinhard, A. Repko and J. Kvasil

Fig. 3. The same as in Fig. 2 but for  $^{20}$ Ne.

Altogether,  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$ -maximum was obtained in prolate <sup>24</sup>Mg, oblate <sup>28</sup>Si and shapemixed <sup>26</sup>Mg and <sup>24</sup>Ne <sup>19</sup>. So this phenomenon could be rather common for light deformed nuclei. The study <sup>19</sup> shows that i)  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$ -maximum in <sup>24</sup>Mg persists in the g.s. band while increasing the angular momentum I and ii) this effect is basically caused by the collapse of proton and neutron pairing at  $\beta$ =0.4-0.5. The latter is in accordance with our calculations where just a collapse of pairing makes the energy impact decisive and leads to regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ . At  $\beta > 0.5$ , this regime occurs at zero pairing and, as shown below, is governed by evolution of a single 1ph configuration with  $\beta$ .

# 4.2. Microscopic analysis of the results

Since IB, TV and ATDHF give similar results, we use for our analysis only IB model which, being the most simple, embraces nevertheless the most important mean field and pairing impacts. For the sake of brevity, we limit our inspection by  $SkM^*$  results for <sup>24</sup>Mg.

Fig.4 shows  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}(\beta)$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg for the full and limited 2qp configuration spaces. In the latter case, two and eight 2qp pairs with maximal contributions to  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}$  (Eq. (6)) are taken into account. It is seen that eight 2qp configurations (4 proton and similar 4 neutron pairs) reproduce the behavior of the full  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}$  rather well. Even two configurations (proton and similar neutron) show the main  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  effect.

Table 3 (Appendix B) collects some properties (energies, squared  $I_x$ -matrix elements, pairing factors) of 2qp pairs dominating in Eq. (6) for  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{IB}}$ . The states are characterized by asymptotic Nilsson quantum numbers  $[N, n_z, \Lambda]$  47 with arrows



Fig. 4.  $J_{IB}$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg, calculated with the full 2qp set and limited numbers (8 and 2) of 2qp terms. The equilibrium and experimental deformations are marked by the filled rectangle and arrow, respectively.



Fig. 5. Contributions  $\mathcal{J}_{qq'}$  to the moment of inertia  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{IB}}$ , 2qp energies  $\epsilon_{qq'}$ , 1ph energies  $E_{\text{ph}}$ , squared single-particle matrix elements  $f_{qq'}^2$  and products  $(f_{qq'}u_{qq'})^2$  for pairs pp[211  $\uparrow$ , 202  $\uparrow$ ], pp[211  $\uparrow$ , 211  $\downarrow$ ] and pp[101  $\downarrow$ , 330  $\uparrow$ ] in <sup>24</sup>Mg.

indicating direction of the spin. The table shows that two configurations, proton and neutron  $[211 \uparrow, 202 \uparrow]$ , give the dominant contribution to  $\mathcal{J}$  at all the considered deformations.

I

Left panels of Fig. 5 illustrate  $\beta$ -dependence of some characteristics of the proton



10 M.A. Mardyban, V.O. Nesterenko, P.-G. Reinhard, A. Repko and J. Kvasil

Fig. 6. Proton single-particle SkM\* spectrum in <sup>24</sup>Mg. The transition  $[211 \uparrow \rightarrow 202 \uparrow]$  is shown by red arrows.

excitation  $pp[211\uparrow, 202\uparrow]$ . We show the contribution

$$\mathcal{J}_{qq'} = 2 \frac{|f_{qq'} u_{qq'}|^2}{\epsilon_{qq'}} \tag{10}$$

to  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{IB}}$  and all the values entering this expression: 2qp energy  $\epsilon_{qq'} = \epsilon_q + \epsilon_{q'}$  or particle-hole energy  $E_{qq'}$  (for zero pairing), single-particle matrix element  $f_{qq'} = \langle q | I_x | q' \rangle$  and pairing weight  $u_{qq'}$ . Only the proton pair is considered since, in N = Znuclei like <sup>24</sup>Mg, features of neutron and proton excitations are similar (see Table 3). Fig. 5 shows that pairing is important for  $\beta < 0.5$ . In this deformation range,  $\epsilon_{qq'} > E_{ph}$ ,  $(f_{qq'})^2 > (f_{qq'}u_{qq'})^2$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{qq'}$  grows with  $\beta$ . At higher deformations, pairing vanishes, the energy  $E_{ph}$  gradually increases and the squared matrix element  $(f_{qq'})^2$  is almost constant. Such behavior of the energy and matrix element results in the decrease of  $\mathcal{J}_{qq'}$  with  $\beta$ . Since proton and neutron configurations [211  $\uparrow$ , 202  $\uparrow$ ] strongly dominate in  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{IB}}$ , we finally get the anomalous decrease of  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{IB}}$  with  $\beta$ . This trend stems exclusively from shell effects.

The middle and right panels of Fig. 5 show the similar values for pairs pp[211 $\uparrow$ , 211 $\downarrow$ ] and pp[101 $\downarrow$ , 330 $\uparrow$ ]. As compared with left panels, they demonstrate different evolution of the energies and matrix elements. At 0.5 <  $\beta$  < 0.8, their matrix elements are small, which results in low contributions to  $\mathcal{J}_{qq'}$ .

The behavior of the energy  $\epsilon_{qq'}$  for the dominant pair  $[211\uparrow, 202\uparrow]$  can be understood if we consider the proton SkM\* spectrum in <sup>24</sup>Mg. Fig. 6 shows that, at  $\beta = 0.1$ -0.3, the Fermi level (F)  $[211\uparrow]$  is close to F-1 state  $[220\uparrow]$  and F+1 state  $[202\uparrow]$ . The resulting large density of states favors the pairing. With increasing  $\beta$ ,

moments $\varphi_0$ and quadrupole deformations $\beta$ in Figure and Figure .							
Nucleus	Ι	$E_I$	$\mathcal{J}(I)$	$B_I(E2\downarrow)$	$Q_0^2$	$\beta$	
		[MeV]	$[\hbar^2/{\rm MeV}]$	$[e^2 fm^4]$	$[e^2b^2]$		
	2	1.368	2.19	88	0.44	0.61	
$^{24}Mg$	4	4.122	2.54	160	0.29	0.49	
	6	8.113	2.78	155	0.22	0.43	
	2	1.633	1.84	65.4(32)	0.33	0.71	
$^{20}$ Ne	4	4.247	2.68	70.9(64)	0.13	0.45	
	6	8.777	2.43	64.5(10)	0.093	0.38	

Table 2. Experimental 1,19,46,48 energies  $E_I$ , moments of inertia  $\mathcal{J}(I)$ , intraband transition probabilities  $B_I(E2\downarrow) = B(E2, I \rightarrow I - 2)$  in the g.s. rotational bands, squared intrinsic quadrupole moments  $Q_0^2$  and quadrupole deformations  $\beta$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne.

these states are more and more separated, which decreases and finally destroys the pairing. At  $0.5 < \beta < 0.8$ , the separation is so large that the pairing vanishes. Following Fig. 6, the transition energy  $E_{ph}$  for configuration pp[211  $\uparrow$ , 202  $\uparrow$ ] (indicated in the figure by arrows) rapidly grows with  $\beta$ .

The similar analysis shows that, in <sup>20</sup>Ne, the anomalous behaviour of  $\mathcal{J}$  is mainly provided by proton and neutron configurations [211 $\uparrow$ , 220 $\uparrow$ ].

Altogether, we see that, in light deformed Z=N nuclei, a single 2qp configuration can determine behavior of  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$ . Moreover, just this configuration makes the behavior counterintuitive, i.e. with  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ .

### 4.3. Search of $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ regime in experiment

An experimental assessment of the regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  requires means to change the nuclear deformation deliberately. One of the most promising ways is a nuclear rotation. Soft PES for the nuclei studied here favor a change of deformation already for small angular momenta.

The effect could be searched experimentally by simultaneous inspection of the intraband energy intervals  $\Delta E(I) = E_I - E_{I-2}$  (for determination of  $\mathcal{J}(I)$ ) and transition probabilities  $B(E2, I \rightarrow I-2) \propto Q_0^2(I) \propto \beta^2(I)$  (for determination of intrinsic quadrupole moment  $Q_0(I)$  and deformation  $\beta(I)$ ) in the nuclear yrast line E(I). Then, by plotting  $\mathcal{J}(I)$  and  $\beta(I)$ , we should look for *I*-intervals with

$$\frac{d\mathcal{J}(I)}{dI} \cdot \frac{d\beta(I)}{dI} < 0 \text{ or } \frac{d\mathcal{J}(I)}{dI} \cdot \frac{dQ_0^2(I)}{dI} < 0.$$
(11)

Both cases correspond to regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ .

In Fig. 7, we show  $\mathcal{J}(I)$  and  $Q_0^2(I)$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne, extracted from the experimental data and listed in Table 2. The rotational bands in these light nuclei are short. We do not consider here the terminal rotational states with I=8 since available experimental data for these states are still disputed.

The  $\mathcal{J}$ -values in Fig. 7 are obtained from experimental energy intervals in the



Fig. 7. Dependence of the experimental moments of inertia  $\mathcal{J}$  and squared quadrupole moment  $Q_0^2$  on the orbital moment I in <sup>24</sup>Mg (left panel) and <sup>20</sup>Ne (right panel) <sup>46</sup>.

g.s. rotational band as  $^2$ 

$$\mathcal{J}(I) = \frac{\hbar^2 (2I - 1)}{\Delta E_I}.$$
(12)

For I=2, this expression gives the same result as Eq. (1). However, if  $\mathcal{J}(I)$  noticeably changes with I, then Eq. (12) is more relevant for getting  $\mathcal{J}(I)$  at larger spins than direct use of Eq. (1).

 $Q_0^2(I)$ -values in Fig. 7 are evaluated using experimental intraband reduced transition probabilities  $B_I(E2\downarrow) = B(E2, I \rightarrow I-2)$ :

$$Q_0^2(I) = \frac{16\pi}{5} \mathcal{R}_I B(E2, I \to I - 2), \tag{13}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_{I} = \frac{B(E2, I-2 \to I)}{B(E2, I \to I-2)} = \left[\frac{C_{I-2,0,2,0}^{I,0}}{C_{I,0,2,0}^{I-2,0}}\right]^{2} = \frac{2I+1}{2I-3}$$
(14)

and  $C_{I-2,0,2,0}^{I,0}$ ,  $C_{I,0,2,0}^{I-2,0}$  are Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. Fig. 7 shows that, at I=2-6 in <sup>24</sup>Mg and I=2-4 in <sup>20</sup>Ne, the values  $\mathcal{J}(I)$  and

Fig. 7 shows that, at I=2-6 in <sup>24</sup>Mg and I=2-4 in <sup>20</sup>Ne, the values  $\mathcal{J}(I)$  and  $Q_0^2(I)$  have opposite trends and so give  $d\mathcal{J}/dI \cdot dQ_0^2/dI < 0$ . Note that <sup>20</sup>Ne is deformation-soft and so the effect here can be related to onset of triaxiality at low spins <sup>23,24</sup>, leading to decrease of the axial quadrupole deformation. A decrease of  $Q_0^2$  with I is indeed seen in Fig. 7. This can be accompanied by decrease of the pairing with I.

Appearance of the regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  in the experimental data (Fig. 7) is a promising message in favour of our analysis but not yet its robust proof. Indeed,

our analysis is based on the deformation-constrained calculations and does not consider a possible dynamical origin (rotation, triaxialy, clustering) of the effect.

Our calculations omit the Coriolis coupling since it should be weak for the ground-state bands in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne. Indeed, we deal here with small orbital momenta I = 2-6. Following experimental data <sup>46</sup> for both nuclei, rotational bands with  $K^{\pi} = 1^+$ , which could be coupled with g.s. rotational band, are expected only around 10 MeV.

## 5. Conclusions

The evolution of the moment of inertia  $\mathcal{J}$  with axial quadrupole deformation  $\beta$  in light deformed nuclei <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne was investigated in the framework of macroscopic and microscopic models. For macroscopic treatment, the rigid-body (RB) and hydrodynamical (HD) models <sup>1,2,3,4</sup> are applied. The microscopic models include Inglis-Belyaev (IB) <sup>29,30</sup>, Thouless-Valatin (TV) <sup>31</sup> and linear adiabatic time-dependent Hartree-Fock (ATDHF) <sup>2,32,42</sup> approaches, all based on Skyrme mean-field calculations. The microscopic approaches embrace effects from shell structure, pairing, and dynamical linear response. The calculations are performed with three Skyrme parametrizations (SVbas <sup>34</sup>, SkM\* <sup>35</sup> and SLy6 <sup>36</sup>) covering various isoscalar effective masses  $m^*/m$  and different kinds of pairing.

All the microscopic calculations (IB, TV and ATDHF) predict in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne a maximum in  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$ -dependence and corresponding counterintuitive regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ . This effect is explained by the impact of a *single 1ph* configuration dominating in  $\mathcal{J}$  ([211 $\uparrow$ , 202 $\uparrow$ ] in <sup>24</sup>Mg, and [220 $\uparrow$ , 211 $\uparrow$ ] in <sup>20</sup>Ne). At the deformation range where the effect takes place, the pairing is absent and the relevant 1*ph* configuration has a particular behavior: its energy grows with  $\beta$  while the cranking single-particle matrix element  $\langle q|I_x|q'\rangle$  remains almost constant. This is a fully mean-field effect though its manifestation becomes possible due to a collapse of the pairing. Experimental data <sup>19,46,48</sup> for ground-state bands in <sup>24</sup>Mg and <sup>20</sup>Ne also demonstrate the behavior  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  at low spins. This is a promising message in favor of our analysis.

Our deformation-constrained calculations do not directly include physical mechanisms (triaxiality, rotation, ...) which could lead to  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  regime but focus to a possible simple explanation of this effect in terms of single-particle spectra. In this connection, note that  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$ -maximum and related  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  behavior was already found in exploration <sup>19</sup> for <sup>24</sup>Mg, taking into account the triaxiality and rotation impacts. Here we provide a possible mean-field interpretation of such results and show that a macroscopic behaviour  $\mathcal{J}(\beta) \propto \beta^2$  can be strongly violated in light deformed nuclei.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

J. K. appreciates the support by a grant of the Czech Science Agency, Project No. 19-14048S. A. R. acknowledges support by the Slovak Research and Development



14 M.A. Mardyban, V.O. Nesterenko, P.-G. Reinhard, A. Repko and J. Kvasil

Fig. 8. Moments of inertia  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}$  (upper panel) and proton and neutron pairing energies (bottom panel) in <sup>24</sup>Mg, calculated with the force SkM<sup>\*</sup> at attenuation pairing factors  $\gamma=1, 0.75$  and 0.5.

Agency under Contract No. APVV-20-0532 and by the Slovak grant agency VEGA (Contract No. 2/0175/24).

### Appendix A. Case of a weak pairing

Though the regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$  is basically the mean field effect, it is actually realized after the collapse of pairing. In this connection, it is worth to check how the evolution  $\mathcal{J}(\beta)$  would look at the suppressed pairing. We cannot fully turn off the pairing since this will lead to unphysically large values of  $\mathcal{J}$ . Indeed, at weak deformations, the p-h energies entering the denominator of Inglis models are very small, which, without pairing, would result in unphysical enhancement of  $\mathcal{J}$ . However, we can avoid this problem and see the main trends if we only partly weaken the pairing, e.g. using the pairing strength constants with attenuation factors  $\gamma=0.75$  and 0.5 (with  $\gamma=1$  corresponding to the full pairing).

In Fig. 8, the SkM\* moments of inertia  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}(\beta)$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg are shown for  $\gamma=1$ ,

1							
$\beta$	qq'	$\mathcal{J}_{qq'}$	$\epsilon_{qq'}$	$(fu)^2_{qq'}$	$f_{qq'}^2$	$u_{qq'}^2$	$\operatorname{F-pos}_{qq'}$
0.2	nn[211 $\uparrow$ , 202 $\uparrow$ ]	0.28	2.83	0.40	2.50	0.16	F,F+1
	$pp[211\uparrow, 202\uparrow]$	0.26	2.95	0.38	2.53	0.15	F,F+1
	$pp[211\uparrow, 211\downarrow]$	0.07	4.97	0.17	0.28	0.61	F,F+2
	nn[211 $\uparrow$ , 211 $\downarrow$ ]	0.07	5.02	0.18	0.28	0.63	F,F+2
		$\mathcal{J}_{IB} = 0.90$					
0.4	nn[211 $\uparrow$ , 202 $\uparrow$ ]	1.60	2.51	2.01	2.43	0.83	F,F+1
	$pp[211\uparrow, 202\uparrow]$	1.44	2.63	1.90	2.43	0.78	F,F+1
	nn[211 $\uparrow$ , 211 $\downarrow$ ]	0.19	5.20	1.00	1.07	0.94	F,F+2
	$pp[211\uparrow, 211\downarrow]$	0.19	5.14	0.98	1.07	0.92	F,F+2
		$\mathcal{J}_{IB} = 3.75$					
0.5	nn[211 $\uparrow$ , 202 $\uparrow$ ]	1.33	3.63	4.84	4.84	1	F,F+1
	$pp[211\uparrow, 202\uparrow]$	1.33	3.64	4.84	4.84	1	F,F+1
	$pp[211\uparrow, 211\downarrow]$	0.21	5.64	1.18	1.18	1	F,F+2
	nn[211 $\uparrow$ , 211 $\downarrow$ ]	0.21	5.80	1.19	1.19	1	F,F+2
		$\mathcal{J}_{IB} = 3.51$					
1.0	$pp[211\uparrow,202\uparrow]$	0.64	8.40	5.34	5.34	1	F,F+1
	nn[211 $\uparrow$ ,202 $\uparrow$ ]	0.63	8.44	5.31	5.31	1	F,F+1
	$pp[220\uparrow,211\downarrow]$	0.23	11.30	2.62	2.62	1	F-1,F+2
	nn[220 $\uparrow$ ,211 $\downarrow$ ]	0.23	11.54	2.60	2.60	1	F-3,F+2
	$pp[101\uparrow,330\uparrow]$	0.16	4.00	0.64	0.64	1	F-1, F+6
	$pp[211\uparrow,440\uparrow]$	0.15	11.61	1.79	1.79	1	F,F+5
		$\mathcal{J}_{IB} = 2.95$					

Table 3. Characteristics of 2qp configurations qq' in <sup>24</sup>Mg with the largest contributions to  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}$ , calculated with the force SkM\* at various deformations. The table includes: contributions  $\mathcal{J}_{qq'}$  to  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}$ , 2qp energies  $\epsilon_{qq'}$ , squared matrix elements  $f_{qq'}^2$ , Bogoliubov factors  $u_{qq'}^2$ , products  $(fu)_{qq'}^2$ , positions (F-pos) of the s-p levels relative to the Fermi level (F).

0.75 and 0.5. Besides, the corresponding proton and neutron pairing energies are exhibited. We see a one-to-one correspondence between the pairing collapse and onset of the regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ . The weaker the pairing, the smaller the onset deformation  $\beta$ . So just the pairing collapse permits the realization of the mean field regime  $d\mathcal{J}/d\beta < 0$ .

## Appendix B. Properties of 2qp states

Table 3 displays characteristics of 2qp states with the largest contributions  $\mathcal{J}_{qq'}$  to  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}$  in <sup>24</sup>Mg. The calculations are performed with the force SkM\* for deformations  $\beta$ =0.2, 0.4, 0.5 and 1.0. It is seen that, for all these deformations, the dominant contribution to  $\mathcal{J}_{IB}$  is provided by proton (pp) and neutron (nn) pairs [211<sup>+</sup>, 202<sup>+</sup>]. The domination is explained by three favorable factors: large s-p matrix element

 $f_{qq'}$ , modest pairing suppression  $u_{qq'}$  and rather low excitation energy  $\epsilon_{qq'}$ . Just these 2qp pairs are used for calculation of  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{IB}}^{(2)}$ .

The large matrix element for  $[211 \uparrow, 202 \uparrow]$  is explained by holding the asymptotic selection rules  $\Delta N = 0, \pm 2, \Delta n_z = \pm 1, \Delta \Lambda = 1$  for lm = 21-transitions <sup>3</sup>.

As seen from the table, the pairing vanishes at  $\beta > 0.5$ . Then we get  $u_{qq'}=1$ ,  $\epsilon_{qq'} = |e_p - e_h|$ , and  $\mathcal{J}_{IB} \to \mathcal{J}_{Ing}$ .

#### References

- A. Bohr and B. R. Mottelson, *Nuclear Structure*, Vol. II (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).
- P. Ring and P. Schuck, Nuclear Many Body Problem (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980).
- 3. V.G. Soloviev, Theory of Atomic Nuclei, (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1976).
- A.G. Sitenko and V.K. Tartakovsky, Lectures on the theory of the nucleus (Atomizdat, Moscow, 1972).
- M. Brack, J. Damgaard, A.S. Jensen, H.C. Pauli, V.M. Strutinsky, C.Y. Wong, Rev. Mod. Phys. 44, 320 (1972).
- 6. A. Johnson, H. Ryde, and J. Sztarkier, Phys. Lett. B 34, 605 (1971).
- 7. E.R. Marshalek, Nucl. Phys. A **331**, 429 (1979).
- 8. R.G. Nazmitdinov and J. Kvasil, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. 105, 962 (2007).
- 9. S. Frauendorf, Phys. Scr. **93**, 043003 (2018).
- 10. J. Kvasil and R.G. Nazmitdinov, Phys. Rev. C 73, 014312 (2006).
- 11. D.R. Inglis, Phys. Rev. **96**, 1059 (1954).
- 12. D.R. Inglis, Phys. Rev. **103**, 1786 (1956).
- 13. V.V. Pashkevich and S. Frauendorf, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 20, 588 (1975).
- 14. I. Ragnarsson, S. Aberg and R.K. Sheline, Phys. Scr. 24, 215 (1981).
- 15. K. Mühlhaus, E.M. Müller, K. Neergard and U. Mosel, Phys. Lett. B 105, 329 (1981).
- 16. E.M. Müller, K. Mühlhaus, K. Neergard and U. Mosel, Nucl. Phys. A 383, 233 (1982).
- 17. K. Yoshida and N. Van Giai, Phys. Rev. C 78, 064316 (2008).
- C. Losa, A. Pastore, T. Dossing, E. Vigezzi, and R.A. Broglia, Phys. Rev. C 81, 064307 (2010).
- 19. N. Hinohara and Y. Kanada-En'yo, Phys. Rev. C 83, 014321 (2011).
- J.M. Yao, H. Mei, H. Chen, J. Meng, P. Ring, and D. Vretenar, Phys. Rev. C 83, 014308 (2011).
- 21. M. Bender and P.-H. Heenen, Phys. Rev. C 78, 024309 (2008).
- 22. T.R. Rodríguez and J.L. Egido, Phys. Rev. C 81, 064323 (2010).
- 23. P. Gulshani, arXiv:2204.14207 [nucl-th].
- 24. M. Kimura, Phys. Rev. C 69, 044319 (2004).
- 25. M. Kimura, R. Yoshida, and M. Isaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. 127, 287 (2012).
- 26. Y. Chiba, Y. Kanada-En'yo and Y. Shikata, Phys. Rev. C 103, 064311 (2021).
- 27. R. Bijker and F. Iachello, Nucl. Phys. A 1006, 122077 (2021).
- 28. J. Deary et al, Eur. Phys. J. A59, 198 (2023).
- 29. S.T. Belyaev, Mat. Fys. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 31, n. 11 (1959).
- 30. S.T. Belyaev, Nucl. Phys. 24, 322 (1961).
- 31. D.J. Thouless and J.G. Valatin, Nucl. Phys. **31**, 211 (1962).
- 32. K. Goeke and P.-G. Reinhard, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.), 112, 328 (1978).
- P.-G. Reinhard, F. Grümmer and K. Goeke, Z. Phys. A: Atoms and Nuclei 317, 339 (1984).

- P. Klüpfel, P.-G. Reinhard, T. J. Burvenich, and J. A. Maruhn, Phys. Rev. C 79, 034310 (2009).
- J. Bartel, P. Quentin, M. Brack, C. Guet, and H.-B. Hakansson, Nucl. Phys. A 386, 79 (1982).
- E. Chabanat, P. Bonche, P. Haensel, J. Meyer, and R. Schaeffer, Nucl. Phys. A635, 231 (1998).
- 37. M. Bender, K. Rutz, P.-G. Reinhard, J.A. Maruhn, Eur. Phys. J. A 8, 59 (2000).
- 38. A. Repko, J. Kvasil, V.O. Nesterenko, P.-G. Reinhard, Eur. Phys. J. A 53, 221 (2017).
- 39. M. Bender, P.-H. Heenen, and P.-G. Reinhard, Rev. Mod. Phys. 75, 121 (2003).
- 40. J. Kvasil, A. Repko, and V. O. Nesterenko, Eur. Phys. J. A 55, 213 (2019).
- 41. P.-G. Reinhard, Z. Phys. A: Atoms and Nuclei 285, 93 (1978).
- P.-G. Reinhard, F. Grümmer and K. Goeke, Z. Phys. A: Atoms and Nuclei **317**, 339 (1984).
- 43. P. Klüpfel, J. Erler, P.-G. Reinhard, and J. A. Maruhn, Eur. Phys. J A 37, 343 (2008).
- 44. P.-G. Reinhard, B. Schuetrumpf, and J.A. Maruhn, Comput. Phys. Commun. 258, 107603 (2021).
- 45. A. Repko, J. Kvasil, V.O. Nesterenko, P.-G. Reinhard, arXiv:1510.01248 (nucl-th), 2015.
- 46. National Nuclear Data Center (NNDC) http://www.nndc.bnl.gov/nudat3.
- 47. S.G. Nilsson, Mat. Fys. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 29, n.16 (1965).
- D.R. Tilley, C.M. Cheves, J.H. Kelley, S. Raman and H.R. Weller, Nucl. Phys. A 636, 249 (1998).