



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

S. Hilaire CEA, DAM, DIF

ICTP-IAEA Workshop on Simulation of Nuclear Reaction Data with the TALYS Code - TRIESTE - October 2023

- Introduction

- General features about nuclear reactions

- Time scales and associated models
- Types of data needed
- Data format = f (users)

- Nuclear Models

- Basic structure properties
- Optical model
- Pre-equilibrium model
- Compound Nucleus model

- Model ingredients

- Level densities
- Gamma-ray strengths
- Fission transmission coefficients

- Fission reactions

- Generalities about fission
- Fission neutrons and gammas
- Fission yields
- Fission cross sections

- Prospects

- Introduction

- General features about nuclear reactions

- Time scales and associated models
- Types of data needed
- Data format = f (users)

- Nuclear Models

- Basic structure properties
- Optical model
- Pre-equilibrium model
- Compound Nucleus model

- Model ingredients

- Level densities
- Gamma-ray strengths
- Fission transmission coefficients

- Fission reactions

- Generalities about fission
- Fission neutrons and gammas
- Fission yields
- Fission cross sections

- Prospects

ONDAY

- Introduction

- General features about nuclear reactions

- Time scales and associated models
- Types of data needed
- Data format = f (users)

- Nuclear Models

- Basic structure properties
- Optical model
- Pre-equilibrium model
- Compound Nucleus model

- Model ingredients

- Level densities
- Gamma-ray strengths
- Fission transmission coefficients

- Fission reactions

- Generalities about fission
- Fission neutrons and gammas
- Fission yields
- Fission cross sections

- Prospects



- Introduction

- General features about nuclear reactions

- Time scales and associated models
- Types of data needed
- Data format = f (users)

- Nuclear Models

- Basic structure properties
- Optical model
- Pre-equilibrium model
- Compound Nucleus model

- Model ingredients

- Level densities
- Gamma-ray strengths
- Fission transmission coefficients

- Fission reactions

- Generalities about fission
- Fission neutrons and gammas
- Fission yields
- Fission cross sections
- Prospects

THURSDAY

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

- Introduction

- General features about nuclear reactions

- Time scales and associated models
- Types of data needed
- Data format = f (users)

- Nuclear Models

- Basic structure properties
- Optical model
- Pre-equilibrium model
- Compound Nucleus model

- Model ingredients

- Level densities
- Gamma-ray strengths
- Fission transmission coefficients

- Fission reactions

- Generalities about fission
- Fission neutrons and gammas
- Fission yields
- Fission cross sections

- Prospects

FEW REMINDERS

Time scales and associated models





<u>Level</u> densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

Models sequence and required ingredients





LEVEL DENSITIES

Level densities



- Why and where do we need them ?

- Why ?
- Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment

Level densities

- Why and where do we need them ?

- Why ?
- Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment

cea



Level densities : why ?



19/10/2023



Level densities : why ?



19/10/2023



Level densities : why ?



19/10/2023

Level densities : where do we need them ?

 \Rightarrow partial or p-h level densities for pre-equilibrium model



P(n,E,t) = Probability to find for at time t the composite system with an energy E and an exciton number n.

 $\lambda_{a, b}$ (E) = Transition rate from an initial state a towards a state b for a given energy E.

$$\frac{dP(n,E,t)}{dt} = P(n-2, E, t) \lambda_{n-2, n}(E) + P(n+2, E, t) \lambda_{n+2, n}(E)$$
$$-P(n, E, t) \left[\lambda_{n, n+2}(E) + \lambda_{n, n-2}(E) + \lambda_{n, emiss}(E)\right]$$
$$Emission cross section in channel c$$
$$d\sigma_{c}(E, \varepsilon_{c}) = \sigma_{R} \int_{0}^{\infty} \sum_{n, \Delta n=2} P(n, E, t) \lambda_{n, c}(E) dt d\varepsilon_{c}$$

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

Cez

19/10/2023

The pre-equilibrium model : initialisation & transition rates



 $P(n, E, 0) = \delta_{n, n_0}$ with $n_0=3$ for nucleon induced reactions

Transition rates

$$\lambda_{n, n-2} (E) = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \langle M^2 \rangle \quad \omega(p,h,E) \text{ with } p+h=n-2$$

$$\lambda_{n, n+2} (E) = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \langle M^2 \rangle \quad \omega(p,h,E) \text{ with } p+h=n+2$$

$$\lambda_{n, c} (E) = \frac{2s_c+1}{\pi^2 \hbar^3} \mu_c \, \varepsilon_c \, \sigma_{c,inv} \, (\varepsilon_c) \, \frac{\omega(p-p_b,h,E-\varepsilon_c-B_c)}{\omega(p,h,E)} \, Q_c(n) \, F_c$$

State densities

 $\omega(p,h,E)$ = number of ways of distributing p particles and h holes among all accessible single particle levels with the available excitation energy E



 \Rightarrow partial or p-h level densities for pre-equilibrium model

 \Rightarrow total level densities for compound-nucleus model

- Light particle emission in continuum bins
- Gamma decay
- **Fission cross section**

The compound nucleus model : multiple emission







$$\sigma_{NC} = \sum_{b} \sigma_{ab}$$
 where $b = \gamma$, n, p, d, t, ..., fission

$$\sigma_{ab} = \frac{\pi}{k_a^2} \sum_{J,\pi} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{(2J+1)}{(2s+1)(2I+1)} T_{lj}^{J\pi} \left(\alpha \right) \frac{\langle T_b^{J\pi}(\beta) \rangle}{\sum_{\delta} \langle T_d^{J\pi}(\delta) \rangle} W_{\alpha\beta}$$
with $J = I_{\alpha} + s_{\alpha} + I_A = j_{\alpha} + I_A$ and $\pi = (-1)^{I_{\alpha}} \pi_A$

and $\langle T_b(\beta) \rangle$ = transmission coefficient for outgoing channel β associated with the outgoing particle **b**

cea

The compound nucleus model : various decay channels



Possible decays

Emission to a discrete level with energy E_d

 $\langle T_{b}(\beta) \rangle = T_{lj}^{J\pi}(\beta)$ given by the O.M.P.

Emission in the level continuum

$$\langle T_{b}(\beta) \rangle = \int_{E}^{E + \Delta E} T_{lj}(\beta) \rho(E, J, \pi) dE$$

 $\rho(E,J,\pi)$ density of residual nucleus' levels (J, π) with excitation energy E

- Emission of photons, fission
 - **Specific treatment**

The compound nucleus model : various decay channels



Possible decays

Emission to a discrete level with energy E_d



The compound nucleus model : GOE triple integral



$$W_{a,l_{a},j_{a},b,l_{b},j_{b}} = \int_{0}^{+\infty} d\lambda_{1} \int_{0}^{+\infty} d\lambda_{2} \int_{0}^{1} d\lambda \frac{\lambda(1-\lambda)|\lambda_{1}-\lambda_{2}|}{\sqrt{\lambda_{1}(1+\lambda_{1})\lambda_{2}(1+\lambda_{2})}(\lambda+\lambda_{1})^{2}(\lambda+\lambda_{2})^{2}} \prod_{c} \frac{(1-\lambda T_{c,l_{c},j_{c}}^{J})}{\sqrt{(1+\lambda_{1}T_{c,l_{c},j_{c}}^{J})(1+\lambda_{2}T_{c,l_{c},j_{c}}^{J})}} \begin{cases} \delta_{ab}(1-T_{a,l_{a},j_{a}}^{J}) \\ \left[\frac{\lambda_{1}}{1+\lambda_{1}T_{a,l_{a},j_{a}}^{J}} + \frac{\lambda_{2}}{1+\lambda_{2}T_{a,l_{a},j_{a}}^{J}} + \frac{2\lambda}{1-\lambda T_{a,l_{a},j_{a}}^{J}}\right]^{2} + (1+\delta_{ab}) \\ \left[\frac{\lambda_{1}(1+\lambda_{1})}{(1+\lambda_{1}T_{a,l_{a},j_{a}}^{J})(1+\lambda_{1}T_{b,l_{b},j_{b}})} + \frac{\lambda_{2}(1+\lambda_{2})}{(1+\lambda_{2}T_{a,l_{a},j_{a}}^{J})(1+\lambda_{2}T_{b,l_{b},j_{b}})} \right] \end{cases}$$

 $+ \frac{2\lambda(1-\lambda)}{(1-\lambda T^J_{a,l_a,j_a})(1-\lambda T_{b,l_b,j_b})} \bigg] \bigg\}$

Optical model and compound nucleus model

19/10/2023

16

<u>cea</u>

Level densities

- Why and where do we need them ?

- Why ?
- Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment

Level densities

- Why and where do we need them ?
 - Why ?
 - Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment



Level densities : particule-hole level densities

State densities in ESM

- Ericson 1960 : no Pauli principle
- Griffin 1966 : no distinction between particles and holes
- Williams 1971 : distinction between particles and holes as well as between neutrons and protons but infinite number of accessible states for both particle and holes

$$\omega_{p_{\pi}h_{\pi}p_{\nu}h_{\nu}}(U) = g_{\pi}^{p_{\pi}+h_{\pi}}g_{\nu}^{p_{\nu}+h_{\nu}}\frac{(U-B)^{M-1}}{p_{\pi}!p_{\nu}!h_{\pi}!h_{\nu}!(M-1)!},$$

where M is the total number of particles and holes of both kinds and

$$B = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{p_{\pi}^2 + h_{\pi}^2 + p_{\pi} - h_{\pi}}{g_{\pi}} + \frac{p_{\nu}^2 + h_{\nu}^2 + p_{\nu} - h_{\nu}}{g_{\nu}} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h_{\pi}}{g_{\pi}} + \frac{h_{\nu}}{g_{\nu}} \right)$$

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023



Level densities : particule-hole level densities

State densities in ESM

- Ericson 1960 : no Pauli principle
- Griffin 1966 : no distinction between particles and holes
- Williams 1971 : distinction between particles and holes as well as between neutrons and protons but infinite number of accessible states for both particle and holes
- Běták and Doběs 1976 : account for finite number of holes' states
- Obložinský 1986 : account for finite number of particles' states (MSC)
- Anzaldo-Meneses 1995 : first order corrections for increasing number of p-h
- Hilaire and Koning 1998 : generalized expression in ESM





Refinement to the ESM

- Fu 1984 : advanced pairing correction
- Akkermans and Gruppelaar 1985 : ensure consistency between ph and total level densities
- Fu 1985 : advanced spin cut-off factor
- Kalbach 1995 : Inclusion and treatment of a gap in the ESM
- Harangozo 1998 : Energy dependent single particle state density g(ε)

Level densities

- Why and where do we need them ?
 - Why ?
 - Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment

20

Level densities

- Why and where do we need them ?

- Why ?
- Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment

20

Level densities : qualitative aspects from experiment





• Exponential increase of the cumulated number of discrete levels N(E) with energy

$$\Rightarrow \rho(E) = \frac{dN(E)}{dE}$$
 increases exponentially
$$\Rightarrow odd-even effects$$

- Mean spacings of s-wave neutron resonances at ${\rm B_n}$ of the order of few eV

$$\Rightarrow \rho(B_n)$$
 of the order of 10⁴ – 10⁶ levels / MeV

Level densities : qualitative aspects D₀ vs mass A





Iljinov et al., NPA 543 (1992) 517.

 \Rightarrow Mass dependency **Odd-even effects Shell effects**

cea

Level densities : qualitative aspects D_0 vs neutron number \dot{N}



Iljinov et al., NPA 543 (1992) 517.

⇒ Mass dependency Odd-even effects Shell effects

$$\frac{1}{D_0} = \rho (B_n, 1/2, \pi_t) \text{ for an even-even target}$$
$$= \rho (B_n, I_t+1/2, \pi_t) + \rho (B_n, I_t-1/2, \pi_t) \text{ otherwise}$$

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

23

19/10/2023



Level densities : quantitative analysis of D₀

$$\rho(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{J}, \pi) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{12} \frac{\exp(2\sqrt{aU'})}{a^{1/4}U^{5/4}} \frac{2\mathbf{J}+1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^3} \exp\left[\frac{(\mathbf{J}+1/2)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right] + \sigma^2 = \mathbf{I}_{rig} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{U}}{a}}$$

Level densities : quantitative analysis of D₀



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

24

cea
Level densities : quantitative analysis of D₀



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

24

cea

Level densities : quantitative analysis of D₀



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

cea



Level densities : Ignatyuk formula



cea

19/10/2023













cea







cea

19/10/2023







Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023

5

4

E (MeV)

2

3

Temperature law

 $N(E) = \exp\left(\frac{E - E_0}{T}\right)$

6

7

8

 ρ (E) = α

9

Fermi gaz (adjusted at B_n)

exp

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

Discrete levels

(spectroscopy)

19/10/2023

Level densities : More sophisticated analytical expression

• Superfluid model & Generalized superfluid model Ignatyuk et al., PRC 47 (1993) 1504 & RIPL3 paper (IAEA)

 \Rightarrow More correct treatment of pairing for low energies \Rightarrow Fermi Gas + Ignatyuk beyond critical energy

 \Rightarrow Explicit treatment of collective effects



- \Rightarrow **Collective enhancement** only if $\rho_{int}(U) \neq 0$ not correct for vibrational states
- \Rightarrow yet not the most used one in pratice

Level densities : collective levels



 \Rightarrow vibrational level sequence for a spherical even-even nucleus



3 coupled phonons

2 coupled phonons

1 phonon

other levels

Level densities : collective levels



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

29

cea

Level densities : explicit treatment of collective effect



 $\rho(U) = K_{vib}(U) \times K_{rot}(U,\beta) \times \rho_{int}(U)$



19/10/2023

Shell Model Monte Carlo

cea



Courtesy Y. Alhassid

31

Shell Model Monte Carlo approach

Agrawal et al., PRC 59 (1999) 3109 + Koonin et al, Phys. Rep. 278 (1997) 1 + Alhassid et al, Phys. Rev. Lett 99 (2007) 162504.

- \Rightarrow Realistic Hamiltonians but not global
- \Rightarrow Coherent and incoherent excitations treated on the same footing
- \Rightarrow Time consuming and not systematically applied





Shell Model Monte Carlo (collective effects vanishing)

neutron pair breaking proton pair breaking shape transition

19/10/2023



Idmodel 4 in TALYS

Mean Field + Statistical NLD formula

Partition function method applied to the discrete SPL scheme predicted by a MF model

$$\omega(U) = \frac{e^{S(U)}}{(2\pi)^{3/2}\sqrt{D(U)}} \qquad \qquad U(T) = E(T) - E(T = 0)$$

$$S(T) = 2\sum_{q=n,p} \sum_{k} \ln\left[1 + \exp(-E_q^k/T)\right] + \frac{E_q^n/T}{1 + \exp(-E_q^k/T)}$$
$$E(T) = \sum_{q=n,p} \sum_{k} \varepsilon_q^k \left[1 - \frac{\varepsilon_q^k - \lambda_q}{E_q^k} \tanh(\frac{E_q^k}{2T})\right] - \frac{\Delta_q^2}{G}$$

$$E(T) = \sum_{q=n,p} \sum_{k} \varepsilon_{q} \left[1 - \frac{E_{q}^{k}}{E_{q}^{k}} \tanh(\frac{2T}{2T}) \right] - N_{q}$$

$$N_{q} = \sum_{k} \left[1 - \frac{\varepsilon_{q}^{k} - \lambda_{q}}{E_{q}^{k}} \tanh(\frac{E_{q}^{k}}{2T}) \right]$$

$$\frac{2}{G_{q}} = \sum_{k} \frac{1}{E_{q}^{k}} \tanh(\frac{E_{q}^{k}}{2T})$$

$$\sigma^{2}(T) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=n,p} \sum_{k} \omega_{q}^{k^{2}} \operatorname{sech}^{2}(\frac{E_{q}^{k}}{2T})$$

nk In

19/10/2023

33

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea



Idmodel 4 in TALYS

HFBCS Statistical approach

Mean Field + Statistical NLD formula

$$\rho_{sph}(U,J) = \frac{2J+1}{2\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^3}} e^{-\frac{J(J+1)}{2\sigma^2}} \omega(U)$$

$$\rho_{def}(U,J) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K=-J}^{J} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\left[\frac{J(J+1)}{2\sigma_{\perp}^2} + \frac{K^2}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_{\perp}^2}\right)\right]} \omega(U)$$

The inclusion of rotational bands may increase the NLD by a factor of 10-70

→ Strong impact and sensitivity to the GS deformation of the nucleus !
→ deformation is known to disappear with increasing excitation

providing a smooth deformed ($f_{dam}=1$) to spherical ($f_{dam}=0$) transition, e.g.

$$f_{dam}(U) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{(U - E_{def})/d_u}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{1 + e^{(\beta_2 - \beta^*)/d_\beta}}\right]$$

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

Courtesy S. Goriely

Mean Field + Statistical NLD formula

- NLD formula within the statistical (partition function) method based on the Skyrme or Gogny HF-BCS/HFB ground-state properties
 - Single particle level scheme
 - Ground-state deformation parameters and energy
 - Pairing strength
- Microscopic NLD formula includes
 - Shell correction inherent in the mean field s.p. level scheme
 - Pairing correction (in the constant-G approximation) with blocking effects
 - Spin-dependence with microscopic shell and pairing effects
 - Deformation effects included in
 - the single-particle level scheme
 - the collective contribution of the rotational band on top of each intrinsic state
 - disappearance of deformation effects at increasing excitation energies

→ **Reliability**: Exact solution the analytical formulas tries to mimic

Accuracy: Competitive with parametrized formulas in reproducing experimental data



Idmodel 4 in TALYS









Comparison with experimental low-lying levels



NLD provided for all ~8000 $8 \le Z \le 110$ nuclei in table format

19/10/2023





Mean Field + Statistical NLD formula

Reliability: Exact solution the analytical formulas try to mimic **Accuracy**: Competitive with parametrized formulas in reproducing experimental data

But the MF + Statistical approach still makes fundamental approximations :

- Saddle point approximation
- Statistical distribution
- Simple vibrational / rotational enhancement
- Sensitive to the adopted potential, i.e SPL and pairing scheme
- Phenomenological deformed-to-spherical transition at increasing energies
- Partial particle-hole level densities incoherent with total NLD



Idmodel 4 in TALYS



Combinatorial approach

S. Hilaire & S. Goriely, NPA 779 (2006) 63 & PRC 78 (2008) 064307.

- \Rightarrow Direct level counting
- \Rightarrow Total (compound nucleus) and partial (pre-equilibrium) level densities
- \Rightarrow Non statistical effects (spin and parity in particular)

 \Rightarrow Global (tables)

See PRC 78 (2008) 064307 for details

Idmodel 5 in TALYS

- HFB + effective nucleon-nucleon interaction \Rightarrow single particle level schemes

- Combinatorial calculation \Rightarrow intrinsic p-h and total state densities ω_{ph} (U, K, π)





cea





19/10/2023

Idmodel 5 in TALYS

See PRC 78 (2008) 064307 for details

- HFB + effective nucleon-nucleon interaction \Rightarrow single particle level schemes

- Combinatorial calculation \Rightarrow intrinsic p-h and total state densities ω_{ph} (U, K, π)

- Collective effects \Rightarrow from state to level densities $\rho(U, J, \pi)$

1) folding of intrinsic states and vibrational states : $\omega = \omega_{ph} * \omega_{vib}$

19/10/2023









Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023





cea

19/10/2023





cea

19/10/2023





Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

44

<u>cea</u>





Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

44

<u>cea</u>





Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

44

cea





Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

44

<u>cea</u>

Idmodel 5 in TALYS

See PRC 78 (2008) 064307 for details

- HFB + effective nucleon-nucleon interaction \Rightarrow single particle level schemes

- Combinatorial calculation \Rightarrow intrinsic p-h and total state densities ω_{ph} (U, K, π)
- Collective effects \Rightarrow from state to level densities $\rho(U, J, \pi)$

folding of intrinsic states and vibrational states : ω= ω_{ph} * ω_{vib}
 construction of rotational bands for deformed nuclei

$$\rho(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{J}, \pi) = \sum_{\mathbf{K}} \omega \left(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{E}_{\text{rot}}^{\mathbf{JK}}, \mathbf{K}, \pi\right)$$

trivial relation for spherical nuclei

 $\rho(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{J}, \pi) = \omega (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K}=\mathbf{J}, \pi) - \omega (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K}=\mathbf{J}+1, \pi)$

cea




cea





cea



cea

19/10/2023





Idmodel 5 in TALYS

See PRC 78 (2008) 064307 for details

- HFB + effective nucleon-nucleon interaction \Rightarrow single particle level schemes

- Combinatorial calculation \Rightarrow intrinsic p-h and total state densities ω_{ph} (U, K, π)
- Collective effects \Rightarrow from state to level densities $\rho(U, J, \pi)$

1) folding of intrinsic states and vibrational states : $\omega = \omega_{ph} * \omega_{vib}$

2) construction of rotational bands for deformed nuclei

$$\rho(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{J}, \pi) = \sum_{\mathbf{K}} \omega \left(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{E}_{\text{rot}}^{\mathbf{JK}}, \mathbf{K}, \pi\right)$$

trivial relation for spherical nuclei

 $\rho(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{J}, \pi) = \omega (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K}=\mathbf{J}, \pi) - \omega (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K}=\mathbf{J}+1, \pi)$

- Phenomenological mixing of spherical and deformed level densities for small deformations

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

See PRC 78 (2008) 064307 and PRC 86 (2012) 064317 for details

 $\Rightarrow \text{ temperature (energy) dependent single particle level schemes}$ - Combinatorial calculation \Rightarrow intrinsic p-h and total state densities ω_{ph} (U, K, π)
- Collective effects \Rightarrow from state to level densities $\rho(U, J, \pi)$ 1) folding of intrinsic states and vibrational states : $\omega = \omega_{ph} * \omega_{vib}$ 2) construction of rotational bands for deformed nuclei $\rho(U, J, \pi) = \sum_{K} \omega (U + E_{rotp}^{JK} K, \pi)$ Predicted within the same theoretical framework (coherence)

trivial relation for spherical nuclei

TDHFB + effective nucleon-nucleon interaction

 $\rho(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{J}, \pi) = \omega (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K}=\mathbf{J}, \pi) - \omega (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{K}=\mathbf{J}+1, \pi)$

- Phenomenological mixing of spherical and deformed level densities for small deformations

_



Idmodel 6 in TALY



Neutrons levels around Fermi energy for ¹⁵²Sm

Idmodel 6 in TALYS



cea

For each temperature, the excitation energy is determined.

→ expected parabolic shape $(U \propto T^2)$ is observed.



Excitation energy as a function of the temperature

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023



Idmodel 6 in TALYS

Temperature evolution of nuclear structure properties relevant for level density calculations within the combinatorial model



Idmodel 6 in TALYS

19/10/2023



Lev

19/10/2023



60

U[MeV]

T=2.0MeV

80

100

Cea Leve

10°

0

20

40

19/10/2023



Leve

cea

19/10/2023



19/10/2023

023

52

<u>cea</u> Le





Idmodel 6 in TALYS

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023



Idmodel 6 in TALYS

Level densities and gamm

19/10/2023



Idmodel 6 in TALYS

→ Description similar to that obtained with other global approaches

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023



Idmodel 6 in TALYS



19/10/2023

55

cea



Excitation energy (MeV)

19/10/2023

55

cea

Level densities



- Why and where do we need them ?

- Why ?
- Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment

Level densities



- Why and where do we need them ?

- Why ?
- Where ?

- Particle-hole level densities for pre-equilibrium

- The equidistant spacing model
- Beyond the ESM

- Total level densities

- Qualitative features
- Quantitative analysis with analytical approaches
- Shell Model Monte Carlo approach
- HFB+BCS Statistical approach
- Combinatorial approach

- Impacts on cross sections

- Parity non equipartition
- Non-Gaussian spin distribution
- Governing competition
- Tabulated data adjustment

cea

Level densities : parity non-equipartition





cea



Non-statistical feature imply significant deviations from the usual gaussian spin dependence which have significant impact on isomeric production

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023



Level densities : govern competition











Level densities : table adjustment



cea

19/10/2023



Level densities : table adjustment



19/10/2023



Level densities : table adjustment



19/10/2023



Level densities : summary



Last Updated: 08/22/2013 12:00:23



FR 🔺 🏴 🔐 🗐 16:34 03/09/2014



Level densities : summary



Level der 🚱 📋 💿 🏉 👜 🛃 💽

FR 🔺 🏴 🔐 💷 16:34 03/09/2014



Level densities : summary



Last Updated: 08/22/2013 12:00:23



FR 🔺 🏴 🔐 🗐 16:34 03/09/2014

GAMMA-RAY STRENGTHS

Gamma-ray strengths



- Qualitative features
- Analytical approaches

- Microscopic approaches

- HFBCS-RPA
- HFB+QRPA
- Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics

Gamma-ray strengths



- Qualitative features
- Analytical approaches

- Microscopic approaches

- HFBCS-RPA
- HFB+QRPA
- Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics

Gamma-ray strengths : qualitative aspects from photoabsorption



Gamma-ray strengths : qualitative aspects from photoabsorption



Gamma-ray strengths : qualitative aspects from photoabsorption



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023
Gamma-ray strengths : qualitative aspects from photoabsorption



Gamma-ray strengths : qualitative aspects from photoabsorption V



cea

64

Gamma-ray strengths : Brink-Axel hypothesis



Two types of strength functions :

- the « upward » related to photoabsorption

$$\vec{f}_{\rm XL}(\epsilon_{\gamma}) = \frac{\epsilon_{\gamma}^{-2L+1}}{(\pi\hbar c)^2} \frac{\langle \sigma_{\rm XL}(\epsilon_{\gamma}) \rangle}{2L+1}.$$

- the « downward » related to g-decay

$$\overleftarrow{f}_{\rm XL}(\epsilon_{\gamma}) = \epsilon_{\gamma}^{-(2L+1)} \frac{\langle \Gamma_{\rm XL}(\epsilon_{\gamma}) \rangle}{D_l} \qquad \text{which the decay occurs}$$

Spacing of states from

Standard Lorentzian (SLO)
[D.Brink. PhD Thesis(1955); P. Axel. PR 126(1962)]

$$\overrightarrow{f} = \overrightarrow{f} \sim \frac{E_{\gamma} \Gamma_{r}^{2}}{(E_{\gamma}^{2} - E_{r}^{2})^{2} + E_{\gamma} \Gamma_{r}^{2}} \Rightarrow 0 \quad E_{\gamma} \to 0$$

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths : Brink-Axel hypothesis



Two types of strength functions :

- the « upward » related to photoabsorption



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths : Brink-Axel hypothesis



Two types of strength functions :

- the « upward » related to photoabsorption



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths : transmission coefficients



$$T^{k\lambda}(E,ε_{\gamma}) = 2\pi \int_{E}^{E+\Delta E} f(k,\lambda,ε_{\gamma}) ε_{\gamma}^{2\lambda+1} \rho(E-ε_{\gamma}) dE$$

k : transition type (E or M)

λ: transition multipolarity ε_γ: outgoing gamma energy

 $f(k,\lambda, \varepsilon_{\gamma})$: gamma strength function (several models)

Decay selection rules $S(k, \lambda, J_i^{\pi_i}, J_f^{\pi_f})$ from a level $J_i^{\pi_i}$ to a level $J_f^{\pi_f}$:

For <mark>Ε</mark>λ: π_f=(-1)^λ π_i For M λ : $\pi_f = (-1)^{\lambda+1} \pi_i$ $|J_i - \lambda| \le J_f \le J_i + \lambda$

(E1
$$\approx$$
 10 - 100 M1)
(XL \approx 10⁻³ XL-1)

experiment **Renormalisation method for thermal neutrons** $<\mathbf{T}_{\gamma}>=\mathbf{C}\sum_{\mathbf{J}_{i},\pi_{i}}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\sum_{\mathbf{J}_{f},\pi_{f}}\int_{0}^{\mathbf{B}_{n}}\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^{\mathbf{k}}(\varepsilon)\rho(\mathbf{B}_{n}-\varepsilon,\mathbf{J}_{f},\pi_{f})\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{k},\lambda,\mathbf{J}_{i},\pi_{i},\mathbf{J}_{i},\pi_{f})\mathbf{d}\varepsilon=2\pi<\mathbf{T}_{\gamma}>\frac{1}{\mathbf{D}_{\gamma}}$

Gamma-ray strengths



- Qualitative features
- Analytical approaches

- Microscopic approaches

- HFBCS-RPA
- HFB+QRPA
- Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics

Gamma-ray strengths



- Qualitative features

- Analytical approaches

- Microscopic approaches

- HFBCS-RPA
- HFB+QRPA
- Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics



Gamma-ray strengths : analytical approaches

Improved analytical expressions :

- 2 Lorentzians for deformed nuclei
- Account for low energy deviations from standard Lorentzians for E1
 - . Kadmenskij-Markushef-Furman model (1983)
 - \Rightarrow Enhanced Generalized Lorentzian model of Kopecky-Uhl (1990)
 - \Rightarrow Hybrid model of Goriely (1998)
 - \Rightarrow Generalized Fermi liquid model of Plujko-Kavatsyuk (2003)
- Reconciliation with electromagnetic nuclear response theory
 - \Rightarrow Modified Lorentzian model of Plujko et al. (2002)
 - \Rightarrow Simplified Modified Lorentzian model of Plujko et al. (2008)
- Update of SMLO in 2019
 - \Rightarrow Temperature dependence
 - \Rightarrow Adding extra-M1 strength at low energies
 - \Rightarrow guided by microscopic results

68

19/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths : Brink-Axel & Kopecky-Uhl



 $f_{X\ell}(E_{\gamma}) = K_{X\ell} \frac{\sigma_{X\ell} E_{\gamma} \Gamma_{X\ell}^2}{(E_{\gamma}^2 - E_{X\ell}^2)^2 + E_{\gamma}^2 \Gamma_{X\ell}^2} \quad \text{with} \quad K_{X\ell} = \frac{1}{(2\ell+1)\pi^2 \hbar^2 c^2}.$

Kopecky-Uhl (for E1) (option 1 in TALYS)

 $f_{E1}(E_{\gamma},T) = K_{E1} \left[\frac{E_{\gamma} \tilde{\Gamma}_{E1}(E_{\gamma})}{(E_{\gamma}^2 - E_{E1}^2)^2 + E_{\gamma}^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_{E1}(E_{\gamma})^2} + \frac{0.7 \Gamma_{E1} 4\pi^2 T^2}{E_{E1}^3} \right] \sigma_{E1} \Gamma_{E1}$

with
$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{E1}(E_{\gamma}) = \frac{\Gamma_{E1}}{E_{E1}^2} \frac{E_{\gamma}^2 + 4\pi^2 T^2}{E_{E1}^2}$$
 and $T = \sqrt{\frac{E_n + S_n - \Delta - E_{\gamma}}{a(S_n)}}$

⇒ Deformed nuclei : incoherent sum of two Lorentzians

 \Rightarrow Parameters taken from experimental fit of data (RIPL-III) for measured nuclei

⇒ From global systematics otherwise

 $\sigma_{E1} = 1.2 \times 120 NZ / (A\pi\Gamma_{E1}) \text{ mb}, \quad E_{E1} = 31.2 A^{-1/3} + 20.6 A^{-1/6} \text{ MeV}, \quad \Gamma_{E1} = 0.026 E_{E1}^{1.91} \text{ MeV}.$

 $\sigma_{E2} = 0.00014Z^2 E_{E2}/(A^{1/3}\Gamma_{E2})$ mb, $E_{E2} = 63.A^{-1/3}$ MeV, $\Gamma_{E2} = 6.11 - 0.012A$ MeV.

Level densities and gamma-ray sucryurs

cea

69

13/ IU/ZUZJ



Gamma-ray strengths : Brink-Axel



- \Rightarrow Deformed nuclei : two Lorentzians = two peaks \Rightarrow Lorentzian centroid energy decreasing with A
- \Rightarrow M1 much weaker than E1 \Rightarrow **log scale**

cea

Gamma-ray strengths : Brink-Axel in log scale



⁹⁰Zr (spherical)

²³⁸U (deformed)



 \Rightarrow Deformed nuclei : two Lorentzians = two peaks

- \Rightarrow Lorentzian centroid energy decreasing with A
- \Rightarrow Strength \rightarrow 0 for E \rightarrow 0 (ok for gamma absorption but not for gamma decay)

Gamma-ray strengths : various models in TALYS





- \Rightarrow Deformed nuclei : two Lorentzians = two peaks
- \Rightarrow Lorentzian centroid energy decreasing
- \Rightarrow E1 = (10 100) M1 « where it counts »
- \Rightarrow Kopecky-Uhl or Hybrid model correct low energy behavior of Brink-Axel when
- Level densitic considering gamma decay rather than gamma absorption



Gamma-ray strengths : analytical approaches

Improved analytical expressions :

- 2 Lorentzians for deformed nuclei
- Account for low energy deviations from standard Lorentzians for E1
 - . Kadmenskij-Markushef-Furman model (1983)
 - \Rightarrow Enhanced Generalized Lorentzian model of Kopecky-Uhl (1990)
 - \Rightarrow Hybrid model of Goriely (1998)
 - \Rightarrow Generalized Fermi liquid model of Plujko-Kavatsyuk (2003)
- Reconciliation with electromagnetic nuclear response theory
 - \Rightarrow Modified Lorentzian model of Plujko et al. (2002)
 - \Rightarrow Simplified Modified Lorentzian model of Plujko et al. (2008)
- Update of SMLO in 2019
 - \Rightarrow Temperature dependence
 - \Rightarrow Adding extra-M1 strength at low energies
 - \Rightarrow guided by microscopic results

19/10/2023





Improved analytical expressions :

- 2 Lorentzians for deformed nuclei
- Account for low energy deviations from standard Lorentzians for E1
 - . Kadmenskij-Markushef-Furman model (1983)
 - \Rightarrow Enhanced Generalized Lorentzian model of Kopecky-Uhl (1990)
 - \Rightarrow Hybrid model of Goriely (1998)

\Rightarrow Many choices and parameters : extrapolation at your own risks !

- Re

Except maybe the latest SMLO !

- Update of SIVILO IN 2019
 - \Rightarrow Temperature dependence
 - \Rightarrow Adding extra-M1 strength at low energies
 - \Rightarrow guided by microscopic results



The newly proposed Simplified M1 Lorentzian Model (SMLO)

$$\overrightarrow{f_{M1}}(\varepsilon_{\gamma}) = \frac{1}{3\pi^2 \hbar^2 c^2} \sigma_{sc} \frac{\varepsilon_{\gamma} \Gamma_{sc}^2}{(\varepsilon_{\gamma}^2 - E_{sc}^2)^2 + \varepsilon_{\gamma}^2 \Gamma_{sc}^2} \\ + \frac{1}{3\pi^2 \hbar^2 c^2} \sigma_{sf} \frac{\varepsilon_{\gamma} \Gamma_{sf}^2}{(\varepsilon_{\gamma}^2 - E_{sf}^2)^2 + \varepsilon_{\gamma}^2 \Gamma_{sf}^2}$$

Scissors mode for deformed nuclei

Spin-Flip mode

where the SMLO M1 properties are inspired from the D1M+QRPA predictions

$$\overleftarrow{f_{M1}}(\varepsilon_{\gamma}) = \overrightarrow{f_{M1}}(\varepsilon_{\gamma}) + C \exp(-\eta \varepsilon_{\gamma})$$
 M1 upb

A1 upbend for de-excitation

where the upbend properties are inspired from the Shell Model predictions

$C = 3.5 \ 10^{-8} \exp(-6\beta_2) \ \mathrm{MeV^{-3}}$	Schwengner et al. 2017
$\eta = 0.8$	Sieja 2017
	Midtbø et al. 2018

...

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023



Gamma-ray strengths : SMLO 2019



cea



Gamma-ray strengths : SMLO 2019



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths



- Qualitative features

- Analytical approaches

- Microscopic approaches
 - HFBCS-RPA
 - HFB+QRPA
 - Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics

Gamma-ray strengths

- Qualitative features
- Analytical approaches

- Microscopic approaches

- HFBCS-RPA
- HFB+QRPA
- Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics





Systematic approaches : all nuclei feasible

- « Those who know what is (Q)RPA don't care about details, those who don't know don't care either », private communication
 - \Rightarrow Systematic QRPA with Skm/RMF forces
 - \Rightarrow Systematic QRPA with Gogny force

Local approaches : regional study only

 \Rightarrow Shell Model approach













Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023









Photoabsorption : E1 transitions dominate $0^+ \Rightarrow 0^-, 1^-$











Photoabsorption : E1 transitions dominate $0^+ \Rightarrow 0^-$, 1⁻

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023



cea



cea

Photoabsorption : E1 transitions dominate $0^+ \Rightarrow 0^-, 1^-$



+ Broadening with a Lorentzian

$$S_{E_1}(E) = \sum_{i} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma E^2}{[E^2 - (\omega_i - \Delta(\omega_i))^2]^2 + \Gamma^2 E^2} B_{E_1}(\omega_i)$$

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023

Photoabsorption : E1 transitions dominate $0^+ \Rightarrow 0^-, 1^-$



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

79

<u>cea</u>

Photoabsorption : E1 transitions dominate $0^+ \Rightarrow 0^-$, 1⁻



79

cea

Gamma-ray strengths : QRPA raw results



QRPA provides with emission probability between an excited state and the GS



 \Rightarrow Broadening necessary to account for damping of collective motion

19/10/2023
Gamma-ray strengths : QRPA broadened results

QRPA provides with emission probability between an excited state and the GS



 \Rightarrow Shift to account for phonon couplings + beyond 1p-1h approximation \Rightarrow Peak normalization to improve experimental data fitting

19/10/2023





Fig. 4. Ratio of the peak cross section $\sigma_{\max}(th)$ estimated within the HFB + QRPA model with the BSk7 Skyrme force to the experimental value $\sigma_{\max}(exp)$ for the 48 spherical nuclei as a function of the mass number A.

See S. Goriely & E. Khan, NPA 706 (2002) 217. S. Goriely et al., NPA739 (2004) 331.

19/10/2023

82

Level densitie:



Gamma-ray strengths : deformed nuclei



Fig. 5. Photoabsorption cross section for 235 U. The dots correspond to experimental data [16]. The dotted line is the HFB + QRPA calculation obtained with the BSk7 force in the spherical approximation (applying the damping method) and the full line when applying in addition our phenomenological procedure to describe deformation effects. Both cross sections have been shifted by 0.5 MeV upwards to reproduce the low energy tail.

See S. Goriely & E. Khan, NPA 706 (2002) 217. S. Goriely et al., NPA739 (2004) 331.

19/10/2023

5

Level densities

Gamma-ray strengths : QRPA for exotic nuclei





19/10/2023



QRPA calculations can accurately reproduce experimental data, provided empirical corrections are made, *i.e.*

- Empirical damping of collective motions \rightarrow broadening
- Empirical Energy shift (beyond 1p-1h excitations and phonon couplings)
- Empirical deformation effects for spherical calculations

19/10/2023



QRPA calculations can accurately reproduce experimental data, provided empirical corrections are made, *i.e.*

- Empirical damping of collective motions \rightarrow broadening
- Empirical Energy shift (beyond 1p-1h excitations and phonon couplings)
- Empirical deformation effects for spherical calculations

Can be removed within the axial Gogny QRPA framework but high computational cost

Gamma-ray strengths : axial Gogny QRPA approach



Extremely high computational cost !

QRPA calculations performed to

computing time for a given K^{π} with 1024 cpu

N_{sh}	No cut	$\varepsilon_c = 100 \text{ MeV}$	$\varepsilon_c = 60 \text{ MeV}$	$\varepsilon_c = 30 \text{ MeV}$
9	5'	5'	4'	38"
11	2 h	2 h	$1\mathrm{h}$	5'
13	$42 \ h$	26 h	6 h	30'
15	$21 \mathrm{d}$	8 d	30 h	$2\mathrm{h}$
17	286 d	63 d	$7 \mathrm{d}$	$8\mathrm{h}$

1) perform sensitivity analyses w.r.t :

- effective interaction (D1S vs D1M)
- nuclear deformation
- quasiparticle energy cut-off **e**_c
- number of major shells N_{sh}
- compromise accuracy vs computing time

2) compute QRPA strengths for all nuclei included in the IAEA RIPL-3 database

3) compute low energy collective states

- 4) Add "global" corrections to theoretical predictions to fit data
- 5) Produce tables for all nuclei

Gamma-ray strengths : adjustment method





with

$$L(E,\omega) = \frac{K}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma E^2}{[E^2 - (\omega - \Delta)^2]^2 + \Gamma^2 E^2}$$

where K, Δ and Γ can be adjusted

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths : broadening of 2 MeV only



 \Rightarrow Shift to account for phonon couplings + beyond 1p-1h approximation \Rightarrow Peak normalization to improve experimental data fitting

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

19/10/2023



Gamma-ray strengths : all parameters adjusted



 \Rightarrow Good agreement with data \Rightarrow Systematic predictions can be performed

Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

19/10/2023

89

<u>cea</u>



Gamma-ray strengths : deformed QRPA vs Brink-Axel



 \Rightarrow Significant structure for M1 transitions



Gamma-ray strengths : shell model

Shell Model approach

E. Caurier et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 77 (2005) p410-427

 \Rightarrow Very precise

 \Rightarrow Even-even, odd-A, odd-odd nuclei treated on the same footing

- \Rightarrow Possibility to predict within the same framework
 - spectra
 - transitions between any excited state
 - weak decays (beta, double-beta, ...)
 - pairing, deformation, ...

But

 \Rightarrow local (parameters adjusted on exp. data for each mass region)

 \Rightarrow Not applicable everywhere due to the dimension of the matrices

to diagonalize when large valence spaces are required







Gamma-ray strengths : shell model



⇒ Shell model : first microscopic model reproducing low energy experimental data related to gamma decay

cea



 \Rightarrow Shell model validates the non-vanishing of the strength at low energy as phenomenologically introduced in some analytical formulae

cea

Gamma-ray strengths : shell model lesson





 \Rightarrow Shell model shows that both E1 and M1 non vanishing low energy strength stem from intra-band transitions.

Gamma-ray strengths



- Qualitative features
- Analytical approaches

- Microscopic approaches

- HFBCS-RPA
- HFB+QRPA
- Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics

Gamma-ray strengths



- Qualitative features
- Analytical approaches
- Microscopic approaches
 - HFBCS-RPA
 - HFB+QRPA
 - Shell Model

- Impacts on cross sections

- Normalizations
- Exotic nuclei
- Hot topics

Gamma-ray strengths : normalizations

cea



Gamma-ray strengths : normalizations





Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

.9/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths : normalizations





Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea





19/10/2023





Gamma-ray strengths : Hot topics



Low energy upbend of gamma-ray strength observed in several experiment



particle- γ coincidence in the (³He, $\alpha\gamma$) & (³He,³He' γ) reactions

Upbend observed for ^{44,45}Sc, ^{50,51}V, ^{56,57}Fe, ⁷³⁻⁷⁴Ge, ⁹³⁻⁹⁸Mo, Sm but not (yet) for Sn, Dy, Er or Yb

The *M*1 character of the upbend seems to be confirmed by shell model calculations (though an *E*1 character cannot be excluded yet)



R. Schwengner et al. (2013); Brown & Larsen (2014); Sieja (2016)

A.-C. La Optical model and compound nucleus model

cea

19/10/2023

Gamma-ray strengths : Hot topics



Low energy upbend of gamma-ray strength observed in several experiment

particle- γ coincidence in the (³He, $\alpha\gamma$) & (³He,³He' γ) reactions



Upbend interpreted by Shell model as transitions between excited states (intra-band) rather than between excited states and ground state.

Could be calculated within QRPA framework provided a few more developments and "much more calculation"





R. Schwengner et al. (2013); Brown & Larsen (2014); Sieja (2016)

Optical model and compound nucleus model

19/10/2023



Level densities and gamma-ray strengths

cea

Capture cross section OK but gamma spectra constrained by multiplicity not reproduced !





Capture cross section OK but gamma spectra constrained by multiplicity not reproduced !

cea

Capture cross section OK but gamma spectra constrained by multiplicity not reproduced !

 \Rightarrow New resonance added at energies around 4 MeV (E1 or E2 pygmy resonance or M1 scissor mode)



cea

19/10/2023

Capture cross section OK but gamma spectra constrained by multiplicity not reproduced !





Capture cross section OK but gamma spectra constrained by multiplicity not reproduced !

 \Rightarrow New resonance added at energies around 4 MeV (E1 or E2 pygmy resonance or M1 scissor mode)



19/10/2023



Capture cross section OK + gamma spectra OK and no more arbitrary normalization



19/10/2023



cea

19/10/2023 1

Gamma-ray strengths : Gogny QRPA vs analytical





Gamma-ray strengths : Gogny QRPA vs analytical



Comparison of D1M+QRPA+0lim and SMLO with $<\Gamma_{\gamma}>$ data

$$\langle \Gamma_{\gamma} \rangle = \frac{D_0}{2\pi} \sum_{X,L,J,\pi} \int_0^{S_n + E_n} T_{XL}(\varepsilon_{\gamma}) \times \rho(S_n + E_n - \varepsilon_{\gamma}, J, \pi) d\varepsilon_{\gamma}$$



Open diamonds = CT + BSFG Full diamonds = HFB + Combinatorial

cea

Both PSF models reproduce ~230 < Γ_{γ} > within ~ 30-50%

ເອ/ ເບ/2023



Gamma-ray strengths : various options in TALYS

projectile n

- element u
- mass 278
- oporav 1
- energy 1.
- strength $1 \rightarrow 10$
- strength = 1 : GLO model (Kopecky & Uhl 1990)
- strength = 2 : SLO model
- strength = 3 : Skyrme-HFBCS + QRPA
- strength = 4 : Skyrme-HFB + QRPA
- strength = 5 : Hybrid model
- strength = 6 : *T*-dependent Skyrme-HFB + QRPA
- strength = 7 : *T*-dependent RMF-HFB + QRPA
- strength = 8 : Gogny-HFB + QRPA
- strength = 9 : SMLO 2019
- strength =10 : T-dependent Bsk27-HFB + QRPA

With many options to modify/adjust the strength parameters

- Analytical formulas (strength=1,2,5): σ_i , Γ_i , E_i , ... for GR and PR
- Microscopic formulas (strength=3-4,6-8): "etable", "ftable", "wtable"


Gamma-ray strengths : summary



Last Updated: 08/22/2013 12:00:23





FR 🔺 🕨 🖬 👍 🏚 03/09/2014



Gamma-ray strengths : summary



FR 🔺 🏴 🔐 🕼

03/09/2014



Gamma-ray strengths : summary



Last Updated: 08/22/2013 12:00:23





FR 🔺 🕨 🖬 👍 🏚 03/09/2014

FISSION TRANSMISSION COEFFICIENTS

FISSION TRANSMISSION To be discussed on thursday !

cea