

- tatal

5

ŕ

. د بر

P. 2

IC/75/51 INTERNAL REPORT (Limited distribution)

International Atomic Energy Agency

and

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS

TOPICAL MEETING

ON ELECTROMAGNETIC AND WEAK INTERACTIONS IN NUCLEI

30 April - 2 May 1975

(SUMMARIES AND CONTRIBUTIONS)

MIRAMARE - TRIESTE May 1975

D. DRECHSEL

## Institut für Kernphysik, Universität Mainz, Fed. Rep. Germany.

A survey of total and partial nuclear cross section sum rules for electron scattering is presented. Partial sum rule relations are applied to connect transition densities as well as static multipole moments, transition probabilities and radii of low-lying states of anharmonic vibrator nuclei.

By summing the electroexcitation cross section d $\mathbf{G}^{\bullet}$  over all final states it is possible to use closure to eliminate the final states and to relate observable quantities to ground state expectation values<sup>1,2</sup>. In particular

(1)

 $\int_{0}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{dr(q,\omega,\theta)}{dr_{no} \text{ structure}} = A(q) + B(q) \tan^{2} \frac{\theta}{2},$ where

 $A(q) = \sum_{n} \left\{ \frac{q_{\mu}^{4}}{q^{4}} | Q_{no}(q)|^{2} - \frac{q_{\mu}^{2}}{q^{2}} | j_{no}^{+r.}(q)|^{4} \right\}; B(q) = \sum_{n} |j_{no}^{+r.}(q)|^{2}.$ 12)

The sum rule quantities A and B may be measured separately as a function of momentum transfer q and are related to photonuclear sum rules at the photon point  $(q \rightarrow \omega)$ .

More general sum rules are obtained by weighing the cross section with additional powers of the excitation energy,  $\omega^{*}$ . For physical reasons it is useful to obtain separate sum rules for Coulomb and transverse current contributions.

There is some experimental information<sup>3)</sup> on the k = 0 sum rule, recent theoretical estimates<sup>4)</sup> find that statistical and dynamical correlations

- 11 -

tend to cancel. The effects of exchange currents on sum rules have been studied in a simple Fermi gas model<sup>5</sup>), finding modifications of the q-dependence in addition to the standard enhancement of the photonuclear Thomas-Reiche-Kuhn sum rule.

More detailed information is obtained by a decomposition of the sum rule relation into partial waves and isoscalar and isovector components. Assuming that the isoscalar density, which is little affected by exchange currents, commutes with the nucleon-nucleon potential, the following relation may be derived<sup>6</sup>) (note k = 0 in the following)

2∑ ωno Re { gno (q') gno (q) } = + q:q' goo (q'-q). (3)

(4)

From this "progenitor" sum rule one can obtain all previous static multipole sum rules as well as the more recent dynamical relations of Fallieros et al.<sup>7,8</sup>). While previous sum rule relations connected experimental quantities to ground state expectation values, we have recently generalized the sum rule technique and applied it to transition densities of the low-lying collective states of anharmonic vibrator nuclei<sup>9</sup>). We obtain, between general states  $J_i$  and  $J_f$ , the following potential wave decomposition corresponding to Eq.(3)

 $\langle J_{f} \parallel [f^{h}(q), [\hat{H}, \hat{F}^{h}(q)]]^{h} \parallel J_{i} \rangle = \sqrt{2L+1} \sum_{i} (\omega_{ni} \{ J_{i} J_{i} \} + J_{i} + J_$ 

Analying the exhaustion hypothesis of the sum rule within the collective band, it is nossible to solve a system of equations between those states and to relate transition strengths, radii and densities to static values. While recent collective interpretations of electron scattering on anharmonic vibrator nuclei have met with considerable success 10,111, this contribution shows that such results do not depend on the details of the (collective) model, but follow from relatively general sum rule relations.

The predictions obtained have been compared to the results of recent experiments of Neuhausen<sup>12</sup>) for various Zn isotopes. In view of the weakness of the exhaustion hypothesis the overall agreement is surprisingly good. Fig.1. shows the static density  $\textbf{Q}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}$  as well as the transition densities  $\textbf{Q}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}$  and  $\textbf{Q}_{\bullet\bullet\bullet}$  to the first ("one boson") and second ("two boson") quadrupole states, command to the experimental data for  $^{64}$ Zn. The additional fluctuations at small radii are of less practical importance than indicated in the figure, because physical quantities weigh the densities with higher powers of the radius, e.g.,  $r^4$  for transition probabilities.

These deviations are, however, typical of some remaining shell structure, particularly in the interior of the nucleus, as has been demonstrated in RPA calculations<sup>13</sup>. (Note that the relatively good agreement between sum rule prediction and transition density of the surface vibration mode indicates that the transition density of the giant quadrupole mode should have a similar behaviour, because the sum of both should fulfil the sum rule!)

Fig.2. demonstrates, that the present experimental data show a phase transition in Zn isotopes, favouring clearly the prolate shape in  $^{64}$ Zn and an oblate shape in  $^{68}$ Zn. In particular, the ratio of transition radii of two- to one-boson states,  $(R_{20}/R_{10})^2$ , increases from the sum rule prediction 0.76 for  $^{64}$ Zn to 1.19 for  $^{63}$ Zn, in precise agreement with the data.

The results show that electroexcitation data in connection with sum rule assumptions make it possible to get information on nuclear shapes and sizes in excited states, in addition to ground state expectation and transition quantities.

-86-

## References:

1) J.S. O'Connell, in "Proceedings of the International Conference on Photonuclear Physics and Applications", Asilomar (1973), Ed. B. Berman 2) H. Oberall, "Electron Scattering from Complex Nuclei", Part B, Academic Press (1971) 3) J.W. Lightbody Jr., Phys. Lett. 33B (1970) 129 4) A. Malecki and P. Picchi, Phys. Lett. 438 (1973) 351 5) A.Z. Mekjian, Phys. Rev. C9, (1974) 2084 6) J.V. Noble, Ann. Phys. 67 (1971) 98 7) E.I. Kao and S. Fallieros, Phys. Rev. Lett. 25 (1970) 827 8) T.J. Deal and S. Fallieros, Phys. Lett. 44B (1973) 224 9) P.G. Reinhard and D. Drechsel, Phys. Lett. (1975) 10) J.N. Lightbody Jr., Phys. Lett. 38 B (1972) 475 11) E. Borie, D. Drechsel and K. Lezuo, Nucl. Phys. A211 (1973) 393 12) R. Neuhausen, Report KPH 22/73, Inst. f. Kernphysik, Universität Mainz 13) G. Bertsch and S.F. Tsai, Phys. Lett. 50B (1974) 319





Fig.2

-35-