Giant dipole resonance in Sm isotopes within TDHF method

A. Ait Ben Mennana^{1 a} and M. Oulne^{1 b}

¹ High Energy Physics and Astrophysics Laboratory, Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences SEMLALIA, Cadi Ayyad University, P.O.B. 2390, Marrakesh, Morocco.

Received: date / Revised version: date

Abstract. In this work, we have studied the isovector giant dipole resonance (IVGDR) in even-even Sm isotopes within time-dependent Hartree-Fock (TDHF) with four Skyrme forces SLy6, SVbas, SLy5 and UNEDF1. The approach we have followed is somewhat similar to the one we did in our previous work in the region of Neodymium (Nd, Z=60) [Physica Scripta (2020)]. We have calculated the dipole strength of $^{128-164}$ Sm, and compared with the available experimental data. An overall agreement between them is obtained. The dipole strength in neutron-deficient $^{128-142}$ Sm and in neutron-rich $^{156-164}$ Sm isotopes are predicted. Shape phase transition as well as shape coexistence in Sm isotopes are also investigated in the light of IVGDR. In addition, the correlation between the quadrupole deformation parameter β_2 and the splitting $\Delta E/\bar{E}_m$ of the giant dipole resonance (GDR) spectra is studied. The results confirm that $\Delta E/\bar{E}_m$ is proportional to quadrupole deformation β_2 .

1 Introduction

Giant resonances (GRs) represent an excellent example of collective modes of many, if not all, particles in the nucleus [1]. GRs are of particular importance because they currently provide the most reliable information about the bulk behavior of the nuclear many-body system. The so-called isovector giant diople resonance (IVGDR) is the oldest and best known of giant resonances. This is due to high selectivity for isovector E_1 in photo-absorption experiments. Several attempts of theoretical description of GDR have been made using the liquid drop model. Among them, Goldhaber and Teller (GT) interpreted it as collective vibrations of the protons moving against the neutrons in the nucleus with the centroid energy of the form $E_c \propto A^{-1/6}$ [2]. Somewhat later, Steinwedel and Jensen (SJ) interpreted it as a vibration of proton fluid against neutron fluid with a fixed surface where the centroid energy has the form $E_c \propto A^{-1/3}$ [3]. The experimental data are adjusted by a combination of these two [4]: in light nuclei, the data follow the law $A^{-1/6}$, while the dependence $A^{-1/3}$ becomes more and more dominant for increasing values of A. Since its first observation [5], it has been much studied both experimentally (see for example Refs. [4,6–8]) and theoretically (see for example Refs. [9–13]).

The GDR spectra of nucleus can predict its shape (spherical, prolate, oblate, triaxial). It has a single peak for heavier spherical nuclei while in light nuclei it is split into several fragments [1]. In deformed nuclei, the GDR strength is split in two components corresponding to oscillations of neutrons versus protons along and perpendicular to the symmetry axis [1,14]. Several microscopic approaches have been employed to study GDRs in deformed nuclei such as Separable Random-Phase-Approximation (SRPA) [11,15], time-dependent Skyrme-Hartree-Fock method [10,16], Relativistic Quasi-particle Random Phase Approximation (RQRPA) [17] and Extended Quantum Molecular Dynamics (EQMD) [18]. Experimentally, the GDR is induced by various ways such as photoabsorption [6, 7, 19] inelastic scattering [8,20], γ -decay [21].

The time-dependent Hartree-Fock (TDHF) [22] method has been employed in many works to investigate GRs in nuclei. It provides a good approximation for GR. Early, TDHF calculations concentrated on giant monopole resonance (GMR) [23,24] because they require only a spherical one-dimensional code. In the last few years with the increase in computer power, large scale TDHF calculations become possible with no assumptions on the spatial symmetry of the system [10, 25, 26]. Such calculations are performed by codes using a fully three dimensional (3D) Cartesian grid in coordinate space [27].

^a <u>e-mail:</u> azdine.benmenana@gmail.com

^b e-mail: oulne@uca.ma

A. Ait Ben Mennana, M. Oulne: Giant dipole resonance in Sm isotopes within TDHF method

In our previous work [13], TDHF method provided an accurate description of the GDR in ^{124–160}Nd isotopes. Four Skyrme forces were used in this work. We obtained an overall agreement with experiment with slight advantage for SLy6 [28]. In this paper, we aim to study another even-even isotopic chain namely ^{128–164}Sm with four Skyrme forces SLy6 [28], SLy5 [28], SVbas [29] and UNEDF1 [30]. The first three forces were used in our previous work [13] and gave acceptable results for GDR in Nd isotopes. The new Skyrme force UNEDF1 provided also satisfactory results in. Many previous experimental and theoretical works have studied the isotopic chain of Samarium Sm (Z = 62). From the experimental point of view one can see for example Ref. [7]) and from the theoretical one Refs. [12, 18]. Besides the study of GDR, many works (Refs. [12, 17, 31]) studied the so-called pygmy dipole resonance (PDR) which correspond to low-energy E₁ strength in nuclei with a pronounced neutron exces. The pygmy mode is regarded as vibration of the weakly bound neutron skin of the neutron-rich nucleus against the isospin-symmetric core composed of neutrons and protons [32]. In Ref. [12], the authors studied PDR in some spherical nuclei such as ¹⁴⁴Sm and deformed ones such as ^{152–154}Sm. For spherical nuclei, they found a concentration of the E₁ strength in low-energy between 8 and 10 MeV, whereas for deformed nuclei the dipole strength is fragmented into low-energy states. They also showed that the nuclear deformation increases the low-lying strength E₁ at E < 10 MeV. The PDR mode is out of our current work in which we aim at a description of the GDR which lie at a high excitation energy range of ~ 10-20 MeV.

In this paper, the TDHF approximation [33] has been applied to study the GDR and shape evolution in even-even Sm (Z=62) isotopes from mass number A=128 to A=164. This study is done with SKY3D code [27] which uses a fully three dimensional (3D) Cartesian grid in coordinate space with no spatial symmetry restrictions and includes all time-odd terms. Consequently, it is possible to study both spherical and deformed system within the limitation of mean field theory. Due to the open-shell nature of these nuclei, pairing and deformation properties must be taken into account in this study. Firstly, a static calculation gives some properties of the ground-state of the nucleus like root mean square (r.m.s), β_2 , γ . In dynamic calculation, the ground-state of the nucleus is boosted by imposing a dipole excitation to obtain the GDR spectra and some of its properties (resonance energies, width).

The paper is organized as follows: in Sec.2, we give a brief description of TDHF method and the GDR in deformed nuclei. In Sec.3, we present details of the numerical calculations. Our results and discussion are presented in Sec.4. Finally, Sec.5 gives the summary.

2 Time-Dependent Hartree-Fock method (TDHF) to giant resonances

2.1 TDHF method

The time-dependent Hartree-Fock (TDHF) approximation has been extensively discussed in several references [34–36]. A brief introduction of the TDHF method is presented as follows.

The TDHF is a self-consistent mean field (SCMF) theory which was proposed by Dirac in 1930 [22]. It generalizes the static hartree-Fock (HF) and has been very successful in describing the dynamic properties of nuclei such as for example, giant resonances [10, 23, 26, 37] and Heavy-ion collisions [25, 38].

The TDHF equations are determined from the variation of Dirac action

$$S \equiv S_{t_0,t_1}[\psi] = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt \left\langle \psi(t) \right| \left(i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} - \hat{H} \right) \left| \psi(t) \right\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is the Slater determinant, t_0 and t_1 define the time interval, where the action S is stationary between the fixed endpoints t_0 and t_1 , and \hat{H} is the Hamiltonian of the system. The energy of the system is defined as $E = \langle \psi | \hat{H} | \psi \rangle$, and we have

$$\langle \psi | \frac{d}{dt} | \psi \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle \varphi_i | \frac{d}{dt} | \varphi_i \rangle, \qquad (2)$$

where $|\varphi_i\rangle$ are the occupied single-particle states. The action S can be expressed as

$$S = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt \left(i\hbar \sum_{i=1}^N \langle \varphi_i | \frac{d}{dt} | \varphi_i \rangle - E[\varphi_i] \right)$$

=
$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt \left(i\hbar \sum_{i=1}^N \int dx \, \varphi_i^*(x, t) \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_i(x, t) - E[\varphi_i] \right)$$
(3)

The variation of the action S with respect to the wave functions φ_i^* reads

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \varphi_i^*(x,t)} = 0,\tag{4}$$

for each i = 1...N, $t_0 \le t \le t_1$ and for all x. More details can be found for example in Refs. [35, 39]. We finally get the TDHF equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\varphi_i(t) = \hat{h}[\rho(t)]\varphi_i(t) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le N.$$
 (5)

where \hat{h} is the single-particle Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian.

The TDHF equations (5) are solved *iteratively* by a small time step Δt during which we assume that the Hamiltonian remains constant. To conserve the total energy E, it is necessary to apply a symmetric algorithm by time reversal, and therefore to estimate the Hamiltonian at time $t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}$ to evolve the system between time t and $t + \Delta t$ [40, 41]

$$|\varphi(t+\Delta t)\rangle \simeq e^{-i\frac{\Delta t}{\hbar}h(t+\frac{\Delta t}{2})}|\varphi(t)\rangle.$$
(6)

2.2 Giant dipole resonance in deformed nuclei

In deformed axially symmetric nuclei, one of the most spectacular properties of the GDR is its splitting into two components associated to vibrations of neutrons against protons along (K=0) and perpendicularly to (K=1) the symmetry axis. Therefore, the GDR strength represents a superposition of two resonances with energies $E_i \sim R_i^{-1} \sim A^{-1/3}$ [3] where R is the nuclear radius, and even three resonances in the case of asymmetric nuclei. This splitting has been observed experimentally [4, 7, 8, 19] and treated theoretically by different models [10–12]. For the axially symmetric prolate nuclei, the GDR spectra present two peaks where the low-energy E_z corresponds to the oscillations along the major axis of symmetry and the high-energy $E_x = E_y$ corresponds to the oscillations along transverse minor axes of the nuclear ellipsoid, due to $E \sim R^{-1}$. For an oblate nucleus, it is the opposite situation to the prolate case. For triaxial nuclei, the oscillations along three axes are different *,i.e.*, $E_x \neq E_y \neq E_z$. For spherical nuclei, the vibrations along three axes degenerate and their energies coincide $E_x = E_y = E_z$.

3 Details of Calculations

In this work, the GDR in even-even ^{128–164}Sm isotopes has been studied by using the code Sky3D (v1.1) [27]. This code solves the HF as well as TDHF equations for Skyrme interactions [42]. Calculations were performed with four Skyrme functional: SLy6 [28], SLy5 [28], SVbas [29], UNEDF1 [30]. These Skyrme forces are widely used for the ground state properties (binding energies, radii...) and dynamics (as giant resonances) of nuclei including deformed ones. In particular they provide a reasonable description of the GDR: SLy6 [10,11], SVbas [29], SLy5 [16] and UNEDF1 [30]. The parameters set of these functionals used in this study is shown in Table 1.

UNEDF1	SVbas	SLy6	SLy5
-2078.328	-1879.640	-2479.500	-2484.880
239.401	313.749	-1762.880	483.130
1574.243	112.676	-448.610	-549.400
14263.646	12527.389	13673.000	13763.000
0.054	0.258	0.825	0.778
-5.078	-0.381	-0.465	-0.328
-1.366	-2.823	-1.000	-1.000
-0.161	0.123	1.355	1.267
0.270	0.300	0.166	0.166
76.736	124.633	122.000	126.000
	UNEDF1 -2078.328 239.401 1574.243 14263.646 0.054 -5.078 -1.366 -0.161 0.270 76.736	UNEDF1 SVbas -2078.328 -1879.640 239.401 313.749 1574.243 112.676 14263.646 12527.389 0.054 0.258 -5.078 -0.381 -1.366 -2.823 -0.161 0.123 0.270 0.300 76.736 124.633	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$

Table 1: Parameters (t, x) of the Skyrme forces used in this work.

A first step of calculation concerns a static calculation which allows to determine the ground state for a given nucleus. This state is obtained by solving the static HF + BCS equations (8) in a three-dimensional (3D) Cartesian mesh with a damped gradient iteration method on an equidistant grid and without symmetry restrictions [27].

$$\hat{h}\psi_i(x) = \epsilon_i\psi_i(x) \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, A,\tag{7}$$

where \hat{h} is the single-particle Hamiltonien, and ϵ_i is the single-particle energy of the state $\psi_i(x)$ with $x = (\mathbf{r}, \sigma, \tau)$. We used a cubic box with size a = 24 fm and a grid spacing of $\Delta x = 1.00$ fm in each direction. In SKY3D code [27], the static HF + BCS equations (7) are solved iteratively until a convergence is obtained *,i.e.*, when for example the sum of the single-particle energy fluctuations becomes less than a certain value determined at the beginning of the static calculation. In this study we take as a convergence value 10^{-5} which is sufficient for heavy nuclei (for more details see Ref. [27]. The pairing is treated in the static calculation, which allows to calculate the pairing energy

$$E_{pair} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{q \in \{p,n\}} V_{pair,q} \int d^3 r |\xi_q|^2 F(r)$$
(8)

where the pairing density ξ_q reads [27]

$$\xi(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\alpha \in \{p,n\}} \sum_{s} u_{\alpha} v_{\alpha} |\psi_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r},s)|^2$$
(9)

where v_{α} , $u_{\alpha} = \sqrt{1 - v_{\alpha}^2}$ are the occupation and non-occupation amplitude of single-particle state ψ_{α} , respectively, and the function F = 1 or $F = 1 - \rho/\rho_0$ gives a pure δ -interaction (DI), also called volume pairing (VDI) where $\rho_0 \to \infty$ or density dependent δ -interaction (DDDI), respectively, while $\rho_0 = 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ is the saturation density. $V_{P,N}$ represents the pairing strength which is obtained from the force definition in the SKY3D code [27].

In dynamic calculations, the ground-state wave function obtained by the static calculations is excited by an instantaneous initial dipole boost operator in order to put the nucleus in the dipole mode [10, 43, 44].

$$\varphi_{\alpha}^{(g.s)}(r) \longrightarrow \varphi_{\alpha}(r, t=0) = \exp(ib\hat{D})\varphi_{\alpha}^{(g.s)}(r), \tag{10}$$

where $\varphi_{\alpha}^{(g.s)}(r)$ represents the ground-state of nucleus before the boost, b is the boost amplitude of the studied mode, , and \hat{D} the associated operator. In our case, \hat{D} represents the isovector dipole operator defined as

$$\hat{D} = \frac{NZ}{A} \left(\frac{1}{Z} \sum_{p=1}^{Z} \boldsymbol{z}_p - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{z}_n \right)$$
$$= \frac{NZ}{A} \left(\boldsymbol{R}_Z - \boldsymbol{R}_N \right),$$
(11)

where \mathbf{R}_Z (resp. \mathbf{R}_N) measures the proton (resp. neutron) average position on the z axis.

The spectral distribution of the isovector dipole strength is obtained by applying a boost (10) with a small value of the amplitude of the boost b to stay well in the linear regime of the excitation. For a long enough time, the dipole moment $\hat{D} = \langle \psi(t) | \hat{D} | \psi(t) \rangle$ is recorded along the dynamical evolution. Finally, the dipole strength $S_D(\omega)$ can be obtained by performing the Fourier transform $D(\omega)$ of the signal $\hat{D}(t)$, defined as [45]

$$S_D(\omega) = \sum_{\nu} \delta(E - E_{\nu}) |\langle \nu | \hat{D} | 0 \rangle|^2.$$
(12)

Some filtering is necessary to avoid artifacts in the spectra obtained by catting the signal at a certain final time, in order to the signal vanishes at the end of the simulation time. In practice we use windowing in the time domain by damping the signal D(t) at the final time with $\cos\left(\frac{\pi t}{2T_{tin}}\right)^n$ [27].

$$D(t) \longrightarrow D_{fil} = D(t).cos \left(\frac{\pi t}{2T_{fin}}\right)^n,$$
(13)

where n represents the strength of filtering and T_{fin} is the final time of the simulation. More details can be founded in Refs. [27, 46].

In this work, all dynamic calculations were performed in a cubic space with $24 \times 24 \times 24 \text{ m}^3$ according to the three directions (x, y, z) and a grid spacing of 1 fm. We chose nt= 4000 as a number of time steps to be run, and dt = 0.2 fm/c is the time step, so $T_f = 800 \text{ fm/c}$ is the final time of simulation. Pairing is frozen in the dynamic calculation *i.e.*, the BCS occupation numbers are frozen at their initial values during time evolution.

4 Results and Discussion

In this section we present our numerical results of static calculations concerning some properties of the ground-state, and dynamic calculations concerning some properties of the GDR for $^{128-164}$ Sm nuclei.

4.1 Ground-state properties

The isotopic chain of Sm (Z=62) studied in this work displays a transition from spherical, when neutron number N is close to magic number N = 82, to the axially deformed shapes when N increases or decreases [7,18,47,48]. Among the properties of the ground-state of nuclei, there are the deformation parameters β_2 and γ which give an idea on the shape of the nucleus [45,49]. These deformation parameters are defined as follows [27]

$$\beta = \sqrt{a_0^2 + 2a_2^2} \qquad , \quad \gamma = atan\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}a_2}{a_0}\right) \tag{14}$$

$$a_m = \frac{4\pi}{5} \frac{Q_{2m}}{AR^2} , \quad R = 1.2A^{1/3}(fm),$$
 (15)

where Q_{2m} is the quadrupole moment defined as

$$Q_{2m} = \int \rho(\boldsymbol{r}) r^2 Y_{2m}(\theta, \varphi) d\boldsymbol{r}$$
(16)

The deformation parameters (β, γ) often called Bohr-Mottelson parameters are treated as a probe to select the groundstate of all nuclei in this article. Table 2 displays the numerical results obtained for the deformation parameters (β_2, γ) based on Eq. (14) of ^{128–164}Sm isotopes with four Skyrme forces, including the available experimental data from Ref. [50] and the HFB calculations based on the D1S Gogny force [51] for comparison. Fig. 1 shows the variation of β_2 as a function of neutrons number N.

Table 2: The deformation parameters (β_2, γ) calculated with UNEDF1, SVbas, SLy6, and SLy5 are compared with the experimental data are from Ref. [50], and data from Ref. [51].

Nuclei	UNEDF1	SVbas	SLy6	SLy5	HFB_Gogny. [51]	Exp. [50]
128 Sm	$(0.406; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.398; 4.8^{\circ})$	$(0.402; 8.6^{\circ})$	$(0.401; 7.6^{\circ})$	$(0.398; 8.0^{\circ})$	
130 Sm	$(0.393; 0.1^{\circ})$	$(0.377; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.381; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.381; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.377; 0.0^{\circ})$	
132 Sm	$(0.388; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.374; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.371; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.382; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.380; 0.0^{\circ})$	
134 Sm	$(0.377; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.399; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.308; 14.8^{\circ})$	$(0.314; 12.2^{\circ})$	$(0.436; 0.0^{\circ})$	0.366
136 Sm	$(0.260; 21.3^{\circ})$	$(0.252; 22.5^{\circ})$	$(0.261; 22.4^{\circ})$	$(0.263; 21.9^{\circ})$	$(0.252; 22.0^{\circ})$	0.293
138 Sm	$(0.205; 27.5^{\circ})$	$(0.207; 26.1^{\circ})$	$(0.228; 25.6^{\circ})$	$(0.227; 25.2^{\circ})$	$(0.183; 25.0^{\circ})$	0.208
140 Sm	$(0.026; 14.8^{\circ})$	$(0.113; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.181; 27.7^{\circ})$	$(0.181; 27.6^{\circ})$	$(0.147; 35.0^{\circ})$	
142 Sm	$(0.000; 20.6^{\circ})$	$(0.000; 14.4^{\circ})$	$(0.001; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.003; 17.0^{\circ})$	$(0.000; 0.0^{\circ})$	
144 Sm	$(0.001; 4.0^{\circ})$	$(0.000; 8.5^{\circ})$	$(0.000; 12.7^{\circ})$	$(0.000; 1.5^{\circ})$	$(0.000; 0.0^{\circ})$	0.087
146 Sm	$(0.014; 58.0^{\circ})$	$(0.052; 1.2^{\circ})$	$(0.063; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.064; 0.7^{\circ})$	$(0.045; 2.0^{\circ})$	
148 Sm	$(0.128; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.151; 0.2^{\circ})$	$(0.167; 3.6^{\circ})$	$(0.162; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.167; 0.0^{\circ})$	0.142
150 Sm	$(0.211; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.220; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.225; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.223; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.204; 0.0^{\circ})$	0.193
152 Sm	$(0.302; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.306; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.305; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.302; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.273; 0.0^{\circ})$	0.306
154 Sm	$(0.335; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.337; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.341; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.338; 0.0^{\circ})$	$((0.347; 0.0^{\circ})$	0.341
156 Sm	$(0.349; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.348; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.350; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.349; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.336; 0.0^{\circ})$	
158 Sm	$(0.357; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.356; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.362; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.363; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.351; 0.0^{\circ})$	
160 Sm	$(0.361; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.360; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.368; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.366; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.361; 0.0^{\circ})$	
162 Sm	$(0.365; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.362; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.369; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.367; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.360; 0.0^{\circ})$	
164 Sm	$(0.367; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.363;0.0^\circ)$	$(0.373;0.0^\circ)$	$(0.369; 0.0^{\circ})$	$(0.360;0.0^\circ)$	

From Fig.1, we can see the β_2 values of our calculations are generally close to experimental ones [50]. On the other hand, there is an agreement between our calculations and HFB theory based on the D1S Gogny force [51]. In the vicinity of the region where N = 82, the β_2 values show minima ($\beta_2 \simeq 0$) as expected because all nuclei with the magic number N=82 are spherical. For the ¹⁴⁰Sm nucleus, we find different results between the four Skyrme forces in this study. For the Skyrme forces SLy6 and SLy5, ¹⁴⁰Sm has a triaxial shape ($\gamma \simeq 28.0^{\circ}$). It has a prolate shape for SV-bas ($\gamma = 0.0^{\circ}$), and has an approximate spherical form for UNEDF1 force ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.026$). For comparison, Calculations by



Fig. 1: The Quadrupole deformation parameter β_2 of ^{124–160}Nd isotopes as function of their neutron number N. The experimental data are from Ref. [50].

Möller et al. [52], based on the finite-range droplet model, predicted the ground state of ¹⁴⁰Sm nucleus to be triaxial $(\gamma = 30.0^{\circ})$. In table 2, the (β_2, γ) values obtained in this work as well as those of HFB theory based on the D1S Gogny force [51] and avialable experimental data [50] show a shape transition from spherical ¹⁴⁴Sm (N=82) to deformed shape below and above the magic neutron number N=82. For ¹²⁸⁻¹⁴⁴Sm isotopes below N = 82, the isotopic chains exhibit a transition from prolate ($\gamma = 0.0^{\circ}$) to spherical shape ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.000$) passing through triaxial form (22.0° $\leq \gamma \leq 28.0^{\circ}$) for ¹³⁶⁻¹⁴⁰Sm isotopes, and for neutron number higher than N = 82, both the experimental and theoretical results show that the prolate deformation increases gradually and then saturates at a value which closes to $\beta_2 \simeq 0.368$.

4.2 Giant dipole resonance in ^{128–164}Sm nuclei

Based on the TDHF ground states for $^{128-164}$ Sm isotopes obtained in static calculations, we perform dynamic calculation such as GDR in this work to obtain some of its properties as we will see later.

4.2.1 The time evolution of the dipole moment $D_m(t)$

The dipole moment $D_m(t)$ defined by Eq. (11) allows to predict the collective motions of nucleons along the three directions x, y and z. The time evolution of $D_m^i(t)$ where i denotes x, y and z of ¹³⁸Sm, ¹⁴⁴Sm and ¹⁵⁴Sm is plotted in Fig. 2. We note that the collective motion of nucleons in GDR is done generally along two axes. The oscillation frequency ω_i is related to the nuclear radius R_i by $\omega_i \propto R_i^{-1}$ where $i \in \{x, y, z\}$. Fig. 2(a) shows the time evolution of dipole moment for ¹⁴⁴Sm and ¹⁵⁴Sm. For the ¹⁴⁴Sm nucleus, the three components $D_m^x(t)$, $D_m^y(t)$ and $D_m^z(t)$ are identical *i.e.*, the oscillation frequencies along the three axes are equal ($\omega_x = \omega_y = \omega_z$) which confirms that this nucleus has a spherical shape as we predicted in static calculations ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.000$). For the ¹⁵⁴Sm nucleus, the $D_m^x(t)$ and $D_m^y(t)$ values are identical and differ from the values of $D_m^z(t)$ *i.e.*, the oscillation frequencies along the two other axes x and y which they are equal $\omega_x = \omega_y$. This confirms that ¹⁵⁴Sm has a prolate shape because $\omega_z < \omega_x = \omega_y$ [19] which is consistent with our static calculations ($\gamma = 0.0^\circ$). We point out that we found almost the same situation for the prolate nuclei namely ¹³⁰⁻¹³⁴Sm and ¹⁴⁸⁻¹⁶⁴Sm. In Fig. 2(b), the values of the three components $D_m^i(t)$ are different from each other in the case of the ¹³⁸Sm nucleus. We notice that



Fig. 2: The dipole moment $D_m(t)$ as function of the simulation time t(fm/c) calculated with the Skyrme force SLy6 for ¹³⁸Sm, ¹⁴⁴Sm and ¹⁵⁴Sm.

the oscillation frequencies ω_i along the three axes are different from each other $\omega_x \neq \omega_y \neq \omega_z$ which confirms that this nucleus has a triaxial shape as we predicted in static calculations ($\gamma \simeq 25.0^\circ$). The same situation occurs for ¹³⁶Sm. We note also that the time evolution of dipole moment $D_m(t)$ is almost the same for the others Skyrme forces (SLy5, UNEDF1, SVbas) with an exception for some nuclei as ¹⁴⁰Sm. The periodicity of the three components $D_m^i(t)$ allows the excitation energies E_i to be estimated for the oscillations along each of the three axes. For ¹⁴⁴Sm, we obtain, for $D_m^x(t)$, $D_m^y(t)$ and $D_m^z(t)$, the same period T $\simeq 84.3$ fm/c giving an excitation energy $E_x = E_y = E_z \simeq 14.70$ MeV. This value is slightly lower than the experimental one $E_{GDR}^{exp.}=15.3\pm 0.1$ [7]. The table 3 shows the excitation energies for ¹³⁸Sm and ¹⁵⁴Sm nuclei with Skyrme force SLy6.

Table 3: The excitation energies along the three axes for ¹³⁸Sm and ¹⁵⁴Sm with Sly6, obtained from the time evolution of $D_m^i(t)$.

Nuclei	$E_x(MeV)$	$E_y(MeV)$	$E_z(MeV)$
138 Sm	14.75	16.52	13.40
154 Sm	15.62	15.62	11.90

4.2.2 GDR Spectrum

The calculation of the Fourier transform of the isovector signal D(t) allows to obtain the GDR energy spectrum. The spectral strength S(E) (12) is simply the imaginary part of the Fourier transform of D(t).

Figs. 3 - 6 display the GDR spectra in ^{128–164}Sm isotopes calculated with the four Skyrme forces, compared with the available experimental data [7]. It needs to be pointed out that the experimental data for Sm isotopes from A=128 to A=142, and from A=152 to A=160, and ¹⁴⁶Sm are not yet available. The calculated GDR spectra in ^{144–154}Sm isotopes together with the available experimental data [7] are shown in Fig.3. It can be seen that all four Skyrme forces give generally acceptable agreement with the experiment with a slight down-shift of the order of 0.5 MeV for SLy5, SLy6 in the case of the spherical nucleus ¹⁴⁴Sm and the weakly deformed ^{148–150}Sm nuclei , and slight up-shift (~ 0.5 MeV) for SVbas force. The agreement is better for deformed ^{152–154}Sm nuclei , where all Skyrme forces produce the deformation splitting, in which rare-earth nuclei as Samarium (Sm) with neutron number N≈90 show an example of shape transitions [7, 10, 13]. For ¹⁴⁴Sm (N=82), its GDR strength has a single-humped shape. The vibrations along the three axes degenerate *,i.e.*, they are the same resonance energy E_i ($E_x = E_y = E_z$), which confirms that this nucleus is spherical due to the relation $E_i \propto R_i^{-1}$ where $i \in \{x,y,z\}$ [3]. For ¹⁴⁸Sm and ¹⁵⁰Sm nuclei, the two resonance peaks move away slightly from each other but the total GDR presents one peak, so they are also weakly deformed nuclei with prolate shape. For ¹⁵²Sm and ¹⁵⁴Sm nuclei, the total GDR splits into two distinct peaks which confirms that these nuclei are strongly deformed with prolate shape since the oscillations along the major axis (K=0 mode) are characterized by lower frequencies than the oscillations perpendicular to this axis (K=1 mode) [14].

The isotope ¹⁴⁶Sm for which we do not have experimental data, SLy6, Sly5 and SVbas give a weakly deformed nucleus ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.06$) where the resonance peaks along the major and the minor axis are very close together, whereas UNEDF1 gives an approximate spherical nucleus ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.01$). Calculations in Ref. [48], based on the self-consistent Relativistic-Hartree-Bogoliubov (RHB) formalism, predicted a shape coexistence for ¹⁴⁶Sm. In order to verify the shape coexistence [53,54] in ¹⁴⁶Sm nucleus, we redid the static calculations several times from different initial deformations with SLy6 force. In all cases, we obtained two minima (prolate and oblate) whose their properties are displayed in Table 4. We can see that the difference in energy between these two minima is around $\Delta(B.E) \simeq 0.07$ MeV. This is a clear indication of a shape coexistence in ¹⁴⁶Sm nucleus. According to the value of deformation parameter γ , this competition of shape is between oblate ($\gamma = 60^{\circ}$) and prolate ($\gamma = 0^{\circ}$) shape, but the deformation is very weak ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.05$) in both cases. Fig.4 shows the calculated GDR spectra corresponding to two minima (prolate, oblate). It confirms this suggestion: the upper panel (Fig.4(a)) shows an oblate shape for ¹⁴⁶Sm due to oscillations along the shorter axis (K=0 mode) which are characterized by higher energies than the oscillations along the axis (|K|=1 mode) perpendicular to it, while the lower panel (Fig.4(b)) shows a prolate shape for this nucleus. In both cases, the deformation splitting ΔE between the two peaks is too small which confirms that this nucleus is very weakly deformed.

Table 4: The ground-state properties of two minima for ¹⁴⁶Sm nucleus.

Properties	Prolate minimum	Oblate minimum
Binding energy (B.E)	$-1999.73 { m MeV}$	$-1999.66 { m MeV}$
Root mean square (r.m.s)	4.970 fm	4.969 fm
Quadrupole deformation β_2	0.063	0.048
Deformation parameter γ	0°	60°

Fig.5 shows the GDR strength in neutron-deficient ¹²⁸⁻¹⁴²Sm isotopes. We can see that the deformation decreases gradually from the well deformed nucleus ¹²⁸Sm ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.4$) to the approximate spherical one ¹⁴²Sm ($\beta_2 \simeq 0.0$), *i.e.*, when the neutron number N increases and closes to the magic number N=82. We note that all Skyrme forces in this work give almost the same GDR spectra except for ¹⁴⁰Sm. According to the GDR strength along the three axes, the ¹²⁸Sm nucleus is weakly triaxial with SLy6, SLy5 and SVbas whereas it has a prolate shape with UNEDF1. For the ¹³⁰⁻¹³²Sm isotopes, all the four Skyrme forces predict a prolate shape for them. For ¹³⁴Sm, SVbas and UNEDF1 predict a prolate shape, while SLy5 and SLy6 give a weak triaxial shape. For ¹³⁶⁻¹³⁸Sm isotopes, we can see that the oscillations along the three axes correspond to different resonance energies E_i ($E_x \neq E_y \neq E_z$), which shows that these nuclei are deformed with triaxial shape. The four Skyrme forces give different results for ¹⁴⁰Sm as displayed in Fig.5. The SLy family (SLy5 and SLy6) predict a triaxial shape, SVbas predicts a prolate shape while UNEDF1 gives an approximate spherical shape. For ¹⁴²Sm, all Skyrme forces predict a spherical shape where the GDR strengths along the three axes are identical *,i.e.*, ($E_x = E_y = E_z$).

the three axes are identical *i.e.*, $(E_x = E_y = E_z)$. Fig.6 shows the GDR strength in neutron-rich ¹⁵⁶⁻¹⁶⁴Sm isotopes. We can see that all Skyrme forces provide quite similar results. From ¹⁵⁶Sm (N=94) to ¹⁶⁴Sm (N=102), the deformation gradually gets broader, and their GDRs acquire a pronounced double-humped shape. Therefore, these nuclei are strongly deformed with prolate shape since the oscillations energies along the longer axis (z-axis) are lower than those of oscillations along the short axis (x and





Fig. 3: (Color online) GDR spectra in the chain of $^{144-154}$ Sm calculated with SLy6, SLy5, SVbas and UNEDF1. The solid(red), dashed(green) and dotted-dashed(blue) lines denote the dipole strengths: total, along the long axis and the short axis (multiplied by 2) respectively. The calculated strength total is compared with the experimental data [7] depicted by black solid squares.



Fig. 4: (Color online) The calculated GDR spectra for ¹⁴⁶Sm with the Skyrme force SLy6.

y axes) ,*i.e.*, $E_z < E_x = E_y$.

In order to compare the results between different Skyrme forces under consideration, we plot their GDR spectra into one figure, together with experimental data. Fig.7 shows the GDR strength in ¹⁴⁴Sm, and ¹⁵⁴Sm calculated by the four Skyrme forces as well as the experimental data from Ref. [7]. It can be seen there is a dependence of the GDR spectra on various Skyrme forces. We note a small shift of the average peak position of ~ 1 MeV between these forces. The peak position of energy obtained with the Skyrme force SVbas is located highest among these four Skyrme forces. For the spherical nucleus ¹⁴⁴Sm, the Skyrme force UNEDF1 reproduces well the shape and the peak among the four Skyrme forces. The agreement is less perfect with other forces. The SLy5 and SLy6 forces give very similar results, the strength exhibits a slight downshift while a slight upshift with SVbas functional. For the deformed nucleus ¹⁵⁴Sm, there is an excellent agreement between the different functionals and the experiment, with a slight upshift for the K=1 mode for SVbas force. We can explain this dependence y the fact that it is linked to certain basic characteristics and nuclear properties of the Skyrme forces as shown in Table 5. The isovector effective mass m_1^*/m is related to the sum rule enhancement factor κ by $m_1^*/m = 1/(1+\kappa)$ [4], *i.e.*, the larger isovector effective mass corresponds to the lighter value of the enhancement factor. We can easily see that the increase of the factor κ (*i.e.*, low isovector effective mass m_1^*/m causes the GDR strength to shift towards the higher energy region, as indicated in Ref. [55] for the GDR in ¹⁵⁴Sm, ²³⁸U and ¹⁵⁴No, and in Ref. [56] for ¹⁷⁴Yb. For example, the large collective shift in SVbas can be related to a very high enhancement factor $\kappa = 0.4$ compared to other Skyrme forces. In addition to the dependence with the enhancement factor κ , Fig.7 also shows a connection between GDR energy and symmetry energy a_{sym} . The peak energy of the GDR moves towards the higher energy region when a_{sym} decreases, as pointed in Ref. [57] for the GDR in doubly magic 208 Pb, and in our previous work for Nd isotopes [13].







Fig. 5: (Color online) GDR spectra in the isotopic chain $^{128-142}$ Sm calculated with SLy6, SLy5, SVbas and UNEDF1. The solid(red), dashed(green) and dotted-dashed(blue) lines denote the dipole strengths: total, along the long axis and the short axis(multiplied by 2 except $^{136-140}$ Sm) respectively. The dotted (magenta) line denotes the strength along the third middle axis in the case of the triaxial nuclei $^{136-140}$ Sm.

25

25



Fig. 6: (color online) The GDR spectra in the isotopic chain $^{156-164}$ Sm calculated with SLy6, SLy5, SVbas and UNEDF1. The solid(red), dashed(green) and dotted-dashed(magenta) lines denote the dipole strengths: total, along the long axis and the short axis(multiplied by 2) respectively.



Fig. 7: (Color online) The calculated GDR spectra ¹⁴⁴Sm and ¹⁵⁴Sm with Skyrme forces UNEDF1, SLy6, SLy5 and SVbas for . the experimental data [7] are depicted by triangle.

Table 5: The sum rule enhancement factor κ , isovector effective mass $m_1^*/m = 1/(1+\kappa)$, and symmetry energy a_{sym} for the Skyrme forces under consideration.

Forces	m_1^*/m	κ	$a_{sym}(MeV)$
SLy6 [28]	0.80	0.25	31.96
SLy5 [28]	0.80	0.25	32.03
UNEDF1 [30]	$\simeq 1.00$	0.001	28.98
SVbas $[29]$	0.715	0.4	30.00

4.2.3 Relation between deformation splitting ΔE and quadrupole deformation β_2

As we mentioned above, the GDR strength splits into two peaks for deformed nuclei. Each peak corresponds to a resonance energy E_i of GDR. We denoted by E_1 and E_2 the energies corresponding to K=0 and K=1 modes respectively. The total resonance energy of giant resonance is defined by the formula [58]

$$E_m = \frac{\int_0^{+\infty} S(E)EdE}{\int_0^{+\infty} S(E)dE},\tag{17}$$

where S(E) (12) is the strength function of giant resonance. In Table 6, the resonance energies E_1 and E_2 of $^{128-164}$ Sm nuclei are presented, including the available experimental data from Ref. [7]. From this table, we can see an overall agreement between our results and the experimental data, with a slightly advantage for the Sly6 functional. For instance, the result of the semi-spherical 144 Sm gives E_{GDR}^{SLy6} =15.05 MeV which is very close to E_{GDR}^{Exp} =(15.30 ± 0.10) MeV. Also for deformed nuclei as 152 Sm and 154 Sm, the results (E_1, E_2) with SLy6 are very close to those of experiment.

	UNF	EDF1	SV	Bas	SL	Jy5	SI	Jy6	Exp	o. [6]
Nuclei	E_1	E_2	E_1	E_2	E_1	E_2	E_1	E_2	E_1	E_2
^{128}Sm	13.36	17.79	13.36	17.75	12.54	16.61	12.76	16.90		
130 Sm	13.32	17.68	13.46	17.64	12.58	16.49	12.82	16.76		
132 Sm	13.15	17.59	13.47	17.55	12.63	16.46	12.89	16.69		
134 Sm	13.22	17.43	13.22	17.60	12.96	16.13	13.22	16.35		
136 Sm	14.00	16.84	14.20	16.91	13.27	15.87	13.50	16.11	—	—
138 Sm	14.34	16.51	14.47	16.66	13.48	15.70	13.70	15.95	—	—
140 Sm	15.42	15.73	14.93	16.25	13.73	15.50	13.95	15.72	—	—
142 Sm	15.59	15.59	15.78	15.78	14.80	14.83	15.03	15.04	—	—
144 Sm	15.57	15.57	15.79	15.79	14.84	14.84	15.05	15.05	15.30 ± 0.1	—
146 Sm	15.27	15.45	15.45	15.85	14.15	14.95	14.34	15.16		
148 Sm	14.07	15.69	14.25	16.15	13.34	15.24	14.29	15.47	14.80 ± 0.1	—
150 Sm	13.40	15.86	13.62	16.31	12.91	15.38	13.06	15.59	14.60 ± 0.1	—
152 Sm	12.80	16.07	13.14	16.65	12.46	15.62	12.60	15.82	12.45 ± 0.1	$15.85 \pm \ 0.1$
154 Sm	12.53	16.06	12.93	16.98	12.23	15.70	12.37	15.91	12.35 ± 0.1	16.10 ± 0.1
156 Sm	12.36	15.97	12.80	16.55	12.12	15.64	12.26	15.82	—	—
158 Sm	12.22	15.84	12.69	16.47	12.01	15.60	12.15	15.77	_	—
160 Sm	12.08	15.69	12.35	16.37	11.87	15.51	12.07	15.69		
162 Sm	11.96	15.53	12.52	16.26	11.87	15.40	11.99	15.57		
164 Sm	11.84	15.37	12.44	16.14	11.82	15.33	11.95	15.50		

Table 6: The resonance energy centroids E_1 and E_2 of ${}^{128-164}$ Sm corresponding to oscillation along the major axis (K=0) and the minor axis (K=1) respectively. The experimental data are from ref. [7].

Fig. 8 displays the resonance energies (E_1, E_2) evolution as function of the neutron number N from ¹²⁸Sm (N=66) to ¹⁶⁴Sm (N=102). We can see for all the four Skyrme forces that the resonance energy E_1 along the major axis (k=0 mode) increases with the neutron number N (*i.e.*, mass number A) until the region around N=82 (magic number) and then trends to decreases. The opposite happens for the resonance energy E_2 , *i.e.*, it decreases with the increasing of N until N=82, and then gradually increases. We can clearly see that the SLy6 reproduces the experimental data best among the four Skyrme forces. It was shown to provide a satisfying description of the GDR for spherical and deformed nuclei [11,59]. The SV bas functional gives somewhat high values of E_1 and E_2 among the other forces due to its large enhancement factor κ (κ =0.4) as we discussed above.

In Fig. 9, we plotted the evolution of the GDR-splitting value $\Delta E = E_2 - E_1$ as a function of the neutron number N. It can be easily seen for all the four Skyrme forces, that the GDR splitting ΔE decreases gradually with the increase of N and then increases. It takes the minimum value $\Delta E=0$ at N=82 (magic Number) which corresponds to the spherical nucleus ¹⁴⁴Sm and achieves a maximum for strongly deformed nuclei as ¹⁶⁴Sm. Such a result confirms that the splitting of GDR is related to the deformation structure of nuclei.

Since the GDR-splitting is caused by the deformation, it is possible to relate the nuclear deformation parameter β_2 with the ratio $\Delta E/\bar{E}$, where \bar{E} is the mean resonance energy. Fig. 10 displays the correlation between the quadrupole deformation β_2 and $\Delta E/\bar{E}$ for ^{128–164}Sm nuclei calculated with the Skyrme forces under consideration. We can see for all of the four Skyrme forces that there is an almost linear relationship between $\Delta E/\bar{E}$ and β_2 , *i.e.*,

$$\Delta E/\bar{E} \simeq a.\beta_2,\tag{18}$$

where a is a parameter depending slightly on the Skyrme force. This fact confirms that the size of the GDR-splitting is proportional to the quadrupole deformation parameter β_2 . The relation (18) was already studied in Refs. [13,17,60].

5 Conclusion

The isovector giant dipole resonance (IVGDR) has been investigated in the isotopic chain of Samarium (Sm). The study covers even-even Sm isotopes from ¹²⁸Sm to ¹⁶⁴Sm. The investigations have been done within the framework of time dependent Hartree-Fock (TDHF) method based on the Skyrme functional. The calculations were performed with Four Skyrme forces: SLy6, SLy5, SVbas and UNEDF1. In static calculations, some properties of ground state like the deformation parameters (β_2, γ) have been calculated by using SKY3D code [27]. In dynamic calculations, the dipole moment $D_m(t)$ and the strength of GDR are calculated and compared with the available experimental data [7]. The results obtained showed that TDHF method can reproduce the shape and the peak of the GDR spectra. All four Skyrme forces generally reproduce the average position of the GDR strength with a small shift depending on the



Fig. 8: (Color online) The peak positions E_1 and E_2 of GDR in ${}^{128-164}$ Sm along major axis (square symbol) and minor axis (circle symbol) respectively. The experimental data are depicted by black square (E_1) and circle (E_2) .



Fig. 9: (Color online) The GDR-splitting ΔE as a function of the neutron number N for ^{128–164}Sm nuclei calculated with SLy6, SVbas, SLy5 and UNEDF1.



Fig. 10: (Color online) The correlation between the deformation parameter β_2 and the ratio $\Delta E/\bar{E}$. circles denote the data in the Sm isotopes and lines are the fitting results.

used Skyrme force. The agreement is better with the SLy6 force among these Skyrme forces. The GDR strengths in $^{128-142}$ Sm, 146 Sm and $^{156-164}$ Sm nuclei are also predicted in this work.

Finally, some properties of GDR (\bar{E} , E_1 , E_2 , ΔE) have been calculated with the four Skyrme forces. The results with SLy6 were very close to the experimental data compared to the other forces. A correlation between the ratio $\Delta E/\bar{E}$ and the quadrupole deformation parameter β_2 was found. For all Skyrme forces, we have found the relation $\Delta E/\bar{E} = a.\beta_2 + b$ with the value of b is negligible.

In the light of the successful description of the GDR in deformed nuclei with the TDHF method, it was expected that this latter can also be applied for treating the shape coexistence as we predicted for ¹⁴⁶Sm with the SLy6 force.

References

- 1. M. N. Harakeh and A. Woude, <u>Giant Resonances: fundamental high-frequency modes of nuclear excitation</u>, vol. 24. Oxford University Press on Demand, (2001).
- 2. M. Goldhaber and E. Teller Phys. Rev., vol. **74**, p. 1046, (1948).
- 3. J. Speth and A. van der Woude Reports on Progress in Physics, vol. 44, p. 719, (1981).
- 4. B. L. Berman and S. Fultz Reviews of Modern Physics, vol. 47, p. 713, (1975).
- 5. W. Bothe and W. Gentner <u>Z.Phys</u>, vol. **106**, p. 236, (1937).
- 6. P. Carlos, H. Beil, R. Bergere, A. Lepretre, and A. Veyssiere Nuclear Physics A, vol. 172, p. 437, (1971).
- 7. P. Carlos, H. Beil, R. Bergere, A. Lepretre, A. De Miniac, and A. Veyssiere Nuclear Physics A, vol. 225, p. 171, (1974).
- 8. L. Donaldson, C. Bertulani, J. Carter, and al. Physics Letters B, vol. 776, p. 133, (2018).
- 9. K. Goeke and J. Speth Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science, vol. 32, p. 65, (1982).
- 10. J. A. Maruhn, P. G. Reinhard, P. D. Stevenson, J. R. Stone, and M. R. Strayer Phys. Rev. C, vol. 71, p. 064328, (2005).
- 11. W. Kleinig, V. O. Nesterenko, J. Kvasil, P.-G. Reinhard, and P. Vesely Phys. Rev. C, vol. 78, p. 044313, (2008).
- 12. K. Yoshida and T. Nakatsukasa Phys. Rev. C, vol. 83, p. 021304, (2011).
- 13. A. A. B. Mennana, Y. E. Bassem, and M. Oulne Physica Scripta, vol. 95, p. 065301, 2020.
- 14. S. Josef, Electric and magnetic giant resonances in nuclei, vol. 7. World Scientific, (1991).

A. Ait Ben Mennana, M. Oulne: Giant dipole resonance in Sm isotopes within TDHF method

- V. Nesterenko, W. Kleinig, J. Kvasil, P. Vesely, and P.-G. Reinhard <u>International Journal of Modern Physics E</u>, vol. 16, p. 624, (2007).
- 16. S. Fracasso, E. B. Suckling, and P. Stevenson Physical Review C, vol. 86, p. 044303, (2012).
- 17. D. P. n. Arteaga, E. Khan, and P. Ring Phys. Rev. C, vol. 79, p. 034311, (2009).
- 18. S. S. Wang, Y. G. Ma, X. G. Cao, W. B. He, H. Y. Kong, and C. W. Ma Phys. Rev. C, vol. 95, p. 054615, (2017).
- 19. V. M. Masur and L. M. Mel'nikova Physics of Particles and Nuclei, vol. 37, p. 923, (2006).
- 20. E. Ramakrishnan, T. Baumann, and al. Physical review letters, vol. 76, p. 2025, (1996).
- 21. J. Gundlach, K. Snover, J. Behr, and al. Physical review letters, vol. 65, p. 2523, (1990)
- 22. P. A. M. Dirac Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, vol. 26, p. 376, (1930).
- 23. J. Błocki and H. Flocard Physics Letters B, vol. 85, p. 163, (1979).
- 24. P. Chomaz, N. Van Giai, and S. Stringari Physics Letters B, vol. 189, p. 375, (1987).
- 25. J. A. Maruhn, P.-G. Reinhard, P. D. Stevenson, and M. R. Strayer Phys. Rev. C, vol. 74, p. 027601, (2006).
- P. Stevenson, M. Strayer, J. Rikovska Stone, and W. Newton <u>International Journal of Modern Physics E</u>, vol. 13, p. 181, (2004).
- B. Schuetrumpf, P.-G. Reinhard, P. Stevenson, A. Umar, and J. Maruhn <u>Computer Physics Communications</u>, vol. 229, p. 211, (2018).
- 28. E. Chabanat, P. Bonche, P. Haensel, J. Meyer, and R. Schaeffer Nuclear Physics A, vol. 635, p. 231, (1998).
- 29. P. Klüpfel, P.-G. Reinhard, T. J. Bürvenich, and J. A. Maruhn Phys. Rev. C, vol. 79, p. 034310, (2009).
- M. Kortelainen, J. McDonnell, W. Nazarewicz, P.-G. Reinhard, J. Sarich, N. Schunck, M. V. Stoitsov, and S. M. Wild Phys. Rev. C, vol. 85, p. 024304, (2012).
- 31. C. Tao, Y. Ma, G. Zhang, X. Cao, D. Fang, H. Wang, et al. Physical Review C, vol. 87, no. 1, p. 014621, 2013.
- 32. N. Paar, D. Vretenar, E. Khan, and G. Colo Reports on Progress in Physics, vol. 70, no. 5, p. 691, 2007.
- 33. J. W. Negele Reviews of Modern Physics, vol. 54, p. 913, (1982).
- 34. Y. Engel, D. Brink, K. Goeke, S. Krieger, and D. Vautherin Nuclear Physics A, vol. 249, p. 215, (1975).
- 35. A. Kerman and S. Koonin Annals of Physics, vol. 100, p. 332, (1976).
- 36. S. E. Koonin, K. T. R. Davies, V. Maruhn-Rezwani, H. Feldmeier, S. J. Krieger, and J. W. Negele <u>Phys. Rev. C</u>, vol. 15, p. 1359, (1977).
- 37. P.-G. Reinhard, L. Guo, and J. Maruhn The European Physical Journal A, vol. 32, p. 19, (2007).
- 38. C. Simenel and A. Umar Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics, vol. 103, p. 19, (2018).
- 39. C. Simenel The European Physical Journal A, vol. 48, p. 152, (2012).
- 40. H. Flocard, S. E. Koonin, and M. S. Weiss Phys. Rev. C, vol. 17, p. 1682, (1978).
- 41. P. Bonche, S. Koonin, and J. W. Negele Phys. Rev. C, vol. 13, p. 1226, (1976).
- 42. T. Skyrme Nuclear Physics, vol. 9, p. 615, (1958).
- 43. C. Simenel and P. Chomaz Phys. Rev. C, vol. 80, p. 064309, (2009).
- 44. J. M. Broomfield and P. D. Stevenson Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics, vol. 35, p. 095102, (2008).
- 45. P. Ring and P. Schuck, The nuclear many-body problem. Springer-Verlag, (1980).
- 46. P.-G. Reinhard, P. D. Stevenson, D. Almehed, J. A. Maruhn, and M. R. Strayer Phys. Rev. E, vol. 73, p. 036709, (2006).
- J. Meng, W. Zhang, S. Zhou, H. Toki, and L. Geng <u>The European Physical Journal A-Hadrons and Nuclei</u>, vol. 25, p. 23, (2005).
- 48. T. Naz, G. Bhat, S. Jehangir, S. Ahmad, and J. Sheikh Nuclear Physics A, vol. 979, p. 1, (2018).
- 49. K. W. N. Takigawa, "Fundamentals of Nuclear Physics". Springer Japan, (2017).
- 50. S. RAMAN, C. NESTOR, and P. TIKKANEN Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables, vol. 78, p. 1, (2001).
- J.-P. Delaroche, M. Girod, J. Libert, H. Goutte, S. Hilaire, S. Péru, N. Pillet, and G. Bertsch <u>Physical Review C</u>, vol. 81, p. 014303, (2010).
- 52. P. Möller, R. Bengtsson, B. Carlsson, P. Olivius, T. Ichikawa, H. Sagawa, and A. Iwamoto <u>Atomic Data and Nuclear Data</u> Tables, vol. **94**, p. 758, (2008).
- 53. J. Wood, K. Heyde, W. Nazarewicz, M. Huyse, and P. Van Duppen Physics reports, vol. 215, p. 101, (1992).
- 54. K. Heyde and J. L. Wood Reviews of Modern Physics, vol. 83, p. 1467, (2011).
- 55. V. Nesterenko, W. Kleinig, J. Kvasil, P. Vesely, P.-G. Reinhard, and D. Dolci Physical Review C, vol. 74, p. 064306, (2006).
- 56. T. Oishi, M. Kortelainen, and N. Hinohara Phys. Rev. C, vol. 93, p. 034329, (2016).
- 57. J. R. Stone and P.-G. Reinhard Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics, vol. 58, p. 587, (2007).
- 58. U. Garg and G. Colò Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics, vol. 101, p. 55, (2018).
- V. Nesterenko, W. Kleinig, J. Kvasil, P. Vesely, and P.-G. Reinhard <u>International Journal of Modern Physics E</u>, vol. 17, p. 89, (2008).
- 60. K. Okamoto Phys. Rev., vol. 110, p. 143, (1958).