

Gamow-Teller strengths in $A = 34$ isobars (II) - shell-model and DWBA calculations -

Y. Fujita¹ H. Fujita^{2,3} R. Neveling² T. Adachi¹ N.T. Botha⁴ K. Hatanaka⁵ T. Kaneda⁵ H. Matsubara⁵
K. Nakanishi⁵ Y. Sakemi⁵ Y. Shimizu⁵ F.D. Smit² A. Tamii⁵ and M. Yosoi⁵

¹*Department of Physics, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan*

²*iThemba LABS, Somerset West 7129, South Africa*

³*School of Physics, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg 2050, South Africa*

⁴*Department of Physics, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7700, South Africa*

⁵*Research Center for Nuclear Physics (RCNP), Osaka University, Ibaraki, Osaka 567-0047, Japan*

As mentioned in the previous article, the $B(\text{GT})$ values were deduced for GT states by using the ^{34}Ar β -decay $B(\text{GT})$ value of the strongly excited 3.129 MeV state as a normalization standard. For the strongly excited states at 2.580 and 3.129 MeV, a good proportionality was observed between the $^{34}\text{S}(^3\text{He}, t)^{34}\text{Cl}$ values and the $^{34}\text{Ar} \rightarrow ^{34}\text{Cl}$ β -decay $B(\text{GT})$ values. On the other hand, the $B(\text{GT})$ value of 0.091 obtained in the $(^3\text{He}, t)$ reaction for the 0.666 MeV state was 40% larger than that of the β -decay (see Table 1). We try to understand this enhancement by means of shell-model and DWBA calculations.

A shell-model calculation was performed using the WBP interaction [1] and the code OXBASH [2]. The calculated $B(\text{GT})$ values listed in column ten of Table 1 include the average renormalization factor of $(0.76)^2$ [3]. A one-to-one correspondence of GT states is observed. The calculated excitation energies and $B(\text{GT})$ values generally agree with the experimental values; even small $B(\text{GT})$ values of the 0.461 state is well reproduced.

In weak transitions, like the transitions to the 0.461, 0.666, and 4.212 MeV states, the two (or three) “normal $\Delta L = 0$ ” GT configurations that can be activated by the $\sigma\tau$ interaction interfere destructively and the strengths are almost cancelled. There is then a possibility that “ $\Delta L = 2$ ” configurations, like $(s_{1/2} \rightarrow d_{3/2})$, activated by the $T\tau$ (and/or the IV $L = 2$ spin) interaction become relatively important. The DWBA calculations, which included both the $\sigma\tau$ and $T\tau$ interactions ($V_{\sigma\tau} = -2.1$ MeV and $V_{T\tau} = -2.0$ MeV [4]), were performed using the one-body transition densities (OBTD) obtained in the SM calculation. The calculated cross sections at 0° are normalized by the SM $B(\text{GT})$ value of the 3.250 MeV state and given in the last column of Table 1. Most of the derived values were modified by less than 10%, but that of the 0.660 MeV state increased by about 80%, suggesting a constructive interference of the $\sigma\tau$ and $T\tau$ contributions.

Table 1: States in ^{34}Cl and GT transition strengths, $B(\text{GT})$, from $^{34}\text{Ar} \rightarrow ^{34}\text{Cl}$ β decay, and the present $^{34}\text{S}(^3\text{He}, t)^{32}\text{Cl}$ reaction. The results are further compared with the results of shell-model calculations. The configuration having the largest contribution to each GT transition is indicated by “Primary”, while those with less contributions are indicated by “Secondary”, where $d3$, $d5$, and $s1$ shows $1d_{3/2}$, $1d_{5/2}$, and $2s_{1/2}$ shells, respectively. A destructive interference is shown by the $-$ sign, while a constructive one by the $+$ sign. Excitation energies are in units of MeV.

| Evaluated values ^a | | Present experiment | | | | Shell-Model calculation | | | | DWBA $\sigma(0^\circ)^b$ | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|-------|-------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------|
| E_x | J^π | β decay | | E_x | L | $(^3\text{He}, t)$ $B(\text{GT})$ | Configuration | | $B(\text{GT})$ | | |
| | | $B(\text{GT})$ | $B(\text{GT})$ | | | | Primary | Secondary | | | |
| 0.0 | 0 ⁺ | | | 0.0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| 0.461 | 1 ⁺ | 0.019(2) | 0.458 | 0.458 | $0+ \geq 1$ | 0.025(3) | 0.317 | $(d3 \rightarrow d3)$ | $-(d5 \rightarrow d3)$ | 0.009 | 0.011 |
| 0.666 | 1 ⁺ | 0.064(3) | 0.666 | 0.666 | 0 | 0.091(7) | 0.660 | $(d3 \rightarrow d3)$ | $-(d5 \rightarrow d3)$ $-(d3 \rightarrow d5)$ | 0.090 | 0.164 |
| 2.580 | 1 ⁺ | 0.299(28) | 2.579 | 2.579 | 0 | 0.285(21) | 2.522 | $(s1 \rightarrow s1)$ | | 0.366 | 0.329 |
| 2.721 | 2 ⁻ | | 2.718 | 2.718 | ≥ 1 | | | | | | |
| 3.129 | 1 ⁺ | 1.369(95) ^c | 3.129 | 3.129 | 0 | 1.369(95) ^c | 3.250 | $(d5 \rightarrow d3)$ | $+(d3 \rightarrow d3)$ | 1.356 | 1.356 |

^aFrom Ref. [5].

^bValues are normalized by the $B(\text{GT})$ value (= 1.356) of the 3.250 MeV shell-model state.

^c $B(\text{GT})$ value used for the calibration of the $(^3\text{He}, t)$ values.

References

- [1] E.K. Warburton and B.A. Brown, Phys. Rev. C **46**, 923 (1992).
- [2] B.A. Brown *et al.*, NSCL rep. No. 524, and B.A. Brown, private communication.
- [3] B.A. Brown and B.H. Wildenthal, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **33**, 347 (1985).
- [4] R.G.T. Zegers *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 202501 (2003).
- [5] P.M. Endt and R.B. Firestone, Nucl. Phys. **A633**, 1 (1998).