#### THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF PROTON EMISSION FOLLOWING BETA-DECAY OF <sup>56</sup>ZN

<u>W. A. Richter<sup>1</sup></u>, N. A. Smirnova and B. Blank<sup>2</sup>, B. A. Brown<sup>3</sup>, N. Benouaret<sup>4</sup>, Y. H. Lam<sup>5</sup>.

- <sup>1</sup> iThemba LABS and University of the Western Cape, South Africa
- <sup>2</sup> CENBG, CNRS/INP2P3, University of Bordeaux, France
- <sup>3</sup>NSCL, Michigan State University, USA
- <sup>4</sup> USTHB, Algeria
- <sup>5</sup> Key Laboratory of High Precision Nuclear Spectroscopy, Lanzhou, China



#### **OUTLINE**

Introduction: First observation of  $\beta$ -delayed  $\gamma$ -proton decay in the fp shell – Zn-56 (Dossat NPA 792, 2007)

Detailed measurements (Orrigo PRL 112, 2014) Strong isospin mixing of T=2, 0<sup>+</sup> IAS with nearby 0<sup>+</sup>, T=1 state deduced

Question: Why is gamma de-excitation from IAS observed in competition with p decay ? Similar intensities

This work addresses this question using shellmodel calculations with 2 INC interactions

## INTRODUCTION

To explain the observed proton decays to Ni-55 (T=1/2) from the IAS in Cu-56, which are isospin forbidden, it is assumed that the IAS mixes with a nearby T=1 state.

From experiment there is a 0+ T=1 state at 3423 keV i.e. 85 keV below the IAS.

A striking feature of the decay is that the proton and gamma decay widths are very similar, despite a large amount of isospin mixing.

 $I_p = 18.8(10)\%$  and  $I_\gamma = 19.2(10)\%$ 



To understand the decay features and to cross-check theoretical descriptions, we performed large-scale shell-model calculations in the full fp shell.

## **Interactions used:**

1) cdGX1A (NuShellX). Based on GXPF1A with addition of Coulomb, strong charge-asymmetry and chargeindependence-breaking interactions and isovector SPE.

2) cdKB3G (ANTOINE) based on KB3G with addition of Coulomb and isovector SPE.



# **Isospin mixing of the IAS**

Suppose the mixing can be modelled as the admixture of a close-lying 0+, T=1 state (two-level mixing). Thus

$$|IAS> = \sqrt{1-\alpha 2} |T=2> + \alpha |T=1>$$

It is concluded from the splitting of the Fermi strength B(F) from the 0+ ground state of Zn-56 that  $\alpha 2 = 33(10)\%$ .

Thus despite this large mixing and Ep = 2948(10) keV proton decay is not the dominant mode but comparable to  $\gamma$  decay

Using 
$$R = \frac{B(F)3432}{B(F)3508} = 0.69(20)$$
 (exp) and

 $\Delta E = 85(10) \ keV$ , mixing matrix element is

 $V = \Delta E.R/(1+R^2) \sim 40$  keV.

The spectroscopic factor for proton emission from the IAS can be expressed as  $S^{IAS} = \alpha^2 S^{T=1}$ 

In 1<sup>st</sup> order perturbation theory the magnitude of mixing is proportional to  $(V/\Delta E)^2$ 

The mixing matrix elements  $V_{INC}$  for the two interactions are reasonably well reproduced (20 keV – cdGX1A and 48 keV – cdKB3G) but the energy spacings are much too large, resulting in a small amount of mixing of the order of 1%.

In Table I we show spectroscopic factors for the 0<sup>+</sup>, T=1 state in Cu-56 and the 0<sup>+</sup> IAS, but deduce the latter by using the experimental amount of mixing.

The values are somewhat larger than the experimental spectroscopic factors, but still quite small.

TABLE I: Comparison of experimental and theoretical quantities of <sup>56</sup>Zn. The  $\beta$ -decay half-life of <sup>56</sup>Zn, the excitation energy of the 0<sup>+</sup> IAS and of the admixed 0<sup>+</sup> state in <sup>56</sup>Cu are shown together with their electromagnetic and proton decay characteristics.

	Exp	cdGX1A	cdKB3G	
$^{56}$ Zn				
$T_{1/2} [{\rm ms}]$	32.9(4)	35(4)	24(4)	
$^{56}$ Cu, 0 <sup>+</sup> ,IAS				
$E^{IAS}$ [MeV]	3.508(140)	3.505	3.827	
$S^{IAS}$	$0.12(4) \times 10^{-3}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.1 \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_p^{IAS}$ [eV]	0.13(4)	1.6(1)	3.2(2)	
$\Gamma_{\gamma}^{IAS}$ [eV]		0.16	0.11	
$^{56}$ Cu, 0 <sup>+</sup> , T=1				
$E^{T=1}$ [MeV]	3.423(140)	2.910	3.456	
$S^{T=1}$	$0.4(1) \times 10^{-3}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.4 \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_p^{T=1}$ [eV]	0.32(8)	3.6(2)	7.7(3)	
$\Gamma_{\gamma}^{T=1}$ [eV]		0.04	0.02	
$\alpha^2$ (%)	33(10)	11	34	

TABLE II: Excitation energies, interaction mixing matrix element and spectroscopic factors of the lowest  $0^+$  states in  ${}^{56}$ Cu with respect to proton emission to the  $7/2^-$  ground state of  ${}^{55}$ Ni. The values corresponding to the IAS are shown in bold.

State	cdGX1A			cdKB3G		
	$E^*$	$V_{\rm INC}$	$S_p$	$E^*$	$V_{INC}$	$S_p$
	[MeV]	$[\mathrm{keV}]$		[MeV]	$[\mathrm{keV}]$	
$0_{1}^{+}$	1.253	25	0.0590	1.469	16	0.0336
$0_{2}^{+}$	2.675	20	0.0083	3.456	48	0.0094
$0^{+}_{3}$	2.910	20	0.0044	3.827	-	0.0002
$0_{4}^{+}$	3.505	-	0.0021	4.007	16	0.0076
$0_{5}^{+}$	3.511	3	0.0035	4.611	1	0.0044

The main conclusion of our analysis is that the hindrance of the proton decay from the IAS is due to a very small overlap between the admixed 0<sup>+</sup>, T=1 state of <sup>56</sup>Cu and the ground state of <sup>55</sup>Ni plus an  $f_{7/2}$  proton.

Proton emission from the admixed 0<sup>+</sup>, T=1 state is allowed by the isospin quantum number selection rule, however, it is hindered by nuclear structure effects.

