Induced Fission Dynamics



Dario Vretenar University of Zagreb

IEFT Breaking clear fission theory

J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. 47 (2020) 113002



Two basic microscopic approaches to the description of induced fission dynamics:

A) time- dependent generator coordinate method (TDGCM)

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \int_{\boldsymbol{q}\in E} \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{q} |\phi(\boldsymbol{q})\rangle f(\boldsymbol{q},t).$$

 \Rightarrow represents the nuclear wave function by a superposition of generator states that are functions of collective coordinates.

⇒ a fully quantum mechanical approach but only takes into account collective degrees of freedom in the adiabatic approximation.

 \Rightarrow no dissipation mechanism.

B) time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT)

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi_k(\boldsymbol{r},t) = \left[\hat{h}(\boldsymbol{r},t) - \varepsilon_k(t)\right]\psi_k(\boldsymbol{r},t),$$

$$i\frac{d}{dt}n_k(t) = n_k(t)\Delta_k^*(t) - n_k^*(t)\Delta_k(t),$$
 fluct
$$i\frac{d}{dt}\kappa_k(t) = [\varepsilon_k(t) + \varepsilon_{\bar{k}}(t)]\kappa_k(t) + \Delta_k(t)[2n_k(t) - 1]\kappa_k(t) + \Delta_k(t)[2n_k(t) - 1]\kappa_k(t)]$$

⇒ classical evolution of independent nucleons in mean-field potentials, cannot be applied in classically forbidden regions of the collective space, nor does it take into account quantum fluctuations.

 \Rightarrow automatically includes the one-body dissipation mechanism, but can only simulate a single fission event by propagating the nucleons independently.

The time-dependent generator coordinate method (TDGCM)



+ time-dependent Schrödinger equation for the collective wave function:

$$i\hbar \dot{g} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}g.$$

for the collective operator:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{N}^{-1/2} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{N}^{-1/2}$$

TDGCM in the Gaussian overlap approximation (TDGCM+GOA)

+ the overlap between two arbitrary generator states can be approximated by a Gaussian function:

$$\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{q},\boldsymbol{q}')\simeq\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{q}-\boldsymbol{q}')^{t}G(\bar{\boldsymbol{q}})(\boldsymbol{q}-\boldsymbol{q}')\right],$$

 \blacksquare the Hamiltonian kernel can be approximated: $\mathcal{H}(q,q') \simeq \mathcal{N}(q,q')h(q,q'),$

polynomial of degree two in the collective variables

ime-dependent Schroedinger-like equation for the collective wave function. The collective Hamiltonian:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} B(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} + V(\boldsymbol{\alpha}).$$

Example

Time-dependent Schroedinger-like equation for fission dynamics (axial quadrupole and octupole deformation parameters as collective degrees of freedom):

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}g(\beta_2,\beta_3,t) = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2}\sum_{kl}\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta_k}B_{kl}(\beta_2,\beta_3)\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta_l} + V(\beta_2,\beta_3)\right]g(\beta_2,\beta_3,t)$$

RMF+BCS quadrupole and octupole constrained deformation energy surface of 226 Th in the $\beta_2 - \beta_3$ plane.

TAO, ZHAO, LI, NIKŠIĆ, AND VRETENAR PHYSICAL REVIEW C **96**, 024319 (2017)

→ includes static correlations: deformations & pairing

→ does not include dynamic (collective) correlations that arise from symmetry restoration and quantum fluctuations around mean-field minima

-1702 -1705 -1708 -1712 -1715 11 50 1720 00 1720 -1718 4.0 3.5 -1721 3.0 2.5 -1724 2.0 Be -1728 1.5 N 1.0 LE B3 -1731 0.5 0.0 -1734 5 -0.5 6



 \Rightarrow continuity equation for the probability density:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|g(\beta_2,\beta_3,t)|^2 = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}(\beta_2,\beta_3,t)$$

...the probability current:

$$J_k(\beta_2,\beta_3,t) = \frac{\hbar}{2i} \sum_{l=2}^3 B_{kl}(\beta_2,\beta_3) \left[g^*(\beta_2,\beta_3,t) \frac{\partial g(\beta_2,\beta_3,t)}{\partial \beta_l} - g(\beta_2,\beta_3,t) \frac{\partial g^*(\beta_2,\beta_3,t)}{\partial \beta_l} \right]$$

The flux of the probability current through the scission hyper-surface provides a measure of the probability of observing a given pair of fragments at time t.

$$F(\xi, t) = \int_{t=0}^{t} dt \int_{(\beta_2, \beta_3) \in \xi} \mathbf{J}(\beta_2, \beta_3, t) \cdot d\mathbf{S}$$

The yield for the fission fragment with mass A:

$$Y(A) \propto \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}} \lim_{t \to +\infty} F(\xi, t)$$

Collective parameters

The mass tensor associated with $q_2 = \langle Q_2 \rangle$ and $q_3 = \langle Q_3 \rangle$ \implies perturbative cranking approximation

$$B_{kl}(q_2, q_3) = \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \left[\mathcal{M}_{(1)} \mathcal{M}_{(3)}^{-1} \mathcal{M}_{(1)} \right]_{kl}$$
$$\mathcal{M}_{(n),kl}(q_2, q_3) = \sum_{i,j} \frac{\langle i | \hat{Q}_k | j \rangle \langle j | \hat{Q}_l | i \rangle}{(E_i + E_j)^n} (u_i v_j + v_i u_j)^2$$



The mean energy is adjusted in such a way that:

$$\langle g(t=0)|\hat{H}_{\text{coll}}|g(t=0)\rangle = E_{\text{coll}}^*$$

The height of the fission barriers (in MeV) with respect to the corresponding ground-state minima:

	B_I	B_{II}^{asy}	B_{III}^{asy}	B_{II}^{sym}	$B_{III}^{\rm sym}$
90% pairing	8.23	9.47	7.74	15.64	6.38
100% pairing	7.10	8.58	7.32	14.21	5.72
110% pairing	5.92	7.78	7.09	12.72	5.17



Induced Fission - Finite Temperature Effects



Finite temperature effects:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial g(\boldsymbol{q},t)}{\partial t} = \hat{H}_{coll}(\boldsymbol{q})g(\boldsymbol{q},t)$$
$$\hat{H}_{coll}(\boldsymbol{q}) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2} \sum_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} B_{ij}(\boldsymbol{q}) \frac{\partial}{\partial q_j} + V(\boldsymbol{q})$$
$$\text{Helmholtz free energy:} \qquad F = E(T) - TS$$

... entropy of the compound nuclear system:

$$S = -k_B \sum_{k} \left[f_k \ln f_k + (1 - f_k) \ln(1 - f_k) \right]$$

... thermal occupation probabilities:

$$f_k = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta E_k}}$$

$$\rho_V = \sum_k \bar{\psi}_k(\boldsymbol{r}) \gamma^0 \psi_k(\boldsymbol{r}) [v_k^2(1 - f_k) + u_k^2 f_k],$$



$$\Delta_k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k'>0} V^{pp}_{k\bar{k}k'\bar{k'}} \frac{\Delta_{k'}}{E_{k'}} (1 - 2f'_k).$$

$$B_{ij}(\boldsymbol{q}) = \mathcal{M}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{q})$$

Perturbative cranking mass tensor: $\mathcal{M}^{Cp} = \hbar^2 M_{(1)}^{-1} M_{(3)} M_{(1)}^{-1}$

$$\begin{split} [M_{(k)}]_{ij,T} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} \langle 0|\hat{Q}_i|\mu\nu\rangle \langle \mu\nu|\hat{Q}_j|0\rangle \left\{ \frac{(u_\mu u_\nu - v_\mu v_\nu)^2}{(E_\mu - E_\nu)^k} \left[\tanh\left(\frac{E_\mu}{2k_B T}\right) - \tanh\left(\frac{E_\nu}{2k_B T}\right) \right] \right\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu\nu} \langle 0|\hat{Q}_i|\mu\nu\rangle \langle \mu\nu|\hat{Q}_j|0\rangle \left\{ \frac{(u_\mu v_\nu + u_\nu v_\mu)^2}{(E_\mu + E_\nu)^k} \left[\tanh\left(\frac{E_\mu}{2k_B T}\right) + \tanh\left(\frac{E_\nu}{2k_B T}\right) \right] \right\} \end{split}$$

... the initial state is a Gaussian superposition of quasibound states:

$$g(\boldsymbol{q}, t=0) = \sum_{k} \exp\left(\frac{(E_k - \bar{E})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) g_k(\boldsymbol{q})$$

The mean energy is adjusted in such a way that: $\langle g(t=0)|\hat{H}_{coll}|g(t=0)\rangle = E_{coll.}^*$

Free energy along the least-energy fission pathway.

Temperature dependence of the pairing energy.



The diagonal components of the mass tensor.







Dynamics of induced fission

Zhao, Nikšić, Vretenar, Zhou Phys. Rev. C **99**, 014618 (2019).

Charge yields:



Experimental results \implies photoinduced fission with photon energies in the interval 8 – 14 MeV, and a peak value E γ = 11 MeV.

T = 0.5, **0.75**, **1.0**, and 1.25 MeV \rightarrow corresponding internal excitation energies E* are: 2.58, **8.71**, **16.56**, and 27.12 MeV, respectively.



*The temperature is adjusted so that the intrinsic excitation energy corresponds to the experimental exc. energy.

Induced fission: dynamical pairing degree of freedom

Zhao, Nikšić, Vretenar Phys. Rev. C **104**, 044612 (2021).

SCMF deformation energy surface \Rightarrow constraints on the mass multipole moments and the particle-number dispersion operator: $\Delta \hat{N}^2 = \hat{N}^2 - \langle \hat{N} \rangle^2$.







Charge yields calculated in the 3D collective space \rightarrow deformation β_2 , β_3 and dynamical pairing λ_2 coordinates.

Comparison to the results obtained in the 2D space of β_2 and β_3 , with static pairing correlations adjusted to empirical ground-state pairing gaps (100% pairing strength), and enhanced (110% pairing strength). Effect of dynamical pairing on the flux of the probability current through the scission hyper-surface:

$$B(\lambda_2) \propto \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{B}} \lim_{t \to \infty} F(\xi, \lambda_2, t).$$

 \rightarrow time-integrated flux through the scission contour in the (β_2 , β_3) plane, for a given value of the pairing collective coordinate λ_2 .

Adiabatic evolution and dissipative dynamics



DEFORMATION

Negele et al. (1978) — use an adiabatic model for the time interval in which the fissioning nucleus evolves from the quasi-stationary initial state to the saddle point, and a non-adiabatic method for the saddle-to-scission and beyond-scission dynamics.



TDDFT fission trajectories





Dynamical synthesis of ⁴He in the scission phase of nuclear fission

TDDFT fission trajectories

Density profiles at times immediately prior to the scission event.



Ren, Vretenar, Nikšić, Zhao, Zhao, Meng (2022)



$$\tau_{q\sigma}^{\rm TF} = \frac{3}{5} (6\pi^2)^{2/3} \rho_{q\sigma}^{5/3}$$

For homogeneous nuclear matter: $C_{q\sigma} = 1/2$ For the a-cluster of four particles: $C_{q\sigma}(\vec{r}) \approx 1$





When are these light clusters formed?

What is their role in the scission mechanism?

What is their structure?

Methods (TDGCM, TDDFT) based on the framework of universal Energy Density Functionals

✓ ...accurate microscopic description of universal collective phenomena (fission) that reflect the organisation of nucleonic matter in finite nuclei.

- Finite temperature effects
- Energy dissipation and TKE of fragments
- Neck formation and scission mechanism
- Ternary fission
- Fragment angular momentum generation
- Symmetry restoration