Recent developments in NN and 3N interactions for nuclear structure

Achim Schwenk



TRIUMF Theory Group

New Approaches in Nuclear Many-Body Theory, INT, Oct. 15, 2007

supported by



trshare.triumf.ca/~schwenk/

Outline

- 1. NN interactions: Chiral EFT and RG
- 2. Two-body operators
- 3. Three-nucleon interactions: a frontier status and challenges
- 4. Nuclear forces from lattice QCD
- 5. Convergence in nuclear structure calculations

Strong interaction physics in the lab and cosmos

Matter at the extremes: density $\rho \sim 10^{11} \dots 10^{15}$ g/cm³

neutron-rich to proton-rich $Z/N \sim 0.05...0.6$

temperatures T $\sim ...30$ MeV





Many-body challenges

Astrophysics challenges

Resolution Scale dependence of nuclear interactions

with high-energy probes: deconfined quarks+gluons

cf. scale/scheme dependence of parton distribution functions



Lattice QCD

Effective theory for NN, many-N interactions, operators depend on resolution scale Λ

 $H(\Lambda) = T + V_{NN}(\Lambda) + V_{3N}(\Lambda) + V_{4N}(\Lambda) + \dots$

momenta Q ~ λ^{-1} ~ m_{π}: chiral effective field theory nucleons interacting via pion exchanges and contact interactions typical Fermi momenta in nuclei ~ m_{π}

 $Q \ll m_{\pi}$ =140 MeV - pion not resolved: pionless effective field theory nucleons and contact interactions, large scattering lengths + corrections applicable to loosely-bound, dilute systems, reactions at astro energies



Weinberg, van Kolck, Kaplan, Savage, Wise, Epelbaum, Meissner, Nogga, Machleidt,...



Weinberg, van Kolck, Kaplan, Savage, Wise, Epelbaum, Meissner, Nogga, Machleidt,...

Open problems

Power counting with singular pion exchanges, tensor parts ~ $1/r^n$? promotion of contact interactions to lower order (needed beyond ...LO?) Nogga, Timmermans, van Kolck (2005)



FIG. 10: Fit result for the counterterm c_1 as a function of the cutoff, and the resulting cutoff dependence of the ${}^{3}P_{0}$ phase shift at laboratory energies of 10 MeV (solid line), 50 MeV (dashed line), 100 MeV (dotted line), and 190 MeV (dash-dotted line).

Delta-full vs. Delta-less EFT, m_{Δ} - $m_{N} \sim m_{\pi}$?

Counting of 1/m corrections, $m \sim \Lambda^2$ or Λ ? could be important for A_v

Explore breakdown scale value with Lepage plots

.

Renormalization group (RG) for nuclear forces

integrate out high-momentum modes that are not resolved and incorporate their effects in couplings of effective theory

schematically y=short

$$Z = \int dx \int dy \, e^{-S(x,y)} = \int dx \int dy \, e^{-a(x^2+y^2)-b(x^2+y^2)^2}$$

$$= \int dx \, e^{-S_{\text{eff}}(x)} = \int dx \, e^{-a'x^2-b'x^4-c'x^6+\dots}$$

x=long wavelength separate into slow and fast modes $\phi(\omega, k) = \begin{cases} \phi_{<}(\omega, k) & \text{for } \omega, k < \Lambda \\ \phi_{>}(\omega, k) & \text{else} \end{cases}$ and integrate out fast modes

$$\begin{split} Z &= \int \prod d\phi_{<}(\omega,k) \ e^{-S_{\rm free}[\phi_{<}]} \int \prod d\phi_{>}(\omega,k) \ e^{-S_{\rm free}[\phi_{>}] - S_{\rm int}[\phi_{<},\phi_{>}]} \\ &= \int \prod d\phi_{<}(\omega,k) \ e^{-S_{\rm eff}[\phi_{<}]} \end{split}$$

leads to resolution/ Λ -dependent couplings, Λ is not breakdown scale

applied to pionless EFT
$$C_0(\Lambda) = \frac{4\pi}{m} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{a_s} - \frac{2}{\pi}\Lambda}$$

low-energy physics determined by scattering length a_s

Low-momentum interactions from the Renormalization Group evolve to lower resolution/cutoffs by integrating out high-momenta, can be carried out exactly for NN interactions



Collapse in all partial waves

due to same long-distance pion exchange and phase shift equivalence



Connections to EFT



Weinberg eigenvalue diagnostic

study spectrum of $G_0(z)V |\Psi_{\nu}(z)\rangle = \eta_{\nu}(z) |\Psi_{\nu}(z)\rangle$ at fixed energy z governs convergence $T(z) |\Psi_{\nu}(z)\rangle = (1 + \eta_{\nu}(z) + \eta_{\nu}(z)^2 + ...) V |\Psi_{\nu}(z)\rangle$ can write as Schrödinger eqn $\left(H_0 + \frac{1}{\eta_{\nu}(z)}V\right) |\Psi_{\nu}(z)\rangle = z |\Psi_{\nu}(z)\rangle$

high momenta/large cutoffs lead to flipped-potential bound states of - λV for small λ /large $\eta \Rightarrow$ Born series always nonperturbative with cores

Repulsive core eigenvalues small for lower cutoffs



Advantages of lower cutoffs for nuclear structure





slow at 10-100keV level for sharp cutoffs

smooth cutoffs lead to great improvements Bogner, Furnstahl, Ramanan, AS (2007)



Low-momentum interactions with smooth cutoffs

P V_{low k}(Λ) P replaced by smooth regulators Bogner, Furnstahl, Ramanan, AS (2007)

 $V_{\operatorname{low} k}(k',k) = f(k') v(k',k) f(k)$

constructed by effective interaction methods or equivalent smooth-cutoff RG equation





regulator choice = scheme dependence exp, Fermi-Dirac,... regulator

smooth cutoff $V_{low k}(\Lambda)$ reproduces NN observables up to $f^{2}(k)$ factor

Similarity RG interactions (SRG)

Unitary transformations to band-diagonal $V_{srg}(\lambda)$ with cutoff $\lambda = s^{-1/4}$ Bogner, Furnstahl, Perry (2007) evolution of 3N seems feasible

$$\frac{dV_s(k,k')}{ds} = -(k^2 - k'^2)^2 V_s(k,k') + \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty q^2 dq \left(k^2 + k'^2 - 2q^2\right) V_s(k,q) V_s(q,k')$$

reproduces all NN observables

low momentum transfer around the diagonal



Are low-energy nuclear observables sensitive to high-energy phase shifts?

No, but one could be mislead by large cutoffs Bogner, Furnstahl, Perry, AS (2007) SRG decouples high- from low-energy physics, while reproducing all NN high-momentum components (and high-energy phase shifts) can be set to zero when using low-momentum interactions, without loss of information



Decoupling: $V_{srg}(\lambda)$ with $k_{max} \sim \lambda \Rightarrow$ smooth $V_{low k}(\Lambda)$ with $\Lambda \sim \lambda$ keep diagonal high momenta if you worry about high-energy phase shifts

Short-range correlations ???

RG preserves long-range parts of interactions, deuteron observables, with dramatically different wave functions/correlations



Occupation numbers ???

depend on resolution scale

0.9

0.86

0.84

0.82

0.8

0.78∟ 4

occupation prob in ¹⁶O

0.88 - Idaho-A (N²LO)

4.5

simplest occupation number: deuteron D-state probability P_D is not an observable

occupation numbers in ¹⁶O and ⁴⁰Ca correlate with D-state probability [occupation numbers from Gad, Muether (2002)]

CD-Bonn

5

 \mathbf{P}_{D}

5.5



Tjon line

 $V_{low k}(\Lambda)$ defines class of NN interactions with cutoff-independent low-energy NN observables

cutoff variation estimates errors due to neglected parts in $H(\Lambda)$

Cutoff dependence explains Tjon line, 3N required by renormalization

Experiment breaks from line \Rightarrow 3N

29

28

27

26

25

7.5

Nijm II

E(⁴He) [MeV]

Tjon lines

in p-shell nuclei

Bogner et al. (2007)

Nogga et al. (2000)

Nijm I

Nijm 93

8.0

 $E(^{3}H)$ [MeV]

-CD-Bonn



Tjon lines in medium-mass nuclei



NN-only results lead to Tjon lines in ¹⁶O±1 Hagen, Dean, AS, in prep. \Rightarrow 3N truncations in oscillator shells N, different h ω approx on same lines slopes agree with nuclear matter limit A±1/A + surface/Coulomb corr.

Chiral EFT 3N interactions

leading N²LO ~ $(Q/\Lambda)^3$ van Kolck (1994), Epelbaum et al. (2002)



consistent with peripheral NN: $c_1 = -0.76(7)$, $c_3 = -4.78(10)$, $c_4 = 3.96(22)$ Rentmeester et al. (2003)

c₃,c₄ important for structure, but large uncertainties at present

D term can be fixed by tritium beta decay, kinematics matches 3N

Subleading chiral EFT 3N interactions

parameter-free N³LO ~ $(Q/\Lambda)^4$ Status from Epelbaum @ TRIUMF 3N workshop (2007)

■ 1/m-corrections to 1 insertion from $\mathcal{L}_{1/m}^{(2)} = ---+ - + - + - + - + - + \mathcal{O}(\pi^3)$

rich operator structure (includes spin-orbit interactions)

I-loop diagrams with all vertices from $\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_{\text{eff}}$

 2π – exchange

The calculated corrections simply shift the LECs c_i as follows:

$$\delta c_1 = \frac{g_A^2 M_\pi}{64\pi F_\pi^2} \sim 0.13 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \qquad \delta c_3 = \frac{3g_A^4 M_\pi}{16\pi F_\pi^2} \sim 2.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \qquad \delta c_4 = -\frac{g_A^4 M_\pi}{16\pi F_\pi^2} \sim -0.85 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$$

 2π - 1π – exchange

ring diagrams

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{array} \right) + \left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \end{array} \right) + \left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \\ -1 \end{array} \right) + \left(\begin{array}{c} -1 \end{array} \right)$$

contact- 1π – exchange

$$\left| \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle = \left| \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle + \left| \left\langle \frac{1}{$$

contact- 2π – exchange

$$\left| \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle = \left| \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle + \left| \left\langle \frac{1}{$$

Chiral EFT 4N interactions

from Epelbaum @ TRIUMF 3N workshop (2007)

Four-nucleon force (E.E. '05)

- Iirst shows up at order $\nu = 4$
- chiral symmetry plays a crucial role
- 🧢 parameter-free

Contribution of the 4NF to the ⁴He BE is attractive and of the order of few 100 keV (*Rozpedzik et al.* ⁶06)



Results from: Rozpedzik et al., nucl-th/0606017

4N contributions ~ 1 MeV at saturation density not unreasonable



Low-momentum 3N interactions $V_{3N}(\Lambda)$ corresponding $V_{3N}(\Lambda)$ from leading chiral EFT + Λ=1.6 fm fit D,E couplings to A=3,4 binding energies $-+ \Lambda = 1.9 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ $-+ \Lambda = 2.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ for range of cutoffs + $\Lambda = 3.0 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ \mathbf{s}^{H} linear dependences in fits to triton binding 3N interactions perturbative for $\Lambda \leq 2 \, \mathrm{fm}^{-1}$ -3 -2 Nogga, Bogner, AS (2004) c_D nonperturbative at larger cutoffs [°]H c_D-c_F curve Average c_-c_ curve cf. chiral EFT $\Lambda \approx 3 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ ³He c_D-c_E curve ⁴He Exp 0.4 [MeV] 0.2 $\Lambda = 1.6 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ 3N exp. values natural -28.4 HeE $\Lambda = 1.9 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ \mathbf{c}_{E} $\Lambda = 2.1 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ size ~ $(Q/\Lambda)^3 V_{NN}$ -0.2 $\Lambda = 2.3 \text{ fm}^{-1}$ $\left< V_{\rm _{3N}} \right> / \left< V_{\rm _{low\,k}} \right>$ -0.4 Ē -0.6 -0.8A=3...nuclear matter Navratil et al. (2007) 0.01 1.35 1.0 ^{3}H ⁴He 1.2 $k_{\rm F} \, [{\rm fm}^{-1}]$

NCSM highlights with chiral EFT interactions



Navratil et al. (2007)

impressive agreement, highlights the importance of 3N interactions

Theoretical uncertainties

1.7

1.6

1.5

18

 $V_{low k}(\Lambda)$ + leading chiral $V_{3N}(\Lambda) \Rightarrow$ cutoff dependence of observables probes neglected many-body int.

Radii of light nuclei approximately cutoff-independent, agree with exp.

Can provide lower limits on theoretical errors

long-term: uncertainties of matrix elements needed in fundamental symmetry tests neutrinoless double-beta decay

atomic EDMs

isospin-symmetry breaking corrections for V_{ud}



 $\Lambda \,[\mathrm{fm}^{-1}]$

r (³H)

---- exp. r_{p} (⁴He)

2.8

3

3N interactions: a frontier

from H.-O. Meyer @ TRIUMF 3N workshop (2007) 2NF: CDBonn 2NF: AV18 pd scattering 3NF: TM' 3NF: U3 a way to look at (2NF+3NF)-data 880 data points... 135 MeV 3NF increases disagreement +(2NF+3NF)-data exp error 20 ±1.5 ±20 stddv stddv (2NF+3NF)-data 200 MeV 20 (2NF)-data exp error a) 3NF has no effect b) 3NF explains data 0 20 0 (2NF)-data (2NF)-data -20 20 0 20

20

20

coherent 3N effort needed with theoretical uncertainties

3N interactions crucial for many-nucleon systems

Effect of 3N interactions are amplified in nuclei, constrain 3N with few- and many-body data \Rightarrow controlled predictions

<u>3N interaction crucial:</u>



Lattice QCD and nuclear forces



NCSM with low-momentum interactions

Bogner, Furnstahl, Maris, Perry, AS, Vary, arXiv:0708.3754.

very promising convergence from N_{max} ~6-10 with smooth-cutoff and SRG low-mom. interactions

future: include 3N interactions and push limits towards heavier systems



 ^{3}H ⁴He ⁶He ⁶Li 7 Li $E_{\rm gs}$ λ $\hbar\Omega$ $\hbar\Omega$ E_{gs} $\hbar\Omega$ E_{gs} $\hbar\Omega$ E_{gs} $\hbar\Omega$ E_{gs} -7.8542-26.1(8) ∞ 28 - 31.5(8)3.0 $\mathbf{28}$ -8.2934 -27.5(3)28-28(1) $\mathbf{24}$ -38.7(30)24 - 28.9(3)24 - 32.1(3)2.52428-28.2(2) $\mathbf{24}$ -38.7(20)-8.412224 - 28.6(1)22 - 29.4(2)22 - 32.5(2)22-40.3(10)2.25-8.472.0-8.53 $\mathbf{24}$ -28.9020 - 30.0(1)20-33.1(1)20-41.2(5)18 1.7516-8.5520-29.1316-30.618-33.6 $\mathbf{18}$ -41.7(4)-28.86-30.712-8.4818 16 -33.716 -42.0(3)1.514 1.2510-8.2114 -27.5812-29.912-32.912-41.1(2)1.08 -7.6314 -24.8010 -27.410 -30.412-37.8(2)



Fig. 5. Ground-state energy of ⁶Li as a function of $\hbar\Omega$ at four different values of λ (3, 2, 1.5, 1 fm⁻¹). The initial potential is the 500 MeV N³LO NN-only potential from Ref. [11].

Fig. 21. Excitation energies of the lowest natural-partiy states of ⁷Li as a function of $\hbar\Omega$ for $\lambda = 2.0 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. The initial potential is the 500 MeV N³LO NN-only potential from Ref. [11]. The horizontal dotted lines are the experimental values while the vertical dotted lines mark the optimal $\hbar\Omega$ value for the ground-state energy (middle) and the range for which estimates are close to this.



Towards 3N interactions in medium-mass nuclei based on low-momentum $V_{low k}(\Lambda) + V_{3N}(\Lambda)^{-22}$ ⁴He -23 Hagen et al. (2007) developed coupled-cluster theory with E_{ccsD(T)} (MeV) -24 3N interactions, first benchmark for ⁴He -27 extrapolated: -28.23 MeV exact, FY: -28.20(5)MeV Results show that 0-, 1- and 2-body parts Ν ■ 2-body only of 3N interaction dominate 10° $|\Delta E / E_{CCSD}|$ 0-body 3NF residual 3N interaction can be neglected! 1-body 3NF very promising estimated triples corrections •.2-body 3NF 10^{-3} supports that monopole corrections for valence shell interactions due to 3N residual 3NF 10 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)

Perturbative two-body ladders

Weinberg analysis anticipates rapidly converging particle-particle contributions to nuclear matter energy for low-momentum interactions Bogner, AS, Furnstahl, Nogga (2005)



k (fm⁻¹) 3

5

3S1 bare potential

2 3 4 5

AV18

0.5

-0.5

k (fm⁻¹)

3

G matrix

3S1 bare G Matrix, E=-207.4

4

5

0.5

-0.5

2

Perturbation theory for bulk properties in place of ladder resummations

G matrix does not tame off-diagonal coupling



Bogner, AS, Furnstahl, Nogga (2005)

3N drives saturation but expectation values natural, consistent with EFT

will provide key guidance to microscopic DFT for SciDAC

Many on-going developments

CC, NCSM calculations in progress

3N contributions to shell model Jason Holt

new power counting for nuclear matter

microscopic guidance for DFT Bogner, Furnstahl, Platter constructing microscopic interactions for HF+GCM+... Rotival, Duguet et al.

superfluidity in neutron stars Hebeler et al.

finite temperature equation of state for astrophysics Tolos, Friman, AS (2006)



One-line summary and Thanks to my collaborators

Exciting era with advances on many fronts!

J. Braun, J.D. Holt



R.J. Furnstahl, R.J. Perry, S. Ramanan

MICHIGAN STATE S.K. Bogner, P. Piecuch, M. Wloch

 $\begin{array}{c} ST & NY \\ BR & K \\ UNIVERSITY \end{array} G.E. Brown, T.T.S. Kuo$

Forschungszentrum Jülich VA. Nogga

D.J. Dean, G. Hagen, T. Papenbrock

🖪 🚍 📊 B. Friman, K. Hebeler

NORDITA C.J. Pethick

UNIVERSITE UDUIS MATEUR J. Polonyi, A.P. Zuker

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY P. Maris, J.P. Vary

M. Hjorth-Jensen