are the members of the γ -vibrational band via the γ rays of energy 725 and 593 kev, respectively. The transition to the (0,2+) level is also present via the 1600-kev γ ray but its reduced transition probability is about 100 times less than that of the 725-kev γ ray, the 1600-kev γ ray being assumed E1. If this 1723-kev level is collective in origin, an assignment of the K value can be made. The experimental ratio of the reduced transition probabilities of 725- and 593-kev γ rays is compared in Table III with theoretical ratios for different Kvalues assumed for the 1723-kev level. As can be seen from Table III, the assignment K=2 for this level is clearly favored. Such an assignment explains the relative slowness of the 1600-kev γ transition to (0,2+) level since a transition of E1 type is forbidden by the K selection rule. It is interesting to see if any M2 mixture, which is allowed by the K selection rule, is present in this γ transition. An identical γ transition of 1189 kev in W¹⁸² has a 40% M2 mixture.¹⁷

The 2⁻ levels are found in other deformed even-even nuclei also. Table IV summarizes the presently known 2^- levels occurring in the region of medium-heavy and heavy deformed nuclei. An inspection of this table reveals that such 2- levels are occurring in regions where there is a shift from a spherical to a deformed nucleus and vice versa. The ratios of the energies of these 2^- levels to the energy of the 2^+ member of the ground-state rotational band (column 3 in Table IV) seem to be grouped into values of about 14, 10, and 20 in the regions of neutron numbers around 90, 110, and 138, respectively; in each region this ratio appears to increase with the increase of deformation.

¹⁷ C. J. Gallagher, Jr. and J. O. Rasmussen, Phys. Rev. 112, 1730 (1958).

PHYSICAL REVIEW

VOLUME 123, NUMBER 3

AUGUST 1, 1961

Antishielding of Nuclear Electric Hexadecapole Moments*

R. M. Sternheimer Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York (Received March 27, 1961)

The antishielding factor η_{∞} for a possible nuclear electric hexadecapole moment has been calculated for the Cu⁺, Ag⁺ and Hg⁺⁺ ions, using the Hartree-Fock wave functions for the 3d, 4d, and 5d electrons involved. It was found that $\eta_{\infty}(Cu^+)\cong -1200$, $\eta_{\infty}(Ag^+)\cong -8050$, and $\eta_{\infty}(Hg^{++})\cong -63\ 000$. The implication of these results is discussed.

N a previous paper,¹ we have considered the interaction of a possible nuclear electric hexadecapole (16-pole) moment (HDM) with the ion core surrounding the nucleus. It has been shown that for medium and heavy atoms with closed d shells, the interaction energy of the HDM with the fourth-order derivative terms of the potential due to the ionic lattice (for the case of a crystal) will be considerably amplified by antishielding effects of the same type as have been calculated² and observed³ for nuclear quadrupole moments. The antishielding effect arises from the large hexadecapole moment which is induced in the closed d(and possibly f) shells of the ion core. The induced HDM was written as

$$H_{\rm ind} = -\eta_{\infty} H, \qquad (1)$$

where H is the nuclear HDM, and η_{∞} is defined as the hexadecapole antishielding factor, in a completely analogous manner to the antishielding factor² γ_{∞} for the nuclear quadrupole moment.

In the present paper, we wish to report the results of calculations of η_{∞} for the Cu⁺ and Ag⁺ ions, using the Hartree-Fock wave functions which have been obtained for these ions.^{4,5} We have found that $\eta_{\infty} \cong -1200$ for Cu⁺ and $\eta_{\infty} \cong -8050$ for Ag⁺. These values are extremely large, even when compared to typical values of $\gamma_{\infty}(\sim -100)$, and therefore suggest that it may be possible to detect the nuclear HDM for nuclei with spin $I \ge 2$, by observing the deviation from the relationships between the resonance frequencies which would be expected for a pure quadrupole resonance spectrum.6

The predominant contribution to η_{∞} for Cu⁺ and Ag⁺ is due to the $3d \rightarrow d$ and $4d \rightarrow d$ excitations, respectively, produced by the nuclear H. (Although the stable isotopes of Cu and Ag have spin $I=\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{2}$, respectively, we assume the presence of a nuclear

^{*} Work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

¹ R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 190 (1961). This

¹ R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. Letters 6, 190 (1961). Ins Letter will be referred to as I.
² R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. 80, 102 (1950); 84, 244 (1951); 95, 736 (1954); 105, 158 (1957); R. M. Sternheimer and H. M. Foley, *ibid.* 102, 731 (1956).
³ See, for example, M. H. Cohen and F. Reif, in *Solid-State Physics*, edited by F. Seitz and D. Turnbull (Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1957), Vol. 5, p. 321; T. P. Das and E. L. Hahn, *Nuclear Quadrupole Resonance Spectroscopy* (Academic Press, Inc., New York 1958) New York, 1958).

⁴ D. R. Hartree and W. Hartree, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London)

A157, 490 (1936). ⁵ B. H. Worsley, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A247, 390 (1958). ⁶ T. C. Wang, Phys. Rev. 99, 566 (1955).

HDM for the purpose of the calculations, which will also apply approximately to neighboring elements in the periodic table.) The term $\eta_{\infty}(nd \rightarrow d)$ due to the excitation of the *nd* electrons into higher *d* states is given by¹

$$\int_{0}^{\infty} (nd \to d) = (80/63) \int_{0}^{\infty} u_{0}'(nd) u'_{1,H}(nd \to d) r^{4} dr, \quad (2)$$

where $u_0'(nd)$ is r times the radial part of the unperturbed nd function, and $u'_{1,H}(nd \rightarrow d)$ is r times the radial part of the perturbation. (The notation of the present paper is the same as in I.) The function $u'_{1,H}(nd \rightarrow d)$ is determined by the equation,

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{6}{r^2} + V_0 - E_0 \end{bmatrix} u'_{1,H} (nd \to d)$$

= $u_0' (nd) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{r^5} - \left\langle \frac{1}{r^5} \right\rangle_{nd} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$

and by the orthogonality condition,

$$\int_{0}^{\infty} u_{0}'(nd) u'_{1,H}(nd \to d) dr = 0.$$
 (4)

In Eq. (3), V_0 and E_0 are the unperturbed potential and energy eigenvalue for the *nd* state, and $\langle 1/r^5 \rangle_{nd}$ is the average of $1/r^5$ for the wave function $u_0'(nd)$.

The perturbed functions $\mathfrak{gl}'_{1,H}(3d \to d)$ for Cu⁺ and $u'_{1,H}(4d \to d)$ for Ag⁺ were calculated by numerical integration of Eq. (3), using the Hartree-Fock functions $u_0'(3d)$ of Cu⁺ and $u_0'(4d)$ of Ag⁺, which have been obtained by Hartree and Hartree⁴ and by Worsley.⁵ The effective values of $V_0 - E_0$ on the left-hand side of (3) were obtained from the function u_0' as follows^{2,7}:

$$V_0 - E_0 + \frac{6}{r^2} = \frac{1}{u_0'} \frac{d^2 u_0'}{dr^2}.$$
 (5)

We note that for Cu⁺, $\langle 1/r^5 \rangle_{3d} = 219.0a_{\rm H}^{-5}$, and for Ag⁺, $\langle 1/r^5 \rangle_{4d} = 932.3a_{\rm H}^{-5}$.

The solution $u'_{1,H}$ was obtained by inward numerical integration starting at $r \equiv r_1 = 6a_H$ (both for Cu⁺ and Ag⁺), in the same manner as in our previous calculations of the quadrupole antishielding factor² $\gamma_{\infty}(nl \rightarrow l)$ and the dipole polarizability⁷ α_d . The integration is started with an arbitrary value $u'_{1,H}(r_1)$ at $r_1 = 6a_H$. The value of $u'_{1,H}$ at $r_1 + \delta$ (δ = interval of integration) is then obtained from

$$u'_{1,H}(r_1+\delta) = u'_{1,H}(r_1) \exp\{-[N(r_1)]^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta\}, \quad (6)$$

where N is defined by

$$N(r) \equiv \frac{6}{r^2} + (V_0 - E_0) - \frac{I}{u'_{1,H}(r)},$$
(7)

⁷ R. M. Sternheimer, Phys. Rev. **96**, 951 (1954); **107**, 1565 (1957); **115**, 1198 (1959).



and where I is the inhomogeneous term on the righthand side of Eq. (3). As indicated in Eq. (6), N(r) is to be evaluated at $r=r_1$.

The integrations were carried out from $r=r_1$ down to a small radius $r_0 \sim 0.06a_{\rm H}$. For small r, one can obtain the power series expansion for $u'_{1,H}$ which is valid near r=0. We note that $u'_{1,H}$ is finite at r=0, and has the value

$$u'_{1,H}(r=0) = c_3/6,$$
 (8)

where c_3 is the coefficient of r^3 in the expansion of the 3d or 4d wave function u_0' near r=0. Thus we have

$$u_0' = c_3 r^3 + c_4 r^4 + \cdots, \text{ for } r \sim 0,$$
 (9)

where c_3 and c_4 are constant coefficients which can be obtained from the tabulated Hartree-Fock wave functions.^{4,5} For Cu⁺ 3d, we have⁴ $c_3=244.5$, so that $u'_{1,H}(r=0)=40.75$. Similarly, for the 4d function⁵ of Ag⁺, $c_3=1114$, whence $u'_{1,H}(r=0)=185.7$.

For each case (Cu⁺ 3*d* and Ag⁺ 4*d*), two separate integrations were carried out, with starting values at $r_1=6a_H$ which differ by a factor of ~1.5, in order to obtain a check on the calculations. It should be noted that after the numerical integration is completed, the solution $u'_{1,H}$ is made orthogonal to u_0' by adding a suitable multiple of u_0' [see Eq. (4)]. For Ag⁺, the resulting two solutions $u'_{1,H}(4d \rightarrow d)$ differ by less than 1% in the important region between $r=1a_H$ and $4a_H$, which makes the predominant contribution to the integral of Eq. (2) for $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d)$. Correspondingly, the values of $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d)$ which are derived from the two solutions, namely -7999 and -8056, differ only by a factor of 1.007. The average of the two results for $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d)$ is thus -8028.

For Cu⁺, the two solutions $u'_{1,H}(3d \rightarrow d)$ differ by less than 3% between $r=2a_{\rm H}$ and $4a_{\rm H}$. The resulting values of $\eta_{\infty}(3d \rightarrow d)$ are -1179 and -1214 (average =-1197).

We note that these results for both $\operatorname{Cu}^+ 3d \to d$ and $\operatorname{Ag}^+ 4d \to d$ are considerably larger (by a factor of 5–8) than the values which would be obtained for hydrogenic



wave functions with an effective atomic number $Z_e = 1$. As was shown in I, for the hydrogenic case, one finds $\eta_{\infty}(3d \rightarrow d) = -147.2/Z_e \text{ and } \eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d) = -1680.8/Z_e.$ Thus a value of $Z_e = 1$, which would be suggested by results for the quadrupole antishielding factor γ_{∞} , would give $\eta_{\infty}(3d \rightarrow d) \cong -150$ for Cu⁺ and $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d) \cong -1700$ for Ag⁺. The actual values, namely -1197 and -8028are larger by factors of 8.0 and 4.7, respectively. To put it in another way, the results for $\eta_{\infty}(nd \rightarrow d)$ from the Hartree-Fock wave functions correspond to effective Z values: $Z_e = 0.123$ for Cu⁺ $3d \rightarrow d$, and $Z_e = 0.209$ for $Ag^+ 4d \rightarrow d$. It should, of course, be noted that the Cu^+ 3d and Ag⁺ 4d wave functions differ considerably from hydrogenic wave functions for any value of Z_e , so that one should not expect the hydrogenic formula to apply.

The perturbed wave functions $u'_{1,H}(3d \rightarrow d)$ of Cu⁺ and $u'_{1,H}(4d \rightarrow d)$ of Ag⁺ are shown in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively, together with the corresponding unperturbed radial functions $u_0'(nd)$. We note that the large results for $\eta_{\infty}(nd \rightarrow d)$ are essentially due to two effects: (1) the large values of $u'_{1,H}$ in the region of the outermost maximum of the perturbed wave function; e.g., $u'_{1,H}(4d \rightarrow d)$ of Ag⁺ reaches a value of 197 at $r=2.3a_{\rm H}$; (2) the large values of the factor r^4 in the region of the maximum of the integrand $u_0'u'_{1,H}r^4$ of Eq. (2). Thus the maximum of $u_0'u'_{1,H}r^4$ for Ag⁺ $4d \rightarrow d$ occurs at $r=2.8a_{\rm H}$, where $u_0'=-0.232$, $u'_{1,H}=176.5$, $r^4=61.47$, whence $u_0'u'_{1,H}r^4 = -2517$. The fact that u_0' and $u'_{1,H}$ have opposite sign in the region of large r is responsible for the net antishielding effect of $\eta_{\infty}(nd \rightarrow d)$ (<0), in the same manner as for $\gamma_{\infty}(nl \rightarrow l)$.

For the $3d \rightarrow d$ excitation of Ag⁺, the perturbed wave function $u'_{1,H}(3d \rightarrow d)$ was calculated, and the resulting $\eta_{\infty}(3d \rightarrow d)$ is -18.4. If one uses $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d)$ = -8030, one thus obtains for the complete η_{∞} due to the radial modes, $\eta_{\infty, rad}(Ag^+)\cong$ -8048. Similarly, for Cu⁺, we have $\eta_{\infty, rad}(Cu^+)=-1200$.

As has been discussed in I, the contribution to η_{∞} due to the angular modes of excitation of the core $(ns \rightarrow g; np \rightarrow f, np \rightarrow h; nd \rightarrow g, nd \rightarrow i)$ can be obtained by means of the Thomas-Fermi model, in the same manner as for the quadrupole shielding factor² $\gamma_{\infty,ang}$. If we interpolate between the results for K⁺ $(\eta_{\infty,ang}=0.58)$ and Cs⁺ (1.6), as given in I, we obtain $\eta_{\infty,ang}=0.9$ for Cu⁺ and 1.4 for Ag⁺. These values are obviously negligible compared to the radial terms $\eta_{\infty,rad}$ which therefore represent essentially the complete hexadecapole antishielding factor η_{∞} . Thus we have as our final result: $\eta_{\infty}(Cu^+) \cong -1200$ and $\eta_{\infty}(Ag^+) \cong -8050$, with an estimated uncertainty of $\sim 10\%$ due to the procedure of the numerical integration of Eq. (3).

We have also obtained the antishielding factors $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d)$, $\eta_{\infty}(4f \rightarrow f)$, and $\eta_{\infty}(5d \rightarrow d)$ for the Hg⁺⁺ ion, using the Hartree 4d, 4f, and 5d functions for this ion.⁸ The results are: $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d) = -271$, $\eta_{\infty}(4f \rightarrow f) = -17.6$, and $\eta_{\infty}(5d \rightarrow d) = -62,700$. It is expected that the value of $\eta_{\infty}(3d \rightarrow d)$ will be much smaller than $\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d) [|\eta_{\infty}(3d \rightarrow d)| \leq 1]$. Thus the complete antishielding factor η_{∞} for Hg⁺⁺ is $\cong -63\ 000$. Similarly to the results for Ag⁺, where $|\eta_{\infty}(3d \rightarrow d)| \ll |\eta_{\infty}(4d \rightarrow d)|$, it is seen that also for Hg⁺⁺ the outermost d shell makes the predominant contribution to η_{∞} .

As already pointed out above and in reference 1, these large values of η_{∞} may make it possible to detect the presence of a nuclear hexadecapole moment using quadrupole resonance spectra from crystals containing ions with closed d shells. We note that the present results for $\eta_{\infty}(Cu^+)$ and $\eta_{\infty}(Ag^+)$ are considerably larger than the estimates made in reference 1 using $Z_e=1$.

⁸D. R. Hartree and W. Hartree, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A149, 210 (1935).