Enhanced T-Nonconserving Nuclear Moments

W. C. Haxton

Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

and

E. M. Henley

Institute for Nuclear Theory and Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195 (Received 8 August 1983)

 $T-$ and P-nonconserving nuclear moments induced by a parity- and $CP-$ nonconserving interaction in the @CD Lagrangian are discussed. The mixing of nearly degenerate opposite-parity ground-state doublets in certain deformed nuclei leads to electric dipole and magnetic quadrupole moments $10^{1}-10^{3}$ and $10^{3}-10^{4}$ times larger, respectively, than those generated by the unpaired valence nucleon.

PACS numbers: 13.40.Fn, 11.30.Er, 12.35.Ht

The observation of CP nonconservation in the decay $K_L^0 \rightarrow 2\pi$, coupled with the CPT theorem suggests that elementary particles may have nonzero "odd" static moments $(C1/E1, M2, C3/E3,$...) forbidden by time-reversal invariance. Experimental limits on the size of such moments, particularly the electric dipole moment (edm) of the neutron $(d_n \leq 6 \times 10^{-25} \text{ cm})$,² impose important constraints on theories attempting to deal with possible mechanisms for CP nonconservation.

One possible technique for determining the odd moments of charged particles is to consider their interaction energy with an external electromagnetic field when bound in a neutral, composite system. In particular, we will be concerned with nuclear moments in a neutral atom. At first such atomic experiments look unattractive because of a theorem of Schiff that, for a point nucleus, there exists no term in the interaction with an external field that is linear in the electric dipole moment.³ However, the consequences of perfect electronic shielding are mitigated to the extent that, for a finite nucleus, the charge and electric dipole moments have different spatial distributions.⁴ This effect has been exploited successfully by Harrison, Sandars, and Wright, who greatly improved the limit on the proton edm in a molecular beam resonance experiment using the polar molecule TlF.⁵

In this Letter we illustrate an attractive feature of such experiments, that their sensitivity to the underlying parameters governing the strength of CP nonconservation may be much greater than one would expect from free-particle estimates. The phenomenon we exploit is the occurrence of nearly degenerate opposite-parity ground, -state doublets in certain rare-earth and actinide nuclei whose members are connected

by (surprisingly) strong $E1$ matrix elements. The possibility that the mixing of doublet states could enhance T-nonconserving nuclear moments appears to have been first discussed by Feinberg. 4

It has been known for some time that the most general form of the Lagrangian in quantum chromodynamics contains a $P-$ and $CP-$ nonconserving interaction of the form'

$$
L_{\text{CPNC}} = \theta(g^2/32\pi^2) F_a^{\mu\nu} F_{a\mu\nu}^{\ \ *}.
$$
 (1)

where θ is a dimensionless parameter, F and F^* are the field tensor and its dual, a is the color index, and $g^2/4\pi$ is the color coupling constant. Inclusion of weak-interaction effects shifts θ from its bare value to a new angle $\bar{\theta}$.⁷ A longsought observable consequence of this term is an induced neutron edm

$$
d_n \approx 3.6 \times 10^{-16} \overline{\theta} \text{ cm}
$$

 $d_n \approx 3.6 \times 10^{-16} \bar{\theta}$ cm
so that experiment demands $|\bar{\theta}| \leq 10^{-9}.^{8.9}$ Considerable effort has been expended in attempts to understand why $\bar{\theta}$, a combination of pure QCD and weak-interaction parameters, is so much smaller than any natural scale. (See Ref. 7 for. background). Our calculation of T -odd nuclear moments takes such a small but nonzero value for $\bar{\theta}$ as the source of CP nonconservation.

If the CP -nonconserving term in Eq. (1) is added to the usual @CD Lagrangian one obtains, in addition to the familiar pion-nucleon coupling $g_{\pi NN}$, an effective CP-nonconserving coupling $\overline{g}_{\pi NN}$:

$$
L_{\pi NN} = \vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{N} \vec{\tau} (i \gamma_5 g_{\pi NN} + \vec{g}_{\pi NN}) N. \qquad (2)
$$

The strength, $|\overline{g}_{\pi NN}| \approx 0.027 |\overline{\theta}|$, is determined by $SU(3)$ and known quark mass ratios.⁸ The corresponding induced coupling, proportional to $\bar{g}_{\pi NN}$, of the electromagnetic current to nucleons

(4)

can be evaluated rigorously in the chiral limit (o) $\begin{array}{cccc} | & | & | & | \end{array}$ $m_{\pi} \rightarrow 0$, as shown by Crewther *et al.*⁸ The leading order $[M^{-1}\ln(M/m_{\pi})]$ terms are given entirely by the one-pion intermediate-state diagrams of Fig. $1(a)$:

$$
\langle p' | J_{\mu(1)}^{\text{em odd}} | p \rangle = e \overline{U} (p') d_n \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^{\nu} \gamma_5 \tau_3 U(p) \qquad (3)
$$

where $q^{\nu} = (p' - p)^{\nu}$ and $d_n = (g_{\pi NN} \overline{g}_{\pi NN}/4\pi^2M)$ \times ln(M/m_{π}) is the neutron electric dipole moment. $J_{\mu}^{\text{em odd}}$ has the opposite behavior under P and CP from the ordinary electromagnetic current.

In a nucleus the effective Lagrangian of Eq. (2) induces, in addition to single-nucleon odd moments, an exchange-current contribution to the electromagnetic current and a CP-nonconserving nucleon-nucleon potential, as illustrated in Figs.

FIG. l. Representative contributions to nuclear electric dipole moment: (a) One-body mechanism, (b) exchange-current contribution, (c) contribution from CP - and P -nonconserving potential via nuclear wavefunction mixing. The solid blobs represent the CP -nonconserving πNN coupling $\overline{g}_{\pi NN}$. Only positive (negative) energy nucleon intermediate states are included in Fig. 1(c) [in the photoproduction vertex of Fig. 1(b)].

1(b) and 1(c). The former, to leading order in M^{-1} , adds a two-body component $\vec{J}_{(2)}^{\text{em odd}}$ to the threecurrent that satisfies

$$
\nabla \cdot \vec{J}_{(2)}^{\text{em odd}} = -i \left[\left. V^{\text{odd}}, \rho_{(1)}^{\text{em}} \right. \right]
$$

where $\mu_{(1)}^{\text{em}}$ is the usual charge operator and V^{odd} is the CP -nonconserving one-pion-exchange poten tial discussed below. Equation (4) is required to satisfy current conservation to order $\overline{g}_{\pi NN}$. As a result, contributions to T-nonconserving static nuclear moments from electric projections of the three suit, contributions to
current $\vec{J}^{\text{ em odd}}$ vanish

The CP -nonconserving nucleon-nucleon potential of Fig. 1(c) is

$$
v^{\text{odd}}(1,2) = -\frac{1}{8\pi} \frac{m_{\pi}^2}{M} g_{\pi NN} \overline{g}_{\pi NN} \overline{\dot{\tau}}(1) \cdot \overline{\dot{\tau}}(2) [\overline{\dot{\sigma}}(1) - \overline{\dot{\sigma}}(2)] \cdot \hat{r} \frac{\exp(-m_{\pi}r)}{m_{\pi}r} \left[1 + \frac{1}{m_{\pi}r}\right],
$$
(5)

where \tilde{r} is the separation between nucleons. This interaction will induce P-odd components in nuclear states as a result of mixing with nearby levels of the same spin and opposite parity. Expectation values of odd multipole projections of the ordinary electromagnetic charge operator and even magnetic projections of the ordinary three-current are proportional to the strength of this component.

The interaction linear in $\bar{g}_{\pi NN}$ of an atomic electron with the nucleus can be calculated in the longwavelength limit. Because of current conservation, the surviving nuclear operators involve only the $\Delta J = 1$ matrix elements of the electromagnetic charge. We find

$$
V(r) = -\frac{\alpha d_n \vec{r}}{r^3} \cdot \left[\langle 0 | \sum_{i=1}^{A} \tau_3(i) \vec{\sigma}(i) | 0 \rangle + 3.09 \operatorname{Re} \left(\langle 0 | \sum_{i=1}^{A} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\tau_3(i)}{2} M \vec{r}(i) | 1 \rangle \frac{\langle 1 | V^{\text{odd}} | 0 \rangle / \overline{g}_{\pi N N}}{\Delta E} \right) \right]
$$

$$
\equiv -\frac{\alpha D_N \vec{r}}{r^3} \cdot \langle 0 | \sum_{i=1}^{A} \tau_3(i) \vec{\sigma}(i) | 0 \rangle,
$$
 (6)

!

where we use $8\pi^2/g_{\pi NN}\ln(M/m_\pi)$ = 3.09 and assume that the unperturbed nuclear ground state $|0\rangle$ mixes principally with a single nearby excited state $|1\rangle$ of the same spin and opposite parity. Equation (6) defines the total nuclear electric dipole moment so that $D_N - d_n$ in the absence of such mixing [i.e., without contributions from Fig. 1(c). In this limit $V(r)$ would be comparable to, or smaller than, the potential exerted by a single nucleon, depending on the extent to which the ground-state Gamow-Teller (GT) matrix element in Eq. (6) differs from the single-particle value. The interaction energy of a neutral atom in an electric field should scale roughly like $D_{\boldsymbol{N}}$; it also depends in detail on the dipole moment

density, specifically the second moment of the difference between the normalized nuclear charge and electric-dipole distributions.⁴ Calculations of this quantity and of the atomic wave functions needed to estimate the interaction energy will be presented elsewhere.

Our present concern is the enhancement of D_N due to wave-function mixing. According to Eq. (6) such enhancement is likely to occur for a ground-state opposite-parity doublet whose members are separated in energy by a small ΔE and are connected by a relatively strong $E1$ matrix element. In addition, as one can demonstrate by reducing $V^{odd} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} v_{ij}^{odd}$ to an effective onebody potential $\sum_i U_i$, $\langle V \rangle$ depends linearly on (N $-z$ / \overline{A} . These criteria comprise a figure of merit that we employed in selecting nuclei that might have enhanced nuclear dipole moments. The best candidates, as shown in Table I, are found in the rare-earth and actinide regions. The Nilsson wave functions for the relevant levels in these deformed nuclei are given in terms of their asymptotic quantum numbers $[Nn_z\Lambda, K^{\pi}]$. In all cases the transitions between doublet levels involve $\Delta K = 0$, so that mixing by a scalar potential is allowed. The $E1$ matrix elements were determined from the experimental lifetimes of the excited-state members of the doublet and from calculated internal-conversion coefficients.¹⁰ These estimates should be quite reliable in all These estimates should be quite reliable in all
cases except ²²⁹Pa, where the very small energy release of $\Delta E = 220$ eV introduces considerable uncertainty in the internal-conversion calculauncertainty in the internal-conversion calcula-
tion.¹¹ However, the surprisingly large E1 matrix element found in 2^{29} Pa is consistent with the value determined for the analogous $\frac{5}{2}$ + $\frac{5}{2}$ double
in ²²⁵Ac.¹² The ratios of the experimental E1 ma in $^{225}\text{Ac.}^{12}$ The ratios of the experimental E1 matrix elements to those predicted by the Nilsson model generally exceed unity and in two cases do so significantly $(^{153}Sm$ and ^{229}Pa , where the ratios are >19.2 and 13.8, respectively). Such enhancements contradict the general trend in nuclei that the collective giant-dipole resonance results in a substantial depletion of low-lying E1 strength.

We evaluated the Nilsson-model matrix elements of the two-body potential and of the Gamow-Teller operator that appear in Eq. (6). As the matrix elements of $\sigma \tau$ and $\sigma \cdot \vec{r}$, the operator generated by reducing V to an effective one-body form U, are generally strong $[O(1)$ and $O(b)$, respectively, where b is the oscillator parameter], we expect these estimates to be reliable. The resulting predictions for D_N/d_n are shown in Table I.

The atomic shielding problem discussed earlier for the electric dipole moment does not arise for the inhomogeneous external electric and magnetic fields required to interact with higher odd nuclear electromagnetic moments. However, the magnitude of such interactions are expected to be suppressed by $[(\text{nuclear size})/(\text{atomic size})]^{L-1}$, where L is the multipolarity. We consider enhancements due to wave-function admixing for the first such moment, $M2$. The quantity analogous to D_N/d_n in Eq. (6) is

$$
\frac{M2}{m2}=1+\frac{2i \operatorname{Im}(\epsilon\langle 0|)T_2^{\text{ mag}}||1\rangle}{\langle 0||T_2^{\text{ mag}}\bar{s}||0\rangle}
$$

where T_2 ^{mag} \vec{s} , proportional to $\vec{g}_{\pi NN}$, is the M2 where T_2 , property , properties of $J_{\mu}^{\text{em odd}}$

$$
T_2 \stackrel{\text{m} \, \text{as} \, \bar{\mathcal{S}}}{=} \frac{id_n}{3M} \bigg(\frac{2}{5} \bigg)^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^A r(i) \big[\big[Y_1(\Omega_i) \otimes \bar{\sigma}(i) \big]_2 \otimes \bar{\nabla}(i) \big]_2,
$$

and T_2 ^{mag} is the ordinary M2 operator

$$
T_2^{\text{mag}} = -\frac{i}{30M} \sum_{i=1}^{A} \left\{ \left[1 + \tau_3(i) \right] r(i)^2 \left[Y_2(\Omega_i) \otimes \vec{\nabla}(i) \right]_2 - \frac{1}{2} \left[\mu^s + \mu^v \tau_3(i) \right] (15)^{1/2} r(i) \left[Y_1(\Omega_i) \otimes \vec{\sigma} \right]_2 \right\}.
$$
 (7)

The scalar and vector magnetic moments are $\mu^s = 0.88$ and $\mu^v = 4.706$, \parallel and ∞ denote reduced matrix elements and tensor products, and $\epsilon \equiv \langle 1 | V^{CFNC} | 0 \rangle / \Delta E$. Terms arising in the nonrelativistic reduction of Eq. (3) that vanish on shell¹³ as well as exchange currents (which do affect magnetic multipoles) have been ignored in Eq. (7). The enhancements shown in Table I, of order 10^2 -10⁴, are considerable

Nucleus	$[Nn_Z\Lambda, K^{\pi}]_{\text{g.s.}}^{\text{a}}$	$[Nn_Z\Lambda, K^\pi]_{\rm e.s.}$ ^a	ΔE (keV)	$\langle 1 V 0\rangle/\overline{g}$ (keV) $^{\rm b}$	$(0 GT 0 \rangle$ ^b	$\langle 0 \, E1 1 \rangle$ c		D_N/d_n $M2/m2$
153 Sm	$[651, \frac{3}{2}^+]$	$[521, \frac{3}{2}]$	35.8	-170	-0.65	>3.74	>86.1	>10.1
161 Dy	$[642, \frac{5}{2}^+]$	$[523,\frac{5}{2}]$	25.7	-237	-1.21	0.39	10.3	-541
$^{165}\mathrm{Er}$	$[523, \frac{5}{7}]$	$[642, \frac{5}{2}^+]$	47.2	213	1.03	0.64	9.6	664
$^{225}\mathrm{Ac}$	$[532, \frac{3}{2}]$	$[651, \frac{3}{2}^+]$	40.0	180	-0.56	$\zeta - 0.74$	>19.3	$\epsilon - 610$
$^{227}\mathrm{Ac}$	$[532, \frac{3}{2}]$	$[651, \frac{3}{2}^+]$	27.4	187	-0.56	-0.21	8.7	-926
^{229}Pa	$[642, \frac{5}{2}^+]$	$[523, \frac{5}{2}]$	0.22	39	1.05	-4.58	2390	12400

TABLE I. Nuclear electric dipole and magnetic quadrupole moments.

^aNilsson model parameters taken from A. Bohr and B. Mottelson, Nuclear Structure (Benjamin, London, 1975). Vol. II, p. 220. Wave functions for first three nuclei computed for $\delta = 0.3$, last three $\delta = 0.2$. All states have $J=K$. bTheoretical value.

^cMagnitudes calculated from lifetimes given in Nuclear Data Sheets and internal conversion coefficients of Ref. 10; sign from theory.

but reflect in part the weakness of the one-body contribution to the M2 nuclear moment.

To set the scale of the effects under discussion, limits of $(-1.4 \pm 6) \times 10^{-21}$ and $\lt 5.5 \times 10^{-19}$ e·cm have been placed on the proton edm by experiments on the molecule TlF and on atomic cesium, ments on the indicate TIT and on atomic cesture
respectively.⁵ It is believed that the sensitivitie of such experiments can be improved by severa
orders of magnitude.¹⁴ Our results suggest tha orders of magnitude. 14 Our results suggest that for certain T-nonconservation mechanisms, additional leverage can be gained by exploiting the mixing of nearly degenerate opposite-parity ground-state doublets found in some deformed nuclei. Thus it is possible that the ultimate sensitivity of atomic and molecular experiments to the underlying parameters governing T nonconservation may match or exceed that achieved for the neutron.

We thank Dr. L. S. Brown, Dr. E. N. Fortson, Dr. J. L. Friar, Dr. P. Herczeg, and Dr. R. A. Naumann for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy.

¹J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin, V. L. Fitch, and R. Turlay, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13, 138 (1964).

- ²I. S. Altarev et al., Phys. Lett. $102B$, 13 (1981);
- N. F. Ramsey, Phys. Bep. 43C, 409 (1977). ³L. I. Schiff, Phys. Rev. 132, 2194 (1963).
	- 4G . Feinberg, Trans. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 38, 6 (1977).

 5G , E, Harrison, P, G, H, Sandars, and S, J, Wright, Phys. Rev. Lett. 22, 1263 (1969); P. G. H. Sandars, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 1396 (1967); E. A. Hinds and P. G. H. Sandars, Phys. Bev. ^A 21, 471 and 480 (1980); I. B. Khriplovich, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 71 51 (1976) ISov. Phys. JETP 44, 25 (1976)].

 6A . A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Schwartz, and Yu. S. Tyupkin, Phys. Lett. 598, 85 (1975); V. N. Gribov, unpublished; G. 't Hooft, Phys. Bev. Lett. 37, 8 (1976); R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 172 (1976); C. G. Callan, Jr., R. F. Dashen, and D.J. Gross, Phys. Lett. 63B, ³³⁴ (1976).

 ${}^{7}R$. D. Peccei, in Proceedings of the 1981 International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, edited by B.J. Cence, E. Ma, and A. Roberts (University of Hawaii, Honolulu, 1981), Vol. I, and references therein.

 ${}^{8}R$, J. Crewther, P. Di Vecchia, G. Veneziano, and E. Witten, Phys. Lett. 88B, 123 (1979), and 91B, 487 (1980).

 ^{9}V . Baluni, Phys. Rev. D 19, 2227 (1979).

 10 R. S. Hager and E. C. Seltzer, Nucl. Data Sec. $\underline{A4}$, 1 (1968); O. Dragoun, Z. Plajner, and F. Schmutzler, Nucl. Data Tables A9, 119 (1971).

'D. Liberman, private communication. We adopt an internal conversion coefficient $\alpha(E1) = 2635$, calculated in the independent-particle approximation. Calculations based on the random-phase approximation appear to give substantially different results. $M1$ contributions due to weak parity admixing are expected at the 1% level for a typical mixing matrix element $(\sim 1 \text{ eV})$.

 ${}^{2}I$. Ahmad, J. E. Gindler, R. R. Betts, A. R. Chasman, and A. M. Friedman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 1758 (1982), and private communication.

¹³Careful treatment of off-shell corrections would also include their effect on the propagator in Fig. 1(a), etc.

 14 D. MacArthur, F. Calaprice, and E. N. Fortson, private communications.