$0\nu\beta\beta$ Decay with Coupled Cluster Theory, and an analysis of the LO contact term

Samuel J. Novario

University of Tennessee Oak Ridge National Laboratory

May 28, 2020









Samuel J. Novario

Outline





3 Deformed Coupled Cluster and Results



Analyzing the Leading-Order Contact Term





- 3 Deformed Coupled Cluster and Results
- Analyzing the Leading-Order Contact Term

Coupled Cluster $0\nu\beta\beta$ NME

0
uetaeta nuclear matrix element

$$|M^{0\nu}|^{2} = |\langle \mathbf{f}|\,\hat{O}\,|\mathbf{i}\rangle|^{2} = \langle \mathbf{f}|\,\hat{O}\,|\mathbf{i}\rangle\langle\mathbf{i}|\,\hat{O}^{\dagger}\,|\mathbf{f}\rangle$$
$$= \langle \Phi_{0}|\,\mathbf{e}^{-\hat{T}}\,\hat{L}_{\mathbf{f}}\hat{O}\,\mathbf{e}^{\hat{T}}\,|\Phi_{0}\rangle\langle\Phi_{0}|\,\mathbf{e}^{-\hat{T}}\,\hat{L}_{0}\,\hat{O}^{\dagger}\hat{R}_{\mathbf{f}}\,\mathbf{e}^{\hat{T}}\,|\Phi_{0}\rangle$$

$$= \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{L}_f \bar{O} | \Phi_0 \rangle \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{L}_0 \bar{O}^{\dagger} \hat{R}_f | \Phi_0 \rangle$$

Similarity-transformed beta-decay operator

$$e^{-\hat{T}} \hat{O} e^{\hat{T}} = \left(\hat{O} e^{\hat{T}}\right)_{c}$$
$$\hat{O} = \hat{O}_{GT}^{0\nu} + \hat{O}_{F}^{0\nu} + \hat{O}_{T}^{0\nu}$$



2 Initial $0\nu\beta\beta$ Results

- 3 Deformed Coupled Cluster and Results
- 4 Analyzing the Leading-Order Contact Term

$0\nu\beta\beta$ Benchmarks in Light Nuclei: ¹⁴C and ¹⁰He



CC calculations of $^{14}\text{C} \rightarrow ^{14}\text{O}$ agree well with NCSM. The mirror structure of the initial and final nuclei make this comparison somewhat trivial.

CC calculations of ${}^{10}\text{He} \rightarrow {}^{10}\text{Be}$ somewhat agree with NCSM. The final nuclei has an open-shell structure.

Both of these cases have relatively well-converged initial and final wavefunctions.

$0\nu\beta\beta$ Benchmarks in Light Nuclei: ⁸He and ²²O



CC calculations of $^8\text{He} \rightarrow {}^8\text{Be}$ and ${}^{22}\text{O} \rightarrow {}^{22}\text{Ne}$ do not agree well with NCSM.

While the initial wavefunctions are well-converged, the spherical basis does not capture the deformed, open-shell final states.

Describing these states would require correlations beyond double and triple excitations.









Hartree Fock Basis: Spherical



Compute spherical HF basis of initial nucleus
 Decouple initial nucleus ground state
 Diagonalize EOM ground state of final nucleus

Pros: Maintains total angular momentum and is computationally efficient.

Cons: Cannot feasibly calculate open-shell, deformed nuclei.

Hartree Fock Basis: Deformed



Compute deformed natural orbital basis of final nucleus (Tichai et al 2018)
 Decouple final nucleus ground state
 Diagonalize EOM ground state of initial nucleus

Pros: Can calculate open-shell, deformed nuclei without EOM diagonalization.

Cons: Doesn't preserve total angular momentum and is more computationally expensive.

Deformed Basis Example: Even-even Isotopes



Deformed CC calculations of even-even neon isotopes reproduce binding energies and two-neutron separation energies.

Realistic spectra requires symmetry restoration.

$0 u\beta\beta$ Benchmarks in Light Nuclei: ¹⁴C and ¹⁰He



Deformed CC calculations of ${}^{14}\text{C} \rightarrow {}^{14}\text{O}$ and ${}^{10}\text{He} \rightarrow {}^{10}\text{Be}$ still agree well with NCSM.

In the deformed basis, ¹⁰Be can be computed much more easily, and the small differences between NCSM are resolved.

$0\nu\beta\beta$ Benchmarks in Light Nuclei: ⁸He and ²²O



$0 u\beta\beta$ Benchmarks in Light Nuclei



Triples correlations and deformed basis both address deformation in daughter nuclei and should give confidence in calculation of ⁴⁸Ca.

$0\nu\beta\beta$ Decay of ⁴⁸Ca with FCI

Comparing with exact FCI (Javier Menendez) in pf-shell with phenomenological interactions.



The spherical and deformed calculations give upper and lower bounds to the NME. Symmetry restoration is needed.

Ab Initio $0\nu\beta\beta$ Decay of ⁴⁸Ca



NME is consistent with phenomenological models and IM-SRG+GCM at \sim 0.6.

Ab Initio $0\nu\beta\beta$ Decay of ⁴⁸Ca









Analyzing the Leading-Order Contact Term

Determining the Unknown Contact

- 0νββ NME should be cutoff invariant when LO contact is included.
- LECs can be determined by minimizing the spread of the NMEs from different interactions?
- Using benchmarked cases, find g_i to minimize $\chi^2 = \sum_a \sum_{i \neq j} (L_{i,a} + g_i S_{i,a} L_{j,a} g_j S_{j,a})^2$.
- Contact term defined as $C_0 = g_i \delta^3 \left(\mathbf{r} \right)$

LO Contact in Light Benchmark Nuclei



Included VMC results from V. Cirigliano et al (2019)

LO Contact in Light Benchmark Nuclei



Solutions enhance the $0\nu\beta\beta$ NMEs and agree with similar analysis of VMC results from V. Cirigliano et al (2019)

Still need to apply to $^{48}\text{Ca} \rightarrow {}^{48}\text{Ti}.$

Summary

- Coupled cluster $0\nu\beta\beta$ calculations agree well with NCSM benchmarks of light nuclei with well-described final states.
- Deformed coupled cluster can address problems involving open-shell, deformed nuclei.
- The deformed ground state of ⁴⁸Ti is not easily obtained without symmetry restoration.
- $\bullet~$ NME for ${}^{48}\text{Ca} \rightarrow {}^{48}\text{Ti}$ with CC provides upper and lower bounds.
- Missing contact term seems to enhance the $0\nu\beta\beta$ NME.

Current and Future Work

- Investigate quadrupole deformation and symmetry restoration of ⁴⁸Ti.
- Continue analysis of missing LO contact term.
- Use developed machinery for $2\nu\beta\beta$ decays.
- $\bullet\,$ Use deformed basis to calculate previously intractable case of $^{76}\mbox{Ge}.$

Thank You!

- Jonathan Engel (UNC)
- Gaute Hagen (UTK/ORNL)
- Gustav Jensen (ORNL)
- Titus Morris (ORNL)
- Petr Navratil (TRIUMF)
- Thomas Papenbrock (UTK/ORNL)
- Peter Gysbers (UBC/TRIUMF)
- Sofia Quaglioni (LLNL)







