

Quantum Monte Carlo calculations of (electro)magnetic structure in light nuclei

Garrett King

Low-Energy Electron Scattering 2024 Sendai, Japan 10/29/2024

LA-UR-24-31197

Acknowledgements

Graham Chambers-Wall (GS)

Saori Pastore Maria Piarulli

Alex Gnech (JLAB & ODU)

Rocco Schiavilla (JLAB & ODU)

Bob Wiringa (ANL)

https://www.nishina.riken.jp/research/nucleus_e.html

RIB facilities are probing the limits of nuclear existence

Combined with electron probes, can answer fundamental questions:

- How does structure change near the limit of stability?
- What role does clustering play in exotic systems?
- What is the nature of the nuclear force?

The reach of many-body approaches has also expanded greatly in the last decade

We can now study nuclei that intersect with the frontiers probed by experiment

Accurate nuclear theory

Rare isotope beams

Innovative experimental

approaches

Have a great opportunity for experimental and theory communities to identify interesting cases

In order to learn from experimental advances, we need *accurate* theory

Accurate nuclear theory

Outline

Microscopic description of nuclei

The quantum many-body problem

Modeling physical phenomena in a system with many bodies interacting amongst themselves

$$
H = \sum_i T_i + \sum_{i < j} v_{ij} + \sum_{i < j < k} V_{ijk} + \dots
$$

Interaction generates *correlations* in solution of the Schrödinger equation **Mattuck, "A Guide to Feynman Diagrams in**
Mattuck, "A Guide to Feynman Diagrams in
the Many-Body Problem" McGraw-Hill

$$
H|\Psi\rangle=E|\Psi\rangle
$$

the Many-Body Problem", McGraw-Hill

The quantum many-body problem

Wave function of *A* **nucleons** containing information about *coordinates, spins, and isospins*

$$
\Psi(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_A; s_1, s_2, \dots, s_A; t_1, t_2, \dots, t_A)
$$

$$
\dim(\Psi) = 3A \times 2^A \times \frac{A!}{N! \bar{Z}!}
$$

Turn to numerical approaches; In this talk, **Quantum Monte Carlo** which can address **A**≲**14**

Quantum Monte Carlo

Solving the many-body problem using random sampling to compute integrals

Variational MC wave function $|\Psi_T\rangle = \mathcal{F}|\Phi\rangle$ contains model wave function and many-body correlations optimized by minimizing:

$$
E_V = \min\left\{\frac{\langle \Psi_T | H | \Psi_T \rangle}{\langle \Psi_T | \Psi_T \rangle}\right\} \ge E_0
$$

Green's function MC improves by *removing excited*

state contamination and gives the exact ground state

$$
\lim_{\tau \to \infty} e^{-(H-E_0)\tau} \Psi_V = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} e^{-(H-E_0)\tau} \left(c_0 \psi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \psi_i \right) \to c_0 \psi_0
$$

Chiral Effective Field Theory

Procedure to obtain NN interaction rooted in the underlying symmetry of Quantum **Chromodynamics**

Separation of scales: Nucleon momentum *Q ~ mπ* $\sim m_{\text{N}}$ *- m_A* vs. heavier mesons at the scale $\Lambda \sim 1$ GeV

Heavy degrees of freedom integrated out

Low-energy constants (LECs) subsume the underlying QCD

Weinberg, van Kolck, Ordóñez, Epelbaum, Hammer, Meißner, Entem, Machleidt, …

The Norfolk (NV2+3) interaction

$$
H = \sum_{i} K_i + \sum_{i < j} v_{ij} + \sum_{i < j < k} V_{ijk}
$$

Derived in χEFT with pion, nucleon, and delta degrees of freedom by **Piarulli et al. [PRL 120, 052503 (2018)]**

NV2 contains 26 unknown LECs in contacts, two more from the NV3

Eight model classes arrived at from different procedures to constrains the unknown LECs

Electroweak charge and current operators

Need electromagnetic and weak current operators to study decays

Schematically:
$$
\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{A} \rho_i + \sum_{i < j} \rho_{ij} + \dots
$$

$$
\mathbf{j} = \sum_{i=1}^{A} \mathbf{j}_i + \sum_{i < j} \mathbf{j}_{ij} + \dots
$$

External field interacts with single nucleons and correlated pairs of nucleons

Pastore et al. PRC 80, 034004 (2009), Pastore et al. PRC 84, 024001 (2011), Piarulli et al. PRC 87, 014006 (2013), Schiavilla et al. PRC 99, 034005 (2019)

Low-to-moderate energy electroweak structure

1.01

1.00

0.98

 0.2

 $\sum_{\omega_{0.02}}^{\omega_{0.04}}$

 \approx 0.00

 $\frac{1.00}{5}$
 $\frac{1.00}{6}$
 $\frac{1.00}{6}$

King et al. PRC 102, 025501 (2020)

Decay rates **Decay spectra** Decay spectra Decay spectra Captures

King et al. PRC 107, 015503 (2022)

 0.6

 0.4

GFMC

VMC

 0.8

 $\overline{1.0}$

Electron scattering

Cross section

$$
\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = 4\pi \sigma_M f_{\text{rec}}^{-1} \left[\frac{Q^4}{q^4} F_L^2(q) + \left(\frac{Q^2}{2q^2} + \tan^2 \theta_e/2 \right) F_T^2(q) \right]
$$

In elastic scattering:

$$
F_T^2(q) = F_M^2(q) = \frac{1}{2J_i + 1} \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} |\langle J_f || M_L(q) || J_i \rangle|^2 \qquad F_L^2(q) = \frac{1}{2J_i + 1} \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} |\langle J_f || C_L(q) || J_i \rangle|^2
$$

Cross section

$$
\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = 4\pi \sigma_M f_{\text{rec}}^{-1} \left[\frac{Q^4}{q^4} F_L^2(q) + \left(\frac{Q^2}{2q^2} + \tan^2 \theta_e/2 \right) F_T^2(q) \right]
$$

In elastic scattering:

$$
F_T^2(q) = F_M^2(q) = \frac{1}{2J_i + 1} \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} |\langle J_f || M_L(q) || J_i \rangle|^2
$$

Sensitive to single particle structure Sensitive to density, collectivity

$$
F_L^2(q) = \frac{1}{2J_i + 1} \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} |\langle J_f || C_L(q) || J_i \rangle|^2
$$

Cross section

$$
\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = 4\pi \sigma_M f_{\text{rec}}^{-1} \left[\frac{Q^4}{q^4} F_L^2(q) + \left(\frac{Q^2}{2q^2} + \tan^2 \theta_e/2 \right) F_T^2(q) \right]
$$

In elastic scattering:

$$
F_T^2(q) = F_M^2(q) = \frac{1}{2J_i + 1} \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} \left| \langle J_f || M_L(q) || J_i \rangle \right|^2 \qquad F_L^2(q) = \frac{1}{2J_i + 1} \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \left| \langle J_f || C_L(q) || J_i \rangle \right|^2
$$

QMC is used to compute reduced multipoles

Computation of reduced multipoles

Reduced multipoles are defined by **[Carlson and Schiavilla RMP 70 (1998)]**:

$$
\langle J_f M | \rho^{\dagger}(q) | J_i M \rangle = (-1)^{J_i - M} \sum_L \sqrt{4\pi} (-i)^L P_L(\cos \theta) c^M_{J_f J_i L} C_L(q),
$$

$$
J_f M | \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\lambda}^* \cdot \mathbf{j}^{\dagger}(q) | J_i M \rangle = (-1)^{J_i - M + 1} \sum_{L \ge 1} \sqrt{8\pi^2} \frac{(-i)^L}{\sqrt{2L + 1}} Y_{LM}^* (\theta, \phi) c^M_{J_f J_i L} M_L(q)
$$

Computation of reduced multipoles

Reduced multipoles are defined by **[Carlson and Schiavilla RMP 70 (1998)]**:

$$
\langle J_f M | \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^{\dagger}(\boldsymbol{q}) | J_i M \rangle = (-1)^{J_i - M} \sum_{L} \sqrt{4\pi} (-i)^L P_L(\cos \theta) c_{J_f J_i L}^M C_L(\boldsymbol{q}),
$$

$$
\langle J_f M | \hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_{\lambda}^* \cdot \mathbf{j}^{\dagger}(\boldsymbol{q}) | J_i M \rangle = (-1)^{J_i - M + 1} \sum_{L \ge 1} \sqrt{8\pi^2} \frac{(-i)^L}{\sqrt{2L + 1}} Y_{LM}^*(\theta, \phi) c_{J_f J_i L}^M M_L(\boldsymbol{q})
$$

Calculable with QMC techniques

Invert system of equations with as many independent choices of q as allowed multipolarities

Results in light nuclei

Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.03487 (*Accepted PRL***), Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.04744 (***Accepted PRC***)**

Magnetic moments

One-body picture:

$$
\mu^{LO} = \sum_{i} (L_{i,z} + g_p S_{i,z}) \frac{1 + \tau_{3,i}}{2} + g_n S_{i,z} \frac{1 - \tau_{3,i}}{2}
$$

 $\gamma \overset{\text{p}}{\uparrow} \overset{\text{p}}{\downarrow}$

N

N

Two-body currents can play a large role (up to \sim 33%) in describing magnetic dipole moments

Two-body dynamics: VMC magnetic densities

 $NV2+3$ -IIb $*$

QMC allows one access to the two-body dynamics involved in process

$$
\text{Ex:} \qquad \mu^{\text{2b}} = \int dr_{ij} 4\pi r_{ij}^2 \rho_M^{\text{2b}}(r_{ij})
$$

Understand the importance of contributions to matrix elements, multipoles

Not limited to zero momentum transfer

Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.03487 (*Accepted PRL***), Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.04744 (***Accepted PRC***)**

Two-body effects to N3LO needed to describe data up to *q* ~ 600 MeV

Minimal model dependence in total form factor for 3 A 10

Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.03487 (*Accepted PRL***), Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.04744 (***Accepted PRC***)**

Magnetic form factors for mirror nuclei

Spin-orbit interference in M1

Orbital contribution generates positive contribution to M1

Spin can be positive or negative, depending on single particle structure

Minimal contribution orbital contribution to M3

Destructive interference between spin and orbit present in nuclei with smaller M1 peak than M3

Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.03487 (*Accepted PRL***), Chambers-Wall et al., arXiv:2407.04744 (***Accepted PRC***)**

Magnetic radii

Extracted from low-momentum transfer behavior of form factor

Accounts for two-body correlations, finite size/nucleon level corrections via form factors

Limited data for magnetic radii, but good agreement where possible

Uncertainty is statistical, form factor dependence may also be important

King et al., *in preparation*

Longitudinal form factors

Calculation of longitudinal form factors similarly possible

Sensitive to nuclear model around the breakdown scale (q \sim 2.5 fm⁻¹)

Excellent agreement at low energies

Higher-order multipoles

C2 necessary to explain the data at moderate momentum transfer

C4, C6 have small enough effect in $10B$ that we can neglect them

Sensitive to the density and shape of the system

Reproducing distinct features in charge densities could be test of nuclear models

Charge radii

Agreement of ~5% or better across the board

Model successful for He and Li isotopes, less so for Be

Same framework could be used for radioisotopes in the future

Uncertainty is statistical, form factor dependence may also be important

Outlook: Beyond light nuclei

Auxiliary Field Diffusion Monte Carlo

Use the single particle basis:

$$
\langle S|\Psi\rangle\propto\xi_{\alpha_1}(s_1)\,\xi_{\alpha_2}(s_2)\dots\,\xi_{\alpha_A}(s_A)
$$

Advantage of a polynomial scaling with A

Technically more complicated to operate on wave function

Cost is a simpler correlation structure in the wave function

Recent progress in AFDMC for EM properties

Applied to the study of low momentum transfer observable – magnetic moments

Future work to push elastic electron scattering to $A \le 20$

Martin *et al***., PRC 108, L031304 (2023)**

Accurate many-body calculations plus χEFT is a powerful way to understand the impact of the nuclear dynamics on electromagnetic structure

Two-body physics plays an important role in describing experimental data

Framework developed for QMC calculations of form factors, cross sections

Outlook: Push VMC and GFMC to study A=11-14 nuclei, incorporate the framework in AFDMC for heavier systems, collaboration with experimentalists and other many-body theorists in the future

Acknowledgements

Wash U: Chambers-Wall (GS), Pastore (PI), Piarulli (PI) ANL: Wiringa JLab+ODU: Gnech, Schiavilla

Funding from DOE/NNSA Stewardship Science Graduate Fellowship

Additional slides

Variational Monte Carlo

Slater determinant of nucleons in s- and p-shell coupled to the appropriate quantum numbers

Pair correlation operator encoding appropriate cluster structure

Two- and three-body correlation operator to reflect impact of nuclear interaction at short distances

Optimize when you minimize:

$$
E_V = \frac{\langle \Psi_V | H | \Psi_V \rangle}{\langle \Psi_V | \Psi_V \rangle} \ge E_0
$$

Carlson et al. Rev. Mod. Phys. 87, 1607 (2015)

Magnetic form factors 3≤A≤10

