

## Single State Dominance in Two-Neutrino Double Beta decay

S. K. Ghorui<sup>1,\*</sup>, P. K. Raina<sup>1</sup>, and P. K. Rath<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, IIT Ropar, Rupnagar - 140001, INDIA and

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, University of Lucknow, Lucknow - 226007, INDIA

### Introduction

The nuclear double beta( $\beta\beta$ ) decay has long been recognized as a sensitive tool to test the mass and the nature (Dirac or Majorana) of neutrino, lepton number conservation and weak interactions involving right-hand currents. The  $2\nu\beta\beta$  decay is consistent with the Standard Model (SM) and has been observed in ten nuclei [1]. On the other hand,  $0\nu\beta\beta$  decay, forbidden in the SM, is yet to be confirmed experimentally.  $2\nu\beta\beta$  decay gives the opportunity to test the nuclear structure models to calculate nuclear matrix elements, necessary for neutrino Majorana mass estimation.

Single State Dominance (SSD) hypothesis [2] conjectured that, for those  $2\nu\beta\beta$  transitions where the ground state of the intermediate nucleus is a  $J^\pi=1^+$  state, the matrix element for  $2\nu\beta\beta$  decay could be dominated by GT transitions through this state. If the SSD hypothesis is confirmed, the half-lives for  $2\nu\beta\beta$  decay could be determined from single- $\beta$  and electron capture (EC) measurements. From theoretical point of view, the possible realization of the SSD hypothesis for the ground-state to ground-state transitions would lead to simplification in the theoretical description of the intermediate nucleus, since only the lowest  $1^+$  wavefunction has to be calculated.

Here, we describe the  $2\nu\beta^\pm\beta^\pm/\beta^+EC/ECEC$  transitions within a self-consistent mean field model, namely, Deformed Hartree-Fock (DHF) model. There are only few at-

tempts made earlier to study SSD in  $2\nu\beta\beta$  decay [3].

### Theoretical Formalism

The axially deformed states are obtained by solving deformed Hartree-Fock equations in an iterative process. The states of good  $J$  can be extracted by means of angular momentum projection operator. In general, the projected states are not orthogonal. We orthonormalise them using following equation

$$\sum_{K'} (H_{KK'}^J - E_J N_{KK'}^J) b_{K'}^J = 0 . \quad (1)$$

The inverse half-life of the  $2\nu\beta\beta$  decay for the  $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$  transition is given by

$$[T_{1/2}^{2\nu}(0^+ \rightarrow 0^+)]^{-1} = G_{2\nu} |M_{2\nu}|^2 , \quad (2)$$

where  $G_{2\nu}$  is the integrated kinematical factor. The nuclear transition matrix element (NTME)  $M_{2\nu}$ , which is a model dependent quantity, is given by

$$M_{2\nu} = \sum_N \frac{\langle 0_F^+ || \sigma\tau^\pm || 1_N^+ \rangle \langle 1_N^+ || \sigma\tau^\pm || 0_I^+ \rangle}{E_N - (E_I + E_F)/2} , \quad (3)$$

where  $|0_I^+\rangle$ ,  $|0_F^+\rangle$  and  $|1_N^+\rangle$  are initial, final and virtual intermediate states respectively. The quantity  $E_I(E_F)$  is the energy of initial (final) states. For detail formalism see Ref. [4].

### Results and Discussions

In the present work we have analyzed neutrino emitting modes of double beta decay for some nuclei which fulfil SSD hypothesis. In

\*Electronic address: surja@iitrpr.ac.in

TABLE I: The double Gamow-Teller matrix element  $M_{DGT}^{2\nu}$  and corresponding half-life  $T_{1/2}^{2\nu}$  for  $0_{gs}^+ \rightarrow 0_{gs}^+$  transition of  $2\nu \beta^- \beta^-$  decay for nuclei with SSD characteristics. Case A: Extracted from single- $\beta$  and electron-capture decay. Case B: Calculated values by considering only the first  $1^+$  state of intermediate nuclei. Experimental values are taken from [1].

Nucleus	Case	$\log ft_{EC}$	$\log ft_{\beta^-}$	$M_{DGT}^{2\nu}(\text{SSD})$	$T_{1/2}^{2\nu}(\text{SSD})$	$T_{1/2}^{2\nu}(\text{exp.})$
$^{100}\text{Mo}$	A	4.29	4.59	0.19	$5.0 \times 10^{18}$	$7.1 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{18}$
	B	4.06	4.25	0.23	$2.05 \times 10^{18}$	
$^{110}\text{Pd}$	A	4.08	4.66	0.19	$1.2 \times 10^{20}$	$>6.0 \times 10^{16}$
	B	3.96	4.47	0.18	$0.78 \times 10^{20}$	
$^{116}\text{Cd}$	A	4.39	4.66	0.16	$1.1 \times 10^{19}$	$2.8 \pm 0.2 \times 10^{19}$
	B	4.35	4.91	0.09	$1.76 \times 10^{19}$	

order to test the validity of SSD hypothesis, the matrix elements are extracted from  $\log ft$  values corresponding to single- $\beta$  and electron-capture decay [5]. The DGT matrix element for  $2\nu\beta\beta$  decay within SSD hypothesis is obtained by:

$$M_{DGT}^{2\nu}(\text{SSD}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{ft_{EC}ft_{\beta^-}}} \frac{6D}{g_A^2(Q_{\beta^-} - Q_{EC})}, \quad (4)$$

where  $D = 6147$   $\beta$ -decay constant and  $g_A = 1.25$  is the axial-vector coupling strength. In accordance with the matrix element 4, the SSD hypothesis is realized within DHF calculation by restricting the summation of Eq. 3 to the first  $1^+$  state of intermediate nuclei.

Table I shows the matrix elements and corresponding half-life within SSD hypothesis for  $^{100}\text{Mo}$ ,  $^{110}\text{Pd}$  and  $^{116}\text{Cd}$  nuclei. Comparison with available experimental result is also made.

Within DHF model, considering only the lowest  $1^+$  state of intermediate nucleus in calculation of nuclear matrix elements, we have predicted the half-lives as  $3.5 \times 10^{22}$  yrs and  $6.1 \times 10^{21}$  yrs with  $g_A = 1.25$  for  $2\nu ECEC$  transitions in  $^{78}\text{Kr}$  and  $^{106}\text{Cd}$ , respectively.

### Conclusions

Here, we have studied  $2\nu\beta\beta$  nuclear matrix element within self-consistent Deformed Hartree-Fock method with special interest of

SSD in some potential candidates. These results will help in analysis of NEMO3 data to test SSD hypothesis for  $^{100}\text{Mo}$  and  $^{116}\text{Cd}$  nuclei. If observed, it will simplify not only the theoretical description of intermediate nuclei but also the experimental estimation of  $2\nu\beta\beta$  half-life.

### Acknowledgements

Authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), New Delhi, Govt. of India through project No. 03(1216)/12/EMR-II dated 13.05.2012.

### References

- [1] A. S. Barabash, Phys. Part. Nucl. 42, 613 (2011). V.I. Tretyak, Yu.G. Zdesenko, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables 80, 83 (2002).
- [2] J. Abad et al., Ann. Fis. A 80, 9 (1984).
- [3] O. Civitarese & J. Suhonen, Phys. Rev. C 58, 1535 (1998); F. Simkovic et al., J. Phys. G 27, 2233 (2001); P. Domin et al., Nucl. Phys. A 753, 337 (2005); O. Moreno et al., J. Phys. G 36, 015106 (2009).
- [4] S. K. Ghorui, Ph. D. Thesis, IIT Kharagpur (2012). *Unpublished*
- [5] NNDC, URL <http://www.nndc.bnl.gov>