Direct Evidence for Octupole Deformation in ¹⁴⁶Ba and the Origin of Large E1 Moment Variations in Reflection-Asymmetric Nuclei

B. Bucher,^{1,2,*} S. Zhu,^{3,†} C. Y. Wu,¹ R. V. F. Janssens,³ R. N. Bernard,⁴ L. M. Robledo,⁴ T. R. Rodríguez,⁴ D. Cline,⁵ A. B. Hayes,⁵ A. D. Ayangeakaa,³ M. Q. Buckner,¹ C. M. Campbell,⁶ M. P. Carpenter,³ J. A. Clark,³ H. L. Crawford,⁶ H. M. David,^{3,‡} C. Dickerson,³ J. Harker,^{3,7} C. R. Hoffman,³ B. P. Kay,³ F. G. Kondev,³ T. Lauritsen,³ A. O. Macchiavelli,⁶ R. C. Pardo,³ G. Savard,³ D. Seweryniak,³ and R. Vondrasek³

¹Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA

²Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415, USA ³Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA

⁴Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, E-28049 Madrid, Spain

⁵University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA

⁶Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA

(Received 13 January 2017; published 12 April 2017)

Despite the more than 1 order of magnitude difference between the measured dipole moments in ¹⁴⁴Ba and ¹⁴⁶Ba, the octupole correlations in ¹⁴⁶Ba are found to be as strong as those in ¹⁴⁴Ba with a similarly large value of $B(E3; 3^- \rightarrow 0^+)$ determined as $48(\frac{+21}{-29})$ W.u. The new results not only establish unambiguously the presence of a region of octupole deformation centered on these neutron-rich Ba isotopes, but also manifest the dependence of the electric dipole moments on the occupancy of different neutron orbitals in nuclei with enhanced octupole strength, as revealed by fully microscopic calculations.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.152504

Unlike the electrons in atoms, protons and neutrons are closely bound together in nuclei by the strong nuclear force, occupying quantum levels that can result in different nuclear shapes because of sizable long range multipolemultipole interactions. The studies of these shapes, and of the associated nuclear moments, facilitate our understanding of the origin of simple patterns in such complex quantum many-body systems. Certain isotopes are thought to develop octupole deformation due to strong octupoleoctupole interactions present when both types of valence nucleons occupy pairs of single-particle orbitals near the Fermi surface with orbital (ℓ) and total (j) angular momenta differing by $3\hbar$ [1]. There is now experimental evidence to suggest that nuclei with a low-lying negativeparity band of states interleaved with the ground-state positive-parity band and linked by fast E1 transitions between the two sequences result from strong octupole correlations. However, because E3 transitions are fundamentally hindered in the electromagnetic decay of nuclear states when competing with E1 and E2 transitions, the presence of strong octupole correlations is often inferred from the observation of large E1 transition probabilities. The latter are related to the intrinsic electric dipole moment and are typically obtained from E1/E2 intensity ratios, with the E2 transition probabilities then being estimated from lifetime measurements of low-spin states or from systematics. A direct experimental determination of the electric octupole moment requires the use of the Coulomb excitation process for the nuclei of interest.

The neutron-deficient radium isotopes around ²²⁴Ra and the neutron-rich barium isotopes centered at ¹⁴⁶Ba have been predicted to belong to the two regions with the strongest octupole correlations [2]. However, large fluctuations, by as much as 2 orders of magnitude for a given spin, in the value of the intrinsic electric dipole moment have been well documented in these two regions [1,3], even though other spectroscopic features, i.e., negative-parity bands located at comparably low excitation energies, strongly suggest the presence of similar octupole strengths. Classically, octupole-deformed nuclei should be characterized by large electric dipole moments proportional to the strength of the octupole correlations [4,5] because of the redistribution of the mass and charge of the protons and neutrons. Interestingly, in the radium isotopes, a minimum occurs in the value of the intrinsic electric dipole moment for ²²⁴Ra, but the magnitude of the octupole strength in this nucleus, as recently quantified through Coulomb excitation with a ²²⁴Ra radioactive beam, is one of the largest in the region [6]. Neutron-rich barium nuclei form another interesting set in terms of studying the relationship between the intrinsic electric dipole and octupole moments [1,7,8]. Specifically, between ¹⁴⁴Ba₈₈ and ¹⁴⁶Ba₉₀, the electric dipole moments are observed to drop suddenly by more than an order of magnitude [7-9], but the value quickly returns to an enhanced level in ¹⁴⁸Ba₉₂ [9]. Furthermore, it has been pointed out in Ref. [9] that the octupole strength in ¹⁴⁶Ba may in fact be quenched as this could account for the presence of a particle alignment at moderate angular momentum ($I^{\pi} \sim 12^+$) in the ground-state band. Clarification of these issues requires a direct measurement of the *E*3 strength in this nucleus, a challenge until recently because of its short half-life ($T_{1/2} = 2.2$ s [10]).

Despite the many experimental challenges associated with measurements of the electric octupole moments in these nuclei, there is also additional motivation in fundamental physics to understand the relation between the intrinsic electric dipole and octupole moments: the existence of an atomic electric dipole moment has important implications for CP violation in the early Universe that could possibly be responsible for the observed asymmetry between matter and antimatter [11], herewith signifying new physics beyond the standard model [12]. In diamagnetic atoms, a measureable electric dipole moment could be induced by the so-called Schiff moment, a quantity that can be enlarged by orders of magnitude by a sizable octupole moment and is sensitive to details of the charge distribution [13,14]. Moreover, the contribution of the nuclear intrinsic electric dipole moment to the Schiff moment is not negligible [14]. Hence, it is important to recognize the origin and magnitude of nuclear intrinsic moments, especially the electric dipole moment as it is closely associated with the nuclear mass and charge distributions. An accurate estimate of Schiff moments for different nuclei is required to evaluate the precision of calculations of this quantity and to compare the limits on P and T violation reported by various experiments involving them.

To determine the octupole strength in ¹⁴⁶Ba, a Coulomb excitation experiment was performed similar to the one carried out recently for ¹⁴⁴Ba [15]. The beam of ¹⁴⁶Ba ions was produced from ²⁵²Cf fission in the CARIBU facility [16,17] along with the isobaric contaminants ¹⁴⁶La and ¹⁴⁶Ce, and was charge bred to $q = 28^+$. The A = 146 beam was accelerated through the ATLAS accelerator to 659 MeV and was focused onto a 1.1 mg/cm² ²⁰⁸Pb target (99.86% enriched). The average ¹⁴⁶Ba beam intensity was 3×10^3 ions per second over 12 days. Additional stable contaminants (with the same A/q) included ⁹⁴Mo¹⁸⁺, 94 Zr¹⁸⁺, 120 Sn²³⁺, 193 Ir³⁷⁺, and 198 Hg³⁸⁺, but all were readily separated from the A = 146 beam, based on timeof-flight (TOF) and scattering angle data recorded in the CHICO2 heavy-ion counter [18] (Fig. 1). This allowed for a clean $A = 146 \gamma$ -ray spectrum resulting from Coulomb excitation (Fig. 2).

In the spectrum of Fig. 2, measured with the GRETINA γ -ray tracking array [19], several transitions from ¹⁴⁶Ba are apparent, especially those belonging to positive-parity levels in the ground-state band that are excited (and decay) by *E*2 transitions. The negative-parity levels are populated less frequently, but the excitation occurs predominantly



FIG. 1. TOF versus scattering angle recorded by CHICO2 in coincidence with a γ ray observed in GRETINA. The A = 146 group is readily distinguished from the stable beam contaminants.

through E3 transitions and their decay yields provide a measurement of the corresponding E3 matrix elements.

The γ -ray yields were extracted for two separate scattering angle (θ) ranges: 30°–40° and 40°–75°. At lower angles, it is difficult to isolate the A = 146 ions from other beam contaminants in the TOF spectrum while, at higher θ values, statistics are insufficient (the cross sections fall off with the $1/\sin^4(\theta/2)$ Rutherford angular dependence). The data for each set of angles were analyzed with the Coulomb excitation least-squares search code GOSIA [20]. Yields were determined for levels up to $10\hbar$ in the groundstate band and $9\hbar$ in the negative-parity sequence. The energies of all observed γ rays, along with several branching ratios and level lifetimes, were known from previous works [7–10]. The latter information proved useful for constraining the GOSIA fit. The sets of E1, E2, and E3 matrix elements between levels with no previously known lifetimes were coupled according to the rigid-rotor prescription [21] governed by the individual intrinsic $E\lambda$ moments (see also Refs. [7,15,22]). Once the χ^2 minimum was found, the rigid-rotor constraint was removed to properly determine the associated uncertainties, including



FIG. 2. The coincident γ -ray spectrum obtained by gating on the A = 146 group in the CHICO2 TOF spectrum (Fig. 1). Many ¹⁴⁶Ba transitions are seen along with lines from the radioactive isobaric contaminants that were also produced in CARIBU.

TABLE I. The experimental $|\langle I_j^{\pi} || \hat{M}_{\lambda} || I_i^{\pi} \rangle|$ matrix elements $(e \cdot b^{\lambda/2})$ based on the GOSIA fit along with new symmetryconserving configuration-mixing calculations (see text and Ref. [23] for details).

$I^{\pi}_i \to I^{\pi}_f$	Ελ	Experimental	SCCM
$0^+ \rightarrow 1^-$	<i>E</i> 1	$0.000223 \begin{pmatrix} 10 \\ -8 \end{pmatrix}^{a}$	0.00474
$1^- \rightarrow 3^-$	E2	1.2(5)	1.6
$0^+ \rightarrow 2^+$	E2	1.17(2) ^a	1.14
$2^+ \rightarrow 4^+$	E2	1.97(14)	1.90
$4^+ \rightarrow 6^+$	<i>E</i> 2	$2.35\binom{+20}{-24}$	2.43
$6^+ \rightarrow 8^+$	<i>E</i> 2	$2.17\binom{+65}{-33}$	2.90
$0^+ \rightarrow 3^-$	E3	$0.65 \binom{+14}{-20}$	0.54
$2^+ \rightarrow 5^-$	E3	$1.01 \binom{+61}{-20}$	0.87
$4^+ \rightarrow 7^-$	E3	$1.25\binom{+85}{-34}$	1.11
$6^+ \rightarrow 9^-$	E3	$1.5\binom{+8}{-12}$	

^aPrimarily determined by previous lifetime and/or branching ratio data [10].

correlations between matrix elements. In most cases, the uncertainty was primarily limited by the lack of statistics in the measured yields due to the low radioactive beam intensity.

As anticipated, the extracted *E*1 matrix elements did not display much sensitivity to the data; as mentioned above, the dipole strength was known to be small from earlier work [7–9] and, in fact, the only observed γ rays from *E*1 decays in the present measurement came from the 3⁻ and 5⁻ states. Moreover, the relative sign between the intrinsic *E*1 and *E*3 moments was found to also be insensitive to the data. On the other hand, a number of new *E*2 and *E*3 matrix elements were well determined from the data (Table I).

The most significant result obtained here is the groundstate E3 matrix element $|\langle 3_1^- || \hat{M}_{E3} || 0_1^+ \rangle|$; it is determined to be $0.65({+14 \ -20}) eb^{3/2}$ and reflects the amplitude of octupole deformation present in the ground state [1]. This value corresponds to a $B(E3; 3^- \rightarrow 0^+)$ reduced transition probability of $48({+21 \ -29})$ W.u., which is essentially the same as the value of $48({+25 \ -34})$ W.u. reported recently for ¹⁴⁴Ba [15]. This new result supports the long-standing prediction that ¹⁴⁶Ba is indeed one of the isotopes with strong octupole collectivity [24].

The persistence of this strong collectivity between ¹⁴⁴Ba₈₈ and ¹⁴⁶Ba₉₀ confirms that the drastic reduction in electric dipole moment between the two isotopes is not the result of quenched octupole strength, as suggested by

the high-spin behavior of ¹⁴⁶Ba. The sudden band alignments in ¹⁴⁶Ba pointed out in Ref. [9] are then most likely the result of a crossing between yrast and yrare bands predicted in this mass region sometime ago [28,29]. It should be noted that alternative explanations have also been proposed. These include a transition to a more reflectionsymmetric shape at moderate spin [30], and a description in terms of a condensate of rotationally aligned octupole phonons [31,32]. Concerning the latter, however, it should be mentioned that while the interleaved sequences of opposite parity are consistent with the proposed picture, the absence of strong *E*1 linking transitions associated with multioctupole phonon excitations at higher spins is not.

Over the past three decades, extensive theoretical efforts have been devoted to understanding the variation of the E1 transition strengths observed in nuclei near ¹⁴⁶Ba and ²²⁴Ra [33–41]. It is generally believed that the observations are the result of the relation between octupole collectivity and the nonuniform distribution of protons and neutrons. This was first shown within the framework of a macroscopicmicroscopic approach where the experimental E1 transition strengths could be described [33,37]. Early self-consistent Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) calculations with the Gogny interaction were also able to reproduce the very low values of the dipole moment D_0 in ²²⁴Ra and ¹⁴⁶Ba [36,38]. However, all of these models predicted that the nuclei under study are reflection asymmetric, and argued that this is at the core of the observed variations. Thus, the recently measured strong octupole collectivity in ¹⁴⁴Ba [15] and ¹⁴⁶Ba (Table I) provides an important validation of this interpretation.

More recently, microscopic self-consistent methods have been improved by including beyond-mean-field correlations. These developments provide an explanation of the microscopic origin of octupole collectivity and study the impact of octupole correlations on both ground-state properties and electromagnetic transitions. To explore in ¹⁴⁶Ba this phenomenon of a strong octupole collectivity accompanied by a much reduced electric dipole moment, a theoretical model based on mean field HFB intrinsic wave functions has been used with a symmetry-conserving configuration-mixing method (SCCM). The model assumes that only the axially symmetric quadrupole (Q_{20}) and octupole (Q_{30}) degrees of freedom are relevant (collectively referred to as **Q**). A set of constrained HFB states $|\mathbf{Q}\rangle$, subsequently projected onto good angular momentum, parity, and particle number (the corresponding states are denoted as $|\Phi^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q})\rangle$) is used as a variational subspace. Linear combinations of the above states $|\Psi_{\sigma}^{J,\pi}\rangle =$ $\sum_{\mathbf{Q}} f_{\sigma}^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q}) | \Phi^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q}) \rangle$ are used in the spirit of the generator coordinate method (GCM) to obtain the low-lying collective spectrum (see Ref. [23] for a recent account and an application to ¹⁴⁴Ba). The interaction generating the intrinsic states is the well-known Gogny D1S force [42]. The



FIG. 3. The HFB potential energy surface. Axial quadrupole (β_2) and octupole (β_3) deformation parameters are defined as $\beta_{\lambda} \equiv 4\pi \langle \mathbf{q} | r^{\lambda} Y_{\lambda 0} | \mathbf{q} \rangle / (3r_0^{\lambda} A^{\lambda/3+1})$ with $r_0 = 1.2$ fm and A being the mass number. Dashed (solid) contour lines are separated by 0.5 (2.0) MeV.

physics of the low-lying quadrupole and octupole states is contained in the collective amplitudes $F_{\sigma}^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q})$ defined in Eq. (5) of Ref. [23] in terms of the GCM amplitudes $f_{\sigma}^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q})$ [the latter are obtained by solving the Hill-Wheeler equations of the GCM].

The HFB potential energy surface as a function of the deformation parameters β_2 and β_3 is given in Fig. 3 for ¹⁴⁶Ba. Note that the potential energy is symmetric under the change of sign of β_3 due to the parity symmetry of the nuclear interaction. A reflection-asymmetric, absolute minimum is obtained at $\beta_2 = 0.21$ and $\beta_3 = \pm 0.1$. The shape of the $F^{J,\pi}$ collective amplitudes is mainly driven by the intrinsic potential energy surface. As a consequence, the $F^{J,\pi}$ amplitudes for ¹⁴⁶Ba are concentrated around those minima as seen in Fig. 4 where they are compared with those for 144 Ba and 148 Ba. In the three nuclei, the 1^- and 0^+ collective amplitudes have a very large overlap, characteristic of strong octupole correlations. The energy of the 1⁻ state is well reproduced; however, the ground-state and negative-parity sequences are characterized by a smaller moment of inertia than observed, due to limitations discussed in Ref. [23].

The electromagnetic transition strengths have been computed without invoking effective charges or uncontrolled approximations. The calculated values are compared with the experimental data in Table I. There is fair



FIG. 4. Collective amplitudes corresponding to 144 Ba (left), 146 Ba (middle), and 148 Ba (right).

agreement between the calculated and measured $E\lambda$ matrix elements, including the strong B(E3) strengths between the 3^{-} and 0^{+} and the much quenched E1 between the 1^{-} and 0^+ states. In the present microscopic framework, the B(E1)transition strength is proportional to the square of the overlap of the dipole operator between the initial 1^{-} and final 0^+ states. There are two basic ingredients entering the required overlap [see Eq. (4) of Ref. [23]]. One is the structure of the collective wave functions $F_{\sigma}^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q})$, and the other is the overlap between the projected intrinsic states $|\Phi^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q})\rangle$. Because the values of $F^{J,\pi}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{Q})$, as shown in Fig. 4, exhibit little variation with neutron number in the three Ba isotopes, the sudden drop of B(E1) in ¹⁴⁶Ba has to be associated with the overlap of the dipole operator between the projected intrinsic states $|\Phi^{J,\pi}(\mathbf{Q})\rangle$. Specifically, the calculations indicate that the dipole moment changes from positive values in ¹⁴⁴Ba, to nearly zero values in ¹⁴⁶Ba, and finally to negative values in ¹⁴⁸Ba. Hence, the changes in E1 strengths with neutron number are associated with changes in the intrinsic dipole moment linked to the evolving mean field. A similar conclusion was reached in Ref. [38].

The behavior of the dipole moment with neutron number in these Ba isotopes can further be traced back to the occupation of specific single-particle states near the Fermi surface. Considering the evolution of the single-particle energies with β_3 in Fig. 5, three neutron orbitals are of interest with K^{π} quantum numbers $3/2^-$, $5/2^-$, and $1/2^+$. These are of $h_{9/2}$, $f_{7/2}$, and $i_{13/2}$ spherical parentage, respectively. The three states are empty in ¹⁴⁴Ba, but have



FIG. 5. Neutron single-particle energies as a function of β_2 (left) and as a function of β_3 (right) for ¹⁴⁶Ba. The right panel is calculated with a constant value of $\beta_2 = 0.2$ (ground-state value) starting with $\beta_3 = 0$ at the central vertical axis. A thick dotted line shows the Fermi level. The single-particle energy as a function of β_2 is used to justify the spherical orbital assignments and parities of the relevant neutron orbitals (see text for details).

significant respective occupancies of $v^2 = 0.4$, $v^2 = 0.27$, and $v^2 = 0.20$ in ¹⁴⁶Ba. As visualized in Fig. 4 of Ref. [38], their occupation results in a contribution to the dipole moment that almost cancels that by the protons. As the occupancies increase further with two additional neutrons in ¹⁴⁸Ba, the (total) dipole moment changes sign and returns to a sizable value.

To summarize, the E3 strength in short-lived ¹⁴⁶Ba was measured directly by multistep Coulomb excitation with GRETINA and CHICO2. The long-standing prediction of an enhanced octupole collectivity was verified. The data also provide firm experimental evidence that the large drop of the B(E1) value is not the result of quenched octupole collectivity in ¹⁴⁶Ba. Such a collectivity is well reproduced by the SCCM model with the Gogny energy density functional, and the variation in E1 strength between isotopes is associated with changes in the neutron occupancy of high-i, low-Korbitals located near the Fermi surface. The present results help validate the general character of the microscopic origin of large variations in electric dipole moments in the reflection-asymmetric nuclear potential, and they represent an important confirmation of such effects in the Ba region of neutron-rich nuclei.

This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357 (ANL). Work at LLNL and INL is supported by the U.S. DOE under respective Contracts No. DE-AC52-07NA27344 and No. DE-AC07-05ID14517. GRETINA was funded by the U.S. DOE, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics by the ANL contract number above and by Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231 (LBNL). This research used resources of ANL's ATLAS facility, which is a DOE Office of Science User Facility. The work of L. M. R. was supported by Spanish Grants No. FIS2012-34479-P MINECO, No. FPA2015-65929-P MINECO, and No. FIS2015-63770-P MINECO, and the work of T.R.R. by Spanish Grants No. FIS-2014-53434-P MINECO and Programa Ramón y Cajal 2012 No. 11420.

brian.bucher@inl.gov

zhu@anl.gov

[‡]Present address: GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung, 64291 Darmstadt, Germany.

- [1] P. A. Butler and W. Nazarewicz, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 349 (1996).
- [2] P.A. Butler, J. Phys. G 43, 073002 (2016).
- [3] I. Ahmad and P. A. Butler, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 43, 71 (1993).
- [4] B. M. Strutinsky, Sov. J. At. En. 1, 611 (1956).
- [5] A. Bohr and B. R. Mottelson, Nucl. Phys. 4, 529 (1957).
- [6] L. P. Gaffney et al., Nature (London) 497, 199 (2013).

- [7] W. R. Phillips, I. Ahmad, H. Emling, R. Holzmann, R. V. F. Janssens, T.-L. Khoo, and M. W. Drigert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 3257 (1986).
- [8] H. Mach, W. Nazarewicz, D. Kusnezov, M. Moszyński, B. Fogelberg, M. Hellstrom, L. Spanier, R. L. Gill, R. F. Casten, and A. Wolf, Phys. Rev. C 41, R2469 (1990).
- [9] W. Urban et al., Nucl. Phys. A613, 107 (1997).
- [10] L. K. Peker and J. K. Tuli, Nucl. Data Sheets 82, 187 (1997).
- [11] C. P. Liu, M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, W. C. Haxton, R. G. E. Timmermans, and A. E. L. Dieperink, Phys. Rev. C 76, 035503 (2007).
- [12] J. Engel, M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, and U. van Kolck, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 71, 21 (2013).
- [13] N. Auerbach, V. V. Flambaum, and V. Spevak, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4316 (1996).
- [14] V. Spevak, N. Auerbach, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. C 56, 1357 (1997).
- [15] B. Bucher et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 112503 (2016).
- [16] G. Savard, S. Baker, C. Davids, A. F. Levand, E. F. Moore, R. C. Pardo, R. Vondrasek, B. J. Zabransky, and G. Zinkann, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. B 266, 4086 (2008).
- [17] G. Savard, A. Levand, R. Pardo, R. Vondrasek, and B. Zabransky, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. Conf. Proc. 6, 010008 (2015).
- [18] C. Y. Wu, D. Cline, A. Hayes, R. S. Flight, A. M. Melchionna, C. Zhou, I. Y. Lee, D. Swan, R. Fox, and J. T. Anderson, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A 814, 6 (2016).
- [19] S. Paschalis *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **709**, 44 (2013).
- [20] T. Czosnyka, D. Cline, and C. Y. Wu, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.
 28, 745 (1983); GOSIA User Manual, http://www.pas.rochester.edu/~cline/Gosia/Gosia_Manual_20120510.pdf.
- [21] A. Bohr and B. R. Mottelson, *Nuclear Structure*, Vol. 2 (W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, MA, 1975).
- [22] H. J. Wollersheim et al., Nucl. Phys. A556, 261 (1993).
- [23] R. N. Bernard, L. M. Robledo, and T. R. Rodríguez, Phys. Rev. C 93, 061302(R) (2016).
- [24] Recently, a new evaluation on ¹⁴⁶Ba was published [25] that identifies a γ -ray transition with strong intensity connecting the 3^-_1 level to the ground state. However, the details surrounding the measurement responsible for this result are not easily accessible while the corresponding B(E3) is unphysically high (~1600 W.u.). The nonobservation of this γ ray in Refs. [8,9,26,27] is consistent with the present result.
- [25] Yu. Khazov, A. Rodionov, and G. Shulyak, Nucl. Data Sheets 136, 163 (2016).
- [26] S. M. Scott, W. D. Hamilton, P. Hungerford, D. D. Warner, G. Jung, K. D. Wünsch, and B. Pfeiffer, J. Phys. G 6, 1291 (1980).
- [27] A. J. Mitchell et al., Phys. Rev. C 93, 014306 (2016).
- [28] R. Bengtsson and S. Frauendorf, Nucl. Phys. A314, 27 (1979).
- [29] R. Bengtsson, I. Hamamoto, and B. Mottelson, Phys. Lett. B 73, 259 (1978).
- [30] W. Nazarewicz and S. L. Tabor, Phys. Rev. C 45, 2226 (1992).

- [31] S. Frauendorf, in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on ICFN5, 2012, Sanibel Island, Florida, USA* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2013), pp. 39–48.
- [32] S. Frauendorf, Phys. Rev. C 77, 021304(R) (2008).
- [33] G. A. Leander, W. Nazarewicz, G. F. Bertsch, and J. Dudek, Nucl. Phys. A453, 58 (1986).
- [34] I. Hamamoto, J. Höller, and X. Z. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B 226, 17 (1989).
- [35] L. K. Peker and J. H. Hamilton, J. Phys. G 5, L165 (1979).
- [36] J. L. Egido and L. M. Robledo, Nucl. Phys. A494, 85 (1989).

- [37] P.A. Butler and W. Nazarewicz, Nucl. Phys. A533, 249 (1991).
- [38] J. L. Egido and L. M. Robledo, Nucl. Phys. A518, 475 (1990).
- [39] J. L. Egido and L. M. Robledo, Nucl. Phys. A545, 589 (1992).
- [40] L. M. Robledo, M. Baldo, P. Schuck, and X. Viñas, Phys. Rev. C 81, 034315 (2010).
- [41] C. O. Dorso, W. D. Myers, and W. J. Swiatecki, Nucl. Phys. A451, 189 (1986).
- [42] J. F. Berger, M. Girod, and D. Gogny, Nucl. Phys. A428, 23 (1984).