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The classical Hamiltonian function of the liquid drop model has 5 degrees of freedom, namely the two shape variables $\beta$ and $\gamma$ and the three Euler angles.

$$
\mathcal{H}=\underbrace{\frac{B}{2}\left(\dot{\beta}^{2}+\beta^{2} \dot{\gamma}^{2}\right)}_{T_{v i b}}+\underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \omega_{k}^{2} \mathcal{I}_{k}}_{T_{r o t}}+V(\beta, \gamma)
$$

Bohr-Mottelson Hamiltonian after quantization

Imposing a certain value for the $\gamma$ shape variable, one reaches the $\gamma$-rigid version of the collective model which is interesting by itself due to its description of the basic rotation-vibration coupling.

- $\gamma \neq 0^{\circ} \Rightarrow 4$ degrees of freedom $\left(\beta, \theta_{1}, \theta_{2}, \theta_{3}\right) \Rightarrow$ Davydov-Chaban Hamiltonian

Davydov \& Chaban NP 20 (1960) 499

- $\gamma=0^{\circ} \Rightarrow 3$ degrees of freedom $\left(\beta, \theta_{1}, \theta_{2}\right) \Rightarrow X(3)$-type Hamiltonian

Bonatsos et. al. PLB 632 (2006) 238
Although the $\gamma$-rigidity hypothesis is somewhat crude it provides simple approaches to the successful reproduction of the relevant experimental data.
Budaca EPJA 50 (2014) 87, PLB 739 (2014) 86; Buganu \& Budaca PRC 91 (2015) 014306, JPG 42 (2015) 105106;
The similarity between the $\beta$ excited bands of the $\mathbf{X}(5)$ and $\mathbf{X}(3)$ solutions addresses the question about the importance of rigidity in explaining the critical collective phenomena.

## INTERPLAY BETWEEN $\gamma$-STABLE AND $\gamma$-RIGID COLLECTIVE MOTION

The kinetic energy operator $\hat{T}_{v i b}+\hat{T}_{r o t}$ in the five-dimensional shape phase space

$$
T_{s}=-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2 B}\left[\frac{1}{\beta^{4}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \beta^{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}+\frac{1}{\beta^{2} \sin 3 \gamma} \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \sin 3 \gamma \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma}-\frac{1}{4 \beta^{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \frac{Q_{k}^{2}}{\sin ^{2}\left(\gamma-\frac{2}{3} \pi k\right)}\right]
$$

In the prolate $\gamma$-rigid regime defined only by three degrees of freedom, the same operator gets a simpler form

$$
T_{r}=-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2 B}\left[\frac{1}{\beta^{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \beta^{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}-\frac{\mathbf{Q}^{2}}{3 \beta^{2}}\right]
$$

The interplay between $\gamma$-stable and $\gamma$-rigid collective motion is achieved by considering the Hamiltonian:

$$
H=\chi T_{r}+(1-\chi) T_{s}+V(\beta, \gamma), \quad 0 \leqslant \chi<1 \quad \text { rigidity measure }
$$

Budaca \& Budaca JPG 42 (2015) 085103
$\beta$ variable is separated from the $\gamma$-angular ones if the potential have the structure

$$
v(\beta, \gamma)=\frac{2 B}{\hbar^{2}} V(\beta, \gamma)=u(\beta)+(1-\chi) \frac{u(\gamma)}{\beta^{2}}
$$

Factorizing the total wave function as $\Psi(\beta, \gamma, \Omega)=\xi(\beta) \varphi(\gamma, \Omega)$, the associated Schrödinger equation is separated in two parts:
$\gamma$-angular equation
$\left[(1-\chi)\left(-\frac{1}{\sin 3 \gamma} \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \sin 3 \gamma \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma}+\sum_{k=1}^{3} \frac{Q_{k}^{2}}{4 \sin ^{2}\left(\gamma-\frac{2}{3} \pi k\right)}+u(\gamma)\right)+\frac{\chi}{3} \mathbf{Q}^{2}\right] \varphi(\gamma, \Omega)=W \varphi(\gamma, \Omega)$
Small angle approximation $\Rightarrow u(\gamma)=(3 a)^{2} \frac{\gamma^{2}}{2}$
$a$ - stiffness of $\gamma$ oscillations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& W=3 a(1-\chi)\left(n_{\gamma}+1\right)+\frac{L(L+1)-(1-\chi) K^{2}}{3}, \quad \varphi(\gamma, \Omega)=\eta(\gamma) D_{M K}^{L}(\Omega) \\
& \eta_{n_{\gamma},|K|}(\gamma)=N_{n,|K|} \gamma^{|K / 2|} \exp \left(-3 a \frac{\gamma^{2}}{2}\right) L_{n}^{|K / 2|}\left(3 a \gamma^{2}\right), \quad n=\frac{1}{2}\left(n_{\gamma}-\left|\frac{K}{2}\right|\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$\beta$ equation

$$
\left[-\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \beta^{2}}-\frac{2(2-\chi)}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}+\frac{W}{\beta^{2}}+u(\beta)\right] \xi(\beta)=\epsilon \xi(\beta)
$$

Infinite square well (ISW) potential

$$
\begin{gathered}
u(\beta)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
0, \beta \leqslant \beta_{W}, \\
\infty, \beta>\beta_{W} .
\end{array}\right. \\
\epsilon_{L, K, s, n_{\gamma}}\left(\beta_{W}\right)=\left(\frac{x_{s, \nu}}{\beta_{W}}\right)^{2}, \xi_{L, K, s, n_{\gamma}}(\beta)=N_{s, \nu} \beta^{\chi-\frac{3}{2}} J_{\nu}\left(\frac{x_{s, \nu} \beta}{\beta_{W}}\right) \\
\nu=\left[\frac{L(L+1)-(1-\chi) K^{2}}{3}+\left(\frac{3}{2}-\chi\right)^{2}+(1-\chi) 3 a\left(n_{\gamma}+1\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

$x_{s, \nu}$ is $s$-th zero of the Bessel function $J_{\nu}\left(x_{s, \nu} \beta / \beta_{W}\right)$ and $n_{\beta}=s-1$.

Davidson (D) potential

$$
\begin{gathered}
u(\beta)=\beta^{2}+\frac{\beta_{0}^{4}}{\beta^{2}} . \\
\Rightarrow \epsilon_{L K n_{\beta} n_{\gamma}}=2 n_{\beta}+p+\frac{5}{2}, \quad \xi_{L K n_{\beta} n_{\gamma}}(\beta)=N_{n_{\beta} \nu} \beta^{p+\chi} e^{-\frac{\beta^{2}}{2}} L_{n}^{p+\frac{3}{2}}\left(\beta^{2}\right) \\
p=-\frac{3}{2}+\left[\frac{L(L+1)-(1-\chi) K^{2}}{3}+\left(\frac{3}{2}-\chi\right)^{2}+\beta_{0}^{4}+(1-\chi) 3 a\left(n_{\gamma}+1\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

The full solution after proper normalization and symmetrization reads:
$\Psi_{L M K n_{\beta} n_{\gamma}}(\beta, \gamma, \Omega)=\xi_{L, K, n_{\beta}, n_{\gamma}}(\beta) \eta_{n_{\gamma},|K|}(\gamma) \sqrt{\frac{2 L+1}{16 \pi^{2}\left(1+\delta_{K, 0}\right)}}\left[D_{M K}^{L}(\Omega)+(-)^{L} D_{M-K}^{L}(\Omega)\right]$
The $B(E 2)$ rates are calculated with the quadrupole transition operator $T_{\mu}^{(E 2)}=t \beta q_{\mu}$

An identical $\beta$ differential equation for determining the energy of the system is obtained if one starts from the classical picture of LDM:

$$
\mathcal{H}=\frac{B}{2} \dot{\beta}^{2}+(1-\chi) \frac{B}{2} \beta^{2} \dot{\gamma}^{2}+(1-\chi) T_{r o t}^{\gamma \neq 0}+\chi T_{r o t}^{\gamma=0}+V(\beta, \gamma)
$$

Due to its consistent geometrical construction, the LDM kinetic energy operator is given by a Laplacian in a generalized coordinate system $x_{m}=(\beta, \gamma, \Omega)$ :

$$
\hat{T}=-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2} \nabla^{2}=-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2} \sum_{l m} \frac{1}{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{l}} J \bar{g}^{l m} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{m}}
$$

where $J=\sqrt{\operatorname{det}(g)}$ is the Jacobian of the transformation from the quadrupole coordinates

$$
q_{m}(\beta, \gamma, \Omega)=\beta\left\{D_{m 0}^{2}(\Omega) \cos \gamma+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[D_{m 2}^{2}(\Omega)+D_{m-2}^{2}(\Omega)\right] \sin \gamma\right\}
$$

to the curvilinear ones $\left\{x^{l}\right\}$ defined by the metric tensor:

$$
g_{l m}=\sum_{k} \frac{\partial q_{k}}{\partial x^{l}} \frac{\partial q_{k}}{\partial x^{m}}, \quad \bar{g}^{l m}=\sum_{k} \frac{\partial x^{k}}{\partial q_{l}} \frac{\partial x^{k}}{\partial q_{m}} .
$$

- Bohr-Mottelson model (5 variables)

$$
g=B\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \beta^{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 4 \beta^{2} \sin ^{2}\left(\gamma-\frac{2 \pi}{3}\right) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 4 \beta^{2} \sin ^{2}\left(\gamma-\frac{4 \pi}{3}\right) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 \beta^{2} \sin ^{2} \gamma
\end{array}\right)
$$

- Axial $\gamma$-rigid regime (3 variables)

$$
g=B\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 3 \beta^{2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 3 \beta^{2} \sin ^{2} \theta
\end{array}\right)
$$

- Present case (5 variables)

$$
\hat{T}=-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2} \sum_{l m} \frac{1}{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{l}} J \bar{G}^{l m} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{m}}
$$

$G_{l m}$ is a symmetric positive-definite bitensor not necessarily related to the metric $g_{l m}$.
Prochniak \& Rohozinski JPG 36 (2009) 123101
Imbedding the $\chi$ dependence in $G_{l m}$, one obtains after quantization a differential equation whose eigenfunction differs from the previous one by a factor $\beta^{\chi}$.

In order to have both model derivations equivalent one must amend the integration measure in the quantum constructed model by the factor $\beta^{-2 \chi}$. Budaca \& Budaca EPJA 51 (2015) 126

The evolution as function of $\chi$ and $a$ of theoretically evaluated (with ISW potential) spectral observables such as $R_{4 / 2}=E\left(4_{g}^{+}\right) / E\left(2_{g}^{+}\right)$(a) ratio and the $\beta$ (b) and $\gamma(\mathrm{c})$ band heads normalized to the energy of the first excited state.




Bonatsos et. al. PLB 649 (2007) 394

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{ES}-X(5) \\
\chi=0
\end{gathered} \xrightarrow{\chi} \begin{aligned}
& X(3) \\
& \chi=1
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { Bonatsos et. al. PLB } 632 \text { (2006) } 238
$$

- The low lying energy spectrum given as function of the rigidity parameter $\chi$, for different values of the remaining parameters.

- • Experimental ground, $\gamma$ and $\beta$ band states

Theoretical ground, $\gamma$ and $\beta$ band predictions with $\mathbf{D}$ (solid) and ISW (dashed)




| $\chi$ | $3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ | $0.826(0.948)$ | 0.092 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $a$ | 11.349 | $51.538(168.899)$ | 9.052 |
| $\beta_{0}$ | 2.044 | 2.840 | 2.963 |
| $\sigma$ | 0.601 | $0.768(0.567)$ | 0.574 |
| States | 14 | 18 | 12 |

( ) - ISW fits

- . Experimental ground, $\gamma$ and $\beta$ band states
- Experimental $\beta$ band states with uncertain asignment

Theoretical ground, $\gamma$ and $\beta$ band predictions with D (solid) and ISW (dashed)




| $\chi$ | 0.423 | $0.067(0.269)$ | 0.734 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $a$ | 14.519 | $7.934(10.309)$ | 24.473 |
| $\beta_{0}$ | 2.442 | 3.056 | 3.205 |
| $\sigma$ | 0.636 | $0.411(0.845)$ | 0.092 |
| States | 39 | 31 | 20 |

( ) - ISW fits
$\Delta 4$
Theoretical g-g $E 2$ transition probabilities compared with the available experimental data and with the rigid rotor predictions.


- Experimental points are situated between the rigid rotor and present model's predictions.
- The data are closer to the rigid rotor limit in case of the Dy isotopes.
- While the only measurements for the Gd isotopes associated to ${ }^{158} \mathrm{Gd}$ are closer to the present calculations.

Comparison of theoretical results with experiment and rigid rotor (R. R.) predictions for several interband $E 2$ transition probabilities.

| Nucleus | $\frac{2_{\beta}^{+} \rightarrow 2_{g}^{+}}{2_{\beta}^{+} \rightarrow 0_{g}^{+}}$ | $\frac{2_{\beta}^{+} \rightarrow 4_{g}^{+}}{2_{\beta}^{+} \rightarrow 0_{g}^{+}}$ | $\frac{2_{\gamma}^{+} \rightarrow 2_{g}^{+}}{2_{\gamma}^{+} \rightarrow 0_{g}^{+}}$ | $\frac{2_{\gamma}^{+} \rightarrow 4_{g}^{+}}{2_{\gamma}^{+} \rightarrow 0_{g}^{+}}$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ${ }^{158}$ Gd | $0.25(6)$ | $4.48(75)$ | $1.76(26)$ | $0.079(14)$ |
| D 1.93 | 6.01 | 1.46 | 0.077 |  |
| ${ }^{160}$ Gd |  | $1.87(12)$ | $0.189(29)$ |  |
| D 1.79 | 4.97 | 1.44 | 0.074 |  |
| ISW 1.81 | 5.00 | 1.45 | 0.074 |  |
| ${ }^{162} \mathrm{Gd}$ |  |  |  |  |
| D 1.76 | 4.80 | 1.44 | 0.074 |  |
| ${ }^{160}$ Dy | $2.52(44)$ | $1.89(18)$ | $0.133(14)$ |  |
| D 1.89 | 5.70 | 1.45 | 0.075 |  |
| ${ }^{162}$ Dy |  | $1.78(16)$ | $0.137(12)$ |  |
| D 1.75 | 4.70 | 1.44 | 0.073 |  |
| ISW 1.84 | 5.18 | 1.45 | 0.074 |  |
| ${ }^{164}$ Dy |  | $2.00(27)$ | $0.240(33)$ |  |
| D 1.73 | 4.55 | 1.44 | 0.073 |  |
| R.R. 1.43 | 2.57 | 1.43 | 0.071 |  |

- Experimental $\gamma$-g transitions rates are slightly underestimated.
- While $\beta$-g transitions rates are overestimated.
- Overall higher values than the R.R. predictions.
- Very weak dependence on the parameters for $\gamma$-g transitions.

Experimental evidences for the occurrence of ${ }^{160} \mathbf{G d}$ and ${ }^{162} \mathrm{Dy}$ as singular points in their respective isotopic chains.

(a) $\gamma$ band staggering

$$
S(4)=\frac{E\left(4_{\gamma}\right)+E\left(2_{\gamma}\right)-2 E\left(3_{\gamma}\right)}{E\left(2_{g}^{+}\right)}
$$

(b) Relative spacing of the lowest states in the $\beta$ band

$$
R_{2 \beta}=\frac{E\left(2_{\beta}^{+}\right)-E\left(0_{\beta}^{+}\right)}{E\left(2_{g}^{+}\right)}
$$

$\beta$ equation for the spherical vibrator model with an energy dependent string constant:

$$
\left[-\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \beta^{2}}+\frac{(\tau+1)(\tau+2)}{\beta^{2}}+k(\epsilon) \beta^{2}\right] f(\beta)=\epsilon f(\beta), f(\beta)=\beta^{2} F(\beta)
$$

$\Rightarrow$ quadratic equation for the energy of the system:

$$
\epsilon=\sqrt{k(\epsilon)}\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right), \quad N=2 n_{\beta}+\tau
$$

if the simplest energy dependence $k(\epsilon)=1+a \epsilon$ is chosen, which leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_{N} & =\left[\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right) \frac{a}{2}+\sqrt{1+\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right)^{2} \frac{a^{2}}{4}}\right]\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right) \\
F_{n_{\beta} \tau}(\beta) & =C_{n_{\beta} \tau}\left(\xi_{n_{\beta} \tau}\right)^{\tau} e^{-\frac{\left(\xi_{n_{\beta} \tau}\right)^{2}}{2}} L_{n_{\beta}}^{\tau+\frac{3}{2}}\left[\left(\xi_{n_{\beta} \tau}\right)^{2}\right], \xi_{n_{\beta} \tau}=\sqrt{1+a \epsilon_{n_{\beta} \tau}} \beta
\end{aligned}
$$

- Due to the energy dependence of the potential, the scalar product is modified as Formanek, Lombard, Mares, Czech J. Phys. 54 (2004) 289

$$
\beta^{4} d \beta \longrightarrow[1-\underbrace{\frac{\partial v(\beta, \epsilon)}{\partial \epsilon}}_{=a \beta^{2}}] \beta^{4} d \beta
$$

in order to satisfy the continuity equation.

- Not a coherent theory for $a>0$ because $\quad \rho=\left[F_{n_{\beta} \tau}(\beta)\right]^{2}\left(1-a \beta^{2}\right) \beta^{4}$ is not positive definite.



Everything OK in the asymptotic limit of the a parameter, whose energy is described by a parameter free expression (except scale):
$\epsilon_{N}=\left[\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right) \frac{a}{2}+\sqrt{1+\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right)^{2} \frac{a^{2}}{4}}\right]\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right) \xrightarrow{a \gg \frac{4}{5}} \epsilon_{N}=\frac{a}{2}\left(N+\frac{5}{2}\right)^{2}$


Other suitable experimental realizations: ${ }^{104} \mathrm{Pd}$ and ${ }^{106} \mathrm{Pd}$.

- A simple exactly separable model was constructed by taking the kinetic energy of the Bohr Hamiltonian as a combination of prolate $\gamma$-rigid and $\gamma$-stable rotation-vibration kinetic operators.
- The relative weight of these two components is managed through a so called rigidity parameter which bridges the $X(3)$ and $X(3)$-D $\gamma$-rigid solutions to their $\gamma$-stable counterparts represented by ES- $X(5)$ and ES-D models when an ISW and respectively Davidson potential in $\beta$ is adopted.
- The model was successfully applied for the description of the collective spectra for few heavier isotopes of Gd and Dy. In both cases a critical nucleus was identified through a discontinuous behavior in respect to the rigidity parameter and relevant experimental observables.


## The proposed hybrid formalism unveils

alternative features of the collective motion in the Gd and Dy isotopic chains which are known to undergo shape phase transitions.

- Quantum starting point

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[-\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \beta^{2}}-\frac{2(2-\chi)}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}+\frac{W}{\beta^{2}}+u(\beta)\right] \xi(\beta)=\epsilon \xi(\beta)} \\
& \xi_{L K n_{\beta} n_{\gamma}}(\beta)=N_{n_{\beta} \nu} \beta^{p+\chi} e^{-\frac{\beta^{2}}{2}} L_{n}^{p+\frac{3}{2}}\left(\beta^{2}\right) \\
& d V=\beta^{4-2 \chi}|\sin 3 \gamma| d \beta d \gamma d \Omega
\end{aligned}
$$

- Classical starting point

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[-\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \beta^{2}}-\frac{4}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta}+\frac{W}{\beta^{2}}+u(\beta)\right] \xi(\beta)=\epsilon \xi(\beta)} \\
& \xi_{L K n_{\beta} n_{\gamma}}(\beta)=N_{n_{\beta} \nu} \beta^{p} e^{-\frac{\beta^{2}}{2}} L_{n}^{p+\frac{3}{2}}\left(\beta^{2}\right) \\
& d V=\beta^{4}|\sin 3 \gamma| d \beta d \gamma d \Omega
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\eta_{n_{\gamma},|K|}(\gamma)=N_{n,|K|} \gamma^{|K / 2|} \exp \left(-3 a \frac{\gamma^{2}}{2}\right) L_{n}^{|K / 2|}\left(3 a \gamma^{2}\right), \quad n=\frac{1}{2}\left(n_{\gamma}-\left|\frac{K}{2}\right|\right) \\
W=3 \underbrace{a(1-\chi)}_{c}\left(n_{\gamma}+1\right)+\frac{L(L+1)-(1-\chi) K^{2}}{3}, \quad \varphi(\gamma, \Omega)=\eta(\gamma) D_{M K}^{L}(\Omega) \\
\Downarrow \\
\eta_{n_{\gamma},|K|}(\gamma)=N_{n,|K|} \gamma^{|K / 2|} \exp \left(-\frac{3 c}{1-\chi} \frac{\gamma^{2}}{2}\right) L_{n}^{|K / 2|}\left(\frac{3 c}{1-\chi} \gamma^{2}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

When $c=$ const. and $\chi \rightarrow 1$ the associated $\gamma$ probability distribution acquires a strongly localized maximum at a value which tends asymptotically to zero.

- Rigidity $\chi$ and $\gamma$ stiffness $a$ are interrelated.

$$
a^{\square \xrightarrow{\chi \rightarrow 1}}
$$

- . Experimental ground, $\gamma$ and $\beta$ band states
$\circ \circ \circ$ Experimental ground, $\gamma$ and $\beta$ band states with uncertain asignment $/ / /$ Theoretical ground, $\gamma$ and $\beta$ band predictions




| $\chi$ | 0.948 | 0.269 | 0.848 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $a$ | 168.899 | 10.309 | 41.191 |
| $\sigma$ | 0.567 | 0.845 | 1.359 |
| Nr. of states | 19 | 32 | 24 |



- The ground state $\beta$ probability density in respect to the $d \beta$ integration measure.

