Hypernuclear structure with the Nijmegen ESC08 potentials
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DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevC.88.024322 PACS number(s): 21.80.+a, 13.75.Ev, 21.60.Jz, 21.65.–f

1. INTRODUCTION

New and upgraded experimental facilities (DAFNE, FAIR, JLab, J-PARC, ...) now offer the possibility to determine the properties of single- and double-Λ hypernuclei better than ever before [1]. This also challenges the development and improvement of theoretical approaches for hypernuclear structure and of (nonrelativistic potential) models [2–8] for the underlying bare nucleon-hyperon (NY) and hyperon-hyperon (YY) interactions.

We examine in this article the predictions of the recently completed Nijmegen extended soft-core 08 (ESC08) NY and YY potentials [8], which for the first time are based on a unified theoretical framework involving also the nucleon-nucleon (NN) sector, minimizing the number of free parameters. Apart from features regarding the Λ hyperon, of particular interest are also the properties of the Σ and (S = −2) Ξ hyperons, for which better experimental constraints are expected to become available soon, too.

Our theoretical method for this purpose is a two-step process: First, a reliable NY + YY in-medium interaction (G matrix) is computed within a Brueckner-Hartree-Fock (BHF) approach of hypernuclear bulk matter [9,10]. This in-medium interaction is then used in a local-density approximation within a generalized Skyrme-Hartree-Fock (SHF) model for finite hypernuclei [11–13].

We first briefly review the ESC08 potentials in Sec. II, the BHF calculations of hypernuclear bulk matter in Sec. III, and the extended SHF approach for hypernuclei in Sec. IV. We then present the theoretical results for single- and double-Λ hypernuclei in Sec. V, and estimate in Sec. VI the required corrections to our formalism by fitting experimental data within the same framework.

II. THE NIJMEGEN ESC08 POTENTIAL

The ESC08 model [8] for baryon-baryon interactions of the SU(3) flavor octet of baryons (N, Λ, Σ, and Ξ) provides a presentation of the forces in terms of (i) meson exchange, using generalized soft-core Yukawa functions; (ii) multiple gluon exchange (pomeron and odderon); and (iii) structural effects due to the quark core of the baryons, the so-called Pauli-blocking. Relativistic effects are included via expansions in inverse baryon masses 1/m_B. The ESC meson-exchange interactions contain local and nonlocal potentials due to (a) one boson exchanges (OBE), which are members of nonets of pseudoscalar, vector, scalar, and axial mesons; (b) pomeron and odderon exchanges; (c) two pseudoscalar exchanges (TME); and (d) meson pair exchanges (MPE). The OBE and MPE vertices are regulated by gaussian form factors, where the assignment of the cut-off masses for the baryon-baryon-meson (BBM) vertices depends on the SU(3) classification of the exchanged mesons for OBE, and a similar scheme for MPE.

The ESC models describe the NN, NY, and YY interactions in a unified way using broken flavor SU(3) symmetry. This serves to connect the NN, NY, and YY channels and is utilized to make a simultaneous fit to the NN and NY data with a restricted set (≲20) of free coupling constants, etc., see [8] for details. In particular, the BBM coupling constants are calculated via SU(3), using, together with the meson mixing angles, the fitted constants in the NN ≡ NY analysis as input. In ESC08 no breaking of SU(3) is assumed for the couplings with the exception of the following cases: (i) NN: the isospin breaking for the ρ meson is exploited phenomenologically in order to account for the difference between S0(ρρ), S0(np), and Š0(σn); (ii) Charge symmetry breaking in the Δρ and Δn channels, where we include the SU(2) isospin breaking in the OBE, TME, and MPE potentials.

In this paper solution ESC08b [8] is used as a basis for the NY interactions. This model achieves, with single sets of parameters and without ad hoc changes of the rules in particular channels, excellent results for the NN and NY data: (i) For the selected 4233 NN data of the Nijmegen phase shift analysis [14] with energies 0 ≤ Tlab ≤ 350 MeV a χ²/data ≈ 1.157 is realized, which is close to that of the multienery phase shift analysis [14]. (ii) For the set of 38 NY S = −1 data, also used in previous Nijmegen studies, in ESC08b χ²/data ≈ 0.65 was reached, without bound states in these NY channels. As regards the U_A well-depth there is some overbinding, making room for, e.g., three-body repulsion. (iii) For YY there is a weak ΛΛ attraction, e.g., in ESC08 |a_ΔΔ| S0| < 1.0, which matches experimental indication from the Nagara event [15]. Among the predictions for the S = −2 sector (NΣ, ΛΛ, ΛΣ, ΣΣ) are the existence of bound states in the NΣ(S0 = 2D1, T = 1) channel.
In Tables I and II the OBE and MPE couplings are given for the solution of the ESC08b model, which is the basis for the computations of the present paper. See Ref. [8] for the definition of the model parameters. The SU(3) α = F/(F + D) parameters and meson-mixing angles θ enable the calculation of all BBM-couplings, etc. The α_{PB} parameter gives the fraction of the pomeron coupling that is related to the PB effect.

### III. BHF CALCULATION OF HYPERNUCLEAR MATTER

Our results are based on generalized BHF calculations [9,16] [employing continuous single-particle (s.p.) potentials in the computation of the G matrices] of Λ hypermatter, i.e., baryonic matter characterized by partial densities ρ_{p,n,Λ}. The basic input quantities in the Bethe-Goldstone equation are the NN, NY, and YY potentials. In the current work we use the Argonne V_{18} NN potential [17] supplemented by the microscopic nucleonic three-body forces (TBF) of Ref. [18] in order to ensure good saturation properties of pure nuclear matter, and the ESC08 [8] NY and YY potentials. For comparison some results obtained before [11] with the older NSC89 [3] and NSC97 [7] potentials will also be shown. We recall that the NSC89 potential contains no YY components, whereas the ESC08 model comprises the full set of interactions in the strangeness S = –1 and S = –2 channels, namely in the isospin basis it treats the coupled states

\[ S = -1 : \quad T = 1/2 : \quad ΣΣ, ΛΛ, \]
\[ S = 3/2 : \quad ΣΣ, \]
\[ S = -2 : \quad T = 0 : \quad ΣΣ, ΣΣ, ΛΛ, \]
\[ T = 1 : \quad ΣΣ, ΣΣ, ΛΛ, \]
\[ T = 2 : \quad ΣΣ. \]

Using these potentials we have to solve the Bethe-Goldstone integral equation [9,19] for the correlated wave functions u in the various NN, NY, and YY channels:

\[ u_{CC,LL}(k, r) = j_L(kr)δ^{CC}_{LL} + \frac{2}{π} \int_0^{∞} dr r'^2 D_{CC,LL}(k, r, r') \sum_{C',L'} V'_{CC,LL'}(r') u_{CC,LL'}(k, r') \]

with the intermediate propagator

\[ D_{CC,LL}(k, r, r') = \int_0^{∞} dk' k'' j_{L'}(k'r') j_L(k'r) f_C(k') E_C(k) - E_C(k) + iε \]

and

\[ E_C(k) = e_C(k_1) + e_C(k_2), \quad e_C(k) = \frac{k^2}{2M_e} + Re U_C(k) + M_e. \]

Here C = C_1, C', C'' denote channel indices representing baryon pairs, k and k' denote the relative momenta of the initial C and the intermediate C' state, E_C(k) and E_C(k') are the corresponding pair energies, and f_C(k') is the angle-averaged Pauli operator in the intermediate states. More details on these quantities are given in Ref. [9]. The equation has to be solved for a set of states with definite quantum numbers T, S, J, which have not been indicated explicitly. In practice we consider all partial waves up to L = 7 in the NN and L = 5 in the NY and YY sectors. The Bethe-Goldstone equation has thus a 1 × 1, 2 × 2, or 3 × 3 matrix structure according to the relevant isospin channel, Eqs. (1)-(5); for example in schematic notation (now 1,2,3 denote pairs of baryons)

\[ \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} \\ u_{12} \\ u_{13} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} j_L \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} D_{11}v_{11} & D_{11}v_{12} & D_{11}v_{13} \\ D_{12}v_{21} & D_{12}v_{22} & D_{12}v_{23} \\ D_{13}v_{31} & D_{13}v_{32} & D_{13}v_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} \\ u_{12} \\ u_{13} \end{pmatrix}, \]

(9)

with possible permutations, and an additional 2 × 2 structure when the mixing of angular momentum states through the tensor potential applies.

The solutions of the Bethe-Goldstone equation determine the diagonal G-matrix elements

\[ \langle k_1k_2|G^{TS}_{CC,LL}|k_1k_2 \rangle = 4π \int_0^{∞} dr r^2 j_L(kr) \sum_{C',L'} V'_{CC,LL'}(r') u_{CC,LL'}(k, r'), \]

(10)
and the s.p. potentials (in the so-called continuous choice) are then given by

\[
U_a^{(b)}(k_b) = \sum_{\tau,\delta,\mu,\ell} \frac{(2T + 1)(2J + 1)}{(2\ell + 1)(2\delta + 1)} \times \int \delta_{kB} \frac{d^3k_b}{(2\pi)^3} \langle k_a | \hat{G}_{ab,l}^{T_{\delta,\mu}} | k_b \rangle, \tag{11}
\]

where the notation \(U_a^{(b)}\) denotes the s.p. potential of particle \(a\) due to the interaction with particles \(b\) in the medium. Carrying out the calculation for the relevant combinations \(a = N, \Lambda, \Sigma, \Xi; b = N, \Lambda, \\Xi, \Sigma, \), we obtain the total s.p. potentials of nucleons and hyperons as

\[
U_a(k) = U_a^{(N)}(k) + U_a^{(\Lambda)}(k). \tag{12}
\]

Due to the occurrence of the \(U_a\) in Eq. (8), the set of equations (6)–(12) constitutes a coupled system that has to be solved in a self-consistent manner.

We are interested in the total binding energy per baryon \(B/A\), or equivalently the energy density \(\varepsilon_{\text{BHF}}\) of the bulk matter. In the BHF approximation this quantity and the baryon density \(\rho\), are given by

\[
\varepsilon_{\text{BHF}} = \frac{B}{A} = 4\pi \rho \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu} \int_{k_0}^{k_{\nu}^{(s)}} dk k^2 \left( \frac{k^2}{2M_N} + \frac{1}{2} U(k) \right) + \int_{k_0}^{k_{\nu}^{(s)}} dk k^2 \left( \frac{k^2}{2M_\Lambda} + \frac{1}{2} U(k) \right) \right], \tag{13}
\]

and

\[
\rho = \rho_N + \rho_\Lambda = \frac{1}{3\pi^2} \left( 2k_F^{(N)} + k_F^{(\Lambda)} \right)^3. \tag{14}
\]

In the following we will make use of the principal results of the calculations, which are the energy density as function of the nucleon and \(\Lambda\) partial densities, \(\varepsilon_{\text{BHF}}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda)\), as well as the momentum-dependent s.p. potentials of all types of particles involved, \(U_a(k)\).

### A. Results

In order to illustrate the basic features, Fig. 1 shows the complete set of nucleon and hyperon s.p. potentials in pure symmetric nuclear matter at saturation density \(\rho_N = 0.17\) fm\(^{-3}\) (left panel) and in hypernuclear matter with densities \(\rho_N = \rho_0, \rho_\Lambda = \rho_0/2\) (right panel), resulting from our calculations with the ESC08 potential. One notes that the hyperon s.p. potentials are much less attractive than the nucleonic ones, reflecting the weaker strength of the \(N\) compared to the \(N\) potentials. Within the ESC08 model, the well-depths \(U(k = 0)\) in normal nuclear matter of the \(\Lambda, \Sigma, \) and \(\Xi\) hyperons are, respectively, \(-39, +16, -8\) MeV, and thus in reasonable agreement with current experimental estimates of these quantities \([20,21]\). The partial wave decompositions of these values are given in Table III which also lists explicitly the contributions of the different (isospin) channels according to Eqs. (10) and (11). One notes, in particular for the \(\Sigma\) and \(\Xi\) hyperons, strong cancellations between the individual partial wave contributions. For example, in the case of the \(\Xi\), the most important contributions are the \(N\Xi - N\Xi\) \((T = 1)\ \Sigma_1\) and the \(N\Xi - \Sigma\Lambda\) \((T = 1)\ \Sigma_1\) channels with magnitudes of about 50 MeV, but opposite sign, while the final \((T = 1)\) result is of the order of 1 MeV. Clearly a sufficient numerical accuracy is required to handle this feature reliably, and it is also obvious that none of the coupled channels can be disregarded.

The effect of the presence of \(\Lambda\)’s in nuclear matter can be seen in the right panel of Fig. 1: The attractive \(N\Lambda\) interaction provides a deeper mean field for the nucleons (thick vs. thin solid black curves), whereas the \((T = 0)\ \Lambda\Lambda - \Sigma\Sigma - N\Xi\) interaction has a small repulsive effect on the \(\Lambda\) (dashed red curves), while the \((T = 1)\ \Sigma\Lambda - \Sigma\Xi - N\Xi\) channel generates substantial attraction for low-momentum \(\Sigma\)’s (dotted green curves). The \(\Xi\Lambda\) \((S = -3)\) interaction is not considered in the present model and thus the \(\Sigma\) s.p. potential (dash-dotted blue curve) is only affected indirectly (via the modification of the various s.p. potentials) by the presence of \(\Lambda\)’s, which yields a somewhat repulsive effect, as can be seen comparing the left and right panels of Fig. 1.

The most relevant features that can be extracted from plots like Fig. 1 are the \(\Lambda\) effective mass, Eq. (18), and the “well depth” \([22]\) \(U_0^\Lambda \equiv \text{Re } U_\Lambda(k = 0)\). This quantity is slightly more attractive than the relevant SHF potential \(V_A\), Eq. (23), due to rearrangement contributions to the latter \([11]\). The corresponding results are displayed in Fig. 2 (top and central panels) as a function of the nucleonic density for pure nuclear matter (\(\rho_\Lambda = 0\)). Comparing the new ESC08 results with the old NSC89 ones, one notes a slightly stronger effective \(N\Lambda\) attraction, namely, the \(\Lambda\) is more bound (\(V_A \approx -36\) vs. \(\approx -28\) MeV at \(\rho_N = \rho_0\)) and its effective mass is lower (0.74 vs. 0.82) with the former potential. This will have
TABLE III. The contributions (in MeV) of various partial waves to the s.p. potentials \( \text{Re} U_\ell(k=0) \) at \( \rho_N = 0.17 \text{ fm}^{-3} \) and \( \rho_\Lambda = 0 \). Entries denoted “0” vanish in the isospin basis. The total sums include partial waves up to \( L = 5 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>( U_\Lambda(k=0) )</th>
<th>( U_\Sigma(k=0) )</th>
<th>( U_\Xi(k=0) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ^1S_0 )</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3S_1 )</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3D_1 )</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
<td>-26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3P_0 )</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3P_1 )</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3P_2 )</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3D_2 )</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3F_2 )</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^1D_2 )</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ^3D_2 )</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>-38.8</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the ESC08 model in hypernuclear matter with varying \( \rho_N \) and fixed \( \rho_\Lambda = \rho_0/2 \), and its contributions from the different coupled channels (\( T = 0 \)) \( \Lambda \Lambda, \Sigma \Sigma, \Lambda \Xi \). The total result (solid curve) changes from weak attraction (\(-1.1 \text{ MeV}\)) in free space to repulsion in nuclear matter (\(+3.2 \text{ MeV} \) at \( \rho_N = \rho_0 \)) and is the result of strong compensation of the individual contributions, in particular \( \Lambda \Lambda-\Lambda \Lambda \) (repulsive) and \( \Lambda \Lambda-\Lambda \Xi \) (attractive). This balance changes with increasing nuclear density, and the overall effect turns from attraction to repulsion. The free \( \Lambda \Lambda \) interaction can therefore not be used to estimate the in-medium behavior of two \( \Lambda \)'s.

IV. SHF CALCULATION OF HYPERNUCLEI

In our approach the local energy density functional of hypernuclear matter depends on the one-body densities \( \rho_q \), kinetic densities \( \tau_q \), and spin-orbit currents \( J_q \),

\[
\begin{align*}
[n_q][(\phi_q^i)^2, \left| \nabla \phi_q^i \right|^2, \phi_q^i (\nabla \phi_q^i \times \sigma) / i].
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \phi_q^i (i = 1, N_q) \) are the s.p. wave functions of the \( N_q \) occupied states for the species \( q = n, p, \Lambda \) in a hypernucleus. The functional is written as \( \varepsilon_{\text{SHF}} = \varepsilon_N + \varepsilon_\Lambda \), where \( \varepsilon_N \) is the standard purely nucleonic SHF functional [23,24], and

\[
\varepsilon_\Lambda = \frac{\tau_\Lambda}{2m_\Lambda} + \varepsilon_{\Lambda N}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda)
\]

is the functional accounting for the presence of \( \Lambda \)'s, due to the action of \( NY \) and \( YY \) forces.

It can be constructed from the BHF energy density of bulk matter, Eq. (13), as

\[
\varepsilon_{\Lambda N}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda) = \varepsilon_{\text{BHE}}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda) - \varepsilon_{\text{BHE}}(\rho_N, 0) - \frac{C \rho_\Lambda^{5/3}}{2m_\Lambda},
\]

where the last term corresponds to the kinetic energy contribution of the \( \Lambda \)'s in bulk matter. The constant \( C = (3/5)(3\pi^2)^{2/3} \approx 5.742 \) has been introduced. However, we
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FIG. 2. A effective mass (upper panel), \( \Lambda \) well depth (central panel), and \( \text{Re} U_\Lambda^{(A)}(k=0) \) with different contributions (lower panel) in symmetric nuclear matter of density \( \rho_N \), obtained with the ESC08 (thick curves) and ESC09 (thin curves, upper and central panels) potentials.
consider more realistic to work with a Schrödinger equation that involves, instead of the bare $\Lambda$ mass $m_\Lambda$, the hyperon effective mass $m_\Lambda^*$, as extracted from the BHF s.p. potential $U_\Lambda(k)$ (see Fig. 1),

$$\frac{m_\Lambda^*}{m_\Lambda} = \left(1 + \frac{U_\Lambda(k_F^\Lambda) - U_\Lambda(0)}{k_F^\Lambda/2}\right)^{-1}. \quad (18)$$

For this purpose the energy density functional is written instead as

$$\varepsilon_\Lambda = \frac{\tau_\Lambda}{2m_\Lambda^*(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda)} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{N\Lambda}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda) \quad (19)$$

with

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{N\Lambda}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda) = \varepsilon_{N\Lambda}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda) - \left(\frac{m_\Lambda^*}{m_\Lambda^*(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda)} - 1\right) \frac{C_p^{5/3}}{2m_\Lambda}. \quad (20)$$

Minimizing the total energy of the hypernucleus, $E = \int d^3r \, \varepsilon_{\text{SHF}}(r)$, one arrives with Eq. (19) at the SHF Schrödinger equation

$$\left[\nabla \cdot \frac{1}{2m_q^*(r)} \nabla - V_q(r) + i \mathbf{W_q(r)} \cdot (\nabla \times \sigma)\right] \phi_q(r) = \epsilon_q^* \phi_q(r) \quad (21)$$

with the mean fields

$$V_N = V_N^{\text{SHF}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{\varepsilon}_{N\Lambda}}{\partial \rho_N}, \quad (22)$$

$$V_\Lambda = \frac{\partial \tilde{\varepsilon}_{N\Lambda}}{\partial \rho_\Lambda}, \quad (23)$$

where $V_N^{\text{SHF}}$ is the nucleonic Skyrme mean field without hyperons and $W_N$ the nucleonic spin-orbit mean field [23]. At the present level of approximation we do not include a spin-orbit force for the $\Lambda$, which is justified by the experimental observation of very small ($\lesssim 0.2$ MeV) $N\Lambda$ spin-orbit splittings [25]. An approximate center of mass correction is applied as usual [23] by replacing the bare masses:

$$\frac{1}{m_q} \rightarrow \frac{1}{m_q} - \frac{1}{M}, \quad (24)$$

where $M = (N_n + N_p) m_N + N_\Lambda m_\Lambda$ is the total mass of the hypernucleus.

Solving the equation provides the wave functions $\phi_q^*(r)$ and the s.p. energies $-\epsilon_q^*$ for the different s.p. levels $i$ and species $q$. We use in this work the standard nucleonic Skyrme force SLy4 [26], but the results for hyperonic observables hardly depend on that choice.

For an efficient numerical procedure we provide parametrizations of the numerical results for the key quantities $\varepsilon_{N\Lambda}$, Eq. (17), and $m_\Lambda^*$, Eq. (18), in the following functional forms ($\rho_N$ and $\rho_\Lambda$ given in units of fm$^{-3}$, $\varepsilon_{N\Lambda}$ in MeV fm$^{-3}$):

$$\varepsilon_{N\Lambda}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda) \approx -(\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 \rho_N + \varepsilon_3 \rho_\Lambda^2) \rho_N \rho_\Lambda$$

$$+ (\varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_5 \rho_N + \varepsilon_6 \rho_\Lambda^2) \rho_N \rho_\Lambda^{5/3}$$

$$- (\varepsilon_7 - \varepsilon_8 \rho_N + \varepsilon_9 \rho_\Lambda^2) \rho_\Lambda^2, \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{m_\Lambda^*}{m_\Lambda}(\rho_N) \approx \mu_1 - \mu_2 \rho_N + \mu_3 \rho_N^2 - \mu_4 \rho_N^3. \quad (26)$$

The parameters $\varepsilon_i$ and $\mu_i$ are listed in Table IV for the different $N\Lambda$ potentials that we use. These parametrizations have been obtained from BHF calculations of symmetric nuclear matter and therefore depend only on the total nucleonic density $\rho_N$. This is a fairly good approximation for the isoscalar $\Lambda$ hyperon and the nearly symmetric nuclei that we will consider here.

The functional form of Eq. (26) is purely phenomenological, whereas that of Eq. (25) is guided by the fact that the energy density functional can be related to the BHF s.p. potentials in the following manner [11]:

$$\varepsilon_{N\Lambda}(\rho_N, \rho_\Lambda) = \sum_{k<k_F^\Lambda} \left[2U^{(N)}_\Lambda(k) + U^{(\Lambda)}_\Lambda(k)\right]$$

$$+ 2 \sum_{k<k_F^\Lambda} \left[U^{(N)}_\Lambda(k)\right]_{\rho_N} - U^{(\Lambda)}_\Lambda(k)\left|_{\rho_\Lambda=0}\right., \quad (27)$$

which follows directly from Eqs. (12), (13), and (17).

### V. RESULTS

The most significant results are the $\Lambda$ s.p. energies $\varepsilon_\Lambda(i = 1, 1, \rho, 1d, 1f, 1g)$ of various single-$\Lambda$ hypernuclei, for which experimental results are available [27,28]. Figure 3 (top panel) compares the values obtained with the different potentials. Consistent with the results displayed in Fig. 2, the ESC08 force provides more binding than the NSC89, such that heavy hypernuclei result overbound with the former and underbound with the latter potential. Nevertheless the discrepancies are not dramatic in view of the microscopic, parameter-free approach that we are following here. In the next section we will discuss this issue further.

Of particular interest for current and future hypernuclear experiments are the properties of double-$\Lambda$ hypernuclei, since they might provide access to features of the $\Lambda\Lambda$ interaction. Recent experimental results [15] point to a fairly weak (attractive) effective $\Lambda\Lambda$ force. The ESC08 potential...
FIG. 3. (Color online) Λ s.p. energies in different single-Λ hypernuclei. Markers indicate experimental data [27,28] and lines the theoretical predictions obtained with different NY potentials (top panel) and with the fitted versions of Sec. VI (bottom panel).

Table VI. Bond energies, Eq. (28), of several double-Λ hypernuclei, obtained with different potentials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A (^{1})Z</th>
<th>(\Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda}) [MeV]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(^{6})He</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{10})Be</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{14})C</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{18})O</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{30})Si</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{40})Ca</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{92})Zr</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{142})Ce</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(^{210})Pb</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. FIT OF HYPERNUCLEAR DATA

Our approach so far is not devised to provide perfect reproduction of present hypernuclear data, but rather to assess the consistency of the bare NY and YY potentials with those data. The theoretical method involves necessarily several approximations: The BHF approach of bulk hypernuclear matter is based on the summation of ladder diagrams and neglects in particular higher-order correlations (three-hole line diagrams [32]), hyperonic TBF [33], and relativistic effects [34], for example. Going from bulk matter to finite nuclei involves a local-density approximation, currently neglecting surface effects, spin-orbit forces, etc. Also the SHF approach itself is of course a phenomenological one, involving several approximations [24].

Of all these items, hyperonic TBF (NNY, NYY, YY) are currently conjectured to be an essential class of corrections that could in particular have important implications at large baryon density and therefore for astrophysical applications [16]. We therefore would like to estimate the required size of these corrections within our current theoretical approach for hypernuclear structure. For this purpose we extend the energy density functional, Eq. (25), with terms that mimic the effects of hyperonic TBF. Obviously the TBF depend on the chosen baryon-baryon potential, ESC08 or NSC89. In fact in the former case it is clear from Fig. 3 (top panel) that the effect of TBF on the effective ΛΛ interaction must be overall repulsive, while attractive in the latter case. A natural choice for the leading corrections to the energy density caused by hyperonic TBF is an expression of the

evaluated for several double-Λ hypernuclei with the different potentials. From Figs. 1 (right panel) and 2 (lower panel) one notes that the effective ΛΛ interaction in nuclear matter is weakly repulsive and consequently the bond energy turns out negative (repulsive) with the ESC08 force. In fact it is very similar to the results obtained with the NSC89 model without any YY interaction, which yields also small negative bond energies originating from the momentum dependence of the Λ s.p. potential [the \(ε_\Lambda\) term in Eq. (25)], see Ref. [11]. The NSC97 potentials do contain YY forces, but predict also repulsive (NSC97f) or too small (NSC97a) results compared to the recent experimental value for the \(^{6}\)He nucleus [15], \(\Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda} \approx +0.67 \pm 0.17\) MeV, indicating a rather weak ΛΛ attraction.

One should remark that the treatment of the lightest nuclei (\(^{6}\)He, \(^{10}\)Be) is probably not reliable in the mean-field SHF method, and a cluster [29,30] or shell-model [31] approach should be followed. Also, in view of the very large cancellations observed for the decomposition of the s.p. potentials, and the resulting strong in-medium dependence of the effective ΛΛ interaction, see Fig. 2 (lower panel), careful fine-tuning of the various components of the \(S = -2\) YY interaction will be necessary in order to reliably reproduce the very weak effective interaction observed experimentally. This is certainly a difficult problem for the future, when also reliable data for heavier ΛΛ hypernuclei will become available.
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