

# Primary versus secondary $\gamma$ intensities in $^{171}\text{Yb}(n_{\text{th}}, \gamma)$

A. Schiller,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> A. Voinov,<sup>3,4</sup> E. Algin,<sup>2,5,6,7</sup> L.A. Bernstein,<sup>2</sup>  
P.E. Garrett,<sup>2,8</sup> M. Guttormsen,<sup>9</sup> R.O. Nelson,<sup>10</sup> J. Rekstad,<sup>9</sup> and S. Siem<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

<sup>2</sup>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, L-414, 7000 East Avenue, Livermore, California 94551

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701

<sup>4</sup>Frank Laboratory of Neutron Physics, Joint Institute of Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Moscow region, Russia

<sup>5</sup>North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695

<sup>6</sup>Triangle Universities Nuclear Laboratory, Durham, North Carolina 27708

<sup>7</sup>Department of Physics, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Meselik, Eskisehir, 26480 Turkey

<sup>8</sup>Department of Physics, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1 Canada

<sup>9</sup>Department of Physics, University of Oslo, N-0316 Oslo, Norway

<sup>10</sup>Los Alamos National Laboratory, MS H855, Bikini Atoll Rd., Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

The two published literature values [Greenwood *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A252**, 260 (1975) and Gelletly *et al.*, J. Phys. G **11**, 1055 (1985)] for absolute primary  $\gamma$  intensities following thermal neutron capture of  $^{171}\text{Yb}$  differ in average by a factor of three. We have resolved this conflict in favor of Greenwood *et al.* by a measurement of primary versus secondary intensities.

PACS numbers: 23.20.Lv, 25.20.Lj, 25.40.Lw, 27.70.+q

Primary, high-energetic ( $\gtrsim 3.6$  MeV) and secondary, low-energetic, ( $\lesssim 2.4$  MeV)  $\gamma$ -ray intensities from the  $^{171}\text{Yb}(n_{\text{th}}, \gamma)$  reaction have been published by two groups in the past [1, 2]. While they agree on absolute secondary intensities and relative primary intensities, values for absolute primary intensities differ in average by a factor of  $\sim 3$ . The potential problem with [1] is that the authors of this study only measured relative primary intensities; these relative intensities were then brought to an absolute scale by normalizing to a previous measurement on absolute primary intensities [3, 4]. The potential problem with [2] is that primary and secondary  $\gamma$  rays were measured with two distinct detector systems, hence, a systematic error in the absolute efficiency calibration of the high-energy  $\gamma$  detector could have resulted in wrong primary intensities. The ENSDF compilation [5] gives a slight preference for the primary intensities of [2], however, it also mentions that the large disagreement between the two groups is not understood.

We have performed measurements on the  $^{171}\text{Yb}(n_{\text{th}}, \gamma)$  reaction at the Los Alamos Neutron Science Center (LANSCE) with two large-volume ( $\sim 80\%$ ) Ge(HP) detectors placed at beam height at an angle of  $\sim 110^\circ$  with the beam, and one actively shielded  $\sim 200\%$  clover detector placed vertically over the target. All three detectors were at a distance of  $\sim 12$  cm from the target. The target consisted of  $\sim 1$  g of enriched ( $\gtrsim 95\%$ ), dry  $^{171}\text{Yb}_2\text{O}_3$  powder encapsulated in a glass ampule which was mounted in an evacuated beam tube and irradiated by collimated neutrons with a time-averaged flux of  $\sim 4 \times 10^4$  n/cm<sup>2</sup>s over  $\sim 150$  h. The relative detector efficiencies from 1–9 MeV were determined by the  $^{35}\text{Cl}(n, \gamma)^{36}\text{Cl}$  reaction and its known  $\gamma$  intensities [6].

The experiment was divided into two runs. During the first run, the target ampule hung roughly diagonally, having a  $\sim 45^\circ$  angle with the vertical and a  $90^\circ$  angle with the beam. During the second run, the target ampule was mounted parallel to the beam. Two efficiency calibrations, running  $\sim 12$  h each, were performed with corresponding orientations of ampules containing  $\sim 1$  g of NaCl and  $\sim 1$  g of dried  $\text{AlCl}_3$ , respectively.

The main purpose of the experiment was to measure  $\gamma$ - $\gamma$  coincidences, however, downscaled (by a factor of 100) singles  $\gamma$  rays were also recorded. More details of the main experiment are given in [7, 8]. While the experiment was not aimed at measuring absolute intensities and it lacked the sensitivity to determine relative primary or secondary intensities better than in [1, 2], the consistent efficiency calibration of our detectors over a range of 8 MeV gave us the opportunity to investigate the main point of disagreement between [1] and [2] by measuring primary versus secondary intensities. For this reason, we have divided summed peak areas from all three detectors for individual primary and secondary  $\gamma$  rays by the summed relative detector efficiencies and relative intensities from [5] to produce divided yields (see Fig. 1). Divided yields are then averaged for all primary and all secondary  $\gamma$  rays to produce average divided yields.

The ratio of average divided yields between secondary and primary  $\gamma$  rays is 17.5(7) and 18.4(7) for the two runs, respectively, or 17.9(5) combined. This ratio has to be compared to the ratio of normalization factors given by [1, 2] and quoted in [5] to bring the relative secondary and primary intensities to an absolute scale. These ratios are  $0.063/0.00107 \approx 58.9 \pm 50\%$  systematic uncertainty for [2] and  $0.054/0.00287 \approx 18.8(4)$  for [1]. For the latter, the error was calculated assuming that the quoted factors have uncertainties in the order of their least significant digits. Hence, we can conclude that [1] gives correct values of primary intensities (or rather a correct conversion

\*Electronic address: schiller@nsl.msu.edu




FIG. 1: Divided yields of secondary (left panels) and primary (right panels)  $\gamma$  rays. The lines show average values of the divided yields (solid lines) and their error bands (dashed lines). Upper and lower panels correspond to diagonal and parallel mounts of the target ampules, respectively, and different chlorine salts used for the efficiency calibration (see text).

factor to bring relative primary intensities to an absolute scale), while [2] does not. To be more precise, we have only shown that [1] has the correct ratio of absolute primary versus secondary intensities; with our experiment we cannot rule out the possibility that both primary and secondary intensities from [1] might be off by the same factor. However, since there does not seem to be a strong disagreement between different measurements of absolute secondary intensities, we do not expect this to be a serious problem. The  $1.5\sigma$  disagreement between our work and [1] (provided the error estimate for the latter is correct) might be attributed to systematic uncertainties in our efficiency calibration due to the parameterization of the efficiency curve, absorption in the target, and other minor corrections which were all neglected here.

This work has benefited from the use of the Los Alamos Neutron Science Center at the Los Alamos National Lab-

oratory. This facility is funded by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract W-7405-ENG-36. Part of this work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by the University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract W-7405-ENG-48, and Los Alamos National Laboratory under Contract W-7405-ENG-36. Financial support from the Norwegian Research Council (NFR) is gratefully acknowledged. A.V. acknowledges support from a NATO Science Fellowship under project number 150027/432 and from the National Nuclear Security Administration under the Stewardship Science Academic Alliances program through U.S. Department of Energy Research Grant No. DE-FG03-03-NA00074. E.A. acknowledges support by U.S. Department of Energy Grant No. DE-FG02-97-ER41042. We thank Gail F. Eaton for making the targets.

- 
- [1] R.C. Greenwood, C.W. Reich, and S.H. Vergos Jr., Nucl. Phys. **A252**, 260 (1975).  
 [2] W. Gelletly, J.R. Larysz, H.G. Börner, R.F. Casten, W.F. Davidson, W. Mampe, K. Schreckenbach, and D.D. Warner, J. Phys. G **11**, 1055 (1985).  
 [3] Norman C. Rasmussen, Yoshiyuti Hukai, Tamon Inouye, and Victor J. Orphan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MITNE-85 Scientific Report No. 2, 1969.  
 [4] V.J. Orphan, N.C. Rasmussen, and T.L. Harper, Gulf General Atomic Inc., Report No. GA-10248, 1970.  
 [5] Evaluated Nuclear Structure Data File AR\_93316\_3.ens, Balraj Singh, Nucl. Data Sheets **75**, 199 (1995).  
 [6] C. Coceva, A. Brusegan, and C. van der Vorst, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **378**, 511 (1996).  
 [7] A.V. Voinov, A. Schiller, E. Algin, L.A. Bernstein, P.E. Garrett, M. Guttormsen, R.O. Nelson, J. Rekstad, and S. Siem, Yad. Fiz. **67**, 1891 (2004).  
 [8] A. Schiller, A. Voinov, E. Algin, J.A. Becker, L.A. Bernstein, P.E. Garrett, M. Guttormsen, R.O. Nelson, J. Rekstad, and S. Siem, Phys. Lett. B, (in press).