

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

 Auranen, K.; Seweryniak, D.; Albers, M.; Ayangeakaa, A. D.; Bottoni, S.;
 Carpenter, M. P.; Chiara, C. J.; Copp, P.; David, H. M.; Doherty, D. T.; Harker, J.; Hoffman, C. R.; Janssens, R. V. F.; Khoo, T. L.; Kuvin, S. A.; Lauritsen, T.; Lotay, G.; Rogers, A. M.; Sethi, J.; Scholey, Catherine; Talwar, R.; Walters, W. B.; Woods, P. J.; Zhu, S.

Title: Superallowed α Decay to Doubly Magic 100Sn

Year: 2018

Version: Published version

Copyright: © 2018 American Physical Society

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en

Please cite the original version:

Auranen, K., Seweryniak, D., Albers, M., Ayangeakaa, A. D., Bottoni, S., Carpenter, M. P., Chiara, C. J., Copp, P., David, H. M., Doherty, D. T., Harker, J., Hoffman, C. R., Janssens, R. V. F., Khoo, T. L., Kuvin, S. A., Lauritsen, T., Lotay, G., Rogers, A. M., Sethi, J., . . . Zhu, S. (2018). Superallowed α Decay to Doubly Magic 100Sn. Physical Review Letters, 121(18), Article 182501. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.121.182501 Featured in Physics

Superallowed α Decay to Doubly Magic ¹⁰⁰Sn

K. Auranen,^{1,*} D. Seweryniak,¹ M. Albers,¹ A. D. Ayangeakaa,^{1,†} S. Bottoni,^{1,‡} M. P. Carpenter,¹ C. J. Chiara,^{1,2,§} P. Copp,^{1,3}

H. M. David,^{1,||} D. T. Doherty,^{4,¶} J. Harker,^{1,2} C. R. Hoffman,¹ R. V. F. Janssens,^{5,6} T. L. Khoo,¹ S. A. Kuvin,^{1,7} T. Lauritsen,¹

G. Lotay,⁸ A. M. Rogers,^{1,**} J. Sethi,^{1,2} C. Scholey,⁹ R. Talwar,¹ W. B. Walters,² P. J. Woods,⁴ and S. Zhu¹

¹Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Lemont, Illinois 60439, USA

²Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA

³Department of Physics and Applied Physics, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, Massachusetts 01854, USA

⁴University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom

⁵Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599, USA

⁵Triangle Universities Nuclear Laboratory, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, USA

⁷Department of Physics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut 06269, USA

⁸University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, United Kingdom

⁹Department of Physics, University of Jyvaskyla, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyvaskyla, Finland

(Received 31 July 2018; revised manuscript received 7 September 2018; published 30 October 2018)

We report the first observation of the ¹⁰⁸Xe \rightarrow ¹⁰⁴Te \rightarrow ¹⁰⁰Sn α -decay chain. The α emitters, ¹⁰⁸Xe $[E_{\alpha} = 4.4(2) \text{ MeV}, T_{1/2} = 58^{+106}_{-23} \ \mu \text{s}]$ and ¹⁰⁴Te $[E_{\alpha} = 4.9(2) \text{ MeV}, T_{1/2} < 18 \text{ ns}]$, decaying into doubly magic ¹⁰⁰Sn were produced using a fusion-evaporation reaction ⁵⁴Fe(⁵⁸Ni, 4n)¹⁰⁸Xe, and identified with a recoil mass separator and an implantation-decay correlation technique. This is the first time α radioactivity has been observed to a heavy self-conjugate nucleus. A previous benchmark for study of this fundamental decay mode has been the decay of ²¹²Po into doubly magic ²⁰⁸Pb. Enhanced proton-neutron interactions in the N = Z parent nuclei may result in superallowed α decays with reduced α -decay widths significantly greater than that for ²¹²Po. From the decay chain, we deduce that the α -reduced width for ¹⁰⁸Xe or ¹⁰⁴Te is more than a factor of 5 larger than that for ²¹²Po.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.182501

The region around the self-conjugate doubly magic ¹⁰⁰Sn nucleus, located near the proton drip line [1], is one of the focal points of nuclear structure [2]. Recently, ¹⁰⁰Sn β decay was shown to exhibit the largest Gamow-Teller strength measured to date [3], and the first single-neutron excitation was identified in ¹⁰¹Sn [4,5]. Another manifestation of the doubly magic nature of ¹⁰⁰Sn is the existence of an island of enhanced α emitters which decay towards the Z = N = 50 closed shells. In fact, the emission of heavier clusters such as ⁸Be, ¹²C, and ¹⁴C was also proposed in this region [6–8]. A similar decay pattern can be found in the well-studied region near the stable doubly magic ²⁰⁸Pb nucleus. In contrast to ²⁰⁸Pb, valence protons and neutrons in nuclei near ¹⁰⁰Sn occupy the same orbitals, resulting in stronger proton-neutron interactions.

 α decay is a fundamental nuclear decay mode. Despite scores of known α emitters, calculating associated lifetimes remains a challenge [9]. The α -emission probability is the product of the formation probability of the α particle inside the nucleus (preformation factor) and its transmission through the Coulomb barrier. While the latter can be readily computed, the former requires microscopic calculations, in which the preformation can be viewed as the overlap between the initial-state wave function and those of the states in the daughter nucleus and of the outgoing α particle. Residual nucleon-nucleon interactions are an important ingredient in such calculations. Because of its simplicity, the α decay of ²¹²Po to its doubly magic ²⁰⁸Pb daughter can be viewed as a benchmark for models of α emission [10]. In fact, it is the only known α decay to a doubly magic daughter. The only other decay of the same type involves ¹⁰⁴Te, which is located far from the line of stability and, prior to this work, had not been observed due to a very small production cross section and anticipated short half-life. It is noteworthy that this ${}^{104}\text{Te} \rightarrow {}^{100}\text{Sn}$ decay is also of particular interest because enhanced proton-neutron interactions could result in an unusually large preformation factor. Hence, a comparison between ²¹²Po and ¹⁰⁴Te provides a direct assessment of the role of these interactions in α -particle formation [11,12]. Such a superallowed α decay was proposed already in 1965 by Macfarlane and Siivola [13]. Experimentally, enhanced α decays have been observed near the N = Z line in ¹⁰⁵Te [14,15], ¹⁰⁶Te [16,17], ¹¹⁰Xe [16,17], and ¹¹⁴Ba [17]. However, prior to this work, no information was available for any self-conjugate α emitters, where this effect should be the strongest.

In this Letter, the first observation of the new N = Z isotopes ¹⁰⁸Xe and ¹⁰⁴Te, decaying into doubly magic ¹⁰⁰Sn, is reported. The measured decay properties are compared

with those in neighboring even-even nuclei. It is shown that, in at least one of these nuclei, the α -particle preformation factor is more than 5 times larger than that seen in ²¹²Po, suggesting superallowed α decay and resulting in one of the largest values among the α emitters near the N = Z line and, in fact, in the entire nuclear chart.

The experiment was conducted at the ATLAS facility of Argonne National Laboratory using the Fragment Mass Analyzer (FMA) [18]. The expected half-life of ¹⁰⁴Te is of the order of a few nanoseconds [19], about a factor of a hundred shorter than the time of flight of reaction products through the separator. Therefore, the 54 Fe $({}^{58}$ Ni, $4n){}^{108}$ Xe reaction was chosen to produce ¹⁰⁸Xe instead. The latter decays into ¹⁰⁴Te, but is expected to live long enough to survive the flight through the FMA. The anticipated production cross section of ¹⁰⁸Xe is less than 1 nb, in the presence of background from other reaction channels corresponding to about 700 mb. In order to achieve the required selectivity, the recoil-decay correlation method was implemented to identify weakly produced α emitters. Self-supporting $450 \mu g/cm^2$ -thick ⁵⁴Fe targets were mounted on a rotating wheel in order to accommodate the high beam intensity. Downstream from the target wheel, a $20 \mu g/cm^2$ stationary carbon foil was used to reset the charge-state distribution of the recoiling residues. The ⁵⁸Ni beam had a laboratory energy of 245 MeV and an average intensity of 32 particle nA (2×10^{11} ions/s). The total irradiation time was approximately 118 h. The FMA was set to collect fusion-evaporation residues (referred to as recoils below) with a mass number of 108 and a charge state of +26 or +27 through slits located at the focal plane. A position-sensitive parallel-grid avalanche counter (PGAC) measured mass-to-charge-state ratios of nuclei transported through the FMA. Behind the PGAC, the recoils were implanted into a 100- μ m thick, 64 × 64 mm², 160 × 160 strip double-sided silicon detector (DSSD). Eight $300-\mu m$ thick, $4 \times 7 \text{ cm}^2$ single-sided silicon detectors, each composed of seven strips, were placed upstream from the DSSD in a box geometry (referred to as the BOX detector below) to detect α particles escaping from the DSSD. Individual events from each detector were time stamped with a 100-MHz clock. An approximately $4-\mu s$ long trace was collected for each DSSD event in order to analyze pileup events. The energies deposited in the DSSD were extracted using a linear energy calibration obtained with an α source containing ²⁴⁰Pu and ²⁴⁴Cm isotopes (gain parameter) and with the observed ¹⁰⁸Te [$E_{\alpha} = 3314(4)$ keV [20]] α activity (offset parameter). The BOX detector was calibrated using the escaping ¹⁰⁸Te α particles. The α -decay recoil effect [21,22], as well as dead layer effects in both detectors, were accounted for in these calibrations.

In Fig. 1, all observed decay events correlated with a recoil event measured in the same pixel of the DSSD are displayed. An event was considered to be a recoil if (i) the



FIG. 1. Time difference between a recoil implantation and a subsequent decay event occurring in the same pixel of the DSSD as a function of the energy deposited by the decay event. Previously identified activities are labeled. The two events associated with the new activities are marked with numbers 1 and 2. The inset provides the time distribution of these events. The half-life of ¹⁰⁸Xe was extracted using the maximum like-lihood method [23], and the solid line in the inset is the determined probability distribution function. The ordinate of the inset is arbitrary. See text for details on the region marked with a dashed line.

PGAC yielded A = 108, (ii) the energy registered in the DSSD was greater than 15 MeV, and (iii) a time-of-flight condition between the PGAC and the DSSD was satisfied. An event without a PGAC signal was considered to be a decay event. In Fig. 1, events arising from previously known activities are labeled. The high-energy background present in Fig. 1 is due to scattered beam and other implants, which were not vetoed by the PGAC. The two events, clearly separated from the background, marked with numbers 1 and 2, are shorter lived and more energetic than any known α emitter in this region. Furthermore, a particle was registered by the BOX detector in coincidence with both of these events; see Fig. 2. As can be seen in the inset of Fig. 2, the energy sum of the two coincident DSSD and



FIG. 2. Energies of coincident events observed within 250 ns in the DSSD and the BOX and in less than 1 ms after a recoil implantation. The two dashed lines correspond to the literature α -particle energies of ¹⁰⁷Te and ¹⁰⁸Te. The inset provides the energy sum (events of interest are adjusted vertically for clarity).

TABLE I. The ¹⁰⁸Xe \rightarrow ¹⁰⁴Te \rightarrow ¹⁰⁰Sn α -decay chains observed in the present study. E_{α} is the reconstructed α -particle energy and τ is the recorded decay time.

Chain	$\begin{array}{c} E_{\alpha}(^{108}\mathrm{Xe})\\ (\mathrm{MeV}) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} E_{\alpha}(^{104}\mathrm{Te})\\ \mathrm{(MeV)} \end{array}$	$ au^{(108}_{ m Xe}) \ (\mu m s)$	$\tau(^{104}\text{Te})$ (ns)
1	4.56(26)	4.73(24)	139	<20
2	4.23(20)	5.06(25)	28	<20

BOX events is nearly identical. By fitting and integrating the background in Fig. 1, it was found that less than 0.09 events can be attributed to random correlations in the region near the events of interest, marked with dashed lines in Fig. 1. Furthermore, the background is reduced by a factor greater than 400, once a coincidence event in the BOX is required. Given the nearly equal total energies and the low background, it is very unlikely that the two observed coincidence events are due to random correlations.

The energy deposited in the DSSD is too high to originate from a single escaping high-energy α particle, suggesting another origin. Consequently, event 1 (2) was interpreted as the α particle from ¹⁰⁸Xe stopped in the DSSD (BOX), rapidly followed by an α particle from ¹⁰⁴Te stopped in the BOX (DSSD). There are no events indicating the observation of both α decays with full energy in the DSSD. The deduced properties of these chains are listed in Table I and are discussed in detail below. Regardless of which α particle was stopped in the DSSD, the time difference between this DSSD event and the preceding recoil event, observed in the same pixel of the DSSD, reflects the decay time of ¹⁰⁸Xe. This time distribution is presented in the inset of Fig. 1. The ¹⁰⁸Xe half-life of 58^{+106}_{-23} µs was determined with the maximum likelihood method [23]. In order to extract the anticipated short halflife of ¹⁰⁴Te, DSSD traces corresponding to ¹⁰⁸Xe-¹⁰⁴Te pileup events were analyzed. In Fig. 3, the second



FIG. 3. The second derivative of the DSSD traces of events (a) 1 and (b) 2 compared to the second derivative of a reference double-decay trace (see text for details) with a time delay from 0 to 60 ns between the consecutive decays. The reference decay events with lower amplitude are escape events.

derivatives of the recorded DSSD traces are displayed for each event and compared to differentiated reference double-decay traces with a delay varying from 0 to 60 ns between consecutive decays. The reference traces were obtained by taking an average trace recorded for the α decay of ¹⁰⁸Te from the same DSSD strips in which the events of interest were recorded, then scaling and delaying it before summing it with the original trace to simulate a sequence of two decays. The peak in the reference trace for $\Delta t = 20$ ns displays a broadening, which is not visible in the traces of events 1 and 2, implying a decay time shorter than 20 ns for both events, and resulting in an upper limit of 18 ns with a 68% probability for the 104 Te half-life. This is about a factor of 3 shorter than the reported half-life of ²¹⁹Pa $[53(10) \text{ ns } [24], 60^{+28}_{-15} \text{ ns } [25]], \text{ making } {}^{104}\text{Te the shortest-}$ lived ground-state α emitter observed thus far [26].

The ¹⁰⁸Xe and ¹⁰⁴Te α -particle energies were reconstructed from the energies deposited in the DSSD and the BOX detector. The energy registered by the DSSD is the sum of one full α -particle energy, one partial α -particle energy, and two α -decay recoil energies partially recorded [22]. The partition of the energy deposited in the DSSD depends sensitively on the implantation depth, which was deduced from the observed ¹⁰⁸Te escape events. A correction term was applied to account for the difference between the energy loss of the ¹⁰⁸Te α particles and that of the 108 Xe and 104 Te α particles in the dead layers of the DSSD and the BOX. The required ranges for α particles in silicon were computed using the ASTAR calculator [27], which is based on the ICRU Report 49 [28]. The α -particle energy reconstruction resulted in values of $E_{\alpha}(^{108}\text{Xe}) =$ 4.4(2) MeV and $E_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te}) = 4.9(2)$ MeV. The higher energy was assigned to ¹⁰⁴Te, based on systematics. The quoted uncertainty is dominated by the determination of the implantation depth.

The extracted values of $Q_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te}) = 5.1(2)$ MeV and $Q_{\alpha}(^{108}\text{Xe}) = 4.6(2)$ MeV are compared to the known even-even α emitters in the ¹⁰⁰Sn region, and to the analogous nuclei in the ²⁰⁸Pb region, in Fig. 4. From Fig. 4 one can notice a nearly linear, increasing trend



FIG. 4. Q_{α} values of the even-even α emitters in the ¹⁰⁰Sn region (solid symbols) and in the ²⁰⁸Pb region (open symbols) as a function of the number of valence neutrons.

Chain	Nuclide	E_{α} (keV)	$T_{1/2}$	b_{α} (%)	W_{lpha}
$\overline{N = Z}$ $N = Z$	¹⁰⁸ Xe ¹⁰⁴ Te	4400(200)	$58^{+106}_{-23} \ \mu s$	100 ^a 100 ^a	~3.7 ^b >13.1 ^c
N = Z N = Z + 2	¹¹⁴ Ba	3480(20) [17]	380^{+190}_{-110} ms [17]	0.9(3) [35]	$^{-15.1}_{-3}$ [17]
N = Z + 2	¹¹⁰ Xe	3720(20) [17]	95^{+25}_{-20} ms [17]	64(35) [35]	$2.4^{+1.5}_{-1.6}$ [16]
N = Z + 2	¹⁰⁶ Te	4128(9) [36]	$70^{+20}_{-15} \ \mu s \ [17]$	100 [35]	$4.4^{+1.2}_{-0.9}$ [17]
N = Z + 4	¹¹² Xe	3216(7) [36]	2.7(8) s [37]	$0.8^{+1.1}_{-0.5}$ [36]	3.4 ^{+4.7} _{-2.5} [36]
N = Z + 4	¹⁰⁸ Te	3314(4) [20]	2.1(1) s [37]	49(4) [36]	2.7(3) [36]

TABLE II. Properties of α -decay chains in even-even nuclei around ¹⁰⁰Sn, including the N = Z chain from the present work. See the text and Fig. 5 for detailed discussion on W_{α} values.

^aAssumed value.

^bObtained using the most likely E_{α} and $T_{1/2}$ values.

°Obtained using the most likely E_{α} and the 18-ns half-life limit.

towards the neutron shell closure in both cases. Once the N = 126 shell closure is reached, the Q_{α} values drop suddenly. The present data are in agreement with this linear trend, and therefore with the extrapolated values of $Q_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te}) = 5.053 \text{ MeV}$ and $Q_{\alpha}(^{108}\text{Xe}) = 4.440 \text{ MeV}$ [29]. Furthermore, the folding potential calculations $[Q_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te})=5.42(7)\text{ MeV}$ and $Q_{\alpha}(^{108}\text{Xe})=4.65(15)\text{ MeV}$ [19]] appear to reproduce well the present value for 108 Xe, but differ slightly from 104 Te. The mass excesses $\Delta({}^{104}$ Te)=-49.8(4)MeV and $\Delta({}^{108}$ Xe)=-42.8(4)MeV were obtained from the measured Q_{α} values and from the known masses of ¹⁰⁰Sn and ⁴He [30]. Based on these masses and those of ¹⁰²Sn and ¹⁰⁶Te [30], two-proton decay Q values of $Q_{2p}(^{104}\text{Te}) = 0.6(4)$ MeV and $Q_{2p}(^{108}\text{Xe}) = 0.0(4)$ MeV 0.9(4) MeV were deduced. These are the first nuclei in the ¹⁰⁰Sn region with experimentally determined positive Q_{2n} values; however, in both cases 2p emission is dominated by α decay. The situation is different for ¹⁰³Te, where the α decay straddles the N = 50 shell closure, resulting in a much slower α decay. In fact, ¹⁰³Te has been proposed to be the best candidate for 2p emission in nuclei with A > 100[31–33]. The ⁸Be-emission Q value of 9.6(5) MeV was extracted for ¹⁰⁸Xe. While this is the largest value in the ¹⁰⁰Sn region, it is still too small to compete with α decay.

A useful quantity in the comparison of properties of α -emitting nuclei is the reduced decay width δ^2 , which is defined as $\lambda_{\alpha} = \delta^2 P/h$, where λ_{α} is the partial α -decay constant, *P* is the Coulomb-barrier penetration factor, and *h* is Planck's constant. A standard way to obtain *P* for ground-state to ground-state α decay of even-even nuclei is to calculate the WKB integral [34], assuming *s*-wave α -particle emission. The quantity δ^2 is often given relative to ²¹²Po, $W_{\alpha} = \delta^2/\delta^2(^{212}\text{Po})$. The extracted W_{α} values, together with other properties of the new isotopes, are summarized and compared in Table II to those of previously known chains in even-even nuclei in the ¹⁰⁰Sn region.

Because of large energy uncertainties, W_{α} values are not tightly constrained for ¹⁰⁴Te and ¹⁰⁸Xe. Whereas it is not possible to deduce the individual α -particle energies with

high precision, their sum of 9.29(9) MeV is better constrained. The $E_{\alpha}(^{108}\text{Xe})$ and $E_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te})$ energies and, thus, $W_{\alpha}(^{108}\text{Xe})$ and $W_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te})$ values are strongly correlated. This correlation can be found in Fig. 5, where the α -particle energies are varied within the present uncertainties, while keeping their sum constant. Solutions corresponding to the shaded area in Fig. 5 are excluded. Hence, solutions with $W_{\alpha} \lesssim 5$ for both ¹⁰⁸Xe and ¹⁰⁴Te are not likely, and at least for one of them $W_{\alpha} \gtrsim 5$, indicating superallowed character. This value is larger than for most of the neighboring nuclei, thus amplifying the increasing trend in preformation factors towards the N = Z line.

Based on the α -decay systematics [15], it was concluded that the α -particle preformation factor of ¹⁰⁴Te is at least 3 times larger than that of ²¹²Po. Recently, a microscopic approach based on the multistep shell model predicted a factor of 4.85 enhancement for ¹⁰⁴Te [11], in fair agreement with the present data. In Ref. [12], the complex-energy



FIG. 5. The lower limit of $W_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te})$ as a function of that for ^{108}Xe , where the two α -particle energies are varied within ± 200 keV, while keeping their sum constant. The solid line corresponds to the most likely half-life of ^{108}Xe , whereas the dashed lines correspond to the upper and lower uncertainty limit. The shaded area is excluded by the present data. The data point marked with an arrow corresponds to the most likely $E_{\alpha}(^{108}\text{Xe})$ and $E_{\alpha}(^{104}\text{Te})$ values.

shell model was used and a preformation factor of 104 Te comparable to that of 212 Po was obtained, possibly pointing to the importance of proton-neutron interactions, which were not included in this latter calculation. The inclusion of the proton-neutron interaction was also necessary to reproduce the 212 Po α -decay lifetime [10].

In summary, the self-conjugate ${}^{108}\text{Xe} \rightarrow {}^{104}\text{Te} \rightarrow {}^{100}\text{Sn}$ α -decay chain was observed for the first time. ${}^{104}\text{Te}$ is only the second instance of α decay to a doubly magic nucleus. The decay properties of ${}^{108}\text{Xe}$ and ${}^{104}\text{Te}$ indicate that the α -particle preformation factor, for at least one of these nuclei, is more than 5 times larger than that of ${}^{212}\text{Po}$, suggesting superallowed α decay. This observation confirms the increasing trend of the preformation factor towards the N = Z line, and provides the first quantitative information about this effect in self-conjugate nuclei, where it is expected to be strongest.

In order to stimulate further theoretical studies of the α -particle formation, and of the role of the proton-neutron interactions in particular, observation of more $^{108}\text{Xe} \rightarrow ^{104}\text{Te} \rightarrow ^{100}\text{Sn}$ chains and reduction of uncertainties in neighboring α emitters are essential. A measurement of the ^{104}Te half-life is equally important, but will require a detection system sensitive to subnanosecond decay times. Observation of ^{112}Ba , a heavier $N = Z \alpha$ emitter, is also possible.

This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, under Contracts No. DE-AC02-06CH11357 (ANL), No. DE-FG02-94ER40834 (UMCP), No. DE-FG02-94ER40848 (UMass Lowell), No. DE-FG02-97ER41041 (UNC), and No. DE-FG02-97ER41033 (TUNL). This research used resources of ANL's ATLAS facility, which is a DOE Office of Science User Facility. C. S. acknowledges that this work has been supported by the Academy of Finland under the Finnish Center of Excellence Programme (Contract No. 284612).

*kauranen@anl.gov

- ^{*}Present address: Department of Physics, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland 21402, USA.
- [‡]Present address: Universitá degli Studi di Milano and INFN, Via Celoria 16, I-20133 Milano, Italy.
- [§]Present address: U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi, Maryland 20783, USA.
- Present address: GSI, Planckstraße 1, D-64291, Darmstadt, Germany.
- ¹Present address: University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, United Kingdom.
- ^{**}Present address: Department of Physics and Applied Physics, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, Massachusetts 01854, USA.
- J. Erler, N. Birge, M. Kortelainen, W. Nazarewicz, E. Olsen, A. M. Perhac, and M. Stoitsov, Nature (London) 486, 509 (2012).

- [2] T. Faestermann, M. Górska, and H. Grawe, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 69, 85 (2013).
- [3] C. B. Hinke et al., Nature (London) 486, 341 (2012).
- [4] D. Seweryniak, M. P. Carpenter, S. Gros, A. A. Hecht, N. Hoteling, R. V. F. Janssens, T. L. Khoo, T. Lauritsen, C. J. Lister, G. Lotay, D. Peterson, A. P. Robinson, W. B. Walters, X. Wang, P. J. Woods, and S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 022504 (2007).
- [5] I. G. Darby, R. K. Grzywacz, J. C. Batchelder, C. R. Bingham, L. Cartegni, C. J. Gross, M. Hjorth-Jensen, D. T. Joss, S. N. Liddick, W. Nazarewicz, S. Padgett, R. D. Page, T. Papenbrock, M. M. Rajabali, J. Rotureau, and K. P. Rykaczewski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 162502 (2010).
- [6] A. Florescu and A. Insolia, Phys. Rev. C 52, 726 (1995).
- [7] S. Kumar, D. Bir, and R. K. Gupta, Phys. Rev. C 51, 1762 (1995).
- [8] S. Kumar and R. K. Gupta, Phys. Rev. C 49, 1922 (1994).
- [9] R. G. Lovas, R. J. Liotta, A. Insolia, K. Varga, and D. S. Delion, Phys. Rep. 294, 265 (1998).
- [10] K. Varga, R. G. Lovas, and R. J. Liotta, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 37 (1992).
- [11] M. Patial, R. J. Liotta, and R. Wyss, Phys. Rev. C 93, 054326 (2016).
- [12] R. I. Betan and W. Nazarewicz, Phys. Rev. C 86, 034338 (2012).
- [13] R. D. Macfarlane and A. Siivola, Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 114 (1965).
- [14] D. Seweryniak, K. Starosta, C. N. Davids, S. Gros, A. A. Hecht, N. Hoteling, T. L. Khoo, K. Lagergren, G. Lotay, D. Peterson, A. Robinson, C. Vaman, W. B. Walters, P. J. Woods, and S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. C 73, 061301 (2006).
- [15] S. N. Liddick et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 082501 (2006).
- [16] Z. Janas, C. Mazzocchi, L. Batist, A. Blazhev, M. Górska, M. Kavatsyuk, O. Kavatsyuk, R. Kirchner, A. Korgul, M. La Commara, K. Miernik, I. Mukha, A. Plochocki, E. Roeckl, and K. Schmidt, Eur. Phys. J. A 23, 197 (2005).
- [17] L. Capponi et al., Phys. Rev. C 94, 024314 (2016).
- [18] C. N. Davids and J. D. Larson, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. B 40–41, 1224 (1989).
- [19] P. Mohr, Eur. Phys. J. A 31, 23 (2007).
- [20] F. Heine, T. Faestermann, A. Gillitzer, J. Homolka, M. Köpf, and W. Wagner, Z. Phys. A 340, 225 (1991).
- [21] S. Hofmann et al., Eur. Phys. J. A 48, 62 (2012).
- [22] S. Hofmann, G. Münzenberg, K. Valli, F. P. Heßberger, J. R. H. Schneider, P. Armbruster, B. Thuma, and Y. Eyal, GSI Sci. Rep. **1982-1**, 241 (1982).
- [23] K. H. Schmidt, C. C. Sahm, K. Pielenz, and H. G. Clerc, Z. Phys. A **316**, 19 (1984).
- [24] T. Faestermann, A. Gillitzer, K. Hartel, W. Henning, and P. Kienle, AIP Conf. Proc. 164, 675 (1987).
- [25] M. D. Sun et al., Phys. Lett. B 771, 303 (2017).
- [26] G. Audi, et al., Chin. Phys. C 41, 030001 (2017).
- [27] https://physics.nist.gov/PhysRefData/Star/Text/intro.html.
- [28] M. J. Berger, M. Inokuti, H. H. Andersen, H. Bichsel, D. Powers, S. M. Seltzer, D. Thwaites, and D. E. Watt, J. Int. Comm. Radiat. Units Meas. os25, NP (1993).
- [29] C. Xu and Z. Ren, Phys. Rev. C 74, 037302 (2006).
- [30] M. Wang, G. Audi, F. G. Kondev, W. J. Huang, S. Naimi, and X. Xu, Chin. Phys. C 41, 030003 (2017).

- [31] E. Olsen, M. Pfützner, N. Birge, M. Brown, W. Nazarewicz, and A. Perhac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 222501 (2013).
- [32] E. Olsen, M. Pfützner, N. Birge, M. Brown, W. Nazarewicz, and A. Perhac, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 139903(E) (2013).
- [33] S. Hofmann, Radiochim. Acta 70-71, 93 (1995).
- [34] J.O. Rasmussen, Phys. Rev. 113, 1593 (1959).
- [35] C. Mazzocchi, Z. Janas, L. Batist, V. Belleguic, J. Döring, M. Gierlik, M. Kapica, R. Kirchner, G. A. Lalazissis,

H. Mahmud, E. Roeckl, P. Ring, K. Schmidt, P. J. Woods, and J. Żylicz, Phys. Lett. B 532, 29 (2002).

- [36] R. D. Page, P. J. Woods, R. A. Cunningham, T. Davinson, N. J. Davis, A. N. James, K. Livingston, P. J. Sellin, and A. C. Shotter, Phys. Rev. C 49, 3312 (1994).
- [37] D. Schardt, R. Kirchner, O. Klepper, W. Reisdorf, E. Roeckl, P. Tidemand-Petersson, G. Ewan, E. Hagberg, B. Jonson, S. Mattsson, and G. Nyman, Nucl. Phys. A326, 65 (1979).