# Disintegration of  $Sn<sup>113</sup>$ <sup>†</sup>

H. E. BOSCH, M. C. SIMON,\* E. SZICHMAN,\* L. GATTO,\* AND S. M. ABECASIS<sup>†</sup> Laboratorio de Radiaciones, IIAE, DINFIA, Buenos Aires, Argentina (Received 28 September 1966; revised 23 February 1967)

A re-investigation of the decay of 119-day Sn<sup>113</sup> was carried out with scintillation spectrometers, as well as with lithium-drifted silicon and germanium detectors. In addition to x rays, two  $\gamma$  rays of 0.2555 $\pm$ 0.0005 and 0.3910 $\pm$ 0.0005 MeV were found of relative intensity  $(2.9\pm0.3)\times10^{-2}$ . The K-conversion coefficient of the 0.2555-MeV transition was measured to be  $0.040\pm0.006$  and that of the 0.3910-MeV transition, 0.49  $\pm$ 0.04  $\lceil K/(L+M) = 4.2 \pm 0.4 \rceil$ . The electron-capture ratio  $P_{\text{EC}}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{\text{EC}}(K)$  to the 0.6465-MeV level of  $In^{18}$  was determined to be 0.33 $\pm$ 0.14. The bremsstrahlung endpoint energy to the same level was ( $0.080\pm0.005$  MeV). From these values, the decay energy transitions to that level were deduced to be  $0.050-0.110$  MeV and  $(0.110 \pm 0.005)$  MeV, respectively. A decay scheme is constructed.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

HE different parameters characterizing the decay of Sn<sup>113</sup> have been measured by many authors, leaving at the present time a few inconsistencies in some of the reported values. The main discrepancy results from the values of the decay energies derived from the  $P_{\text{EC}}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{\text{EC}}(K)$  capture ratios. This is one reason why an additional method for determining the decay energy, such as the measurement of the bremsstrahlung spectrum, has been used in the present work. In addition, a systematic series of measurements of different parameters has been undertaken, using conventional scintillation spectrometers as well as lithium-drifted silicon- and germanium-semiconductor counters. As a result of these measurements, a disintegration scheme for  $Sn<sup>113</sup>$  is proposed.

## II. MEASUREMENTS

The radioactive source of Sn<sup>113</sup> was produced by ORTEC; it contained in addition an activity of  $Sn^{119m}$  (250 day).

# A. "Singles" y-Ray and Electron-Conversion Spectra

The electromagnetic radiation was detected with a lithium-drifted germanium counter of 3-mm depletion region; the corresponding spectrum is depicted in Fig. 1.

TABLE I. Energies and relative intensities of the  $\gamma$  rays following electron capture in Sn<sup>133</sup>.

$E(\gamma_2)$ (MeV)	$E(\gamma_1)$ (MeV)	$N\left(\gamma_{2}\right)/N\left(\gamma_{1}\right)$ $\times$ (10 <sup>-2</sup> )	Reference
0.255	0.393	$2.8 + 0.1$	
$0.257 + 0.002$	0.393	$3.0 + 0.3$	2
0.255	0.393	$2.7 + 0.2$	3
$0.2555 + 0.0005$	$0.3910 + 0.0005$	$2.9 + 0.3$	Present authors

† Work done under the auspicies of the U. S. Army Researcl<br>Office (Grant No. DA-ARO-49-092-65-G75).<br>\* Fellow of the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científica

f. Member of the Scientific Research Career of the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Argentina.

The average energies of both  $\gamma$  rays as well as their relative intensities are shown in Table I, where the latest values obtained by other authors<sup>1-3</sup> are also quoted.

The electron-conversion spectrum was recorded with a lithium-drifted silicon detector of 3-mm depletion depth and is shown in Fig. 2.

### B. Conversion Coefficients,  $K/L+M$  Ratios, and Branching Ratios

The  $K$ -conversion coefficient for the  $0.3910$ -MeV transition was determined by measuring the areas of the electron and  $\gamma$ -ray peaks in the corresponding "singles" spectra. Since the conversion electrons belonging to the  $0.2555$ -MeV transition cannot be detected, the K-electron intensity ratio corresponding to the cascade 0.2555–0.3910 MeV, as reported by other authors, $2^{-5}$ must be used. The corresponding results are presented in



FIG. 1. Gamma rays of Sn<sup>113</sup> detected with a lithium-drifted ger-<br>manium detector (ORTEC, model G-29-C).

<sup>1</sup> R. C. Greenwood and E. Brannen, Phys. Rev. 122, 1849  $(1961)$ 

<sup>2</sup> R. K. Girgis and R. van Lieshout, Physica 24, 672 (1958).<br><sup>3</sup> S. B. Burson, H. A. Grench, and L. C. Schmid, Phys. Rev. 115,

188 (1959)

S. K. Sen and I. O. Durosinmi-Etti, Phys. Rev. Letters 18, 144 (1965).

 $^{6}$  M. E. Rose, Internal Conversion Coefficients (North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1958).

y Tecnicas, Argentina.



FIG. 2. Electron-conversion spectrum from a Sn<sup>113</sup> source as taken with a lithium-drifted silicon counter (ENL, model LB-103).

Table II. The branching  $b_2$  to the 0.6465-MeV level was determined to be  $(1.9\pm0.2)\times10^{-2}$ , assuming no feeding to the ground state.

### C.  $P_{EC}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{EC}(K)$  Orbital-Electron Capture Ratio to the 0.6465-MeV Level

The  $P_{EC}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{EC}(K)$  orbital-electron capture ratio to the 0.6465-MeV level was derived by com-



FIG. 3. Electromagnetic-radiation spectrum from the decay of Sn<sup>113</sup> recorded by a NaI(Tl) crystal operated in coincidence with<br>pulses corresponding to 24-keV x rays detected in a NaI(Tl) crystal covered with a beryllium window.

TABLE II. Internal-conversion coefficients and  $K/(L+M+\cdots)$ ratios for both transitions in In<sup>113</sup>

$0.2555$ -MeV $\alpha$ K	transi- tion $K/(L+M\cdots)$	$0.3910$ -MeV $\alpha$ K	transition $K/(L+M\cdots)$	Reference
$0.044 + 0.008$		$0.43 + 0.06$		2
$0.039 + 0.003$	$8 + 3$		$4.3 + 0.1$	3
		$0.431 + 0.007$	$4.30 + 0.04$	4
		0.44		5
$0.040 \pm 0.006$		0.49 $+0.04$	$4.2 + 0.4$	Present authors

paring the intensity of the 0.2555-MeV  $\gamma$  ray in cascade with the  $K\alpha$  and  $K\beta$  x-ray transitions with the intensity of the same peak in the "singles" spectrum. The corresponding coincidence spectrum is displayed in Fig. 3.

The ratio of the intensity of the 0.2555-MeV peak in both spectra allows one to get the numerical value of the K-electron-capture probability decay  $P_{EC}(K)$  to the 0.6465-MeV level, determined to be  $P_{\text{EC}}(K) = 0.75$  $\pm 0.10$ . Accordingly the  $P_{EC}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{EC}(K)$  ratio becomes  $0.33 \pm 0.14$ .

The contribution of the  $L_{II}$  subshell can be neglected and that of the  $L_{\text{III}}$  one is null in allowed and first forbidden transitions.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, the ratio  $P_{EC}(M+N+\cdots)/P_{EC}(L)$  is found to be 0.193.7 Nevertheless, the assumption can be made that all of the  $P_{EC}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{EC}(K)$  ratio arises from the  $P_{\text{EC}}(L)/P_{\text{EC}}(K)$  ratio, because of the large errors involved in the determination of the first ratio. In turn, this last ratio equals the value of the  $P_{EC}(L_1)/P_{EC}(K)$ ratio. The values of the decay energies of Sn<sup>113</sup> to the levels of In<sup>113</sup> derived from the experimental  $P_{\text{EC}}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{\text{EC}}(K)$  ratios obtained by different authors are quoted in Table III.<sup>1,8-14</sup>

### D. Inner Bremsstrahlung from the Radiative Electron Capture from Sn<sup>113</sup>

The transition energy from the ground state of  $Sn<sup>113</sup>$ to the 0.6465-MeV level of In<sup>113</sup> was determined by measuring the end-point energy of the bremsstrahlung spec-

<sup>7</sup> B. L. Robinson and R. W. Fink, Rev. Mod. Phys. 32, 117  $(1960)$ .

<sup>8</sup> C. D. Broyles, D. A. Thomas, and K. Haynes, Phys. Rev. 89, 715 (1953).

<sup>9</sup> P. Avignon, Ann. Phys. (Paris) 1, 10 (1956).

<sup>10</sup> R. G. Jung and M. L. Pool, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. 1, 172 (1956). <sup>11</sup> Bhatki, Gupta, Jha, and Madan, Nuovo Cimento 6, 1464  $(1957)$ 

<sup>12</sup> W. E. Phillips and J. I. Hopkins, Phys. Rev. 119, 1315 (1960). <sup>13</sup> Manduchi, Nardelli, Russo-Manduchi, and Zannoni, Nuovo Cimento 31, 1380 (1964).

<sup>14</sup> I. O. Durosinmi-Etti, D. R. Brundrit, and S. K. Sen, in The Proceedings of the International Conference on Internal Conversion Process (Academic Press Inc., New York, 1965), p. 201.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> H. Brysk and M. E. Rose, Oak Ridge National Laboratory Report No. ORNL-1830, 1955 (unpublished); Rev. Mod. Phys. 30, 1169 (1958).

	$P_{\text{EC}}(L+M+\cdots)/P_{\text{EC}}(K)$		Bremsstrahlung end-point energy (MeV)		Partial decay energy (MeV)	
to the $0.3910$ -MeV level	to the $0.6465$ -MeV level	to the $0.3910$ -MeV level	corresponding corresponding to the $0.6465$ -MeV level	to the $0.3910$ -MeV level	to the $0.6465$ -MeV level	Reference
$0.18 + 0.09$				$0.070 - 1.0$		8
$0.17 + 0.12$		$0.072 + 0.010$		$0.100 + 0.010$		9 10
	$2.23_{-0.88}^{+1.12}$				$0.036_{+0.004}^{-0.001}$	11
	< 0.19				> 0.150	
		$0.900 \pm 0.300$		$0.930 + 0.300$		12
$0.44 \pm 0.04$				$0.049 + 0.003$		13
$0.16 + 0.02$				$0.280_{-0.100}$ <sup>+0.350</sup>		14
	$0.33 + 0.14$				$0.050 - 0.110$	Present authors
			$0.080 + 0.005$		$0.110 + 0.005$	Present authors

TABLE III. Values of partial disintegration energies from  $Sn^{113}$  to the excited levels of In<sup>113</sup> as experimentally obtained by different authors.

trum corresponding to the orbital-electron capture to this level. This was achieved by recording the bremsstrahlung spectrum in coincidence with the 0.2555-MeV  $\gamma$  ray. This spectrum is shown in Fig. 4(a) and the corresponding Kurie-type plot in Fig. 4(b). The decay energy as obtained by this method is  $(0.110\pm0.005)$  MeV.

The measurement of the  $\gamma$  continuum spectrum was also performed by other authors both in "singles" <sup>12</sup> also performed by other authors both in "singles"<br>and in coincidence with  $K \times \text{rays}^{10}$  The correspondir results are quoted in Table III.

#### III. DISCUSSION

The spin of the ground state of In<sup>113</sup> was measure<br>be  $\frac{9}{2}$ +,<sup>15</sup> and that of the first excited state  $\frac{1}{2}$ -. The spin of the ground state of In<sup>113</sup> was measured<br>to be  $\frac{9}{2} +$ ,<sup>15</sup> and that of the first excited state  $\frac{1}{2} -$ .<sup>16</sup> These values are supported by the shell-model assignments.<sup>17</sup> The second excited level could be assumed to

TABLE IV.  $Q$  values of the pair Sn<sup>113</sup>-In<sup>113</sup> obtained from different mass tables.

Reference
Hillman <sup>a</sup> 22 23 24 Present authors

<sup>a</sup> Reference 21. The first value corresponds to the calculated excess mass; the second one, to the observed mass.

be  $2p_{3/2}$ . This configuration agrees with the values experimentally obtained for the  $K$ -conversion coefficient and  $K/(L+M)$  ratio corresponding to the 0.2555-MeV transition. The proposed sequence is also predicted by<br>Kisslinger and Sorensen.<sup>18</sup> Kisslinger and Sorensen.

For the ground state of Sn<sup>113</sup>, the assignment  $3s_{1/2}$ is assumed, since it agrees with shell-model predictions as well as with those of Kisslinger and Sorensen,<sup>1</sup> Arvieu,<sup>19</sup> and the surface delta interaction model.<sup>20</sup> as well as with those of Kisslinger and Sore<br>Arvieu,<sup>19</sup> and the surface delta interaction model

The orbital electron-capture transition from the ground state of Sn<sup>113</sup> to the second excited state of In<sup>113</sup> is of the first-forbidden type. Choosing the measured bremsstrahlung end-point energy (plus the binding energy) as the transition energy between these states, a  $\log ft$  of 7.1 is obtained. Similarly, a  $\log ft$  of 6.5 for the transition to the isomeric state is deduced.

As results of the above discussion, a Q value of  $0.760\pm0.005$  MeV is derived and the disintegration scheme shown in Fig. 5 is proposed. In Table IV the Q values obtained from different mass tables are<br>quoted.<sup>21-24</sup>  $\,$  quoted.  $\!21-24}$ 

The imprecision of the values of the  $P_{EC}(L+M+\cdots)/$  $P_{\text{EC}}(K)$  capture ratios does not allow one to apply the exchange-overlap corrections theoretically derived by

<sup>18</sup> L. S. Kisslinger and R. A. Sorensen, Rev. Mod. Phys. 35,

- 853 (1963). "<br><sup>19</sup> R. Arvieu, Ann. Phys. (Paris) 8, 407 (1963). <sup>20</sup> A. Plastino, R. Arvieu, and S. A. Moszkowski, Phys. Rev.<br>**145**, 837 (1966).
- <sup>21</sup> M. Hillman, Brookhaven National Laboratory Report No.<br>BNL-846, 1964 (unpublished).
- <sup>22</sup> J. H. E. Mattauch, W. Thiele, and A. H. Wapstra, Nucl. Phys. 67, 1 (1965).
- <sup>23</sup> A. G. W. Cameron, Chalk River Project Report No. CRP-690, 1957 (unpublished); Can. J. Phys. 35, 1021 (1957).
- <sup>24</sup> W. D. Myers and W. J. Swiatecki, Vniversity of Cali-fornia Radiation Laboratory Report No. UCRL-11980, 1965 (unpublished) .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> J. E. Mack, Rev. Mod. Phys. 22, 64 (1950).<br><sup>16</sup> W. J. Childs and L. S. Goodman, Phys. Rev. 118, 1578 (1960).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>M. G. Mayer and J. H. D. Jensen, *Elementary Theory of* Nuclear Shell Structure (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1955).



(a)

Fro. 4. (a) Bremsstrahlung spectrum from the decay of Sn<sup>113</sup> recorded by a NaI(Tl) crystal covered with a beryllium window operated in coincidence with pulses corresponding to the 0.2555-MeV  $\gamma$ -rays detected in a NaI(Tl) crystal. (b) Corresponding Kurie-type plot.



FIG. 5. Proposed disintegration scheme for Sn<sup>113</sup>.

Bahcall<sup>25,26</sup> and by Robinson.<sup>27</sup> This is verified by the results of Fink and Ledingham.<sup>28</sup>

As far as the bremsstrahlung is concerned, the corresponding spectrum exhibits a shape similar to those of sponding spectrum exhibits a shape similar to those of  $Sb^{119}$  and  $Cs^{131}$  obtained by Olsen *et al.*<sup>30</sup> and Wu *et al.*,<sup>30</sup> respectively. Despite the decay-energy differences and the order of forbiddenness of the transitions, it seems natural to assume that the bremsstrahlung spectrum from Sn<sup>113</sup> could be composed of contributions from S-<br>and mainly from P-state electrons.<sup>31,32</sup> Actually both and mainly from P-state electrons.<sup>31,32</sup> Actually both the low energy available for the transitions and the relatively high atomic number give support to the relatively high atomic number give support to the<br>above-mentioned hypothesis.<sup>33</sup> Since the Glauber and Martin theory <sup>33</sup> only applies to allowed transitions, no quantitative predictions can be derived from the present data.

- 
- 
- 
- <sup>28</sup> J. N. Bahcall, Phys. Rev. **132**, 362 (1963).<br><sup>28</sup> J. N. Bahcall, Phys. Rev. **131**, 1756 (1963).<br><sup>27</sup> B. L. Robinson, Nucl. Phys. **64**, 197 (1965).<br><sup>28</sup> R. W. Fink and K. W. D. Ledingham, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.

 $11, 20$ <br>
<sup>29</sup> J. L. Olsen, L. G. Mann, and M. Lindner, Phys. Rev. 106, 985 (1957).

- <sup>30</sup> M. H. Biavati, S. J. Nassiff, and C. S. Wu, Phys. Rev. 125, 1364 (1962).
- 1364 (1962).<br><sup>31</sup> R. J. Glauber and P. C. Martin, Phys. Rev. **95**, 572 (1954).<br><sup>32</sup> R. J. Glauber and P. C. Martin, Phys. Rev. **104**, 158 (1956).<br><sup>38</sup> P. C. Martin and R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1307 (1958).
-