Evidence from Nuclear Masses on Proposed Closed Shells at 20 Nucleons~

W. Low AND C. H. TowNES Physics Department, Columbia University, New York, New York (Received May 18, 1950)

Combining microwave measurements of sulfur and chlorine masses with mass spectroscopic and nuclear reaction information, the effect of nuclear shell structure on masses in the region of 20 neutrons or protons is investigated. It is found that except for Ca⁴⁰, nuclei with 20 neutrons or protons do not show any special stability.

HERE are various types of evidence¹⁻⁴ that neutron and proton numbers N and Z of 2, 8, 20, 50, 82 and 126 form particularly stable nuclei. These numbers can be associated with the completion of shells of the quantum levels of a single particle in a potential well.^{$5-7$} Such a single particle model has been used with considerable success to correlate nuclear moments, isomerism, and β -decay. However, there has as yet been very little information about nuclear masses at X or Z of 20, 50, or 82. Hence, the most direct test for closed shells having extra stability has not yet been made.

Combining the recent microwave measurements of masses \mathbb{S}^{36} , $\tilde{\mathbb{S}}^{34}$, $\mathbb{C} \mathsf{l}^{36}$, and $\mathbb{C} \mathsf{l}^{37}$ with mass spectroscopi and nuclear transmutation data, one can determine the masses of a large number of nuclei in the region of $N=20$ or $Z=20$. It is, therefore, feasible to test the

FIG. 1. Variation of nuclear mass with fixed Z and varying neutron number.

[~] Work supported jointly by the Signal Corps and the ONR. '

- ¹W. Elsasser, J. de phys. et rad. 5, 625 (1934).
² E. Wigner, Phys. Rev. 51, 447 (1937).
-
-
-
-
- ³ A. Berthelot, J. de phys. et rad. 3, 17, 52 (1942).
⁴ M. G. Mayer, Phys. Rev. 74, 235 (1948).
⁶ E. Feenberg and K. C. Hammack, Phys. Rev. 75, 1877 (1949).
⁶ L. W. Nordheim, Phys. Rev. 75, 1894 (1949).
⁷ M. G. M
- -

expected variation in proton or neutron binding energy near the supposed closed shell at 20 nucleons. This is most conveniently done by comparison of the experimentally determined masses with those calculated from a semi-empirical formula which allows for most of the known sources of mass variation except shell structure. Such a formula has been given by Bohr and Wheeler^{8, 9} as:

 $M_{AZ} = A - 0.00081Z - 0.00611A + 0.014A^{\frac{3}{2}}$ $+0.083(A/2-Z)^{2}/A+0.000627Z^{2}A^{-\frac{1}{3}}+\lambda,$

where $A =$ mass number, $Z =$ nuclear charge, $\lambda = 0$ for A odd, $\lambda = -0.036A^{-1}$ for A even, Z even, $\lambda = 0.036A^{-1}$ for A odd, Z odd.

This equation thus takes into account the normal odd-even fluctuations of masses. Although in general this expression does not agree with the experimentally measured masses to high accuracy, nevertheless the diference between the experimental and calculated masses plotted as a function of N or Z should give a relatively smooth curve. Any marked deviation from this curve, i.e. , a sudden change in slope, might indicate the effects of shell structure.

Figures 1 and 2 show a plot of the difference between

FIG. 2. Variation of nuclear mass with fixed neutron number and varying Z.

⁸ N. Bohr and J. A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. 56, 426 (1939). G. B. von Albada, Astrophys. J. 105, 393 (1947).

TABLE I. Mass differences calculated from microwave data and nuclear reactions,

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
- **a** E. C. Pollard, Phys. Rev. 57, 1086 (1940).
 b B. R. Elliott and L. D. P. King, Phys. Rev. 59, 403 (1941); White,

Creutz, Delasso, and Wilson, Phys. Rev. 59, 63 (1941).
 d K. Siegbahn, Phys. Rev. 70, 127 (1946).

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-

w H. T. Richards and R. V. Smith, Phys. Rev. 74, 1870 (1948).
 x O. Hizel and H. Waffler, Helv. Phys. Acta 19, 216 (1946).
 y See reference 21a.
 e See reference 20.
 4 See reference 20.
 a Dzelepow, Kopjova,

the experimental and computed masses against A for various Z and N. Tables I and II summarize data employed for determination of the masses, the mass values, estimates of their probable errors, and the references. Figure 3 indicates the experiments which relate the various nuclear masses.

TABLE II. Atomic masses based on Table I.*

Standard: $S^{12} = 31,98089$, $A^{40} = 39,97516$					
			Masses computed from	Δ differ-	
	Mass, based on		Bohr- Wheeler	ence in	
Nucleus	Table I	Comment	formula	m.m.u.	
P ₃₁	30.98239±40	Average of $P^{31} \alpha \phi S^{34}$ and $P^{31}d\rho P^{32}$ reactions	30.98218	0.21	
$_{\mathrm{P}^{32}}$	$31.98268 + 20$		31.98315	-0.47	
P^{34}	33.98326±25		33.98219	0.07	
S ³¹	$30.98758 + 50$		30.98756	0.02	
S ³²	31.98089	Standard all nuclei from P ³¹ to A ⁴⁰ calculated with respect to S ³²	31.98051	0.38	
S ³³	$32.98058 + 10$		32.98011	$_{0.47}$	
S ³⁴	$33.97780 + 20$	Average of microwave and $S^{32} - d\rho - S^{33}$ reaction	33.97566	2.14	
S ³⁵	$34.97907 + 45$		34.97649	2.58	
S36	35.97834±40		35.97510	3.24	
S ³⁷	36.98111 ± 50		36.97866	2.45	
$\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{133}}$	$32.98607 \!\pm\! 10$		32.98575	0.32	
Cl ³⁴	33.98436 ± 25		33.98391	0.45	
Cl ³⁵	34.97889±40	Average of $S^{32} - \alpha p - C^{35}$ and $S^{33} - d\alpha - C^{35}$	34.97817	0.72	
Cl36	35.97892 ± 50	Average of Cl ³⁵ dpCl ³⁶ and microwave data	35.97855	$+0.37$	
Cl37	36.97640 ± 50		36.97503	1.37	
\mathbf{C}]38	$37.97868 \!\pm\! 55$		37.97728	1.40	
A35	34.98468 ± 50		34.98406	0.63	
A36	35.97822±55		35.97717	1.05	
A38	37.97320 ± 60	Average of $Cl^{35}\alpha\phi A^{38}$ and Cl $^{38} \beta^-$ A 38 reactions	37.97138	1.82	
A40	39.97516±26		39.97020	4.96	
		Standard, reevaluated using references 10, 11 (Mattauch)			
A41	40.97765 ± 05		40.97293	4.72	
\mathbf{K}^{38}	37.97905 ± 70	Assuming β^+ and γ are in cascade	37.98035	-1.30	
\mathbf{K}^{39}	38.97613±30		38.97460	$+1.53$	
K40	39.97683±10		39.97446	2.37	
K 41	40.97491 ± 25		40.97075	4.16	
\mathbf{K}^{42}	41.97600 ± 30		41.97235	3.65	
\mathbf{K}^{43}	42.97433±65		42.97038	3.95	
A37	36.9783 ± 60		35.97634	1.49	
$\rm Ca^{39}$	$38.98232 + 40$	Theoretical value using $\beta^+ = 4.8$ Mev.	38.98100	$+1.32$	
Ca ⁴⁰	39.97546±08		39.97701	-1.55	
Ca ⁴¹	$40.97543 + 12$		40.97299	2.44	
Ca42	41.97217 ± 35		41.96829	3.88	
Ca ⁴³	42.97346±55		42.96888	4.58	
Sc^{41}	40.98173 ± 35		40.97955	2.18	
Sc ⁴³	42.97572 ± 50		42.97141	4.29	

* Note that masses and errors given are not absolute values, but are relative to the masses chosen for S^{22} and A^{40} .

^{dd} H. T. Richards and R. V. Smith, Phys. Rev. **74**, 1257 (1948).

^{ee} E. C. Pollard and E. J. Brasefield, Phys. Rev. 51, 8 (1937).

¹⁴ G. T. Seaborg and I. Perlman, Rev. Mod. Phys. 20, 589 (1948).

^{se} Hibdon, Pool,

Fro. 3. Known connections between masses of certain nuclei.

II. DISCUSSION OF MASS DETERMINATIONS

All masses from P^{31} to A^{40} have been calculated with respect to the mass of $S^{32} = 31.98089$. The masses from argon to scandium have been computed with respect to A^{40} . The mass of A^{40} has been taken as 39.97516 ± 0.00028 determined from the doublet¹⁰ (Ne - A/2) $=111.42\times10^{-4} \pm 0.38$ and using¹¹ Ne²⁰ = 19.99872 ± 0.00013 . All reactions used for the determination of masses have been recalculated using Bainbridge's values¹¹ for the masses of H, n, D, and α . The mass values of a few nuclei require further explanations as given below.

 S^{31} .— S^{31} is positron active and has been determined with respect to S^{32} through the mass of P^{31} , as is indicated in Fig. 3. The P^{31} mass obtained is 30.98238 ± 45 or 30.98240 ± 40 for the reaction paths involving $S³⁴$ or $P³²$ respectively. The $S³¹$ mass is obtained immediately from P31.

Cl³⁵.—The mass of Cl³⁵ can be determined from two different reactions as shown in Fig. 3. From the αp reaction Cl³⁵ = 34.97889 ± 40 and from the d α -reaction Cl³⁵=34.97888 ± 40 . For the αp reactions Bethe's revised Q values have been used throughout.¹²

 $Cl³⁷$.—The $Cl³⁷$ mass is determined from the mass ratio of $Cl³⁵/Cl³⁷$. Unfortunately there are different values for this ratio from mass spectroscopy and microwave spectroscopy. A recent mass spectroscopic determination¹³ of this ratio gives the value as 0.9459441 ± 65 (Aston¹⁴ had found earlier the ratio as 0.9459806, but his experimental error is stated as ± 300 . This value disagrees with the values obtained from microwave measurements^{15, 16} in ICl

and FCl which give 0.9459801 ± 50 and 0.9459775 ± 40 respectively. Isotopic frequencies for Cl³⁵, Cl³⁶, and Cl³⁷ in the molecul CICN have also been measured.^{16a} With these and a knowledg of the mass difference $Cl^{35} - Cl^{36}$ (obtained from $Cl^{35} d\rho Cl^{36}$ reaction) one finds this ratio $Cl³⁵/Cl³⁷=0.9459906\pm120$ in agreement with other microwave results. Moreover, an evaluation of this ratio from transmutation data^{17, 18} leads to a value in essential agreement with microwave results. Hence the most recent mass spectroscopic value must be in error. Table III summarizes these results.

 A^{38} .— A^{38} may be determined from Cl³⁵ with an α, β reaction and from the beta-decay of $Cl³⁸$. The values are 37.97332 and 33.97322 ± 60 respectively.

K³⁸.—K³⁸ gives off a positron of 2.53 Mev and a γ -ray of 2.15 Mev. We assume that these are in cascade.

Ca³⁹.—Ca³⁹ belongs to a class of nuclei with $Z-N=1$ which are positron active. These "mirror" nuclei have been studied extensively; their half-lives and positron energies form a very regular and apparently well-understood series. The half-life of Ca^{39} has been measured recently¹⁹ and is 1.06 sec. in good agreement with expectations from this series. Hence the predicted²⁰ but still unmeasuredt value of 4.8 Mev for the positron energy seems to us very reliable for obtaining the mass difference K39—Ca39.

Ca⁴⁰.—The mass difference Ca⁴⁰—A⁴⁰ has recently been obtained as $(3.2\pm0.8)\times10^{-4}$ from mass spectroscopy^{20a} and as (2.7 ± 2.1) as $(3.2\pm0.8)\times10^{-4}$ from mass :
 $\times10^{-4}$ from nuclear reactions.²¹

 K^{43} , Ca^{42, 43}, Sc⁴³, Ca⁴².--The Ca⁴² mass has been determined from beta-decay of K^{42} . From the measurement by Sailor²¹ of the mass difference $K^{42}-K^{41}$ one obtains for the mass of Ca^{42} =41.97217 \pm 35. If the K³⁹ αp Ca⁴² reaction reported by Pollard and Brasefield²² is used, a value 41.97293 ± 50 results. This gives support to Bethe's suggestion¹² that the αp reaction measured does not represent a transition to the ground state. Similarly, it is not quite certain whether the observed $Ca^{40} \alpha p$ Sc⁴³ reaction represents a transition to the ground state, and therefore, the

TABLE III. Value of Cl³⁵/Cl³⁷ ratio.

Name	Method	Value	
Aston [*]	Mass spectroscopy	0.9459806 ± 300	
Okuda et al. ^b	Mass spectroscopy	0.9459452 ± 65	
Townes et al. ^c	Microwave (ICI)	0.9459801 ± 50	
Roberts et al. ^d	Microwave (FCI)	0.9459775 ± 40	
Townes et al. ^o	Microwave (ClCN)	0.9459906 ± 120	
Pollard ^f	Nuclear reaction	$0.9459893 + 110$	

'See reference 14.

b See reference 13.
« See reference 15.
« See reference 16.
« Townes and Shulman, private communicatio
! See references 17 and 18.

¹⁶ Gilbert, Roberts, and Griswold, Phys. Rev. **76**, 1721 (1949).
^{16a} We are grateful for the help of Dr. R. G. Shulman in measuring the difference in B_0 values for Cl³⁵CN and Cl³⁶CN as
63.51±0.02 Mc. The similar difference for Cl³⁵CN and Cl³⁷CN
is 123.56 Mc. [Townes, Holden, and Merritt, Phys. Rev. **74**, 1123 (1948).

¹⁷ E. C. Pollard, Phys. Rev. 57, 1086 (1940).

¹⁸ J. H. Shrader and E. C. Pollard, Phys. Rev. 59, 277 (1941).
¹⁹ Huber, Leinhardt, Scherrer, and Waffler, Helv. Phys. Acta

16, 33 (1943). E. Wigner, private communication to Walke, Phys. Rev. 57,

177 (1940). \dagger L. Motz has pointed out to us the determination of the (γ, n)
threshold for Ca⁴⁰ as 15.9±0.4 Mev by McElhinney, Hanson,
Becker, Duffield, and Diven, Phys. Rev. 75, 542 (1949). This
would give Ca³⁹ th

would not appreciably modify other conclusions presented here. $\frac{20 \text{ s}}{4}$ T. R. Roberts and A. O. C. Nier, Phys. Rev. 79, 198 (1950). $\frac{21 \text{ s}}{4}$ V. L. Sailor, Phys. Rev. 75, 1836 (1949).

~~ E. C. Pollard and C. J. Braseheld, Phys. Rev. 51, 8, (1937).

¹⁰ J. Mattauch, Nuclear Physics Tables (Interscience Publishers,

Inc., New York, 1942).
¹¹ K. Bainbridge, *Isotopic Weights of the Fundamental Isotopes*,
 $\frac{1}{2}$ R. Council 1949).

Nuclear Science Series (Nat. Res. Council, 1949).
¹² M. S. Livingston and H. A. Bethe, Rev. Mod. Phys. 9, 300 (1937).

²³ Okuda, Ogata, Aoki, and Sugawara, Phys. Rev. **58**, 578 (1940).
¹⁴ F. W. Aston, Proc. Roy. Soc. **162A,** 191 (1937).
¹⁵ Townes, Merritt, and Wright, Phys. Rev. **73**, 1334 (1948).

masses of Ca⁴³, K⁴³, and Sc⁴³ given in Table I may be somewhat too high.

III. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Figures 1 and 2 show that although there is considerable deviation of the measured masses from the Bohr- Wheeler formula, all deviations with the exception of the value for Ca^{40} lie on relatively smooth curves. The deviations from the curves are not generally larger than 0.5 Mev. There seems to be no abrupt change of mass or of slope of the curves of mass versus neutron number near S^{36} , Cl^{37} , A^{38} , or K^{39} , all of which are atoms with 20 neutrons. Similarly, there is no evidence of shell structure at 20 protons from the curves of mass versus proton number, except in the case of Ca⁴⁰ which shows a striking deviation from the smooth curves of about 3.5 Mev. This deviation is far greater than the probable error of mass determinations or than the deviation of any other nucleus plotted.

The absence of any change in slope at 20 nucleons makes it rather questionable whether 20 nucleons should be regarded as the closing point of a major shell. The well-known stability of Ca^{40} seems not to be simply connected with the completion of a shell at 20 nucleons. This case indicates that some large deviations from the stability curve may be encountered for other nuclei which are not attributable to neutron or proton shells alone but depend on the combination of neutron and proton numbers. Perhaps the large mass spread of stable Ca isotopes is due to this exceptional stability of $Ca⁴⁰$ and to a shell at 28 neutrons which makes Ca⁴⁸ stable rather than to a general stability of 20 protons.

PHYSICAL REVIEW VOLUME 80, NUMBER 4 NOVEMBER 15, 1950

On a Difference Equation Method in Cosmic-Ray Shower Theory*

W. T. Scorr Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts

and.

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York (Received May 29, 1950)

The recent results of Snyder and Bhabha-Chakrabarty for the cascade theory of cosmic-ray showers are shown to be derivable from a general approach involving the use of the Laplace and Mellin transforms, and a general and powerful method, due to Snyder, for solving the resulting difference equations. Boundary conditions are introduced in a natural and automatic way, and the accuracy of the solution is limited by the possible ways of evaluating the resulting triple complex integral.

I. INTRODUCTION

 $S^{\text{NYDER}1}$ has recently obtained numerical result for the cascade theory of electron-photon showers NYDER' has recently obtained numerical results which appear to be considerably more accurate than those of Bhabha and Chakrabarty. ' It is the object of this paper to present a general method of solving the shower equations which yield both of the abovementioned solutions, and which should be applicable to a number of other problems.

II. THEORY

Using Snyder's' notation, we write the diffusion equation for $P(E, t)$, the mean energy spectrum of electrons at depth t, and $\gamma(E, t)$, the mean energy spectrum of photons;

BP(E, t) =lim t" P(E', t)R(E', E' E) E'E- dE'— — E'dE' BP(E, t) P(E, t) [~] R(E, E') — +P aE dE' +2 q(E', t)R(E, E'), (I) ^z E' By(E, t) " EdE'

$$
\frac{\partial \gamma(E,t)}{\partial t} = \int_{E}^{\infty} P(E',t)R(E',E)\frac{EdE}{E'^2}
$$

$$
-\gamma(E,t)\int_{0}^{E} R(E',E)\frac{dE'}{E}.
$$
 (2)

In these equations $R(E', E)$ is a function which yields the elementary probabilities per unit path length of the pair-production and bremsstrahlung processes. In the case of high energies, the asymptotic form of R is that of a function homogeneous in E/E' ; this is the only case dealt with in the present treatment.

This work was started in 1940 (Ph.n. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1941}.It was completed at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, under the auspices of the AEC. ¹ H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. 76, 1563 (1949).

^{&#}x27;H. J. Bhabha and S. K. Chakrabarty, Phys. Rev. 74, ¹³⁵² (1948).