New isotope 286Mc produced in the 243Am ⁺ 48Ca reaction

Yu. Ts. Oganessian[,](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2766-4766) ¹ V. K. Utyonkov ⁽¹⁾, N. D. Kovrizhnykh, ¹ F. Sh. Abdullin, ¹ S. N. Dmitriev, ¹ A. A. Dzhioev, ¹

D. Ibadullayev,^{1,2} M. G. Itkis,¹ A. V. Karpov,¹ D. A. Kuznetsov,¹ O. V. Petrushkin,¹ A. V. Podshibiakin,¹ A. N. Polyakov,¹

A. G. Popeko,¹ I. S. Rogov,¹ R. N. Sagaidak,¹ L. Schlattauer,^{1,3} V. D. Shubin,¹ M. V. Shumeiko,¹ D. I. Solovyev,¹

Yu. S. Tsyganov,¹ A. A. Voinov,¹ V. G. Subbotin,¹ A. Yu. Bodrov,^{1,4} A. V. Sabel'nikov,¹ A. V. Khalkin,¹ K. P. Rykaczewski,⁵

T. T. King,⁵ J. B. Roberto,⁵ N. T. Brewer,^{5,*} R. K. Grzywacz,^{5,6} Z. G. Gan,⁷ Z. Y. Zhang,⁷ M. H. Huang,⁷ and H. B. Yang^{1,7}

¹*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, RU-141980 Dubna, Russian Federation*

²*Institute of Nuclear Physics, 050032 Almaty, Kazakhstan*

³*Palacky University Olomouc, Department of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Science, 771 46 Olomouc, Czech Republic*

⁴*Lomonosov Moscow State University, Department of Chemistry, Radiochemistry Division, RU-119991 Moscow, Russian Federation* ⁵*Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA*

⁶*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA*

⁷*Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou 730000, China*

(Received 10 October 2022; accepted 22 November 2022; published 7 December 2022)

In this paper, we present results of the second experiment on the synthesis of Mc isotopes in the $^{243}Am + ^{48}Ca$ reaction performed at the gas-filled separator DGFRS-2 of the SHE Factory at JINR. The new isotope 286Mc was synthesized, and its half-life of 20^{+98}_{-9} ms and α -particle energy of 10.71 \pm 0.02 MeV were determined. A ²⁸⁶Mc α -decay chain was recorded down to the spontaneous fission of ²⁶⁶Db. The spontaneous fission of ²⁷⁹Rg was observed for the first time in one of four new decay chains of ²⁸⁷Mc. The excitation function of the reaction was measured at three ⁴⁸Ca energies of 242, 250, and 259 MeV; the latter resulted in the first observation of the 5*n*-evaporation channel with a cross section of 0.5^{+1.3} pb. The decay properties of 21 previously known odd-*Z* isotopes were improved. The potential for an electron-capture decay mode is discussed for 288 Mc and 284 Nh isotopes. The half-lives of spontaneously fissioning nuclei produced in the ⁴⁸Ca-induced reactions with actinide targets are compared with several theoretical predictions.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.106.064306](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.106.064306)

I. INTRODUCTION

We present the results of experiments aimed at the study of the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction at the gas-filled separator DGFRS-2 [\[1\]](#page-7-0) online to the cyclotron DC280 at the SHE Factory (FLNR, JINR) [\[2\]](#page-7-0). The first series of these experiments was performed during the November 2020 to February 2021 period [\[3\]](#page-7-0). The purpose of the first series was to study the parameters of the new separator and the possibilities of its use for the synthesis of new elements heavier than $Og (Z = 118)$. For this optimization, a reaction was chosen in which superheavy nuclei are formed with the largest cross section among other fusion reactions of actinide nuclei with 48Ca. In addition to solving of technical issues, a more detailed study of the properties of nuclei in the decay chains of Mc isotopes as well as a measurement of the excitation function of the reaction were completed.

For the synthesis of new element 119, the reactions 243 Am + 54 Cr and 248 Cm + 51 V can be used to create 297 119^{*} and ²⁹⁹119[∗] compound nuclei. The α -emission products of the 3*n*- and 4*n*-evaporation channels lead to new isotopes of

 $Z = 117$ Ts and to the following neutron-deficient isotopes $285, 286$ Mc and $287, 288$ Mc, respectively. Therefore, the decay properties of the latter are important for the identification of new superheavy elements and nuclei. However, only three decays of 287Mc were observed in the 243Am(48Ca, 4*n*) reaction, which was studied at DGFRS (see [\[4\]](#page-7-0) and references therein) and TASCA [\[5\]](#page-7-0). The isotopes $285, 286$ Mc have not been observed in earlier studies. In the 237 Np(48 Ca, 3*n*) reaction, only two chains of 282 Nh, a daughter activity of 286 Mc, were produced [\[6\]](#page-7-0). In one of these ²⁸²Nh chains, an α -particle energy of ²⁷⁴Mt was measured with poor precision and the detected energy in the second chain was smaller by 0.5–0.8 MeV than that expected from the α -decay energy Q_{α} systematic for the ground-to-ground state transition for this isotope. Also, in the second chain, the spontaneous fission (SF) of 266 Db was missing.

The synthesis of isotopes 286 Mc and 287 Mc requires experiments with a fairly high sensitivity. The isotope ²⁸⁷Mc was observed in the 243 Am(48 Ca, 4*n*) reaction with a maximum cross section of about 1 pb at the excitation energy of the compound nucleus $E^* = 45$ MeV [\[4\]](#page-7-0). The production cross section of the 243 Am(48 Ca, $5n$)²⁸⁶Mc reaction could be expected at a noticeably lower level. It should be noted that during all the studies of fusion reactions of actinide nuclei with 48 Ca, the products of the channel with evaporation of five

^{*}Present address: Premise Health, Brentwood, Tennessee 37027, USA.

TABLE I. Lab-frame beam energies in the middle of the target layer, resulting excitation energy intervals (with use of mass tables [\[9,10\]](#page-7-0)), total beam doses, the numbers of observed decay chains assigned to ²⁸⁹Mc (2*n*), ²⁸⁸Mc (3*n*), ²⁸⁷Mc (4*n*), and ²⁸⁶Mc (5*n*), and the cross sections of their production.

$E_{\rm lab}$ (MeV)	E^* (MeV)	Beam dose $\times 10^{18}$	No. of chains 2n/3n/4n/5n	σ_{2n} (pb)	σ_{3n} (pb)	σ_{4n} (pb)	σ_{5n} (pb)
242.2	$34.0 - 36.3$	9.2	4/52/2/0	$1.2^{+1.0}_{-0.6}$	15^{+5}_{-3}	$0.6^{+0.7}_{-0.4}$	
250.8	$41.3 - 43.5$	2.0	0/3/1/0		$4.1^{+4.2}_{-2.3}$	$1.4^{+3.2}_{-1.2}$	
259.1	$48.2 - 50.4$	5.0	0/0/1/1			$0.5^{+1.3}_{-0.4}$	$0.5^{+1.3}_{-0.4}$

neutrons were detected only in two chains—in the reactions with 244 Pu [\[7\]](#page-7-0) and 242 Pu [\[8\]](#page-7-0). The cross sections of these reactions, determined with a large statistical error, were about 1 and 0.6 pb, respectively. However, it is obvious that in order to improve the models of nuclear fusion with the subsequent formation of neutron-evaporation products, the cross section of channels with the evaporation of five neutrons are of particular interest for estimating the probability of survival of nuclei in the process of deexcitation of the compound nucleus.

II. EXPERIMENT

During November 10 to December 04, 2021, and February 2022, we performed experiments aimed at observation of Mc isotopes in the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction at the gas-filled separator DGFRS-2. The experiments were performed at the cyclotron DC280 of the new experimental complex SHE Factory. Unlike the first series of experiments on the synthesis of Mc isotopes [\[3\]](#page-7-0), a differential pumping system was installed in front of DGFRS-2 instead of a rotating entrance window [\[1\]](#page-7-0). Most of the other experimental conditions, including the method of calibration of the detectors, were the same as in [\[3\]](#page-7-0).

The target consisted of the enriched isotope 243 Am (99.5%) and was produced by electrodeposition and had an average Am layer thickness of 0.36 mg/cm². Six target sectors were mounted on a disk with a diameter of 15 cm and rotated with a frequency of 1500 or 1700 rpm. The maximum beam intensity was $1.2-1.3$ $p\mu$ A. The settings of magnetic optical elements of DGFRS-2 were the same as at the end of the first series of experiments [\[3\]](#page-7-0). The chamber of DGFRS-2 was filled with hydrogen at a pressure of 0.89 mbar with constant flow though the separator to the pumping system. The detector chamber was separated from the DGFRS-2 volume by a Mylar foil of 0.7 μ m thickness and filled with pentane at a pressure of 1.6 mbar. In front of the detectors, two multiwire proportional chambers were installed to register nuclei arriving from the separator. The focal detector consisted of 48 1-mm horizontal strips and 110 2-mm vertical strips. It is assembled out of two 48×128 -mm² double-sided strip detectors (DSSDs), model BB17 (DS)-300 by Micron Semiconductor Ltd., mounted in such a way that the front detector shields a part of the rear detector. The 48 front horizontal strips of both detectors were connected. The back strips were paired together to form 110 strips of 2 mm width. The focal detector was surrounded by eight 60×120 -mm² side detectors (W4-300), each with eight

strips, forming a box with a depth of 120 mm. All signals in detectors with amplitudes above a threshold of 0.55–0.6 MeV were recorded independently by digital and analog data acquisition systems. The analog system was used for online registration of spatial, energy, and temporal correlations of evaporation residues (ERs) and α particles, registered with full energy in the focal detector. For parameters expected for implantation signals in the detectors and α decay of Mc or daughter nuclei, the beam was turned off to observe decays of descendant nuclei under low background conditions. Details of the detector system are given in [\[1\]](#page-7-0).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Experimental conditions and some results are summarized in Table I. The energies and decay times of nuclei in the chains of 286 Mc, 287 Mc, 288 Mc, and 289 Mc are included in the Supplemental Material [\[11\]](#page-7-0).

The energy spectra of α particles originating from ²⁸⁶Mc, ²⁸⁷Mc, ²⁸⁸Mc, and ²⁸⁹Mc observed in $[4-6, 12-16]$, as well as in our recent experiments [\[3\]](#page-7-0) and this work are shown in Fig. [1.](#page-2-0) For α -particle spectra, events with an energy resolution of ≤ 40 keV [full width at half maximum (FWHM) ≤ 95 keV] were selected (α -particle energy of ²⁸³Nh of 10.214(42) MeV from chain 1 in Table III of the Supplemental Material [\[11\]](#page-7-0) is also shown in Fig. [1\)](#page-2-0). The half-lives shown in the figures have been extracted from all known data.

At a maximum beam energy of ${}^{48}Ca$ (see Fig. [2](#page-2-0) below), we registered the α decay of a new isotope ²⁸⁶Mc with an energy of 10.71 ± 0.02 MeV and a half-life of 20^{+98}_{-9} s (see Table IV in the Supplemental Material $[11]$). The energies of the α particles of ²⁸²Nh, ²⁷⁸Rg, and ²⁷⁰Bh coincide with those values that were measured in the ²³⁷Np (⁴⁸Ca, 3*n*)²⁸²Nh reaction [\[6\]](#page-7-0). The total energy of the α particle of ²⁷⁴Mt has not been observed, but the decay times of the isotopes from 282Nh to 270Bh do not contradict the half-lives measured earlier. The decay time of 266 Db turned out to be lower than the value observed in [\[6\]](#page-7-0) (31.7 min), however, this may be due to the statistical spread of the decay times of one nucleus. Both decay times satisfy the criterion for a single exponential decay suggested in [\[17\]](#page-7-0). The half-life determined by the two decay times of ²⁶⁶Db is 11^{+21}_{-4} min.

The cross section for the ²⁴³Am (⁴⁸Ca, 5*n*)²⁸⁶Mc reaction was measured for the first time for the reactions of

FIG. 1. Alpha-particle energy spectra for ^{286–289}Mc and descendant nuclei. The events observed in [\[3\]](#page-7-0) and in this work as well as a summary of previously known and new data are shown by full (red) and open histograms, respectively. The *Y* -axis scale values begin at zero.

⁴⁸Ca with odd-*Z* target nuclei and was $0.5^{+1.3}_{-0.4}$ pb at E^* = 49 MeV (Fig. 2). This value is close to those measured in the ²⁴⁴Pu (⁴⁸Ca, 5*n*)²⁸⁷Fl (1.1^{+2.6}_{-0.9} pb at $E^* = 53$ MeV) [\[7\]](#page-7-0) and ²⁴²Pu (⁴⁸Ca, 5*n*)²⁸⁵Fl (0.6^{+0.9}_{-0.5} pb at $E^* = 50 \text{ MeV}$) [\[8\]](#page-7-0) reactions.

It is interesting to note that channels with evaporation from 2−3 to 5 neutrons from an excited nuclei are observed in all these reactions, and the cross section of the 5*n* channel is within two orders of magnitude of the maxima of the fusionevaporation cross sections. This fact may indicate a relatively high survival probability of the superheavy compound nucleus

FIG. 2. Cross sections for the 2*n*-, 3*n*-, 4*n*-, and 5*n*-evaporation channels for the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction. Vertical error bars correspond to total uncertainties. Symbols with arrows show upper cross-section limits. Data are shown by open (from Ref. [\[14\]](#page-7-0)), halfclosed (from Ref. [\[4\]](#page-7-0)), and closed symbols (from Ref. [\[3\]](#page-7-0) and this work). The cross sections of nuclei observed at BGS at *E*[∗] = 36 MeV [\[13\]](#page-7-0) and assigned by us to the 2*n*- and 3*n*-evaporation channels, are specified arbitrarily (see the text). The dashed lines through the data are drawn to guide the eye.

created with a fusion of 48 Ca beam and actinide target in the process of deexcitation which is largely determined by the fission barriers.

At all the beam energies listed in Table III of the Supplemental Material [\[11\]](#page-7-0), we registered a total of four decay chains of 287 Mc. The doubling of the number of 287 Mc chains compared to the known data made it possible to more accurately determine the decay properties of isotopes from ²⁸⁷Mc to 267 Db. Compared with the data given in [\[18\]](#page-7-0), half-lives of ²⁸⁷Mc, ²⁷⁹Rg, ²⁷⁵Mt, and ²⁶⁷Db ($T_{SF} = 1.4^{+1.0}_{-0.4}$ h) practically coincide with the values known earlier. The half-lives of ²⁸³Nh and ²⁷¹Bh turned out to be longer, but the difference does not go beyond statistical uncertainties.

In one of the chains of 287 Mc, we registered for the first time the spontaneous fission of 279 Rg, which is the third of 26 odd-*Z* known nuclides with $Z > 105$ and $N > 162$ undergoing SF decay mode. The probability that α decay of ²⁷⁹Rg has not been registered, and the fission belongs to 275 Mt, is less than 8% (the probability of registering an α particle exceeds 92%). Moreover, the decrease of the half-life of 279 Rg compared to that for ²⁸¹Rg ($log_{10}T_{SF}$ [²⁸¹Rg]−log₁₀*T*_{SF}[²⁷⁹Rg]) would be about 1.3, which is close to similar ratios for odd-*N* isotopes ²⁷⁹Ds and ²⁸¹Ds (\approx 1.8) and even-even ²⁸²Cn and ²⁸⁴Cn (\approx 2.2) [\[18–20\]](#page-7-0); see below. Such ratios are in agreement with the predictions of the spontaneous fission half-lives of nuclei, namely, the drop of half-lives with a decrease in the number of neutrons, the reaching the minimum values for nuclei with $N \approx 167-170$, and again the increase of halflives up to the magic number $N = 162$. We estimated the branch for α decay of ²⁷⁹Rg $b_{\alpha} = 87^{+5}_{-19}\%$; partial half-lives are $T_{\alpha} = 0.10^{+0.08}_{-0.03}$ s and $T_{\rm SF} = 0.7^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$ s.

In these experiments, products of the 4*n*-evaporation channel were observed in the excitation energy range 35−49 MeV. The maximum cross section of $1.4^{+3.2}_{-1.2}$ pb was observed at about 42 MeV.

At an excitation energy of about 35 MeV, we registered 52 new decay chains of 288 Mc. As in [\[3\]](#page-7-0), we observed α activity with $E_\alpha = 7.6$ –8.0 MeV between α decays of ²⁷²Bh and spontaneous fission events, which we attributed to the isotope ²⁶⁴Lr. The new results made it possible to more accurately determine the half-life of ²⁶⁴Lr $(4.8^{+2.2}_{-1.3}h)$ and the branch for α decay of ²⁶⁸Db (51⁺¹⁴%). The increased background of α -like events in this experiment did not allow us to improve the accuracy of the half-life of $16-h^{268}$ Db.

With an increase in the number of registered nuclei, α particles with lower energy compared to the energies of the main peaks were observed. For example, the energy of 280 Rg in chain 19 (Table I in the Supplemental Material [\[11\]](#page-7-0)) of 8.10 MeV is smaller than the energy of the main peak by almost 1.7 MeV. In chain 47, the energy of the last of the registered α particles, which may belong to ²⁷⁶Mt or ²⁷²Bh, is 7.10 MeV, which differs from the main peaks of these isotopes by 2.5 or 2 MeV, respectively. One cannot exclude that these particles deposited the main part of full energy in the focal detector and escaped from it at a small angle, with the remaining part (1.7−2.5 MeV) lost in its dead layer or missing the side detector. For example, the α particle might be implanted into the gap between the focal and side detectors, see, e.g., Ref. [\[4\]](#page-7-0). In test reaction $natYb+48Ca$, it was found that up to 0.7% of α decays of ²¹⁷Th deposited in the detector can be detected by a focal detector with energies in the range 6.5−7.8 MeV, which is 1.46–2.76 MeV lower than the energy of the main line of 9.26 MeV. It can be expected that due to the lower implantation depth of Mc isotopes, the fraction of α particles with low energies will be approximately half as low. However, with large a number of obtained Mc chains, it becomes possible to observe a few α decays with incomplete energy deposition.

It can be noted that for none of the nuclei did we find grouping events with specific values $\log_{10}T_{\alpha}$ vs E_{α} which would differ from the main bulk of events and which could indicate the observation of isomeric decays in these nuclei.

In this work, we have registered 55 new decay chains of 288 Mc. Together with the results of $[3-5,13,16]$, the number of chains of this nucleus has reached about 210. However, in this and previous experiments, the decay chain ER⁻²⁸⁸Mc (EC/ β ⁺, $T_{1/2} = 0.2$ s)-²⁸⁸Fl $(E_{\alpha} = 9.9 \text{ MeV}, T_{1/2} = 0.7 \text{ s})^{-284}$ Cn (SF, $T_{1/2} = 0.1 \text{ s}$), namely, the product of the electron capture or β^+ decay $(EC/\hat{\beta}^+)$ of ²⁸⁸Mc or the *p2n* channel of the ²⁴³Am + ⁴⁸Ca reaction, was not observed. Only one chain (T2 in [\[14\]](#page-7-0)) could belong to this channel, however, the total energy of the α particle has not been measured, which does not allow it to be attributed with certainty to 288 Fl. Based on this, we can conclude that the probability of EC does not exceed about 0.5% for 288 Mc. At the same time, out of 24 short chains observed in the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction in [\[3,4,13,14\]](#page-7-0) and these experiments, nine chains may resemble α decay of 288 Mc, followed by EC of 284 Nh and spontaneous fission

of 284Cn. Unfortunately, predictions of half-lives relative to EC are scarce and the accuracy of theoretical estimates can vary by up to two orders of magnitude depending on the parameters of the models, see, e.g., [\[21,22\]](#page-7-0). It should be noted that both nuclides 288Mc and 284Nh are located in the region of nuclei where the predicted lifetimes relative to EC exceed 100 s [\[23\]](#page-7-0).

We roughly estimated the EC/β^+ half-lives within the independent quasiparticle approximation on the basis of Skyrme energy-density functionals SLy4 and SkO. For these estimates self-consistent calculations of the mean field were first performed by means of a deformed Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) model, for which we used the code HFTHO [\[24\]](#page-7-0). This code treats odd nucleons in the HFB ground state through the equal-filling approximation [\[25\]](#page-7-0). We performed our calculations on a 20-shell cylindrical transformed deformed harmonic oscillator basis. It is interesting to note that both Skyrme forces, SLy4 and SkO, predict the same groundstate proton-neutron configurations: $1/2$ ⁻[510]_{*p*}1/2⁺[611]_{*n*} in 288Mc and 3/2[−][512]*p*1/2⁺[611]*ⁿ* in 284Nh, and give close values of the quadrupole deformations: $\beta_2 \approx 0.137$ for ²⁸⁸Mc and $\beta_2 \approx 0.161$ for ²⁸⁴Nh.

When calculating EC/β^+ half-lives, we follow [\[21\]](#page-7-0) and consider only allowed Gamow-Teller $(GT₊)$ transitions. Final states in the daughter nucleus are treated as proton-neutron two-quasiparticle states above the parent HFB ground state. Then, the energy released in the GT_+ transition to the *n*th state in the daughter nucleus is approximated by [\[26\]](#page-8-0)

$$
Q_{\rm EC}^n = \Delta M_{H-n} + \lambda_p - \lambda_n - E_n, \quad Q_{\beta^+}^n = Q_{\rm EC}^n - 2m_ec^2,
$$

where ΔM_{H-n} is the hydrogen-neutron mass difference, λ_p and λ_n are the proton and neutron HFB chemical potentials, and E_n is the energy of the two-quasiparticle state. For an oddodd parent nucleus the lowest E_n value, i.e., E_1 , is negative when the g.s. \rightarrow g.s. transition takes place [\[27\]](#page-8-0). In that case Q_{EC}^1 corresponds to the electron capture *Q* value. For ²⁸⁸Mc we obtain $Q_{EC}^1 = 4.3$ MeV with Sly4 and $Q_{EC}^1 = 5.5$ MeV with SkO, while for ²⁸⁴Nh we have $Q_{\text{EC}}^1 = 4.5 \,\text{MeV}$ with Sly4 and $Q_{EC}^1 = 5.0$ MeV with SkO. Note, however, that according to obtained ground-state configurations there are no g.s. \rightarrow g.s. allowed beta transitions in the considered nuclei.

The resulting half-lives are $T_{EC/\beta^+} = 1.1 \times 10^3$ s (SLy4), 1.0×10^2 s (SkO) for ²⁸⁸Mc, and $T_{EC/\beta^+} = 9.9 \times 10^2$ s (SLy4), 2.0×10^{2} s (SkO) for ²⁸⁴Nh. The difference of an order of magnitude between half-lives obtained with two different Skyrme forces has two reasons: (i) SkO parametrization predicts larger weak-decay *Q* values and (ii) produces a larger effective nucleon mass. The latter leads to a denser quasiparticle spectrum and respectively to a greater number of two-quasiparticle states contributing to EC/β^+ decay. It is worth noting that the simpler calculations performed in [\[21\]](#page-7-0) lead to $T_{EC/\beta^+} = 4.5$ s for ²⁸⁸Mc and $T_{EC/\beta^+} = 7$ s for ²⁸⁴Nh that are significantly shorter than the obtained results. Present half-lives, however, are consistent with the experimental value of the lower T_{EC/β^+} limit of about 40 s for ²⁸⁸Mc and with theoretical estimates of [\[22\]](#page-7-0) for nuclei in the same mass region.

We also compared the branches b_{EC} with respect to α decay for 288Mc and 284Nh. For this we used the empirical systematic of the EC half-life T_{EC} vs energy Q_β shown in Fig. 9 of Ref. [\[18\]](#page-7-0), the EC energies from the tables [\[9,](#page-7-0)[28–31\]](#page-8-0), as well as experimental half-lives (Fig. [1\)](#page-2-0). It follows from these estimates that the b_{EC} branch for 284 Nh may be the same as that for ²⁸⁸Mc or up to twice as high, namely, $\leq 1\%$. Based on this, it seems unlikely that the nine chains are due to EC of 284 Nh and fission of 284 Cn.

At this time, there is no clear understanding of the origin of the short chains. Apparently, only a direct measurement of the mass number of one of the isotopes in the short chain will dispel doubts, e.g., using the devices presented at $[16,32]$ $[16,32]$. As can be seen in Fig. [2,](#page-2-0) the production cross sections of the short chains, which we tentatively assign to 289 Mc, are somewhat grouped at lower excitation energies. In [\[16\]](#page-7-0), 46 chains were published; the duration of decays of three of them is significantly shorter than that of chains which were presumably assigned by the authors to 288Mc. Since the reaction cross section is not given in $[16]$, we tentatively equated the cross section for the 43 long chains to 10 pb, and the remaining three to 0.7 pb (10*3/43).

The 2*n*-evaporation channel was unambiguously observed in the ²⁴⁵Cm + ⁴⁸Ca reaction [\[18,](#page-7-0)[33\]](#page-8-0). In this case, the values of the cross sections for the 2*n* and 3*n* channels are consistent with each other within the measurement errors at energies of 33 and 38 MeV. The results of calculations [\[34,35\]](#page-8-0) also indicate that the energy maxima of the cross sections of the 2*n* and 3*n* channels of the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction coincide with each other. In [\[36,37\]](#page-8-0), the maximum of the 3*n* channel is shifted by 2–3 MeV relative to that of the 2*n* channel. The location of the maximum of the 2*n* channel is 7–9 MeV less than that for the 3*n* channel in [\[38–40\]](#page-8-0), however, in the same calculations, the locations of the same channels for the 245 Cm + 48 Ca reaction are also shifted relative to each other by 6–10 MeV, which is not consistent with the results of the experiment [\[18,](#page-7-0)[33\]](#page-8-0). Thus, the results of calculations of the excitation function of the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction do not allow us to draw definitive conclusions.

The decay times of the parent and daughter nuclei in the long and short chains are close to each other, but the half-lives are definitely different and the uncertainties (for a confidence level of 68%) do not overlap (Fig. [1\)](#page-2-0).

It should be noted that the probability of fission of nuclei with an odd number of neutrons (²⁸⁸Mc and ²⁸⁴Nh) should be less compared to nuclei with an even *N* (²⁸⁹Mc and ²⁸⁵Nh).

Finally, the pattern of the decay chain of 293 Ts, the product of the 249 Bk(48 Ca, 4*n*) reaction, coincides well with the pattern of decay in the short chain observed in the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction.

We add that the statement that the "cross-reaction link between α -decay chains associated with the isotopes $^{293}117$ and 289 115 is highly improbable" [\[41\]](#page-8-0) was based on the misleading method used to analyze the decay times of nuclei; see [\[42\]](#page-8-0).

Nevertheless, we cannot completely exclude that short chains originate from another branch of the decay of 288Mc, but we believe that assignment of the short chain to 289 Mc seems more realistic. Further discussions will be based on this interpretation.

In experiments on the synthesis of element Ts in the 249 Bk + 48 Ca reaction at DGFRS, α decay of 285 Nh was not observed in two of the 16 chains of 293Ts [\[12\]](#page-7-0), but it was registered in both chains obtained at TASCA [\[15\]](#page-7-0). In the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction, α decay of 285 Nh was found in all four chains at DGFRS [\[4\]](#page-7-0), but in two of the seven chains obtained at TASCA and in two of the three chains at BGS $[13,14]$, 285 Nh was not observed. From the analysis of results of [\[4,13,14\]](#page-7-0) it was concluded that there is a 29% branch for SF of 285 Nh [\[14\]](#page-7-0). In [\[3\]](#page-7-0) and this paper (see Table II of the Supplemental Material [\[11\]](#page-7-0)) we also did not observe α decay of 285 Nh in half of the ten chains. Thus, α decay of 285 Nh has not been registered in 11 of the 42 chains, which cannot be due to the limited registration efficiency of detector. At the same time, in two of these 11 ER- α -SF chains (see Refs. [\[3,14\]](#page-7-0) and this work), the total α -particle energy was not recorded, which does not allow them to be attributed with confidence to ²⁸⁹Mc. In eight such chains, the α -particle energy at least exceeds 10.1 MeV which corresponds to the energy interval for ²⁸⁹Mc. From the set of these data, it follows that ²⁸⁵Nh has a branch for SF of $18^{+10}_{-9}\%$, which does not contradict the result of [\[14\]](#page-7-0). We estimated the partial half-lives of $T_{\alpha} = 2.6^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$ s and $T_{\rm SF} = 12^{+12}_{-5}$ s for ²⁸⁵Nh. We also estimated an α -decay branch for the daughter nucleus ²⁸¹Rg of $14^{+10}_{-4}\%$ with partial half-lives of $T_{\alpha} = 79^{+42}_{-34}$ s and $T_{\rm SF} = 13^{+4}_{-2}$ s.

We attribute all observed fission fragments to spontaneous fission of the corresponding nuclei. Although it has been shown that the probability of EC for ²⁸⁸Mc is less than 0.5% and for 284 Nh apparently does not exceed 1%, it should be noted that the contribution of this decay mode for odd nuclei is not completely excluded. This may be especially true for light odd-odd nuclei at the end of the observed chains. Electron capture in these nuclei leads to even-even nuclei, for which relatively rapid spontaneous fission is expected to be quite likely. The future experimental and theoretical study of this issue presents a serious challenge.

The partial SF half-life of 279 Rg measured for the first time in this work, along with the refined values for the isotopes 264 Lr, $^{266-268}$ Db, 281 Rg, 285 Nh, are shown in Fig. [3.](#page-5-0) The remaining experimental data are taken from the reviews [\[18](#page-7-0)[,44\]](#page-8-0) and Refs. [\[3,19,20,](#page-7-0)[45\]](#page-8-0). The gray area shows the half-life inter-val predicted in [\[43\]](#page-8-0) for even-even nuclei with $Z = 104-110$, $N = 160-164$ and $Z = 110-114$, $N = 164-177$. The model predictions for even-even isotopes are in good agreement with experimental data for 280 Ds, $^{282, 284}$ Cn, and 286 Fl. It is interesting to note that predictions [\[43\]](#page-8-0) were published in 1999, when the region of superheavy nuclei was completely unknown.

All other odd-*Z* and/or odd-*N* nuclei have half-lives noticeably higher than the specified region, which may be naturally caused by the presence of hindrance factors (HFs) on the probability of their spontaneous fission. The values for the odd-*Z* nuclei do not seem unreasonable. From the presented data, it is possible to extract from experimental values, and not from comparisons with calculated ones, the hindrance factors for SF for odd-*N* isotopes of elements Ds and Cn using the

FIG. 3. Common logarithm of partial spontaneous fission halflife $[log_{10}(T_{\rm SF}[s])]$ vs neutron number for isotopes of elements with $Z = 100 - 114$. The area of half-lives of even-even isotopes with $Z =$ 104−110, *N* = 160–164 and *Z* = 110–114, *N* = 164–177 predicted in [\[43\]](#page-8-0) is highlighted in gray. Partial half-lives of nuclei produced in the 48 Ca -induced reactions with actinide targets are shown by filled symbols.

ratios

$$
log_{10}HF = {log_{10} T_{SF}(^{279}Ds) + log_{10} T_{SF}(^{281}Ds) } / {2log_{10} T_{SF}(^{280}Ds) }
$$

= 3.66

and

$$
\log_{10} HF = 2\log_{10} T_{SF}({}^{283}Cn)/{\log_{10} T_{SF}({}^{282}Cn)}
$$

+ $\log_{10} T_{SF}({}^{284}Cn)$ }
= 3.95.

As a result of experiments $(3,19)$ and this work) performed at the new separator DGFRS-2, new data were obtained on the SF half-lives for three isotopes 264 Lr, 268 Db, and 279 Rg, as well as updated data for four odd-Z^{266, 267}Db, ²⁸¹Rg, ²⁸⁵Nh and eight even-*Z* ^{286, 287}Fl, ^{282, 283}Cn, ²⁷⁹Ds, ²⁷⁵Hs, ²⁷¹Sg, 267 Rf.

As shown in Fig. 3, the results of the calculations [\[43\]](#page-8-0) for even-even isotopes 280 Ds, $^{282, 284}$ Cn, and 286 Fl agree well with experimental data. The same figure shows the partial SF half-lives for other nuclei with an odd number of protons and/or neutrons, which were produced in the reactions of $48Ca$ with the nuclei of actinide elements. To compare the results of calculations with these nuclei having certain *N* and *Z*, we calculated the unhindered SF half-lives as the geometrical mean of the fission half-lives T_{SF} of the neighboring even-even nuclei as

$$
T_{\rm SF}(N, Z) = \{T_{\rm SF}(N - 1, Z - 1) \times T_{\rm SF}(N + 1, Z - 1) \times T_{\rm SF}(N - 1, Z + 1) \times T_{\rm SF}(N + 1, Z + 1)\}^{1/4},
$$

for odd-odd isotopes,

$$
T_{\rm SF}(N, Z) = \{T_{\rm SF}(N-1, Z) \times T_{\rm SF}(N+1, Z)\}^{1/2},
$$

for odd-*N* and even-*Z* isotopes, and

$$
T_{\rm SF}(N, Z) = \{T_{\rm SF}(N, Z - 1) \times T_{\rm SF}(N, Z + 1)\}^{1/2},
$$

for even-*N* and odd-*Z* isotopes.

The comparison of experimental SF half-lives for different nuclei with several predictions [\[21,](#page-7-0)[43,46–51\]](#page-8-0) is given in Ta-ble [II.](#page-6-0) To obtain better agreement of the predictions $[43]$ with the experimental data, we applied a hindrance factor of $10²$ for odd-*A* and odd-odd isotopes. In this case, the best agreement with the experiment is obtained. The average differences (ADs) of the corrected for HF theoretical predictions $\log_{10}T_{\rm SF}$ (calc) from experimental data $log_{10}T_{SF}$ (expt) is closest to 0, and the standard deviation $(SD = 1.27)$ is the lowest compared to other models. For even-even nuclei corresponding values are $AD = 0.640$ and $SD = 0.245$.

For another model [\[46\]](#page-8-0), also macroscopic-microscopic and published in 1995, a good agreement of the predictions with the experiment is also achieved if we use hindrance factors of 10 and 10³ for odd-*A* and odd-odd isotopes, respectively. Note that for all models, we calculated individual deviations of the theory (for unhindered half-lives) from the experiment for different nuclei (odd-odd, odd *Z*, odd *N*), and then introduced appropriate hindrance factors. For even-even nuclei, this model results in a somewhat larger $AD = 1.45$ but relatively low $SD = 0.464$.

The table also provides a comparison of experimental results with self-consistent calculations performed in the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) approach with the D1S Gogny force [\[47\]](#page-8-0). If we apply a hindrance factor of 10 for odd-odd isotopes, the AD of 1.06 will be obtained but with a relatively large SD of 2.38. This model predicts systematically longer T_{SF} for even-even nuclei, $AD = 3.30$, $SD = 1.74$.

Other self-consistent Skyrme-HFB calculations [\[48\]](#page-8-0) have larger differences from the experiment for even-even nuclei, on average six orders of magnitude lower $(AD = -6.04,$ $SD = 1.88$). All data for this model are given without adding a hindrance factor.

Recently, a new cluster approach was developed and applied for calculating the SF half-lives of even-*Z* nuclei [\[49\]](#page-8-0). The SF process is described in terms of the dinuclear system (DNS) model and considered as the evolution of a nucleus in collective charge asymmetry coordinates. The DNS states responsible for the SF correspond to the minima of the DNS potential energy as a function of charge asymmetry. These states are fully described with the stationary Schrödinger equation. For even-odd nuclei the origin of the SF hindrance comes from the DNS potential energy changes which are strongly related to the spin of the nucleus considered. The calculations reproduce the experimental data quite well. The AD value is only −0.22, and the SD of 1.15 is the lowest of all those given in the table. Note that the hindrance factor was not applied, although 8 of the 12 values belong to odd-*N* nuclei.

In addition to the mentioned models, we present in the table the results of calculations of SF half-lives of given nuclei using a number of phenomenological formulas [\[21](#page-7-0)[,50,51\]](#page-8-0). These formulas are based on the idea by Swiatecki [\[52\]](#page-8-0) who suggested a simple relation between the SF half-lives and the deviations of experimental mass from their liquid-drop

a References are given in the text.

^bHindrance factors of 10 and 10³ were applied for odd-*A* and odd-odd isotopes, respectively. AD value $\log_{10} T_{SF}$ (calc) - $\log_{10} T_{SF}$ (expt) and SD for even-even nuclei are 1.45 and 0.464, respectively.

^cHindrance factor of 10² was applied for odd-A and odd-odd isotopes. $AD = 0.640$ and $SD = 0.245$ for even-even nuclei.

^dHindrance factor of 10 was applied for odd-odd isotopes. $AD = 3.30$ and $SD = 1.74$ for even-even nuclei.

^eHindrance factor was not applied. $AD = -6.04$ and $SD = 1.88$ for even-even nuclei.

estimates (shell correction energy). Note that the hindrance factors in the formulas are either already taken into account $[21,50]$ $[21,50]$ or are not used $[51]$.

Formula [\[21\]](#page-7-0) gives results that exceed experimental data by almost three orders of magnitude $(AD = 2.81)$, but has a noticeably smaller variation in deviations between calculated and experimental values $(SD = 1.45)$. On the contrary, the results of later suggested formulas [\[50,51\]](#page-8-0) are much closer to the experiment $(AD = 0.204$ and -1.23 , respectively), but have a larger spread in deviations $(SD = 2.39)$.

In addition, Swiatecki-like systematics of SF half-lives have recently been proposed in [\[53\]](#page-8-0). It was shown that the simple one-dimensional WKB model reproduces the measured lifetimes quite well, within several orders of magnitude, for even and odd nuclei up to $Z = 102$, as well as for eveneven nuclei from Th to Ds.

Summarizing, one can conclude that *T*_{SF} calculations based on macroscopic-microscopic models, which were published about a quarter of a century ago, still reproduce experimental data for nuclei obtained in the ${}^{48}Ca$ -induced reactions better than later self-consistent models, even though the self-consistent models are based on realistic effective interactions. In addition, calculating the SF half-lives of nuclei with odd *N* and/or *Z* within these models still remains a great challenge.

Simplified formulas can reproduce with some accuracy the half-lives of nuclei even with odd numbers *N* and/or *Z*. However, these formulas do not take into account the variety of mechanisms that determine nuclear fission.

IV. CONCLUSION

A second series of experiments on the study of the 243 Am + 48 Ca reaction was carried out at the gas-filled separator DGFRS-2 online to the DC280 cyclotron at the SHE Factory at JINR. The reaction was studied at three projectile energies of 242, 250, and 259 MeV.

At maximum energy, a new lightest isotope ²⁸⁶Mc with an α -particle energy of 10.71 \pm 0.02 MeV and a halflife of 20^{+98}_{-9} ms was synthesized for the first time. The

cross section of the 5*n*-evaporation channel was $0.5^{+1.3}_{-0.4}$ pb. This value is close to those that were determined in the 244Pu (48Ca, 5*n*) 287Fl [7] and 242Pu (48Ca, 5*n*) 285Fl [8] reactions when observing one chain in each of the reactions.

At all three energies, four new decay chains of 287 Mc were registered, which made it possible to measure the excitation function of the reaction in a wide energy range. Spontaneous fission of 279Rg was observed for the first time in one of the chains; its partial half-lives were established to be T_{α} = $0.10^{+0.08}_{-0.03}$ s and $T_{\rm SF} = 0.7^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$ s.

At the two lowest 48 Ca energies, 55 new 288 Mc chains were obtained. The results confirmed the existence of an approximately 50% α decay branch for ²⁶⁸Db, which leads to the spontaneously fissioning ²⁶⁴Lr observed in the first series of experiments at DGFRS-2 [3].

The origin of four additionally observed short ER- α - (α) -SF chains is discussed based on the cross sections of their formation and the properties of all nuclei in the chains. It is concluded that they are more likely to be attributed to 289 Mc, but for the final solution of this issue, it is necessary to measure the mass number of at least one of the nuclei in the chain.

The decay properties of 21 previously known odd-*Z* isotopes were determined with higher precision. Seven of them partially or completely decay by spontaneous fission. The partial half-lives of nuclei synthesized in the reactions of actinide targets with 48Ca are compared with predictions within several models or based on simplified formulas similar to the Swiatecki model. The expanded database for the fission half-lives of very heavy nuclei still points to fact that the understanding of the fission mechanism requires further theoretical and experimental attention.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the personnel operating the DC280 cyclotron and the associates of the ion-source group for obtaining 48 Ca beams. These studies were supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation through Grant No. 075-10-2020-117 and by the JINR Directorate grant. Research at ORNL was supported by the U.S. DOE Office of Nuclear Physics under DOE Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725 with UT Battelle, LLC. This work was also supported by the Strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant No. XDB34010000).

- [1] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, V. K. Utyonkov, A. G. Popeko, D. I. [Solovyev, F. Sh. Abdullin, S. N. Dmitriev](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2022.166640) *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **1033**, 166640 (2022).
- [2] G. G. Gulbekian, S. N. Dmitriev, M. G. Itkis, Yu. Ts. [Oganessyan, B. N. Gikal, I. V. Kalagin](https://doi.org/10.1134/S1547477119060177) *et al.*, Phys. Part. Nucl. Lett. **16**, 866 (2019).
- [3] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, V. K. Utyonkov, N. D. Kovrizhnykh, F. Sh. [Abdullin, S. N. Dmitriev, D. Ibadullayev](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.106.L031301) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **106**, L031301 (2022).
- [4] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, F. Sh. Abdullin, S. N. Dmitriev, J. M. [Gostic, J. H. Hamilton, R. A. Henderson](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.87.014302) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 014302 (2013).
- [5] D. Rudolph, U. Forsberg, P. Golubev, L. G. Sarmiento, A. [Yakushev, L.-L. Andersson](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.112502) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 112502 (2013).
- [6] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, V. K. Utyonkov, Yu. V. Lobanov, F. Sh. [Abdullin, A. N. Polyakov, R. N. Sagaidak](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.76.011601) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **76**, 011601(R) (2007).
- [7] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, V. K. Utyonkov, Yu. V. Lobanov, F. Sh. [Abdullin, A. N. Polyakov, I. V. Shirokovsky](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.69.054607) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 054607 (2004).
- [8] P. A. Ellison, K. E. Gregorich, J. S. Berryman, D. L. Bleuel, [R. M. Clark, I. Dragojevic´](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.182701) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 182701 (2010).
- [9] M. Wang, G. Audi, F. G. Kondev, W. J. Huang, S. Naimi, and X. Xu, Chin. Phys. C **41**[, 030003 \(2017\).](https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-1137/41/3/030003)
- [10] [W. D. Myers and W. J. Swiatecki,](https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9474(95)00509-9) Nucl. Phys. A **601**, 141 (1996).
- [11] See Supplemental Material at [http://link.aps.org/supplemental/](http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevC.106.064306) 10.1103/PhysRevC.106.064306 for tables which provide detailed information on the decay chains presented in this paper.
- [12] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, F. Sh. Abdullin, P. D. Bailey, D. E. Benker, M. E. Bennett, S. N. Dmitriev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **83**, 054315 [\(2011\); Yu. Ts. Oganessian, F. Sh. Abdullin, C. Alexander, J.](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.83.054315)

[Binder, R. A. Boll, S. N. Dmitriev](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.162501) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 162501 (2012); Phys. Rev. C **87**[, 054621 \(2013\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.87.054621)

- [13] J. M. Gates, K. E. Gregorich, O. R. Gothe, E. C. Uribe, G. [K. Pang, D. L. Bleuel](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.92.021301) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **92**, 021301(R) (2015).
- [14] U. Forsberg, D. Rudolph, L.-L. Andersson, A. Di Nitto, Ch. [E. Düllmann, C. Fahlander](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2016.04.025) *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **953** 117, (2016).
- [15] J. Khuyagbaatar, A. Yakushev, Ch. E. Düllmann, D. [Ackermann, L.-L. Andersson, M. Asai](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.99.054306) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **99**, 054306 (2019).
- [16] J. M. Gates, G. K. Pang, J. L. Pore, K. E. Gregorich, J. [T. Kwarsick, G. Savard](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.222501) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 222501 (2018).
- [17] K. H. Schmidt, [Eur. Phys. J. A](https://doi.org/10.1007/s100500070129) **8**, 141 (2000).
- [18] [Yu. Ts. Oganessian and V. K. Utyonkov,](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2015.07.003) Nucl. Phys. A **944**, 62 (2015); [Rep. Prog. Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/78/3/036301) **78**, 036301 (2015).
- [19] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, V. K. Utyonkov, D. Ibadullayev, F. Sh. [Abdullin, S. N. Dmitriev, M. G. Itkis](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.106.024612) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **106**, 024612 (2022).
- [20] A. Såmark-Roth, D. M. Cox, D. Rudolph, L. G. Sarmiento, [B. G. Carlsson, J. L. Egido](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.032503) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 032503 (2021).
- [21] A. V. Karpov, V. I. Zagrebaev, Y. Martinez Palenzuela, L. [Felipe Ruiz, and W. Greiner,](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218301312500139) Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **21**, 1250013 (2012).
- [22] P. Sarriguren, Phys. Rev. C **100**[, 014309 \(2019\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.100.014309)
- [23] [P. Möller, J. R. Nix, and K.-L. Kratz,](https://doi.org/10.1006/adnd.1997.0746) At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **66**, 131 (1997).
- [24] M. V. Stoitsov, N. Schunck, M. Kortelainen, N. Michel, H. [Nam, E. Olsen, J. Sarich, and S. Wild,](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2013.01.013) Comput. Phys. Commun. **184**, 1592 (2013).
- [25] [S. Perez-Martin and L. M. Robledo,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.78.014304) Phys. Rev. C **78**, 014304 (2008).
- [26] J. Engel, M. Bender, J. Dobaczewski, W. Nazarewicz, and R. Surman, Phys. Rev. C **60**[, 014302 \(1999\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.60.014302)
- [27] [E. M. Ney, J. Engel, T. Li, and N. Schunck,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.102.034326) Phys. Rev. C **102**, 034326 (2020).
- [28] [N. Wang, M. Liu, X. Wu, and J. Meng,](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2014.05.049) Phys. Lett. B **734**, 215 (2014).
- [29] [P. Jachimowicz, M. Kowal, and J. Skalski,](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adt.2020.101393) At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **138**, 101393 (2021).
- [30] [I. Muntian, Z. Patyk, and A. Sobiczewski,](https://doi.org/10.1134/1.1586412) Phys. At. Nucl. A **66**, 1015 (2003).
- [31] [P. Möller, A. J. Sierk, T. Ichikawa, and H. Sagawa,](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adt.2015.10.002) At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **109–110**, 1 (2016).
- [32] A. M. Rodin, A. V. Belozerov, D. V. Vanin, V. Yu. Vedeneyev, [A. V. Gulyaev, A. V. Gulyaeva](https://doi.org/10.1134/S0020441214030208) *et al.*, Instruments and Experimental Techniques **57**, 386 (2014).
- [33] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, V. K. Utyonkov, Yu. V. Lobanov, F. Sh. [Abdullin, A. N. Polyakov, R. N. Sagaidak](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.74.044602) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **74**, 044602 (2006).
- [34] V. I. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, [Nucl. Phys. A](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2015.02.010) **944**, 257 (2015).
- [35] [L. Zhu, Z.-Q. Feng, C. Li, and F.-S. Zhang,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.90.014612) Phys. Rev. C **90**, 014612 (2014).
- [36] [X. J. Bao, Y. Gao, J. Q. Li, and H. F. Zhang,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.92.034612) Phys. Rev. C **92**, 034612 (2015).
- [37] B. M. Kayumov, O. K. Ganiev, A. K. Nasirov, and G. A. Yuldasheva, Phys. Rev. C **105**[, 014618 \(2022\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.105.014618)
- [38] J. Zhang, C. Wang, and Z. Ren, [Nucl. Phys. A](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2013.04.010) **909**, 36 (2013).
- [39] K. Siwek-Wilczyńska, T. Cap, M. Kowal, A. Sobiczewski, and J. Wilczynski, Phys. Rev. C **86**[, 014611 \(2012\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.86.014611)
- [40] [J. Hong, G. G. Adamian, and N. V. Antonenko,](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.11.002) Phys. Lett. B **764**, 42 (2017).
- [41] U. Forsberg, D. Rudolph, C. Fahlander, P. Golubev, L. G. Sarmiento, S. Åberg, M. Block, Ch. E. Düllmann, F. P. Heβ[berger, J. V. Kratz, and A. Yakushev,](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.07.008) Phys. Lett. B **760**, 293 (2016).
- [42] [V. B. Zlokazov, and V. K. Utyonkov,](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6471/aa7293) J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **44**, 075107 (2017); **46**[, 018002 \(2019\).](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6471/aaf0cb)
- [43] Z. Łojewski and A. Staszczak, [Nucl. Phys. A](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9474(99)00328-0) **657**, 134 (1999).
- [44] F. P. Heβberger, [Eur. Phys. J. A](https://doi.org/10.1140/epja/i2017-12260-3) **53**, 75 (2017).
- [45] Yu. Ts. Oganessian, V. K. Utyonkov, F. Sh. Abdullin, S. N. [Dmitriev, R. Graeger, R. A. Henderson](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.87.034605) *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 034605 (2013).
- [46] R. Smolańczuk, J. Skalski, and A. Sobiczewski, *Phys. Rev. C* **52**, 1871 (1995).
- [47] M. Warda and J. L. Egido, Phys. Rev. C **86**[, 014322 \(2012\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.86.014322)
- [48] [A. Staszczak, A. Baran, and W. Nazarewicz,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.87.024320) Phys. Rev. C **87**, 024320 (2013).
- [49] [I. S. Rogov, G. G. Adamian, and N. V. Antonenko,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.100.024606) Phys. Rev. C **100**, 024606 (2019); **104**[, 034618 \(2021\);](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.104.034618) **105**[, 034619 \(2022\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.105.034619)
- [50] X. J. Bao, S. Q. Guo, H. F. Zhang, Y. Z. Xing, J. M. Dong, and J. Q. Li, [J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/42/8/085101) **42**, 085101 (2015).
- [51] [K. P. Santhosh and C. Nithya,](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.94.054621) Phys. Rev. C **94**, 054621 (2016).
- [52] W. J. Swiatecki, Phys. Rev. **100**[, 937 \(1955\).](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.100.937)
- [53] K. Pomorski, A. Dobrowolski, B. Nerlo-Pomorska, M. Warda, [J. Bartel, Z. Xiao, Y. Chen, L. Liu, J.-L. Tian, and X. Diao,](https://doi.org/10.1140/epja/s10050-022-00737-3) Eur. Phys. J. A **58**, 77 (2022).