

Synthesis of heavy nuclei using damped collisions: A test

W. Loveland and A. M. Vinodkumar

Department of Chemistry, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon 97331, USA

D. Peterson and J. P. Greene

Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA

(Received 24 November 2010; revised manuscript received 25 February 2011; published 14 April 2011)

We have measured the angular distributions and production cross sections for the products of the reaction of 859-MeV ($E_{c.m.} = 461.9$ MeV) ^{160}Gd with ^{186}W . We detected fragments that stopped in the 5.775 mg/cm² target as well as fragments emerging at 9°–17°, 17°–90°, and 90°–180°. We also made a chemical separation of the Pb isotopes formed in this reaction. An unusually large yield of trans-target reaction products near $Z = 79$ was observed. We compare these observations with the recent predictions of Zagrebaev and Greiner for this reaction.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.83.044610](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.83.044610)

PACS number(s): 25.70.Jj, 25.85.-w, 25.60.Pj, 27.90.+b

I. INTRODUCTION

In Fig. 1, we show the current situation with regard to the synthesis of superheavy nuclei using cold-fusion and hot-fusion reactions. [Cold-fusion reactions involve the use of ^{208}Pb or ^{209}Bi target nuclei leading to the formation of evaporation residues (ERs) with an excitation energy (E^*) of ~ 13 MeV which results in a high survival against fission. Hot-fusion reactions involve the use of actinide target nuclei and lighter projectiles and lead to the production of highly excited ERs ($E^* = 30$ –60 MeV) with lower survival against fission. For review articles summarizing recent progress in this field, see [1–5].] For cold-fusion syntheses, the production cross sections decrease with increasing atomic number of the completely fused system, Z_{CN} , until one reaches element 113, where the measured fusion cross section is 32 fb, a production rate of about 1 atom/yr. Even with the modest expected increase in production cross section for element 114, further use of this path to the superheavy nuclei will require significant technical advances.

For syntheses involving hot-fusion reactions, the cross sections decrease significantly from $Z = 102$ to $Z = 110$ and then decrease more slowly until $Z = 118$, where the production cross section is 0.5 pb. Attempts to synthesize element 120 by the $^{64}\text{Ni} + ^{238}\text{U}$ reaction and the $^{58}\text{Fe} + ^{244}\text{Pu}$ reaction have resulted in upper limit cross sections of about 0.1 and 0.4 pb, respectively [6,7]. In view of this situation, there has been a revival of interest in the use of damped collisions of massive nuclei at near-barrier energies to synthesize superheavy nuclei, particularly those nuclei with large neutron excess, approaching the $N = 184$ shell. In the 1980s [8] there were attempts to use the $^{238}\text{U} + ^{238}\text{U}$ and the $^{238}\text{U} + ^{248}\text{Cm}$ reactions at above barrier energies to produce trans-target nuclides. While there was evidence for the formation of neutron-rich isotopes of Fm and Md at the 0.1- μb level, no higher actinides were found. The fundamental problem was that the nuclei that were produced far above the target nucleus were the result of events with high total kinetic energy loss, i.e., high excitation energies and resulting poor survival probabilities. Very recently, Zagrebaev and Greiner [9–16], using a new model [17] for these collisions, have examined

the older experiments and some proposed new experiments ($^{232}\text{Th} + ^{250}\text{Cf}$, $^{238}\text{U} + ^{238}\text{U}$, and $^{238}\text{U} + ^{248}\text{Cm}$). With their new model, which emphasizes the role of shell effects in damped collisions, they are able to correctly describe the previously measured fragment angular, energy, and charge distributions from the $^{136}\text{Xe} + ^{209}\text{Bi}$ reaction and the isotopic yields of Cf, Es, Fm, and Md from the $^{238}\text{U} + ^{248}\text{Cm}$ reaction. They predict that, by a careful choice of beam energies and projectile-target combinations, one might be able to produce n -rich isotopes of element 112 in the $^{248}\text{Cm} + ^{250}\text{Cf}$ reaction. They suggest the detection of $^{267,268}\text{Db}$ and $^{272,271}\text{Bh}$ (at the Pb level) in the Th + Cf or U + Cm reactions to verify these predictions. Such experiments are very difficult because of the low cross sections, the lower intensities of these massive projectile beams, and the problems of detecting the reaction products in an ocean of elastically scattered particles, etc.

However, in 2007, Zagrebaev and Greiner [18] outlined a simpler test of their theoretical predictions. They applied the same model used to study the U + Cm, Th + Cf, and U + U collisions to the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction. The predicted mass yield distributions and the yields of the Pb transfer products ($\Delta Z = +8$) are shown in Figs. 2 and 3. The predicted mass yields range from 1 to 100 mb, while the Pb isotopic yields range from 1 to 5 mb. Other models for producing trans-target nuclides in massive damped collisions have been discussed elsewhere [19–21]. Based upon our prior experience of determining fragment mass and isotopic distributions in the reaction of low-energy, intermediate-energy, and relativistic heavy ions with Ta, Au, and Pb [22–55], we concluded that these same quantities could be determined in the reaction of 856-MeV ^{160}Gd with ^{186}W . We also note similar measurements by Asano *et al.* for the proton-induced spallation of W [56].

II. EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

The experiment took place in the ATSCAT chamber at the ATLAS facility at the Argonne National Laboratory. A beam of 960-MeV ^{160}Gd struck a 5.775 mg/cm² foil of ^{186}W (99% enriched) mounted at the center of the chamber. The center of




FIG. 1. (Color online) Measured cross sections for the production of the heaviest elements. Experimental data are from [1–5]. “Unconfirmed” means the observation has not been repeated by another laboratory.

the target beam energy was 859 MeV ($E_{c.m.} = 461.9$ MeV). A deep suppressed Faraday cup at the exit of the chamber was used to monitor the beam intensity. The average on-target projectile intensity was 70 enA of $^{160}\text{Gd}^{34+}$. The foil was irradiated for 19 h. The target-catcher foil assembly is shown schematically in Fig. 4. The experimental geometry used was that of a cylinder lined with catcher foils. The cylinder was 16 cm in length with a diameter of 5 cm. A 1-cm-diameter hole allowed the beam to enter the chamber and a 2.54-cm-diameter hole allowed the beam to exit the chamber. The top half of the cylinder was lined with 9.7 mg/cm² Mylar foil (shown




FIG. 2. Predicted [18] Pb isotopic distribution for the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction. The labels 500 and 460 refer to the center-of-mass (c.m.) energies of the ^{160}Gd . The solid lines are the final product distributions after particle evaporation, while the dashed lines refer to the primary product distributions. (Reproduced from Ref. [18] with permission.)




FIG. 3. Predicted [18] mass distribution for the products of the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction. The terms “primary” and “final” refer to the product distributions before and after particle evaporation. (Reproduced from Ref. [18] with permission.)

in blue) while the bottom half of the cylinder was covered by 13.5 mg/cm² Al foil (shown in red). These foils should stop all reaction products. After irradiation, the catcher foils were divided into three samples: “backward,” “forward,” and “side,” corresponding to angular cuts of 90°–180°, 9°–17°, and 17°–90°, respectively. The 90°–180° cut corresponded to the back half of the cylinder. The 17°–90° cut corresponded to the wall of the cylinder. The 9°–17° cut was the foil lining the front face of the cylinder. For each of these angular cuts, there are two samples, Mylar and Al, corresponding to azimuthal angles of 0°–180° and 180°–360°. Gamma-ray spectroscopy of the Mylar catcher foil samples and the ^{186}W target was carried out using a well-calibrated Ge detector in the ATLAS hot chemistry laboratory. The total observation period was 11 days, during which about 15 measurements of each sample were made. The Al catcher foils were dissolved in mineral acid and the Pb isotopes were separated from the solution [57]. Following chemical separation, the Pb isotope fraction was counted on the same Ge detector. The analysis of the γ -ray spectra was done using a modified version of the DECHAOS software [58]. 107 radionuclides were identified in the samples. The end of bombardment (EOB) activities of the nuclides were used to calculate production cross sections,




FIG. 4. (Color online) Schematic diagram of the experimental apparatus. All dimensions are given in centimeters. (For more details, see text.)




FIG. 5. Predicted [18] angular distribution of the reaction products from the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction. (Reproduced from Ref. [18] with permission.)

taking into account the variable beam intensities using standard equations for the growth and decay of radionuclides during irradiation [59].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first aspect of the Zagrebaev and Greiner predictions for this reaction that can be checked is the Pb isotopic distribution (Fig. 2). No Pb isotopes were detected in the target, catcher foil, or chemical fractions. A rough upper limit cross section for the relevant radionuclides (51.9 h ^{203}Pb and 67.2 m $^{204}\text{Pb}^m$) is ~ 0.05 mb. Based upon the predictions shown in Fig. 2, the expected cross sections for these radionuclides are ~ 3




FIG. 6. Comparison of predicted [18] and observed angular distributions for a typical reaction product with $A = 159$. For the observed angular distributions, the horizontal lines indicate the angular range of the “detector,” while the vertical error bars indicate the statistical uncertainty in the result.




FIG. 7. (Color online) Predicted [18] and observed mass distributions for the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction.

and 4 mb, respectively. Our observations are thus inconsistent with Fig. 2, although it should be noted that the spin and parity of $^{204}\text{Pb}^m$ is 9^- , while ^{204}Pb has $J\pi = 0^+$. Therefore, the nonradioactive low-spin ground state could still be populated as indicated in Fig. 2, although studies of similar reactions have shown that high-spin isomers are preferentially populated [60]. The predicted large cross sections for $^{205-207}\text{Pb}$ are not observable in this work.

The second aspect of the Zagrebaev and Greiner predictions for this reaction that can be checked are the product angular distributions (Fig. 5). For the three fragment groups ($A = 130-150$, $A = 150-190$, and $A = 190-210$), we expect their angular distributions to peak at laboratory angles of 80° , 55° , and 35° , respectively, or what we term the “side” samples. Our




FIG. 8. Predicted [18] primary fragment excitation energies for the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction. (Reproduced from Ref. [18] with permission.)




FIG. 9. (Color online) (a) Predicted [18] and observed mass distributions for trans-target nuclides from the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction. (b) Contour plot of observed nuclidic yields in the trans-target region.

crude three-point angular distributions (Fig. 6) for a typical fragment ($A = 159$) agree with this prediction.

The measured nuclidic formation cross sections were placed in seven groups according to mass number ($A = 43\text{--}58$, $79\text{--}100$, $111\text{--}140$, $146\text{--}160$, $161\text{--}180$, $181\text{--}190$, and $191\text{--}201$). These cross sections were corrected for precursor β decay, where necessary, by assuming the independent yield cross sections for a given species $\sigma(Z, A)$ can be expressed as a histogram that lies along a Gaussian curve:

$$\sigma(Z, A) = \sigma(A) [2\pi C_Z^2(A)]^{-1/2} \exp\left[-\frac{(Z - Z_{\text{mp}})^2}{2C_Z^2(A)}\right], \quad (1)$$

where $C_Z(A)$ is the Gaussian width parameter for mass number A and $Z_{\text{mp}}(A)$ is the most probable atomic number for that A . Using this assumption and the further assumption that $\sigma(A)$ varies slowly and smoothly as a function of A [allowing data from adjacent isobars to be combined in determining $Z_{\text{mp}}(A)$ and $C_Z(A)$], one can use the laws of radioactive decay to iteratively correct the measured cumulative formation cross sections for precursor decay.

Within each of the seven groups, the data were fit to a Gaussian-shaped independent yield distribution. The width

parameter was found to be constant over a given range in A , while the centers of the charge distributions were adequately represented by linear functions in A over a limited range in A , although we expect $Z_{\text{mp}}(A)$ to be nonlinear. (Only nuclides with well-characterized β -decay precursors and cases where both members of an isomeric pair were observed were included in the analysis.) The integration of the independent yield distributions to give the total mass yield corrects any unobserved radioactive or stable nuclei. The production cross section for ^{187}W (72.7 ± 8.2 mb) was not included in this analysis as it is expected that this nuclide is formed by neutron capture reactions, which are not part of this study. The isobaric yield distribution obtained from this analysis is shown in Fig. 7 along with the predictions of Zagrebaev and Greiner. Both the observed and predicted mass distributions are angle integrated. The error bars on the integrated data points reflect the uncertainties due to counting statistics and those introduced in the charge distribution fitting process, which have been estimated to be approximately 25% [61].

At first glance, it appears there are significant differences between the measured and predicted mass distributions. The observed mass yield curve shows two prominent peaks: a broad peak centered at $A \sim 140$ and a narrow peak centered at $A \sim 180$. The latter peak might be associated with the target-like fragments formed in this reaction. A detailed examination of the former group shows there is a narrower prominent peak near $A = 160$ with a plateau of yields extending down to $A = 120$. The product yields from $A = 70$ to $A = 120$ are usually associated with fission fragments from the fission of the target-like nucleus [56]. The fragments with $A < 70$ are usually taken to be intermediate-mass fragments similar to those observed previously in the $^{197}\text{Au} + ^{197}\text{Au}$ reaction at energies ≤ 15 MeV/u [62], although the excitation energies in this work are expected to be low given the near-barrier projectile energy.

Compared to the known mass distributions for the interaction of 0.5–12 GeV protons with W, the observed distribution is noteworthy because of the lower yields of products from $A = 160$ to $A = 175$. This is presumably due to the lack of spallation processes which operate in high-energy proton-induced reactions. Some insight into the observed patterns may be gleaned from the predicted [18] excitation energies of the primary fragments, as shown in Fig. 8. The low-excitation-energy (10-MeV) groups are centered near the projectile mass number (between $A = 150$ and $A = 170$), and near the target mass number of ~ 186 . These groups may be consistent with the broad mass peaks (after deexcitation) centered at $A = 140$ and $A = 180$. The higher-excitation-energy (40-MeV) group is missing from the observed secondary fragment distribution, perhaps because it has deexcited by fission.

A closer look at the trans-target mass and isotopic yields is shown in Fig. 9. In addition to the peak centered at 2–3 amu below the target mass number, enhanced yields are seen for nuclides with $A = 193$ to $A = 202$. While the observed nuclei are not isotopes of Pb [$Z_{\text{mp}}(196)$ of the observed nuclides is 79], this broad “goldfinger” is unexpected and in stark contrast with the usual pattern of steeply decreasing product yields for $A_{\text{product}} \geq A_{\text{target}}$. A detailed look at the N/Z ratio of these products shows them to be less neutron rich than

the peak yield nuclides as predicted in [18]. Thus one has observed surviving trans-target nuclides in the $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction, although they are not in the place predicted in [18], but are somewhat closer to the target Z and A . The magnitude of these yields is similar to or greater than those predicted in [18].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

What have we learned in this study?

- (i) We have measured the yields of the reaction products from the 859-MeV $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction using radio-analytical techniques.
- (ii) We have established upper limits for the yields of the Hg and Pb isotopes that are one to two orders of magnitude below the predicted yields of [18].
- (iii) We have deduced, from the observed radionuclide yields, a fragment mass distribution for the 859-MeV $^{160}\text{Gd} + ^{186}\text{W}$ reaction. That distribution shows yields

of intermediate-mass fragments, nominal fission fragments, and two prominent peaks that are consistent with being the secondary fragment projectile-like and target-like fragments.

- (iv) We have observed enhanced yields of trans-target nuclides in the region of Au that are similar in magnitude (although differing in N and Z) to the shell-stabilized trans-target species predicted in [18].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank R. Pardo and the ATLAS accelerator staff for providing us with high-quality beams during the experiment. We thank Professor V. I. Zagrebaev for helpful comments and for furnishing copies of several figures from his article. This work was supported, in part, by the Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Nuclear Physics Division, US Department of Energy, under Grant No. DE-FG06-97ER41026 and Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.

-
- [1] Y. T. Oganessian, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **912**, 235 (2007).
 - [2] S. Hofmann *et al.*, *Z. Phys. A* **358**, 377 (1997).
 - [3] Y. T. Oganessian, *J. Phys. G* **34**, R165 (2007).
 - [4] K. Morita *et al.*, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **73**, 2593 (2004).
 - [5] Y. T. Oganessian *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 142502 (2010).
 - [6] E. M. Kozulin *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **686**, 227 (2010).
 - [7] Y. T. Oganessian *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **79**, 024603 (2009).
 - [8] See G. T. Seaborg and W. Loveland, *The Elements Beyond Uranium* (Wiley, New York, 1990), for a review of these data.
 - [9] V. I. Zagrebaev, Y. T. Oganessian, M. G. Itkis, and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rev. C* **73**, 031602(R) (2006).
 - [10] V. Zagrebaev, and W. Greiner, *J. Phys. G* **34**, 1 (2007).
 - [11] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, *J. Phys. G* **35**, 125103 (2008).
 - [12] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 122701 (2008).
 - [13] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, in *FUSION08: New Aspects of Heavy Ion Collisions Near the Coulomb Barrier*, edited by K. E. Rehm, B. B. Back, H. Esbensen, and C. J. Lister, AIP Conf. Proc. No. 1098 (American Institute of Physics, New York, 2009), pp. 326–333.
 - [14] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, *Nucl. Phys. A* **834**, 366c (2010).
 - [15] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rev. C* **78**, 034610 (2008).
 - [16] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, *Russ. Chem. Rev.* **78**, 1089 (2009).
 - [17] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, *J. Phys. G* **31**, 825 (2005).
 - [18] V. Zagrebaev and W. Greiner, *J. Phys. G* **34**, 2265 (2007).
 - [19] Z. Li, X. Wu, and N. Wang, *Romanian Rep. Phys.* **59**, 729 (2007).
 - [20] J. L. Tian, X. Wu, Z. Li, and K. Zhao, *Chin. Phys. C* **32**, 34 (2008).
 - [21] K. Zhao, X. Wu, and Z. Li, *Phys. Rev. C* **80**, 054607 (2009).
 - [22] W. Loveland, R. J. Otto, D. J. Morrissey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 230 (1977).
 - [23] W. D. Loveland, R. J. Otto, D. J. Morrissey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Lett. B* **69**, 284 (1977).
 - [24] D. J. Morrissey, W. Loveland, R. J. Otto, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Lett. B* **74**, 35 (1978).
 - [25] R. J. Otto, D. J. Morrissey, G. T. Seaborg, and W. Loveland, *Z. Phys. A* **287**, 97 (1978).
 - [26] D. J. Morrissey, W. R. Marsh, R. J. Otto, W. Loveland, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **18**, 1267 (1978).
 - [27] D. J. Morrissey, W. Loveland, and G. T. Seaborg, *Z. Phys. A* **289**, 123 (1978).
 - [28] D. J. Morrissey, W. Loveland, M. de Saint Simon, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **21**, 1783 (1980).
 - [29] W. Loveland, D. J. Morrissey, K. Aleklett, G. T. Seaborg, S. B. Kaufman, E. P. Steinberg, B. D. Wilkins, J. B. Cumming, P. E. Haustein, and H. C. Hseuh, *Phys. Rev. C* **23**, 253 (1981).
 - [30] K. Aleklett, D. J. Morrissey, W. Loveland, P. L. McGaughey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **23**, 1044 (1981).
 - [31] W. Loveland, C. Luo, P. L. McGaughey, D. J. Morrissey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **24**, 464 (1981).
 - [32] Y. Morita, W. Loveland, P. L. McGaughey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **26**, 511 (1982).
 - [33] B. V. Jacak, W. Loveland, D. J. Morrissey, P. L. McGaughey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Can. J. Chem.* **61**, 701 (1983).
 - [34] Y. Morita, W. Loveland, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **28**, 2519 (1983).
 - [35] R. H. Kraus Jr., W. Loveland, T. T. Sugihara, K. Aleklett, P. L. McGaughey, G. T. Seaborg, Y. Morita, T. Lund, E. Hagebo, and I. R. Haldorsen, *Nucl. Phys. A* **432**, 525 (1985).
 - [36] P. L. McGaughey, W. Loveland, D. J. Morrissey, K. Aleklett, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **31**, 896 (1985).
 - [37] W. Loveland, K. Aleklett, and G. T. Seaborg, *Nucl. Phys. A* **447**, 100 (1986).
 - [38] K. Aleklett, W. Loveland, T. Lund, P. L. McGaughey, Y. Morita, G. T. Seaborg, E. Hagebo, and I. R. Haldorsen, *Phys. Rev. C* **33**, 885 (1986).
 - [39] K. Aleklett, W. Loveland, T. T. Sugihara, A. N. Behkami, D. J. Morrissey, W. Li, K. Wing, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Scr.* **34**, 489 (1986).
 - [40] W. Loveland, K. Aleklett, L. Sihver, Z. Xu, C. Casey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Nucl. Phys. A* **471**, 175 (1987).
 - [41] K. Aleklett, L. Sihver, and W. Loveland, *Phys. Lett. B* **197**, 34 (1987).
 - [42] W. Loveland and G. T. Seaborg, *Revue Roumaine de Physique* **33**, 721 (1988).

- [43] W. Loveland, Z. Xu, C. Casey, K. Aleklett, J. O. Liljenzin, D. Lee, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **38**, 2094 (1988).
- [44] C. Casey, W. Loveland, Z. Xu, L. Sihver, K. Aleklett, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **40**, 1244 (1989).
- [45] K. Aleklett, W. Loveland, M. de Saint Simon, L. Sihver, J. O. Liljenzin, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Lett. B* **236**, 404 (1990).
- [46] W. Loveland, K. Aleklett, L. Sihver, Z. Xu, C. Casey, D. J. Morrissey, J. O. Liljenzin, M. de Saint Simon, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **41**, 973 (1990).
- [47] W. Loveland, M. Hellstrom, L. Sihver, and K. Aleklett, *Phys. Rev. C* **42**, 1753 (1990).
- [48] L. Sihver, K. Aleklett, W. Loveland, P. L. McGaughey, D. H. E. Gross, and H. R. Jaqaman, *Nucl. Phys. A* **543**, 703 (1992).
- [49] A. Yokoyama, W. Loveland, J. O. Liljenzin, K. Aleklett, D. J. Morrissey, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **46**, 647 (1992).
- [50] K. Aleklett, R. Yanez, W. Loveland, A. Srivastava, and J. O. Liljenzin, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **30**, 297 (1993).
- [51] W. Loveland, K. Aleklett, R. Yanez, A. Srivastava, and J. O. Liljenzin, *Phys. Lett. B* **312**, 53 (1993).
- [52] R. Yanez, W. Loveland, K. Aleklett, A. Srivastava, and J. O. Liljenzin, *Phys. Rev. C* **52**, 203 (1995).
- [53] R. Yanez, W. Loveland, D. J. Morrissey, K. Aleklett, J. O. Liljenzin, E. Hagebo, D. Jerrestam, and L. Westerberg, *Phys. Lett. B* **376**, 29 (1996).
- [54] W. Loveland, M. Andersson, K. E. Zyromski, N. Ham, B. Altschul, J. Vlcakova, D. Menge, J. O. Liljenzin, R. Yanez, and K. Aleklett, *Phys. Rev. C* **59**, 1472 (1999).
- [55] R. W. Stoenner, R. L. Klobuchar, P. E. Haustein, G. J. Virtes, J. B. Cumming, and W. Loveland, *Phys. Rev. C* **73**, 047602 (2006).
- [56] Y. Asano *et al.*, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **54**, 3734 (1985); **57**, 2995 (1988).
- [57] W. M. Gibson, Report No. NAS-NS-3040, USAEC, 1961, Procedure 11.
- [58] K. Aleklett, J. O. Liljenzin, and W. Loveland, *J. Radioanal. Nucl. Chem.* **193**, 187 (1995).
- [59] G. Friedlander, J. W. Kennedy, E. S. Macias, and J. M. Miller, *Nuclear and Radiochemistry*, 3rd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1981), p. 191.
- [60] J. V. Kratz, W. Bröchle, G. Franz, M. Schädel, I. Warneke, G. Wirth, and M. Weis, *Nucl. Phys. A* **332**, 447 (1979).
- [61] D. J. Morrissey, W. Loveland, M. de Saint Simon, and G. T. Seaborg, *Phys. Rev. C* **21**, 1783 (1980).
- [62] Th. Blaich, J. V. Kratz, R. Schmoll, K. Sümmerer, and G. Wirth, *Z. Phys. A* **356**, 49 (1996).