β decay and E_{β}	Target angle to beam	Corrected I 180°// 90°
Li ⁸ , $E_{\beta} > 9.7$ Mev	45°	1.03 ± 0.02
Li ⁸ , 3.8 Mev $< E_{\beta} < 6.1$ Mev	45°	1.03 ± 0.02
Li ⁸ , 1.5 < E_{β} < 3.8 Mev	45°	1.05 ± 0.02
$B^8, E_{\beta} > 9.7 Mev$	30°	1.02 ± 0.03
$B^8, E_{\beta} > 9.7 Mev$	20°	1.00 ± 0.05
B ⁸ , $E_{\beta} > 9.7$ Mev	30°	1.00 ± 0.03^{a}

Table I. Summary of measured asymmetries in the β - α angular correlations of Li⁸ and B⁸.

 a Using the dashed extrapolations in Fig. 2.

that the M1 matrix element is anomalously small, then the present experiment would not be a suitable method for testing the conserved vector current hypothesis, since there are probably other corrections of the order of a few percent which could mask the expected anisotropy, ⁵ for example, a term proportional to the E2 matrix element.

The authors would like to acknowledge their indebtedness to Professor W. A. Fowler, Professor T. Lauritsen, and Dr. H. Weidenmuller for their advice and interest in this experiment.

^TSupported in part by the joint program of the Office of Naval Research and the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

*Present address: The Institute "J. Stefan," Ljubljana, Yugoslavia.

¹J. Bernstein and R. R. Lewis, Phys. Rev. <u>112</u>, 232 (1958).

²R. P. Feynman and M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Rev. <u>109</u>, 193 (1958); M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Rev. <u>111</u>, 362 (1958); E. C. G. Sudarshan and R. E. Marshak, Phys. Rev. <u>109</u>, 1860 (1958); S. S. Gershtein and J. B. Zeldovich, Zhur. Eksptl. i Teoret. Fiz. <u>29</u>, 698 (1955) [translation: Soviet Phys. JETP <u>2</u>, 576 (1957)].

³Hanna, LaVier, and Class, Phys. Rev. <u>95</u>, 110 (1954); D. StP. Bunbury, Phys. Rev. <u>90</u>, 110 (1953).

⁴Lauritsen, Barnes, Fowler, and Lauritsen, Phys. Rev. Letters <u>1</u>, 326 (1958); Barnes, Fowler, Greenstein, Lauritsen, and Nordberg, Phys. Rev. Letters <u>1</u>, 328 (1958).

⁵M. Morita, Phys. Rev. <u>113</u>, 1584 (1959).

DECAY OF OXYGEN 20[†]

Gertrude Scharff-Goldhaber Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York

and

Albert Goodman and Myron G. Silbert Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico (Received December 2, 1959)

It is of considerable theoretical interest to discover the decay of the isotope O^{20} and its properties. Jarmie and Silbert,¹ by studying the energies of the protons produced in the reaction $O^{18}(t,p)O^{20}$, were able to deduce for the energy difference $Q(O^{20} \rightarrow F^{20}) = 3.75$ Mev. However, earlier attempts²⁻⁴ to search for the decay of the isotope have been unsuccessful. Katcoff and Hudis³ were able to exclude a half-life of

10 min $\leq \tau_{1/2}(O^{20}) \leq 150$ yr with reasonable certainty, and Amiel and Segel⁴ showed that $\tau_{1/2} \leq 30$ to 50 sec.

We studied the decay of O^{20} produced by 2.66-Mev tritons from the 3-Mev Los Alamos Van de Graaff in an O^{18} (95% enriched) gas target. As detector for the γ rays we used a scintillation spectrometer. The front face of a 3 in.×3 in. NaI(T1) crystal was placed about 4 in. from the

target, behind a $\frac{5}{8}$ -inch Be absorber which removed β rays. A one-hundred channel pulseheight analyzer served to study the spectrum. Bombardments of one to five seconds duration were used. The spectra obtained during 10-sec counts, starting at various intervals (1-40 sec) after bombardment, were printed out. In addition to the 1.63-Mev line from F^{20} , which is the daughter product of O²⁰ and also independently produced in the reaction $O^{18}(t, n) F^{20}$, we observed a weaker γ ray (~6% of the 1.63-Mev line) at 1.067 ± 0.020 Mev (Fig. 1, curve A). This energy agrees within limits of error with that of the fourth excited state⁵ of F^{20} (1.059 ± 0.008 Mev), found in the reaction $F^{19}(d, p) F^{20}$. The decay curves of both the 1.63-Mev and the 1.067-Mev γ rays were followed by taking 1-sec counts obtained within a channel set at the appropriate energy. It was observed that both γ rays decay with half-lives of ~ 12.5 sec, which is in fair agreement with the 11.4-sec half-life reported⁵ for F^{20} . The 1.06-Mev photopeak, of course, is superimposed on the Compton spectrum of the 1.63-Mev γ ray. The latter accounts for about 60-70% of the counts in the channel.⁶

We now made the tentative assumption that the

beta decay of O²⁰ takes place mainly to the 1.06-Mev state in F^{20} and that the half-life of O^{20} differs only slightly from that of F^{20} . To prove this we decided to measure the half-life and gamma-ray spectrum of F^{20} in the absence of O²⁰. For this purpose F²⁰ was produced by bombarding F^{19} (CaF₂ crystal) with 2-Mev deuterons in another Los Alamos Van de Graaff generator. The same detector, in approximately the same geometry as before, was used for these measurements (curves B on Figs. 1 and 2). It is seen (a) that the 1.06-Mev peak does not occur in the F^{20} spectrum, and (b) that the decay of the 1.63-Mev γ ray from the pure F^{20} is slightly steeper than that from the O^{20} - F^{20} mixture. $[\tau_{1/2}(F^{20})]$ $= 11.2 \pm 0.1$ sec.] This confirms our tentative assumption stated above.

A computer analysis of the decay curves obtained from the O^{20} - F^{20} mixture, analyzed on the basis of a single activity plus a background, yielded apparent half-lives of 12.4 ± 0.1 sec for the 1.06-Mev peak and 12.1 ± 0.1 sec for the 1.63-Mev peak. As is evident from Fig. 2, the decay curve of the 1.63-Mev peak from the O^{20} - F^{20} mixture closely approximates a straight line. The data were further analyzed, however, by



FIG. 1. Scintillation spectra obtained following the bombardment of O^{18} (95% enriched) with tritons (Curve A) and F^{19} with deuterons (Curve B). The annihilation peak is due to positrons from 1.87-hr F^{18} , formed by the reaction $O^{16}(t, n)$.



FIG. 2. Decay of the 1.63-Mev γ ray. The lines are based on an IBM-704 least-squares fit of the data which have been corrected for background.

fitting them to the decay of two-partly genetically related-activities plus a background, using the measured F^{20} half-life of 11.2 sec as one of the activities. This analysis yielded a value for the O^{20} half-life of 13.6 ± 1.0 sec.

The amount of O^{20} relative to F^{20} produced in the target was deduced from this analysis and also calculated independently from the $O^{20} + F^{20}$ spectrum (Fig. 1, Curve A). The validity of the analysis using two activities plus a background is substantiated by the good agreement between these two values, $6.2 \pm 3.5\%$ and $5.8 \pm 1.0\%$, respectively.

Figure 3 shows the proposed decay scheme of O^{20} . From the values for $\tau_{1/2}(O^{20})$ and for $E_{\beta\max}(O^{20}) = (3.75 - 1.06)$ Mev = 2.69 Mev, we compute $\log ft = 3.77$. The analysis of the stripping reaction $F^{19}(d, p)F^{20}$ has shown⁵ that the 1.06-Mev state in F^{20} is either 1+ or 0+. The low $\log ft$ value for the beta transition from O^{20} (I=0, even) to the 1.06-Mev state indicates that the transition is of the Gamow-Teller type, as a Fermi transition with $\Delta T = 1$ is forbidden. Hence we conclude that the 1.06-Mev state in F^{20} is 1+.

We wish to thank Dr. A. Schardt for his gener-



FIG. 3. Proposed decay scheme for O^{20} . The excited states of F^{20} and the decay scheme of F^{20} are taken over from reference 5. The spin and parity assignment of the 1.06-Mev state results from the present work.

ous advice and help given during the course of this experiment. One of us (G. S.-G.) should like to thank the staff of Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory for their hospitality.

²Sheline, Campbell, and Peele, Oak Ridge National Laboratory Report ORNL-1798, 1954 (unpublished).

³S. Katcoff and J. Hudis, J. Inorg. Nuclear Chem. <u>3</u>, 253 (1956).

⁴S. Amiel and R. E. Segel, J. Inorg. Nuclear Chem. <u>10</u>, 4 (1959).

⁵F. Ajzenberg-Selove and T. Lauritsen, Nuclear Phys. 11, 1 (1959).

⁶Amiel and Segel (reference 4) "observed the possible presence of a weak γ ray of 1.1 Mev and a halflife of 13.5 sec for the decay of the 1.63-Mev γ ray, somewhat higher than but consistent with the 11.4-sec half-life" reported for F^{20} . They did not pursue the problem further.

^TWork performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

¹N. Jarmie and M. G. Silbert, Phys. Rev. Letters $\underline{3}$, 50 (1959).