

# Synthesis of transactinide nuclei in cold fusion reactions using radioactive beams

Robert Smolanczuk\*

Theoretical Physics Department, Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies,  
Hoża 69, PL-00-681 Warszawa, Poland

April 11, 2022

## Abstract

Chances of synthesis of transactinide nuclei in cold fusion reactions (one-neutron-out reactions) using radioactive beams are evaluated. Because intensities of radioactive beams are in most of the cases significantly lower than the ones of the stable beams, reactions with the highest radioactive beam intensities for the particular elements are considered. The results are compared with the recent ones obtained by Loveland [1] who investigated the same nuclei.

Since cold fusion reactions based on  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  and  $^{209}\text{Bi}$  targets have been proposed [2] elements from Bh ( $Z = 107$ ) up to 112 have been discovered by using these reactions [3]. Recently also synthesis of element 113 has been reported using this method [4]. All these nuclei have been obtained using stable projectiles. The objective of the present paper is to evaluate chances of production, in other words production rates, of more neutron rich nuclei which may be obtained in cold fusion reactions using neutron-rich radioactive-ion beams. For this purpose we use beam intensities predicted on the Rare Isotope Accelerator (RIA) webpage, which are listed in Ref.[1], and formation cross sections calculated in our model introduced in Ref.[5], where the formation cross sections for cold fusion reactions using stable beams have been reproduced.

The formation cross section for optimal bombarding energy corresponding to the maximum of the excitation function we calculate by using the model formula

$$\sigma_{1n} = c_1 \sigma_{\text{class}} P_{\text{CN}} \left( \frac{\Gamma_n}{\Gamma_f} \right)_{l=0} = \sigma_{\text{capt}} P_{\text{CN}} \left( \frac{\Gamma_n}{\Gamma_f} \right)_{l=0} = \frac{1}{2} \pi R_B^2 \left( 1 - \frac{V_B}{E_{\text{cm}}} \right) \cdot \exp \{ -a [R_B - R_{\text{inner}}] \} \cdot \exp \left( \frac{B_f + \Delta_{sd}}{T_{sd}} - \frac{S_n + \Delta_{eq}}{T_{eq}} \right). \quad (1)$$

Formula (1) consists of four factors. The first factor is a coefficient  $c_1$  which originates from integration over partial waves and for cold fusion reactions leading to transactinides has been evaluated in Ref.[5] to be equal to approximately 0.5. The following three factors are the classical cross section  $\sigma_{\text{class}}$ , the formation probability of the compound nucleus (the so-called fusion hindrance)  $P_{\text{CN}}$  and the survival probability of the compound nucleus for the maximum of the excitation function and for zero angular momentum  $\left( \frac{\Gamma_n}{\Gamma_f} \right)_{l=0}$ . The so-called capture cross section is equal to  $c_1 \cdot \sigma_{\text{class}}$ .

---

\*Electronic address: smolan@fuw.edu.pl

The classical cross section (the considered reactions are overbarrier reactions, see Table I) depends on radial coordinate of the average fusion barrier  $R_B$ , the height of the average fusion barrier  $V_B$  and the optimal bombarding energy in the center-of-mass system  $E_{cm}$  corresponding to the maximum of the excitation function. The fusion barrier and its position are calculated by using the folding potential with built-in dependence on the thickness of nuclear surface and the separation energy of the least bound nucleon. The separation energy is calculated using masses from Ref.[6]. Full details of the potential are given in Ref.[5].

The formation probability of the compound nucleus  $P_{CN}$  depends on the difference between radial coordinates of the average fusion barrier  $R_B$  and the inner barrier  $R_{inner}$ . The larger distance between both barriers the less likely compound nucleus formation because of the competing quasifission process.  $P_{CN}$  is independent of energy in the energy range of interest what one can deduce from the experimental data obtained for  $^{220}\text{Th}$  [7]. We also assumed that  $P_{CN}$  is independent of angular momentum. The position of the inner barrier  $R_{inner} = b_{inner}/x_f$  is assumed to be inversely proportional to the fissility parameter  $x_f = 4Z_T Z_P / [A_T^{1/3} A_P^{1/3} (A_T^{1/3} + A_P^{1/3})]$ , where  $Z_T$ ,  $A_T$  and  $Z_P$ ,  $A_P$  are the atomic and mass numbers of the target  $T$  and the projectile  $P$ , respectively. The constant  $b_{inner} = 427.69$  fm was determined assuming that the reaction  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{48}\text{Ca}, 1n)^{255}\text{No}$  is unhindered ( $P_{CN} = 1$ ) because of very low quasifission rates measured for this reaction [8]. The constant  $a = 5.03$  fm $^{-1}$  was adjusted to the maxima of the following measured excitation functions for one-neutron-out reactions  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{50}\text{Ti}, 1n)^{257}\text{Rf}$ ,  $^{209}\text{Bi}(^{50}\text{Ti}, 1n)^{258}\text{Db}$ ,  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{54}\text{Cr}, 1n)^{261}\text{Sg}$ ,  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{58}\text{Fe}, 1n)^{265}\text{Hs}$  and  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{64}\text{Ni}, 1n)^{271}\text{Ds}$  [9].

The survival probability at the maximum of the excitation function  $(\Gamma_n/\Gamma_f)_{l=0}$  depends on effective thresholds for fission  $B_f + \Delta_{sd}$ , neutron emission  $S_n + \Delta_{eq}$  and temperatures at the saddle point of the compound nucleus  $T_{sd}$  and at the equilibrium point of the evaporation residue  $T_{eq}$ . Here,  $B_f$  is the static fission barrier,  $S_n$  is the neutron separation energy,  $\Delta_{sd}$  and  $\Delta_{eq}$  are the energy shifts in the saddle-point of the compound nucleus and the equilibrium configuration of  $1n$ -evaporation residue, respectively. They are used to take into account differences between level densities for even-even, odd and odd-odd nuclei. The energy shift  $\Delta_{sd}$  is equal to  $24/\sqrt{A}$ ,  $12/\sqrt{A}$  and 0 for the even-even, odd and odd-odd compound nucleus and  $\Delta_{eq} = 24/\sqrt{A-1}$ ,  $12/\sqrt{A-1}$  and 0 for the even-even, odd and odd-odd  $1n$ -evaporation residue, respectively.  $A$  is the mass number of the compound nucleus.

Influence of shell effects on the survival probability was taken implicitly into account through different temperatures in the transitional states for fission and neutron emission. Temperature at the equilibrium point of the evaporation residue  $T_{eq} = (\frac{d}{dE^*} \ln \rho)^{-1}$  is smaller than at the saddle point of the compound nucleus  $T_{sd}$  because the level density  $\rho(E^*)$  in the equilibrium configuration increases faster with increasing excitation energy  $E^*$  in comparison with the level density in the saddle-point configuration of the compound nucleus. This is due to thermal damping of the strong ground-state shell-effect. In the saddle point, there is no shell effect or it is much weaker than in the equilibrium configuration. In the calculation  $T_{sd} = 1$  MeV,  $T_{eq} = 0.55$  MeV for the even-even and odd-N compound nucleus and  $T_{eq} = 0.5$  MeV for odd-Z and odd-odd compound nucleus were used. In Ref.[5] it was checked out that the values of survival probabilities obtained with these temperatures are close to those obtained with shell damping of the experimental level density parameter [10] described by the Ignatyuk, Smirenkin and Tishin formula [11].

The optimal bombarding energy in the center-of-mass system  $E_{cm}$  corresponding to the maxi-

imum of the excitation function is calculated as the sum of the absolute value of  $Q$ -value necessary to form an unexcited compound nucleus, the effective threshold for one neutron emission and the effective threshold for next decay process, which for the evaporation residue is fission because for transactinides fission barriers are smaller than neutron separation energies.

The  $Q$ -value was calculated by subtracting from the measured masses [6] of the reaction partners the mass of the compound nucleus that was calculated in the macroscopic-microscopic model [12, 13]. The static fission barrier height and the neutron separation energy are obtained in the macroscopic-microscopic model [14, 12, 13].

Obtained results in the present paper and in the paper by Loveland who investigated the same nuclei [1], as well as beam intensities given in Ref.[1] after the RIA webpage are collected in Table I. Because intensities of radioactive beams are in most of the cases significantly lower than the ones of the stable beams, reactions using the highest radioactive beam intensities for the particular elements are considered. One can see that our cross section of  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{51}\text{Ti},1n)^{258}\text{Rf}$  seems to be to large.  $^{258}\text{Rf}$  has only one neutron more than the nucleus obtained by using stable  $^{50}\text{Ti}$  beam. From systematics we know that this should lead to increase of the cross section by a factor smaller than one order of magnitude whereas the calculation gives the increase of the cross section by two orders of magnitude. Possible reason for this is both overestimation of the fission barrier and underestimation of the neutron separation energy in the macroscopic-microscopic model for the compound nucleus  $^{259}\text{Rf}$ .

As stated in Ref.[1] the cross section times beam intensity factor governs the choice of reactions. To have an idea how the cross section times beam intensity factor works we use as the reference the reaction  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{70}\text{Zn},1n)^{277}\text{112}$  with the stable beam  $^{70}\text{Zn}$  with the intensity of  $3 \cdot 10^{12}$  for which the cross section of 0.5 pb was measured [9]. These numbers correspond to the production rate of 23 days/atom.

The best reaction taking into account the cross section times beam intensity factor and disregarding overestimated result for  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{51}\text{Ti},1n)^{258}\text{Rf}$  is  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{54}\text{V},1n)^{261}\text{Db}$ , the same reaction as indicated in Ref.[1]. We obtain the production rate 0.13 days/atom.

Our obtained results are generally smaller than those obtained in Ref.[1] except for  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{54}\text{V},1n)^{261}\text{Db}$ . Synthesis of lower  $Z$  (106-107, 109-111) transactinides using neutron-rich radioactive ion beams is most likely if beam intensities given in Ref.[1] after the RIA webpage are predicted correctly. Production rates are of the order of days/atom for these elements except for element Rg ( $Z=111$ ) for which production rate of almost 23 days/atom have been obtained.

The synthesis of higher  $Z$  transactinide nuclei by means of the neutron-rich radioactive-ion beams seems to be practically excluded using present-day technology because of small cross sections and low beam intensities (small cross section times beam intensity factor leading to low production rates). Our results are even more pesymistic in this regard in comparison with the results obtained by Loveland [1]. We obtain production rates even up to two orders of magnitude smaller than that observed for the reference reaction and for the case of  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{78}\text{As},1n)^{285}\text{115}$  even up to three orders of magnitude. The only exeption is the reaction  $^{208}\text{Pb}(^{91}\text{Kr},1n)^{298}\text{118}$ . In this case the predicted beam intensity is high enough to produce the nuclei at the production rate of 23 atoms/day to obtain the isotope of element 118 with the neutron number 180 very close to the neutron magic number 184.

## References

- [1] W. Loveland, Phys. Rev. C **76** 014612 (2007).
- [2] Yu.Ts. Oganessian et al., Nucl. Phys. A **239**, 353 (1975).
- [3] S. Hofmann and G. Münzenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72**, 733 (2000) and references therein.
- [4] K. Morita et al., J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73**, 2593 (2004).
- [5] R. Smolańczuk, Phys. Rev. C **78** 024601 (2008).
- [6] G. Audi, A.H. Wapstra, and C. Thibault, Nucl. Phys. A **729**, 337 (2003).
- [7] D.J. Hinde, M. Dasgupta and A. Mukherjee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** 282701 (2002).
- [8] M.G. Itkis et al., Nucl. Phys. A **734**, E29 (2004).
- [9] S. Hofmann et al., Nucl. Phys. A **734**, 93 (2004) and private communication.
- [10] S.F. Mughabghab and C. Dunford, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4083 (1998).
- [11] A.V. Ignatyuk, G.N. Smirenkin and A.S. Tishin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **21**, 255 (1975).
- [12] R. Smolańczuk, Ph.D. thesis, Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, 1996.
- [13] R. Smolańczuk, Phys. Rev. C **56**, 812 (1997).
- [14] R. Smolańczuk, J. Skalski, and A. Sobiczewski, Phys. Rev. C **52**, 1871 (1995).

TABLE I. The optimal bombarding energy in the center-of-mass-system  $E_{cm}$ , the average fusion barrier height  $V_B$ , the radial coordinates of the average fusion barrier  $R_B$  and the inner barrier  $R_{inner}$ , the capture cross section  $\sigma_{capt}$ , the formation probability of the compound nucleus  $P_{CN}$ , the neutron-to-fission-width-ratio for zero angular momentum  $(\Gamma_n/\Gamma_f)_{l=0}$  and the formation cross sections for  $1n$ -evaporation residue  $\sigma_{1n}$  calculated in the present paper and in the paper by Loveland  $\sigma_{1n}^L$  [1] as well as the beam intensity given in Ref.[1] after the RIA webpage.

Reaction	$E_{cm}$ MeV	$V_B$ MeV	$R_B$ fm	$R_{inner}$ fm	$\sigma_{capt}$ mb	$P_{CN}$	$(\Gamma_n/\Gamma_f)_{l=0}$	$\sigma_{1n}$ pb	$\sigma_{1n}^L$ pb	$\Psi$ ions/s
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{51}\text{Ti},1n)^{258}\text{Rf}$	185.8	182.2	13.57	12.55	56	$5.8 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.6 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1200000	5190	$4.0 \cdot 10^9$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{54}\text{V},1n)^{261}\text{Db}$	192.7	189.4	13.64	12.32	49	$1.3 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.2 \cdot 10^{-3}$	74000	11700	$3.6 \cdot 10^9$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{57}\text{Cr},1n)^{264}\text{Sg}$	201.9	196.3	13.73	12.11	82	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.8 \cdot 10^{-3}$	4300	8890	$2.8 \cdot 10^9$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{58}\text{Mn},1n)^{265}\text{Bh}$	210.3	204.8	13.71	11.72	78	$4.5 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$5.0 \cdot 10^{-4}$	1700	3210	$8.0 \cdot 10^9$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{61}\text{Fe},1n)^{268}\text{Hs}$	220.2	211.6	13.80	11.54	117	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$9.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$	120	3380	$4.0 \cdot 10^9$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{58}\text{Co},1n)^{265}\text{Mt}$	224.9	222.1	13.66	10.85	38	$7.3 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$5.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$	1.6	2.4	$4.0 \cdot 10^{12}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{65}\text{Ni},1n)^{272}\text{Ds}$	239.1	226.9	13.85	11.03	154	$7.0 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$9.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	100	497	$3.6 \cdot 10^{10}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{66}\text{Cu},1n)^{273}\text{Rg}$	246.6	235.2	13.85	10.73	139	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$2.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$	5.5	60	$2.8 \cdot 10^{11}$
$^{209}\text{Bi}(^{66}\text{Cu},1n)^{274}112$	248.8	237.9	13.85	10.63	132	$9.1 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$1.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$	1.5	5.7	$2.8 \cdot 10^{11}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{74}\text{Ga},1n)^{281}113$	265.1	248.5	14.00	10.59	192	$3.6 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$5.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$	0.41	18.9	$1.2 \cdot 10^{11}$
$^{209}\text{Bi}(^{74}\text{Ga},1n)^{282}114$	267.4	251.4	14.01	10.49	184	$2.1 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$6.1 \cdot 10^{-5}$	0.23	34.5	$1.2 \cdot 10^{11}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{78}\text{As},1n)^{285}115$	283.7	263.6	14.06	10.20	220	$3.7 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$1.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$	0.014	7.6	$8.0 \cdot 10^{10}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{85}\text{Se},1n)^{292}116$	297.8	267.8	14.25	10.31	322	$2.5 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$1.4 \cdot 10^{-3}$	1.1	17.6	$1.6 \cdot 10^{10}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{89}\text{Br},1n)^{296}117$	303.7	275.6	14.26	10.24	296	$1.6 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.55	3.4	$8.0 \cdot 10^{10}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{91}\text{Kr},1n)^{298}118$	314.4	281.6	14.34	10.06	337	$4.5 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$3.6 \cdot 10^{-3}$	0.55	0.7	$2.8 \cdot 10^{12}$
$^{208}\text{Pb}(^{90}\text{Rb},1n)^{297}119$	326.1	290.7	14.28	9.74	347	$1.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$5.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$	0.022	0.1	$3.6 \cdot 10^{12}$