

Double beta decay to the excited states: experimental review

A.S. Barabash

*Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, B. Cheremushkinskaya 25, 117218 Moscow,
Russia*

Abstract. A brief review on double beta decay to excited states of daughter nuclei is given. The ECEC(0ν) transitions to the excited states are discussed in association with a possible enhancement of the decay rate by several orders of magnitude.

Keywords: neutrino mass, double beta decay, excited states

PACS: 23.40.-s, 14.80.Mz

INTRODUCTION

The $\beta\beta$ decay can proceed through transitions to the ground state as well as to various excited states of the daughter nucleus. Studies of the latter transitions allow supplementary information about $\beta\beta$ decay. The first experimental studies of $\beta\beta$ decay to the excited state was done by E. Fiorini in 1977 [1]. It was just an aside to his main experiment with ^{76}Ge (transition to 0^+ ground state). First special experimental work to investigate the $\beta\beta$ decay to the excited states were done in 1982 [2]. In 1989 it was shown that using low-background facilities utilizing High Purity Germanium (HPGe) detectors, the $2\nu\beta\beta$ decay to the 0_1^+ level in the daughter nucleus may be detected for such nuclei as ^{100}Mo , ^{96}Zr and ^{150}Nd [3]. Soon after double beta decay of ^{100}Mo to the 0^+ excited state at 1130.29 keV in ^{100}Ru was observed [4]. Then this result was confirmed in a few independent experiments with HPGe detectors [5, 6, 7]. In 2004 for the first time this transition was detected in ^{150}Nd [8]. Recently the $2\nu\beta\beta$ decay of ^{100}Mo to the 0_1^+ level in ^{100}Ru was detected using tracking detector NEMO-3 where all the decay products (two electrons and two γ -rays) were detected and hence all the information about the decay was obtained (total energy spectrum, single electron spectrum, single γ spectrum and all angular distributions) [9]. In addition in the last 15 years new limits for many nuclei and different modes of decay to the excited states were established (see reviews [10, 11]). Present motivations to do this search are the following:

- 1) Nuclear spectroscopy (to know decay schemes of nuclei).
- 2) Nuclear Matrix Elements.
- 3) Examination of some new ideas (such as the "bosonic" component of the neutrino, [12, 13]).
- 4) Neutrino mass investigations:
 - a) $0\nu\beta\beta(0^+ - 0_1^+)$ decay; in this case one has a very nice signature for the decay and hence high sensitivity to neutrino mass could be reached;

TABLE 1. Best present limits on $2\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 2_1^+ excited state (90% C.L.).

Nuclei	$E_{2\beta}$, keV	Experiment $T_{1/2}$, y	Theory [17]	Theory [18, 19]
^{48}Ca	3288.5	$> 1.8 \times 10^{20}$ [20]	1.7×10^{24}	-
^{150}Nd	3033.6	$> 9.1 \times 10^{19}$ [21]	-	-
^{96}Zr	2572.2	$> 7.9 \times 10^{19}$ [22]	2.3×10^{25}	$(3.8 - 4.8) \times 10^{21}$
^{100}Mo	2494.5	$> 1.6 \times 10^{21}$ [4]	1.2×10^{25}	3.4×10^{22} [23]
^{82}Se	2218.5	$> 1.4 \times 10^{21}$ [24]	-	$2.8 \times 10^{23} - 3.3 \times 10^{26}$
^{130}Te	1992.7	$> 2.8 \times 10^{21}$ [25]	6.9×10^{26}	$(3.0 - 27) \times 10^{22}$
^{116}Cd	1511.5	$> 2.3 \times 10^{21}$ [26]	3.4×10^{26}	1.1×10^{24}
^{76}Ge	1480	$> 1.1 \times 10^{21}$ [27]	5.8×10^{28}	$(7.8 - 10) \times 10^{25}$

b) high sensitivity to the effective Majorana neutrino mass can be reached in the case of the ECEC (0ν) transition if the resonance condition is realized (see [14, 15, 16]).

DOUBLE BETA DECAY TO THE EXCITED STATES

The present experimental status of $\beta\beta$ decay to the excited states of daughter nuclei is the following.

$2\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 2_1^+ excited state

The $2\nu\beta\beta$ decay to the 2_1^+ excited state is strongly suppressed and practically inaccessible to detection. However, for a few nuclei (^{96}Zr , ^{100}Mo , ^{130}Te) there are some "optimistic" predictions for half-lives ($T_{1/2} \sim 10^{22} - 10^{24}$ y) and there is a chance to detect such decays in the next generation of the double beta decay experiments. The best present limits are shown in Table 1.

$2\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 0_1^+ excited state

For these transitions the best results and limits are presented in Table 2. Table 3 presents all the existing positive results for $2\nu\beta\beta$ decay of ^{100}Mo to the first 0^+ excited state of ^{100}Ru . The half-life averaged over all four experiments is given in the bottom row. The average value was calculated using the standard procedure of determining the average for different accuracy measurements, and the statistical and systematic errors were summed quadratically (for more details see [28]).

TABLE 2. Best present results and limits on $2\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 0_1^+ excited state. Limits are given at the 90% C.L. *) Corrected value is used (see [31]).

Nuclei	$E_{2\beta}$, keV	Experiment $T_{1/2}$, y	Theory [18, 19]	Theory [23]
^{150}Nd	2627.1	$= 1.4^{+0.5}_{-0.4} \times 10^{20}$ [8]	-	-
^{96}Zr	2202.5	$> 6.8 \times 10^{19}$ [22]	$(2.4 - 2.7) \times 10^{21}$	3.8×10^{21}
^{100}Mo	1903.7	$= 6.2^{+0.9}_{-0.7} \times 10^{20}$	1.6×10^{21} [29]	2.1×10^{21}
^{82}Se	1507.5	$> 3.0 \times 10^{21}$ [24]	$(1.5 - 3.3) \times 10^{21}$	-
^{48}Ca	1274.8	$> 1.5 \times 10^{20}$ [20]	-	-
^{116}Cd	1048.2	$> 2.0 \times 10^{21}$ [26]	1.1×10^{22}	1.1×10^{21}
^{76}Ge	916.7	$> 6.2 \times 10^{21}$ [30]	$(7.5 - 310) \times 10^{21}$	4.5×10^{21}
^{130}Te	735.3	$> 2.3 \times 10^{21}$ [31]	$(5.1 - 14) \times 10^{22*}$	-

TABLE 3. Present "positive" results on $2\nu\beta\beta$ decay of ^{100}Mo to the first 0^+ excited state of ^{100}Ru . N is the number of useful events, S/B is the signal-to-background ratio.

	$T_{1/2}$, y	N	S/B	Year, References	Method
$6.1^{+1.8}_{-1.1} \times 10^{20}$		66	$\sim 1/7$	1995 [4]	HPGe
$9.3^{+2.8}_{-1.7} \pm 1.4 \times 10^{20}$		80	$\sim 1/4$	1999 [5]	HPGe
$6.0^{+1.9}_{-1.1} \pm 0.6 \times 10^{20}$		19.5	8/1	2001 [6, 7]	2xHPGe
$5.7^{+1.3}_{-0.9} \pm 0.8 \times 10^{20}$		37.5	3/1	2007 [9]	NEMO-3
Average value: $6.2^{+0.9}_{-0.7} \times 10^{20}$ y					

$0\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 2_1^+ excited state

The $0\nu\beta\beta(0^+ - 2_1^+)$ decay had long been accepted to be possible because of the contribution of right-handed currents and is not sensitive to the neutrino mass contribution. However, in Ref. [32] it was demonstrated that the relative sensitivities of $(0^+ - 2_1^+)$ decays to the neutrino mass $\langle m_\nu \rangle$ and the right-handed current $\langle \eta \rangle$ are comparable to those of $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay to the ground state. At the same time, the $(0^+ - 2_1^+)$ decay is more sensitive to $\langle \lambda \rangle$. The best present experimental limits are shown in Table 4.

$0\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 0_1^+ excited state

The $0\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 0^+ excited states of the daughter nuclei provides a clear-cut signature. In addition to two electrons with a fixed total energy, there are two photons, whose energies are strictly fixed as well. In a hypothetical experiment detecting all decay products with high efficiency and high energy resolution, the background can be reduced to nearly zero. It is possible this idea will be used in future experiments featuring a large mass of the isotope under study (as mentioned in Refs. [11, 10, 38]). In Ref. [39] it was mentioned that detection of this transition will give us the additional possibility to

TABLE 4. Best present limits on $0\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 2_1^+ excited state (90% C.L.).

Nuclei	$E_{2\beta}$, keV	Experiment $T_{1/2}$, y	Theory [32], $\langle m_\nu \rangle = 1$ eV	Theory [32], $\langle \lambda \rangle = 10^{-6}$
^{76}Ge	1480	$> 8.2 \times 10^{23}$ [33]	8.2×10^{31}	6.5×10^{29}
^{100}Mo	2494.5	$> 1.6 \times 10^{23}$ [9]	6.8×10^{30}	2.1×10^{27}
^{130}Te	1992.7	$> 1.4 \times 10^{23}$ [34]	-	-
^{116}Cd	1511.5	$> 2.9 \times 10^{22}$ [35]	-	-
^{136}Xe	1649.4	$> 6.5 \times 10^{21}$ [36]	-	-
^{82}Se	2218.5	$> 2.8 \times 10^{21}$ [37]	-	-

TABLE 5. Best present limits on $0\nu\beta\beta$ transition to the 0_1^+ excited state (90% C.L.). Theoretical predictions for $\langle m_\nu \rangle = 1$ eV are given.

Nuclei	$E_{2\beta}$, keV	Experiment $T_{1/2}$, y	Theory [41, 38, 42, 43]	Theory [44]
^{150}Nd	2627.1	$> 1.0 \times 10^{20}$ [21]	-	-
^{96}Zr	2202.5	$> 6.8 \times 10^{19}$ [22]	2.4×10^{24}	-
^{100}Mo	1903.7	$> 8.9 \times 10^{22}$ [9]	2.6×10^{26}	1.5×10^{25}
^{82}Se	1507.5	$> 3.0 \times 10^{21}$ [24]	9.5×10^{26}	4.5×10^{25}
^{48}Ca	1274.8	$> 1.5 \times 10^{20}$ [20]	-	-
^{116}Cd	1048.2	$> 1.4 \times 10^{22}$ [35]	1.5×10^{27}	-
^{76}Ge	916.7	$> 1.3 \times 10^{22}$ [40]	4.9×10^{26}	2.4×10^{26}
^{130}Te	735.3	$> 3.1 \times 10^{22}$ [34]	7.5×10^{25}	-

distinguish the $0\nu\beta\beta$ mechanisms. The best present limits are presented in Table 5.

ECEC(0ν) TRANSITION TO THE EXCITED STATES

In Ref. [45] it was the first mentioned that in the case of ECEC(0ν) transition a resonance condition could exist for transition to a "right energy" excited level of the daughter nucleus (when decay energy is closed to zero). In 1982 the same idea was proposed for transition to the ground state [46]. In 1983 this possibility was discussed for the transition ^{112}Sn - ^{112}Cd (0^+ ; 1871 keV) [14]. In 2004 the idea was reanalyzed in Ref. [15] and some new resonance condition for the decay was formulated. The possible enhancement of the transition rate was estimated as $\sim 10^6$ [14, 15]. This means that this process starts to be competitive with $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay for the sensitivity to neutrino mass and it is interesting to check this idea by experiment. There are several candidate for such resonance transition, to the ground (^{152}Gd , ^{164}Eu and ^{180}W) and to the excited states (^{74}Se , ^{78}Kr , ^{96}Ru , ^{106}Cd , ^{112}Sn , ^{130}Ba , ^{136}Ce and ^{162}Er) of daughter nuclei (see [13, 15]). The precision needed to realize resonance condition is well below 1 keV. To select the best candidate from the above list one will have to know the atomic mass difference with an accuracy better than 1 keV. Such measurements are planed for the future. Recently the first experiment to search for such a resonance transition

in ^{74}Se - ^{74}Ge (2^+ ; 1206.9 keV) was performed yielding a limit $T_{1/2} > 5.5 \times 10^{18}$ y [16]. It was also demonstrated that using enriched ^{74}Se and an installation such as GERDA or MAJORANA a sensitivity on the level $\sim 10^{26}$ y can be reached.

REFERENCES

1. E. Fiorini, in *Proc. Int. Conf. NEUTRINO'77*, "Nauka", Moscow, 1978, Vol. 2, p. 315-320.
2. E. Bellotti et al., *Lett. Nuovo Chim.* **33**, 273-283 (1982).
3. A.S. Barabash, *JETP Lett.* **51**, 207-209 (1990); preprint ITEP 188-89 (1989).
4. A.S. Barabash et al., *Phys. Lett.*, **B 345**, 408-413 (1995).
5. A.S. Barabash et al., *Phys. At. Nucl.*, **62**, 2039-2043 (1999).
6. L. De Braekeleer et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **86**, 3510-3513 (2001).
7. M.J. Hornish et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **C 74**, 044314 (2006).
8. A.S. Barabash et al., *JETP Lett.*, **79**, 10-12 (2004).
9. R. Arnold et al., *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 781**, 209-226 (2007).
10. A.S. Barabash, *Czech. J. Phys.*, **50**, 447-453 (2000).
11. A.S. Barabash, *Phys. At. Nucl.*, **67**, 438-452 (2004).
12. A.D. Dolgov and A.Yu. Smirnov, *Phys. Lett.*, **B 621**, 1-10 (2005).
13. A.S. Barabash et al., *hep-ph/0704.2944* (2007).
14. J. Bernabeu, A. De Rujula and C. Jarlskog, *Nucl. Phys.*, **B 223**, 15-28 (1983).
15. Z. Sujkowski and S. Wycech, *Phys. Rev.*, **C 70**, 052501 (2004).
16. A.S. Barabash et al., *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 785**, 371-380 (2007).
17. A.A. Raduta and C.M. Raduta, *Phys. Lett.*, **B 647**, 265-270 (2007).
18. M. Aunola and J. Suhonen, *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 602**, 133-166 (1996).
19. J. Toivanen and J. Suhonen, *Phys. Rev.*, **C 55**, 2314-2323 (1997).
20. A. Bakalyarov et al., *JETP Lett.*, **76**, 545-547 (2002).
21. C. Arpesella et al., *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)*, **70**, 249-251 (1999).
22. A.S. Barabash et al., *J. Phys.*, **G 22**, 487-496 (1996).
23. S. Stoica and I. Mihut, *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 602**, 197-210 (1996).
24. J. Suhonen et al., *Z. Phys.*, **A 358**, 297-301 (1997).
25. E. Bellotti et al., *Europhys. Lett*, **3**, 889-893 (1987).
26. A. Piepke et al., *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 577**, 493-510 (1994).
27. A.S. Barabash et al., *Z. Phys.*, **A 352**, 231-233 (1995).
28. A.S. Barabash, *Czech. J. Phys.*, **56**, 437-445 (2006).
29. J.G. Hirsch et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **C 51**, 2252-2255 (1995).
30. A.A. Klimenko et al., *Czech. J. Phys.*, **52**, 589-596 (2002).
31. A.S. Barabash et al., *Eur. Phys. J.*, **A 11**, 143-145 (2001).
32. T. Tomoda, *Phys. Lett.*, **B 474**, 245-250 (2000).
33. B. Maier, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)*, **35**, 358-362 (1994).
34. C. Arnaboldi et al., *Phys. Lett.*, **B 557**, 167-175 (2003).
35. F.A. Danevich et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **C 68**, 035501 (2003).
36. E. Bellotti et al., *J. Phys.*, **G 17**, S231-S241 (1991).
37. R. Arnold et al., *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 636**, 209-223 (1998).
38. J. Suhonen, *Phys. Rev.*, **C 62**, 042501 (2001).
39. F. Simkovic and A. Faessler, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, **48**, 201-209 (2002).
40. A. Morales et al., *Nuovo Cimento*, **A 100**, 525-551 (1988).
41. J. Suhonen, *Phys. Lett.*, **B 477**, 99-106 (2000).
42. J. Suhonen, *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 700**, 649-665 (2002).
43. J. Suhonen and M. Aunola, *Nucl. Phys.*, **A 723**, 271-288 (2003).
44. F. Simkovic et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **C 64**, 035501 (2001).
45. R.G. Winter, *Phys. Rev.*, **100**, 142-144 (1955).
46. M. Voloshin, G. Mizelmacher and R. Eramzhan, *JETP Lett.*, **35**, 656-658 (1982).