

Branching ratios of α -decay to excited states of even-even nuclei

Chang Xu¹ and Zhongzhou Ren^{1,2,3}

¹*Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210008, China*

²*Center of Theoretical Nuclear Physics,*

National Laboratory of Heavy-Ion Accelerator, Lanzhou 730000, China

³*CPNPC, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210008, China*

Abstract

We make a systematic calculation on α -decay branching ratios to members of ground-state rotational band and to excited 0^+ states of even-even nuclei by a simple barrier penetration approach. The branching ratios to the excited states of daughter nucleus are determined by the α -decay energy, the angular momentum of α -particle, and the excitation probability of the daughter nucleus. Our calculation covers isotopic chains from Hg to Fm in the mass regions $180 < A < 202$ and $A \geq 224$. The calculated branching ratios of α -transitions are consistent with the experimental data. Some useful predictions are made for future experiments.

PACS numbers: 23.60.+e, 21.10.Re

I. INTRODUCTION

The first successful application of quantum mechanics to nuclear physics problem is the theory of α -decay which was presented independently by Gamow and by Condon and Gurney in 1928 [1, 2]. Based on the Gamow theory, the experimental α -decay half-lives of nuclei can be well explained by both phenomenological and microscopic models [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Such α -decay calculations are mainly concentrated on the favored cases, *e.g.* the ground-state to ground-state α -transitions of even-even nuclei ($\Delta\ell=0$) [13, 14]. Besides the favored α -transitions, the ground-state of the parent nucleus can also decay to the excited states of the daughter nucleus ($\Delta\ell\neq 0$) [13]. Recently, there is increasing interest in two kinds of α -transitions of even-even nuclei from both experimental and theoretical sides, *i.e.* the α -decay to excited 0^+ states and to members of the ground-state rotational band [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. These α -transitions belong to the unfavored case, which are strongly hindered as compared with the ground-state ones. Theoretically, the hindered α -transition is an effective tool to study the properties of α -emitters because it is closely related to the internal structure of nuclei [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. However, it is very difficult to describe quantitatively the unfavored α -transitions due to the influence of both non-zero angular momentum and excitation of nucleons, especially for α -emitters in the neighborhood of the shell closures. Although the favored α -decay model can be straightforwardly applied to the unfavored α -transition, the calculated branching ratios usually deviate significantly from the experimental data. Considering the complexity of hindered α -decay, it is very interesting to find a simple way of explaining the available data of hindered α -decay based on the favored α -decay theory. Experimentally it is also very helpful to make theoretical predictions on unobserved hindered α -transitions for future studies.

The aim of this paper is to study the hindered α -transitions of even-even nuclei with mass numbers $180 < A < 202$ and $A \geq 224$. We apply a simple barrier penetration approach to calculate the branching ratios of α -decay based on the Gamow theory. The influence of the α -decay energy, the angular momentum of the α -particle, and the excitation probability of the daughter nucleus are properly taken into account. The outline of this paper is as follows. Section II is the framework of the barrier penetration approach. The numerical results and corresponding discussions are given in Section III. Section IV is a brief summary.

II. FORMALISM

Firstly, we start with the radial Schrödinger equation

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \frac{d^2\psi(r)}{dr^2} + [U(r) + \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{r^2}] \psi(r) = E\psi(r), \quad (1)$$

where the centrifugal potential $\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{r^2}$ is included in the Schrödinger equation and $U(r)$ is the standard square well potential

$$U(r) = \begin{cases} -U_0 & (r < R_0) \\ Z_1 Z_2 e^2 / r & (r \geq R_0). \end{cases} \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1: The standard square well potential of α -decay and the quantum-tunnelling effect of the α -particle.

The schematic representation of the square well potential is given in Fig.1. The α -particle in the parent nucleus is initially trapped within this square well potential and the corresponding wave function is denoted by ψ_I in Fig.1, *i.e.* the incoming wave function. Through quantum-tunnelling effect the α -particle is finally emitted from the parent nucleus and then characterized by the wave function of a free particle ψ_{III} , *i.e.* the outgoing wave function. The penetration probability of the α -particle through the Coulomb barrier is proportional to the square of the ratio between the outgoing and incoming wave functions. Using the well known WKB technique, one can obtain the penetration probability of the

α -particle [21]

$$P_\alpha(Q_\alpha, E_\ell^*, \ell) \propto \left| \frac{\psi_{III}}{\psi_I} \right|^2 = \exp\left[-2 \int_{R_0}^{R_{out}} k(r) dr\right], \quad (3)$$

with

$$k(r) = \sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\hbar^2} \left[\frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2}{r} + \frac{\hbar^2 \ell(\ell+1)}{2\mu r^2} - (Q_\alpha - E_\ell^*) \right]^\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4)$$

where Z_1 and Z_2 are the charge numbers of the α -particle and the daughter nucleus, respectively. μ is the reduced mass of the α -core system and ℓ is the angular momentum carried by the α -particle. Q_α is the decay energy of the ground-state transition and E_ℓ^* is the excitation energy of state ℓ . R_0 is the radius of the daughter nucleus ($R_0 = 1.2A_2^{1/3}$) and R_{out} is the outer classic turning point (see Fig.1).

In describing α -decay of heavy nuclei, the height of the centrifugal barrier at $r = R_0$ is generally very small compared with the Coulomb barrier [22]

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\hbar^2 \ell(\ell+1)}{2\mu R_0^2} : \frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2}{R_0}. \quad (5)$$

By expanding the wave number $k(r)$ in powers of the small quantity ε , the penetration probability can be written in a simple form [22]

$$P_\alpha(Q_\alpha, E_\ell^*, \ell) = \exp\left[-\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\hbar^2} \frac{Z_1 Z_2 e^2 \pi}{(Q_\alpha - E_\ell^*)^\frac{1}{2}}}\right] \times \exp\left[-\sqrt{\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \frac{2\ell(\ell+1)}{(Z_1 Z_2 e^2 R_0)^\frac{1}{2}}}\right], \quad (6)$$

where the first term represents the influence of the excitation energy E_ℓ^* on the penetration factor and the second term denotes the influence of the non-zero angular momentum ℓ . Historically, the separable form of the penetration factor (Eq.(6)) was first derived by Gamow [22] and then discussed by Rasmussen *et al.* [23]. Similar expression of the penetration factor is also given in the textbook of Bohr and Mottelson [24]. From Eq.(6), it is easy to find that the penetration probability of the α -particle reaches maximum value when both the excitation energy E_ℓ^* and the angular momentum ℓ are zero, *i.e.* the α -transition to the ground-state of the daughter nucleus. This is in accord with the experimental fact that the ground-state branching ratio of α -decay is the largest for all even-even α -emitters [13]. The residual daughter nucleus after disintegration has the most probability to stay in its ground state, and the probability to stay in its excited state is relatively much smaller. Therefore it is a reasonable assumption that the probability of the residual daughter nucleus to stay in its excited states ($I^+=2^+, 4^+, 6^+, \dots$) obeys the Boltzmann distribution

$$w_\ell(E_\ell^*) = \exp[-cE_\ell^*], \quad (7)$$

where E_ℓ^* is the excitation energy of state ℓ and c is a free parameter. We include the excitation probability function (Eq.(7)) in our approach. The value of parameter c is fixed to 1.5 in present calculation. This means that only a single parameter is introduced in the whole calculation. It is stressed that the inclusion of the excitation probability is reasonable in physics and it can lead to good agreement between experiment and theory. Here we define $I_{\ell+}$ as the product of the penetration factor and the excitation probability

$$I_{\ell+} = w_\ell(E_\ell^*)P_\alpha(Q_\alpha, E_\ell^*, \ell), \quad (8)$$

which denotes the total probability of α -transition from the ground-state of the parent nucleus to the excited state ℓ^+ of the daughter nucleus. It is written in a very accessible style of three exponential factors which contain the essential theory of α -decay. It is very convenient to estimate the influence of these factors on the hindered α -transitions from $I_{\ell+}$. With the help of $I_{\ell+}$, the branching ratios of α -decay to each state of the rotational band of the daughter nucleus can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} b_{g.s.}^{0+} \% &= I_{0+}/(I_{0+} + I_{2+} + I_{4+} + I_{6+} + \dots) \times 100\% \\ b_{e.s.}^{2+} \% &= I_{2+}/(I_{0+} + I_{2+} + I_{4+} + I_{6+} + \dots) \times 100\% \\ b_{e.s.}^{4+} \% &= I_{4+}/(I_{0+} + I_{2+} + I_{4+} + I_{6+} + \dots) \times 100\% \\ &\dots \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Similarly, the branching ratio of α -decay to the excited 0^+ state of the daughter nucleus is given by

$$b_{e.s.}^{0+} \% = b_{g.s.}^{0+} \% \times \frac{w_0(E_0^*)}{w_0(0)} \frac{P_\alpha(Q_\alpha, E_0^*, 0)}{P_\alpha(Q_\alpha, 0, 0)}, \quad (10)$$

where $b_{g.s.}^{0+} \%$ is the branching ratio of α -transition between the ground states. It can be further simplified because the angular momentum carried by the α -particle is zero

$$b_{e.s.}^{0+} \% = b_{g.s.}^{0+} \% \times \exp[-cE_\ell^*] \times \exp\left\{\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\hbar^2}} Z_1 Z_2 e^2 \pi \left[\frac{1}{Q_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{1}{(Q_\alpha - E_\ell^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right]\right\}. \quad (11)$$

The α -transition to the excited 0^+ state of the daughter nucleus does not involve the change of angular momentum ℓ , which is an ideal case for theoretical studies of hindered α -transitions.

Here we would like to mention that the derivation of the above formulas starts with a square well potential, which is a rough approximation of the real potential between the

α -particle and the daughter nucleus. In principle, the nuclear and Coulomb potentials determining the α -decay process should be very smooth and not peaked. Actually more realistic potentials have been widely used to describe the decay properties of a large number of nuclei. For instance, Royer has made a systematic calculation on the α -decay half-lives by the generalized liquid drop model (GLDM) [8]. The important proximity energy is properly included due to the attractive forces in the neck and the gap between the two close fragments [8]. The obtained α -decay barrier is more realistic as compared with the pure Coulomb barrier [8]. We also systematically calculated the favored α -decay half-lives with a double-folding potential in the framework of the density-dependent cluster model (DDCM) [11, 12]. The nuclear potential from the double-folding formalism is also microscopic because it correctly includes the low-density behavior of the nucleon-nucleon interaction and guarantees the antisymmetrization of identical particles in the α -cluster and in the core [11, 12]. In present study, we are interested in calculating the α -decay branching ratio to the rotational members and to the excited 0^+ states. To simplify the above problem, we assume that the nuclear potential vanishes outside the radius of the daughter nucleus R_0 (see Fig.1) by using a square well potential. However, it is expected that the final expression is not very sensitive to the form of the nuclear potential. This is due to the magnitude of the branching ratio is determined by the proportion of the total penetration factors between the excited and ground states ($b_{e.s.}^{\ell^+} = b_{g.s.}^{0^+} I_{\ell^+} / I_{0^+}$). In this situation, the influence of the non-vanishing nuclear potential on the branching ratio can be approximately cancelled in calculations. This is also different from the studies of α -decay half-lives where the details of the nuclear potential become very important (decay width $\lambda \propto I_{\ell^+}$). It is considered that the present approximation with a square well potential will not affect the final results of the branching ratios significantly.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The α -transitions to members of the ground-state rotational band are systematically calculated for well deformed nuclei with $Z \geq 90$. The systematic calculation on α -decay branching ratios to the rotational band is rare because some data of the excited states have been obtained very recently [13]. Experimentally it is known that the ground-state of the even-even actinides mainly decays to the 0^+ and 2^+ states of their daughter nucleus [13].

The sum of branching ratios to the 0^+ and 2^+ states is as large as 99% in many cases. The α -transitions to other members of the rotational band ($I^+=4^+, 6^+, 8^+ \dots$) are strongly hindered. This is different from the α -transition to the ground or excited 0^+ state where the angular momentum carried by the α -particle is zero ($\Delta\ell=0$). Here the influence of the non-zero angular momentum should be included for $\Delta\ell\neq 0$ transitions. In Fig.2–Fig.4, we give three typical figures for α -decay fine structure of ^{238}Pu , ^{242}Cm and ^{246}Cf . The α -decay branching ratios of ^{238}Pu and ^{242}Cm have been measured up to 8^+ state of the rotational band, and the branching ratio of ^{246}Cf has been measured up to 6^+ state in experiment. It is shown in these figures that the calculated values agree with the experimental ones for both the low-lying states (0^+ , 2^+) and the high-lying ones (6^+ , 8^+), however, the calculated branching ratio to 4^+ state is slightly larger than the experimental one. Let us take the α -decay of ^{238}Pu as an example to illustrate the discrepancy of branching ratio to 4^+ state. From Fig.2, we can see that the proportion between the experimental branching ratios of 2^+ and 4^+ states is $b_{e.s.}^{4^+}/b_{e.s.}^{2^+}=28.98\%/0.105\%\approx 276$, but the proportion between the branching ratios of 4^+ and 6^+ states is only $0.105\%/0.0030\%\approx 35$ and the proportion between 6^+ and 8^+ states is also small $0.0030\%/(6.8\times 10^{-5}\%)\approx 44$. Thus the proportion of $b_{e.s.}^{4^+}/b_{e.s.}^{2^+}$ is very large as compared with those of other rotational members. This shows that the variation of the experimental branching ratios is not very smooth. On the contrary, our calculated branching ratios vary smoothly for different excited states and this leads to the slight disagreement between theory and data for 4^+ state. Besides the calculation of decay chain $^{246}\text{Cf}\rightarrow^{242}\text{Cm}\rightarrow^{238}\text{Pu}$, we have also calculated the branching ratios of ground-state rotational band for even-mass α -emitters $^{224-230}\text{Th}$, $^{228-238}\text{U}$, $^{236-244}\text{Pu}$, $^{240-248}\text{Cm}$, $^{240-252}\text{Cf}$ and $^{250-254}\text{Fm}$. The discrepancy in describing 4^+ state also exists for these even-even α -emitters in our calculation. We call this as the abnormality of 4^+ state in α -decay for convenience. It is very interesting to pursue this by performing more microscopic calculation in future. Nevertheless, the overall agreement of branching ratios to the rotational band of these nuclei is acceptable in present study.

We also perform a systematic calculation on the unfavored α -decays to the excited 0^+ states of even-even α -emitters in the actinide region. Table I gives the experimental and calculated branching ratios of α -transition to the excited 0^+ states for even-mass isotopes of Th, U, Pu, and Cm. The experimental ground-state branching ratio ($b_{g.s.}^{0^+}$) is used and its variation ranges mainly from 67.4% to 77.9% for different nuclei in this region

	^{238}Pu	
	$0^+ \quad Q_\alpha = 5.593$	
8^+	0.497	$6.8 \times 10^{-6}\%$ $14.1 \times 10^{-6}\%$
6^+	0.296	0.0030% 0.0093%
4^+	0.143	0.105% 1.06%
2^+	0.043	28.98% 21.52%
0^+	0.000	70.91% 77.41%
^{234}U	Expt.	Calc.

FIG. 2: The α -decay to the rotational band of the ground-state of ^{238}Pu .

	^{242}Cm	
	$0^+ \quad Q_\alpha = 6.216$	
8^+	0.513	$2.0 \times 10^{-5}\%$ $3.2 \times 10^{-5}\%$
6^+	0.303	0.0031% 0.0152%
4^+	0.146	0.035% 1.333%
2^+	0.044	25.0% 22.7%
0^+	0.000	74.0% 76.0%
^{238}Pu	Expt.	Calc.

FIG. 3: The α -decay to the rotational band of the ground-state of ^{242}Cm .

[13]. However, the variation of the experimental branching ratio to the excited 0^+ state is relatively much larger and its amplitude is as high as $0.0006\% / (5.1 \times 10^{-7}\%) \approx 10^3$ times (see Table I). Therefore it is a challenging task to obtain a quantitative agreement between experiment and theory. Unexpectedly, our simple barrier penetration model with only one free parameter yields results in good agreement with the experimental data. From the last two columns of Table I, we can see that the calculated branching ratios are very close to

$0^+ \text{ } ^{246}\text{Cf}$		
$Q_\alpha = 6.862$		
6^+	0.284	← 0.016% 0.032%
4^+	0.138	← 0.150% 1.82%
2^+	0.042	← 20.6% 24.3%
0^+	0.000	← 79.3% 73.9%
^{242}Cm		Expt. Calc.

FIG. 4: The α -decay to the rotational band of the ground-state of ^{246}Cf .

the experimental ones. The experimental data are generally reproduced within a factor of 2 except for the case of ^{234}U . The calculated value of ^{234}U is ten times larger than the experimental data and we denote this abnormally large value by symbol * in Table I. We notice that the excitation energy $E_{0^+}^*$ in the decay of ^{234}U is significantly lower than those of neighboring nuclei. Besides the first excited 0^+ state, the α -transitions to the second excited 0^+ state have also been observed in experiment for some nuclei, such as ^{238}Pu and ^{242}Cm . Our calculated branching ratios also agree with the experimental ones in these cases. In Table I, the experimental branching ratios to the first excited 0^+ state have not been measured yet for nuclei ^{232}Th , ^{236}U , and ^{242}Pu [13]. We list the corresponding predicted values for these nuclei in Table I. Meanwhile, the predicted branching ratio to the second excited 0^+ state in decay of ^{244}Cm is also given in Table I. It is very interesting to compare these theoretical predictions with future experimental observations.

In Table II, we list the experimental and calculated branching ratios to the excited 0^+ states for even-mass isotopes of Rn, Po, Pb and Hg. The hindered transitions ($\Delta\ell=0$) of these nuclei involve complex particle-hole excitations above or below the closed shell $Z=82$ [25]. Although the situation becomes more complicated, it is seen from Table II that the experimental results are reasonably reproduced by the simple barrier penetration model. The α -decay energies, the ground-state branching ratios, and the excitation energies of the nuclei in Table II are taken from the experimental values given by Wauters *et al.* [15]

TABLE I: Experimental and calculated branching ratios of α -decay to the excited 0^+ states of the daughter nucleus. Q_α is the ground-state α -decay energy and $b_{g.s.}^{0+}\%$ is the branching ratio of α -decay to the ground state of the daughter nucleus. $E_{0^+}^*$ is the excitation energy of the excited 0^+ state. $b_{e.s.}^{0+}\%$ is the corresponding experimental or theoretical α -decay branching ratio.

Nuclei	Q_α (MeV)	$b_{g.s.}^{0+}\%$ (Expt.)	$E_{0^+}^*$ (MeV)	$b_{e.s.}^{0+}\%$ (Expt.)	$b_{e.s.}^{0+}\%$ (Calc.)
^{226}Th	6.452	75.5%	0.914	0.00034%	0.00040%
^{228}Th	5.520	71.1%	0.916	$1.8 \times 10^{-5}\%$	$1.6 \times 10^{-5}\%$
^{230}Th	4.770	76.3%	0.825	$3.4 \times 10^{-6}\%$	$3.2 \times 10^{-6}\%$
^{232}Th	4.083	77.9%	0.721	#	$7.1 \times 10^{-7}\%$
^{230}U	5.993	67.4%	0.805	0.00030%	0.00042%
^{232}U	5.414	68.0%	0.832	$2.2 \times 10^{-5}\%$	$3.6 \times 10^{-5}\%$
^{234}U	4.859	71.4%	0.635	$2.6 \times 10^{-5}\%$	0.00025%*
^{236}U	4.572	73.8%	0.730	#	$7.5 \times 10^{-6}\%$
^{236}Pu	5.867	69.3%	0.691	0.0006%	0.0016%
$^{238}\text{Pu}^1$	5.593	70.9%	0.810	$5 \times 10^{-5}\%$	$8 \times 10^{-5}\%$
$^{238}\text{Pu}^2$	5.593	70.9%	1.045	$1.2 \times 10^{-6}\%$	$0.9 \times 10^{-6}\%$
^{240}Pu	5.256	72.8%	0.919	$6.3 \times 10^{-7}\%$	$2.3 \times 10^{-6}\%$
^{242}Pu	4.983	77.5%	0.926	#	$4.8 \times 10^{-7}\%$
$^{242}\text{Cm}^1$	6.216	74.0%	0.942	$5.2 \times 10^{-5}\%$	$5.6 \times 10^{-5}\%$
$^{242}\text{Cm}^2$	6.216	74.0%	1.229	$5.1 \times 10^{-7}\%$	$3.8 \times 10^{-7}\%$
$^{244}\text{Cm}^1$	5.902	76.4%	0.861	$1.55 \times 10^{-4}\%$	$0.81 \times 10^{-4}\%$
$^{244}\text{Cm}^2$	5.902	76.4%	1.089	#	$1.2 \times 10^{-6}\%$

represents the cases where the experimental branching ratio is still unknown.

* denotes the cases where the calculated branching ratio deviates from the experimental one.

and by Andreyev *et al.* [16]. It is found that the calculated branching ratios of ^{202}Rn , $^{190,194-198}\text{Po}$, ^{188}Pb and $^{182,184}\text{Hg}$ are consistent with the experimental data. For ^{186}Pb and ^{180}Hg , the calculated values slightly deviate from the experimental ones. The agreement may be further improved by taking into account nuclear deformations and shape changes in these nuclei [25].

TABLE II: The same as Table I, but for even isotopes of Rn, Po, Pb and Hg. The experimental data of ^{180}Hg – ^{202}Rn are taken from Ref.[15]. The experimental data of ^{190}Po are taken from Ref.[16].

Nuclei	Q_α (MeV)	$b_{g.s.}^{0+}$ %(Expt.)	E_{0+}^* (MeV)	$b_{e.s.}^{0+}$ %(Expt.)	$b_{e.s.}^{0+}$ %(Calc.)
^{202}Rn	6.775	(80–100)%	0.816	$(1.4-1.8)\times 10^{-3}\%$	$(5.4-6.7)\times 10^{-3}\%$
^{198}Po	6.307	57%	0.931	$7.6\times 10^{-4}\%$	$3.4\times 10^{-4}\%$
^{196}Po	6.657	94%	0.769	$2.1\times 10^{-2}\%$	$1.1\times 10^{-2}\%$
^{194}Po	6.986	93%	0.658	0.22%	$7.3\times 10^{-2}\%$
^{188}Pb	6.110	(3–10)%	0.375	$(2.9-9.5)\times 10^{-2}\%$	$(2.9-9.7)\times 10^{-2}\%$
^{186}Pb	6.474	<100%	0.328	<0.20%	2.4%*
^{184}Hg	5.658	1.25%	0.478	$2.0\times 10^{-3}\%$	$1.9\times 10^{-3}\%$
^{182}Hg	5.997	8.6%	0.422	$2.9\times 10^{-2}\%$	$4.4\times 10^{-2}\%$
^{180}Hg	6.257	33%	0.443	$2.6\times 10^{-2}\%$	0.18%*
$^{190}\text{Po}^1$	7.695	96.4%	0.532	3.3%	$6.4\times 10^{-1}\%$
$^{190}\text{Po}^2$	7.695	96.4%	0.650	0.3%	0.2%

* denotes the cases where the calculated branching ratio deviates from the experimental one.

IV. SUMMARY

To conclude, we apply a simple barrier penetration approach to calculate α -decay branching ratios of even-even nuclei with mass numbers $180 < A < 202$ and $A \geq 224$. We improve the original α -decay formula by taking into account the excitation probability of the residual daughter nucleus. The calculated branching ratios to the rotational band of the ground state of even-even actinides are consistent with the experimental data. The abnormal deviation of branching ratios to 4^+ state is a common phenomenon in present calculation and deserves further analysis. The calculated branching ratios to the first and second excited 0^+ states of the daughter nucleus are also in agreement with the available experimental values. Some predicted branching ratios are given for the cases where the experimental values are still unknown. It is hoped that our present barrier penetration approach will serve as a good starting point for the microscopic study of α -decay phenomenon.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.10125521, No.10535010) and by 973 National Major State Basic Research and Development of China (No.G2000077400).

- [1] G. Gamov, *Z. Phys.* 51 (1928) 204.
- [2] E. U. Condon and R. W. Gurney, *Nature* 122 (1928) 439.
- [3] V. E. Viola and G. T. Seaborg, *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem.* 28 (1966) 741.
- [4] D. N. Poenaru and M. Ivascu, *J. Phys.* 44 (1983) 791.
- [5] Y. Hatsukawa, H. Nakahara and D. C. Hoffman, *Phys. Rev. C* 42 (1990) 674.
- [6] B. A. Brown, *Phys. Rev. C* 46 (1992) 811.
- [7] B. Buck, A. C. Merchant, and S. M. Perez, *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* 54 (1993) 53.
- [8] G. Royer, *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.* 26 (2000) 1149.
- [9] V. Yu. Denisov and H. Ikezoe, *Phys. Rev. C* 72 (2005) 064613.
- [10] P. Mohr, *Phys. Rev. C* 73 (2006) 031301(R).
- [11] Chang Xu and Zhongzhou Ren, *Phys. Rev. C* 73 (2006) 041301(R).
- [12] Chang Xu and Zhongzhou Ren, *Phys. Rev. C* 74 (2006) 014304.
- [13] R. B. Firestone, V. S. Shirley, C. M. Baglin, S. Y. Frank Chu and J. Zipkin, *Table of Isotopes*, 8th ed. Wiley Interscience, New York, 1996.
- [14] P. Möller, J. R. Nix and K. -L. Kratz, *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* 66 (1997) 131.
- [15] J. Wauters, N. Bijmens, P. Dendooven, M. Huyse, H. Y. Hwang, G. Reusen, J. von Schwarzenberg, P. Van Duppen, R. Kirchner and E. Roeckl, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 72 (1994) 1329.
- [16] A. N. Andreyev, M. Huyse, P. Van Duppen, L. Weissman, D. Ackermann, J. Gerl, F. P. Heßberger, S. Hofmann, A. Kleinböhl, G. Münzenberg, S. Reshitko, C. Schlegel, H. Schaffner, P. Cagarda, M. Matos, S. Saro, A. Keenan, C. Moore, C. D. O’Leary, R. D. Page, M. Taylor, H. Kettunen, M. Leino, A. Lavrentiev, R. Wyss and K. Heyde, *Nature* 405 (2000) 430.
- [17] J. D. Richards, C. R. Bingham, Y. A. Akovali, J. A. Becker, E. A. Henry, P. Joshi, J. Kormicki, P. F. Mantica, K. S. Toth, J. Wauters and E. F. Zganjar, *Phys. Rev. C* 56 (1996) 2041.
- [18] D. S. Delion, A. Florescu, M. Huyse, J. Wauters, P. Van Duppen (ISOLDE Collaboration), A.

- Insolia and R. J. Liotta, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 3939.
- [19] D. Karlgren, R. J. Liotta, R. Wyss, M. Huyse, K. Van de Vel and P. Van Duppen, Phys. Rev. C 73 (2006) 064304.
- [20] M. Asai, K. Tsukada, S. Ichikawa, M. Sakama, H. Haba, I. Nishinaka, Y. Nagame, S. Goto, Y. Kojima, Y. Oura and M. Shibata, Phys. Rev. C 73 (2006) 067301.
- [21] Chang Xu and Zhongzhou Ren, Nucl. Phys. A753 (2005) 174; A760 (2005) 303.
- [22] G. Gamov and C. L. Critchfield, Theory of atomic nucleus and nuclear energy-sources, Vol. III, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1949.
- [23] J. O. Rasmussen, in Alpha-, Beta-, and Gamma-Ray Spectroscopy, Vol. I, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1965.
- [24] A. Bohr and B. R. Mottelson, Nuclear Structure, Vol. II, World Scientific, Singapore, 1998.
- [25] J. L. Wood, K. Heyde, W. Nazarewicz, M. Huyse and P. van Duppen, Phys. Rep. 215 (1992) 101.