Title
New low-energy 0+ state and shape coexistence in Ni70

Journal
Physical Review C, 92(6)

ISSN
2469-9985

Authors
Prokop, CJ
Crider, BP
Liddick, SN
et al.

Publication Date
2015-12-01

DOI
10.1103/physrevc.92.061302

Peer reviewed

New low-energy 0^+ state and shape coexistence in ^{70}Ni

C. J. Prokop, B. P. Crider, S. N. Liddick, A. D. Ayangeakaa, M. P. Carpenter, J. J. Carroll, J. Chen, C. J. Chiara, H. M. David, A. C. Dombos, S. Go, J. Harker, R. V. F. Janssens, N. Larson, T. Lauritsen, R. Lewis, S. J. Quinn, F. Recchia, D. Seweryniak, A. Spyrou, S. Suchyta, W. B. Walters, and S. Zhu

ABSTRACT

In recent models, the neutron-rich Ni isotopes around $N=40$ are predicted to exhibit multiple low-energy excited 0^+ states attributed to neutron and proton excitations across both the $N=40$ and $Z=28$ shell gaps. In ^{68}Ni, the three observed 0^+ states have been interpreted in terms of triple shape coexistence between spherical, oblate, and prolate deformed shapes. In the present work a new (0^+_2)state at an energy of 1567 keV has been discovered in ^{70}Ni by using β-delayed, γ-ray spectroscopy following the decay of ^{70}Co. The precipitous drop in the energy of the prolate-deformed 0^+ level between ^{68}Ni and ^{70}Ni with the addition of two neutrons compares favorably with results of Monte Carlo shell-model calculations carried out in the large $fpg_{9/2}d_{5/2}$ model space, which predict a 0^+_2state at 1525 keV in ^{70}Ni. The result extends the shape-coexistence picture in the region to ^{70}Ni and confirms the importance of the role of the tensor component of the monopole interaction in describing the structure of neutron-rich nuclei.

- 
- 
- 

- Received 15 June 2015
- Revised 9 September 2015
- Corrected 28 December 2015

DOI:https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.92.061302

CORRECTIONS

28 December 2015

ERRATUM

Publisher's Note: New low-energy 0^+ state and shape coexistence in ^{70}Ni [Phys. Rev. C **92**, 061302(R) (2015)]

C. J. Prokop, B. P. Crider, S. N. Liddick, A. D. Ayangeakaa, M. P. Carpenter, J. J. Carroll, J. Chen, C. J. Chiara, H. M. David, A. C. Dombos, S. Go, J. Harker, R. V. F. Janssens, N. Larson, T. Lauritsen, R. Lewis, S. J. Quinn, F. Recchia, D. Seweryniak, A. Spyrou, S. Suchyta, W. B. Walters, and S. Zhu

Phys. Rev. C **93**, 019901 (2016)

AUTHORS & AFFILIATIONS

C. J. Prokop[1,2,*], B. P. Crider[1], S. N. Liddick[1,2], A. D. Ayangeakaa[3], M. P. Carpenter[3], J. J. Carroll[4], J. Chen[1], C. J. Chiara[5], H. M. David[3,†], A. C. Dombos[1,6], S. Go[7], J. Harker[3,8], R. V. F. Janssens[3], N. Larson[1,2], T. Lauritsen[3], R. Lewis[1,2], S. J. Quinn[1,6], F. Recchia[9], D. Seweryniak[3], A. Spyrou[1,6], S. Suchyta[10], W. B. Walters[8], and S. Zhu[3]

- [1]National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA
- [2]Department of Chemistry, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA
- [3]Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA
- [4]U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi, Maryland 20783, USA
- [5]Oak Ridge Associated Universities Fellowship Program, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi, Maryland 20783, USA
- [6]Department of Physics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA
- [7]Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
- [8]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
- [9]Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia, Università degli Studi di Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- [10]Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, USA
- [*]prokop@nscl.msu.edu
- [†]Present address: GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung, 64291 Darmstadt, Germany.

ARTICLE TEXT

Atomic nuclei display regular patterns as either the proton Z or neutron N number changes. Examples include properties such as the energy necessary to remove a pair of nucleons (protons or neutrons) from a nucleus and the excitation energy of the first 2^+ state in nuclei with even numbers of neutrons and protons. Such regularities eventually led to the establishment of the nuclear shell model wherein nucleons fill separate sets of single-particle states. The latter states cluster together in energy with large gaps between groups at characteristic nucleon numbers [1]: the so-called magic numbers. This nuclear shell structure is analogous to that observed in atomic systems responsible for the regular behavior of the chemical elements; e.g., the chemical inertness of the noble gases [2].

The shape of the nucleus, described by Bohr and Mottelson [3], also exhibits regularity with respect to the location of the shell gaps; near the gaps, nuclei are predominately spherical and more deformed shapes occur as a progression is made toward the middle of a shell. Transitions between spherical and deformed nuclei can occur rapidly as a function of neutron or proton number and have sometimes been used to infer the collapse of predicted shell closures [4] and the development of new ones [5].

Changes in shape can also occur within a single nucleus as a function of excitation energy, based on a redistribution of nucleons across a shell gap that can drive the nucleus toward deformation. Naively, the energy cost to promote a nucleon across the energy gap should be prohibitive, but residual proton-neutron interactions can provide an energy stabilization to offset the cost. When the energy gain obtained from the residual proton-neutron interactions is comparable to the magnitude of the shell gap, the probability of exciting an n-particle n-hole configuration increases and this excitation mode can drive the nucleus towards a deformed shape. Near a shell gap, in nuclei with even numbers of protons and neutrons, such excitations can give rise to multiple, low-energy 0^+ states often taken as a hallmark of shape coexistence. Shape coexistence occurs when two or more states with different underlying configurations of protons and/or neutrons associated with differing intrinsic shapes coexist at similar excitation energies [6]. Prominent examples of this type of shape coexistence can be found in both the Hg [7–9] and Sn [10–13] regions. In particular, ^{186}Pb exhibits triple shape coexistence between spherical, prolate, and oblate configurations, all located below 700 keV excitation energy [14].

The region around ^{68}Ni has recently been studied extensively, both experimentally and theoretically, and an overall picture of shape coexistence is progressively emerging. Three 0^+ states in $^{68}_{28}$Ni$_{40}$, at 0, 1604 [15,16], and 2511 keV [17] associated with multiple particle-hole excitations across Z=28 and N=40 [18,19], have been interpreted in terms of spherical, oblate, and prolate shapes based on comparisons with Monte Carlo shell-model (MCSM) calculations [15,20]. The presence of spherical-prolate shape coexistence in the lighter ^{66}Ni [21], as well as in ^{68}Ni [21,22], is also expected based on mean-field calculations. However, the mean-field and shell-model calculations have qualitatively different expectations for the presence of shape coexistence beyond N=40 in ^{70}Ni, with the former finding none and the latter suggesting that the prolate excitation occurs at lower excitation energy in ^{70}Ni than in ^{68}Ni. The key difference between the two sets of calculations can be traced to the role of the tensor component of the monopole interaction [23,24]. As neutrons are added from ^{68}Ni to ^{70}Ni, the occupancy of the $g_{9/2}$ orbital increases and alters the energy gap at Z=28, increasing the probability of proton particle-hole excitations across the gap. These proton excitations drive the nucleus toward a deformed shape, further enhancing the occupancy of the neutron $g_{9/2}$ orbital. As a result, when progressing to more neutron-rich Ni isotopes, only the more recent shell-model calculations have predicted an increase in the depth of the prolate potential well and a decrease in the energy of the associated 0^+ state [20]. Identification of a low-energy excited (0^+) state in ^{70}Nielevates the experimental evidence of shape coexistence in the Ni isotopes from its isolation to a single nucleus, ^{68}Ni, to a more general characteristic of the region and validates the importance of the tensor interaction.

In the present manuscript, a new (0^+) state in ^{70}Ni at 1567 keV is identified and is in agreement with recent theoretical predictions, expanding the picture of shape coexistence in the region. Excited states in ^{70}Ni were populated through the β decay of ^{70}Co at the National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory (NSCL). Ions of ^{70}Co were produced via projectile fragmentation on a ^{9}Be target of a ^{76}Geprimary beam at 130MeV/A. Fragments of interest were separated from other reaction products using the A1900 fragment separator [25] and transmitted to the experimental end station. This β-decay station consisted of a series of three silicon PIN detectors located approximately 1 m upstream of a central implantation detector. All incident ions were deposited 1 mm deep into a planar germanium double-sided strip detector (GeDSSD) [26] and identified event by event using standard ΔE-TOF techniques. The GeDSSD is electrically segmented into 16 5-mm strips on one side and 16 5-mm orthogonal strips on the other for a total of 256 pixels. The position and time of arrival of each ion was recorded and subsequent β-decay electrons were correlated with previously implanted ions using both spatial and temporal information. The GeDSSD was surrounded by 16 detectors of the segmented germanium array (SeGA) [27] arranged into two concentric rings of eight detectors each to record the β-delayed γ rays. All detectors were read out by using the NSCL digital data-acquisition system [28]. Absolute γ-ray efficiencies were determined by using a NIST-calibrated ^{154,155}Eu source and GEANT4 simulations [29] of the detection system.

The β-delayed, γ-ray spectra observed within two correlation windows of 0 to 500 and 500 to 1000 ms of the implantation of a ^{70}Co ion are given in Fig. 1. Many of the transitions labeled as belonging to ^{70}Ni have been seen previously in multinucleon-transfer reactions [30], in-beam γ-ray spectroscopy following secondary fragmentation [30], β decay [31,32], and isomeric decay studies [33]. Additional transitions were placed in ^{70}Ni based on correlated β-γ-γ coincidence relationships. Some additional γ rays associated with ^{69}Co,^{69}Ni, and ^{70}Zn are also observed in Fig. 1, indicated by black triangles, circles, and squares, respectively, due to the long correlation time taken for the present analysis. However, γ rays from these other implanted nuclei do not impact the present results.



FIG. 1

+Open in new window

Spectrum of β-delayed γ rays observed within (a) 0 to 500 ms and (b) 500 to 1000 ms of the arrival of a ^{70}Co ion at the experimental station. Gamma rays with black energy labels, such as the 448.5- and 969.7-keV γ rays, follow the β decay of the high-spin, short-lived ^{70}Co isomeric state, while γ rays with red energy labels, such as those at 307.5, 607.4, and 1866.4 keV, are associated with the decay of the low-spin, long-lived ^{70}Co isomer. For all transitions shown in red, their intensities relative to the 1259.0-keV γ ray increase from panel (a) to panel (b). Additional γ rays associated with ^{69}Co,^{69}Ni, and ^{70}Zn are also observed and are indicated by black triangles, circles, and squares, respectively.

There are two known isomeric states in ^{70}Co; a low-spin, long-lived state [31] and a high-spin, short-lived state [31,32,34,35]. The contributions of both isomeric decays are observed in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b)and assignment of γ rays to either the long- or short-lived ^{70}Co isomeric state is based on γ-gated β-decay curves. The 607.4- and 1866.4-keV γ rays are known from previous studies to be exclusive to the β decay of the low-spin, long-half-life isomeric state [31]. Many transitions are associated with the deexcitation of the high-spin, short-half-life isomeric state and the rapid decrease in peak area at longer correlation times is observed in Fig. 1(b). The 448.5- and 969.7-keV γ rays are marked in Fig. 1as examples. The 1259.0-keV γ ray is common to both decays.

The 307.5-keV γ ray, associated with the decay of the long-lived ^{70}Co isomer, has not been observed in previous ^{70}Ni studies and is placed in ^{70}Ni based on the γ-γ coincidence relationships. Figure 2presents a series of γ-γ coincidence spectra gated on the γ rays at (a) 307.5, (b) 607.4, (c) 969.7, (d) 1259.0, and (e) 1943.7 keV.



FIG. 2.

+Open in new window

Background-subtracted γ-γ coincidence spectra following the β decay of ^{70}Co within 2000 ms of the arrival of the ion. Spectra are gated on the (a) 307.5-, (b) 607.4-, (c) 969.7-, (d) 1259.0-, and (e) 1943.7-keV γ rays.

The γ rays in coincidence with the $2^+_1 \rightarrow 0^+_1$, 1259.0-keV γ ray are seen in Fig. 2(d). Strong coincidence relationships are observed at 969.7, 448.5, 607.4, 915.2, and 234.6 keV, which correspond to the $4^+_1 \rightarrow 2^+_1, 6^+_1 \rightarrow 4^+_1, 2^+_2 \rightarrow 2^+_1, (6^-_1) \rightarrow 6^+_1$, and $(5^-_1) \rightarrow 6^+_1$ transitions, respectively, where the spins and parities are adopted from the most recent ^{70}Ni level scheme by Chiara *et al.* [30]. A number of other γ rays are observed in Fig. 1 which depopulate higher-energy levels and will be detailed in a subsequent publication. However, the coincident γ rays at 307.5 and 1943.7 keV will be discussed separately below. The 640-keV γ ray observed previously [30] was not detected in coincidence with either the 1259.0- or the 607.4-keV, $2^+_2 \rightarrow 2^+_1$ transition [Fig. 2(b)] in the present work, suggesting that the known (4^+_2) state was not populated in the ^{70}Co β decay and could indicate that the long-lived β-decaying ^{70}Co isomer has a spin lower than three. Likewise, the known 8^+_1 isomer at 2861 keV [33] was not observed following ^{70}Co β decay, in agreement with results of earlier investigations [31,32]. Lastly, the 1259.0-keV γ ray was not observed to be self-coincident, as suggested in Ref. [31].

Gating on the 969.7-keV, $4^+_1 \rightarrow 2^+_1$ transition of the ground-state band leads to the coincidence spectrum of Fig. 2(c). Based on the number of counts in the 969.7-keV peak in the singles spectrum, the known ^{70}Ni level scheme, and the detector efficiency at 1259.0 keV, a total of 1158 ± 12 counts are expected at 1259.0 keV. The measured number of counts is 1130 ± 50. All other previously known coincident γ rays measured in the present analysis were checked in a similar manner and were found to be consistent with the known level scheme. This exercise confirms both our efficiency determination and the validity of the main portions of the ^{70}Ni, low-energy level scheme.

The strong 307.5-keV γ ray present in Fig. 1(a), and in the coincidence spectrum gated by the 1259.0-keV γ ray [Fig. 2(d)], is new to the current work. In Fig. 2(a), the gate on this 307.5-keV γ ray indicates a coincidence with a strong 1259.0-keV line and a weaker 1943.7-keV γ ray. The 1943.7-keV coincidence spectrum [Fig. 2(e)] also contains the 307.5- and 1259.0-keV γ rays. The former is not observed in coincidence with any of the other γ rays assigned to the decay of ^{70}Co in Fig. 1(a), suggesting that this 307.5-keV γ ray directly populates the 1259.0-keV, 2^+_1 state from a level at 1567 keV. There is no direct γ-ray emission from the latter level to the ground state, based on the absence of a detectable γ ray in the appropriate region of the β-delayed, γ-ray spectrum in Fig. 1, and on the lack of a 1567-keV γ ray in Fig. 2(e). The low-energy level scheme of ^{70}Ni, highlighting the decay of the long-lived ^{70}Co isomeric state, is shown in Fig. 3 (left). Gamma-ray intensities are relative to the 1259-keV transition.



FIG. 3.

+Open in new window

Simplified low-energy level scheme of ^{70}Ni populated in the decay of ^{70}Co, highlighting the decay of the long-lived ^{70}Co isomeric state (left). Experimentally observed transitions are labeled with their energy and intensity relative to the 1259-keV transition. Experimentally observed levels are labeled with excitation energies along with spins and parities and are compared to the predictions of the MCSM shown on the extreme right [30].

The relative intensities of the 307.5- and 1943.7-keV transitions strongly suggest the placement of the 1943.7-keV transition feeding the 1567-keV level. If the order of the 307.5- and 1943.7-keV transitions were reversed, a resulting 3203-keV state would have seven times more intensity feeding it than depopulating it. Furthermore, no γ rays are observed that could correspond to the deexcitation of such a 3203-keV state. The 3203-keV state could not be assigned a 0^+ spin and parity due to the absence of 511-keV γ rays coincident with the 307.5-keV transition. Therefore, the 1943.7-keV transition is placed as feeding the firmly established 1567-keV state in the revised ^{70}Ni level scheme of Fig. 3. The 1567-keV state is tentatively assigned a 0^+ spin and parity based on its association with the decay of the long-lived, low-spin isomeric state, its nonobservation in multinucleon transfer reactions populating yrast states [30], and the lack of a γ ray at 1567 keV in the β-delayed, γ-ray spectrum. In addition, an upper limit of 100 ns is placed on the lifetime of the 1567-keV state based on analysis of the time-difference spectra between β-decay electrons detected in the planar GeDSSD and the 307.5-keV γ rays detected in SeGA.

Low-energy 0^+ states are now known in both ^{68,70}Ni and the evolution of these states beyond $N=40$can be investigated. The two low-energy 0^+_2 and 0^+_3 states in ^{68}Ni are attributed to configurations associated predominately with two-particle, two-hole excitations across the $N=40$ and $Z=28$ gaps. The low-energy level structure of ^{68}Ni has been predicted numerous times (see Ref. [15] and references therein). However, only theoretical calculations utilizing the full $fpg_{9/2}d_{5/2}$ model space for both protons and neutrons, thereby allowing excitations across their respective energy gaps, can account for the presence of three 0^+ states in ^{68}Ni [18,20] at low excitation energy.

Other shell-model calculations with more restrictive model spaces that do not explicitly allow for proton excitations out of the $\pi f_{7/2}$ single-particle state fail to reproduce the energy of the 0^+_3 state [36–38]. A fourth 0^+ level at 2202 keV was briefly proposed experimentally [39], but subsequent investigations employing similar techniques have so far failed to support the claim [17] and such a fourth 0^+ state in ^{68}Ni is not suggested by theoretical calculations, either.

The MCSM [15] calculations with the A3DA [40] interaction further predict that the three 0^+ states in ^{68}Ni are characterized by different intrinsic deformations with the lowest-energy state being spherical, the 0^+_2 level having a slight oblate deformation, and the 0^+_3 state being associated with a large prolate deformation. The energy [15,16] and $E0$ decay [15] of the 0^+_2 state at 1604 keV in ^{68}Ni are consistent with the theoretical predictions of a slight oblate deformation. The 0^+_3 state in ^{68}Ni was confirmed by angular-correlation measurements at 2511 keV [17]. However, the $E0$ branching ratios from the prolate 0^+_3 to either the 0^+_2 or 0^+_1 states have not been directly observed, but the upper limit for the sum intensity has been placed at 4% [41].

The MCSM predictions for ^{70}Ni are included in Fig. 3 (right). Transitioning from ^{68}Ni to ^{70}Ni, the potential well which confines the prolate-deformed two-particle two-hole proton excitation is predicted to increase in depth [20], resulting in a concomitant drop in the energy of the predicted prolate 0^+ state from 2511 keV in ^{68}Ni to 1525 keV in ^{70}Ni. The energies of the 2^+_2 and 4^+_2 states, also associated with the prolate potential well, have been observed to drop for ^{70}Ni compared to ^{68}Ni [30]. This is explained by the increased occupancy of the $\nu g_{9/2}$ orbital in ^{70}Ni compared to ^{68}Ni. The attractive $\nu g_{9/2}$-$\pi f_{5/2}$ and repulsive $\nu g_{9/2}$-$\pi f_{7/2}$ monopole interactions of the tensor force alter the effective single-particle energies of the $\pi f_{7/2}$ and $\pi f_{5/2}$ single-particle states, thereby increasing the likelihood of excitations into the $\pi f_{5/2}$ state, the dominant proton excitation in the prolate-deformed 0^+ states in ^{68,70}Ni [20,30].

The energy of the tentative 0^+_2 state in ^{70}Ni of 1567 keV agrees with the theoretically predicted value, as observed in Fig. 3, further supporting its 0^+ assignment. The 2^+_2 level at 1866 keV and the 4^+_2 one at 2508 keV (not observed in the present work, but proposed in Ref. [30]) have already been suggested as members of a band built on the 0^+_2 state [30], but the 0^+_2 state itself had not yet been identified. Unfortunately, it was not possible to observe the $2^+_2 \rightarrow 0^+_2$ branch due to strong competition from the higher-energy $2^+_2 \rightarrow 0^+_1$ transition. Based on the predicted ratio of $B(E2, 2^+_2 \rightarrow 0^+_2)/B(E2, 2^+_2 \rightarrow 0^+_1)$ of 400 [30], the expected branching ratio of the $2^+_2 \rightarrow 0^+_2$ transition would be unobservable in the present experiment in the singles spectrum or in coincidence with the 1643.5-keV γ ray.

In conclusion, a new (0^+_2) state in ^{70}Ni, located at 1567 keV, has been discovered through β-decay spectroscopy at NSCL. The present experimental results are in good agreement with theoretical predictions by the MCSM with the A3DA interaction, which successfully reproduces the low-energy level scheme of ^{68}Ni. The predicted deepening of the prolate potential well from ^{68}Ni to ^{70}Ni is borne out experimentally based on the drop in energy of the excited (0^+) states. The observations support a picture of shape coexistence in the neutron-rich Ni isotopes, based on proton excitations across the $Z=28$ shell gap.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported in part by National Science Foundation (NSF) under contract No. PHY-1102511, by the Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) under Awards No. DE-NA0000979, No. DE-NA0002132, and No. DE-FG52-08NA28552, by the U.S Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, under Contract No. DE-AC-06CH11357 (ANL) and Grants No. DE-FG02-94ER40834 (Maryland) and No. DE-FG02-96ER40983 (UT), and by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory under Cooperative Agreement W911NF-12-2-0019.

REFERENCES

1. M. G. Mayer and J. H. D. Jensen, *Elementary Theory of Nuclear Shell Structure* (Wiley, 1955).
2. N. Bohr, Philos. Mag. **26**, 1 (1913).
3. A. Bohr and B. Mottelson, *Nuclear Structure* (Benjamin, 1975), II.
4. B. Bastin, S. Grévy, D. Sohler, O. Sorlin, Z. Dombrádi, N. L. Achouri, J. C. Angélique, F. Azaiez, D. Baiborodin, R. Borcea, C. Bourgeois, A. Buta, A. Bürger, R. Chapman, J. C. Dalouzy, Z. Dlouhy, A. Drouard, Z. Elekes, S. Franchoo, S. Iacob, B. Laurent, M. Lazar, X. Liang, E. Liénard, J. Mrazek, L. Nalpas, F. Negoita, N. A. Orr, Y. Penionzhkevich, Z. Podolyák, F. Pougheon, P. Roussel-Chomaz, M. G. Saint-Laurent, M. Stanoiu, I. Stefan, F. Nowacki, and A. Poves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 022503 (2007).
5. D. Steppenbeck, S. Takeuchi, N. Aoi, P. Doornenbal, M. Matsushita, M. Matsushita, H. Wang, H. Baba, N. Fukuda, S. Go, M. Honma, J. Lee, K. Matsui, S. Michimasa, T. Motobayashi, D. Nishimura, T. Otsuka, H. Sakurai, Y. Shiga, P.-A. Soderstrom, T. Sumikama, H. Suzuki, R. Taniuchi, Y. Utsuno, J. J. Valiente-Dobon, and K. Yoneda, Nature (London) **502**, 207 (2013).
6. K. Heyde and J. L. Wood, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 1467 (2011).
7. J. Bonn, G. Huber, H.-J. Kluge, L. Kugler, and E. Otten, Phys. Lett. B **38**, 308 (1972).
8. J. H. Hamilton, A. V. Ramayya, E. L. Bosworth, W. Lourens, J. D. Cole, B. Van Nooijen, G. Garcia-Bermudez, B. Martin, B. N. S. Rao, H. Kawakami, L. L. Riedinger, C. R. Bingham, F. Turner, E. F. Zganjar, E. H. Spejewski, H. K. Carter, R. L. Mlekodaj, W. D. Schmidt-Ott, K. R. Baker, R. W. Fink, G. M. Gowdy, J. L. Wood, A. Xenoulis, B. D. Kern, K. J. Hofstetter, J. L. Weil, K. S. Toth, M. A. Ijaz, and K. F. R. Faftry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 562 (1975).
9. J. D. Cole, J. H. Hamilton, A. V. Ramayya, W. G. Nettles, H. Kawakami, E. H. Spejewski, M. A. Ijaz, K. S. Toth, E. L. Robinson, K. S. R. Sastry, J. Lin, F. T. Avignone, W. H. Brantley, and P. V. G. Rao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 1185 (1976).
10. W. Dietrich, A. Bäcklin, C. Lannergård, and I. Ragnarsson, Nucl. Phys. A **253**, 429 (1975).
11. A. Bácklin, B. Fogelberg, and S. Malmskog, Nucl. Phys. A **96**, 539 (1967).
12. R. L. Auble, J. B. Ball, and C. B. Fulmer, Phys. Rev. **169**, 955 (1968).
13. J. Bron, W. Hesselink, A. V. Poelgeest, J. Zalmstra, M. Uitzinger, H. Verheul, K. Heyde, M. Waroquier, H. Vincx, and P. V. Isacker, Nucl. Phys. A **318**, 335 (1979).
14. A. N. Andreyev, M. Huyse, P. Van Duppen, L. Weissman, D. Ackermann, J. Gerl, F. P. Hessberger, S. Hofmann, A. Kleinbohl, G. Munzenberg, 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 (London) **405**, 430 (2000).

15. S. Suchyta, S. N. Liddick, Y. Tsunoda, T. Otsuka, M. B. Bennett, A. Chemey, M. Honma, N. Larson, C. J. Prokop, S. J. Quinn, N. Shimizu, A. Simon, A. Spyrou, V. Tripathi, Y. Utsuno, and J. M. VonMoss, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 021301 (2014).
16. F. Recchia, C. J. Chiara, R. V. F. Janssens, D. Weisshaar, A. Gade, W. B. Walters, M. Albers, M. Alcorta, V. M. Bader, T. Baugher, D. Bazin, J. S. Berryman, P. F. Bertone, B. A. Brown, C. M. Campbell, M. P. Carpenter, J. Chen, H. L. Crawford, H. M. David, D. T. Doherty, C. R. Hoffman, F. G. Kondev, A. Korichi, C. Langer, N. Larson, T. Lauritsen, S. N. Liddick, E. Lunderberg, A. O. Macchiavelli, S. Noji, C. Prokop, A. M. Rogers, D. Seweryniak, S. R. Stroberg, S. Suchyta, S. Williams, K. Wimmer, and S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. C **88**, 041302 (2013).
17. C. J. Chiara, R. Broda, W. B. Walters, R. V. F. Janssens, M. Albers, M. Alcorta, P. F. Bertone, M. P. Carpenter, C. R. Hoffman, T. Lauritsen, A. M. Rogers, D. Seweryniak, S. Zhu, F. G. Kondev, B. Fornal, W. Królas, J. Wrzesiński, N. Larson, S. N. Liddick, C. Prokop, S. Suchyta, H. M. David, and D. T. Doherty, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 041304 (2012).
18. S. M. Lenzi, F. Nowacki, A. Poves, and K. Sieja, Phys. Rev. C **82**, 054301 (2010).
19. D. Pauwels, J. L. Wood, K. Heyde, M. Huyse, R. Julin, and P. Van Duppen, Phys. Rev. C **82**, 027304 (2010).
20. Y. Tsunoda, T. Otsuka, N. Shimizu, M. Honma, and Y. Utsuno, Phys. Rev. C **89**, 031301 (2014).
21. P. Möller, A. Sierk, R. Bengtsson, H. Sagawa, and T. Ichikawa, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **98**, 149 (2012).
22. M. Girod, P. Dessagne, M. Bernas, M. Langevin, F. Pougheon, and P. Roussel, Phys. Rev. C **37**, 2600 (1988).
23. T. Otsuka, T. Suzuki, R. Fujimoto, H. Grawe, and Y. Akaishi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 232502 (2005).
24. T. Otsuka, T. Suzuki, M. Honma, Y. Utsuno, N. Tsunoda, K. Tsukiyama, and M. Hjorth-Jensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 012501 (2010).
25. D. Morrissey, B. Sherrill, M. Steiner, A. Stolz, and I. Wiedenhoever, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. B **204**, 90 (2003).
26. N. Larson, S. Liddick, M. Bennett, A. Bowe, A. Chemey, C. Prokop, A. Simon, A. Spyrou, S. Suchyta, S. Quinn, S. Tabor, P. Tai, V. Tripathi, and J. VonMoss, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **727**, 59 (2013).
27. W. Mueller, J. Church, T. Glasmacher, D. Gutknecht, G. Hackman, P. Hansen, Z. Hu, K. Miller, and P. Quirin, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **466**, 492 (2001).
28. C. Prokop, S. Liddick, B. Abromeit, A. Chemey, N. Larson, S. Suchyta, and J. Tompkins, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **741**, 163 (2014).
29. S. Agostinelli, J. Allison, K. Amako, J. Apostolakis, H. Araujo, P. Arce, M. Asai, D. Axen, S. Banerjee, G. Barrand, F. Behner, L. Bellagamba, J. Boudreau, L. Broglia, A. Brunengo, H. Burkhardt, S. Chauvie, J. Chuma,

R. Chytracek, G. Cooperman, G. Cosmo, P. Degtyarenko, A. Dell'Acqua, G. Depaola, D. Dietrich, R. Enami, A. Feliciello, C. Ferguson, H. Fesefeldt, G. Folger, F. Foppiano, A. Forti, S. Garelli, S. Giani, R. Giannitrapani, D. Gibin, J. G. Cadenas, I. González, G. G. Abril, G. Greeniaus, W. Greiner, V. Grichine, A. Grossheim, S. Guatelli, P. Gumplinger, R. Hamatsu, K. Hashimoto, H. Hasui, A. Heikkinen, A. Howard, V. Ivanchenko, A. Johnson, F. Jones, J. Kallenbach, N. Kanaya, M. Kawabata, Y. Kawabata, M. Kawaguti, S. Kelner, P. Kent, A. Kimura, T. Kodama, R. Kokoulin, M. Kossov, H. Kurashige, E. Lamanna, T. Lampén, V. Lara, V. Lefebure, F. Lei, M. Liendl, W. Lockman, F. Longo, S. Magni, M. Maire, E. Medernach, K. Minamimoto, P. M. de Freitas, Y. Morita, K. Murakami, M. Nagamatu, R. Nartallo, P. Nieminen, T. Nishimura, K. Ohtsubo, M. Okamura, S. O'Neale, Y. Oohata, K. Paech, J. Perl, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pia, F. Ranjard, A. Rybin, S. Sadilov, E. D. Salvo, G. Santin, T. Sasaki, N. Savvas, Y. Sawada, S. Scherer, S. Sei, V. Sirotenko, D. Smith, N. Starkov, H. Stoecker, J. Sulkimo, M. Takahata, S. Tanaka, E. Tcherniaev, E. S. Tehrani, M. Tropeano, P. Truscott, H. Uno, L. Urban, P. Urban, M. Verderi, A. Walkden, W. Wander, H. Weber, J. Wellisch, T. Wenaus, D. Williams, D. Wright, T. Yamada, H. Yoshida, and D. Zschiesche, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).

30. C. J. Chiara, D. Weisshaar, R. V. F. Janssens, Y. Tsunoda, T. Otsuka, J. L. Harker, W. B. Walters, F. Recchia, M. Albers, M. Alcorta, V. M. Bader, T. Baugher, D. Bazin, J. S. Berryman, P. F. Bertone, C. M. Campbell, M. P. Carpenter, J. Chen, H. L. Crawford, H. M. David, D. T. Doherty, A. Gade, C. R. Hoffman, M. Honma, F. G. Kondev, A. Korichi, C. Langer, N. Larson, T. Lauritsen, S. N. Liddick, E. Lunderberg, A. O. Macchiavelli, S. Noji, C. Prokop, A. M. Rogers, D. Seweryniak, N. Shimizu, S. R. Stroberg, S. Suchyta, Y. Utsuno, S. J. Williams, K. Wimmer, and S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. C **91**, 044309 (2015).
31. W. F. Mueller, B. Bruyneel, S. Franchoo, M. Huyse, J. Kurpeta, K. Kruglov, Y. Kudryavtsev, N. V. S. V. Prasad, R. Raabe, I. Reusen, P. Van Duppen, J. Van Roosbroeck, L. Vermeeren, L. Weissman, Z. Janas, M. Karny, T. Kszczot, A. Plochocki, K.-L. Kratz, B. Pfeiffer, H. Grawe, U. Köster, P. Thirolf, and W. B. Walters, Phys. Rev. C **61**, 054308 (2000).
32. M. Sawicka, R. Grzywacz, I. Matea, H. Grawe, M. Pfützner, J. M. Daugas, M. Lewitowicz, D. L. Balabanski, F. Becker, G. Bélier, C. Bingham, C. Borcea, E. Bouchez, A. Buta, M. La Commara, E. Dragulescu, G. de France, G. Georgiev, J. Giovinazzo, M. Górska, F. Hammache, M. Hass, M. Hellström, F. Ibrahim, Z. Janas, H. Mach, P. Mayet, V. Méot, F. Negoita, G. Neyens, F. de Oliveira Santos, R. D. Page, O. Perru, Zs. Podolyák, O. Roig, K. P. Rykaczewski, M. G. Saint-Laurent, J. E. Sauvestre, O. Sorlin, M. Stanoiu, I. Stefan, C. Stodel, Ch. Theisen, D. Verney, and J. Żylicz, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 044304 (2003).
33. R. Grzywacz, R. Béraud, C. Borcea, A. Emsallem, M. Glogowski, H. Grawe, D. Guillemaud-Mueller, M. Hjorth-Jensen, M. Houry, M.

Lewitowicz, A. C. Mueller, A. Nowak, A. Płochocki, M. Pfützner, K. Rykaczewski, M. G. Saint-Laurent, J. E. Sauvestre, M. Schaefer, O. Sorlin, J. Szerypo, W. Trinder, S. Viteritti, and J. Winfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 766 (1998).
34. O. Sorlin, C. Donzaud, F. Azaiez, C. Bourgeois, L. Gaudefroy, F. Ibrahim, D. Guillemaud-Mueller, F. Pougheon, M. Lewitowicz, F. de Oliveira Santos, M. Saint-Laurent, M. Stanoiu, S. Lukyanov, Y. Penionzhkevich, J. Angélique, S. Grévy, K.-L. Kratz, B. Pfeiffer, F. Nowacki, Z. Dlouhy, and J. Mrasek, Nucl. Phys. A **719**, C193 (2003).
35. F. Ameil, M. Bernas, P. Armbruster, S. Czajkowski, P. Dessagne, H. Geissel, E. Hanelt, C. Kozhuharov, C. Miehe, C. Donzaud, A. Grewe, A. Heinz, Z. Janas, M. de Jong, W. Schwab, and S. Steinhäuser, Eur. Phys. J. A **1**, 275 (1998).
36. A. F. Lisetskiy, B. A. Brown, M. Horoi, and H. Grawe, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 044314 (2004).
37. B. Cheal, E. Mané, J. Billowes, M. L. Bissell, K. Blaum, B. A. Brown, F. C. Charlwood, K. T. Flanagan, D. H. Forest, C. Geppert, M. Honma, A. Jokinen, M. Kowalska, A. Krieger, J. Krämer, I. D. Moore, R. Neugart, G. Neyens, W. Nörtershäuser, M. Schug, H. H. Stroke, P. Vingerhoets, D. T. Yordanov, and M. Žáková, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 252502 (2010).
38. M. Honma, T. Otsuka, T. Mizusaki, and M. Hjorth-Jensen, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 064323 (2009).
39. A. Dijon, E. Clément, G. de France, G. de Angelis, G. Duchêne, J. Dudouet, S. Franchoo, A. Gadea, A. Gottardo, T. Hüyük, B. Jacquot, A. Kusoglu, D. Lebhertz, G. Lehaut, M. Martini, D. R. Napoli, F. Nowacki, S. Péru, A. Poves, F. Recchia, N. Redon, E. Sahin, C. Schmitt, M. Sferrazza, K. Sieja, O. Stezowski, J. J. Valiente-Dobón, A. Vancraeyenest, and Y. Zheng, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 031301 (2012).
40. N. Shimizu, T. Abe, Y. Tsunoda, Y. Utsuno, T. Yoshida, T. Mizusaki, M. Honma, and T. Otsuka, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2012**, 01A205 (2012).
41. F. Flavigny, D. Pauwels, D. Radulov, I. J. Darby, H. De Witte, J. Diriken, D. V. Fedorov, V. N. Fedosseev, L. M. Fraile, M. Huyse, V. S. Ivanov, U. Köster, B. A. Marsh, T. Otsuka, L. Popescu, R. Raabe, M. D. Seliverstov, N. Shimizu, A. M. Sjödin, Y. Tsunoda, P. Van den Bergh, P. Van Duppen, J. Van de Walle, M. Venhart, W. B. Walters, and K. Wimmer, Phys. Rev. C **91**, 034310 (2015).