

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

## Precision half-life measurement of $^{25}\text{Al}$

J. Long, T. Ahn, J. Allen, D. W. Bardayan, F. D. Becchetti, D. Blankstein, M. Brodeur, D. Burdette, B. Frentz, M. R. Hall, J. M. Kelly, J. J. Kolata, P. D. O'Malley, B. E. Schultz, S. Y. Strauss, and A. A. Valverde

Phys. Rev. C **96**, 015502 — Published 12 July 2017

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.96.015502](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.96.015502)

# Precision half-life measurement of $^{25}\text{Al}$

J. Long,<sup>1,\*</sup> T. Ahn,<sup>1</sup> J. Allen,<sup>1</sup> D.W. Bardayan,<sup>1</sup> F.D. Becchetti,<sup>2</sup> D. Blankstein,<sup>1</sup> M. Brodeur,<sup>1</sup> D. Burdette,<sup>1</sup> B. Frentz,<sup>1</sup> M.R. Hall,<sup>1</sup> J.M. Kelly,<sup>1</sup> J.J. Kolata,<sup>1</sup> P.D. O'Malley,<sup>1</sup> B.E. Schultz,<sup>1</sup> S.Y. Strauss,<sup>1</sup> and A.A. Valverde<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556 USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Physics Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA*

(Dated: March 20, 2017)

A new precision half-life measurement of  $^{25}\text{Al}$  was conducted using the *TwinSol*  $\beta$ -counting station at the University of Notre Dame. The new measured value of  $t_{1/2}^{new} = 7.1657(24)$  s is in good agreement with the most recent measurement, while being 3 times more precise. Using these new measurements, an evaluation of the  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life has been performed, leading to an average half-life of  $t_{1/2}^{world} = 7.1665(26)$  s, which is 5 times more precise than its predecessor and has a more satisfactory Birge ratio of 1.1. To aid in future measurements of correlation parameters, a new Fermi to Gamow-Teller mixing ratio  $\rho$  and correlation parameters for this mixed transition have been calculated assuming Standard Model validity using the new world half-life.

PACS numbers: 21.10.Tg, 23.40.-s, 24.80.+y

## I. INTRODUCTION

Precision measurements provide a key window into the nature of the forces at play in the nucleus. These measurements not only allow for further constraint of a number of theories and models of the nuclear interaction [1], but also provide a test of the electroweak sector of the Standard Model (SM) [2]. One means of probing the SM is through the unitarity test of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark-mixing matrix [3]. Currently, the most precise unitarity test is performed by taking the sum of the magnitudes of the squares of the three matrix elements in the top row ( $V_{ud}$ ,  $V_{us}$ ,  $V_{ub}$ ). Among the three elements entering the sum, only  $V_{ud}$  and  $V_{us}$  play critical roles for the unitarity test [4]. Even though the current best values for these elements are consistent with CKM unitarity [4], there are a number of experimental [5, 6] and theoretical efforts [7, 8] centered on ensuring the reliability of every component entering into the unitarity test, including the determination of  $V_{ud}$  since its extracted value has shifted in the past due to more precise measurements [9].

The  $V_{ud}$  element can be determined from four types of decay studies: pion decay, neutron decay, superallowed mixed  $\beta$  decay, and superallowed pure Fermi  $\beta$  decay transitions [3]. Of these four, studies of superallowed pure Fermi decays currently yield the most precise value of  $V_{ud}$  [3]. Despite the high precision achieved from pure Fermi transitions, there is a growing interest to obtain more precise  $V_{ud}$  measurements from the other types of decays to test the accuracy of the pure Fermi value [10]. As such, superallowed mixed decays are particularly interesting as they provide another opportunity to test the conserved vector current (CVC) hypothesis [11]. If an apparent violation of the CVC hypothesis is found in mirror transitions, which is respected in pure Fermi transitions,

it could be due to either unaccounted systematic errors in a given measurement, inappropriate isospin symmetry breaking corrections being applied to individual members of the data set, or to new physics beyond the SM. Furthermore, since the same calculation methods are used to determine  $\delta_c$ , the isospin symmetry-breaking correction, in pure Fermi transitions, measurements in mirror transitions would also make interpretation of the pure Fermi data set more robust.

To extract  $V_{ud}$  from either pure Fermi or mirror transitions requires measurements of the half-life, branching ratio, and  $Q_{EC}$ -value [12]. To obtain  $V_{ud}$  from the mirror transitions additionally requires the more challenging determination of the Fermi to Gamow-Teller mixing ratio  $\rho$ , which is only characterized for five transitions [10]. All five of these nuclei are consistent, respecting CVC hypothesis, while their average [10], is within  $1.3\sigma$  from the pure Fermi transition values [3]. The mixing ratio has been derived from measurements of one of the following three correlation parameters: the beta asymmetry parameter  $A_\beta$ , the neutrino asymmetry parameter  $B_\nu$ , and the beta-neutrino asymmetry angular correlation parameter  $a_{\beta\nu}$  [10]. Recent efforts to determine the mixing ratio  $\rho$  in mirror transition nuclei include a polarization measurement on  $^{37}\text{K}$  in anticipation of a measurement of  $A_\beta$  at the TRINAT experiment of TRIUMF [13]. Another effort is the Versatile Ion-polarized Techniques online (VITO) [14] at ISOLDE, which aims at measuring  $A_\beta$  in  $^{35}\text{Ar}$  [15], as well as in  $^{21}\text{Na}$  and  $^{23}\text{Mg}$  in the future [16]. Likewise, the LPCtrap experiment [17] at GANIL plans to measure  $a_{\beta\nu}$  precisely in  $^{19}\text{Ne}$  and  $^{35}\text{Ar}$  [18]. Finally a new ion trapping experiment is currently being planned at the Nuclear Science Laboratory (NSL) of the University of Notre Dame [19]. Simultaneously, a new precision half-life measurement program on mirror transitions has also begun at the NSL [20]. As part of these efforts, several new radioactive ion beams are currently being developed and separated using the Twin Solenoid (*TwinSol*) separator [21]. Of the nuclei most recently produced,  $^{25}\text{Al}$ , a nucleus that decays by such a super-

---

\* jlong10@nd.edu

allowed mixed decay, is of particular interest as its half-life is derived from a series of conflicting measurements, each of which is over 40 years old [12]. Hence, to clarify the disagreement, and provide a more reliable lifetime, a precision half-life measurement on  $^{25}\text{Al}$  has recently been performed at the NSL and is reported here.

## II. EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

The radioactive ion beam (RIB) of  $^{25}\text{Al}$  was produced using transfer reactions in inverse kinematics of a  $^{24}\text{Mg}^{8+}$  ion beam onto a deuterium gas target via the  $^{24}\text{Mg}(d,n)$  reaction. To produce the primary beam, a MgCu - TiH cathode was used in the NSL cesium sputtering ion source (SNICS) to create  $\text{MgH}^-$  molecules. These negatively ionized molecules were then accelerated in the NSL FN tandem accelerator set to a terminal voltage of 7.5 MV. A thin carbon foil at the center of the tandem high voltage terminal broke up the molecules while stripping multiple electrons from the Mg beam. A mass analyzing magnet downstream of the tandem was used to select only  $^{24}\text{Mg}^{8+}$  ions, which were then sent to the RIB production target.

After its production, the  $^{25}\text{Al}^{10+}$  RIB was separated from the primary beam using the *TwinSol* system. Then, the beam of  $^{25}\text{Al}$  was implanted in a thick tantalum foil in the NSL  $\beta$ -decay counting station [20, 22]. The measurement was performed using the same procedure outlined in [20] except that the primary beam was turned off during the counting phase to avoid the presence of a cumulative background from the  $\gamma$ -rays emitted after the annihilation of the  $e^+$  from the implanted  $^{25}\text{Al}$ . The beam was deflected by applying a high voltage on a steerer plate upstream from the tandem.

The  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life measurement was comprised of a series of 32 runs where for each run either the photomultiplier tube bias, the discriminator threshold, or the initial decay count rate was varied to probe for any possible systematic effects that would affect the measurement.

## III. DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis followed the well-established and widely used method described in detail in [23], which was also used for the precision half-life measurement of  $^{17}\text{F}$  at the NSL [20]. The fitting procedures were tested against simulated data to ensure accuracy and probe for systematic uncertainties. The data analysis was also performed separately by two different group members to ensure the validity of results. Specific details of the data analysis are presented below.

First the data of a given run were screened for any cycles containing only background counts. These corresponded to a few instances where the primary beam was lost due to an electrical discharge of the tandem high voltage terminal.




Figure 1. (Color online) Summed  $\beta$ -decay curve of all 32 runs. Below are the residuals of the fit divided by the square root of the number of ions in a given bin  $N$ . The data has been rebinned to 500 bins.

Except for these brief interruptions over the course of a run, the total number of detected counts per cycle varied by at most 39%, due largely to variations of the SNICS output. All runs had cycle durations of 145 seconds, roughly twenty times the half-life of  $^{25}\text{Al}$ . The first eight runs were composed of twenty cycles each, with the remaining twenty-four runs consisting of fifty cycles each. The data were re-binned from the original 14,500 bins to avoid bins with zero counts, as those may introduce a bias into the fitting procedure (See section III A.1).

The  $^{25}\text{Al}$  data were fit using the *summed fit* procedure described in detail in [23]. Since all runs in this experiment had the same cycle lengths, all the data could be combined together into one data set and fit as a whole. The number of counts in each bin was corrected for the losses expected from the dead-time inherent in the detector system. After this procedure, the following function

$$r(t) = r_0 e^{-(\ln 2)t/t_0} + b \quad (1)$$

for the decay rate was used to fit the data, where  $r_0$  is the initial rate,  $t_0$  is the half life, and  $b$  is the background.

The summed fit and corresponding residuals of all the dead-time corrected runs combined and binned to 500 bins is shown in Fig. 1, for which the resulting half-life is 7.1657(23) s. The fit yielded a reduced  $\chi^2_\nu = 0.97$  and a mean residual of  $-0.01 \pm 0.98$ , which together imply that time-dependent systematic effects, such as the presence of unknown contamination or an improper dead time evaluation, are below the level of our statistical uncertainty.




Figure 2. (Color online)  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life fits from Monte Carlo simulated data for various numbers of bins. The blue circles indicate data simulated with a typical background while the orange squares show data simulated with a low background. The central orange line is the true value and the two red outer lines indicate the uncertainty on the weighted average from this work. the blue circle.

### A. Uncertainty estimation

Several sources of uncertainties in both the measurement and fitting procedures were explored. These include the influence of binning choice on the outcome of the fit, effects from a possible contaminant, and uncertainty on the dead-time determination.

#### 1. Time Binning Effects

The effect of rebinning the data was explored using Monte Carlo generated data. In the analysis the binning was varied from the original 14,500 down to 100, at which point the binning becomes too coarse to perform a meaningful fit. To study this effect, 32 runs with  $r_0 = 200 \text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $b = 3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , corresponding to the lowest observed rate and a typical background, as well as a half-life of  $t_0 = 7.16 \text{ s}$  were used. To get a better statistical uncertainty on the effect of rebinning, the Monte Carlo simulations were repeated seven times for each rebinning. The average of these seven simulation results are shown by the blue circles in Fig. 2. No systematic variations of the fitted half-life with binning within the level of statistical uncertainty of the measurement (red double lines) observed. Also, the half-life obtained from fitting does not present a bias, within statistical uncertainty, with respect to the half-life used to generate the artificial data indicated by the orange center line. These rebinning effects were also tested for Monte Carlo generated data with a low background count set to  $b = 0.3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . The result of these fits, which are shown by the orange squares in Fig. 2, show that when the number of time bins is too large, the fit exhibits a bias from many bins with zero counts. Therefore, the data were repartitioned to 500 bins, a choice that does not affect the half-life determination.




Figure 3. (Color online) Fitted half-lives for the total summed data with leading bins removed and the fit performed on the remaining bins. Up to 15 half-lives were removed. The two red lines indicate the uncertainty on the summed fit without any bin removal.

#### 2. Contamination-related Considerations

At the energy used to create  $^{25}\text{Al}$  (60 MeV) the only other radionuclide expected to be produced was  $^{22}\text{Na}$ . In order to test the effect of possible  $^{22}\text{Na}$  contamination in the beam on the  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life, Monte Carlo generated data has been fitted using Eq. 1 and also with two exponentials using:

$$r(t) = r_0 e^{-(\ln 2)t/t_0} + r_1 e^{-(\ln 2)t/t_1}, \quad (2)$$

where  $r_1$  and  $t_1$  are the initial rate and half-life of the contaminant. The artificial data were generated using Eq. 2 where the same  $r_0$  as obtained from the experimental data fit was used while  $r_1$  was set equal to the observed background level. The conservative assumption that all the background comes from the decay of  $^{22}\text{Na}$  leads to an upper value estimate on the uncertainty due to the contribution of that decay. Given this assumption, it was found that unaccounted  $^{22}\text{Na}$  contamination would result in a relative change in half-life of  $2.3 \times 10^{-6}$  s at most, so this effect was deemed negligible.

To further investigate the possibility that there could be an unaccounted short-lived contaminant, the leading bins of the total summed histogram were removed one-by-one and a summed half-life fit performed on the remaining bins. Up to the first fifteen half-lives of the data were removed, corresponding to 98% of all measured counts. Past this point not enough data were left to perform a meaningful fit. The results of this can be seen in Fig. 3, where no time-dependent systematic trends are apparent.

#### 3. Dead Time Uncertainty

The uncertainty in the dead time  $\tau = 30.4(2) \mu\text{s}$  also affects the deduced  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life. Hence, summed fits




Figure 4. (Color online) Plot of the half-lives of  $^{25}\text{Al}$  vs. the beam current for each run. The point color denotes the discriminator voltage and the point shape denotes the photomultiplier tube voltage for each run. The red double lines represent the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty on the weighted average of the individual half-lives.

over all the runs were performed with a binning of 500 and for the two extreme dead times  $\tau = 30.2$  and  $\tau = 30.6 \mu\text{s}$ . The difference of the half-life from each of these fits divided by two was taken as a systematic uncertainty. The resulting value, 0.52 ms, was added in quadrature to the statistical counting uncertainty.

#### 4. Other Systematic Effects

Other systematic effects also explored including the influence of the photomultiplier voltage, the discriminator threshold, and the beam current. The primary beam current was varied from 2.5 to 15.5 nA, the photomultiplier tube was set to 1505, 1550, 1600, 1605, and 1650 V and the discriminator was set to 1.02, 1.22, 0.82, and 0.62 V. Runs combining nearly all possible combinations of both photomultiplier tube and discriminator voltages were taken, as shown in Fig. 4. As can be seen in the figure, there are no apparent systematic effects due to these factors.

The half-life was also determined by performing a summed fit for each run individually to probe for systematics. The weighted average of all these values yields a half-life of 7.1651(23) s, with a Birge ratio [12, 24] of 0.88. Since this Birge ratio is close to one it implies that the fluctuations in the data set are statistical in nature. This half-life value is also in good agreement with the half-life result from the summed fit.

Finally, adding the statistical uncertainty on the half-life of 2.3 ms with the uncertainty due to the dead time determination of 0.52 ms yields an overall uncertainty of 2.4 ms.




Figure 5. (Color online)  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-lives [30] considered in the evaluation of the new world value. The triangle points colored red were included in the old world value but removed from our evaluation. The scaled uncertainty on the overall  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life of 7.1665(26) s is represented by the red band.

## IV. $^{25}\text{Al}$ HALF-LIFE

The new  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life measurement of 7.1657(24) s is within  $1.4\sigma$  of the previous world value 7.183(12) s while being the most precise measurement to date. With the new lifetime from this work, we also re-evaluated the world data. The same procedure as outlined in [25] was used. Two measurements used to calculate the previous world value [26, 27] were rejected because least-squares fitting was used in those analyses. In addition, the oldest  $^{25}\text{Al}$  [28] value was removed from the new evaluation due to its uncertainty being over ten times larger than the most recent measurement, as per the criteria used by [25] and the Particle Data Group [29]. Thus only the 1975 measurement [30] was used to calculate the new world value. The two values used to find the new world value are shown in blue in Fig. 5, while the rejected measurements are in red. A weighted average yields a half-life of 7.1665(23) s. The Birge ratio of the world data went from 1.9 down to 1.1 with the new measurement. Using the practices from [25, 29], and scaling the uncertainty by the Birge ratio gives a  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life value of 7.1665(26) s, a reduction on the uncertainty of the world half-life by a factor of 5. This new world average is shown by the red band in Fig. 5.

## V. DISCUSSION

The  $^{25}\text{Al}$  half-life is one of three experimental quantities needed to calculate the  $ft$ -value for that  $T = 1/2$  mixed transition, the others being the  $Q_{EC}$ -value and the branching ratio. Prior to the new half-life measurement the  $Q_{EC}$ -value of the  $^{25}\text{Al}$  decay had been measured more precisely and accurately using a Penning trap [31], yielding a value of  $Q_{EC} = 4276.805(45)$  keV. Using the  $Q_{EC}$ -value from [31] and the parametrization from [32],






Figure 6. (Color online) The relative uncertainty for quantities needed to calculate  $\mathcal{F}t^{mirror}$ . The  $f_v$ -value was calculated from the  $Q_{EC}$ -value

Table I. Values for various parameters of relevance for determining  $V_{ud}$  from the  $^{25}\text{Al}$  mirror transition. The  $Q_{EC}$ -value from [31] was used in the calculations.

Parameter	This work	With Previous $t_{1/2}$
$t_{1/2}$	7.1665(26) s	7.182(12) s
$f_v t$	3678.4(18) s	3686.9(63) s
$\mathcal{F}t^{mirror}$	3713.3(26) s	3721.8(66) s
$\rho$	-0.7997(20)	-0.7974(26)
$a_{SM}$	0.4799(16)	0.4817(21)
$A_{SM}$	0.93594(81)	0.9350(10)
$B_{SM}$	0.71303(12)	0.71289(16)

a value of  $f_v=508.520(32)$  was calculated. Then using the electron capture fraction  $P_{EC} = 0.079$ , the branching ratio 99.151(31)% from [12], the  $Q_{EC}$ -value from [31], the theoretical corrections  $\delta'_R = 1.475(20)$ , and  $\delta_C^V - \delta_{NS}^V = 0.52(5)$  from [12]. The relative uncertainties for these values are summarized in Fig. 6. The  $\mathcal{F}t^{mirror}$  values were calculated using both the half-lives from [12] and the new world value. The half-life from this work changes the  $\mathcal{F}t^{mirror}$ -value by 8.5 s while being 2.5 times more precise. Using this  $\mathcal{F}t^{mirror}$ -value, we can extract a SM

predicted value for the mixing ratio  $\rho$  using [12]:

$$\mathcal{F}t^{mirror} = \frac{2\mathcal{F}t^{0^+ \rightarrow 0^+}}{1 + \frac{f_A}{f_V}\rho^2} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}t^{0^+ \rightarrow 0^+} = 3072.27(72)$  s [4] is the average value of the 14 most precisely known pure Fermi  $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$  superallowed transitions and  $f_A$  is the axial-vector part of the statistical rate function.  $f_A$  was evaluated using the parametrization found in [32] and found to be 520.583(32). Using this new SM predicted value for  $\rho$ , the measurable parameters  $a_{SM}$ ,  $A_{SM}$ , and  $B_{SM}$  were calculated assuming that the  $^{25}\text{Al}$  mirror transition obeys the Standard Model. All these values are given in Table I. The more precise lifetime of  $^{25}\text{Al}$  result in an improvement of  $\approx 25\%$  on the uncertainty in the various correlation parameter estimates.

## VI. OUTLOOK

A precision half-life measurement of  $^{25}\text{Al}$  was performed at the NSL of the University of Notre Dame using a RIB from *TwinSol*. The new half-life of 7.1657(24) s results in a 5 times more precise world average. The  $f_v t$ -value uncertainty is still dominated by the half-life so more precision measurements are needed. Finally, in order test the CVC hypothesis and to extract a value for  $V_{ud}$ , an experimental measurement of the mixing ratio  $\rho$  is required. In order to measure  $\rho$  for  $^{25}\text{Al}$  and other nuclei, a Paul trap is currently being planned at the Nuclear Science Laboratory of the University of Notre Dame [19].

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grants No. PHY-1419765, No. PHY-1401343, and No. PHY-1401242.

- 
- [1] M. Brodeur *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 052504 (2012).
  - [2] N. Severijns and O. Naviliat-Cuncic, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **61**, 23 (2011).
  - [3] J. C. Hardy and I. S. Towner, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **73**, 046301 (2010).
  - [4] J. C. Hardy and I. S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**, 025501 (2015).
  - [5] K. Gulyuz *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 012501 (2016).
  - [6] M. R. Dunlop *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 172501 (2016).
  - [7] W. Satuła, J. Dobaczewski, W. Nazarewicz, and T. R. Werner, *Phys. Rev. C* **86**, 054316 (2012).
  - [8] A. Bazavov *et al.* (Fermilab Lattice and MILC Collaborations), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 112001 (2014).
  - [9] J. C. Hardy and I. S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **79**, 055502 (2009).
  - [10] O. Naviliat-Cuncic and N. Severijns, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 142302 (2009).
  - [11] R. P. Feynman and M. Gell-Mann, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 193 (1958).
  - [12] N. Severijns, M. Tandecki, T. Phalet, and I. S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **78**, 055501 (2008).
  - [13] B. Fenker *et al.*, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 073028 (2016).
  - [14] M. Stachura *et al.*, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms* **376**, 369 (2016), proceedings of the {XVIIIth} International Conference on Electromagnetic Isotope Separators and Related Topics (EMIS2015), Grand Rapids, MI, U.S.A., 11-15 May 2015.
  - [15] P. H. Velten, M. Bissell, N. Neyens, G. Severijns, and W. Gins, *CERN-INTC-2014-062/INTC-P-426* (2015).
  - [16] N. Severijns and M. Neyens, G. and Bissell, *CERN-INTC-2013-013/INTC-O-017, Section 2.2.3* (2013).

- [17] G. Ban, D. Durand, X. Fléhard, E. Liénard, and O. Naviliat-Cuncic, *Annalen der Physik* **525**, 576 (2013).
- [18] X. Fabian *et al.*, “Precise measurement of the angular correlation parameter  $a_{\beta\nu}$  in the  $\beta$  decay of  $^{35}\text{Ar}$  with LPCTrap,” in *EPJ Web of Conferences*, Vol. 66 (2014).
- [19] M. Brodeur, J. Kelly, J. Long, C. Nicoloff, and B. Schultz, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms* **376**, 281 (2016), proceedings of the {XVI-Ith} International Conference on Electromagnetic Isotope Separators and Related Topics (EMIS2015), Grand Rapids, MI, U.S.A., 11-15 May 2015.
- [20] M. Brodeur *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **93**, 025503 (2016).
- [21] F. Becchetti, M. Lee, T. O’Donnell, D. Roberts, J. Kolata, L. Lamm, G. Rogachev, V. Guimarães, P. DeYoung, and S. Vincent, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **505**, 377 (2003), proceedings of the tenth Symposium on Radiation Measurements and Applications.
- [22] T. Ahn *et al.*, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms* **376**, 321 (2016), proceedings of the {XVIIth} International Conference on Electromagnetic Isotope Separators and Related Topics (EMIS2015), Grand Rapids, MI, U.S.A., 11-15 May 2015.
- [23] V. Koslowsky, E. Hagberg, J. Hardy, G. Savard, H. Schmeing, K. Sharma, and X. Sun, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **401**, 289 (1997).
- [24] G. F. Grinyer *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **71**, 044309 (2005).
- [25] J. C. Hardy and I. S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **71**, 055501 (2005).
- [26] F. Jundt, E. Aslanides, B. Fride, and A. Gallmann, *Nuclear Physics A* **170**, 12 (1971).
- [27] I. Tanihata, T. Minamisono, A. Mizobuchi, and K. Sugimoto, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **34**, 848 (1973), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.34.848>.
- [28] T. Muller, E. Gelsema, and P. Endt, *Physica* **24**, 577 (1958).
- [29] J. Beringer *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [30] G. Azuelos and J. E. Kitching, *Phys. Rev. C* **12**, 563 (1975).
- [31] L. Canete *et al.*, *The European Physical Journal A* **52**, 124 (2016).
- [32] I. S. Towner and J. C. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**, 015501 (2015).