First nuclear moment measurement with radioactive beams by recoil-in-vacuum method: g-factor of the 2^{+}_{1} $_1^+$ state in $^{132}\mathsf{Te}$

N.J. Stone^{1,2,a}, A.E. Stuchbery³, M. Danchev², J. Pavan⁴, C.L. Timlin¹, C. Baktash⁴, C. Barton^{5,6}, J.R. Beene⁴, N. Benczer-Koller⁷, C.R. Bingham^{2,4}, J. Dupak⁸, A. Galindo-Uribarri⁴, C.J. Gross⁴, G. Kumbartzki⁷, D.C. Radford⁴, J.R. Stone^{1,9}, and N.V. Zamfir⁵

¹ Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3PU, UK

² Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA $\frac{3}{2}$ Department of Nicolas Physics ANU. Caphenye ACT, 0000, Astrolia

³ Department of Nuclear Physics, ANU, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia

- ⁴ Physics Division, ORNL, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA
- ⁵ Wright Nuclear Structure Laboratory, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520-8124, USA
- ⁶ Department of Physics, York University, York, YO12 5DD, UK
- ⁷ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, USA
- 8 Institute of Scientific Instruments, 624 64 Brno, Czech Republic
- ⁹ Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

Received: 14 January 2005 / Published online: 9 August 2005 – © Società Italiana di Fisica / Springer-Verlag 2005

Abstract. Following Coulomb excitation of the radioactive ion beam (RIB) ¹³²Te at HRIBF, we report the first use of the recoil-in-vacuum (RIV) method to determine the g-factor of the 2^+_1 state to be (+)0.35(5). The advantages offered by the RIV method in the context of RIBs and modern detector arrays are discussed.

PACS. 21.10.Ky Electromagnetic moments – 25.70.De Coulomb excitation – 27.60.+j $90 \le A \le 149$ – 23.20.En Angular distribution and correlation measurements

1 Introduction

The advent of radioactive ion beams (RIBs) constitutes a major new initiative in nuclear structure investigations, opening up many new opportunities. However, the new beams, being not only orders of magnitude weaker than stable ones, but also producing background radioactivity levels which can mask useful reaction yields, present fresh challenges to experimenters to design methods appropriate for their best exploitation.

The g-factors of nuclear excited states yield valuable information as to the make-up of their wave functions. This paper presents the first result of applying the littleused technique of recoil in vacuum (RIV) to exploit its considerable advantages for g-factor measurements in the new RIB regime using modern detector arrays.

When an energetic ion beam emerges from a solid into vacuum the ions have a range of charge states and many differing electronic configurations, each with its own total angular momentum J which is assumed to be randomly oriented in space. The hyperfine interaction couples the nuclear spin I and J and causes them to precess about their resultant F. Whenever the nuclear spin is initially

oriented by a nuclear reaction, such precession forms a de-orientation mechanism. Particularly in highly ionized states, the de-orientation is dominated by the large magnetic interactions with angular frequency proportional to the nuclear g-factor. This is the basis of the so-called recoil in vacuum (RIV) method of measurement of the nuclear g-factor, which was first studied in the 1970s [\[1\]](#page-3-0).

In recent years the method most widely used for qfactor studies of states of half-life ∼ ns has been the transient field (TF) method. After excitation into an oriented excited state (usually by Coulomb excitation), the nuclei traverse a magnetized ferromagnetic layer of the target in which their spins precess due to the action of the transient field. The precession is measured by the change in angular distribution of the gamma decay of the excited state when the magnetization is reversed and can be analysed to give the magnitude and sign of the g-factor. Giving the sign of the g-factor is an advantage of the TF method as compared to the RIV method.

Problems which arise for the TF method with RIBs, several orders of magnitude weaker than stable beams, are that good statistics are required to give an accurate g-factor and that the beam is usually stopped in the target producing high radioactive background. Even if the

^a Conference presenter; e-mail: n.stone@physics.ox.ac.uk

beam, and excited nuclei, are allowed to recoil out of the target (when the longer lived beam activity will leave the target area and the excited nuclei decay nearby), the possibility of contaminant activity can cause large undesirable background. The RIV method by contrast has attractive features when used with RIBs. There is no need for a thick target, so the beam escapes, and the unperturbed angular distributions can be very anisotropic so that attenuations can be measured with relatively poor statistics yet yield a useful g-factor. This paper describes the first application of the RIV method to obtain the *q*-factor of the first $2+$ state of an RIB isotope: ¹³²Te.

2 Experimental details and data analysis

The experiments were carried out at the HRIBF Facility at Oak Ridge National Laboratory using the devices CLAR-ION for γ detection and Hyball, an array of CsI particle detectors [\[2\]](#page-3-1). In the RIB measurement a beam of 3×10^7 ¹³²Te ions/s at 396 MeV was incident on a $0.83 \,\mathrm{mg/cm^2}$ self-supporting C target for 3 days. 29000 de-excitation γ -rays were recorded from the 973.9 keV, 2^+_1 , state, in coincidence with C recoils [\[3\]](#page-3-2).

Data were taken in event-by-event mode, registering the energies and identifications of the particles detected in the Hyball segments, and the energies deposited in all CLARION detector segments. Data were analyzed by setting particle identification gates on carbon recoils, applying Doppler correction to the γ energy, and correcting for random coincidences.

Similar experiments were carried out with stable beams of 122,126,130 Te. The beam energies were respectively 366, 378 and 390 MeV, chosen to ensure that the velocities, and hence the hyperfine interactions, of the Te ions emerging from the back of the C target would be very similar for all isotopes. For each stable isotope, data were taken with two different targets. The first was a $0.956 \,\mathrm{mg/cm^2}$ self-supporting C foil, from which both Te ions and C recoils escaped into vacuum, and the second consisted of a $0.630 \,\mathrm{mg/cm^2}$ layer of C, backed with $14.3 \,\mathrm{mg/cm^2}$ Cu. The Cu backing stopped the Te recoils but allowed the C recoils to emerge and reach the Hyball array without appreciable angular straggling. Results from the un-backed C target show attenuation of the unperturbed distribution, observed from the Cu-backed target. Analysis of the C- γ coincident data was made taking full advantage of the segmented nature of the CLARION and Hyball devices to give a detailed angular distribution. CLARION consists of eleven detectors in the backward hemisphere with respect to the target, five in a ring at $\theta_{\gamma} = 90^{\circ}$, four at $\theta_{\gamma} = 132^{\circ}$ and two at $\theta_{\gamma} = 155^{\circ}$ to the beam (z-axis). The Hyball particle detection array is in the forward hemisphere. In this work three rings of detectors were used, set in circles about the beam axis. The first ring is segmented into six detectors and receives particles scattered at angles between $7^{\circ} < \theta_p < 14^{\circ}$, the second ring has ten detectors with $14° < \theta_p < 28°$ and the third ring has 12 detectors with $28° < \theta_p < 44°$. Requiring the carbon recoil to be in a specific segment of a Hyball ring

Fig. 1. Experimental and calculated unattenuated angular distributions for ¹³⁰Te corresponding to CLARION detectors at $\theta_{\gamma} = 90^{\circ}$, 132° and 155° and Hyball rings 1, 2, and 3.

defines, along with the beam axis, the azimuthal angle ϕ_p of the reaction plane for each event. Combining this information with ϕ_{γ} of each CLARION detector the angular distribution of the γ rays as a function of both θ_{γ} and $\phi = \phi_p - \phi_\gamma$ was obtained.
The stable-beam ^{122,126,130}Te experiments with the

Cu-backed target aimed to establish not only that the unperturbed γ anisotropy was independent of the isotope, but also to demonstrate that it could be calculated from first principles. The calculation was carried out using standard formalism for perturbed particle- γ correlation from nuclei oriented in Coulomb excitation

$$
W(\theta_{\gamma}, \phi) = \sum_{k,q} \sqrt{2k+1} \rho_{kq} G_k A_k Q_k D_{q0}^{k*}(\phi, \theta_{\gamma}, 0), \quad (1)
$$

where G_k are the vacuum deorientation coefficients, dependent on the nuclear g-factor. ρ_{ka} are statistical tensors, evaluated using Coulomb excitation scattering amplitudes [\[4\]](#page-3-3) obtained from the Winther-de Boer computer code [\[5\]](#page-3-4). All the other symbols have their standard meaning, explained, for example, in ref. [\[6\]](#page-3-5). Figure [1](#page-1-0) shows comparison of the calculated correlation with data taken with ¹³⁰Te. The data have been obtained by normalizing the counts in each CLARION detector coincident with a specific element of a Hyball ring to the sum of counts in the complete Hyball ring. The theory was normalized to the calculated value of $W(\theta_\gamma) = \int_0^{2\pi} W(\theta_\gamma, \phi) d\phi$. The data have not been fitted to the theory in any way.

The agreement is extremely good for all nine combinations of Hyball rings and CLARION angles. This is an important result as it gives encouragement that such calculations may be used in the future to give the unattenuated distribution in cases where it is not possible to measure it directly.

Performing similar analysis of the data from the unbacked C targets, RIV attenuated distributions were

Fig. 2. Experimental and fitted attenuated angular distributions for ^{126,130,132}Te measured using CLARION detectors at $\theta_{\gamma} = 90^{\circ}$, 132° and 155° and Hyball ring 3.

found for all three stable Te isotopes and for ¹³²Te. For each isotope, the full data set, comprising a total of 308 individual $W(\theta_{\gamma}, \phi)$ points, were fitted simultaneously to yield the best values of the attenuation parameters as described below. The interaction strength will depend upon recoil velocity; the small variation of this recoil velocity between the three Hyball rings has been neglected. Figure [2](#page-2-0) shows the ring 3 attenuated angular distributions and best fits for 126,130,132 Te. 126 Te (longer lifetime) shows stronger attenuation than the other two isotopes, while 132 Te is somewhat less attenuated than 130 Te.

3 Results and discussion

Detailed theoretical description of the RIV attenuation process is complex. It would require full knowledge of the range and weighting of ionic charge states, electron angular momentum states, their hyperfine interaction strengths and lifetimes. To date two extreme models of the process have been considered. In the first, the "rapid fluctuation" model, the electronic state is assumed to change frequently during the nuclear lifetime, giving abrupt changes in both magnitude and direction of the hyperfine interaction. This chaotic process leads eventually to complete attenuation of the γ anisotropy and can be described, within fairly broad limits, by a single relaxation time τ_2 [\[7,](#page-3-6)[8\]](#page-3-7). For purely magnetic hyperfine interactions, the parameters G_2 and G_4 in eq. [\(1\)](#page-1-1) are given as functions of τ_2 and the nuclear mean life τ by $G_2 = \frac{\tau_2}{(\tau_2 + \tau)}$ and $G_4 = \frac{0.3\tau_2}{(0.3\tau_2 + \tau)}$. In this model $\tau_2 = C/g^2$, where C is a constant for isotopes having the same ionic state distribution and there is a relationship $G_4 = 0.3G_2/(1 - 0.7G_2)$.

The second extreme, a "static" model, considers the case that the electronic state lifetime is long compared to the nuclear state mean life. For this limit the nuclei undergo Larmor precession about an axis in space determined by their individual **F** quantization axis $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{J}$, which is related to their randomly oriented **J** angular momentum. For each pair of quantum numbers I and J , integration over time, weighting by the nuclear decay $e^{-t/\tau}$, yields [\[9\]](#page-3-8)

$$
G_k = \sum_{F} \frac{(2F+1)^2}{2J+1} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} F \ F \ k \\ I \ I \ J \end{array} \right\}^2 +
$$

$$
\sum_{F \neq F'} \frac{(2F+1)(2F'+1)}{2J+1} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} F \ F' \ k \\ I \ I \ J \end{array} \right\}^2 \frac{1}{\omega_{FF'}^2 \tau^2 + 1}.
$$
 (2)

The full expression for G_k averaged over charge state and electronic excitation is a weighted sum of G'_{k} s of the form of eq. [\(2\)](#page-2-1), each having two terms, a "hard core" maximum attenuation plus a term involving $g^2 \tau^2$ (since $\omega \sim g$). There is no simple algebraic form for the result of such a summation. Simulations of this model for a wide range of values of J and different hyperfine interaction strengths have been made [\[10\]](#page-3-9). The dependence of G_k upon $g\tau$ is sensitive to these electronic state parameters, as is the ratio G_2/G_4 to lesser degree. Thus in this model the relationship between G_2 and G_4 is not predictable without detailed knowledge of the distribution of the states of the ions and their hyperfine interactions. The Te isotope 2_1^+ state mean lifetimes, energies and weighted mean g factors, are given in table [1,](#page-3-10) which also includes the best fit values of G_2 and G_4 taken as independent parameters. A simple check shows that these best fit G_k values are in clear disagreement with the relationship required by the random fluctuation model so this model was discarded as a possible route to the g-factor. The experimental values of G_2 and G_4 for the three "calibration" isotopes ^{122,126,130}Te, taken as a function of $g\tau$, were then fitted using the static model by adjusting the distribution of J states and the magnitude of the hyperfine interaction. This was an essentially empirical exercise to find dependencies consistent with the calibrations which could be extrapolated to obtain $g\tau$ for ¹³²Te. Two sets of the model parameters were found which gave extremum fits constituting upper and lower limits of the variation of G_2 and G_4 with $g\tau$. The experimental values of G_2 and G_4 for ¹³²Te then each yielded a range for $g\tau$ for the first 2^+ state. The results, $g\tau$ (from G_2) = 0.92(14) ps and $g\tau$ (from G_4) = 0.90(10) ps agree very well with each other. Thus, taking the lifetime of ¹³²Te given in ta-ble [1,](#page-3-10) we obtain, using the more precise $g\tau$, the result $g = 0.346(38)(35)$ where the first error arises from the variation between the two sets of model parameters and the second stems from the uncertainty in the lifetime. The final result (with sign from systematics) is

$$
g(2_1^{+ 132} \text{Te}) = (+)0.35(5). \tag{3}
$$

Theoretical interest in the g -factor of this state is due to the proximity of ¹³²Te to doubly magic ¹³²Sn. As the number of valence neutron holes in the double magic configuration decreases, the g-factor is expected to rise since proton contributions to the 2^+ excitation will become

<i>Isotope</i>	E_{2^+} (keV)	τ_{2^+} (ps) [11]	g-factor $ 12 $	$g\tau$ (ps)	G ₂	G_4
122 Te 126 Te 130 Te 132 Te	564.1 663.3 839.5 973.9	10.8(1) 6.5(2) 3.3(1) $2.6(2)$ [13]	0.340(10) 0.275(30) 0.295(35)	3.67(12) 1.79(20) 0.97(12) 0.90(10)	0.355(18) 0.505(19) 0.629(19) 0.715(26)	0.214(11) 0.366(12) 0.503(12) 0.522(17)

Table 1. Te 2^+_1 excited state data and fits to attenuated distributions (see text for details).

Table 2. Calculated and experimental g-factors for 2^+_1 states in Te isotopes close to $N = 82$.

Nuclear model	130 Te	132 Te	134 Te	136 Te	Ref.
Shell model QRPA	$+0.347$ $+0.314$	$+0.488$ $+0.491$	$+0.862$ $+0.695$	$+0.360$ -0.174	14 15 ¹
Experiment	$+0.295(35)$	$(+)0.35(5)$			

more important. Table [2](#page-3-16) displays recent calculated values for the g-factors of heavy Te isotopes close to the closed shell. The present result is consistent with a modest increase in g -factor between ¹³⁰Te and ¹³²Te.

4 Conclusions

This experiment has shown that the RIV method can provide a good-quality g-factor measurement for 132 Te RIB. The result further indicates the possibility of performing similar experiments with beams that are at least one order of magnitude weaker than in this work. Since RIV attenuations are available for study whenever Coulombexcited states recoil from and decay beyond a thin target, this method is expected to be generally useful for g-factor determinations of short-lived excited states using RIBs. To maximize the potential of the method requires short calibration experiments with stable beams of nuclei having known g-factors, suitable lifetimes and the same spin as the RIB nuclei. More meaningful a priori modeling of the RIV process should emerge as further results become available.

We acknowledge valuable discussions with G. Goldring and J. Billowes at the early stages of this work. Financial support came from US DOE grants DE-AC05-00OR22725 (ORNL), DE-FG02-96ER40983 (UT), DE-FG02-94ER40834 (JRS) and the US National Science Foundation (RU).

References

- 1. G. Goldring, in Heavy Ion Collisions, edited by R. Bock Vol. 3 (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982) p. 484. See also Treatise on Heavy-Ion Science, edited by D.A. Bromley Vol. 3 (Plenum, New York, 1984) p. 539.
- 2. C.J. Gross et al., Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A 450, 12 (2000).
- 3. N.V. Zamfir et al., private communication, 2004.
- 4. K. Alder, A. Bohr, T. Huus, B. Mottelson, A. Winther, Rev. Mod. Phys. 28, 432 (1956).
- 5. K. Alder, A. Winther, in Coulomb Excitation (Academic Press, New York and London, 1966) p. 303.
- 6. A.E. Stuchbery, M.P. Robinson, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A 485, 753 (2002).
- 7. A. Abragam, R.V. Pound, Phys. Rev. 92, 943 (1953).
- 8. F. Bosch, H. Spehl, Z. Phys. A 280, 329 (1977).
- 9. R. Brenn et al., Z. Phys. A 281, 219 (1977) and references therein.
- 10. C.L. Timlin, Project Report, Oxford 2004 (unpublished).
- 11. S. Raman et al., At. Data Nucl. Data Tables 78, 1 (2001).
- 12. N.J. Stone, Nuclear Moment Table, Nuclear Data Center, www.nndc.bnl.gov.
- 13. D.C. Radford et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 222501 (2002).
- 14. B.A. Brown et al., Phys. Rev. C 71, 044317 (2005), arXiv:nucl-th/0411099v1.
- 15. J. Terasaki et al., Phys. Rev. C 66, 054313 (2002); J. Teresaki, private communication (2004).