### Beta-delayed fission in the lead region: mapping asymmetry-to-symmetry transition

Andrei Andreyev

University of York, UK, ISOLDE-CERN(Geneva, Switzerland) Japan Atomic Energy Agency (JAEA), Tokai, Japan On behalf of York-Leuven-Bratislava-Brussels-Bruyeres-le-Chatel-Bordeaux-ISOLDE-JAEA Collaboration



JAEA, 25<sup>th</sup> March 2019

### Beta-delayed fission in the lead region: mapping asymmetry-to-symmetry transition

- Low-energy fission in the "new" regions of the Nuclear Chart
- βDF of <sup>178,180</sup>Hg, <sup>194,196</sup>At, <sup>202</sup>Fr at ISOLDE(CERN)
- $\beta$ DF of <sup>188m1,m2</sup>Bi probing spin dependence of fission at low E\*
- Theory efforts (see several follow-up talks)

### Experimental information on low-energy fission Nuclei with measured charge/mass split (RIPL-2 + GSI)



A.N. Andreyev, K.Nishio, K.-H. Schmidt, "Review on experimental progress in fission", Reports on Progress in Physics, 81, 016301 (2018)

### Experimental information on low-energy fission Nuclei with measured charge/mass split (RIPL-2 + GSI)



## **Beta-Delayed Fission**



A.N. Andreyev, M. Huyse, P. Van Duppen, Reviews of Modern Physics, 85, 1541 (2013) A.N. Andreyev, K.Nishio, K.-H. Schmitd, Reports on Progress in Physics, 81, 016301 (2018)



# Detection system for $\beta DF$ studies at ISOLDE



# Year 2008: Mass distribution of fission fragments in $\beta$ DF of <sup>180</sup>Tl (the fission of <sup>180</sup>Hg)

# ASYMMETRIC energy split! Thus asymmetric mass split: M<sub>H</sub>=100(4) and M<sub>L</sub>= 80(4)



A problem: "low-energy" FF's - 1 AMeV only, Z identification difficult The most probable fission fragments are <sup>100</sup>Ru (N=56,Z=44) and <sup>80</sup>Kr (N=44,Z=36)

### New Type of Asymmetric Fission in Proton-Rich Nuclei



## Two types of asymmetry: what's the difference?

#### PHYSICAL REVIEW C 86, 024610 (2012)

#### **Contrasting fission potential-energy structure of actinides and mercury isotopes**

Takatoshi Ichikawa,<sup>1</sup> Akira Iwamoto,<sup>2</sup> Peter Möller,<sup>3</sup> and Arnold J. Sierk<sup>3</sup>

**Conclusions:** The mechanism of asymmetric fission must be very different in the lighter proton-rich mercury isotopes compared to the actinide region and is apparently unrelated to fragment shell structure. Isotopes lighter than <sup>192</sup>Hg have the saddle point shielded from a deep symmetric valley by a significant ridge. The ridge vanishes for the heavier Hg isotopes, for which we would expect a qualitatively different asymmetry of the fragments.



#### **Brownian Metropolis Shape Motion**

based on J. Randrup and P. Moller, PRL 106, 132503 (2011)

#### Phys. Rev. C 85, 024306 (2012)

#### Calculated fission yields of neutron-deficient mercury isotopes

Peter Möller<sup>1</sup>,\* Jørgen Randrup<sup>2</sup>, and Arnold J. Sierk<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA <sup>2</sup> Nuclear Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, USA (Dated: November 21, 2011)

The recent unexpected discovery of asymmetric fission of <sup>180</sup>Hg following the electron-capture decay of <sup>180</sup>Tl has led to intense interest in experimentally mapping the fission-yield properties over more extended regions of the nuclear chart and compound-system energies. We present here a first calculation of fission-fragment yields for neutron-deficient Hg isotopes, using the recently developed Brownian Metropolis shape motion treatment. The results for <sup>180</sup>Hg are in approximate agreement with the experimental data. For <sup>174</sup>Hg the symmetric yield increases strongly with decreasing energy, an unusual feature, which would be interesting to verify experimentally. PACS numbers: 25.85.-w, 24.10.Lx, 24.75.+i



FIG. 4. (Color online) Minima, saddles, major valleys, and ridges in the 5D potential-energy surface of <sup>180</sup>Hg (see text). At the last plotted point on the fission barrier,  $(Q_2/b)^{(1/2)} \approx 11$ , the asymmetry of the shape is  $A_{\rm H}/A_{\rm L} = 108/72$ .





### 'Improved' Scission-Point Model

#### PHYSICAL REVIEW C 86, 044315 (2012)

#### Mass distributions for induced fission of different Hg isotopes

A. V. Andreev, G. G. Adamian, and N. V. Antonenko Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia (Received 20 June 2012; revised manuscript received 6 September 2012; published 11 October 2012)

With the improved scission-point model mass distributions are calculated for induced fission of different Hg isotopes with even mass numbers A = 180, 184, 188, 192, 196, and 198. The calculated mass distribution and mean total kinetic energy of fission fragments are in good agreement with the existing experimental data. The asymmetric mass distribution of fission fragments of <sup>180</sup>Hg observed in the recent experiment is explained. The change in the shape of the mass distribution from asymmetric to more symmetric is revealed with increasing A of the fissioning <sup>A</sup>Hg nucleus, and reactions are proposed to verify this prediction experimentally.

- Inter-fragment distance is not fixed and calculated.
  values of ~0.5-1 fm result (Wilkins fixed at 1.4 fm)
- •Mass symmetry/asymmetry doesn't change as a function of E\* (up to E\*~60 MeV) good for future experiments



### 'Self-consistent Scission-Point Model'

PHYSICAL REVIEW C 86, 064601 (2012)

#### Role of deformed shell effects on the mass asymmetry in nuclear fission of mercury isotopes

Stefano Panebianco, Jean-Luc Sida, Héloise Goutte, and Jean-François Lemaître IRFU/Service de Physique Nucleaire, CEA Centre de Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

> Noël Dubray and Stéphane Hilaire *CEA, DAM, DIF, F-91297, Arpajon, France* (Received 9 October 2012; published 3 December 2012)

$$\begin{split} E_{\text{av}}(Z_{1,2}, N_{1,2}, \beta_{1,2}, d) \\ &= E_{\text{tot}} - E_{\text{HFB}}(Z_1, N_1, \beta_1) - E_{\text{HFB}}(Z_2, N_2, \beta_2) \\ &- E_{\text{nucl}}(Z_{1,2}, N_{1,2}, \beta_{1,2}, d) - E_{\text{Coul}}(Z_{1,2}, N_{1,2}, \beta_{1,2}, d). \end{split}$$



FIG. 4. (Color online) Total nuclear density for the most energetically favorable scission configuration in <sup>180</sup>Hg fission, extracted from a self-consistent HFB calculation. In the lower part of the figure, two



FIG. 2. (Color online) Minimum absolute available energy at scission calculated for all possible fragmentations in (a)  $^{180}$ Hg and (b)  $^{198}$ Hg fission at 10 MeV and in (c) the thermal *n*-induced fission of  $^{235}$ U.

#### Mean-field HFB+Gogny D1S

PHYSICAL REVIEW C 86, 024601 (2012)

#### Fission modes of mercury isotopes

M. Warda,<sup>1</sup> A. Staszczak,<sup>1,2,3</sup> and W. Nazarewicz<sup>2,3,4</sup>





FIG. 2. (Color online) PES for <sup>180</sup>Hg (top) and <sup>198</sup>Hg (bottom) in the plane of collective coordinates  $Q_{20} - Q_{30}$  in HFB-SkM<sup>\*</sup>. The aEF fission pathway corresponding to asymmetric elongated fragments is marked. The difference between contour lines is 4 MeV. The effects due to triaxiality, known to impact inner fission barriers in the actinides, are negligible here.

FIG. 3. (Color online) PES in HFB-D1S for <sup>180</sup>Hg (top) and <sup>198</sup>Hg (bottom) in the  $(Q_{20}, Q_{30})$  plane in the pre-scission region of aEF valley. The symmetric limit corresponds to  $Q_{30} = 0$ . The aEF valley and density profiles for pre-scission configurations are indicated. The difference between contour lines is 0.5 MeV. Note different  $Q_{30}$ -scales in <sup>180</sup>Hg and <sup>198</sup>Hg plots.



#### Mass Distributions of $^{194,196}$ Po via $\beta$ DF of $^{194,196}$ At at ISOLDE



Clear difference in energy (thus, mass) distribution between 2-peaked fission of <sup>180</sup>Hg and a broad distribution in <sup>194,196</sup>Po

#### Multimodal Mass Distributions in βDF of <sup>194,196</sup>At and <sup>200,202</sup>Fr L.Ghys et al., Phys. Rev. C 90, 044305 (2014)



# Multimodal Mass Distributions in $\beta$ DF of <sup>194,196</sup>At and <sup>200,202</sup>Fr L.Ghys et al., Phys. Rev. C 90, 044305 (2014)



#### FFMDs in the Lead Region: Experiment vs Theory L.Ghys et al., Phys. Rev. C 90, 044305 (2014)



Calculated FFMDs: P. Moller and J.Randrup

#### Beta-Delayed Fission of two isomers in <sup>188</sup>Bi (fission of <sup>188</sup>Pb): probing spin dependence of fission?



A.Andreyev et al, EPJA18,39(2003) -alpha decay; J.Lane et al, Phys. Rev.C87 (2013) –  $\beta$ df at SHIP

### Very schematically: $\beta$ DF of two isomers in <sup>188</sup>Bi:



<sup>188</sup>Pb

At ISOLDE, we can produce **clean (laser-separated !) beams** of both isomers in <sup>188</sup>Bi, and study whether their respective β**DF has different properties** (e.g. **different FFMDs**,**TKE's**, **fission probabilities**)

### <sup>188</sup>Bi (hs) in comparison to <sup>194,196</sup>Po via $\beta$ DF of <sup>194,196</sup>At



Clear difference in energy (thus, mass) distribution between 2-peaked fission of <sup>180</sup>Hg and a broad distribution in <sup>194,196</sup>Po,<sup>188hs</sup>Bi

#### βDF of hs isomer in <sup>188</sup>Bi at ISOLDE (fission of <sup>188</sup>Pb) (preliminary data)



Either pure mass-asymmetric split or a mixture of symmetric and mass asymmetric

### SOFIA@GSI: Coulex-induced fission of relativistic RIBs in inverse kinematics (J. Taieb, A. Chatillon et al)

#### Physics cases

- Application purpose: high statistics
  - $\Rightarrow {}^{238}U$  ~2 days
  - $\Rightarrow {}^{235}\text{U}{}^{-238}\text{Np}$

#### Transition from asymmetric to symmetric fission modes

- $\Rightarrow ^{230}Th$
- $\Rightarrow {}^{226}Th$
- $\Rightarrow ^{222}Th$



## Conclusions

• βDF experiments at ISOLDE allow to probe the low-energy fission in the transitional region between the asymmetry of <sup>178,180</sup>Hg and symmetry around <sup>210</sup>Rn (studies by Coulex)

•A mixture of asymmetric and symmetric FFMD's is observed in several cases

•This inference is in a qualitative agreement with 'global' predictions by Moller/Randrup's model, though some quantitative discrepancies are noted. Many other theory approaches!

• SOFIA-like experiments, which can provide much better Z and A determination are a must.

• Excitation energy dependence (see talk by I. Tsekhanovich)