

Proposal for an Experiment at GSI, Darmstadt

Submit to **EA32**
Title of Proposal: **Electron Screening and alpha-decay**

New Proposal Continuation of Previous Experiment with Exp. No.:

Spokesperson: **Musumarra, Agatino, Dr**
musumarra@lns.infn.it
University of Catania Laboratori Nazionali del Sud - INFN Catania
via Santa Sofia, 62 Catania, 95123, Italy

Participants: **Musumarra A., musumarra@lns.infn.it**
Nociforo C., C.Nociforo@gsi.de
Geissel H., H.Geissel@gsi.de
Litvinov Y., Y.Litvinov@gsi.de
.....

GSI Contact Person: **Nociforo Chiara**

UNILAC: SIS: ESR:

Phelix Laser:

Requested Beam Properties and Experimental Equipment:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| a) Ion Species (Charge State): | 238U |
| b) Intensity (Particle nA): | 10E9 ppp |
| c) Energy (MeV/u): | 550 MeV/u |
| d) Target Station: | FRS/ESR |
| Target Station Phelix Laser: | |
| e) Special Requests on Beam Properties: | --- |
| f) Special Target Requirements: | --- |

Requested Beam Time (in Shifts of 8 Hours each)

Primary: **41** Secondary: **0** Phelix Laser: **0**

Number of Runs: **2**

Detailed description of the Proposal: Please attach an experiment description (max. 10 pages including figures) which should summarize the scientific justification and relevant technical details for the proposed experiment. For a continuation request, a brief status report of the previous as well as an outline of the future experiments should be given.

Attachment (PDF file): **Experiment Proposal (alpha-decay) FRS-ESR.pdf**

SUPPLEMENTARY FORM FOR SAFETY ASPECTS OF A PROPOSAL

Title: **Electron Screening and alpha-decay**

Spokesperson: **Musumarra, Agatino, Dr**
University of Catania Laboratori Nazionali del Sud - INFN Catania, 95...

GSI-Contact Person: **Nociforo Chiara**

1. General Safety

- a. Do you use combustible or hazardous gases within your experiment Yes No
(e.g. gas target, gas detectors)?
What sort of gases?
Which quantities or flow rates?
- b. Do you use other dangerous (e.g. toxic, inflammable, biologically hazardous etc.) materials within your experiment? Yes No
What sort of materials?
Which quantities?
- c. Is your vacuum set-up equipped with fragile parts like thin glass or foil windows etc. (danger of implosion)? Yes No
Brief description of the construction:
- d. Is it intended to move heavy parts for setting-up your experiment or during the experiment? Yes No
Brief description of the equipment and working procedure:

2. Radiation Safety

- a. Do you use radioactive sources or materials on-site? Yes No
What sources?
Which activities?
- b. Is it intended to direct the beam through air or other gases? Yes No
Beam sort, energy, intensity:
Distance through air or gas:

3. Electrical/Laser Safety

- a. Do you use electrical instruments on-site? Yes No
Max. Voltage/max. current:
- b. Do you use high-intensity radio frequency (RF) sources on-site? Yes No
Frequency region/power:
- c. Do you use lasers in your experiment? Yes No
Laser-type, max. power:

4. Is there any other special safety aspect to be considered in connection with your proposal ? Yes No

Mar 17, 2006

Experiment Proposal for the FRS-ESR Facility at GSI

Electron Screening and α -decay

A.Musumarra^{1,2}, C. Nociforo³, H. Geissel^{3,4}, Y. Litvinov^{3,4}, G. Baur⁵, K. Beckert³, P. Beller³, A. Bonasera², F. Bosch³, D. Boutin⁴, L. Chen⁴, A. Del Zoppo², A. Di Pietro², T. Faestermann⁶, P. Figuera², K. Hagino⁷, S. Kimura², P. Kienle^{6,9}, R. Knöbel^{3,4}, C. Kozhuharov³, J. Kurcewicz³, K. Langanke³, M. Lattuada^{1,2}, S. Litvinov^{3,4}, M. Mazzocco³, F. Montes³, Y. Motizuki¹⁰, F. Nolden³, M.G. Pellegriti⁸, G. Martinez-Pinedo³, W. Plaß⁴, V. Scuderi¹, C. Scheidenberger³, M. Steck³, B. Sun³, H. Weick³, M. Winkler³

¹ University of Catania, Italy ² LNS-INFN Catania, Italy ³ GSI Darmstadt, Germany

⁴ JLU Giessen, Germany ⁵ FZ Jülich, Germany ⁶ TU München, Germany

⁷ Tohoku University, Sendai Japan ⁸ IPN-Orsay, France ⁹ SMI Wien, Austria

¹⁰ RIKEN Wako, Japan

Abstract: we propose to measure Q_α -values and α -decay lifetimes of fully stripped heavy ions in order to get for the first time an unambiguous determination of the electron screening energy. This is possible because changes in Q -value and lifetime are expected, with respect to the neutral atoms, due to the screening effect on the nucleus. In fact relative changes in the decay constant $\delta\lambda/\lambda$ have been calculated by some authors [1,2,14] to range from 20% up to 100%, depending on the Q_α -value involved in the decay. We stress that at present no lifetime measurements of bare and few-electron alpha-emitters are available and the experimental facility FRS-ESR at GSI represents a worldwide unique opportunity to perform the proposed studies.

1. Introduction.

One of the open questions in nuclear astrophysics is the interpretation of the electron screening effects observed in low-energy nuclear reactions with light nuclei [3]. As pointed out by several authors [3-6] screening corrections deeply affect the reaction rates at low relative energies. Screening in the laboratory largely differs from plasma screening in stars forcing a double step procedure in extracting astrophysical reaction rates [4,6]. Therefore it is essential to clarify at least the screening effects on the measured cross sections.

The screening enhancement factor in charged-particle reactions at the astrophysical energies is usually written as $f(E) = \frac{\sigma_s(E)}{\sigma_b(E)} = \exp\left(\frac{\pi\eta U_e}{E}\right)$ [4], where $\sigma_s(E)$ and $\sigma_b(E)$ are the screened and bare cross sections of an arbitrary charged-particle reaction respectively, η is the Sommerfeld parameter and U_e the so called electron screening energy. In order to extract information on U_e , $\sigma_s(E)$ and $\sigma_b(E)$ must be determined. Large experimental sources of uncertainties for $\sigma_s(E)$ are due to the small reaction cross sections involved, the missing knowledge of stopping powers and the high accuracy needed in the knowledge of the relative energy between the interacting ions[4]. Concerning $\sigma_b(E)$, so far it can be evaluated by extrapolation or, at the best, by using R-matrix fit [5].

In this uncertain scenario one of the intriguing puzzles in nuclear astrophysics comes out, namely the discrepancy between experimental U_e^{exp} and theoretical U_e^{theo} values so far deduced. In particular, the U_e^{exp} values mostly exceed the maximum admitted theoretical ones and in some cases also by a factor two [4,8].

Since extracting information on U_e by studying nuclear reactions at very low energy is very difficult we suggest here a completely different experimental method by simplifying, as much as possible, the system affected by the electron screening. It is well known since long time [1,7,9] that Q_α -values and nuclear alpha-decay lifetimes should be different for bare nuclei from the neutral atoms, but till now these changes have not been experimentally verified. An interesting scenario appears when one deals with fully stripped emitters, since the inner electron shells play there a key role because of the large binding energies involved [2]. Infact, relative changes in lifetime are expected by some authors to range up to 100%, compared to the neutral case [1]. Details on the variation of nuclear decay rates are reported in the Emery [10] and Dostal, Nagel and Pabst [11] reviews.

Concerning the astrophysical implications, alpha-decay rates are also important for the determination of the r-process abundances of elements with $A > 206$ AMU, including the cosmochronometers U and Th [12], and for determining the end point of the rp-process [13].

Already in the pioneering experiments with the combination of the FRS and the ESR Q -values and half-lives of bare and few electron projectile fragments have been measured for projectile fragments decaying via weak interaction [24]. The stored mother and daughter nuclei can be measured in different experimental scenarios depending on the difference in magnetic rigidities. If the half-live of the selected α -emitters and their daughters are a few seconds or longer, the combination of stochastic and electron cooling [30] can be applied and both mother and daughter nuclei circulate in closed orbits, allowing time-correlated Schottky analysis [22,31].

It is our aim, with the present proposal, to start a campaign of measurements devoted to the investigation of the alpha-decay properties of highly charged emitters. The strategy we want to pursue can be summarized by the following points:

- Q_α -values and α -decay lifetimes measurement of the “bare” emitters (present proposal).
- Q_α -values and α -decay lifetimes measurement of one electron (H-like) and two electrons (He-like) alpha emitters.
- Lifetimes measurement of the corresponding neutrals species at the FRS focal plane.

The investigation of H-like and He-like emitters will give us information on the screening effects related with the K-shell. The lifetime measurement of the neutral atoms will cross check and complement the existing data, sometime very old, found in literature, therefore establishing a solid reference data set, required to be conclusive about the expected evidence of lifetimes changes.

2. Theoretical prediction of U_e and lifetime evaluation.

In order to introduce the theoretical approach for deducing the electron screening energy U_e in heavy atoms, we consider here the sudden and the adiabatic limit of electron screening, as already reported in ref. [14].

In the sudden limit one considers the value of the electrostatic potential at the nucleus due to the electrons. This is the average energy acquired by the alpha particle experiencing a static electric field produced by the “frozen” electron cloud at the nucleus. This electrostatic potential, deduced long time ago by Hartree calculations for the full range of atoms [15], can be parameterised by a power-law formula fitting the values tabulated by Dickinson [16], who reports non relativistic calculations. Relativistic corrections are not negligible in case of heavy nuclei and in ref. [2] we show for the first time the correct value of the sudden limit U_e^{sl} :

$$U_e^{sl} = 2 \left(\frac{12}{5} \right) Z^{7/3} R + 1.72665 \cdot 10^{-3} Z^{10/3}. \quad (1)$$

Here R is the Rydberg constant in energy unit ($R=13.595$ eV) and Z is the charge of the daughter nucleus. This parameterisation has been obtained by fitting the relativistic Hartree-Fock-Slater calculations performed by Feiock and Johnson [17].

It is interesting at this stage to remark how, in case of alpha-decaying nuclei, U_e^{sl} spans from 20 keV up to 40 keV, i.e. about 1% of the Q_α energy and it is 10^3 times larger than the typical U_e changes due to the chemical environment.

The adiabatic limit (giving the upper limit of U_e) can be deduced by considering the difference in the total electron binding energies of the parent atom $E_B(Z+2)$ and the daughter one $E_B(Z)$:

$$U_e^{al} = E_B(Z+2) - E_B(Z), \quad (2)$$

with E_B [18] parameterised as a function of the charge number Z :

$$E_B(Z) = 14.4381Z^{2.39} + 1.55468 \cdot 10^{-6} Z^{5.35} eV$$

The trend of equation (2) is shown in Fig. 1.

A numerical comparison between the two limits (1) and (2) shows negligible differences, i.e. $U_e^{sl} = U_e^{al} = U_e$. The physical meaning of this can be inferred by using the Hellmann-Feynman theorem if, like in our case, $Z_\alpha \ll Z_{parent}$ (refer to [15] for further details). We will not discuss here the important consequences of such a result, but we stress that in the statistical regime where many electrons are involved, one gets a single theoretical prediction for U_e , removing any ambiguity. This marks a big difference with respect to the light systems involved in low energy reactions since in presence of few electrons one has to deal with a complex few-body system where particle-particle correlations play a major role.

As a matter of fact, any experimental evidence of very large screening potential energies in case of heavy nuclei, as those actually found in low energy astrophysical relevant reactions, could have dramatic effects on the alpha decay systematic.

In the following, we will use formula (2) in order to deduce the value of the screening energy. Moreover this is consistent with the fact that alpha particle velocity is much lower than electron velocity $v_\alpha \ll v_e$, fully supporting the adiabatic interpretation.

The values of U_e^{al} calculated for three alpha decaying nuclei, ^{222}Rn , ^{212}Po and ^{147}Sm are reported in Table 1. The three systems have been selected for comparison on the basis of their different Q_α values, spanning all the allowed range.




Fig 1. U_e screening energy potential vs Z nuclear charge of the parent evaluated within the adiabatic limit.

We will compute now relative variations of the α -decay constant λ by using the two models proposed originally by Erma [1] and Rubinson and Perlman [9]. The two approaches strongly differ each other and they lead to different theoretical estimations.

According to Erma the “bare” lifetime can be evaluated by the “artificial” change in the Q_α -value which is completely equivalent to increasing the electrostatic barrier thickness [1]. Then one can deduce in a straightforward way the relative changes in the decay constants by using, for instance, the Coulomb penetrability written in terms of the regular and irregular Coulomb Functions as suggested in [2]. In Table 1 these changes are reported for the three different systems and they are consistent with Erma’s and Liolios’ expectations [1,14].

Nucleus	$Q_\alpha (MeV)$	$U_e^{al} (keV)$	$\lambda_{scr} / \lambda_{bare}$
^{222}Rn	5.59	37.3	1.56
^{212}Po	8.95	35.8	1.21
^{147}Sm	2.31	21.9	2.17

Table I. Screening energy U_e^{al} and relative alpha-decay constants $\lambda_{scr} / \lambda_{bare}$ calculated in the adiabatic limit.

In the case of bare ^{147}Sm , due to the small Q_α -value, a change by a factor two in lifetime is expected. This is a peculiar case, hardly accessible experimentally, because of the very long lifetime involved ($T_{1/2}=10^{11}$ years).

In the second model proposed by Rubinson and Perlman [9] is stated that on the assumption that U_e is rigorously constant in the range $R \leq r \leq r_t$, where R is the nuclear radius and r_t the classical turning point, any non zero value of $\delta\lambda$ will be wrong. This can be also expressed by the general remark that adding a spatially constant value to the potential cannot change the dynamics of the system. Consequently they derived a formula taking into account the slight radial dependence of U_e in the range $R \leq r \leq r_t$. This can be worked out within a model of constant electron charge density in the volume bounded by the nuclear surface and a sphere of radius r_t . We will not report here the development of the theory [9], instead we will use the final result in order to deduce relative decay constant variations.

$$\frac{\Delta\lambda}{\lambda} = 4000 \cdot (Z - 2)^3 E^{-7/2} \rho_e \quad (3)$$

where Z is the nuclear charge of the parent nucleus, E and ρ_e are the energy of the emitted α -particle and the electron density at the nucleus respectively, both in atomic units.

By substituting in (3) the decaying properties of ^{147}Sm , the most favourable case, and the electron density at the nucleus ρ_e [9] we obtain a $\delta\lambda/\lambda \approx 10^{-3}$. Thus, two interesting scenarios come out. In particular, in the second case no change in the lifetime should be detected within the experimental errors, vanishing any possibility to change drastically α -decay lifetime by any modification of the *static* electron configuration inside and outside the atom. Nevertheless, in both the scenarios a change of Q_α -value in the decay of the bare and the screened systems should appear, leading to the straightforward relationship $U_e^{sl} = Q_\alpha^{bare} - Q_\alpha^{screened}$ [19].

3. Experimental method.

We propose two ways to get ultimately experimental information on the electron screening effect in alpha decay:

- Measuring bare lifetimes, thus deducing U_e through the Coulomb penetrability.
- Measuring bare Q_α -values and comparing them with the atomic ones.

The combination of the fragment separator FRS [20] and the cooler-storage ring ESR at GSI [21] is a worldwide unique facility, which would allow for experimental investigation of the discussed topic.

3.1 Lifetime determination of bare nuclei.

We propose to use time-resolved Schottky mass spectrometry (SMS) [22,23] in order to measure the lifetimes of bare ^{212}Rn , ^{213}Fr and ^{220}Fr nuclei.

All of the proposed nuclei are known to be merely alpha decaying nuclei and they can be produced in the projectile fragmentation reaction with the required intensity (larger than 10^2 pps) due to rather large production cross-sections of uranium projectiles. Table II summarizes their known decay properties, calculated screening energy and expected relative decay-constant changes according to the approach of Erma.

Nucleus	$T_{1/2}$	α -Branch (%)	$Q_\alpha(\text{MeV})$	$U^{\text{at}}(\text{keV})$	$\lambda_{\text{scr}}/\lambda_{\text{bare}}$
$^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$	34.6 s (3)	99.45	6.905	38.0	1.40
$^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$	27.4 s (3)	99.65	6.801	38.0	1.40
$^{212}\text{Rn}^{86+}$	23.9 m (12)	100	6.385	37.3	1.44

Table II. Decay properties of the selected nuclei.

The SMS is ideally suited for measuring half-lives in the range from about a few seconds to a few ten minutes. Thus, the lifetimes lie in the optimal range in which such Schottky half-life measurements are well established [24-26]. In the case of ^{212}Rn , due to the longer lifetime involved, it will not be possible to neglect the unavoidable beam losses in the machine due to atomic charge changing in the electron cooler or the residual gas. In this case λ_{loss} correction has been evaluated to be of the same order of magnitude as the expected λ_{exp} . Therefore it will be mandatory to deduce experimentally λ_{loss} by measuring the lifetimes of nearby stable or long-lived species circulating simultaneously in the ESR, e.g. of the daughter nucleus $^{208}\text{Pb}^{82+}$. A similar technique has been previously applied in order to deduce $^{207}\text{Tl}^{81+}$ β -decay constant [26].

The constraints due to the time-range for applying the SMS ($30 \text{ s} < \tau < 30 \text{ min}$) determine a narrow range of the Q_α -values from 6.3 to 6.9 MeV to be accessed in the experiment. Moreover, the small range of nuclear charges involved ($Z=83-86$) restricts the range of electron screening energy U_e . As a result, one gets a narrow range for the expected $\Delta\lambda/\lambda$ variations as confirmed by Table 2.

As stated in the introduction, in future it would be important to perform measurements on one electron (H-like) and two electrons (He-like) alpha emitters in order to eventually reveal the expected strong effects of the K-shell on the decay.

The secondary bare ions will be produced by using projectile fragmentation of ^{238}U on a Be target ($\sim 1030 \text{ mg/cm}^2$ thick) and will be separated in the FRS by applying the so-called Bp- ΔE -Bp method [20]. For this purpose an Al wedge-shaped degrader will be used at the middle focal plane of the FRS (730 mg/cm^2 thick). In Table III the primary beam energy and the production cross-sections as given by the EPAX2 approximation [27] are reported. Intensities of injected beams into the ESR have been evaluated with the LISE++ [28] and MOCADI [29] codes. MOCADI calculations result in 10-15% less intensity. Prior to the injection into the ESR, identification of the selected species will be performed at S4, the achromatic plane of the FRS, by standard ΔE -TOF method.

Bare Ion	$E_{\text{lab}}(^{238}\text{U})$ [MeV·A] 10^9 ppp	σ_{prod} [mb] EPAX	$E_{\text{fra.}}$ [MeV·A]	Bp [T·m]	ESR Injected intensity [ppp]
$^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$	550	2.6	399	7.762	2400
$^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$	550	0.5	403	8.066	500
$^{212}\text{Rn}^{86+}$	550	1.45	401	7.838	1350

Table III. Expected production rates of secondary species.

Selected “hot” fragments will be stored in the ESR where the stochastic pre-cooling, combined with the electron cooling, will be applied in order to reduce their velocity spread during a time interval of typically a few seconds [30]. Differences in A/q ratio between parent and daughter nuclei are in the range of 0.5 %, well within the ESR momentum acceptance of about 2.5 %. The momentum transfer ($\Delta p_{\text{cm}} \approx 200 \text{ MeV}/c$) to the daughter, due to the alpha-decay, induces quite small velocity changes, therefore it should be possible to record the disappearance of a parent nucleus and the appearance of the daughter nucleus after a short cooling time ($\sim 0.2 \text{ s}$). Large betatron oscillations in the ring following the decay might induce losses of daughter ions. Since no data about in-ring mother to daughter transition are actually available for alpha decaying nuclei, we would like to perform a test measurement in the regime of a few-particle injection (see beam time requirements for further details). In this way we will experimentally verify the post-decay storage of the daughter ions in the ring.

In case of $^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ the daughter (^{216}At) has a very short lifetime and α -decays into $^{212}\text{Bi}^{83+}$, which will then be observed with a difference in A/q ratio of about 1%.

In order to improve the reliability of the measurement we would like to perform the experiment in two different regimes:

- Injection of many particles into the ESR and integration of the frequency peak of the Fourier-transformed Schottky noise, following the spectra waterfall for both parent and daughter ions (many particles decay).
- Injection of a few particles followed by single particle decay-time measurements (single particle decay).

Both methods meanwhile represent standard lifetime measurements at the FRS-ESR [31]. As a matter of fact, the feasibility of the present measurement in the case of ^{212}Rn has been verified in September 2002 in a different experimental context [30]. Unfortunately the measurement time was not long enough ($\Delta t \sim 60 \text{ s}$) in order to extract information relevant for our purpose (see Fig 2).




Fig 2. Waterfall of Schottky spectra showing the isobaric mass triplet with $^{212}\text{Rn}^{86+}$ as already measured in September 2002 (from [30]) by applying stochastic cooling.

In the single-decay measurements we avoid systematic uncertainties due to ring losses and contaminants by using parent-daughter time correlation, cross checking the obtained results. As mentioned above, the applicability of this method is submitted to the post-decay daughter survival in the ring, furthermore it is time consuming, due to the statistical sample needed.

Preliminary Monte Carlo calculations have been performed in order to estimate the number of ESR injections necessary to fulfil the required statistics for the case of single particle decays. In Fig. 3 the simulated decays, corresponding to a sample of $2 \cdot 10^3$ ESR injections of $^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$, are plotted. The injected parent distribution has been assumed to be Poissonian with an average of $\langle N \rangle = 2$ (see Fig. 3a) and the total measurement time has been set equal to the expected bare lifetime in the lab frame $\tau = 70 \cdot \gamma$ s where $\gamma = 1.429$ (see Fig. 3b). Such low injection multiplicity is mandatory in order to disentangle each single parent decay (variation of the area of the Schottky frequency peak). Simulations performed for the other systems ($^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ and $^{212}\text{Rn}^{86+}$) give similar results. The single-decay measurements appear more time consuming only in the case of ^{220}Rn due to the longer lifetime involved.

The statistical error on the extracted lifetime has been estimated to be 6% for both $^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ and $^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ nuclei by considering $2 \cdot 10^3$ ESR injections. In both cases this uncertainty leads to an error on the electron screening energy $\Delta U/U = 18\%$.

In conclusion the error on the deduced screening energy will be dominated by the systematic error due to λ_{loss} evaluation in the case of ^{212}Rn and by the statistical errors in the cases of ^{220}Fr and ^{213}Fr nuclei. As shown by the Monte Carlo calculations, the measuring time will be mainly determined by the statistical sample needed by the single-decay method.

Beam time requirements are shown in the last section.




Fig 3. Monte Carlo simulations for a sample of $2 \cdot 10^3$ injections of $^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ into the ESR. (a) Initial Poisson distribution of parent ions. (b) Decay time spectrum. (c) Expected decay multiplicity per injection.

3.4 Bare Q_α determination in ESR.

Bare Q_α -value measurements in the ESR would allow a direct determination of the screening energy U_e by comparison with the tabulated atomic Q_α -values.

In order to accomplish this task, a resolution $\Delta Q/Q = 10^{-3}$ is needed, which is a challenge at the present ESR performance. Parent ($^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ and $^{212}\text{Rn}^{86+}$) and daughter ($^{209}\text{At}^{85+}$ and $^{208}\text{Po}^{84+}$) nuclei must circulate in the ESR at the same time in order to record simultaneously Schottky frequencies for both species. The measurement can be performed at the same time as the bare lifetime determination. In this way, the masses of all circulating ions will be measured with the SMS, as is being done routinely at the FRS-ESR [22,23,31,32]. The Q_α -value will be determined from the mass difference of the corresponding nuclides. Since the tabulated atomic masses cannot be used

directly for the calibration, we will use for this purpose the well-measured excitation energies of long-lived isomeric states, several of which will, as well, be stored in the ESR [22].

As already reported, it will not be possible for $^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ parent nucleus to observe the daughter, but its decay product $^{212}\text{Bi}^{83+}$. In this case the bare Q-value= $M(^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+})-2\cdot m_{\alpha}-M(^{212}\text{Bi}^{83+})$ can be obtained and compared with the tabulated (atomic) one determining an electron screening energy

$$U_e^{tot} \cong 2 \cdot U_e^{220\text{Fr}}.$$

4. Beam time requirement.

We would like to perform the proposed experiment in two separate runs:

1. FRS set-up and calibration, identification of mother nuclei at S4 (FRS), many-particles injection measurement, verification of post-decay daughter survival, preliminary Q_{α} -determination.
2. Single particle measurements and the final Q_{α} measurement.

The analysis of the first run will give us necessary information about optimisations to be applied in the second run. Precise FRS calibration is mandatory to be confident about the ion species injected into the ESR.

In order to deduce the electron-screening energy of the selected alpha emitters with a relative error of 18% we need to analyse single particle decays in $2 \cdot 10^3$ ESR injections of $^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ and $^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ bare nuclei.

Thus, we ask for:

First run (1 shift=8 h) :

- 12 shifts for FRS setting, calibration and identification at S4(FRS).
- 9 shifts to perform many particles decay measurements for $^{220}\text{Fr}^{87+}$, $^{213}\text{Fr}^{87+}$ and $^{212}\text{Rn}^{86+}$ including 3 shifts for ESR settings.

Second run:

- 3 shifts for FRS-ESR setting.
- $2 \cdot 10^3 \cdot (120\text{s} + 120\text{s}) = 17$ shifts for the single particle measurement.

In summary we ask for a total of 41 shifts of ^{238}U at E_{lab} of about 550 MeV/A ($I=10^9$ particles per pulse).

- 21 shifts, to be assigned to the first run
- 20 shifts, to be assigned to the second run

Bibliography

- [1] A. Erma, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1784(1957).
- [2] A. Musumarra, arXiv nucl-th/0412036, December 2004.
- [3] S. Engstler, A.Krauss, K. Neldner, C. Rolfs, U. Schröder and K. Langanke PLB **202**, 179(1980).
- [4] F. Strieder, C. Rolfs, C. Spitaleri and P. Corvisiero, Naturwissenschaften **88**, 461(2001).
- [5] F. C. Barker, Nuclear Physics A **707**, 277(2002).
- [6] H.J. Assembaum, K. Langanke and C. Rolfs, Z. Phys. A **327**, 461(1987).

- [7] I. Perlman and J.O. Rasmussen, "*Alpha Radioactivity*" *Handbuch der Physik* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1957), Vol. **42**.
- [8] T. D. Shoppa, S. E. Koonin, K. Langanke, and R. Seki, *Phys. Rev. C* **48**, 837(1993).
- [9] W. Rubinson and M. L. Perlman, *PLB* **40**, 352(1972).
- [10] G. T. Emery, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Science* **22**, 165 (1972).
- [11] K.-P. Dostal, M. Nagel and D. Pabst, *Z. Naturforsch.* **32a**, 345(1977).
- [12] H. Schatz, R. Toenjes, B. Pfeiffer, T.C. Beers, J.J. Cowan, V. Hill, K.-L. Kratz, *APJ* **579** 626(2002).
- [13] H. Schatz, A. Aprahamian, V. Barnard, L. Bildsten, A. Cumming, M. Ouellette, T. Rauscher, F.-K. Thielemann, M. Wiescher, *PRL* **86** 3471(2001).
- [14] T. E. Liolios, *Phys. Rev. C* **68**, 015804(2003).
- [15] L. L. Foldy, *Phys. Rev.* **83**, 397(1951).
- [16] W. C. Dickinson, *Phys. Rev.* **80**, 563 (1950).
- [17] F. D. Feiock and W.R. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 785(1968).
- [18] D. Lunney, J. M. Pearson and C. Thibault, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 1021 (2003).
- [19] R. Serber and H.S. Snyder, *Phys. Rev.* **87**, 152-153 (1952).
- [20] H. Geissel et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **B70**, 286 (1992).
- [21] B. Franzke, *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **B24/25**, 18 (1987).
- [22] Yu.A. Litvinov et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **A756**, 3 (2005).
- [23] F. Bosch, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **36**, 585 (2003).
- [24] H. Irnich et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4182 (1996).
- [25] Yu.A. Litvinov et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B573**, 80 (2003).
- [26] T. Ohtsubo, F. Bosch, H. Geissel et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 052501(2005).
- [27] K. Sümmerer et al. *Phys. Rev.* **C61**, 034607(2000).
- [28] D. Bazin et al. *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **A482**, 307(2002).
- [29] N. Iwasa et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **B126**, 284 (1997).
- [30] F. Nolden et al., *Nucl. Instr. and Meth.* **A532**, 329(2004).
- [31] H. Geissel, Yu.A. Litvinov, B. Pfeiffer et al., in *Proc. FINUSTAR05*, Cos, Greece, 2005.
- [32] D. Boutin, PhD thesis, Justus-Liebig Universität Giessen 2005, 41.