Inclusion of Absolute γ–ray Emission Probabilities in ENSDF Decay Data

J. Chen (MSU), T. Kibédi (ANU) & F.G. Kondev (ANL)

- a proposal [F.G. Kondev (ANL), T. Kibédi (ANU) & E. Browne (LBNL)] was made at the 21th Meeting of the NSDD Network, Vienna, Austria 2015, but was not adopted - it was recommended that the necessary computational infrastructure is developed and tested prior the adoption

- a lot of progress was made since 2015 with the modernization and improvement of existing ENSDF codes [IAEA ENSDF-codes development project and effort from T. Kibédi (ANU) and J. Chen (MSU)] - we (Tibor, Jun and I) would like to bring the proposal to this NSDD meeting for discussion and its adoption as a policy

ENSDF decay data



- for many applications the end users need absolute γ, β, α, CE, etc. emission probabilities, e.g. **%radiation per decay of the parent**
  - ✓ %α decay involves discrete radiations – no problem (in general)
  - ✓ %γ and %β are mostly determined from the decay scheme, while CE, X-ray, Auger are derived - deduced from %Iγ and ICC

- ✓ what actually the authors measure and publish are relative γ-ray emission probabilities ($I_{\gamma i}$)
- ✓ crucial part of the nuclear data evaluation work is to convert the relative gamma-ray emission probabilities to absolute ones ($\%I_{\gamma i}$)

$$NR = \frac{(100 - I_{\beta 0})}{\sum I_{\gamma i} \times (1 + \alpha_{Ti})}$$

$$\%I_{\gamma i} = NR \times I_{\gamma i}$$

in ENSDF

providing NR and relative Iγ seems sufficient?



$I\gamma_1$=100 +/- 10; $I\gamma_2$= 60 +/- 6; $I\gamma_3$= 50 +/- 5

$I_{\beta 0}$=79.4 +/- 0.5 %

$$\%I_{\gamma j} = NR \times I_{\gamma j}$$

$\%I\gamma_1$= 9.8 +/- 1.1 – relative unc. **11.2 %**

$\%I\gamma_2$= 5.9 +/- 0.7

$\%I\gamma_3$= 4.9 +/- 0.6

$$\%I_{\gamma j} = \frac{(100 - I_{\beta 0})}{\sum I_{\gamma i} \times (1 + \alpha_{Ti})} \times I_{\gamma j}$$

- ✓ E. Browne, NIM A249 (1986)
- ✓ uncertainties package (python)
  www.pythonhosted.org/uncertainties/

$\%I\gamma_1$= 9.8 +/- 0.7 – relative unc. **7.1 %**

$\%I\gamma_2$= 5.9 +/- 0.5

$\%I\gamma_3$= 4.9 +/- 0.5



might end up with a huge differences in cases where precision matters!

Consequences

- ✓ using NR and relative I$\gamma_{i,}$ the end-users may end up with incorrect uncertainties for the absolute γ-ray emission probabilities for gamma rays that are used in the normalization procedure

- ✓ in many such cases the uncertainties for absolute γ-ray emission probabilities that you can find in derivative database such as NuDat , LiveChart, ENDF, JEFF … are incorrect - same is true for DDEP – in some of these derivative databases the uncertainties are missing …

Solution & Implementation

- **%Iγ** must be provided by the evaluators in the ENSDF decay data sets, by correctly taking into account the uncertainty propagation & correlations

- we have the tools to do that promptly and with little additional effort
  - ✓ the **GABS** analysis program – T. Kibedi (ANU)
  - ✓ the **GLSC** code – J. Chen (MSU)

- change the ENSDF policy that %Iγ are provided mandatory in each decay data set that can be normalized