## Production cross sections of ${}^{52g}$ Mn in $\alpha$ -particle-induced reactions on ${}^{nat}V^{\dagger}$

G. Damdinsuren,<sup>\*1,\*2</sup> M. Aikawa,<sup>\*1,\*2,\*3</sup> Kh. Tegshjargal,<sup>\*4</sup> N. Erdene,<sup>\*4</sup> S. Ebata,<sup>\*5,\*2</sup> and H. Haba<sup>\*2</sup>

Manganese-52 has the longer-lived ground state  $^{52g}\mathrm{Mn}\ (T_{1/2}=5.6~\mathrm{d},\,\varepsilon+\beta^+:\,100\%)$  and the shorterlived excited state  ${}^{52m}$ Mn ( $T_{1/2} = 21.1 \text{ min}$ , IT: 1.78%,  $\varepsilon + \beta^+$ : 98.22%). The decay processes of  ${}^{52g}$ Mn are electron capture (70.6%) and positron emission  $(29.4\%, \langle E_{\beta^+} \rangle = 242 \text{ keV})^{.1}$  The positrons emitted from the decay of  ${}^{52g}$ Mn can be used for Positron Emission Tomography (PET).<sup>2)</sup> The direct routes to produce <sup>52g</sup>Mn involve charged-particle-induced reactions on chromium and vanadium. Whereas, the indirect route involves the internal transition of  ${}^{52m}Mn$ co-produced simultaneously in the reactions. This study, we focused on the  $\alpha$ -particle-induced reaction on  $^{nat}V$ . Eleven experimental cross section data of the  $^{nat}V(\alpha, x)^{52g}Mn$  reactions were found in the EX-FOR library.<sup>3</sup> However, their data are largely scattered. Therefore, we measured the excitation function of the  $^{nat}V(\alpha, x)^{52g}Mn$  reaction up to 50 MeV. The obtained cross sections were compared with the literature data and theoretical calculation in the TENDL-2019 library.<sup>4)</sup>

The stacked-foil activation technique and highresolution  $\gamma$ -ray spectrometry were used to measure the cross sections. Pure metallic foils of  $^{nat}V$  (25- $\mu$ m thick, 99% purity), <sup>nat</sup>Ti (5- $\mu$ m thick, 99.6% purity), and  $^{27}$ Al (5- $\mu$ m thick, >99% purity) were purchased from Nilaco Corp., Japan, and used for the stacked target. The <sup>nat</sup>Ti foils were interleaved for the  $^{nat}$ Ti $(\alpha, x)^{51}$ Cr monitor reaction. The <sup>27</sup>Al foils were used to catch recoiled products from the <sup>nat</sup>V and <sup>nat</sup>Ti foils. The average target thicknesses were derived from the measured size and weight of the original foils. Derived average thicknesses of  $^{nat}\mathrm{V},~^{nat}\mathrm{Ti},$  and  $^{27}\mathrm{Al}$  foils were 20.4, 2.24, and 1.22  $mg/cm^2$ , respectively. The original foils were cut into a size of  $8 \times 8$  mm. Eleven sets of V-Al-Ti-Ti-Al foils were stacked into a target holder, which served as a Faraday cup.

The stacked target was irradiated with an  $\alpha$ -particle beam for 30 min. The primary beam energy was measured by the time-of-flight method.<sup>5)</sup> The measured beam energy was 50.6 ± 0.2 MeV. Consequently, the energy degradation in the stacked target was calcu-

- \*<sup>2</sup> RIKEN Nishina Center
- \*<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University
- \*4 School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, National University of Mongolia
- $^{*5}~$  Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Saitama University

lated using stopping powers obtained from the SRIM code.<sup>6</sup> The average beam intensity measured using the Faraday cup was 194 nA.

 $\gamma$  rays emitted from each irradiated foil were measured by a high-resolution HPGe detector (ORTEC GEM-25185-P), which was calibrated with a multiple gamma-ray emitting point source. The spectra were analyzed using dedicated software (SEIKO EG&G Gamma Studio). Each <sup>nat</sup>V foil with the following <sup>27</sup>Al catcher foil was measured several times. The distance between the detector and foils was arranged to ensure a dead time of less than 3%.

The cross sections of the <sup>nat</sup>Ti( $\alpha, x$ )<sup>51</sup>Cr monitor reaction were derived and used to assess the beam parameters and target thicknesses. The measurement of the  $\gamma$  line at 320.08 keV ( $I_{\gamma} = 9.91\%$ ) from the decay of <sup>51</sup>Cr ( $T_{1/2} = 27.7025$  d) was performed following a cooling time of 3 days. Only the Ti foils at the beam downstream of each Ti-Ti foil pair in the stack were used for cross section deduction because the compensation of recoiled <sup>51</sup>Cr was expected. The dead time during the measurements was maintained at less than 1%. Subsequently, the derived cross sections were compared with the IAEA-recommended values<sup>7)</sup> and found to be consistent with each other. We adopted the measured beam parameters and target thicknesses without any corrections for data analyses.

The cross sections of the  $^{nat}V(\alpha, x)^{52g}Mn$  reaction were derived. The  $\gamma$  line at 935.544 keV ( $I_{\gamma} = 94.5\%$ ) from the decay of  $^{52g}Mn$  was measured following a cooling time of 17 d. During the cooling time, the excited state  $^{52m}Mn$  completely decayed to the ground state  $^{52g}Mn$  or the stable nuclide  $^{52}Cr$ . The cumulative cross

<sup>nat</sup>V(a,x)<sup>52g</sup>Mn(cum)



Fig. 1. Excitation functions of the  ${}^{nat}V(\alpha, x)^{52g}Mn$  reaction.

400

350

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> Condensed from the article in Appl. Radiat. Isot. 184, 110204 (2022)

<sup>\*1</sup> Graduate School of Biomedical Science and Engineering, Hokkaido University

sections could be derived from the measured net counts of the  $\gamma$  line. The excitation functions are shown in Fig. 1 along with the literature data and TENDL-2019 values.<sup>4)</sup> The measured cross sections exhibited a smooth curve and agreement with part of the previous experimental data. However, the shape of the TENDL-2019 values was largely different from the experimental data.

G. Damdinsuren was granted a scholarship by the M-JEED project (Mongolian-Japan Engineering Education Development Program, J11B16).

## References

- 1) Y. Dong et al., Nucl. Data Sheets 128, 185 (2015).
- 2) F. Bianchi et al., Appl. Radiat. Isot. 166, 109329 (2020).
- 3) N. Otuka *et al.*, Nucl. Data Sheets **120**, 272 (2014).
- 4) A. J. Koning et al., Nucl. Data Sheets 155, 1 (2019).
- T. Watanabe *et al.*, Proc. 5th Int. Part. Accel. Conf. (IPAC 2014), (2014), p. 3566.
- J. F. Ziegler *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. B 268, 1818 (2010).
- 7) F. Tárkányi et al., IAEA-TECDOC-1211 (2007).