

## Measurement of the fission mass yields of Am242 at the Lohengrin Spectrometer



#### Charlotte AMOUROUX<sup>1</sup>

A. Bidaud<sup>2</sup>, N. Capellan<sup>2</sup>, S. Chabod<sup>2</sup>, H. Faust<sup>3</sup>, G. Kessedjian<sup>2</sup>, U. Köster<sup>3</sup>,
A. Letourneau<sup>1</sup>, F. Martin<sup>2</sup>, T. Materna<sup>1</sup>, S. Panebianco<sup>1</sup>, Ch. Sage<sup>2</sup>, O. Serot<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CEA, DSM-Saclay, France <sup>2</sup>LPSC Grenoble, CNRS/IN2P3, France <sup>3</sup>Institut Laue Langevin, France <sup>4</sup>CEA, DEN-Cadarache, France

## <sup>242</sup>Am(Z=95)

<sup>241</sup>Am : 90% of the radiotoxicity of the nuclear waste (without plutonium) between 200 and 1000 years -> Transmutation of <sup>241</sup>Am



## <u>PLAN</u>

- Experimental Set-up & Analysis Method
- Energy and Charge Distributions
- Uncertainties Determination
- Results

## **Experimental setup**



□ High neutron flux Reactor

Target

□ Magnet: Selection A/q

Condenser: Selection: E/q

Detector: E 🥣



# How do we measure the energy of the fragment?

#### $\Box$ $\Delta$ E-E Ionisation Chamber





Valid if no correlation between E and q

In reality we have a correlation but its influence on Y(A) in less than 3%

## **Q-Distribution**

 Example of Q-distribution : two differents cases
 Measured Charge is determined at the last crossed material (Nickel)



70 E, [MeV]

## **E-Distribution**





## Kinetic energy as a fonction of the fragment mass



## **E-Distribution**



Amplitude [a.u]

## **Determination of the systematic error**

#### This point is known twice



#### For the same mass as a



#### For all masses:



ν ν σ~3%

Charlotte AMOUROUX-WONDER -25/09/2012

## Sources of relative uncertainties and their respective contributions.

Source	Contribution
Statistical	~1 %
Extrapolation of the low part of the energy distribution	1.5 %
Extrapolation of the high part of the energy distribution	1%
Discrepancies between the two measurements of the common point	3%
Normalisation	?
Total of the systematic error	3.5%

### **Fission Yields of Am-242**

□ <u>Objectives of the experiment :</u>

- Fission Mass Yields from Am-241(2n,f)
- Is there any difference between the fission yields of Am-242(n,f) and Am-242m(n,f)?



## How do we proceed to observe a possible difference ?



of the target (large energy shift)

B: vaccum problem

## What is the maximum possible difference ?



Hypothesis: X=0.

General case : **Г~1** 

$$\Gamma(t_1, t_2) = \frac{\gamma(t_1)}{\gamma(t_2)} = \frac{(1 + \beta(t_1) * X')}{(1 + \beta(t_2) * X')}$$
  
$$\sigma_{\Gamma} = |\beta(t_2) - \beta(t_1)| * \sigma_{X'} \text{ for } X' = 0$$

with  $|\beta(t_2) - \beta(t_1)|_{max} = 0.17$  and  $\sigma_{\Gamma} \sim 0.08$ (0.04 for all  $\sigma_{\gamma}$ )  $\sigma_{\gamma} \sim 0.47$ 

Charlotte AMOUROUX-WONDER -25/09/2012

If we know  $Y_1^m$  et  $Y_2^m$  then:

 $\beta(t_2)$ =0,5 during the measurement of the masses so  $\sigma_{\Gamma}$ ~0,11 (0,04 for all  $\sigma_{\gamma}$  and 0,07 for  $\sigma_{\gamma_m}$ )

## **Conclusions**



□ No difference between the yields: quantification on-going.

□ If you assume they are equal ...



## **Future**



## Back-up

## **Comparaison with the GEF code(June 2012)**



## **Number of fissions**



# Evolution of the kinetic energy as a function of time



## FWHM of the energy distribution as a

## function of time

