

Submitted to Inorg. Nucl.  
Chem. Letters

RECEIVED  
SEP 15 1971  
DOCUMENTS SECTION

LBL-230  
Preprint c.2

COMMENTS ON  
"CHEMICAL SEPARATION OF KURCHATOVIIUM"

A. Ghiorso, M. Nurmia, K. Eskola,  
and P. Eskola

September 1971

AEC Contract No. W-7405-eng-48



**TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY**  
*This is a Library Circulating Copy  
which may be borrowed for two weeks.  
For a personal retention copy, call  
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 5545*

LBL-230  
c.2

4

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

## COMMENTS ON "CHEMICAL SEPARATION OF KURCHATOVIVM"\*†

A. Ghiorso, M. Nurmia, K. Eskola<sup>‡</sup> and P. EskolaLawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
University of California  
Berkeley, California

September 1971

The Editor has asked for our comments on the paper of Zvara et al., inasmuch as the work reported seems to bear upon the discovery of element 104.

In the present paper this Dubna group now interprets the ephemeral "kurchatovium" activity (which, it should be remembered, originally was characterized with a half-life of 0.3 seconds) in terms of an assumed spontaneous-fission branching decay of the nuclide,  $^{259}\text{Rf}$ . This isotope of rutherfordium was discovered by our group<sup>1</sup> and characterized as a 3-second alpha emitter with main alpha-particle groups at 8.86 and 8.77 MeV. For the following reasons we cannot agree that the new experiment which they report upon does support their claim to prior discovery of element 104.

1. At present we have only set an upper limit of 20% for the SF branching of  $^{259}\text{Rf}$  and such a limit does not by itself rule out the possibility that they have observed such a branching. It seems to us however, that it would be very surprising if the branching is high enough ( $\approx 10\%$ ) to account for the fissions observed in the Dubna experiments. Recall that  $^{261}\text{Rf}$ , a 65-second alpha emitter discovered by our group,<sup>2</sup> has already been shown to have an SF Tl/2 greater than 500 seconds and this isotope has two more neutrons than  $^{259}\text{Rf}$ . From the precipitous slope<sup>3,4</sup> of SF Tl/2 vs N for nuclides with more than 152 neutrons one would expect the half life of  $^{259}\text{Rf}$  to be orders of magnitude longer than that of  $^{261}\text{Rf}$ .

2. It should be noted that the new Dubna experiment gives no information about the half-life of the activity responsible for the fissions observed in section III of their apparatus. They assume that the half-life must be the same as that observed in recent purely physical experiments in which a 4.5-second SF activity was observed.<sup>5</sup> In a paper<sup>6</sup> published in 1966 it was pointed out that as much as 2% of the gross activity produced in a given experiment was able somehow to pass through a hot filter interposed in the chromatographic column line. It would seem logical to us to expect a much greater fraction to pass downstream through a straight tube which did not have any filter at all and consequently we wonder whether the  $^{256}\text{Md}$ - $^{256}\text{Fm}$  SF-emitting duo could conceivably be responsible for the 16 events observed.

3. A rather puzzling result of the new experiment is the apparent absence of the 0.1-sec (née 0.3-sec) "kurchatovium" atoms which should have decayed "in flight" in section II of their chromatographic column. From their previous work this " $^{260}\text{Ku}$ " activity should be almost as abundant as the "4.5-sec" activity. Does this prove chemically that the 0.1-sec spontaneous fission activity is not due to element 104? If so, then it is worth noting that the non-chemical angular-collimation and excitation-function evidence that "proved" that it was due to element 104 is of the same character as that which purportedly showed that the 4.5-sec activity was due to that element.

We believe that these comments raise some valid questions as to whether or not "element 104 (kurchatovium-Ku) was chemically isolated and identified." We hope to provide satisfactory answers in some new experiments which we will undertake in the near future.

REFERENCES

\* Work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

† I. Zvara, V. Z. Belov, L. P. Chelnokov, V. P. Domanov, M. Hussonois, Yu. S. Kortkin, V. A. Schegolev and M. R. Shalayevisky, "Chemical Separation of Kurchatovium," to be published in Inorganic and Nuclear Chemistry Letters.

‡ On leave of absence from Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

1. A. Ghiorso, M. Nurmia, J. Harris, K. Eskola, and P. Eskola, Phys. Rev. Letters 22, 1317 (1969).
2. A. Ghiorso, M. Nurmia, K. Eskola, and P. Eskola, Phys. Letters 32B, 95 (1970).
3. A. Ghiorso, and T. Sikkeland, Phys. Today 20, 25 (1967).
4. E. K. Hulet, J. F. Wild, R. W. Loughheed, J. E. Evans, B. J. Qualheim, M. Nurmia, and A. Ghiorso, Phys. Rev. Letters 26, 523 (1971).
5. G. N. Flerov, Yu. A. Lazarev, Yu. V. Lobanov, Yu. Ts. Oganesyanyan, and S. P. Tretiakova, Internat. Conf. Heavy Ion Phys., Dubna, 1971.
6. I. Zvara, Yu. T. Chuburkov, R. Tsaletka, T. S. Zvarova, M. R. Shalaeviskii, and B. V. Shilov, At. Energ. (USSR) 21, 83 (1966)[transl.: Soviet J. At. Energy 21, 709 (1966)].

LEGAL NOTICE

*This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.*

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DIVISION  
LAWRENCE RADIATION LABORATORY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720