# Cross section of ${}^{36}\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{n},\gamma){}^{37}\mathbf{S}$

H. Beer

Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, Institut für Kernphysik, P. O. Box 3640, D-76021 Karlsruhe, Germany

P. V. Sedyshev, Yu. P. Popov Frank Laboratory of Neutron Physics, JINR, 141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia

W. Balogh, H. Herndl, H. Oberhummer Institut für Kernphysik, Wiedner Hauptstr. 8–10, TU Wien, A–1040 Vienna, Austria (May 8, 2019)

At the Karlsruhe pulsed 3.75 MV Van de Graaff accelerator the  $^{36}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{n},\gamma)^{37}\mathrm{S}(5.05\,\mathrm{min})$  cross section was measured by the fast cyclic activation technique via the 3.103 MeV  $\gamma$ -ray line of the  $^{37}\mathrm{S}$ -decay. Samples of elemental sulfur enriched in  $^{36}\mathrm{S}$  by 5.933 % were irradiated between two gold foils which served as capture standards. The capture cross section was measured at the neutron energies 25, 151, 176, and 218 keV, respectively. The  $^{36}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{n},\gamma)^{37}\mathrm{S}$ -cross section in the thermonuclear and thermal energy range has been calculated using the direct-capture (DC) model combined with the folding procedure used for the determination of the potentials. The non-resonant experimental data for this reaction can be reproduced excellently using this method. The input parameters of the DC-calculation (masses, Q-values, nuclear density distributions, spectroscopic factors, spin-parity assignments and excitation energies of the low-lying states of the residual nucleus) have been taken from the available experimental data.

### PACS numbers: 25.40.Lw, 24.50.+g, 25.40.Dn

### I. INTRODUCTION

In the last years the importance of the direct–reaction (DI) mechanism in nucleosynthesis has been realized. The DI dominates over the compound–nucleus (CN) reaction mechanism if there exist no CN–levels near the threshold that can be excited in the reaction. For instance, this can be the case in reactions involving light nuclei, in the bigbang scenario as well as in in stellar hydrogen and helium burning. Direct capture (DC) can also be of importance in proton capture by proton–rich target nuclei [1]– [6] in the rp–process occurring in novae or X–ray bursts and in neutron capture by neutron–rich nuclei [7]– [11] in the inhomogenous big bang as well as in the s–process taking place in helium burning of red giants. Furthermore, DC can dominate for neutron capture by light [9] and heavy [12]– [16] target nuclei far from stability in the  $\alpha$ –process and r–process occurring in supernovae of type II, respectively. The reaction rates of the neutron–rich S–isotopes are of interest in the nucleosynthesis of nuclei in the s–process in the S–Cl–Ar–Ca region [14], [15], inhomogenous big–bang scenario [17], [10], and in the  $\alpha$ –rich freeze out of the neutron–rich hot neutrino bubble in supernovae of type II [18]– [21].

For the rare isotope  $^{36}$ S a significant abundance contribution is expected from the s-process nucleosynthesis. For quantitative analyses the size of the destruction rate, i.e. the neutron capture rate, is of fundamental importance to estimate the magnitude of the  $^{36}$ S abundance formed by the weak and main s-process components. Using the statistical model the  $^{36}$ S capture cross section has been estimated to be  $300\,\mu$ barn at  $30\,\text{keV}$  by Woosley et al. [22]. The present measurement, the first experimental investigation of this cross section, applies the fast cyclic activation technique [23] developed at the Karlsruhe  $3.75\,\text{MV}$  Van de Graaff accelerator.

We investigate the capture reaction  $^{36}S(n,\gamma)^{37}S$  from thermal (25.3 meV) to thermonuclear (25–218 keV) projectile energies and compare the calculated cross sections in the DC–model with the experimental data. In Sections II and III the activation technique is described, and the experimental results are given. In Section IV we introduce the methods used for calculating the direct–capture (DC) cross sections. In Section V the experimental and theoretical results for the neutron–capture cross section of  $^{36}S$  are compared and discussed.

# II. FAST CYCLIC ACTIVATION TECHNIQUE

The measurements have been carried out at the Karlsruhe pulsed 3.75 Van de Graaff accelerator. A common activation measurement is subdivided into two parts: (1) the irradiation of the sample, (2) the counting of the induced activity [24]. The cyclic activation method is the repetition of the irradiation and activity counting procedure

many times to gain statistics. Especially for nuclei with half lives of only minutes or seconds, in our case  $^{37}$ S with a half life of 5.05 minutes, a large number of irradiation and counting cycles is needed. The time constants for each cycle which are chosen shorter than the fluctuations of the neutron beam and comparable or shorter than the decay rate  $\lambda$  of the measured isotope are, the irradiation time,  $t_{\rm b}$ , the counting time,  $t_{\rm c}$ , the waiting time,  $t_{\rm w}$  (the time to switch from the irradiation to the counting phase), and the total time,  $T=t_{\rm b}+t_{\rm w}+t_{\rm c}+t'_{\rm w}$  ( $t'_{\rm w}$  the time to switch from the counting to the irradiation phase). In the actual  $^{36}$ S measurements the runs were partly carried out with  $t_{\rm b}=19.58\,\rm s$ ,  $t_{\rm c}=19.24\,\rm s$ ,  $T=40\,\rm s$ , partly with  $t_{\rm b}=49.58\,\rm s$ ,  $t_{\rm c}=49.24\,\rm s$ ,  $T=100\,\rm s$ . The waiting time is in both cases  $t_{\rm w}=0.42\,\rm s$ .

 $t_c$ =19.24s, T=40s, partly with  $t_b$ =49.58s,  $t_c$ =49.24s, T=100s. The waiting time is in both cases  $t_w$ =0.42s. The accumulated number of counts from a total of n cycles,  $C = \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_i$ , where  $C_i$ , the counts after the i-th cycle, are calculated for a chosen irradiation time,  $t_b$ , which is short enough compared with the fluctuations of the neutron flux with [23]

$$C = \epsilon_{\gamma} K_{\gamma} f_{\gamma} \lambda^{-1} [1 - \exp(-\lambda t_{c})] \exp(-\lambda t_{w}) \frac{1 - \exp(-\lambda t_{b})}{1 - \exp(-\lambda T)} N \sigma [1 - f_{b} \exp(-\lambda T)] \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Phi_{i}$$

$$\tag{1}$$

with

$$f_{\rm b} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \Phi_i \exp[-(n-i)\lambda T]}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \Phi_i} .$$

The following additional quantities have been defined:  $\epsilon_{\gamma}$ : Ge-efficiency,  $K_{\gamma}$ :  $\gamma$ -ray absorption,  $f_{\gamma}$ :  $\gamma$ -ray intensity per decay, N: the number of target nuclei,  $\sigma$ : the capture cross section,  $\Phi_i$ : the neutron flux in the i-th cycle. The quantity  $f_{\rm b}$  is calculated from the registered flux history of a  $^6{\rm Li}$  glass monitor.

The efficiency determination of the 35% HPGe–detector (2 keV resolution at 1.332 MeV) has been reported elsewhere [7]. The  $\gamma$ –ray absorption was calculated using tables published by Storm and Israel [25] and Veigele [26]. The half–lives and the  $\gamma$ –ray intensities per decay of <sup>37</sup>S and <sup>198</sup>Au are given in Table I.

The activities of nuclides with half lives of several hours to days, i.e. the activity of  $^{198}$ Au, can be also counted after the end of the cyclic activation consisting of n cycles using

$$C_n = \epsilon_{\gamma} K_{\gamma} f_{\gamma} \lambda^{-1} [1 - \exp(-\lambda T_{\rm M})] \exp(-\lambda T_{\rm W}) [1 - \exp(-\lambda t_{\rm b})] N \sigma f_{\rm b} \sum_{i=1}^n \Phi_i \quad . \tag{2}$$

Here  $T_{\rm M}$  is the measuring time of the Ge–detector and  $T_{\rm W}$  the time elapsed between the end of cyclic activation and begin of the new data aquisition.

The Eqs. 1 and 2, respectively, contain the unknown quantities  $\sigma$  and the total neutron flux  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \Phi_i$ . Therefore, cross section ratios can be formed for different isotopes exposed to the same total neutron flux. This is the basis for the determination of the <sup>36</sup>S capture cross section relative to the well–known standard <sup>197</sup>Au capture cross section [27]. As the <sup>36</sup>S sample to be investigated is characterized by a finite thickness it is necessary to sandwich the sample by two comparatively thin gold foils for the determination of the effective neutron flux at sample position. The activities of these gold foils were counted also individually after termination of the cyclic activation. The effective count rate of gold was obtained from these individual rates as well as from the accumulated gold count rate during the cyclic activation run. Therefore, the effective neutron flux at sample position was determined in two ways by way of the gold activation according to the Eqs. 1 and 2. Using Eq. 1 has the advantage that saturation effects in the gold activity for irradiations over several days are avoided [23].

# III. EXPERIMENTAL ARRANGEMENTS AND RESULTS

In Fig. 1 a scheme of the experimental setup is shown. The kinematically collimated neutron beam is generated with the  $^7\text{Li}(p,n)$  reaction near the reaction threshold (1.912 MeV proton energy) with thick  $^7\text{Li}$ —targets (30  $\mu$ m) and corresponds to a Maxwellian neutron spectrum with a thermal neutron energy of  $kT=25\,\text{keV}$  [23–27]. The neutron spectra at the neutron energies 151, 176, and 218 keV keV were generated using thin Li–targets (2.5  $\mu$ m). The required proton energy conditions and the neutron spectra integrated over the solid angle of the sample were determined in time–of–flight (TOF) measurements before the actual activation runs using the accelerator in pulsed mode (Fig. 2). These neutron spectra are in good agreement with corresponding Monte Carlo calculations [28] and [29]. The proton beam was wobbled initiated by magnetic deflection to cover the area of the Li–target. The beam profile formed was studied on a quartz target. To switch back and forth between sample irradiation and activity counting a fast sample changer operating with compressed air was used. Close to the beam line where the neutrons have been generated the Ge–detector for activity counting, well shielded by lead and Li–loaded paraffin, has been installed (Fig. 1). During

the irradiation phase the analog to digital converter was gated to prevent data acquisition. The relative neutron flux was recorded continuously with a  $^6$ Li glass detector. During the activity counting phase neutron generation was interrupted by a beam stop for the proton beam. This is essential to reduce all prompt accelerator dependent  $\gamma$ -rays. The beam stop was installed in the beam line at the accelerator hall so that in the activity counting periods the experimental hall was free of prompt background radiation. In Table I the sample characteristics of  $^{36}$ S and  $^{197}$ Au and the decay properties of the product nuclei are listed. Table II gives a survey of the sample weights and the measured  $^{36}$ S capture cross sections. The sulfur was pressed to self supporting tablets of 6 mm diameter, the gold foils on back and front side of the sulfur sample with regard to the impinging neutrons had the same dimensions. At 25 keV neutron energy measurements were carried out with sulfur sample masses between 20 and 100 mg. No significant effect from multiple neutron scattering was observed. A sample of the sulfur powder was also heated to  $^{300}$ ° C. No measurable weight loss due to absorbed water was found. In Fig. 3 the accumulated  $\gamma$ -ray intensity from one of the  $^{36}$ S activations is shown. The  $\gamma$ -line is well isolated on a low level of background counts.

The following systematic uncertainties were combined by quadratic error propagation: Au standard cross section: 1.5-3%, Ge–detector efficiency: 6%,  $\gamma$ –ray intensity per decay: 0.6% for the  $^{37}$ S and 0.1% for the  $^{198}$ Au decay, divergence of neutron beam: 2-12%, factor  $f_b$ : 1.5%, sample weight: <0.5%, and other systematic errors: 2%.

### IV. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

#### A. Reaction mechanism and models

In nuclear reactions two extreme types of reaction mechanisms can exist: the compound–nucleus (CN) and the direct (DI) process. In the CN mechanism the projectile merges in the target nucleus and excites many degrees of freedom of the CN. The excitation proceeds by way of a multistep process and therefore has a reaction time typically of the order  $10^{-16}$  s to  $10^{-20}$  s. After this time the CN decays into various exit channels. The relative importance of the decay channels is determined by the branching ratios to the final states. In the DI process the projectile excites only a few degrees of freedom (e.g. single–particle or collective). The excitation proceeds in one single step and has a characteristic time scale of  $10^{-21}$  s to  $10^{-22}$  s. This corresponds to the time it takes the projectile to pass through the target nucleus; this time is much shorter than the reaction time of CN processes.

# B. Folding procedure

The folding procedure is used for calculating the nucleon–nucleus potentials to describe the elastic scattering data and the bound states. This method has been applied successfully in describing many nucleon–nucleus systems. In the folding approach the nuclear density  $\rho_A$  is folded with an energy and density dependent nucleon–nucleon interaction  $v_{\rm eff}$  [30], [31]

$$V(R) = \lambda V_{\rm F}(R) = \lambda \int \rho_A(\vec{r}) v_{\rm eff}(E, \rho_A, |\vec{R} - \vec{r}|) d\vec{r}$$
(3)

with  $\vec{R}$  being the separation of the centers of mass of the two colliding nuclei. The normalization factor  $\lambda$  is adjusted to reproduce the elastic scattering data the binding energies of the residual nuclei. The folding potentials of Eq. 3 were determined with the help of the code DFOLD [32].

#### C. Direct-capture model

In thermonuclear scenarios the projectile energy is well below the Coulomb and/or centrifugal barrier. Consequently, the CN formation may be suppressed, because there are almost no CN levels that can be populated, especially in light, magic and far-off-stability nuclei. In this work the theoretical cross sections are calculated by only considering the DC-contributions. The theoretical cross section  $\sigma^{\text{th}}$  is obtained from the DC cross section  $\sigma^{\text{DC}}$  by [31], [33]

$$\sigma^{\text{th}} = \sum_{i} C_i^2 S_i \sigma_i^{\text{DC}} \quad . \tag{4}$$

The sum extends over the ground state and excited states in the final nuclei, where the spectroscopic factors  $S_i$  are known. The isospin Clebsch–Gordan coefficients are given by  $C_i$ . The DC cross sections  $\sigma_i^{DC}$  are essentially determined

by the overlap of the scattering wave function in the entrance channel, the bound–state wave function in the exit channel and the multipole transition–operator. The radial dependence of the wave functions in the DC–integral is in our case determined uniquely by the folding potentials.

### V. CALCULATIONS AND RESULTS

In the folding approach the nuclear density  $\rho_A$  for the stable nucleus  $^{36}\mathrm{S}$  was derived from the experimental charge distribution [34]. The normalization factor  $\lambda$  for  $^{36}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{n},\gamma)^{37}\mathrm{S}$  of the optical potential in the entrance channel was adjusted to fit the thermal ( $^{36}\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{n}$ )-scattering cross section of  $(1.1\pm0.8)\,\mathrm{barn}$  [35]. Even so this cross section is not determined well, we fitted our normalization factor to reproduce 1.1 barn. However, applying the same fitting procedure to the ( $^{34}\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{n}$ )-scattering cross section that is known much better ( $(1.52\pm0.03)\,\mathrm{barn}$  [35]) we obtained almost the same volume integral per nucleon in the two cases ( $^{34}\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{n}$ :  $501.7\,\mathrm{MeV}\,\mathrm{fm}^3$ ;  $^{36}\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{n}$ :  $497.1\,\mathrm{MeV}\,\mathrm{fm}^3$ ). The imaginary part of the optical potential is small for the ( $^{36}\mathrm{S}+\mathrm{n}$ )-channel and can be neglected. For the exit channels the normalization constants  $\lambda$  were adjusted to the energies of the ground and the excited states. The potentials obtained in this way ensure the correct behavior of the wave functions in the nuclear exterior.

The spectroscopic factors for one–nucleon stripping of <sup>37</sup>S were determined from the most recent experimental <sup>36</sup>S(d,p)<sup>37</sup>S–data [39]. We also carried out shell–model calculations using a combined sd– and pf–shell with an effective nucleon–nucleon interaction derived by Warburton et al. [36]. For these calculations the program OXBASH [37] was used to calculate the wave functions and spectroscopic factors. The calculated spectroscopic factors are larger than those extracted from the experimental <sup>36</sup>S(d,p)<sup>37</sup>S–data (see Table III). This fact might be due to the strong truncation of the model space (only one neutron in the pf–shell for the negative parity states). Inclusion of more particle–hole excitations should give smaller spectroscopic factors. The masses and Q–values for the transitions to the different states of the residual nucleus <sup>37</sup>S were taken from experimental data [38], [39]. For the DC–calculations the code TEDCA [41] was used.

The level scheme of the relevant levels for  $^{37}\mathrm{S}$  is shown in Fig. 4. The cross section for the reaction  $^{36}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{n},\gamma)^{37}\mathrm{S}$  obtained from the DC–calculation is compared with the experimental data from the thermal to the thermonuclear energy region in Fig. 5. There are two types of E1–transitions contributing for the transitions to the residual nucleus  $^{37}\mathrm{S}$ . The first one comes from an s–wave in the entrance channel exciting the negative–parity states  $3/2^-$  and  $1/2^-$  (see Table III). These transitions give the well–known  $1/\mathrm{v}$ –behavior (see Fig. 4). The second type of E1–transition comes from an initial p–wave and excites the positive–parity state  $3/2^+$  in the final nucleus. This transition has a v–behavior and can be neglected in the relevant energy range (see Fig. 4 and Table III). The E1–transition to the  $7/2^-$ –ground state of  $^{37}\mathrm{S}$  can also be neglected, because of the higher centrifugal barrier necessary for the incoming d–wave (see Table III). As can be seen from Fig. 4 this contribution effects the deviation from an  $1/\mathrm{v}$ –behavior of the cross section only above about 700 keV.

The spin and parity assignments of the final states in  $^{37}$ S, the Q-values for the transitions to the different final states, the spectroscopic factors obtained from  $^{36}$ S(d,p) $^{37}$ S and shell-model calculations are shown in Table III. Also in this table the calculated cross sections for  $^{36}$ S(n, $\gamma$ ) $^{37}$ S at 25.3 meV, 25, 151, 176, and 218 keV keV using DC with the spectroscopic factors obtained from the (d,p)-data are compared with the experimental data.

We have determined the thermonuclear–reaction–rate factor  $N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle$  [40]. Since the cross section follows an 1/v–law up to 150 keV we obtain a constant reaction–rate factor

$$N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle = 2.56 \times 10^4 \,\text{cm}^3 \,\text{mole}^{-1} \,\text{s}^{-1}$$
 (5)

## VI. DISCUSSION

Direct–capture calculations using the folding procedure can excellently reproduce the non–resonant experimental data for the capture cross section by the neutron–rich sulfur isotope <sup>36</sup>S in the thermal and thermonuclear energy region. The enhancement in the region of 176 keV comes from resonant contributions [39] not considered in the DC–calculation.

DC is also the dominant reaction mechanism for neutron capture by neutron-rich isotopes far-off stability occurring in the  $\alpha$ -and r-process. For such isotopes the Q-value and therefore the excitation energy of the compound nucleus gets still lower, leading to a further substantial diminution of the level density of the compound nucleus. Thus, the DC-contribution becomes the dominating reaction mechanism. Nuclear-structure models are indispensable for extrapolating reaction rates to nuclei near and far-off the region of stability, because only a limited or no experimental information is available in this region. The DC cross reaction  ${}^{36}S(n,\gamma){}^{37}S$  can be considered as a benchmark of different

nuclear–structure models (Shell Model, Relativistic Mean Field Theory, Quasi Particle Random Phase Approximation, Hartree Fock Bogoliubov Theory) for calculating neutron–capture cross sections by neutron–rich nuclei taking place in the  $\alpha$ – or r–process [42].

The s-process production of  $^{36}$ S was recently discussed quantitatively by Schatz et al. [29] but without a reliable  $^{36}$ S(n, $\gamma$ ) cross section. The s-process reaction network in the sulfur to calcium region contains (n, $\gamma$ ), (n,p), and (n, $\alpha$ ) reactions. The  $^{36}$ S production is mediated by the  $^{36}$ Cl(n,p) $^{36}$ S reaction from seed nuclei with mass numbers <36. But also seed nuclei >36 can contribute through the  $^{39}$ Ar(n, $\alpha$ ) $^{36}$ S reaction channel. Besides its formation the destruction of  $^{36}$ S by the (n, $\gamma$ ) reaction is important. A decrease in the  $^{36}$ S(n, $\gamma$ ) $^{37}$ S cross section leads to a corresponding increase of the abundance formed. As our measured  $^{36}$ S(n, $\gamma$ ) $^{37}$ S value is by a factor of 1.8 smaller than the estimate of Woosley et al. [22] the s-process abundance production of  $^{36}$ S will be enhanced by this factor. The quantitative analysis requires also model parameters for the main and especially the weak s-process component. This information can be obtained from the analysis of the s-process beyond A=56 [43].

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to thank our technician G. Rupp and the Van de Graaff staff members, E.-P. Knaetsch, D. Roller, and W. Seith for their skill in preparing the metallic Li-targets in the required quality. We are also indebted to the Van de Graaff staff for providing reliable beam conditions of the accelerator. We thank the Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung in Österreich (project S7307–AST) and the Östereichische Nationalbank (project 5054) for their support. Two of the authors (H.H. and H.O.) express their gratitude to M. Wiescher for valuable and helpful discussions during their stay at the Univ. of Notre Dame. One of the authors (H.B.) is grateful to Ch. Theis and S. Jaag for support in special problems of the computer system for data acquisition and handling.

- [1] G. Hardie, R. E. Segel, A. J. Elwyn, and J. E. Monahan, Phys. Rev. C 38, 2003 (1988).
- [2] M. Wiescher and J. Görres, Ap. J. 346, 1041 (1989)...
- [3] S. M. Graff, J. Görres, M. Wiescher, R. E. Azuma, J. King, J. Vise, G. H. Hard, and T. R. Wang, Nucl. Phys. 510, 346 (1990).
- [4] J. Görres, S. M. Graff, M. Wiescher, R. E. Azuma, C. A. Barnes, H. W. Becker, and T. R. Wang, Nucl. Phys. 517, 329 (1990).
- [5] C. Iliades, U. Giesen, J. Görres, M. Wiescher, S. Graff, R. E. Azuma, and C. A. Barnes, Nucl. Phys. 539, 97 (1992).
- [6] H. Herndl, J. Görres, M. Wiescher, B. A. Brown, and L. Van Wormer, Phys. Rev. C (to be published).
- [7] H. Beer, M. Wiescher, F. Käppeler, J. Görres, and P. Koehler, Ap. J. 387, 258 (1992).
- [8] H. Beer, F. Käppeler, and M. Wiescher, in Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Capture Gamma-Ray Spectroscopy and Related Topics, Fribourg, Switzerland, 1994, edited by J. Kern (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994), p. 756.
- [9] K. Grün, R. Pichler, and H. Oberhummer, in *Neutrons and Their Applications*, edited by G. Vourvopolous and T. Paradellis, Proc. SPIE **2339**, 77 (1995).
- [10] T. Rauscher, J. H. Applegate, J.C. Cowan, F.-K. Thielemann, and M. Wiescher, Ap. J. 429, 499 (1994).
- [11] J. Meißner, H. Schatz, H. Herndl, M. Wiescher, H. Beer, and F. Käppeler, in *Proceedings of Nuclei in The Cosmos III*, edited by M. Busso, R. Gallino, and C. M. Raiteri, AIP Conf. Proc. **327**, 307 (1995).
- [12] G. J. Mathews, A. Mengoni, F.-K. Thielemann, and W. A. Fowler, Ap. J. 270, 740 (1983).
- [13] W. Balogh, R. Bieber, H. Oberhummer, T. Rauscher, K.-L. Kratz, P. Mohr, G. Staudt, and M. M. Sharma, in *Proceedings of the European Workshop on Heavy Element Nucleosynthesis, Budapest 1994*, edited by E. Somoraj and Zs. Fülöp (Institute of Nuclear Research of the Hung. Acad. of Sci., 1994), p. 67.
- [14] H. Beer and R.-D. Penzhorn, Astron. Astrophys. 174, 323 (1987).
- [15] S. Druyts, C. Wagemans, and P. Geltenbort, Nucl. Phys. A 573 291 (1994).
- [16] T. Rauscher, R. Bieber, S. Lingner, and H. Oberhummer, in *Proceedings of Nuclei in The Cosmos III*, edited by M. Busso, R. Gallino, and C. M. Raiteri, AIP Conf. Proc. 327, 183 (1995).
- [17] R. Malaney and G. J. Mathews, Phys. Rep. 229, 145 (1993).
- [18] S. E. Woosley and R. D. Hoffmann, Ap. J. 395, 202 (1992).
- [19] S. E. Woosley, J. R. Wilson, G. J. Mathews, R. D. Hoffmann, and B.S. Meyer, Ap. J. 433, 229 (1994).
- [20] W. M. Howard, S. Gloriely, M. Rayet, and M. Arnould, Ap. J. 417, 713 (1993).
- [21] J. Witti, H.-Th. Janka, and K. Takahashi, Astron. and Astrophys. 286, 841 (1994).

- [22] S. E. Woosley, W. A. Fowler, J. A. Holmes, and B. A. Zimmerman, Atomic Data Nucl. Data Tables 22, 371 (1978).
- [23] H. Beer, G. Rupp, F. Voß, F. Käppeler, Nucl. Instr. Methods A 337, 492 (1994).
- [24] H. Beer and F. Käppeler, Phys. Rev. C 21, 53 (1980).
- [25] E. Storm and H. Israel, Nucl. Data Tables A 7, 565 (1970).
- [26] WM. J. Veigele, Atomic Data Nucl. Data Tables 5, 51 (1973).
- [27] W. Ratynski and F. Käppeler, Phys. Rev. C 37, 595 (1988).
- [28] H. Schatz, Diplomarbeit, Universität Karlsruhe, 1992.
- [29] H. Schatz, S. Jaag, G. Linker, R. Steininger, and F. Käppeler, Phys. Rev. C 51, 379 (1995).
- [30] A. M. Kobos, B. A. Brown, R. Lindsay, and G. R. Satchler, Nucl. Phys. A 425, 205 (1984).
- [31] H. Oberhummer and G. Staudt, in *Graduate Texts in Contemporary Physics, Nuclei in the Cosmos*, (Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1991), p. 25.
- [32] H. Abele, code DFOLD, Universität Tübingen, 1991 (unpublished).
- [33] P. Mohr, H. Abele, R. Zwiebel, G. Staudt, H. Krauss, H. Oberhummer, A. Denker, J. W. Hammer, and G. Wolf, Phys. Rev. C 48, 1420 (1993).
- [34] H. De Vries, C. W. De Jager, and C. De Vries, At. Data and Nucl. Tables 36, 495 (1987).
- [35] V. F. Sears, Neutron News 3, 26 (1992).
- [36] E. K. Warburton, J. A. Becker, D. J. Millener, and B.A. Brown, Brookhaven National Report No. 40890, 1987 (unpublished).
- [37] B. A. Brown, A. Etchegoyen, W. D. M. Rae, and N.S. Godwin, code OXBASH, 1984 (unpublished).
- [38] G. Audi and A. H. Wapstra, Nucl. Phys. A 565, 1 (1993).
- [39] P. M. Endt, Nucl. Phys. A **521**, 1 (1990).
- [40] W. A. Fowler, G. R. Caughlan, and B. A. Zimmerman, Ann. Rev. Astron. and Astrophys. 5, 525 (1967).
- [41] H. Krauss, code TEDCA, TU Wien, 1992 (unpublished).
- [42] H. Oberhummer, W. Balogh, R. Bieber, H. Herndl, U. Langer, T.Rauscher, and H. Beer, in Proceedings of the International Conference on Exotic Nuclei and Atomic Masses 1995 (ENAM95), Arles, France, (Les Editions Frontières, Gif sur Yvette, France, to be published).
- [43] H. Beer, B. Spettel, H. Palme, in *Proceedings of Nuclei in The Cosmos III*, edited by M. Busso, R. Gallino, and C. M. Raiteri, AIP Conf. Proc. **327**, 307 (1995).

TABLE I. Sample characteristics and decay properties of the product nuclei <sup>37</sup>S and <sup>198</sup>Au

Isotope	Chemical	Enrichment	Reaction	$T_{1/2}$	$E_{\gamma}$	Intensity per decay	
	form	(%)			(keV)	(%)	
$^{36}S$	sulfur powder	5.933	$^{36}{ m S}({ m n},\gamma)^{37}{ m S}$	5.05 min	3103	94.0±0.6	
$^{197}\mathrm{Au}$	metallic	100	$^{197}\mathrm{Au}(\mathrm{n},\gamma)^{198}\mathrm{Au}$	2.69 d	412	$95.50 \pm 0.096$	

TABLE II. Sample weights and experimental  $^{36}\mathrm{S}$  capture cross sections

Mean neutron	Mass of Au	Mass of	Mass of Au	Irradiation	σ	Uncertainty	
energy	front side	sulfur	back side	$_{ m time}$	$(\mu \text{barn})$	statistical	total
(keV)	(mg)	(mg)	(mg)	(d)		(%)	(%)
25	16.80	100.32	16.84	3.54	192	1.2	11.3
	16.61	95.32	16.64	1.70	195	1.1	10.5
	16.57	50.40	16.51	1.16	169	2.8	8.3
	16.57	50.40	16.51	1.70	168	2.3	8.1
	15.71	148.89	15.73	0.58	191	1.5	13.9
	8.86	50.11	8.80	2.70	178	1.0	8.3
	17.15	21.18	17.22	5.10	190	1.6	7.5
				Average	$187 \pm 14$		
$151 \pm 15$	16.38	94.96	16.71	3.70	85	3.3	9.5
	16.46	150.19	16.33	6.90	80	1.8	11.5
				Average	81±7		
$176 \pm 20$	17.35	94.94	17.34	2.40	114	7.2	11.4
	17.35	94.94	17.34	7.80	128	3.2	9.4
				Average	125±11		
$218 \pm 23$	17.39	150.00	17.39	3.20	87	6.3	11.2
	17.40	149.85	17.38	6.80	74	4.7	11.7
				Average	78±7		

TABLE III. Final states, Q-values, transitions and spectroscopic factors for the states of  $^{37}\mathrm{S}$  obtained from shell-model calculations and  $^{36}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{d,p})^{37}\mathrm{S}$ . Cross sections for  $^{36}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{n,\gamma})^{37}\mathrm{S}$  at 25.3 meV, 25 keV, 151 keV, 176 keV, and 218 keV using DC with the experimental data.

Final	Q-value	Transition	Spectroscopic factor		Cross section					
state	[MeV]		shell	(d,p)-reaction	$25.3\mathrm{meV}$	$25\mathrm{keV}$	$151\mathrm{keV}$	$176\mathrm{keV}$	$218\mathrm{keV}$	
			model	[39]	[mbarn]	$[\mu { m barn}]$	$[\mu \mathrm{barn}]$	$[\mu \mathrm{barn}]$	$[\mu \mathrm{barn}]$	
$\frac{7}{2}$	4.303	$\mathrm{d} \to \mathrm{f}$	0.91	0.50	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	
$\frac{\frac{2}{3}}{\frac{2}{3}}$ +	3.657	$s \to p$	0.86	0.55	157.1	158.0	64.3	59.5	53.5	
$\frac{\bar{3}}{2}$ +	2.906	$p \to d$	0.07	0.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
$\frac{\bar{3}}{2}$	2.312	$s \to p$	0.12	0.03	5.3	5.3	2.1	2.0	1.8	
$\frac{\overline{1}}{2}$	1.666	$s \to p$	0.97	0.47	28.3	28.5	11.6	10.8	9.7	
_			Total cross section: DC		190.7	191.8	78.1	72.5	65.2	
		Total cross section: experiment			$150 \pm 30^{1}$	$187 \pm 14$	$81 \pm 7$	$125 \pm 11$	$78 \pm 7$	

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  Ref. [35]

FIG. 1. Scheme of experimental setup

FIG. 2. Neutron spectra with mean neutron energies of 151(top), 176(middle), and 218 keV(bottom) at sample position. Using the proton energies and the metallic Li-targets (2.5  $\mu$ m thickness) of the actual activation measurements they were calculated from TOF spectra measured under different angles with respect to the beam axis.

FIG. 3. Accumulated intensity of the 3103 keV  $^{37}$ S  $\gamma$ -line from the activation with a 100.32 mg sulfur sample

FIG. 4. Level scheme of  $^{37}$ S





