

CONF-850507--35

to be presented at the International Conference on Nuclear Data for Basic and Applied Science on May 13-17, 1985 at Santa Fe, New Mexico.

BNL-NCS-36379

Prompt Neutron Multiplicities for the Transplutonium Nuclides BNL-NCS--36379

Norman E. Holden and Martin S. Zucker

DE85 013297

I. Introduction

The neutron emission multiplicity distribution, P_ν is the probability that a given fission will result in the emission of ν neutrons. The basic method used by all experimenters to generate P_ν data involves a way of detecting each fission as it occurs in a sample of the nuclide under study and correlates this fission with the detection of the emitted neutrons. Since the efficiency, ϵ , of the neutron detector for the detection of a single neutron is less than unity, allowance for those neutrons emitted but not detected must be made, with the resulting probability, Q_n , of actually observing n neutrons even if ν were emitted ($n < \nu$) being just:

$$Q_n = \sum P_\nu [\nu! / n!(\nu-n)!] \epsilon^n (1-\epsilon)^{\nu-n} \quad (1)$$

The P_ν are constants of nature, whereas the Q_n depend upon the efficiency of the particular detector used. From the above expression it follows directly that P_ν is given in terms of the observed relative frequencies of observation, Q_n , by the expression:

$$P_\nu = \sum Q_n [n! / \nu!(n-\nu)!] \epsilon^{-n} (\epsilon-1)^{n-\nu} \quad (2)$$

Knowledge of the detector efficiency which is essential to relate the observed frequencies Q_n , to the multiplicities, P_ν , is usually determined from the count rate with a calibrating nuclide, whose nubar value is well known, i.e. some standard nuclide.

$$g = \epsilon \langle \nu \rangle q \quad (3)$$

where q is the fission rate of the sample of the calibrating nuclide and g is the gross count rate for the calibrating nuclide. (The efficiency is thus inversely related to the assumed value of $\langle \nu \rangle$.) This is possible because $\langle \nu \rangle$ can be determined independently of the determination of P_ν and with greater accuracy than if it were calculated from the P_ν distribution using

$$\langle \nu \rangle = \sum \nu P_\nu \quad (4)$$

In deriving the $\langle \nu \rangle$ values for the various spontaneous fissioning nuclides, one primary standard value is assumed, for ^{252}Cf . From an earlier evaluation¹, a value of $\langle \nu \rangle = 3.757 \pm 0.010$ neutrons/fission is derived. In addition to this primary standard, a secondary standard for the various fissile nuclides is assumed, for ^{235}U , i.e., the value at 2200 meters/second neutron energy. From a previous preliminary evaluation², a value of $\langle \nu \rangle = 2.414 \pm 0.007$ neutrons/fission is determined.

In the following sections, we will review the direct determination of $\langle \nu \rangle$ values and then describe the method of comparing different sets of P_ν values. It might be noted that there are substantially more measurements of the average prompt neutron emission multiplicity value than there are of the neutron multiplicity distribution.

II. Average Prompt Neutron Emission Probability, $\langle \nu_p \rangle$

The average number of neutrons released in fission is of interest for sustaining chain reactions in nuclear reactors and is also a measure of the average excitation energy left in a fission fragment immediately after scission. The systematic variation of fission properties for the various heavy nuclides must account for the variation in $\langle \nu_p \rangle$. In this study, we have restricted ourselves to those nuclides which spontaneously fission or which are fissionable with neutrons of thermal energies, i.e. $E_n = 0.0253$ electron volts.

MASTER

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of 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. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by 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. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

^{252}Cf is one of the better known nuclides and is of great interest for safeguards because it is the standard against which other nuclides have been measured and with which equipment and techniques are tested. In recent years, $\langle \nu_p \rangle$ measurements for ^{252}Cf by liquid scintillator techniques and by manganese bath techniques have begun to converge, leading to the presently recommended value of $\nu_p = 3.757 \pm 0.010$ neutrons/fission¹. Using this standard value and the recommended value for ^{235}U and for ^{240}Pu of 2.414 ± 0.007 neutrons/fission and 2.154 ± 0.005 neutrons/fission, respectively², the average neutron multiplicities for the various nuclides of the transplutonium elements have been reevaluated. In general, the weighted average of all measurements for each nuclide has been recommended in Table XIX. For some nuclides, no direct measurement of the average multiplicity has been made and the estimated value, which has been calculated from the measurement of fission yields, has been recommended.

III. Method of Comparing Different P_ν Sets

The Q_n and P_ν can be considered vectors, whose components are probabilities, related by an operation and its inverse which converts one set of probabilities into the other, i.e. equation (1) and (2). Certain ratios composed of specific functions of the various moments of the distributions are independent of the efficiency, e.g. $\langle \nu(\nu-1)\dots(\nu-k) \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^{k+1} = \langle n(n-1)\dots(n-k) \rangle / \langle n \rangle^{k+1}$. A particular case is Diven's parameter, for $k = 1$, $\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^2$, which can be considered as a measure of the shape of the P_ν distribution. However, another indicator of the distribution's shape, which is not conserved, (independent of ϵ) is the ratio of the mean square deviation to the square of the mean: $\langle (\nu - \langle \nu \rangle)^2 \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^2 = (\langle \nu^2 \rangle - \langle \nu \rangle^2) / \langle \nu \rangle^2$.

For each given experiment, the equations (1) and (2) were used with the quoted distribution P_ν and the reported efficiency ϵ to derive the original Q_n set. The efficiency was then varied until the calculated $\langle \nu \rangle$ ($\sum \nu P_\nu$) value was obtained corresponding to the recommended value. In those few cases where the experimentalist did not report the efficiency, a reasonable value was assumed appropriate to the experimental conditions and then the above procedure was also followed.

After various sets of P_ν for the same nuclide are transformed so that each set yields the same $\langle \nu \rangle$, any remaining differences between the corresponding P_ν can be ascribed to systematic errors other than those in ϵ or $\langle \nu \rangle$, or to random errors (e.g. counting statistics) in the respective experiments. Evaluation of the standard deviation of corresponding values of P_ν gives a realistic estimate of the uncertainty involved in determining the P_ν . Our earlier work³ contains more details on the method.

IV. Recommendations and Discussion

The recommended values for $\langle \nu \rangle$ and P_ν for the various nuclides of americium, curium, berkelium, californium, einsteinium, fermium and nobelium are given in the Tables in section VI. Although there are data of some sort available for twenty-six of these nuclides, data on the multiplicity distributions are only available for twelve of the nuclides and no recommendations could be made for two of those. Some Q_n sets for fermium nuclides did not produce physically meaningful results no matter how ϵ was varied. The reason for this difficulty is still under investigation, but it is probably due to poor statistical accuracy of the Q_n data involved.

If one plots the various recommended sets of P_ν given here as well as those previously determined versus $(\nu - \langle \nu \rangle)$ on the same figure, a continuous curve drawn through the data points will have a width or standard deviation of 1.094 ± 0.007 , for the various nuclides of uranium, plutonium and curium. This calculation takes into account Sheppard's correction⁴ for sampling from the mid-point of a histogram to approximate the width of a continuous distribution. All nuclides agree within 4% with the calculated average. For the various nuclides of californium, fermium and nobelium, however, the standard deviation or width for the various recommended sets of P_ν is 1.41 ± 0.14 .

If one now selects only the spontaneously fissioning nuclides, the standard deviation for the curium and californium elements are 1.087 ± 0.007 and 1.224 ± 0.014 , respectively, as compared to a standard deviation of 1.100 ± 0.007 for the spontaneously fissioning nuclides of plutonium.

It might also be noted that the variation of ν with mass number for a given element and fission type has approximately the same slope for the curium and californium nuclides, i.e. 0.094 ± 0.001 .

This document is
PUBLICLY RELEASABLE

3 Steels
 Authorizing Official
 Date: 3-25-07

V. References

1. N.E.Holden and M.S.Zucker, Proc. ANS/INMM Topical Meeting on Safeguards and Technology. Hilton Head, S.C., Nov.28-Dec.2,1983. Trans. Amer. Nucl. Soc. 45, suppl.1, 23 (1983).
2. N.E.Holden and M.S.Zucker, BNL-NCS-35513-R. IAEA Advisory Group Meeting on Neutron Standard Reference Data, 12-16 Nov. 1984, at Geel, Belgium.
3. M.S.Zucker and N.E.Holden, Proc. 6th ESARDA Symp. on Safeguards and Nucl. Material Management. Venice, Italy, May 14-18,1984. p.341.
4. W.F.Sheppard, Proc. London Math. Soc. 29, 353 (1898).
5. A.H.Jaffey and J.L.Lerner, Nucl. Phys. A145, 1 (1970).
6. V.I.Lebedev and V.I.Kalashnikova, Sov. Atom. Energy 5, 90 (1958).
7. J.G.Cuninghame, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem. 4, 1 (1957).
8. R.E.Howe et al., Nucl. Sci. Eng. 77, 454 (1981).
9. S.C.Fultz et al., Phys. Rev. 152, 1046 (1966).
10. N.I.Kroshkin and Yu.S.Zamyatnin, Sov. Atom. Energy 29, 790 (1970).
11. H.Zhang, Z.Liu, S.Ding and S.Liu, Nucl. Sci. Eng. 86, 315 (1984).
12. J.Halperin et al., Nucl. Sci. Eng. 75, 56 (1980).
13. D.A.Hicks, J.Ise,Jr. and R.V.Pyle, Phys. Rev. 101, 1016 (1956).
14. W.W.T.Crane, G.H.Higgins and H.R.Bowman, Phys. Rev. 101, 1804 (1956).
15. K.D.Zhuraviev, Yu.S.Zamyatnin and N.I.Kroshkin, Nat. Sov. Conf. on Neut. Phys. Kiev, USSR May 28-Jun.1,1973 Vol.4, 57 (1974).
16. C.J.Orth, Nucl. Sci. Eng. 43, 54 (1971).
17. R.Schmidt and H.Henschel, Nucl. Phys. A395, 29 (1983).
18. V.V.Golushko et al., Sov. Atom. Energy 34, 178 (1973).
19. L.I.Prokhorova et al., Sov. Atom. Energy 33, 875 (1973).
20. V.I.Bol'shov, L.I.Prokhorova, V.N.Okolovich and G.N.Smirenkin, Sov. Atom. Energy 17, 715 (1964).
21. B.C.Diven, H.C.Martin, R.F.Taschek and J.Terrell, Phys. Rev. 101, 1012 (1956).
22. R.E.Howe et al., Nucl. Phys. A407, 193 (1983).
23. R.W.Stoughton, J.Halperin, C.E.Bemis and H.W.Schmitt, Nucl. Sci. Eng. 50, 169 (1973).
24. D.M.Dakovskii, Yu.A.Lazarev and Yu.Ts.Oganesyan, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 18, 371 (1974).
25. M.C.Thompson, Phys. Rev. C2, 763 (1970).
26. J.W.Boldeman, Nat. Sov. Conf. on Neut. Phys. Kiev, USSR May 28-Jun.1,1973 Vol.4, 114 (1974).
27. V.N.Kosyakov et al., Sov. Atomic Energy 33, 903 (1973).
28. R.Pyle, Gordon Conference paper (1957).
29. M.Dakovskii, Yu.A.Lazarev, Yu.Ts.Oganesyan and G.V.Buklanov, Sov. Atomic Energy 17, 360 (1973).
30. J.P.Unik et al., Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. Phys. Chem. of Fission. Rochester, New York, Aug.13-17,1973. Vol.2, 19 (1974).
31. K.E.Volodin et al., Sov. Nucl. Phys. 15, 17 (1972).
32. B.V.Kurchatov et al., Sov. Nucl. Phys. 14, 528 (1972).
33. Yu.S.Zamyatnin, N.I.Kroshkin, A.K.Melnikov and V.N.Nefedov, Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. Nucl Data for Reactors. Helsinki, Finland, June 15-19,1970. Vol.2, 183 (1970).
34. K.F.Flynn and H.R.von Gunten, Helv. Chim. Acta 52, 2216 (1969).
35. D.C.Hoffman, G.P.Ford, J.P.Balagna and L.R.Veeser, Phys. Rev. C21, 637 (1980).
36. J.R.Smith, priv. comm. May 20, 1983.
37. R.R.Spencer et al., Nucl. Sci. Eng. 80, 603 (1982).
38. G.Edwards, D.J.S.Findlay and E.W.Lees, Ann. Nucl. Energy 9, 127 (1982).
39. B.M.Aleksandrov et al., Proc. 1980 Kiev Conf. 4, 119 (1981).
40. H.Q.Zhang and Z.H.Liu, Chin. Nucl. Phys. 1, 9 (1979).
41. H.Bozorgmanesh, PhD Dissertation, Univ. Michigan (1979).
42. J.W.Boldeman, Nucl. Sci. Eng. 55, 188 (1974).
43. E.J.Axton, Proc. Int. Conf. Neutron Standard Reference Data. Vienna, Austria,
44. G.K.Mehta et al., Phys. Rev. C7, 373 (1973).
45. A.DeVolpi and K.G.Porges, Phys. Rev. C1, 683 (1970).
46. P.H.White and E.J.Axton, J. Nucl. Energy 22, 73 (1968).
47. D.W.Colvin and M.G.Sowerby, Proc. Symp. on Phys. Chem of Fission. Salzburg, Austria,Mar.22-26,1965 Vol.2, 25 (1965).
48. J.C.Hopkins and B.C.Diven, Nucl. Phys. 48, 433 (1963).
49. I.Asplund-Nilsson et al., Nucl. Sci. Eng. 15, 213 (1963).

50. K.F.Flynn, J.E.Gindler, R.K.Sjoblom and L.E.Glendenin, Phys. Rev. C11, 1676 (1975).
51. K.F.Flynn, J.E.Gindler, L.E.Glendenin and R.K.Sjoblom, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem. 38, 661 (1976).
52. D.D.Bogdanov et al., JINR report P15-81-708, Dubna, USSR (1981).
53. Yu.A.Lazarev, O.K.Nefediev, Yu.Ts.Oganesyan and M.Dakovskii, Phys. Lett. 52B, 321 (1974).
54. G.R.Choppin et al., Phys. Rev. 102, 766 (1956).
55. G.M.Ter-Akopian et al., Nucl. Instr. Methods 190, 119 (1981).
56. M.Dakovskii, Yu.A.Lazarev and Yu.Ts.Oganesyan, Sov. Nucl. Phys. 16, 641 (1973)
57. K.F.Flynn et al., Phys. Rev. C5, 1725 (1972).
58. J.P.Balagna et al., Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. Phys. Chem. of Fission. Rochester, New York, Aug.13-17,1973. Vol.2, 191 (1974).
59. E.Cheifetz, H.R.Bowman, J.B.Hunter and S.G.Thompson, Phys. Rev. C3, 2017 (1971).

VI. Tabulated Results

Table I Measured Nubar Values for ^{241}Am

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value	Comment
Jaffey(70)	5	3.219 (0.021)		
Lebedev(58)	6	3.14 (0.05)	3.07 (0.05)	No efficiency correction
Cuninghame(57)	7	3. (0.5)		Calc. from Fission Yields

Table II Measured Nubar Values for ^{242m}Am

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Howe(81)	8	3.269 (0.145)	
Jaffey(70)	5	3.264 (0.024)	3.265 (0.024)
Fultz(66)	9	3.24 (0.12)	3.22 (0.12)
Kroshkin(70)	10	3.28 (0.10)	3.26 (0.10)

Table III Measured Nubar Values for ^{242}Cm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Zhang(84)	11	2.562 (0.020)	2.572 (0.020)
Halperin(80)	12	2.532 (0.013)	2.530 (0.013)
Hicks(56)	13	2.65 (0.09)	2.53 (0.09)
Crane(55)	14	2.33 (0.11)	2.48 (0.11)

Table IV Measured Nubar Values for ^{243}Cm , ^{247}Cm and ^{250}Cm

Nuclide	Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value	Comment
^{243}Cm	Zhuraviev(73)	15	3.39 (0.14)	3.40 (0.04)	Neut. Fiss.
^{243}Cm	Jaffey(70)	5	3.430 (0.047)	3.432 (0.047)	Neut. Fiss.
^{247}Cm	Zhuraviev(73)	15	3.79 (0.15)	3.80 (0.15)	Neut. Fiss.
^{250}Cm	Orth(71)	16	3.31 (0.08)	3.30 (0.08)	Spont.Fiss.

Table V Measured Nubar Values for ^{244}Cm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Zhang(84)	11	2.72 (0.02)	2.74 (0.02)
Schmidt(83)	17	2.73 (0.16)	2.74 (0.16)
Golushko(73)	18	2.68 (0.03)	
Prokhorova(73)	19	2.70 (0.014)	
Jaffey(70)	5	2.692 (0.024)	2.700 (0.024)
Kroshkin(70)	10	2.77 (0.08)	2.76 (0.08)
Bol'shov(64)	20	2.71 (0.04)	2.69 (0.04)
Diven(56)	21	2.81 (0.06)	2.68 (0.06)
Hicks(56)	13	2.84 (0.09)	2.71 (0.09)

Table VI Measured Nubar Values for ^{245}Cm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Howe(83)	22	3.60 (0.06)	3.64 (0.06)
Kroshkin(70)	10	3.83 (0.16)	3.81 (0.16)
Jaffey(70)	5	3.832 (0.034)	3.84 (0.03)

Table VII Measured Nubar Values for ^{246}Cm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Stoughton(73)	23	2.86 (0.06)	2.88 (0.06)
Dakovskii(73)	24	2.98 (0.03)	3.01 (0.03)
Golushko(73)	18	2.927 (0.027)	2.93 (0.03)
Prokhorova(72)	19	2.950 (0.015)	2.95 (0.015)
Thompson(70)	25	3.20 (0.22)	3.17 (0.22)

Table VIII Measured Nubar Values for ^{248}Cm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Boldeman(73)	26	3.092 (0.007)	3.12 (0.007)
Stoughton(73)	23	3.14 (0.06)	3.16 (0.06)
Golushko(73)	18	3.173 (0.022)	3.17 (0.02)
Prokhorova(72)	19	3.157 (0.015)	3.16 (0.015)
Orth(71)	16	3.11 (0.09)	3.10 (0.09)

Table IX Measured Nubar Values for ^{249}Bk

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Kosyakov(72)	27	3.395 (0.026)	3.40 (0.03)
Pyle(57)	28	3.72 (0.16)	3.55 (0.16)

Table X Measured Nubar Values for ^{246}Cf

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Dakovski(73)	29	3.14 (0.09)	3.18 (0.09)
Pyle(57)	28	2.92 (0.19)	2.79 (0.19)

Table XI Measured Nubar Values for ^{249}Cf

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value	Comment
Unik(73)	30	4.4 nu		Neut.Fiss
Volodin(72)	31	4.06 (0.04)	4.08 (0.04)	Neut.Fiss
		3.4 (0.4)	3.4 (0.4)	Spont.Fiss
Kurchatov(71)	32	4.0 (0.5)		Neut.Fiss
Zamyatnin(70)	33	4.60 (0.21)	4.56 (0.21)	Neut.Fiss
Flynn(69)	34	6. (1.5)		Neut.Fiss

Table XII Measured Nubar Values for ^{250}Cf

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Hoffman(80)	35	3.49 (0.04)	3.51 (0.04)
Orth(71)	16	3.53 (0.09)	3.52 (0.09)

Table XIII Measured Nubar Values for ^{252}Cf

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value	Comment
Smith(83)	36	3.767 (0.007)	3.767 (0.01)	Manganese Bath Technique
Spencer(82)	37	3.782 (0.008)		Liquid Scintillator Technique
Edwards(82)	38	3.761 (0.029)		Boron Pile Technique
Aleksandrov(80)	39	3.758 (0.015)		Manganese Bath Technique
Zhang(79)	40	3.752 (0.018)		Liquid Scintillator Technique
Bozorgmanesh(77)	41	3.744 (0.023)		Manganese Bath Technique
Boldeman(74)	42	3.747 (0.015)	3.755 (0.016)	Liquid Scintillator Technique
Axton(74)	43	3.725 (0.019)	3.744 (0.022)	Manganese Bath Technique
Mehta(73)	44	3.766 (0.002)		Liquid Scintillator Technique
DeVolpi(70)	45	3.725 (0.015)	3.747 (0.019)	Manganese Bath Technique
White(68)	46	3.796 (0.031)	3.8156 (0.040)	Manganese Bath Technique
Colvin(65)	47	3.713 (0.015)	3.739 (0.021)	Boron Pile Technique
Hopkins(63)	48	3.780 (0.030)	3.777 (0.031)	Liquid Scintillator Technique
Asplund-Nilsson(63)	49	3.808 (0.034)	3.792 (0.040)	Liquid Scintillator Technique

Table XIV Measured Nubar Values for ^{254}Cf

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Hoffman(80)	35	3.77 (0.05)	3.79 (0.05)
Orth(71)	18	3.93 (0.05)	3.92 (0.05)

Table XV Measured Nubar Values for ^{251}Cf , $^{253,254}\text{Es}$, $^{244,246,255}\text{Fm}$ and ^{252}No

Nuclide	Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value	Comment
^{251}Cf	Flynn(75)	50	4.1 (0.5)		Neut. Fiss.
^{253}Es	Flynn(76)	51	4.7 nu		Spont. Fiss.
^{254}Es	Flynn(76)	51	4.2 nu		Neut. Fiss.
^{244}Fm	Bogdanov(81)	52	4. (1.)		Spont. Fiss.
^{246}Fm	Bogdanov(81)	52	4. (1.)		Spont. Fiss.
^{255}Fm	Flynn(75)	50	4.0 (0.5)		Neut. Fiss.
^{252}No	Lazarev(74)	53	4.15 (0.30)	4.2 (0.3)	Spont. Fiss.

Table XVI Measured Nubar Values for ^{254}Fm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Unik(73)	30	3.7 nu	
Choppin(56)	54	4.05 (0.19)	3.99 (0.28)

Table XVII Measured Nubar Values for ^{256}Fm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Ter-Akopian(81)	55	3.59 (0.06)	3.61 (0.06)
Dakovski(73)	56	3.73 (0.18)	3.77 (0.18)
Unik(73)	30	3.2 nu	
Flynn(72)	57	3. (1.)	

Table XVIII Measured Nubar Values for ^{257}Fm

Author (Year)	Ref.	Measured Value	Revised Value
Hoffman(80)	35	3.85 (0.05)	3.87 (0.05)
Balagna(73)	58	3.77 (0.02)	3.79 (0.02)
Cheifetz(71)	59	3.97 (0.13)	4.01 (0.14)

Table XIX Recommended Nubar Values for Am, Cm, Bk, Cf, Es, Fm and No Nuclides

Nuclide	Value (Uncertainty)	Nuclide	Value (Uncertainty)
^{241}Am	3.22 (0.04)	^{250}Cf	3.51 (0.04)
$^{242\text{m}}\text{Am}$	3.26 (0.03)	^{251}Cf	4.1 (0.5)
^{242}Cm	2.54 (0.02)	^{252}Cf	3.757 (0.010)
^{243}Cm	3.43 (0.14)	^{254}Cf	3.85 (0.06)
^{244}Cm	2.72 (0.02)	^{253}Es	4.7
^{245}Cm	3.75 (0.10)	^{254}Es	4.2
^{246}Cm	2.93 (0.03)	^{244}Fm	4. (1.)
^{247}Cm	3.80 (0.15)	^{246}Fm	4. (1.)
^{248}Cm	3.13 (0.03)	^{254}Fm	4.0 (0.3)
^{250}Cm	3.30 (0.08)	^{255}Fm	4.0 (0.5)
^{249}Bk	3.40 (0.05)	^{256}Fm	3.63 (0.06)
^{246}Cf	3.1 (0.1)	^{257}Fm	3.87 (0.05)
^{249}Cf	4.1 (0.3)-Neutron fission	^{252}No	4.20 (0.30)
^{249}Cf	3.4 (0.4)-Spontaneous fission		

Table XX Measured and Recommended P_ν for ^{242}Cm

Parameter	Hicks ¹³	Halperin ¹²	Zhang ¹¹	Recommended
P_0	0.01665	0.02287	0.02424	0.02125
P_1	0.14755	0.13404	0.15862	0.14674
P_2	0.33715	0.32913	0.31398	0.32675
P_3	0.32679	0.33898	0.31471	0.32683
P_4	0.12634	0.14631	0.13988	0.13751
P_5	0.04143	0.02653	0.04419	0.03738
P_6	0.00334	0.00207	0.00237	0.00259
P_7	0.00075	0.00007	0.00145	0.00076
P_8			0.00056	0.00019
$\langle \nu \rangle$	2.54	2.54	2.54	2.54 \pm 0.02
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle$	5.11	5.04	5.24	5.13 \pm 0.10
$\langle \nu(\nu-1)(\nu-2) \rangle$	8.04	7.40	8.67	8.04 \pm 0.64
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^2$	0.792	0.782	0.812	0.795 \pm 0.016
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle - \langle \nu \rangle^2$	1.20	1.13	1.33	1.22 \pm 0.10
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle$	7.65	7.58	7.78	7.67 \pm 0.10

Table XXI Measured and Recommended P_ν for ^{244}Cm

Parameter	Diven ²¹	Hicks ¹³	Dakovskii ²⁴	Zhang ¹¹	Recommended
P_0	0.01280	0.00550	0.02788	0.01384	0.01501
P_1	0.12458	0.11864	0.09174	0.12973	0.11617
P_2	0.30326	0.30138	0.30960	0.28513	0.29984
P_3	0.31201	0.35146	0.33337	0.33581	0.33316
P_4	0.20115	0.17634	0.18024	0.17736	0.18378
P_5	0.02892	0.04122	0.05502	0.04675	0.04298
P_6	0.01728	0.00546	0.00215	0.01023	0.00879
P_7	-	-	-	0.00110	0.00027
$\langle \nu \rangle$	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72	2.72 \pm 0.02
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle$	5.99	5.82	5.95	6.00	5.94 \pm 0.09
$\langle \nu(\nu-1)(\nu-2) \rangle$	10.51	9.47	9.88	10.54	10.10 \pm 0.52
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^2$	0.810	0.786	0.804	0.811	0.803 \pm 0.012
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle - \langle \nu \rangle^2$	1.31	1.14	1.27	1.32	1.26 \pm 0.09
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle$	8.71	8.54	8.67	8.72	8.66 \pm 0.09

Table XXII Measured and Recommended P_ν for ^{246}Cm

Parameter	Stoughton ²³	Dakovskii ²⁴	Recommended
P_0	0.01305	0.01738	0.01522
P_1	0.08249	0.07007	0.07628
P_2	0.25120	0.27420	0.26270
P_3	0.35224	0.33761	0.34492
P_4	0.22587	0.21026	0.21807
P_5	0.06598	0.08520	0.07559
P_6	0.00917	0.00528	0.00722
$\langle \nu \rangle$	2.93	2.93	2.93 \pm 0.03
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle$	6.92	6.96	6.94 \pm 0.03
$\langle \nu(\nu-1)(\nu-2) \rangle$	12.59	12.82	12.71 \pm 0.16
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^2$	0.806	0.811	0.808 \pm 0.003
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle - \langle \nu \rangle^2$	1.27	1.30	1.29 \pm 0.03
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle$	9.85	9.89	9.87 \pm 0.03

Table XXIII Measured and Recommended P_ν for ^{248}Cm

Parameter	Boldeman ²⁶	Stoughton ²³	Recommended
P_0	0.00631	0.00716	0.00673
P_1	0.06224	0.05706	0.05965
P_2	0.22726	0.21384	0.22055
P_3	0.34581	0.35599	0.35090
P_4	0.24354	0.26522	0.25438
P_5	0.09076	0.08795	0.08936
P_6	0.02070	0.01278	0.01674
P_7	0.00338	-	0.00169
$\langle \nu \rangle$	3.13	3.13	3.13 \pm 0.03
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle$	8.03	7.89	7.96 \pm 0.10
$\langle \nu(\nu-1)(\nu-2) \rangle$	16.56	15.31	15.94 \pm 0.88
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^2$	0.820	0.805	0.812 \pm 0.010
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle - \langle \nu \rangle^2$	1.36	1.22	1.29 \pm 0.10
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle$	11.16	11.02	11.09 \pm 0.10

Table XIV Measured P_ν for ^{246}Cf , ^{250}Cf , ^{254}Cf , ^{257}Fm and ^{252}No

Nuclide	^{246}Cf	^{250}Cf	^{254}Cf	^{257}Fm	^{252}No
Parameter	Dakovskii ²⁹	Hoffman ³⁵	Hoffman ³⁵	Hoffman ³⁵	Lazarev ⁵³
P_0	0.00051	0.00382	0.00020	0.02057	0.05692
P_1	0.11360	0.03654	0.01902	0.05203	0.05768
P_2	0.23460	0.16734	0.11264	0.11726	0.09249
P_3	0.27428	0.29453	0.26389	0.19970	0.14374
P_4	0.22087	0.29827	0.31834	0.26279	0.18325
P_5	0.12597	0.14514	0.19418	0.20078	0.18315
P_6	0.03017	0.04722	0.07453	0.10617	0.14559
P_7	-	0.00402	0.01500	0.03330	0.09630
P_8	-	0.00312	0.00220	0.00740	0.03820
P_9	-	-	-	-	0.00268
$\langle \nu \rangle$	3.10	3.51	3.85	3.87	4.2
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle$	8.19	10.34	12.50	13.60	17.65
$\langle \nu(\nu-1)(\nu-2) \rangle$	8.26	25.19	33.71	41.77	-
$\langle \nu(\nu-1) \rangle / \langle \nu \rangle^2$	0.852	0.840	0.843	0.908	1.001
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle - \langle \nu \rangle^2$	1.68	1.53	1.53	2.49	4.21
$\langle \nu^2 \rangle$	11.29	13.85	16.35	17.47	21.85