## STOPPING POWERS OF METALLIC ELEMENTS FOR 6.5 MEV PROTONS

N.Shiomi, R.Ishiwari and N.Sakamoto

Department of Physics, Nara Women's University

Stopping powers of Be, Al, Ti, V, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn, Mo, Rh, Ag, Sn, Ta, Pt and Au have been measured for 6.75 MeV protons from the Kyoto University Cycrotron using a surface barrier silicon detector. The experimental procedures are similar to those described in the previous papers(1,2). What we call the absorber wheel technique(1,2) has been used to measure the pulse heights with and without the sample target simultaneously in one exposure. The pulse height spectrum has been calibrated by a very high precision pulse generator (ORTEC 448). The thickness of the sample target has been chosen in such a way that the energy loss of protons in the target is nearly 500 keV. Therefore, the average energy of protons in the target is very close to 6.5 MeV. The results have been reduced to 6.5 MeV by assuming that the stopping power is proportional to  $lnv^2/v^2$  in a narrow velocity range.

In Table I, the present results are shown and compared with the Risø data of Andersen et al. The uncertainty of the present results has been estimated to be  $\pm 0.3\%$ .

Table I Comparison of the present data with the Risø data. The stopping power is given in keV/mg cm $^2$ .  $\Delta$  denotes the percentage difference.

				4				
Element	Ве	Al	Ti	V	Fe	Со	Ni	Cu
Present data	53.34 ±0.16	46.83 ±0.14	40.72 ±0.12	39.58 ±0.12	39.02 ±0.12	37.86 ±0.11	38.79 ±0.12	36.71 ±0.11
Risø data	53.42 ±0.16	47.34 ±0.14	41.10 ±0.12	39.90 ±0.12	39.31 ±0.12	38.00 ±0.11	39.30 ±0.12	37.00 ±0.11
△(%)	-0.15 ±0.43	-1.09 ±0.43	-0.93 ±0.42	-0.81 ±0.43	-0.74 ±0.44	-0.37 ±0.42	-1.31 ±0.44	-0.79 ±0.44
Element	Zn	Мо	Rh	Ag	Sn	Ta	Pt	Au
Present data	36.31 ±0.11	32.31 ±0.10	31.43 ±0.09	30.86 ±0.09	29.60 ±0.09	24.64 ±0.07	23.66 ±0.07	23.52 ±0.07
Risø data	37.07 ±0.11			30.96 ±0.09		24.79 ±0.07	23.60 ±0.07	23.72 ±0.07
<b>∇</b> (%)	-1.26 ±0.44			-0.32 ±0.42		-0.61 ±0.41	+0.25 ±0.42	-0.85 ±0.42

Risø data are systematically higher than the present results, on average the Riso data are higher than the present results by 0.7%.

We write the Bethe-Bloch Formula as follows

$$-\frac{dE}{dx} = \frac{4\pi e^4 Z_1^2}{m v_1^2} N_2 Z_2 \left\{ ln \frac{2m v_1^2}{I} - \frac{C}{Z_2} + \Phi + L_1 Z_1 \right\}$$

Were  $\Phi$  denotes the Bloch correction and L $_1$ Z $_1$  represents the Z $_1^3$ correction. We have adoped the shell correction of Bonderup (8) and  $Z_1^3$ -correction of Ashley, Ritchie and Brandt(9-11). evaluate the  $Z_1^3$ -correction we took  $\chi = 1.358$  and b=1.3. results are shown in Table II and compared with the values given by Turner(12) and Ziegler(13).

Table II

Element	Present result	Turner 2	Ziegler	Element	Present result	Turner	Ziegler
Ве	64.0±1.0	61.7	63	Zn	331.3±8.2	319	323
Al l	67.7±2.8	163	162	Mo	413 ±12	422	393
Ti 2	232.3±4.9	224	228	Rh	445 ±14	440	436
V 2	241.8±5.2	250	237	Aq	464 ±15	466	470
Fe 2	282.5±6.5	277	284	Sn	471 ±15	486	512
Co 2	295.9±6.9	290	304	Ta .	676 ±26	692	682
Ni 3	312.7±7.4	312	314	Pt	730 ±29	711	760
Cu 3	323.5±7.9	316	330	Au	746 ±30	760	742

The present results agree fairly well with the values given by Turner and Ziegler.

## References

- 1) R. Ishiwari et al., Bull. Inst. Chem. Res., Kyoto Univ. 49 (1971) 390
- 2) R. Ishiwari et al., Bull. Inst. Chem. Res., Kyoto Univ. 52 (1974) 19
- 3) H.H. Andersen et al., Kgl. Dan. Vid. Selsk. Mat. Fys. Medd. 35 (1966) no.4

- 4) H.H. Andersen et al., Phys. Rev. 153 (1967) 338 5) H.H. Andersen et al., Phys. Rev. 175 (1968) 389 6) H.H. Andersen et al., Phys. Rev. 186 (1969) 372 7) H. Sørensen and H.H. Andersen, Phys. Rev. B8 (1973) 1854 8) E. Bonderup, Kgl. Dan. Vid. Selsk. Mat. Pys. Medd. 35 (1967) no.17
- 9) J.C. Ashley, R.H. Ritchie and W. Brandt, Phys. Rev. B5 (1972) 2393
- 10) J.C. Ashley, R.H. Ritchie and W. Brandt, Phys. Rev. A8 (1973) 2402
- 11) R.H. Ritchie and W. Brandt, Phys. Rev. Al7 (1978) 2102
- 12) J.E. Turner, Health Physics 18 (1970)  $1\overline{59}$
- 13) J.F. Ziegler, Nucl. Inst. Meht. 168 (1980) 17