Negative Muons and the Isotopic Composition of the Rare Gases in the Earth's Atmosphere

WE wish to draw attention to the possible influence negative muons may have had on the isotopic composition of the rare gases now present in the Earth's atmosphere and crust and in meteorites. The specific reaction to be considered is of the form

negative muon + target nuclide (A,Z) \rightarrow rare gas nuclide $(A, Z-1) \rightarrow$ rare gas nuclide (A-x, Z-1) + x neutrons + neutrino

where x is the neutron multiplicity of the target nuclide. A detailed discussion of this muon capture reaction was first given by Fermi and Teller¹. Suggestions that it might be possible to observe the reaction products resulting from the bombardment of the Earth's crust by cosmic-ray produced neutrons and negative muons have been made by several authors^{2–5}.

The present muon flux of 10^{-2} cm⁻² s⁻¹, if maintained over 4.5×10^9 years, is insufficient by a factor of ~10⁶ to produce the isotopic differences observed between the rare gases in the terrestrial atmosphere and those found in primitive meteorites. There is no evidence to indicate that the muon flux was higher in the past; indeed, data from stable and radioactive cosmogenic nuclides suggest that the cosmic radiation has been constant over at least the past 2×10^9 years (ref. 6).

It is conceivable, however, that a higher muon flux prevailed at a still earlier stage in the primitive solar nebula. Bernas et al.⁷ have proposed that Li, Be and B were synthesized in the solar rebula by charged particle irradiation. They suggest that high energy protons impinged on a low density solar nebula, thus producing the Li, Be and B. These conditions seem to be satisfactory for both initiating and propagating a high muon flux.

It is not our intention, however, to suggest how this required muon flux was produced but rather to point out how its presence could have influenced the isotopic abundances of the rare gases.

Negative muons, reacting with alkali element target nuclides, will produce rare gases the isotopic abundance patterns of which will depend critically on the neutron multiplicities of the individual isotopes of each target element. Significantly, some of the isotopes produced in greatest yield are the very ones which seem necessary in order to explain the observed isotopic differences between the noble gases found in the terrestrial atmosphere and in meteorites.

Table 1. TARGET ELEMENTS AND PRODUCTS AFTER MUON BOMBARDMENT Major target Rare gas element

major targer	Trate Say ciement
element	produced

ement	produced	Comment
Li Na K Rb Cs	Ne Ar Kr	Low yield of ⁴ He High yield of ^{3*} Ne High yield of ^{3*} Ar ^{5*} Kr dominates the yield pattern Does not produce ¹⁴⁴ Xe or ¹⁴⁶ Xe. Maxi- mum yield at ¹⁴² Xe. Possible small contribution at ¹³⁰ Xe

Table I indicates those target and product nuclides which have a special significance in relation to rare gas studies.

Target nuclides, other than those listed, may also have contributed to the production pattern by means of a twostage process involving negative muon capture followed by positron decay or electron capture.

The general isotopic pattern to be expected for some of the target elements listed has been described by Hagan⁵. We cannot discuss the many implications of this muon flux hypothesis in relation to all the rare gases in this communication and so neon is considered as a specific example.

Atmospheric neon, with 20Ne/22Ne=9.8, is generally regarded as a mixture of solar neon $({}^{20}\text{Ne}/{}^{22}\text{Ne} = 12.5)$ and planetary neon (${}^{20}Ne/{}^{22}Ne \sim 8.2$) (see ref. 8). In the present picture, it seems possible that up to 30 per cent of the ²²Ne in the Earth's atmosphere has resulted from the capture of negative muons by ²³Na.

An important number in this respect would be the experimentally observed value for the ²¹Ne/²²Ne ratio resulting from the bombardment of ²³Na by negative muons. Unfortunately, this ratio has not been measured. Hagan⁵ gives an estimate for this figure of 0.2 ± 0.14 , but he has been forced to extrapolate from the published data of MacDonald et al.⁹, which add an additional error to his estimate. Atmospheric Ne would now be considered a mixture of solar type Ne with muon produced Ne in suitable proportions.

Although the other rare gases each present special problems, the muon contribution to their isotopic composition would still be significant in some cases.

A critical determining factor in producing an anomaly is the quantity of a target nuclide that was available for the muon capture process. Because the atom ratio of Na to Cs in the Earth's crust is moderately large, the addition of some 30 per cent to the ²²Ne atmospheric abundance implies only 1 per cent or so addition to the ¹³²Xe abundance. If the elemental abundance values for a chondritic Earth model are substituted rather than crustal values, the muon produced ¹³²Xe contribution for the same ²²Ne production will be smaller. Similar estimates may be made for K and Rb as long as the altered abundances of their radioactive nuclides are taken into account.

In spite of the many obvious difficulties associated with this model, it seems most significant that for a single value of time integrated negative muon flux, the muon capture reaction can simultaneously account for several of the isotopic anomalies observed in the atmospheric rare gases.

In particular it provides the following rare gas components from alkali element targets. (a) Neon with a low 21 Ne/ 22 Ne ratio. (b) Kr with an 86 Kr/ 84 Kr ratio that is much higher than that of atmospheric Kr. (c) Xenon with an isotopic pattern that is a maximum at ¹³²Xe and decreases with mass. Whether the yield at ¹³⁰Xe relative to ¹³²Xe is significant can only be surmised. The muon capture reaction does not produce ¹³⁴Xe or ¹³⁶Xe so that these isotopes are absent from muon produced xenon.

Rare gas components with isotopic patterns very similar to these seem to be required if the atmospheric rare gases are to be derived from the primitive gases found in certain meteorites.

The low energy neutron flux produced in situ by the muon capture reaction may also have been significant in the case of nuclides with very low abundances.

We thank Drs R. Ganapathy, J. W. Larimer, G. W. Reed, A. Turkevich and Professor E. Anders for discussion and critical comment. This work was supported by the Research Grants Committee of the University of Western Australia and an AEC contract.

P. M. Jeffery*

Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago.

P. J. HAGAN

Department of Nuclear Physics. University of Oxford.

Received May 12, 1969.

* On leave from Physics Department, University of Western Australia.

- ¹ Fermi, E., and Teller, E., Phys. Rev., 72, 399 (1947).
- ² Davis, R., and Schaeffer, O. A., Ann. NY Acad. Sci., 62, 105 (1955).
 ³ Rama, and Honda, M., J. Geophys. Res., 66, 3533 (1961).
 ⁴ Rama, Bull. Nat. Geophys. Res. Inst., 1, 241 (1963).

- ⁵ Hagan, P. J., thesis, University of Western Australia (1968).
- ⁶ Geiss, J., Oeschger, H., and Schwarz, U., Space Sci. Rev., 1, 197 (1962).
- ⁷ Bernas, R., Gradsztajn, E., Reeves, H., and Schatzman, E., *Ann. Phys.*, **44**, 426 (1967). ⁸ Pepin, R. O., Earth Planet. Sci. Lett., 2, 13 (1967).

⁹ MacDonald, B., Diaz, J. A., Kaplan, S. N., and Pyle, R. V., *Phys. Rev.*, **139** B1253 (1965).