

Intercomparison of a  $^{134}\text{Cs}$  solution (July-September 1974)

A. Rytz

In their answers to the Questionnaire (1974-03-26), the members of Section II of the Comité Consultatif pour les Étalons de Mesure des Rayonnements Ionisants manifested much interest in the standardization of  $^{139}\text{Ce}$  and  $^{134}\text{Cs}$ . Therefore, the working party for advising on future intercomparisons decided to carry out small comparisons of these radionuclides. The participants in the present comparison of  $^{134}\text{Cs}$  were:

L.M.R.I. Laboratoire de Métrologie des Rayonnements Ionisants, Saclay, France  
N.P.L., National Physical Laboratory, Teddington, United Kingdom  
B.I.P.M., Bureau International des Poids et Mesures, Sèvres, France.

Each participant received a sealed glass ampoule with 5 g of a  $^{134}\text{Cs}$  solution (approximately  $1\ 200\ \text{s}^{-1}\ \text{mg}^{-1}$ ) containing 550  $\mu\text{g}$  of CsCl in HCl 0.1 M. This solution was generously distributed by LMRI who carried out measurements using  $4\pi\beta(\text{PC})-\gamma$ ,  $4\pi\beta(\text{LS})-\gamma$  counting and  $4\pi\gamma$  counting with a large NaI well crystal. The two other participants did  $4\pi\beta(\text{PC})-\gamma$  counting only.

Extensive information regarding the  $4\pi\beta-\gamma$  measurements and the sources has been collected in order to be able to compare the results and to fix the shape of the reporting form for a large scale intercomparison. The information received is summarized in the following tables. The complete information is given in the following pages, together with a graphical summary of the results.

JULY 1974

LMRI  
(distributor)

NPL

BIPM

Sources

Was the original solution diluted?  
 If yes - number of dilutions prepared  
 - approximate dilution factors  
 - diluent

no  
 -  
 -  
 -

no  
 -  
 -  
 -

yes  
 3  
 2.8 2.6 2  
 HCl 0.1 M

Source mount. Nature

Outer diameter  
 Inner diameter  
 Thickness

mm  
 mm  
 mm

Al

38

22

3

Cellulose

≈ 10

2

80

yes

Al

38

25

0.46

VYNS

10

2

40

yes

stainless steel

40

16

0.1

VYNS

≈ 10

1 (sandwich)

40

no

Backing. NatureMass per cm<sup>2</sup>μg/cm<sup>2</sup>

≈ 10

2

80

yes

VYNS

10

2

40

yes

Wetting agent

Range of source mass

Number of sources prepared

Number of sources used in final result

mg

Insuline  
15 - 25

24

17

0.03% in water  
15 - 26

65

43

Ludox SM, 154  
27 - 70

30

11

Counting equipment4π proportional counter

wall material

height of each half

mm

perspex

top and bottom: Cu  
sides: perspexbrass,  
gold plated

22.5

20

W

Phosphor bronze

stainless steel

50

20

75

55

80

75

11.5

10

14

55

mm

40

55

max. path length of

β-particles in gas

mm

2.75

3.4

kV

2.32

CH<sub>4</sub>CH<sub>4</sub>Ar/CH<sub>4</sub> (9:1)

%

atm.

technically pure

99.9

atm.

atmospheric

10 000

240 000

gas amplif. factor

V

150

200

plateau length

400

0.13

0.66

plateau slope

%

300

≈ 300

discrim. level (energy)

eV

atm.

Number of crystals

10 000

1

Nature

NaI (Tl)

NaI (Tl)

mm

76

76

Diameter

76

50

Height

75

100

Full width of half max

50

85

of the <sup>54</sup>Mn β-line(662 keV, <sup>137</sup>Cs)Dead times and their uncertaintiesτ<sub>β</sub>

μs

7.5 ± 0.1

1.54 ± 0.01

3.18 ± 0.05

τ<sub>γ</sub>

μs

7.5 ± 0.1

2.4 ± 0.4

5.42 ± 0.

Coincidence resolving timeτ<sub>x</sub>

μs

0.90 ± 0.01

0.536 ± 0.010

1.05 ± 0.05

# INTERCOMPARISON OF A $^{134}\text{Cs}$ SOLUTION (CONTINUED)

$(4\pi\beta(\text{PC})-\gamma \text{ METHOD})$

Counting data	LM RI			NPL		BIPM		
	I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II
$\gamma$ channel setting keV	530 / 670	730 / 860	1270 / 1470	700 / 900	500 / 690	690 / 905	1300 / 1560	
Background rate $\beta$ $\text{s}^{-1}$	2.1	2.1	2.1	1	0.84	0.86	0.87	
$\gamma$ $\text{s}^{-1}$	1.8	0.9	0.8	0.5	1.08	0.80	0.103	
C $\text{s}^{-1}$	0.002	0.005	0.007	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.003	
Number of sources used	1	17	1	40+3	11	11	5	
Number of points measured					58	58	15	
Range of $\epsilon_\beta$ %	80 - 55	92 - 62	78 - 50	92 - 65	92 - 72	93 - 76	80 - 40	
Procedure used for variation of $\epsilon_\beta$				addition of foils				
Slope / intercept % s/mg	+14	-1	+26	3	18.3	2.4	63.7	
Intercept ( $\epsilon_\beta \rightarrow 1$ ) $\text{s}^{-1} \text{mg}^{-1}$	1167.8	1167.3	1168	1166.2	1164.9	1162.4	1162.9	
1974-07-01 OH UT								
Random uncertainty (1 $\sigma$ ) $\text{s}^{-1} \text{mg}^{-1}$	0.3	0.06	1	0.17	2.9	3.8	3.0	
Mean measuring time s for one point	1200	1200	1200	500	7 × 600	7 × 600	10 × 5000	
E $\sigma$ of measurement	Sept.	Sept.	Sept.	July 9 July 24	June 24	— August 1		
Half-life adopted				$(18040 \pm 105) \text{ h}$				

Final result (in $\text{s}^{-1} \text{mg}^{-1}$ )	LM RI	NPL	BIPM
1167.3	1166.2	1163.6	
Reference date: 1974-07-01 OH UT			
Random uncertainty	0.0053 %	0.015 %	I 0.027 % II 0.015 % (III 0.15 %)
How was it obtained?	$t \frac{s_x}{\bar{x}}$ (P = 68.3%)	standard error of the mean of measurements on 43 sources corrected for decay scheme using parameter obtained from measurements on 3 sources	s.e.o.m. of 11 results extrapolated, using parameter ("slope") determined from 58 points
Systematic Uncertainty			
due to dead times	0.04 %	< 0.01 %	0.003 %
resolving time	0.068	0.06	0.11
background	—	0.01	0.002
extrapolation	0.025	0.1	0.11
weighing	0.1	0.05	0.04
others	0.053	—	—
total (linear sum)	0.26 %	0.23 %	0.27 %

Formulae used	$N_0 = \frac{N'_\beta N'_\gamma}{N'_c - 2\tau_r(N'_\beta + N'_\gamma)} \left[ 1 + \frac{2\tau_c N'_c - 2\tau_r(N'_\beta + N'_\gamma)}{2 - \tau_c(N'_\beta + N'_\gamma)} \right]$ (Bryant)	$\tau_\beta = \tau_\gamma = \tau$ $\tau_r < \tau/2$
---------------	---	--

NPL	$N_0 = \frac{N'_\beta N'_\gamma [1 - \tau_r(N'_\beta + N'_\gamma)] [1 - \tau_\beta N'_\beta - \tau_\gamma N'_\gamma + (\tau_\beta + \tau_\gamma - \tau_c) N'_c]}{(1 - \tau_\beta N'_\beta)(1 - \tau_\gamma N'_\gamma)(N'_c - 2\tau_r N'_\beta N'_\gamma)}$	
-----	--	--

$N_0$  and  $\epsilon_\beta$  were measured on 43 sources;  $N$  was obtained using  $N_0 = N(1 - \frac{1 - \epsilon_\beta}{\epsilon_\beta} \times 0.030)$

BIPM	$N_0 = \frac{N'_\beta N'_\gamma [1 - \tau_r(N'_\beta + N'_\gamma)]}{(N'_c - 2\tau_r N'_\beta N'_\gamma)(1 - \tau_c N'_c)}$	$\tau$ is the shorter of $\tau_\beta$ and $\tau_\gamma$ , $\tau_c < \tau$
------	--	--

$N'_\beta, N'_\gamma, N'_c$  are observed count rates (uncorrected)  
 $N_\beta, N_\gamma, N_c$  are count rates corrected for background

# ADDITIONAL MEASUREMENTS BY L.M.R.I.

4 $\beta$ (LS)-8

## Sources

Number of dilutions	2
Approximate dilution factors	550; 700
Diluent	Toluene
Scintillators	butyl PBD $10\text{ g/dm}^3$ BIBUQ $12\text{ g/dm}^3$
Complexing agent	DBP    10%
Volume of vessel	2.8 cm <sup>3</sup>

## Counting data

	keV	I 550 / 660	II 720 / 880	III 1270 / 1460
Background rate $\beta$	s <sup>-1</sup>	15	15	15
$\beta$	s <sup>-1</sup>	19	13	9
C	s <sup>-1</sup>	0.2	0.1	0.02
Number of sources measured	%	1	11	1
Range of $\epsilon_{\beta}$	%	95 - 84	95 - 84	93 - 79
Procedure used for varying $\epsilon_{\beta}$		Shift of discrimination level		
Slope/intercept	% s mg <sup>-1</sup>	+ 3.6 · 10 <sup>-4</sup>	- 0.0025	+ 0.0192
Intercept ( $\epsilon_{\beta} \rightarrow 1$ )	s <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup>	1167	1168	1171
Epoch of measurement	1974-07-01, OH UT	0.69	0.84	0.73
Random uncertainty (1G)	s <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-2</sup>	$\approx 10^4$	$\approx 10^4$	$\approx 10^4$
Mean measuring time for one point	s			
Epoch of measurement		1974-08-26 to 1974-09-05		

Formula used for calculating the activity: the same as with 4 $\beta$ (PC)- $\gamma$  method

Result: Radioactive concentration =  $1168 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ mg}^{-1}$  (1974-07-01, OH UT)

Random uncertainty (1G)  $100 \frac{ts_x}{X} = 0.07\%$

Systematic uncertainties: total 0.33%

dead times	0.01 %
resolving time	0.01
background	0.05
extrapolation	0.20
weighing	0.06

## 4 $\beta$ (well crystal)

### Sources

1 dilution, factor $\approx 12$
Diluent: HCl 0.1 M
Carrier: CsCl 10 $\mu\text{g}$ per g of solution
Source backing: Mylar
Diameter: 10 mm (the source is plastified)
Number of sources measured: 19

### Result

Radioactive concentration =  $1165 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ mg}^{-1}$   
(1974-07-01, OH UT)

Random uncertainty (1G) 0.022 %

Systematic uncertainties:

Dead time	0.05 %
Background	0.10
Weighing	0.15
Efficiency calculation	0.4

## Counting equipment

$\beta$  detector: 2 photomultipliers RCA 8850  
 $\gamma$  detector: 2 NaI(Tl) crystals  
 $(d=150 \text{ mm}, h=75 \text{ mm})$   
dead times  $\tau_{\beta} = (5.0 \pm 0.1) \mu\text{s}$   
 $\tau_{\gamma} = (5.0 \pm 0.1) \mu\text{s}$   
Resolution time  $\tau_r = (1.005 \pm 0.010) \mu\text{s}$

	I 550 / 660	II 720 / 880	III 1270 / 1460
Background rate $\beta$	15	15	15
$\beta$	19	13	9
C	0.2	0.1	0.02
Number of sources measured	1	11	1
Range of $\epsilon_{\beta}$	95 - 84	95 - 84	93 - 79
Procedure used for varying $\epsilon_{\beta}$	Shift of discrimination level		
Slope/intercept	$\% s \text{ mg}^{-1}$	+ 3.6 · 10 <sup>-4</sup>	- 0.0025
Intercept ( $\epsilon_{\beta} \rightarrow 1$ )	$s^{-1} \text{ mg}^{-1}$	1167	1168
Epoch of measurement	1974-07-01, OH UT	0.69	0.84
Random uncertainty (1G)	$s^{-1} \text{ mg}^{-2}$	$\approx 10^4$	$\approx 10^4$
Mean measuring time for one point	s	$\approx 10^4$	$\approx 10^4$
Epoch of measurement		1974-08-26 to 1974-09-05	

## Counting equipment

1 well crystal, NaI(Tl)  
Diameter: 125 mm  
Height: 102 mm  
Well diameter: 12 mm  
depth: 50 mm  
Thickness of lining 1 mm (Be)  
Dead time  $\tau = (8.0 \pm 0.1) \mu\text{s}$   
Calculated efficiency  
for  $^{134}\text{Cs}$   $\gamma$ -spectrum: 0.953  
Counting time for each source: 600 s  
Counting epoch Sept. 12/13, 1974

Total systematic uncertainty: 0.7 %

INTERCOMPARISON OF A  $^{134}\text{Cs}$  SOLUTION  
(JULY 1974)

Radioactive  
concentration ( $\text{s}^{-1}\text{mg}^{-1}$ )  
(1974-07-01)  
JH UT

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

