Fig. 1. C/E ratio in $^{252}$Cf(s.f.) field: obvious outliers: $^{59}$Co(n,$\gamma$), $^{92}$Mo(n,p), $^{60}$Ni(n,p) and $^{46}$Ti(n,2n).

Fig. 2. C/E ratio in $^{252}$Cf(s.f.) field: all measured data but without obvious outliers. Error bars include only experimental (black), additionally IRDFF-1.03 evaluated XS (blue) and Cf(s.f.) spectrum (pink) uncertainties. C/E for outliers $^{59}$Co(n,$\gamma$), $^{92}$Mo(n,p), $^{60}$Ni(n,p) and $^{46}$Ti(n,2n) are located outside of Figure.
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C/E ratio for spectrum averaged cross sections (SPA) in $^{235}$U(n$_{th}$,f) field

Fig. 1. C/E ratio in $^{235}$U(n$_{th}$,f) field: obvious outliers: $^{55}$Mn(n,γ), $^{238}$U(n,γ), $^{139}$La(n,γ), $^{31}$P(n,p) and $^{238}$U(n,2n). Error bars include only experimental (black) and additionally IRDFF XS and ENDF/B-VII.1 spectrum (red) uncertainties. $^6$Li(n,α), $^{10}$B(n,α) are not outliers, since inclusion of other α-production reactions increase C/E up to 1.0 !

Fig. 2. The same as Fig. 1, but log scale for energy.
Fig. 3. C/E with IRDFF-1.03 cross sections averaged in the $^{235}$U(n$_{th}$,f) PFNS from ENDF/B-VII.1 [1]. Uncertainties: experimental SPA (black bars), IRDFF-1.03 cross sections (blue), evaluated spectra (pink) - not shown.

Fig. 4. C/E with IRDFF-1.03 cross sections averaged in the $^{235}$U(n$_{th}$,f) PFNS from ENDF/B-VII.1 [1] and Scale method [2]. Uncertainties: experimental SPA (black bars), IRDFF-1.03 cross sections (red), evaluated spectra - not shown. Three curved arrows show the change of C/E for $^{127}$I(n,2n), $^{55}$Mn(n,2n) and $^{58}$Ni(n,2n) when SPA recommended by W. Mannhart are replaced with K. Zolotarev values.
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