

$^{100}\text{Mo}(\alpha, \alpha')$ 1988Ry02, 2015Yo04, 2020Ho11

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Balraj Singh and Jun Chen		NDS 172,1 (2021)	31-Jan-2021

[1988Ry02](#): $E(\alpha)=32.2$ MeV from the tandem Van de Graaff at Heidelberg. Enriched target. Measured $\sigma(\theta)$ data from 10° to 40° (c.m.), with a Q3D spectrograph (FWHM=20 keV). Deduced levels, J, π , deformation lengths from DWBA analysis. Transition rates deduced from deformation parameters; see [1986La18](#) (from the same group) for details of the experimental arrangement and analysis of results.

[2013Yo07](#), [2015Yo04](#): $E(\alpha)=240$ MeV from Texas A&M K500 superconducting cyclotron. Target=self-supporting target foils 5-8 mg/cm² of >96% enriched ^{100}Mo . Measured $E\alpha$, $I\alpha$, $\alpha(\theta)$ using multipole-dipole-multipole (MDM) spectrometer at Texas A&M. Deduced isoscalar giant resonances (ISGMR, ISGDR, ISGQR and ISGOR), and E0, E1, E2 and E3 strengths. Comparison with Spherical Hartree-Fock-based random-phase approximation calculations. DWBA analysis of $\sigma(\theta)$ data.

[2020Ho11](#): $E(\alpha)=386$ MeV from RCNP-Osaka accelerator facility. Measured $E\alpha$, $I\alpha$, $\alpha(\theta)$ using Grand Raiden high-resolution spectrometer. DWBA analysis of angular distributions. Deduced energies, widths and intensities of the isoscalar giant monopole resonances (ISGMR).

See also [2013Yo07](#).

Others: [1975Bu04](#) (seven levels given), [1972Ma56](#), [1971Go36](#), [1971Go28](#).

(α, α) $E=14$ -32 MeV: [2003Av04](#): analyzed $\sigma(\theta)$ data, deduced optical- model parameters.

[Additional information 1](#).

All data for levels up to 3701 are from [1988Ry02](#). Above this energy, data for giant resonances are from [2015Yo04](#).

 ^{100}Mo Levels

Total Isoscalar E0 EWSR=110% 12, E1 EWSR=55% 7, E2 EWSR=79% 14, and E3 EWSR=53% 7 ([2015Yo04](#)).

Reduced transition strength in Weisskopf units from [1988Ry02](#), deduced from deformation lengths. For comparison of these values with those deduced from electromagnetic transitions, see Adopted Levels.

E(level)	L &	Comments
0		
526 20	2	Transition strength (W.u.)=35.4. $\beta_2 R=1.08$ fm. Others: 1972Ma56 , 1971Go36 .
1063 20	2	Transition strength (W.u.)=1.1. $\beta_2 R=0.19$ fm.
1139 20	(4)	Transition strength=1.2 4 (1975Bu04).
1918 20	3	Transition strength (W.u.)=40.8. $\beta_3 R=0.96$ fm. Other: 1972Ma56 .
2029 20		
2121 20	4	Transition strength (W.u.)=3.4. $\beta_4 R=0.22$ fm.
2183 20		
2330 20	2	Transition strength (W.u.)=0.4. $\beta_2 R=0.12$ fm.
2384 20	5	Transition strength (W.u.)=8.1. $\beta_5 R=0.26$ fm.
2416 20	3	Transition strength (W.u.)=3.5. $\beta_3 R=0.28$ fm.
2444 20		
2464 20	4	Transition strength (W.u.)=8.2. $\beta_4 R=0.34$ fm.
2566 20		
2610 20	4	Transition strength (W.u.)=3.4. $\beta_4 R=0.22$ fm.
2656 20	(4,5)	
2707 20		
2790 20	(4)	Transition strength (W.u.)=2.3.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{100}\text{Mo}(\alpha, \alpha')$ **1988Ry02, 2015Yo04, 2020Ho11** (continued) ^{100}Mo Levels (continued)

E(level)	$J\pi^{\ddagger}$	$T_{1/2}^{\dagger}$	L&	Comments
2852 20			4	$\beta_4 R=0.18$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=5.1.
2869 20			(2)	$\beta_4 R=0.27$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=0.5.
2882 20			4	$\beta_2 R=0.13$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=2.8.
2970 20			4	$\beta_4 R=0.20$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=4.4.
3029 20			(6)	$\beta_4 R=0.25$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=3.6.
3041 20			4	$\beta_6 R=0.13$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=3.1.
3085 20			5	$\beta_4 R=0.21$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=7.5.
3114 20			(5)	$\beta_5 R=0.25$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=2.7.
3153 20				$\beta_5 R=0.15$ fm.
3196 20			4	Transition strength (W.u.)=1.6.
3216 20			3	$\beta_4 R=0.15$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=1.8.
3276 20			(5)	$\beta_3 R=0.20$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=3.4.
3398 20			(4)	$\beta_5 R=0.17$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=1.0.
3603 20			3	$\beta_4 R=0.12$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=1.0.
3701 20			5	$\beta_3 R=0.15$ fm. Transition strength (W.u.)=5.8.
13.0 $\times 10^3$ [#] 3	1 ⁻ [#]	11.6 [#] MeV 12		$\beta_5 R=0.22$ fm. %E1 EWSR=18 3 for ISGDR (2015Yo04).
13.2 $\times 10^3$ @ 4	0 ⁺ @	2.6@ MeV 6		%E0 EWSR=32 4 for ISGMR.
13.60 $\times 10^3$ [#] 26	2 ⁺ [#]	4.75 [#] MeV 38		Other: energy=15.8 MeV, $\Gamma=7.1$ MeV, %EWSR=97 (2013Yo07, 2015Yo04).
16.8 $\times 10^3$ @ 4	0 ⁺ @	2.5@ MeV 5		%E2 EWSR=79 14 for ISGQR (2015Yo04).
21.5 $\times 10^3$ [#] 4	3 ⁻ [#]	3.7 [#] MeV 3		%E0 EWSR=60 3 for ISGMR.
30.1 $\times 10^3$ [#] 7	1 ⁻ [#]	12.5 [#] MeV 38		Other: energy=23.6 MeV, $\Gamma=5.5$ MeV, %EWSR=14 (2013Yo07, 2015Yo04).
				%E3 EWSR=53 7 for ISGOR (2015Yo04).
				%E1 EWSR=47 10 for ISGDR (2015Yo04).

[†] From 2015Yo04.[‡] Natural parity states defined by L-value.[#] From 2015Yo04.[@] From 2020Ho11. Values from 2015Yo04 are given under comments. Due to background subtraction procedures in 2013Yo07 and 2015Yo04, as discussed in 2019Ho17 and 2016Gu13, values from 2020Ho11 are preferred here. Further, for ISGMR, there can only be two peaks, as GMR strength splits into two components in case of deformed nuclei, because of the mixing with the K=0 component of the GQR, as discussed in 1980Ga21, and also communication with Prof. U. Garg, Oct 29, 2020.& From comparison of $\sigma(\theta)$ data to DWBA calculations (1988Ry02).