## $^{100}$ Rb $\beta^-$ decay (52 ms) 2001Lh02

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

Parent: <sup>100</sup>Rb: E=0;  $J^{\pi}=(4^{-})$ ;  $T_{1/2}=52$  ms 2;  $Q(\beta^{-})=13574$  21;  $\%\beta^{-}$  decay=100.0

<sup>100</sup>Rb-E,  $J^{\pi}$ ,  $T_{1/2}$ : From <sup>100</sup>Rb Adopted Levels. From the log *ft* values given in Table II of 2001Lh02, it is likely that a low-spin isomer of possible  $J^{\pi}=1^{-}$  is mixed with the (4<sup>-</sup>) activity.

2001Lh02: <sup>100</sup>Rb isotope obtained from U(p,F) at 600 MeV followed by mass separation at ISOLDE facility. Measured E $\gamma$ , I $\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma(t)$ ,  $\beta\gamma$  coin. Deduced levels, J,  $\pi$ , decay branching ratios, log *ft*. Earlier studies from the same laboratory: 1995Pf04, 1990Lh01, 1990Lh03.

Others: 1986Wa17, 1982Kr11, 1980JuZY, 1979Az01, 1979Pe01, 1978Ko29.

Isotopic identification and half-life measurements: 1986Wa17, 1979Pe01, 1978Ko29.

 $Q(\beta^{-})$  measurement using  $\beta\gamma$ : 1984Pa19, 1985IaZZ.

%β<sup>-</sup>n measurement: 1981JoZV, 1986ReZU, 1986Wa17, 1993Ru01.

Eγ, Iγ: 1995Pf04, 1990Lh01, 1982Kr11, 1979Az01.

 $\beta ce(t): 1979Az01.$ 

 $\gamma\gamma$ (t): 1995Pf04, 1990Lh01.

Additional information 1.

Level scheme is from 2001Lh02. Earlier level scheme from 1995Pf04 and 1990Lh03 contained seven excited states up to 1779 keV and  $\gamma$  rays.

<sup>100</sup>Sr Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	T <sub>1/2</sub>	Comments
0.0	0+		
129.18 9	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	3.91 ns <i>16</i>	T <sub>1/2</sub> : from γγ(t) (1990Lh01), recommended in the Adopted Levels. Other: 5.15 ns 20 from $\beta$ (ce)(t) (1979Az01). $\beta_2$ =0.40 <i>I</i> from T <sub>1/2</sub> and rotational model.
416.99 <i>19</i>	(4 <sup>+</sup> )		
851.8 <i>3</i>	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		
937.8 4	$(0^{+})$		
1257.05 22	$(1,2^+)$		
1315.35 23	$(1,2^{+})$		
1326.6 4			
1414.5 3	$(3,4^{+})$		
1418.7 4	(2.4)		
1500.68 23	$(3,4^{+})$		
1521.8 4	(2, 4+)		
1560.4 3	$(3,4^{+})$	104 10	
1618.71 22	(4)	104 ns 19	$T_{1/2}$ : from the Adopted Levels. Other: 85 ns / from $\gamma\gamma(t)$ (1995Pf04). Possible configuration= $\nu 3/2[411] \otimes \nu 5/2[532]$ (1995Pf04).
1648.0 5			
1745.7 5			
1780.5 <i>3</i>	(5 <sup>-</sup> )		
1956.7 5	$(2^+,3,4^+)$		
1974.9 4	$(6^{-})$		
2055.99 23	$(1,2^+)$		
2115.78 23	$(2^+)$		
2211.32 22	(1,2)		
2211.41 22	(1,2)		
250594			
2005.94	$(1 2^+)$		
3165.0.6	$(1,2^+)$		
5105.0 0	(1,2)		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>100</sup>Rb-Q( $\beta^{-}$ ): From 2017Wa10.

# $^{100}$ Rb $\beta^-$ decay (52 ms) 2001Lh02 (continued)

## 100Sr Levels (continued)

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	Comments
3316.3 6	
5371+x	E(level): x<8203.23 from $O(B^{-})$ (for <sup>100</sup> Rb decay)-S(n)( <sup>100</sup> Sr), where $O(B^{-})=13574.21$ and S(n)=5371.9 from
5571 FX	2017Wa10.
9540+x	E(level): x<4034 23 from Q( $\beta^-$ ) (for <sup>100</sup> Rb decay)-S(2n)( <sup>100</sup> Sr), where Q( $\beta^-$ )=13574 21 and S(2n)=9540 8 from 2017Wa10.

<sup>†</sup> From least-squares fit to  $E\gamma$  data.

<sup>‡</sup> From the Adopted Levels.

#### $\beta^{-}$ radiations

Apparent  $\beta$  feedings and corresponding log *ft* values from 2001Lh02 are given in comments, together with evaluators' deduced apparent  $\beta$  feedings, when different from 2001Lh02. These values cannot be reliable for two reasons: 1.  $Q(\beta^-)=13574$  keV and the last populated level in <sup>100</sup>Sr in the present decay scheme at 3346 keV suggests that higher levels in <sup>100</sup>Sr are possibly populated, although above  $\approx 6$  MeV excitation, levels are expected to decay by neutron emission, for which the probability has been measured as 5.6% for one-neutron emission and 0.15% for two-neutron emission. 2. Apparent  $\beta$  feedings to levels of  $J^{\pi}=0^+$ ,  $2^+$  and  $6^+$  and associated log *ft* values are mutually inconsistent with a single parent of  $J^{\pi}=(4^-)$ . It is likely that the several of the low-spin levels such as  $0^+$ ,  $2^+$  and  $(1,2^+)$  are fed by an isomer with expected  $J^{\pi}=1^-$  as proposed in 2002Lh01.

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^{-\dagger}$	Comments
$(2.0 \times 10^{3\#} 20)$	9540+x	0.15 5	$I\beta^-$ : $\%\beta^-2n=0.15$ 5 for the decay of the <sup>100</sup> Rb g.s.
$(4 \times 10^{3 \#} 4)$ (10228 21)	5371+x 3346.0	5.6 12	I $\beta^-$ : % $\beta^-$ n=5.6 12 for the decay of the <sup>100</sup> Rb g.s. av E $\beta$ =4744 10
(10258 21)	3316.3		$I\beta$ =0.4 2, log <i>ft</i> =6.7 (2001Lh02). Evaluators obtain $I\beta$ =1.5 13. av $E\beta$ =4758 10 $I\beta$ =0.9 2, log <i>ft</i> =6.3 (2001Lh02).
(10409 <sup>‡</sup> 21)	3165.0		av E $\beta$ =4830 10 I $\beta$ =1.2 2, log ft=6.2 (2001Lh02). Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (1.2 <sup>+</sup> ) state.
(10477 <sup>‡</sup> 21)	3097.2		av E $\beta$ =4863 10 $\beta$ =6.2 (20011 h02) Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (1.2 <sup>+</sup> ) state
(11068 21)	2505.9		av $E\beta$ =5146 10 B=1.2.2 log ft=6.3 (2001Lh02)
(11091 21)	2482.7		$V = 2\beta = 5157 \ IO$ $I\beta = 2.0 \ 4. \log ft = 6.1 \ (2001Lh02).$
(11297 <sup>‡</sup> 21)	2277.47		av E $\beta$ =5255 10 I $\beta$ =5.2 5, log ft=5.7 (2001Lh02). Evaluators obtain I $\beta$ =5.1 6. Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (1,2 <sup>+</sup> ) state.
(11362 <sup>‡</sup> 2 <i>1</i> )	2211.52		av E $\beta$ =5287 10 I $\beta$ =6.1 7, log ft=5.7 (2001Lh02). Evaluators obtain I $\beta$ =5.9 8. Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (1,2 <sup>+</sup> ) state.
(11458 <sup>‡</sup> 2 <i>1</i> )	2115.78		av E $\beta$ =5333 10 I $\beta$ =4.0 4, log ft=5.9 (2001Lh02). Evaluators obtain I $\beta$ =4.2 6. Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (2 <sup>+</sup> ) state.
(11518 <sup>‡</sup> 21)	2055.99		av E $\beta$ =5361 10 I $\beta$ =8.2 7, log <i>ft</i> =5.6 (2001Lh02). Evaluators obtain I $\beta$ =5.8 7. Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (1.2 <sup>+</sup> ) state.
(11599 <sup>‡</sup> 21)	1974.9		av E $\beta$ =5400 10

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

# $^{100}$ Rb $\beta^-$ decay (52 ms) 2001Lh02 (continued)

### $\beta^{-}$ radiations (continued)

E(decay)	E(level)	Comments
		$I\beta = 0.4 \ I, \log ft = 7.0 \ (2001Lh02).$
(11617 21)	1956.7	av $E\beta = 5409 \ 10$
(11704, 21)	1780.5	$I\beta = 1.1 \ 2, \log ft = 6.5 \ (2001 Lh02).$
(11/94 21)	1760.5	IB=2.15, log ft=6.2 (2001Lh02).
(11828 21)	1745.7	av E $\beta$ =5510 <i>10</i>
		I $\beta$ =0.6 2, log <i>ft</i> =6.8 (2001Lh02).
(11926 21)	1648.0	av $E\beta = 5556 \ IO$
$(11955 \ 21)$	1618 71	$\mu = 0.5, 10g f = 0.9 (2001 Lilo2).$ av $F\beta = 5570, 10$
(11)55 21)	1010.71	$I\beta = 9.2$ 15, log $ft = 5.6$ (2001Lh02). Strong $\beta$ feeding is expected to this level from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent with
		possible configuration= $\pi 3/2[431] \otimes v 5/2[532]$ , where $3/2[431]$ proton changes to $3/2[411]$ neutron in
(10014.01)	1500 4	$\beta^-$ decay, while 5/2[532] neutron remains a spectator.
$(12014 \ 21)$	1560.4	av $E\beta$ =5598 10 19-11 2 log fr=6.5 (20011 h02). Evaluators obtain 19-0.7.5
$(12052 \ 21)$	1521.8	$\mu = 1.12, \log \beta = 0.5$ (2001Ello2). Evaluators obtain $\mu = 0.75$ . av E $\beta = 5617.10$
()		$I\beta = 4.5 5$ , log ft=6.0 (2001Lh02).
(12073 21)	1500.68	av E $\beta$ =5627 10
(10155.01)	1410 7	$I\beta = 5.9 \ 6, \ \log ft = 5.8 \ (2001 \ Lh02).$
(12155 21)	1418./	av $B\beta = 5666 IU$ I $\beta = 1, 1, 3, \log ft = 6.5 (20011, h02)$
(12160 21)	1414.5	av E $\beta$ =5668 10
(		$I\beta=3.4 \ 4, \log ft=6.1 \ (2001Lh02).$ Evaluators obtain $I\beta=2.8 \ 5.$
(12247 21)	1326.6	av $E\beta = 5710 \ 10$
+		$l\beta = 5.1 \ 8, \ \log ft = 5.9 \ (2001 \ Lh02).$
(12259 + 21)	1315.35	av $E\beta = 5715 \ IO$ $IQ = 6.4.6 \ \log 6 = 5.8 \ (20011 \ \log 2)$ . Unrealistic facting from $(4^{-})$ parent to $(1.2^{+})$ state
(10217 21)	1257.05	p=0.4 0, log $f=5.8$ (2001Ln02). Unrealistic feeding from (4 ) parent to (1,2) state.
$(12317^{*}21)$	1257.05	$IB=9.7.10$ log $ft=5.6$ (20011 b02) Evaluators obtain $IB=7.5.10$ Unrealistic feeding from $(4^{-})$ parent to
		$(1,2^+)$ state.
(12636 <sup>‡</sup> 21)	937.8	av E $\beta$ =5895 10
		$I\beta = 2.1 \ 3$ , log $ft = 6.4$ (2001Lh02). Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (0 <sup>+</sup> ) state.
$(12722^{\ddagger} 21)$	851.8	av E $\beta$ =5936 10
(10155.01)	116.00	I $\beta$ =1.9 2, log <i>ft</i> =6.4 (2001Lh02). Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to (6 <sup>+</sup> ) state.
(1315/21)	416.99	av $E\beta = 0.145 IU$ I $B = 2.9.26 \log fr = 6.3 (20011 \log 2)$
(13445 21)	120.19	$\mu = 2.5 20, \log (1 - 0.5) (2001 E 102).$
(13443 · 21)	127.10	IB=11.5 24, log ft=5.7 (2001Lh02). Evaluators obtain IB=10.3. Unrealistic feeding from (4 <sup>-</sup> ) parent to
		$(2^+)$ state.

<sup>†</sup> Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

<sup>‡</sup> Existence of this branch is questionable.

<sup>#</sup> Estimated for a range of levels.

# $\gamma(^{100}\mathrm{Sr})$

I $\gamma$  normalization: 0.55 6 from  $\Sigma(I(\gamma+ce) \text{ of } \gamma \text{ s to g.s.})=94.2$  12, based on  $\%\beta^-n+\%\beta^-2n=5.8$  12 from <sup>100</sup>Rb Adopted Levels, and no  $\beta$  feeding to <sup>100</sup>Sr g.s., as expected from  $\Delta J$ . However, This  $\gamma$  normalization factor is not recommended as the decay scheme is incomplete, implied from unrealistic  $\beta$  feedings to levels for which no direct  $\beta$  feedings are expected from  $\Delta J^{\pi}$ . There is the possibility of a low-spin isomer contributing to some of the  $\beta$  feedings to low-spin levels. In addition, levels above 3.4 MeV excitation can be populated.

# <sup>100</sup>**Rb** $\beta^-$ decay (52 ms) **2001Lh02** (continued)

 $\gamma(^{100}\text{Sr})$  (continued)

The decay scheme is not normalized as it is considered incomplete in several ways.

			$^{100}$ Rb $\beta^-$ decay (52 ms)			2001Lh02 (continued)			
				<u>γ(</u>	<sup>100</sup> Sr) (c	continued)			
Eγ	$I_{\gamma}$	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_f$	$J_f^{\pi}$	Mult.	$\alpha^{a}$		
5832	0.20.5	1618 71	$(4^{-})$	1560.4	$(3.1^+)$	[D E2]	3031		
106 / C	0.20 5	1010.71	(4)	1/	$(3,4^+)$	[D, E2]	5.9 54 0 045 36		
118.0.2	112	1618 71	$(4^{-})$	1500.68	(3, +) $(3, 4^+)$	[D, E2]	0.31.25		
129.2 1	100	129.18	$(2^+)$	0.0	$0^+$	[E2]	0.397		
161.8 2	4.9 8	1780.5	$(5^{-})$	1618.71	$(4^{-})$	[M1+E2]	0.11 7		
194.4 <sup>c</sup> 3	0.6 2	1974.9	(6 <sup>-</sup> )	1780.5	(5-)	[M1+E2]	0.06 4		
204.4 3	1.1 2	1618.71	(4-)	1414.5	$(3,4^{+})$	[D,E2]	0.044 31		
287.8 2	41 4	416.99	(4+)	129.18	$(2^+)$	[E2]	0.0222		
434.8 2	3.3 4	851.8	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	416.99	$(4^{+})$				
<sup>x</sup> 593.8 <sup>†‡</sup> 4	1.0 4								
$x_{614} 8^{\dagger \#} 4$	124								
$637.4^{\circ}.3$	1.7.3	2055.99	$(1.2^{+})$	1418.7					
$702.3 \frac{bc}{4}$	$0.8^{b}$ 3	2115 78	$(2^+)$	1/1/1/1/5	$(3.1^{+})$				
702.3 + 702.3	0.8 J	2115.76	(2)	1414.5	(3,4)				
702.3° 4	$0.8^{\circ}$ 3	2482.7	$(1, 2^{+})$	1/80.5	(5)				
740.7 3	0.9 3	2055.99	$(1,2^{+})$	1313.33	$(1,2^+)$				
864.0.3	5.04 287	2482 7	(0)	1618 71	$(2^{-})$				
$x_{071,1} \frac{0}{2} 4$	2.67	2-102.7		1010.71	(-)				
<sup></sup> 8/1.1 <sup></sup> 4	0.5 2	1414 5	$(2, 4^{\pm})$	416.00	$(4\pm)$				
1083 7 3	1.0 4	1414.5	$(3,4^+)$	410.99	$(4^+)$				
1127.8.3	2.90	1257.05	(3,4) $(1,2^+)$	120.55	$(2^+)$				
1127.8 3	173	1560.4	(1,2) $(3.4^+)$	416.99	$(2^{+})$				
1186.2.3	7.5.8	1315.35	$(1,2^+)$	129.18	$(2^+)$				
1197.4 4	9.0 15	1326.6	(1,2)	129.18	$(2^+)$				
1201.7 2	21 3	1618.71	$(4^{-})$	416.99	$(4^+)$				
1231.0 4	0.9 5	1648.0	~ /	416.99	(4+)				
1257.1.3	9.7 <mark>&amp;</mark> 17	1257.05	$(1.2^{+})$	0.0	$0^{+}$				
1285.5 4	5.4 6	1414.5	$(3.4^+)$	129.18	$(2^+)$				
1289 5 <mark>b</mark> 3	3 7 <mark>b</mark> 5	1418 7		129.18	$(2^+)$				
1289.5 c 3	$3.7b_{5}$	3346.0		2055.00	$(2^{-})$				
1209.5 5	3.7 J 468	1315 35	$(1 2^+)$	2055.99	(1,2)				
1328 7 4	103	1745 7	(1,2)	416.99	$(4^+)$				
1371.3 4	8.7 10	1500.68	$(3.4^{+})$	129.18	$(2^+)$				
1392.6 3	7.6 9	1521.8	(=,: )	129.18	$(2^+)$				
1431.8 <sup>c</sup> 5	0.6 4	1560.4	$(3,4^{+})$	129.18	$(2^+)$				
$x_{1504,0}^{\dagger}$ 5	1.0.5								
1539.4 7	1.0 4	1956.7	$(2^+, 3, 4^+)$	416.99	$(4^{+})$				
1699.0 5	1.3 4	2115.78	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	416.99	(4+)				
x1807.8 <sup>†</sup> 8	0.9.5								
1827.8 6	1.0 5	1956.7	$(2^+, 3, 4^+)$	129.18	$(2^{+})$				
x1883 0 <sup>†</sup> 6	0.8.3		( )- ) )						
1926.8.3	8.4.9	2055.99	$(1.2^{+})$	129.18	$(2^{+})$				
x1045 0 7	0.8.4	2000.000	(1,2)	12/110	(- )				
1945.9	195	2115 78	$(2^{+})$	129.18	$(2^{+})$				
2055.9 4	3.3 6	2055.99	$(1,2^+)$	0.0	$0^{+}$				
2082.2 3	3.6 7	2211.52	$(1,2^+)$	129.18	$(2^+)$				
2115.6 3	3.7 7	2115.78	(2+)	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>				
2148.4 3	7.4 9	2277.47	$(1,2^+)$	129.18	$(2^{+})$				
2211.6 3	7.1 12	2211.52	$(1,2^+)$	0.0	$0^{+}$				
2277.3 3	1.8 4	2277.47	$(1,2^{+})$	0.0	$0^{+}$				
<sup>x</sup> 2336.9 <sup>†</sup> 9	0.8 5								
2376.7 <sup>°</sup> 4	2.1 5	2505.9		129.18	$(2^{+})$				

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

From ENSDF

#### $^{100} {\rm Rb}\,\beta^-$ decay (52 ms) 2001Lh02 (continued)

# $\gamma(^{100}\text{Sr})$ (continued)

Eγ	$I_{\gamma}$	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_f$	$\mathbf{J}_{f}^{\pi}$	$E_{\gamma}$	$I_{\gamma}$	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$\mathbf{E}_{f}$	$\mathbf{J}_{f}^{\pi}$
x2635.9 <sup>†</sup> 8 2929.0 9 2967.8 7 3035 9 8	0.8 5 0.7 4 1.0 6	3346.0 3097.2 3165.0	$(1,2^+)$ $(1,2^+)$	416.99 129.18 129.18	$(4^+)$ $(2^+)$ $(2^+)$	3164.9 8 3187.1 <sup>c</sup> 6 <sup>x</sup> 4306.4 <sup>†</sup> 9 <sup>x</sup> 4483 3 <sup>†</sup> 8	0.2 <i>1</i> 1.6 6 0.9 5	3165.0 3316.3	(1,2 <sup>+</sup> )	0.0 129.18	0 <sup>+</sup> (2 <sup>+</sup> )
3097.3 7	1.4 5	3097.2	$(1,2^+)$ $(1,2^+)$	0.0	$\binom{2}{0^{+}}$	0 105.50	1.2 /				

<sup>†</sup> Possibly in coincidence with  $129\gamma$ .

<sup>±</sup> Since this  $\gamma$  is also placed in <sup>99</sup>Nb, its appearance in 129 $\gamma$ -gated spectrum might be due to accidental coincidence. <sup>#</sup> Since this  $\gamma$  is also placed in <sup>99</sup>Zr and <sup>100</sup>Zr, its appearance in 129 $\gamma$ -gated spectrum might be due to accidental coincidence.

<sup>@</sup> Possibly in coincidence with  $162\gamma$ .

& About 25% of the intensity is contributed by  $^{100}$ Mo.

<sup>a</sup> Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code (2008Ki07) with Frozen orbital approximation based on  $\gamma$ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.

<sup>b</sup> Multiply placed with undivided intensity.

<sup>c</sup> Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

 $x \gamma$  ray not placed in level scheme.



# <sup>100</sup>Rb $\beta^-$ decay (52 ms) 2001Lh02

