

^{102}Cd ε decay [1991Ke08](#),[1970Hn02](#)

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	D. De Frenne	NDS 110, 1745 (2009)	31-Dec-2008

Parent: ^{102}Cd : $E=0$; $J^\pi=0^+$; $T_{1/2}=5.5$ min 5; $Q(\varepsilon)=2587$ 8; $\% \varepsilon + \% \beta^+$ decay=100.0

[1991Ke08](#): source: mass separated spallation source produced at ISOLDE (CERN), also by fusion evaporation reactions using an on-line mass separator at GSI. Measured: $E\beta$, $I\beta$, $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $X\gamma$ and $\gamma\gamma$ -coin, Ice, α . Deduced: ^{102}Ag levels J, π , $Q(\beta^+)$.

[1970Hn02](#): measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ -coin, Ice, α ; isotopically separated samples.

Others: [1966Bu05](#), [1969Ha03](#), [1970Hn03](#), [1976CoYX](#), [1977CoZT](#).

Absolute $\alpha(K)$ values were determined by simultaneously measuring ce and γ spectra ([1970Hn02](#)).

 ^{102}Ag Levels

E(level) [†]	J^π [#]	$T_{1/2}$ [‡]	Comments
0	5 ⁽⁺⁾	12.9 min 3	
9.40 7	2 ⁺	7.7 min 5	E(level): the position of this level was deduced from γ -ray energy differences of γ -rays ordered according to $\gamma\gamma$ -coincidence results (1991Ke08).
97.45 5	4 ⁽⁺⁾		
125.54 10	2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺		
156.49 6	3 ⁺		
369.98 8	2 ⁺		
490.44 11	1 ⁺		
540.59 13	1 ⁺ ,2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺		
1045.59 15	1 ⁺		
1368.6 3	1 ⁺		
1449.0 4	1 ⁺		
1727.2 7	(1 ⁺)		
1965.4 7	1 ⁺		

[†] From a least-squares procedure using measured gammas.

[‡] From Adopted Levels.

[#] From Adopted Levels.

 ε, β^+ radiations

β -branches were deduced from total γ -ray transition intensities assuming no β -feeding either to the g.s. or to 9.3-keV isomer.

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$ [†]	$I\varepsilon$ [†]	Log ft	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$ [†]	Comments
(622 8)	1965.4		0.36 2	4.88 3	0.36 2	$\varepsilon K=0.8573$; $\varepsilon L=0.1142$; $\varepsilon M+=0.02846$
(860 8)	1727.2		0.14 5	5.58 16	0.14 5	$\varepsilon K=0.8598$; $\varepsilon L=0.1123$; $\varepsilon M+=0.02789$
(1138 8)	1449.0		0.57 8	5.22 7	0.57 8	$\varepsilon K=0.8614$; $\varepsilon L=0.1111$; $\varepsilon M+=0.02754$
(1218 8)	1368.6	0.0021 4	6.3 6	4.24 5	6.3 6	av $E\beta=95$ 4; $\varepsilon K=0.8614$; $\varepsilon L=0.1108$; $\varepsilon M+=0.02746$
(1541 8)	1045.59	0.44 3	25.3 8	3.841 18	25.7 8	av $E\beta=236$ 4; $\varepsilon K=0.8478$; $\varepsilon L=0.10821$ 13; $\varepsilon M+=0.02679$ 4
(2046 [‡] 8)	540.59	0.21 13	1.1 7	>5.5	<1.3	av $E\beta=456$ 4; $\varepsilon K=0.721$ 4; $\varepsilon L=0.0914$ 4; $\varepsilon M+=0.02260$ 11
(2097 8)	490.44	12.1 4	51.8 15	3.799 17	63.9 18	av $E\beta=478$ 4; $\varepsilon K=0.701$ 4; $\varepsilon L=0.0888$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.02195$ 11

[†] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

[‡] Existence of this branch is questionable.

^{102}Cd ε decay **1991Ke08,1970Hn02** (continued) $\gamma(^{102}\text{Ag})$ Normalization from sum of $I(\gamma+ce)$ to g.s. + 9.3 level=100. $\alpha(K)\text{exp}$, $\alpha(L)\text{exp}$ from (1991Ke08), $K:(L+M)$ from (1970Hn02).

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^\dagger@$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. #	α^\ddagger	Comments
(9.40 8)		9.40	2 ⁺	0	5 ⁽⁺⁾	(M3)	1.2×10^7 5	
28&	<0.06	125.54	2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺	97.45	4 ⁽⁺⁾			I_γ : from $\gamma\gamma$ data.
59.05 5	2.4 1	156.49	3 ⁺	97.45	4 ⁽⁺⁾	M1	1.89	$\alpha(K)=1.642$; $\alpha(L)=0.2057$; $\alpha(M)=0.0392$; $\alpha(N+..)=0.00677$ $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=1.5$ 2 $K/(L+M)=6.2$ 8
97.46 5	5.9 3	97.45	4 ⁽⁺⁾	0	5 ⁽⁺⁾	M1	0.451 7	$\alpha(K)=0.3916$; $\alpha(L)=0.0487$; $\alpha(M)=0.00927$; $\alpha(N+..)=0.0016$ $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.51$ 12; $\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.058$ 9 $K/(L+M)>3$
116.13 8	10.9 6	125.54	2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺	M1	0.276 4	$\alpha(K)=0.2395$; $\alpha(L)=0.0297$; $\alpha(M)=0.00565$; $\alpha(N+..)=0.0016$ $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.25$ 3; $\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.030$ 4 $K/(L+M)=6$ 2
120.47 9	4.6 3	490.44	1 ⁺	369.98	2 ⁺	M1	0.249	$\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.20$ 3 $\alpha(K)=0.2163$; $\alpha(L)=0.02677$; $\alpha(M)=0.0051$
147.09 10	0.87 12	156.49	3 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺	M1+E2		$\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.22$ 3; $\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.037$ 9 $\alpha(K)=0.2104$; $\alpha(L)=0.03592$; $\alpha(M)=0.00694$; $\alpha(N+..)=0.00115$ δ : No δ given by (1970Hn02).
156.1 3	0.40 15	156.49	3 ⁺	0	5 ⁽⁺⁾			
213.50 9	7.5 7	369.98	2 ⁺	156.49	3 ⁺	M1	0.0526	$\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.0506$; $\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.0086$ 19 $K/(L+M)=5$ 2
244.4 7	0.24 10	369.98	2 ⁺	125.54	2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺			
322.5&	<0.3	1368.6	1 ⁺	1045.59	1 ⁺			
360.58 10	5.6 3	369.98	2 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺	E2	0.0171	$\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.0165$ 18; $\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.0020$ 3 $\alpha(K)=0.01461$; $\alpha(L)=0.0020$; $\alpha(M)=0.00038$
384	0.25 10	540.59	1 ⁺ ,2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺	156.49	3 ⁺			
415.05 15	12.8 9	540.59	1 ⁺ ,2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺	125.54	2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺	M1,E2		$\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.0095$ 8; $\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.00106$ 15 $\alpha(K)=0.0089$; $\alpha(L)=0.0011$; $\alpha(M)=0.00022$ $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.0063$ 7 $\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.00083$ 11 $\alpha(K)(M1)=0.00585$ 9 $\alpha(K)(E2)=0.00610$ 9. $\alpha(L)(M1)=0.000694$ 10 $\alpha(L)(E2)=0.000791$ 12.
481.00 18	100 3	490.44	1 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺	M1,E2		$\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.0048$ 7 $\alpha(K)=0.0052$; $\alpha(L)=0.00065$; $\alpha(M)=0.00012$
505.00 15	12.6 9	1045.59	1 ⁺	540.59	1 ⁺ ,2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺	M1,E2		E_γ : placement from 1991Ke08, other placement by 1970Hn02.
531.20 20	1.7 2	540.59	1 ⁺ ,2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺	M1,E2		$\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.0058$ 16 $\alpha(K)=0.0046$; $\alpha(L)=0.00057$; $\alpha(M)=0.00011$

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{102}Cd ε decay **1991Ke08,1970Hn02** (continued) $\gamma(^{102}\text{Ag})$ (continued)

E_γ [†]	I_γ ^{†@}	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π
555&	<3.8	1045.59	1 ⁺	490.44	1 ⁺
675.65 20	7.0 4	1045.59	1 ⁺	369.98	2 ⁺
920& 1	<0.1	1045.59	1 ⁺	125.54	2 ⁺ ,3 ⁺
998.6 7	0.48 10	1368.6	1 ⁺	369.98	2 ⁺
1036.1 3	23 1	1045.59	1 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺
1079.1 5	0.25 9	1449.0	1 ⁺	369.98	2 ⁺
1359.2 3	10 1	1368.6	1 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺
1439.6 5	0.7 1	1449.0	1 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺
1717.8 7	0.23 8	1727.2	(1 ⁺)	9.40	2 ⁺
1956.0 7	0.60 3	1965.4	1 ⁺	9.40	2 ⁺

[†] From **1991Ke08**, unless noted otherwise.

[‡] Theoretical total conversion coefficients (bricc) were used for calculating $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$. These coefficients corresponded to the multipolarity indicated.

Deduced from $\alpha(K)_{\text{exp}}$, $\alpha(L)_{\text{exp}}$ and $K:(L+M)$ ratios. Possible multiplicities, which can be ruled out based on the decay scheme, are omitted.

@ For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.60 2.

& Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

^{102}Cd ϵ decay 1991Ke08,1970Hn02

Legend

- $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- - - → γ Decay (Uncertain)
- Coincidence

Decay Scheme

Intensities: $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$ per 100 parent decays

