

¹⁰⁴Ru(d,p) 1976Ma49,1971Fo01

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	S. Lalkovski, J. Timar and Z. Elekes		NDS 161, 1 (2019)	1-Apr-2019

1976Ma49: Facility: MP Tandem at Munich; Beam: E(d)=14 MeV; Target: 50 μg/cm² enriched to 99.6% in ¹⁰⁴Ru, 10 μg/cm² carbon backing; Detectors: Q3D spectrograph (FWHM=5 keV), multiwire chamber (ΔE/E≈2.4%), time-of-flight system, one CsI, Faraday cup, parafin and aluminium shields; Measured: E(p), dσ/dΩ(θ); Deduced: ¹⁰⁵Ru level scheme, L from DWBA analysis with DWUCK2 code, J^π.

1971Fo01: Facility: Argonne FN tandem; Beam: E(d)=14 MeV; Target: 25-50 μg/cm² enriched in ¹⁰⁴Ru and thin carbon backing (≤20 μg/cm²); Detectors: magnetic spectrograph (FWHM≈12 keV), photo emulsions, Faraday cup; Measured: dσ/dΩ(θ); Deduced: ¹⁰⁵Ru level scheme, J^π from DWBA analysis with JULIE code; Also, from the same collaboration: **1968No02**.

Others: **1976ZaZV**, **1974MIZZ**, **1973ShYA**, **1969Mi06**, **1969MiZY**.

¹⁰⁵Ru Levels

E(level) [†]	J ^{π‡}	L [@]	S ^{#@}	Comments
0	3/2 ⁺	2	0.009 4	configuration: ν2d _{3/2} .
20.5 1	5/2 ⁺	2	1.54 6	configuration: ν2d _{5/2} .
108.3 2	5/2 ⁺	2	0.07 1	configuration: ν2d _{5/2} .
159.2 3	1/2 ⁺	0	0.74 6	configuration: ν3s _{1/2} .
163.7 3	(5/2 ⁺)	2	0.18 4	configuration: ν2d _{5/2} .
208.6 7	(7/2 ⁻)	5	2.7 4	configuration: ν1h _{11/2} .
229.7 4	7/2 ⁺	4	0.75 8	configuration: ν1g _{7/2} .
246.4 3	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	4,3	0.15 3	E(level): Could be unresolved multiplet given two close lying levels are observed at 244 and 246 keV in (n,γ). L: The adopted J ^π supports L=4. S: for L=4, ν1g _{7/2} in 1976Ma49 ; Otherwise: 0.04 1 for L=3, ν1f _{5/2} or 0.03 1 for L=3, ν1f _{7/2} in 1976Ma49 . configuration: ν1g _{7/2} , ν1f _{5/2} , ν1f _{7/2} .
301.6 9	7/2 ⁺	4	0.24 8	configuration: ν1g _{7/2} .
321.5 2	3/2 ⁻	1	0.080 8	configuration: 2p _{3/2} .
441.8 2	3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺	2	0.36 3	S: for L=2, ν2d _{3/2} in 1976Ma49 ; Also: 0.31 2 for L=2, ν2d _{5/2} in 1976Ma49 . configuration: ν2d _{3/2} or 2νd _{5/2} .
466.2 3	3/2 ⁺	2	1.32 7	configuration: ν2d _{3/2} .
491.2 15	(1/2,3/2) ⁻	3,1	0.25 7	S: for L=3, ν1f _{5/2} in 1976Ma49 ; Also: 0.18 5 for L=3 ν1f _{7/2} or 0.030 15 for L=1, ν2p _{1/2} or L=1, ν2p _{3/2} in 1976MA49 . configuration: ν1f _{5/2} , ν1f _{7/2} , ν2p _{1/2} , ν2p _{3/2} .
577.6 7	5/2 ⁻	3	0.21 4	S: for L=3, ν1f _{5/2} in 1976Ma49 ; Also: 0.15 3 for L=3, ν1f _{7/2} in 1976Ma49 . configuration: ν1f _{7/2} , ν1f _{7/2} .
583.0 8	3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺	2	0.14	S: for L=2, 2d _{3/2} in 1976Ma49 ; Also: 0.12 3 for L=2, 2d _{5/2} in 1976Ma49 . configuration: ν2d _{3/2} , ν2d _{5/2} .
625.2 4	(7/2 ⁺ ,9/2 ⁺)	4,5	0.70 2	L: the adopted J ^π supports L=4. S: for L=4, ν1g _{7/2} in 1976Ma49 ; Otherwise: 1.1 4 for L=5, ν1h _{11/2} in 1976Ma49 . configuration: ν1g _{7/2} , ν1h _{11/2} .
631.1 2	1/2 ⁺	0	0.06 1	configuration: ν3s _{1/2} .
725.7 20	(3/2 to 9/2)	≥3	0.46 23	S: for L=4, νg _{7/2} in 1976Ma49 ; Otherwise: 0.9 4 for L=5 νh _{11/2} in 1976Ma49 . configuration: ν1g _{7/2} , ν1h _{11/2} .
759& 5	(3/2,5/2) ⁺	2 ^a	0.19 ^a	
807& 5	1/2 ⁺	0 ^a	0.20 ^a	
825& 5	3/2 ⁺	2 ^a	0.46 ^a	
841& 5	(7/2,9/2) ⁺	4 ^a	0.61 ^a	S: calculated for J ^π =7/2 ⁺ .
876& 5	1/2 ⁺	0 ^a	0.14 ^a	
890& 5	3/2 ⁺	2 ^a	0.11 ^a	
914& 5	3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺	2 ^a	0.11 ^a	

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{104}\text{Ru}(\text{d,p})$ **1976Ma49,1971Fo01 (continued)** ^{105}Ru Levels (continued)

E(level) [†]	J π [‡]	L [@]	S ^{#@}	Comments
994 ^{&} 5	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	2 ^a	0.15 ^a	
1114 ^{&} 5	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	2 ^a	0.24 ^a	
1134 ^{&} 5	(1/2 ⁺ to 7/2 ⁺)	(1,3) ^a	(0.08) ^a	L: for L=1 in 1971Fo01; Also: 0.37 for L=3 in 1971Fo01. S: also 0.37 (1971Fo01).
1145 ^{&} 5	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	(2) ^a	(0.10) ^a	
1185 ^{&} 5	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	2 ^a	0.15 ^a	E(level): Possible doublet.
1581 ^{&} 10	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	(2) ^a	(0.15) ^a	
1931 ^{&} 10	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	(2) ^a	(0.20) ^a	

[†] From 1976Ma49, unless otherwise noted.

[‡] From the Adopted Levels.

[#] Label=(2J+1)S.

[@] From 1976Ma49, based on DWBA analysis with DWUCK2, unless otherwise noted;

$N = ((d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{exp}} / (d\sigma/d\Omega)_{\text{DWUCK2}}) (G_{ij} / (2j+1)) = 1.53$, where $G_{ij} = S_{ij} (2J_f+1) / (2J_i+1)$.

[&] From 1971Fo01 and corrected by the evaluators given all level energies are systematically overestimated by the authors by 21 keV.

^a From 1971Fo01, based on DWBA analysis with JULIE; $N = \sigma_{\text{exp}} / \sigma_{\text{JULIE}} 1 / (2J_f+1) S_{ij} = 1.65$.