¹⁰⁸Sn ε decay **1978Hs01,1981Bu20**

	History							
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date					
Full Evaluation	Jean Blachot	ENSDF	1-Jul-2008					

Parent: ¹⁰⁸Sn: E=0.0; $J^{\pi}=0^+$; $T_{1/2}=10.30$ min 8; Q(ε)=2075 19; $\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+$ decay=100.0

¹⁰⁸In Levels

The decay scheme proposed by 1981Bu20 is identical to that of 1978Hs01, except for the 847.6, 1926.8 and 1957.2 levels for which the deexciting transitions were not observed by 1981Bu20.

E(level) ^{†#}	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	T _{1/2}	Comments
0	7+	58.0 min 12	
29.7 10	2+	39.6 min 7	
198.1 <i>10</i>	3+		
265.9 10	3+		
302.4 10	2^{+}		J^{π} : $J^{\pi}=2^+$ not compatible with log $ft=4.6$ from 0^+ .
698.8 10	1^{+}		
867.4? 11			E(level): the 565γ was placed feeding the g.s. by $1978Hs01$, $1981Bu20$.
1191.6 <i>10</i>	1^{+}		

 † All levels have been determined by evaluator considering the energy and the position of the two isomers.

[‡] From Adopted Levels, except as noted.

[#] From evaluator.

ε, β^+ radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	Ιβ ⁺ ‡	$I\varepsilon^{\ddagger}$	Log ft	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)^{\dagger \ddagger}$	Comments
(883 19)	1191.6		5.2 5	4.38 5	5.2 5	εK=0.8569; εL=0.11400 16; εM+=0.02912 5
(1208 19)	867.4?		0.06 4	6.6 <i>3</i>	0.06 4	εK=0.8584; εL=0.1126; εM+=0.02870
(1376 19)	698.8	0.33 10	87.5 12	3.540 18	87.8 12	av E β =173 11; ε K=0.8560 9; ε L=0.11173 19; ε M+=0.02846 5
(1773 19)	302.4	0.30 12	5.1 19	5.00 17	5.4 20	av E β =345 11; ε K=0.812 6; ε L=0.1052 8; ε M+=0.02676

 $I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$: the feeding leads to too small a log *ft* for a 0⁺ to 2⁺ transition. There must be additional feeding of the 302 level by unplaced or unobserved γ' s.

[†] From I(γ +ce)-imbalance at each level.

[‡] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

I γ normalization: from sum I(γ +ce to g.s.)=100.

Ν

E_{γ}^{\dagger}	$I_{\gamma}^{\textcircled{0}{b}}$	E _i (level)	\mathbf{J}_i^{π}	$\mathbf{E}_f \mathbf{J}_f^{\pi}$	Mult. ^{&}	δ^{a}	α^{c}	$I_{(\gamma+ce)}^{b}$	Comments
36.7 2	0.67 17	302.4	2+	265.9 3+	M1+(E2)	<0.45	14 4	10.2 4	α(K)=9.0 8; α(L)=3.8 27; α(M)=0.8 6 $ I_{(γ+ce)}: from int. balance at the 266 level. $ $ I_γ: Iγ from 1977Va14. $ Mult: 1978Hs01 estimate $ I(γ+ce)(36.6γ)/Iγ(396γ)≈0.10 on the basis of coincidence data although the transition is not seen in their singles spectrum; thus, α≈14. The requirement of an intensity balance at the 266 level leads to α= 14 4. α(theory)=60.4(E2), 9.5(M1); thus, δ<0.45. $
104.31 12	21.5 7	302.4	2+	198.1 3+	M1(+E2)	-0.06 10	0.468		$\alpha(K)=0.7 \ 3; \ \alpha(L)=0.17 \ 10 \ \alpha(K)\exp=0.6 \ 1 \ (1977Va14), \ 0.47 \ 10 \ (1975Ad10).$
168.24 9	31.0 6	198.1	3+	29.7 2+	M1		0.121		$\alpha(K)=0.105; \alpha(L)=0.013$ K/L=7.0 7 (1975Ad10); $\alpha(K)\exp=0.096$ 15 (1977Va14); $\alpha(K)\exp=0.13$ 2 (1975Ad10)
236.19 8	9.7 4	265.9	3+	29.7 2+	M1+E2	+0.07 3	0.049		$\alpha(K) = 0.042$ $\alpha(K) = 0.041$ 9 (1975Ad10)
272.69 11	70.8 10	302.4	2+	29.7 2+	M1+(E2)	+0.14 14	0.034		$\begin{aligned} &\alpha(K) = 0.039; \ \alpha(L) = 0.0061 \\ &\alpha(K) = 0.032 \ 8 \ (1975 \text{Ad10}); \ \alpha(K) = 0.051 \ 7 \\ &(1977 \text{Va14}) \\ &\text{Mult.: } 1978 \text{Hs01, in } (p,n\gamma), \ \text{determine } \delta = -2.25 \ 24 \ \text{for} \\ &J(279 \ \text{level}) = 2^+. \end{aligned}$
^x 363.0 [‡] 3 396.34 8	<0.2 [#] 100 <i>1</i>	698.8	1^{+}	302.4 2+	M1+E2	+0.4 +11-6	0.0133 3		I_{γ} : Iγ= 1.1 3 (1978Hs01). α(K)exp=0.014 3 (1975Ad10); α(K)exp=0.015 2 (1977Va14)
492.65 17	1.6 3	1191.6	1+	698.8 1+	D+Q	-0.53 8			
500.4 3	1.7 4	698.8	1+	198.1 3+					I_{γ} : from 1977Va14 corrected for contribution from summing of 396 and 104 γ 's. 1978Hs01 report I_{γ} = 2.7 2.
565.00 15	<0.2	867.4?		302.4 2+					I _{γ} : from 1977Va14 who established that most of the intensity in the 565 peak is from summing of the 396.3 and 168.2 γ 's. 1978Hs01 report I γ = 3.0 4, 1981Bu20 report I γ = 2.1 6.
669.16 <i>13</i>	35.1 6	698.8	1^{+}	29.7 2+	D+Q				ciper of the second secon
^x 829.3 ⁺ 5 ^x 847.6 4	<0.2 <0.2 [#]								I_{γ} : I_{γ} = 5.7 6 (1978Hs01). 1978Hs01 report I_{γ} = 3.3 8 and, on the basis of this transition, postulate a level at 847.6.
^x 858.7 [‡] 6	<0.2 [#]								I_{γ} : I_{γ} = 4.0 <i>10</i> (1978Hs01).
889.16 [‡] 17	5.1 [#] 5	1191.6	1^{+}	302.4 2+	D+Q	+1.3 +17-8			

 $^{108}_{49}\text{In}_{59}\text{-}2$

108 Sn ε decay 1978Hs01,1981Bu20 (continued)

$\gamma(^{108}\text{In})$ (continued)

${\rm E_{\gamma}}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{@b}$	E_i (level)	\mathbf{J}_i^{π}	\mathbf{E}_{f}	\mathbf{J}_f^{π}	Mult. ^{&}	Comments
^x 903.5 6 1161.83 <i>12</i>	<0.2 [#] 1.4 4	1191.6	1+	29.7	2+	Q	I_{γ} : I_{γ} = 1.0 2 (1978Hs01).
^x 1231.0 [‡] 5	<0.2 [#]						I_{γ} : $I\gamma = 1.0 \ 2 \ (1978 H s 0 1)$.
^x 1654.4 [‡] 5	<0.2 [#]						1978Hs01 report I γ = 2.8 3 and, on the basis of this transition, postulate a level at 1926.
^x 1684.8 [‡] 6	<0.2 [#]						1978Hs01 report I γ = 4.3 5. See 1957 γ .
^x 1957.2 6	<0.2 [#]						1978Hs01 report I γ = 1.2 3 and, on the basis of this transition and the 1684.8 γ , postulate a level at 1957.
[†] From 198 [‡] From 197	31Bu20, e	xcept where	noted	l other	wise.	Others: 19	78Hs01, 1977Va14, 1975Ad10, 1970Ki04.

[#] From 1981Bu20.

ω

[@] From 1978Hs01, except where noted otherwise. Others: 1981Bu20, 1979Pl06, 1977Va14, 1975Ad10, 1970Ki04.

& From $\alpha(K)$ exp based on I γ and Ice(K) of 1977Va14 (Ice for 36 γ). Data are normalized so that $\alpha(K)$ exp(633 γ ¹⁰⁸Cd)=0.00301 (E2 theory) multipolarities designated D,Q are from $\gamma(\theta)$ in ¹⁰⁸Cd(p,n) (1978Hs01). $\alpha(K)$ exp for the 236 γ is from Ice(K) of 1975Ad10 normalized to $\alpha(K)$ exp(168 $\gamma)$ value of 1977Va14. Other α (K)exp: 1975Ad10.

^{*a*} From $\gamma(\theta)$ in ¹⁰⁸Cd(p,n γ) (1978Hs01) with adopted J^{π} . ^{*b*} For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.643 6.

^c Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code (2008Ki07) with Frozen orbital approximation based on γ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.

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

108 Sn ε decay 1978Hs01,1981Bu20

Decay Scheme



¹⁰⁸₄₉In₅₉