

^{109}Te ε decay **2002Re28**

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	S. Kumar(a), J. Chen(b) and F. G. Kondev		NDS 137, 1 (2016)	31-May-2016

Parent: ^{109}Te : $E=0.0$; $J^\pi=(5/2^+)$; $T_{1/2}=4.4$ s 2; $Q(\varepsilon)=8536$ 7; $\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+$ decay=96.1 13

^{109}Te - $Q(\varepsilon)$: From [2012Wa38](#).

2002Re28: ^{109}Te was produced using $E(^{58}\text{Ni})=230$ MeV and 260 MeV beams on a ^{54}Fe ($617 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$) target at Argonne National Laboratory. Fragment Mass Analyzer. Detectors: 3 large volume HPGe and Moving Tape Collector. Measured: $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$, and $\gamma(t)$.

 ^{109}Sb Levels

$E(\text{level})^\dagger$	$J^\pi^\ddagger$	$T_{1/2}^\ddagger$	$E(\text{level})^\dagger$	$J^\pi^\ddagger$	$E(\text{level})^\dagger$
0	(5/2 ⁺)	17.2 s 5	1330.8 4	(3/2,5/2,7/2)	2019?
402.0 4	(1/2 ⁺)		1591.8 6	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	2045.5? 4
752.3 4	(3/2 ⁺)		1619.5? 4	(3/2,5/2,7/2)	2106.0? 6
831.9 4	(7/2 ⁺)		1837.4 4	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	
1100.7 4	(9/2 ⁺)		1968.8 6		

† From a least-squares fit to γ -ray energies.

‡ From Adopted Levels.

 $\gamma(^{109}\text{Sb})$

$I\gamma$ normalization: Decay scheme is incomplete (pandemonium) and tentative, thus it was not normalized and no $\log ft$ values and $I\beta$ were deduced.

$E_\gamma^\ddagger$	$I_\gamma^\ddagger$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π
268.6 4	≤ 10	1100.7	(9/2 ⁺)	831.9	(7/2 ⁺)
402.0 4	50 3	402.0	(1/2 ⁺)	0	(5/2 ⁺)
752.3 4	100	752.3	(3/2 ⁺)	0	(5/2 ⁺)
$^{x760}^\ddagger$					
$^{x796}^\ddagger$					
831.6 4	79 5	831.9	(7/2 ⁺)	0	(5/2 ⁺)
918 [#]	≤ 10	2019?		1100.7	(9/2 ⁺)
$^{x959}^\ddagger$					
$^{x964}^\ddagger$					
1085.0 4	≤ 10	1837.4	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	752.3	(3/2 ⁺)
$^{x1101}^\ddagger$					
1101.0 4	30 4	1100.7	(9/2 ⁺)	0	(5/2 ⁺)
1136.9 4	21 5	1968.8		831.9	(7/2 ⁺)
1186 [#]	10 3	2019?		831.9	(7/2 ⁺)
1189.8 4	11 4	1591.8	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	402.0	(1/2 ⁺)
$^{x1255}^\ddagger$					
1274.1 [#] 4	27 11	2106.0?		831.9	(7/2 ⁺)
1330.8 4	32 4	1330.8	(3/2,5/2,7/2)	0	(5/2 ⁺)
1435.4 4	15 9	1837.4	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	402.0	(1/2 ⁺)
$^{x1447}^\ddagger$					
1592 [#]	≤ 10	1591.8	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	0	(5/2 ⁺)
1619.5 4	10 1	1619.5?	(3/2,5/2,7/2)	0	(5/2 ⁺)

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

 ^{109}Te ε decay **2002Re28** (continued)

 $\gamma(^{109}\text{Sb})$ (continued)

<u>E_γ</u>	<u>I_γ</u>	<u>$E_i(\text{level})$</u>	<u>E_f</u>	<u>J_f^π</u>
$^{x1621}\dagger$				
1969 [#]	≤ 10	1968.8	0	(5/2 ⁺)
2045.5 [#] 4	7 1	2045.5?	0	(5/2 ⁺)

[†] In coincidence with some of the placed transitions ([2002Re28](#)).

[‡] From [2002Re28](#).

[#] Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

^{109}Te ε decay 2002Re28

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)

Decay Scheme

Intensities: Relative I_γ 