

$^{109}\text{Ag(d,p)} \quad 1972\text{Br52}$

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	G. Gürdal and F. G. Kondev		NDS 113, 1315 (2012)	1-Aug-2011

Reaction: $^{109}\text{Ag(d,p)}$ at ED=10.0 MeV. $200\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$, 99.26% enriched ^{109}Ag was used as a target. The protons were detected using 5, 2-mm-thick Si(Li) detectors. $\sigma(\text{E(p)},\theta)$ measurements were carried out at 28 angles between 20° to 170° . Measured: $\sigma(\text{E(p)},\theta)$, FWHM \approx 20 keV. DWBA analysis.
 $J^\pi(^{109}\text{Ag})=1/2^-$.

 $^{110}\text{Ag Levels}$

E(level) [†]	L [‡]	S ^{#@}	Comments
1.15 3	2	0.59 ^{&}	E(level): From Adopted Levels.
235 4	0	0.475	
269 4	2	(0.11) ^{&a}	
337 4	0	0.24	
378 4	2	0.625 ^{&}	S: 0.73 if d3/2 ν single-particle orbital involved. E(level): possible unresolved doublet. L: DWBA fit was generated assuming an admixture of 15% L=0 and 85% L=2 transfers. For L=2 transfer, S=0.875 (for d3/2 ν -orbital) or S=0.725 (for d5/2 ν -orbital). For L=0 transfer, S=0.035 (for s1/2 ν -orbital).
433 4	0+2		
484 4	0	(0.07) ^a	
494 4			
536 4	0	0.57	
594 4	2	0.525	
661 4	2	0.285	
711 4	0	(0.04) ^a	
725 4			
751 4	2	0.095	
770 4			
793 4	2	0.155	
814 4			
864 4	2	0.16	
893 4			
925 4			
948 4	2	(0.24) ^a	
993 4	(2)	(0.05)	
1026 4	(2)	(0.135)	
1115 4	2	(0.205) ^a	
1165 4	2	(0.405) ^a	
1188 4			
1230 4	2	(0.13) ^a	
1263 4			
1315 4	0	(0.055) ^a	
1343 4			
1377 4			
1402 4	2	(0.285) ^a	
1480 4			
1513 4			
1535 4			
1568 4			
1659 4	2	(0.155) ^a	

[†] From 1972Br52, unless otherwise stated.

[‡] From comparison of experimental angular distributions with DWBA calculations.

 $^{109}\text{Ag}(\text{d,p})$ **1972Br52 (continued)**

 ^{110}Ag Levels (continued)

$S' = S_J(2J+1)/(2J_i+1)$, where $J_i=1/2$.

@ For $L=0$, $s1/2$ ν single-particle orbital, for $L=2$, $d3/2$ ν single-particle orbital involved, unless otherwise stated.

& $d5/2$ ν single-particle orbital involved.

^a Values are tentative. Reliable cross-section data can only be extracted for a few scattering angles because either cross-sections were small or data were masked by contaminant peaks.