

$^{116}\text{I}$   $\beta^+$  decay 1992ZiZW,1976Go02

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Jean Blachot	NDS 111, 717 (2010)	1-Dec-2009

Parent:  $^{116}\text{I}$ : E=0.0;  $J^\pi=1^+$ ;  $T_{1/2}=2.91$  s 15;  $Q(\beta^+)=7.78\times 10^3$  10;  $\% \beta^+$  decay=100.0

The decay scheme is that proposed by 1992ZiZW. Evaluators consider it as preliminary.

Measured:  $\gamma$ (semi),  $\beta$ (scin),  $\beta\gamma$ .

Previous reports: 1969Sp07, 1973XeZY, 1974Ha10.

$^{92}\text{Mo}(^{32}\text{S},\text{xpyn})$  E=220 MeV, on-line ms (1992ZiZW,1992ZiZY).

$^{116}\text{I}$  produced from  $^{103}\text{Rh}(^{16}\text{O},3\text{n})$  E=83 MeV, on-line ms (1976Go02).

Daughter( $^{116}\text{Xe}$ ) from  $\text{Ce}(p,5\text{pxn})$  E=600 MeV, on-line ms (1969Ha03).

 $^{116}\text{Te}$  Levels

E(level)	$J^\pi^\dagger$	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0	$0^+$	2.49 h 4	
678.92 3	$2^+$		
1059.79 8			E(level): no E0 to g.s. found by 1992ZiZW.
1219.12 5	$2^+$		
1360	$4^+$		
1637.59 5	$3^+$		
1811.49 11	$4^+$		E(level): a weak $\beta$ branching to this level is given by 1992ZiZW?
2080.95 5	$(1,2^+)$		

$^\dagger$  From Adopted Levels.

 $\varepsilon, \beta^+$  radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^{\#\dagger}$	$I\varepsilon^\#$	Log $ft$	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)^{\ddagger\#}$	Comments
$(5.70\times 10^3$ 10)	2080.95	2.2	0.16	5.3	2.4	av $E\beta=2142$ 63; $\varepsilon\text{K}=0.058$ 5; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.0076$ 7; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.00200$ 17
$(6.14\times 10^3$ 10)	1637.59	1.7	0.095	5.6	1.8	av $E\beta=2354$ 63; $\varepsilon\text{K}=0.045$ 4; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.0059$ 5; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.00156$ 12 $I\beta^+$ : 1992ZiZW assigns $2^+$ to this level because it seems feed from $1^+$ . The evaluator has adopted the result of 1986Lo14 in ( $^3\text{He},3\text{n}\gamma$ ).
$(6.56\times 10^3$ 10)	1219.12	3.0	0.13	5.5	3.1	av $E\beta=2555$ 63; $\varepsilon\text{K}=0.036$ 3; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.0047$ 4; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.00125$ 9
$(6.72\times 10^3$ 10)	1059.79	0.3	0.01	6.6	0.3	av $E\beta=2632$ 63; $\varepsilon\text{K}=0.0336$ 23; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.0044$ 3; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.00115$ 8
$(7.10\times 10^3$ 10)	678.92	18.7	0.63	4.9	19.3	av $E\beta=2816$ 63; $\varepsilon\text{K}=0.0280$ 18; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.00364$ 23; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.00096$ 6
$(7.78\times 10^3$ $^\dagger$ 10)	0.0	70.8	1.75	4.5	72.6	av $E\beta=3144$ 64; $\varepsilon\text{K}=0.0207$ 12; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.00269$ 16; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.00071$ 4

$^\dagger$   $E(\beta^+)=6740$  130 (1970BeYT), 6690 200 (1976Go02).

$^\ddagger$  From  $\gamma^\pm$  intensity (1976Go02) and theoretical  $\varepsilon/\beta^+$ . Due to large Q value, and the probable incompleteness of the decay scheme, only the strong branches to g.s. and 679 level are considered by the evaluators to be reliable. Other feedings should probably be considered as upper limits.

$^\#$  Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

$^{116}\text{I}\beta^+$  decay [1992ZiZW,1976Go02](#) (continued) $\gamma(^{116}\text{Te})$ 

I $\gamma$  normalization: from I( $\beta^+$ )/I $\gamma$ (679 $\gamma$ )=11.40 16 ([1976Go02](#)).

$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma^{\dagger\ddagger}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Comments
380.88 8	2.06 15	1059.79		678.92	2 <sup>+</sup>	
540.21 4	14.8 5	1219.12	2 <sup>+</sup>	678.92	2 <sup>+</sup>	
577.91 20	0.9 3	1637.59	3 <sup>+</sup>	1059.79		
678.92 3	100.0 5	678.92	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	
681	<0.5	1360	4 <sup>+</sup>	678.92	2 <sup>+</sup>	I $\gamma$ : the intensity given by <a href="#">1992ZiZW</a> is an upper limit. The evaluators think that this measurement needs confirmation.
<sup>x</sup> 742.7 4	0.73 17					
861.84 5	3.00 16	2080.95	(1,2 <sup>+</sup> )	1219.12	2 <sup>+</sup>	
958.66 3	5.64 15	1637.59	3 <sup>+</sup>	678.92	2 <sup>+</sup>	
1132.57 10	1.92 13	1811.49	4 <sup>+</sup>	678.92	2 <sup>+</sup>	
<sup>x</sup> 1219	<0.02					
<sup>x</sup> 1360	<0.05					
<sup>x</sup> 1368.1 3	0.86 13					
1402.01 5	5.93 18	2080.95	(1,2 <sup>+</sup> )	678.92	2 <sup>+</sup>	
<sup>x</sup> 1633.0 9	1.02 23					
<sup>x</sup> 1637	<0.09					
1811 <sup>#</sup>	<0.02	1811.49	4 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	
<sup>x</sup> 1903.83 13	1.83 12					
2081	<0.35	2080.95	(1,2 <sup>+</sup> )	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	
<sup>x</sup> 2154.4 20	0.7 3					

<sup>†</sup> From [1992ZiZW](#), I( $\gamma^\pm$ )=2280 32, summed I( $\beta^+$ )=1140 16 ([1976Go02](#)).

<sup>‡</sup> For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.0855.

<sup>#</sup> Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

<sup>x</sup>  $\gamma$  ray not placed in level scheme.

$^{116}\text{I}$   $\beta^+$  decay 1992ZiZW,1976Go02

## Decay Scheme

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

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