

$^{118}\text{Ag} \beta^-$  decay (2.0 s) 1979HiZR,1987Ap01

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	K. Kitao	NDS 75,99 (1995)	1-Feb-1993

Parent:  $^{118}\text{Ag}$ :  $E=127.74$  16;  $J^\pi=(4^+)$ ;  $T_{1/2}=2.0$  s 2;  $Q(\beta^-)=7.06 \times 10^3$  10;  $\% \beta^-$  decay=59.0

$^{118}\text{Ag}$ - $\% \beta^-$  decay: from  $I(127\gamma)/I(487\gamma)=0.124$  15 from 1973FoZF.

The decay scheme is deduced from that given for the combined 2.0- and 3.76-s decay by 1979HiZR, based on following assumptions: levels with  $J^\pi \geq 4$  given in 1979HiZR are fed from the 2.0-s decay but ones with  $J^\pi=(1^+, 1^-, 2^+)$ ,  $2^+$  and  $0^+$  not fed. Levels with  $J=(2,3)$ ,  $(2,3,4)$  and  $(3,4,5)$  are also populated by the decay. Both 2091 level ( $3^+$ ) and 2471 level ( $J^\pi$  unknown) proposed by 1987Ap01 are added in this scheme. The 1973 ( $6^+$ ) level proposed by 1971Fo22 is not adopted because it has been not confirmed by other authors. However, this scheme results in a large intensity imbalance between the deexciting and populating  $\gamma$ 's at the lowest  $2^+$  and  $4^+$  levels.

For observed  $E\beta$ , see  $^{118}\text{Ag} \beta^-$  decay (3.76 s).

1979HiZR: fission products, on-line mass;  $\gamma$ ;  $\gamma\gamma$  coin,  $\gamma(t)$ .

1982Al29: U(n,F), on-line mass;  $\beta\gamma$  coin.

1987Ap01:  $^{235}\text{U}$ (n,F), on-line mass;  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$ ;  $\gamma\gamma$ ,  $\beta\gamma$  coin;  $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$   $\gamma(t)$ .

1971Fo22: U(n,F), on-line mass;  $\gamma$ , ce;  $\gamma\gamma$  coin.

1973FoZF: as quoted by 1976Ca02.

Others: 1984Ap04, 1982Br10.

 $^{118}\text{Cd}$  Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^\pi$ <sup>†</sup>	Comments
0.0	$0^+$	
487.77 8	$2^+$	
1164.94 9	$4^+$	
1269.55 8	$2^+$	
1915.77 10	$2^+$	
1929.14 9	$(3,4^+)$	
1935.94 13	$(6^+)$	
2091.61 <sup>‡</sup> 9	$3^+$	
2182.14? 25		$J^\pi: (\geq 4)$ in 1979HiZR.
2223.33 10	$3,4,5$	
2322.31 10	$3,4^+$	
2471.84 <sup>‡</sup> 11		
2621.00? 11		$J^\pi: (\geq 4)$ in 1979HiZR.
2640.55 25		$J^\pi: (\geq 4)$ in 1979HiZR.
2756.00 20		$J^\pi: (\geq 4)$ in 1979HiZR.
3031.85 18		$J^\pi: (\geq 4)$ in 1979HiZR.
3181.73 23	$2,3,4$	
3265.77 19	$2,3,4$	
3329.0 4		$J^\pi: (\geq 4)$ in 1979HiZR.
3381.8? 3		$J^\pi: (2,3,4)$ in 1979HiZR.

<sup>†</sup> From Adopted Levels.

<sup>‡</sup> From 1987Ap01.

$^{118}\text{Ag} \beta^-$  decay (2.0 s) **1979HiZR,1987Ap01** (continued) $\gamma(^{118}\text{Cd})$ 

I $\gamma$  normalization:  $\Sigma I\gamma(\text{to g.s.})=100$  assuming no  $\beta^-$  feeding to g.s. and 487 level.  
 For unplaced and isomeric uncertain  $\gamma$ 's, see  $^{118}\text{Ag} \beta^-$  decay (3.76 s).

$E_\gamma$ $^{\dagger\dagger}$	$I_\gamma$ $^{\&f}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Mult. <sup>e</sup>	$\delta^e$
230.66 <sup>#@</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2322.31	3,4 <sup>+</sup>	2091.61	3 <sup>+</sup>		
246.2 3	1.33 13	2182.14?		1935.94	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		
248.50 <sup>#@</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2471.84		2223.33	3,4,5		
275.8 3	1.07 11	3031.85		2756.00			
294.20 <sup>@</sup> 10	1.26 13	2223.33	3,4,5	1929.14	(3,4 <sup>+</sup> )		
391.3 3	1.06 11	3031.85		2640.55			
397.67 10	1.27 13	2621.00?		2223.33	3,4,5		
406.54 <sup>a@</sup> 10	<0.27 <sup>a</sup>	2322.31	3,4 <sup>+</sup>	1915.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		
410.9 3	0.88 9	3031.85		2621.00?			
433.6 3	0.46 5	2756.00		2322.31	3,4 <sup>+</sup>		
487.77 10	22.0 <sup>cd</sup> 22	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>		
532.7 3	1.58 16	2756.00		2223.33	3,4,5		
542.70 <sup>#@</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2471.84		1929.14	(3,4 <sup>+</sup> )		
646.20 <sup>b</sup> 10	<0.08 <sup>b</sup>	1915.77	2 <sup>+</sup>	1269.55	2 <sup>+</sup>		
659.63 <sup>a</sup> 10	<2.7 <sup>a</sup>	1929.14	(3,4 <sup>+</sup> )	1269.55	2 <sup>+</sup>		
677.13 10	21.7 <sup>cd</sup> 22	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		
691.87 <sup>#@</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2621.00?		1929.14	(3,4 <sup>+</sup> )		
704.6 3	1.65 17	2640.55		1935.94	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		
764.23 <sup>a</sup> 10	<1.6 <sup>a</sup>	1929.14	(3,4 <sup>+</sup> )	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
771.00 <sup>@</sup> 10	7.4 7	1935.94	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
781.73 <sup>b</sup> 10	0.8 <sup>b</sup> 5	1269.55	2 <sup>+</sup>	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		
808.5 3	2.6 3	3031.85		2223.33	3,4,5		
822.02 <sup>#</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2091.61	3 <sup>+</sup>	1269.55	2 <sup>+</sup>		
849.7 3	1.16 12	3031.85		2182.14?			
926.53 <sup>#</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2091.61	3 <sup>+</sup>	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
1058.39 <sup>@</sup> 10	11.7 12	2223.33	3,4,5	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
1157.40 <sup>a@</sup> 10	<1.73 <sup>a</sup>	2322.31	3,4 <sup>+</sup>	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
1269.54 <sup>b</sup> 10	0.6 <sup>b</sup> 3	1269.55	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>		
1336.8 <sup>a</sup> 3	<1.05 <sup>a</sup>	3265.77	2,3,4	1929.14	(3,4 <sup>+</sup> )		
1428.02 <sup>b</sup> 10	<0.19 <sup>b</sup>	1915.77	2 <sup>+</sup>	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>	E2+M1	+1.9
1441.34 <sup>a</sup> 10	<1.3 <sup>a</sup>	1929.14	(3,4 <sup>+</sup> )	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		
1603.96 <sup>#</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2091.61	3 <sup>+</sup>	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>	E2+M1	+1.15
1735.52 <sup>#@</sup> 10	<i>d</i>	2223.33	3,4,5	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		
2016.9 <sup>a</sup> 3	<1.36 <sup>a</sup>	3181.73	2,3,4	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
2100.8 <sup>a</sup> 3	<8.1 <sup>a</sup>	3265.77	2,3,4	1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
2164.0 3	4.0 4	3329.0		1164.94	4 <sup>+</sup>		
2693.8 <sup>a</sup> 3	<2.5 <sup>a</sup>	3181.73	2,3,4	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		
2777.8 <sup>a</sup> 3	<8.2 <sup>a</sup>	3265.77	2,3,4	487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		
2894.0 <sup>a</sup> 3	<2.0 <sup>a</sup>	3381.8?		487.77	2 <sup>+</sup>		

<sup>†</sup> From 1979HiZR, but values of  $\gamma$ 's with uncertainties of 0.10 keV are from 1987Ap01.

<sup>‡</sup> Uncertainties are assigned by evaluator.

<sup>#</sup> From 1987Ap01. Not reported in 1979HiZR.

<sup>@</sup> Value calculated by evaluator from relevant levels in authors' fig. 2.

---

$^{118}\text{Ag} \beta^-$  decay (2.0 s) [1979HiZR,1987Ap01](#) (continued)

---

$\gamma(^{118}\text{Cd})$  (continued)

& From [1979HiZR](#). Values are relative to  $I_{\gamma}(787\gamma)=100$  for the 3.76-s and 2.0-s combined decay, unless otherwise noted.  
Uncertainty of 10% assigned by evaluator.

<sup>a</sup> Placed in both 3.76-s and 2.0-s decay schemes. Intensity is not divided.

<sup>b</sup> Placed in both 3.76-s and 2.0-s decay schemes. Intensity is divided.

<sup>c</sup> Deduced from [1973FoZF](#) using with the average value of ratios of  $I_{\gamma}$  from [1973FoZF](#) to that from [1979HiZR](#) for 770 $\gamma$ , 808 $\gamma$  and 1058 $\gamma$ .

<sup>d</sup> No intensity was given by authors.

<sup>e</sup> From  $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$  in [1987Ap01](#).

<sup>f</sup> For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 2.6 3.

$^{118}\text{Ag} \beta^-$  decay (2.0 s) 1979HiZR,1987Ap01

Decay Scheme

Intensities:  $I_\gamma$  per 100 parent decays

Legend

- $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
- $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
- $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
- Coincidence

$(4^+)$  127.74 2.0 s 2  
 $Q_{\beta^-} = 7.06 \times 10^3$  10  
 $\% \beta^- = 59.0$   
 $^{118}_{47}\text{Ag}_{71}$

