$^{128}\mathbf{Pr}\ \varepsilon$ decay 1999Xi03

History							
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date				
Full Evaluation	Zoltan Elekes and Janos Timar	NDS 129, 191 (2015)	28-Feb-2015				

Parent: ¹²⁸Pr: E=0.0; J^{π}=4,5,6; T_{1/2}=2.85 s 9; Q(ϵ)=9.20×10³ 4; % ϵ +% β ⁺ decay=100.0

1999Xi03: ⁹⁶Ru(³⁶Ar,xpyn) E(³⁶Ar)=²²O MeV; 94% enriched target, He-jet method; HPGe $\gamma \gamma \gamma(t)$, (K x ray) $\gamma(t)$. 1988Ba42, 1994GiZZ: ^{92–}96MO(⁴⁰Ca,xnyp),E(⁴⁰Ca)=250 MeV, He-jet method; G. 1997As05, 1998AsZX: for experimental details, see the comment on the ¹²⁸La ε decay (<1.4 min).

The decay scheme is that proposed by 1999Xi03. The levels at 799 and 1080 keV proposed by 1988Ba42 are not confirmed in 1999Xi03.

 α : Additional information 1.

¹²⁸Ce Levels

E(level) [†]	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	T _{1/2}	E(level) [†]	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	E(level) [†]	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$
0.0	0^{+}	3.93 min 2	1052.3 5	0^{+}	1311.8 7	4+
207.0 5	2+		1138.6 6	3+	1700.7 7	
606.6 5	4+		1157.2 6	6+	1889.0 7	5-
869.4 6	2^{+}		1305.9 5	2^{+}	1979.4 7	4(-)

[†] From a least-squares fit to $E\gamma'$ s by the evaluators.

[‡] From Adopted Levels.

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$	$\mathrm{I}\varepsilon^{\dagger}$	Log <i>ft</i>	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)^{\dagger}$	Comments
$(7.22 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	1979.4	2.3 4	0.12 2	5.82 8	2.4 4	av Eβ=2874 20; εK=0.0440 8; εL=0.00603 11; εM+=0.00169 3
$(7.31 \times 10^3 4)$	1889.0	1.7 4	0.089 20	5.97 10	1.8 4	av E β =2918 20; ε K=0.0423 8; ε L=0.00579 11; ε M+=0.00163 3
$(7.50 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	1700.7	1.3 4	0.064 18	6.14 <i>13</i>	1.4 4	av Eβ=3008 20; εK=0.0390 7; εL=0.00534 10; εM+=0.00150 3
$(7.89 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	1311.8	1.4 4	0.058 16	6.22 12	1.5 4	av Eβ=3196 20; εK=0.0332 6; εL=0.00454 8; εM+=0.001276 21
$(7.89 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	1305.9	3.8 7	0.16 3	5.80 8	4.0 7	av E β =3199 20; ε K=0.0331 6; ε L=0.00453 8; ε M+=0.001273 21
$(8.04 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	1157.2	1.5 5	0.059 18	6.24 14	1.6 5	av E β =3271 20; ε K=0.0312 5; ε L=0.00426 7; ε M+=0.001199 20
$(8.06 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	1138.6	3.9 <i>3</i>	0.15 1	5.85 4	4.0 3	av E β =3280 20; ε K=0.0309 5; ε L=0.00423 7; ε M+=0.001190 20
$(8.15 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	1052.3	10.81 20	0.394 10	5.423 20	11.20 21	av Eβ=3321 20; εK=0.0299 5; εL=0.00409 7; εM+=0.001150 19
(8.33×10 ³ 4)	869.4	4.64 20	0.157 7	5.84 <i>3</i>	4.80 21	av E β =3410 20; ε K=0.0279 5; ε L=0.00381 6; ε M+=0.001071 17
$(8.59 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	606.6	16.2 14	0.50 4	5.37 4	16.7 14	av E β =3537 20; ϵ K=0.0252 4; ϵ L=0.00345 6; ϵ M+=0.000970 15
$(8.99 \times 10^3 \ 4)$	207.0	49.3 <i>13</i>	1.30 4	4.990 21	50.6 13	av E β =3731 20; ϵ K=0.0218 4; ϵ L=0.00298 5; ϵ M+=0.000839 12

[†] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

ε, β^+ radiations

¹²⁸ Pr ε decay 1999Xi03 (continued)								
γ ⁽¹²⁸ Ce)								
E_{γ}^{\dagger}	$I_{\gamma}^{\dagger b}$	E _i (level)	\mathbf{J}_i^{π}	$E_f J_f^{\pi}$	Mult.&	δ^{a}	α	Comments
207.3 5	85.9	207.0	2+	0.0 0+	E2		0.163 3	I_{γ} : from I(γ +ce)=100 given by author's.
^x 253 [‡]								
253 [‡] 1		1305.9	2^{+}	1052.3 0+				
399.7 <i>3</i>	26 1	606.6	4+	207.0 2+	E2		0.0203	
550.6 <i>3</i>	3.4 3	1157.2	6+	606.6 4+				
^x 592 ^{#c}								
662.4 4	4.8 2	869.4	2+	$207.0\ 2^+$				
699.4 <i>4</i>	1.1 5	1305.9	2+	606.6 4+				E_{γ} : value of 669.4 keV in the authors' Table 2 is misprint.
705.2 4	1.5 4	1311.8	4+	606.6 4+	M1+E2		0.00665	
731.8 4	1.8 4	1889.0	5-	1157.2 6+	D			
^x 799 ^{#c}								
845.3 <i>3</i>	11.2 2	1052.3	0^{+}	$207.0\ 2^+$				
^x 873 ^{#c}								
931.6 4	4.0 3	1138.6	3+	$207.0\ 2^+$	M1+E2	4.2 +24-15	0.00241 8	
1052 [@] 1	0.0071 [@] 21	1052.3	0^{+}	$0.0 \ 0^{+}$	E0			
1094.1 4	1.4 4	1700.7		606.6 4+				
1099.0 4	2.9 4	1305.9	2^{+}	$207.0\ 2^+$				E_{γ} : other: 1100 (1998AsZX).
1305 [‡] 1		1305.9	2+	$0.0 \ 0^+$				E_{γ} : not reported in 1999Xi03.
1372.8 4	2.4 4	1979.4	$4^{(-)}$	606.6 4+	D			

[†] From 1999Xi03, unless otherwise noted.

[‡] From 1998AsZX.
[#] From 1988Ba42, but those were not confirmed by 1999Xi03.

[@] From 1994GiZZ. [&] From Adopted Gammas.

^{*a*} If No value given it was assumed δ =0.10 for E2/M1, δ =1.00 for E3/M2 and δ =0.10 for the other multipolarities.

^b For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 1.000 5.

^c Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

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

¹²⁸Pr ε decay 1999Xi03

