

^{136}La IT decay 2005Bh06

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	E. A. Mccutchan	NDS 152, 331 (2018)	1-Apr-2018

Parent: ^{136}La : E=259.3 4; $J^\pi=(7^-)$; $T_{1/2}=114$ ms 5; %IT decay=100.0

Data based on 2005Bh06, although there is significant discrepancies between 2005Bh06 and earlier works. In addition, 2005Bh06 state that while they observe a weak 87.5 γ both in coincidence with the 127.5 γ and in the beam-off spectrum, the 127.5 γ and 87.5 γ are weak and thus, the excitation energy of the isomer should be considered as tentative.

Other: 1985Mo01. The level scheme proposed by 1985Mo01 agrees with 2005Bh06 only in the placement of the 21.8 γ and 22.5 γ . 1985Mo01 propose the following levels (with depopulating transitions). 140.0 (95.7 γ), 158.3 (tentative 18.3 γ), 173.5 (33.5 γ), 230.1 (71.8 γ) and 230+x (56.6+x and x transitions).

α : [Additional information 1](#).

 ^{136}La Levels

E(level)	J^π †	$T_{1/2}$
0.0	1 ⁺	9.87 min 3
21.80 20	(2) ⁺	
44.3 3	(3) ⁺	
171.8 3	(3) ⁺	
259.3? 4	(7 ⁻)	114 ms 5

† From the Adopted Levels.

 $\gamma(^{136}\text{La})$

E_γ	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult.†	α	Comments
21.8 2	21.80	(2) ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺			
22.5 2	44.3	(3) ⁺	21.80	(2) ⁺			
87.5‡ 2	259.3?	(7 ⁻)	171.8	(3) ⁺	[M4]	1.86×10^3 4	$\alpha(\text{K})=580$ 10; $\alpha(\text{L})=965$ 20; $\alpha(\text{M})=249$ 6; $\alpha(\text{N})=54.5$ 12; $\alpha(\text{O})=7.84$ 16; $\alpha(\text{P})=0.228$ 5
127.5 2	171.8	(3) ⁺	44.3	(3) ⁺	M1+E2		
150.2 2	171.8	(3) ⁺	21.80	(2) ⁺	M1+E2		

† From the Adopted Gammas.

‡ Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

^{136}La IT decay 2005Bh06

Legend

Decay Scheme

%IT=100.0

-----► γ Decay (Uncertain)