## Coulomb excitation 2006Ra08

		History	
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Jun Chen	NDS 146, 1 (2017)	30-Sep-2017

2006Ra08:  ${}^{12}C({}^{138}Ce, {}^{138}Ce'\gamma)$  E=480 MeV  ${}^{138}Ce$  beam of about 1 pnA was produced from the ATLAS accelerator at ANL. Target was 1 mg/cm<sup>2</sup>  ${}^{12}C$ .  $\gamma$  rays were detected with the Gammasphere array of 98 HPGe detectors in 15 rings. Measured E $\gamma$ , I $\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma$ -coin,  $\gamma(\theta)$ , DSA. Deduced levels, J,  $\pi$ , lifetimes,  $\gamma$ -ray multipolarities and mixing ratios. Comparisons with neighboring nuclei.

2014Na15: <sup>24</sup>Mg(<sup>138</sup>Ce, <sup>138</sup>Ce' $\gamma$ ) E=480 MeV <sup>138</sup>Ce beam of about 1.7 enA was produced from ATLAS-ANL facility. Target was 0.85 mg/cm<sup>2</sup> <sup>24</sup>Mg followed by a 15.7 mg/cm<sup>2</sup> thick layer of natural copper.  $\gamma$  rays were detected with the Gammasphere array of 100 HPGe detectors and recoils were detected with a silicon detector. Measured E $\gamma$ , I $\gamma$ , (particle) $\gamma$ -coin. Deduced lifetime of first 2<sup>+</sup> state by recoil-distance (RDDS) method using Yale plunger device, and g factor of first 2<sup>+</sup> state by time-dependent recoil into vacuum (TDRIV) following Coulomb excitation. Comparison with predictions from large-scale shell-model (lssm) and quasiparticle phonon model (qpm).

1989Lo01: <sup>138</sup>Ce( $\alpha, \alpha' \gamma$ ) E=9,10 MeV alpha beam was produced from the Cologne FN tandem accelerator. Target was made from material containing <sup>138</sup>Ce and <sup>142</sup>Ce.  $\gamma$  rays were detected with Ge detectors. Measured  $\gamma$ , relative  $\sigma(\theta)$ . Deduced B(E2) from  $\sigma(\theta)$  relative to B(E2)(<sup>142</sup>Ce).

1989Ga24: <sup>138</sup>Ce(p,p' $\gamma$ ) E=3.0 MeV. Measured  $\gamma$ ,  $\sigma(\theta)$ . Deduced  $\beta_2$ , B(E2) from  $\sigma(\theta)$ .

## <sup>138</sup>Ce Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	T <sub>1/2</sub> &	Comments
0.0	0+		
788 1	2+	1.98 ps 4	<ul> <li>B(E2)↑=0.45 3; β<sub>2</sub>=0.126 8</li> <li>g=0.26 8 (2014Na15)</li> <li>T<sub>1/2</sub>: weighted average of 2.06 ps 14 from average B(E2)↑ of 1989Lo01 and 1989Ga24, and 1.97 ps 4 from RDDS (2014Na15).</li> <li>B(E2): weighted average of 0.45 3 (1989Lo01) and 0.461 50 (1989Ga24).</li> <li>β<sub>2</sub>: from average B(E2).</li> <li>The g factor measured by 2014Na15 relative to g(first 2<sup>+</sup>)=0.21 5 for <sup>142</sup>Ce. Statistical</li> </ul>
			uncertainty=0.05, uncertainty from value in $^{142}$ Ce is 0.06.
1476.4 12	0+ <b>#</b>		
1510.3 7	2+	0.834 ps 20	
1826.4 12	4+	-	
2142.7 8	2+	123 fs 7	
2177.3 9	3-		B(E3)↑=0.163 9 (2006Ra08)
2236.7 8	2+	56.8 fs 35	
2470.7 8	$(2^+)^{@}$	109 fs 6	
2642.2 8	2 <sup>+#</sup>	66 fs 32	

<sup>†</sup> From a least-squares fit to  $\gamma$ -ray energies.

<sup>‡</sup> From 2006Ra08 based on  $\gamma(\theta)$  and RUL, unless otherwise noted.

# From Adopted Levels.

<sup>@</sup> 2<sup>+</sup> from 2006Ra08 and brackets are added by the evaluator since no experimental evidence is given in 2006Ra08.

& From DSA method (2006Ra08), unless otherwise noted. 2006Ra08 does not explain the source of the uncertainties. Usually, a  $\approx 5\% - 10\%$  systematic uncertainty due to slowing-down process should be included.

## **Coulomb excitation** 2006Ra08 (continued)

 $\gamma$ <sup>(138</sup>Ce)

A<sub>2</sub>, A<sub>4</sub> values are from 2006Ra08.

$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$E_i$ (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_f  J_f^{\pi}$	Mult. <sup>‡</sup>	$\delta^{\ddagger}$	Comments
667 <i>1</i>	1.97 3	2177.3	3-	1510.3 2+			
688 <i>1</i>	0.069 6	1476.4	$0^{+}$	788 2 <sup>+</sup>			
722 1	7.33 6	1510.3	$2^{+}$	788 2 <sup>+</sup>	M1+E2	-1.97 +32-25	A <sub>2</sub> =-0.172 8; A <sub>4</sub> =-0.018 11
788 <i>1</i>	1000.0 1	788	2+	$0.0 \ 0^+$	E2		$A_2 = +0.112$ 5; $A_4 = -0.003$ 7
1038 <i>I</i>	2.565 15	1826.4	4+	788 2 <sup>+</sup>			A <sub>2</sub> =+0.347 10; A <sub>4</sub> =-0.033 13
1354 <i>I</i>	1.173 13	2142.7	2+	788 2+	M1+E2	-0.83 +6-8	$A_2 = -0.203 \ 15; \ A_4 = -0.005 \ 15$
1389 <i>1</i>	4.10 3	2177.3	3-	788 2 <sup>+</sup>	E1+M2	-0.025 + 12 - 19	$A_2 = -0.191 9; A_4 = -0.006 12$
1448 <i>1</i>	2.263 15	2236.7	2+	788 2+	M1+E2	0.18 + 5 - 4	A <sub>2</sub> =+0.308 14; A <sub>4</sub> =+0.012 18
1510 <i>I</i>	9.68 6	1510.3	$2^{+}$	$0.0 \ 0^+$			A <sub>2</sub> =+0.201 7; A <sub>4</sub> =-0.056 10
1682 <i>I</i>	0.411 5	2470.7	$(2^{+})$	788 2+			
1854 <i>I</i>	0.250 10	2642.2	$2^{+}$	788 $2^+$			
2143 <i>I</i>	0.378 8	2142.7	2+	$0.0  0^+$			
2237 <i>1</i>	1.811 25	2236.7	$2^{+}$	$0.0 \ 0^+$			$A_2 = +0.298 \ 21; A_4 = -0.08 \ 3$
2471 <i>I</i>	0.508 13	2470.7	$(2^{+})$	$0.0  0^+$			
2642 1	0.087 35	2642.2	2+	0.0 0+			$I_{\gamma}$ : deduced from branching ratio in Adopted Gammas.

<sup>†</sup> From 2006Ra08. Values of intensities given by 2006Ra08 have been divided by 1000. <sup>‡</sup> From 2006Ra08 based on  $\gamma(\theta)$ .



<sup>138</sup><sub>58</sub>Ce<sub>80</sub>