

¹³⁹Pr ε decay (4.41 h) **1981ArZW,1976Za03,1975Vy02**

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	P. K. Joshi, B. Singh, S. Singh, A. K. Jain		NDS 138, 1 (2016)	15-Oct-2016

Parent: ¹³⁹Pr: E=0.0; J^π=5/2⁺; T_{1/2}=4.41 h 4; Q(ε)=2129.1 30; %ε+%β⁺ decay=100.0

¹³⁹Pr-J^π,T_{1/2}: From ¹³⁹Pr Adopted Levels.

¹³⁹Pr-Q(ε): From 2012Wa38.

1975Vy02 measured γ's, x rays, and γγ-coincidences, β's and ce's, and ceγ(t) (mag spect, Ge(Li)).

1976Za03 measured γ's.

1981ArZW measured γ's and x rays and β's.

Others: 1976KaYX, 1968De02, 1969Be65, 1963Bi20.

Level scheme is basically from 1976Za03; level at 1578 suggested by 1975Vy02 confirmed by 1981ArZW.

¹³⁹Ce Levels

E(level)	J ^π †	T _{1/2}	Comments
0.0	3/2 ⁺		%ε+%β ⁺ =100
255.078 16	1/2 ⁺	110 ps 20	T _{1/2} : from 1975Vy02.
754.24 8	11/2 ⁻	57.58 s 32	%IT=100 T _{1/2} : from the Adopted Levels. Isomer production ratio=0.008 2 (2000BeZV) discrepant with I(γ+ce)(725γ)=0.015 3 (Evaluators).
1320.249 20	5/2 ⁺		
1347.337 10	7/2 ⁺		
1578.24 22	7/2 ⁻		
1596.590 20	(3/2) ⁺		
1630.674 18	3/2 ⁺		
1818.436 22	3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺		
1842.9 10	(7/2 ⁻)		
1907.661 23	(3/2) ⁺		
1965.36 24	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)		
1984.84 7	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)		
2016.27 4	(3/2 ⁺)		
2090.0 10	(3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)		

† From Adopted Levels.

ε,β⁺ radiations

I_γ(K x ray)=2.17×10⁵ 22 (1981ArZW) compared to 1.71×10⁵ 6 from the decay scheme relative to I_γ(1347γ)=1000.

ε/β⁺=10.2 11 (1981ArZW) compared to 11.08 2 from decay scheme.

β/ce(K)(255γ)=1830 60 (1975Vy02) compared to 460 28 from decay scheme. It is not clear from the text of 1975Vy02 whether the Iβ⁺ includes contributions from ¹³⁹Nd decay.

E(decay)	E(level)	Iε [†]	Log ft	I(ε+β ⁺) [†]	Comments
(39 [‡] 3)	2090.0	<0.00047	>6.5	<0.00047	εL=0.727 6; εM+=0.273 9
(113 3)	2016.27	0.0132 16	6.62 7	0.0132 16	εK=0.723 6; εL=0.212 5; εM+=0.0653 15
(144 3)	1984.84	0.023 3	6.66 7	0.023 3	εK=0.763 3; εL=0.1822 21; εM+=0.0550 7
(164 3)	1965.36	0.0021 6	7.8 1	0.0021 6	εK=0.7772 20; εL=0.1715 15; εM+=0.0513 5
(221 3)	1907.661	0.063 5	6.69 4	0.063 5	εK=0.8015 9; εL=0.1533 7; εM+=0.04512 22
(286 [‡] 3)	1842.9	0.0031 11	8.3 2	0.0031 11	εK=0.8151 5; εL=0.1432 4; εM+=0.04170 13
(311 3)	1818.436	0.072 4	6.97 3	0.072 4	εK=0.8185 4; εL=0.1407 3; εM+=0.04084 10

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{139}Pr ε decay (4.41 h) [1981ArZW](#),[1976Za03](#),[1975Vy02](#) (continued) ε, β^+ radiations (continued)

E(decay)	E(level)	$I_{\beta^+}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}$	Log ft	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)^{\dagger}$	Comments
(498 3)	1630.674		0.485 17	6.59 1	0.485 17	$\varepsilon\text{K}=0.8324$ 2; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.1303$ 1; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.03735$ 4
(533 3)	1596.590		0.039 4	7.75 5	0.039 4	$\varepsilon\text{K}=0.8337$ 2; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.12927$ 9; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.03700$ 3
(551 \ddagger 3)	1578.24		0.0132 24	8.3 1	0.0132 24	$\varepsilon\text{K}=0.8344$ 1; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.12877$ 8; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.03684$ 3
(782 3)	1347.337		0.473 11	7.02 1	0.473 11	$\varepsilon\text{K}=0.8399$; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.12464$ 4; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.03546$ 2
(809 3)	1320.249		0.062 4	7.93 3	0.062 4	$\varepsilon\text{K}=0.8403$; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.12432$ 4; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.03535$ 2
2129 3	0.0	8.28 10	90.47 11	5.631 5	98.75 4	av $E\beta=500.8$ 14; $\varepsilon\text{K}=0.7766$ 6; $\varepsilon\text{L}=0.10884$ 9; $\varepsilon\text{M}+=0.03071$ 3 E(decay): from $E\beta=1107$ 3 (1981ArZW). Other: $E\beta=1090$ 10 (1975Vy02). $I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$: 100-summed $\varepsilon + \beta^+$ feeding to excited states. See also normalization comment for gamma-ray intensities.

\dagger Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

\ddagger Existence of this branch is questionable.

γ(¹³⁹Ce)

I_γ normalization: from ΣI_γ(1+α)(to g.s.), I(γ[±])=3.50×10³ 8 (1976Za03. Other: 3.24×10⁴ 16 (1981ArZW)) relative to I_γ(1347γ)=100, and theoretical ε/β⁺ for the feeding to the ground state.

Except as noted all, E_γ and I_γ are from 1976Za03 and ce and coincidence data are from 1975Vy02. α(K)_{exp}, normalized by 1975Vy02 to α(K)(255γ,M1)=0.0767, renormalized by evaluators to α(K)(255γ,M1+(68% 14)E2)=0.0685 23.

E _γ	I _γ ^{&}	E _i (level)	J _i ^π	E _f	J _f ^π	Mult. [†]	δ [†]	α ^a	Comments
255.11 2	49.8 14	255.078	1/2 ⁺	0.0	3/2 ⁺	M1+E2	1.5 5	0.0840 18	α(K)=0.0680 24; α(L)=0.0126 7; α(M)=0.00270 17 α(N)=0.00059 4; α(O)=9.0×10 ⁻⁵ 5; α(P)=4.7×10 ⁻⁶ 4 K:L:M+=1000:191 20:50 6. K:L1:L2:L3=6.8 20:1.00:≤0.15:≤0.15 (1976KaYX).
354.00 [‡] 10	2.5 5	1984.84	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	1630.674	3/2 ⁺				E _γ : this γ ray is not confirmed in (p,n _γ), treated as uncertain by the evaluators.
587.37 ^b 15	1.5 5	1907.661	(3/2) ⁺	1320.249	5/2 ⁺				
664.60 ^{‡b} 15	≤0.6 [#]	1984.84	(3/2,5/2 ⁺)	1320.249	5/2 ⁺				I _γ : 8 2 (1976Za03).
696.01 ^{‡b} 10	≤0.6 [#]	2016.27	(3/2 ⁺)	1320.249	5/2 ⁺				E _γ : this γ ray is not confirmed in (p,n _γ).
754.24 8	3.0 5	754.24	11/2 ⁻	0.0	3/2 ⁺	M4		0.0800	I _γ : 9 5 (1976Za03). α(K) _{exp} =0.056 12 α(K)=0.0652 10; α(L)=0.01161 17; α(M)=0.00251 4 α(N)=0.000557 8; α(O)=8.86×10 ⁻⁵ 13; α(P)=5.96×10 ⁻⁶ 9
824.0 ^{#@b} 2	2.8 [#] 5	1578.24	7/2 ⁻	754.24	11/2 ⁻	E2		0.00310 5	α(K) _{exp} =0.0020 8 α=0.00310 5; α(K)=0.00263 4; α(L)=0.000365 6; α(M)=7.65×10 ⁻⁵ 11 α(N)=1.689×10 ⁻⁵ 24; α(O)=2.70×10 ⁻⁶ 4; α(P)=1.90×10 ⁻⁷ 3
1065.32 [‡] 20	0.52 [#] 26	1320.249	5/2 ⁺	255.078	1/2 ⁺				I _γ : 7 4 (1976Za03).
1088.70 ^{‡b} 10	0.66 [#] 23	1842.9	(7/2 ⁻)	754.24	11/2 ⁻				I _γ =22 5 (1976Za03) would lead to a possible intensity imbalance at the 754 level (-24 10) suggesting that either I _γ from 1976Za03 is incorrect or 1089γ is misassigned.
^x 1091.4 ^{#@} 7	≤0.3 [#]								
1320.24 2	14.7 2	1320.249	5/2 ⁺	0.0	3/2 ⁺	M1,E2		0.00136 21	α(K) _{exp} =0.0014 5 α=0.00136 21; α(K)=0.00115 18; α(L)=0.000147 21; α(M)=3.1×10 ⁻⁵ 5 α(N)=6.8×10 ⁻⁶ 10; α(O)=1.10×10 ⁻⁶ 17; α(P)=8.5×10 ⁻⁸ 14; α(IPF)=2.54×10 ⁻⁵ 4
1341.50 9	1.0 5	1596.590	(3/2) ⁺	255.078	1/2 ⁺				
1347.33 1	100.0	1347.337	7/2 ⁺	0.0	3/2 ⁺	E2		0.001123 16	α(K) _{exp} =0.00076 10

γ(¹³⁹Ce) (continued)

<u>E_γ</u>	<u>I_γ^{&}</u>	<u>E_i(level)</u>	<u>J_i^π</u>	<u>E_f</u>	<u>J_f^π</u>	<u>Mult.[†]</u>	<u>δ[‡]</u>	<u>α^a</u>	<u>Comments</u>
1375.56 3	32.5 15	1630.674	3/2 ⁺	255.078	1/2 ⁺	M1(+E2)	<1.2	0.00134 11	α=0.001123 16; α(K)=0.000938 14; α(L)=0.0001214 17; α(M)=2.53×10 ⁻⁵ 4 α(N)=5.60×10 ⁻⁶ 8; α(O)=9.06×10 ⁻⁷ 13; α(P)=6.82×10 ⁻⁸ 10; α(IPF)=3.15×10 ⁻⁵ 5 α(K)exp=0.00121 17 α=0.00134 11; α(K)=0.00112 10; α(L)=0.000142 11; α(M)=2.96×10 ⁻⁵ 23 α(N)=6.6×10 ⁻⁶ 6; α(O)=1.07×10 ⁻⁶ 9; α(P)=8.3×10 ⁻⁸ 8; α(IPF)=3.90×10 ⁻⁵ 6
^x 1517.2 [‡] 4 1563.38 2	≤0.4 [#] 8.8 5	1818.436	3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺	255.078	1/2 ⁺	E2		0.000917 13	α(K)exp=0.00045 19 α=0.000917 13; α(K)=0.000704 10; α(L)=8.99×10 ⁻⁵ 13; α(M)=1.87×10 ⁻⁵ 3 α(N)=4.14×10 ⁻⁶ 6; α(O)=6.71×10 ⁻⁷ 10; α(P)=5.12×10 ⁻⁸ 8; α(IPF)=0.0001002 14 α(K)exp=0.0076 26 α=0.00101 12; α(K)=0.00077 10; α(L)=9.8×10 ⁻⁵ 12; α(M)=2.03×10 ⁻⁵ 25 α(N)=4.5×10 ⁻⁶ 6; α(O)=7.3×10 ⁻⁷ 9; α(P)=5.7×10 ⁻⁸ 8; α(IPF)=0.0001147 24 α(K)exp=0.00055 11 α=0.000881 13; α(K)=0.000650 9; α(L)=8.27×10 ⁻⁵ 12; α(M)=1.719×10 ⁻⁵ 24 α(N)=3.81×10 ⁻⁶ 6; α(O)=6.18×10 ⁻⁷ 9; α(P)=4.73×10 ⁻⁸ 7; α(IPF)=0.0001265 18
1596.58 2	7.2 6	1596.590	(3/2) ⁺	0.0	3/2 ⁺	M1,E2		0.00101 12	
1630.67 2	72.5 20	1630.674	3/2 ⁺	0.0	3/2 ⁺	E2		0.000881 13	
1652.58 2	8.2 5	1907.661	(3/2) ⁺	255.078	1/2 ⁺				
^x 1678.5 [‡] 3 1710.27 24 1729.89 9 1818.30 4 1907.61 5 1965.66 ^{‡b} 44 1985.04 ^{‡b} 29 2016.25 4 2090 ^{#b}	≤0.3 [#] 0.36 9 1.9 3 6.5 4 3.6 4 ≤0.15 [#] ≤0.15 [#] 2.5 3 <0.10 [#]	1965.36 1984.84 1818.436 1907.661 1965.36 1984.84 2016.27 2090.0	(3/2,5/2 ⁺) (3/2,5/2 ⁺) 3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺ (3/2) ⁺ (3/2,5/2 ⁺) (3/2,5/2 ⁺) (3/2 ⁺) (3/2 ⁺ ,5/2 ⁺)	255.078 255.078 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	1/2 ⁺ 1/2 ⁺ 3/2 ⁺ 3/2 ⁺ 3/2 ⁺ 3/2 ⁺ 3/2 ⁺ 3/2 ⁺				E _γ : slightly poor fit, level-energy difference=1818.42. I _γ : 1.2 5 (1976Za03). I _γ : 1.6 5 (1976Za03).

[†] From α(K)exp and conversion electron ratios, except as noted. δ's deduced by evaluators.

[‡] Not observed by 1975Vy02.

$\gamma(^{139}\text{Ce})$ (continued)

- # From [1981ArZW](#). The 2090γ expected from a level near this energy in (d,t) was looked for but not observed by [1981ArZW](#).
- @ Not observed by [1976Za03](#). However, it is not clear from the discussion in [1976Za03](#) whether they have included all unplaced γ 's in their table.
- & For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.00473 *II*.
- ^a Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code ([2008Ki07](#)) with Frozen orbital approximation based on γ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.
- ^b Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.
- ^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

