

^{139}Eu ε decay (17.9 s) [1986Re11,1986De35](#)

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: ^{139}Eu : $E=0.0$; $J^\pi=(11/2)^-$; $T_{1/2}=17.9$ s 6; $Q(\varepsilon)=6982$ 17; $\% \varepsilon + \% \beta^+$ decay=100.0

^{139}Eu - $Q(\varepsilon)$: From [2012Wa38](#).

[1986De35](#): ^{139}Eu produced in $^{144}\text{Sm}(p,6n)$, $E=50$ -90 MeV. Identification by means of $T_{1/2} \approx 22$ s, production threshold energy, and constancy of I_γ as a function of bombarding energies. Measured E_γ , I_γ and x rays, $\gamma\gamma$, isomer half-life, ce. The isomer half-life measured over a period of ≈ 200 s; two groups, one with $T_{1/2}$ of 17.9 s 6 and one with a feeding $T_{1/2}$ of 17.9 s 6 and α decay $T_{1/2}$ of 10.7 s 6.

[1986Re11](#): ^{139}Eu produced in $^{112}\text{Sn}(^{32}\text{S},3p2n)$, $E=170$ MeV and $^{106}\text{Cd}(^{35}\text{Cl},2p)$, $E=191$ MeV reactions. Identification by means of γ rays observed in ^{139}Sm IT decay. Measured half-life; He jet.

[1975Va14](#): measured β spectra, $\beta\gamma$ -coin, γ spectra, ce; deduced shape implications for unhindered $11/2^-$ to $11/2^-$ β transition.

All data are from [1986De35](#), except as noted.

 ^{139}Sm Levels

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$ [‡]	Comments
0.0	$1/2^+$	2.57 min 10	$\% \varepsilon + \% \beta^+ = 100$ $T_{1/2}$ and decay modes from Adopted Levels.
111.92 14	$3/2^+$		
223.50 13	$(3/2)^+$		
267.29 13	$5/2^+$		
457.37 23	$11/2^-$	10.7 s 6	$\% \varepsilon + \% \beta^+ = 6.3$ 5; $\% \text{IT} = 93.7$ 5 $T_{1/2}$ and decay modes from Adopted Levels.
(531.4 4)	$5/2^+$		E(level): from Adopted Levels.
589.6 3	$(9/2)^-$		
686.7 4			
720.75 20	$(7/2^+)$		
786.8 5			
920.1 8			
1020.2 6			
1158.5 4			
1176.4 5			
1380.3 4			

[†] $\Delta E_\gamma = 0.5$ keV assumed in least-squares analysis when not given.

[‡] From the Adopted Levels.

 ε, β^+ radiations

The β feedings and log ft values are considered as apparent as the decay scheme seems poorly known.

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$ [†]	$I\varepsilon$ [†]	Log ft	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$ [†]	Comments
(5602 17)	1380.3	11 3	2.0 6	5.3	13 4	av $E\beta = 2096.8$ 95; $\varepsilon K = 0.1324$ 15; $\varepsilon L = 0.01890$ 21; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00543$ 6
(5806 17)	1176.4	16 3	2.7 4	5.2	19 3	av $E\beta = 2193.1$ 95; $\varepsilon K = 0.1189$ 13; $\varepsilon L = 0.01696$ 18; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00487$ 6
(5824 17)	1158.5	13 3	2.1 6	5.3	15 4	av $E\beta = 2201.6$ 95; $\varepsilon K = 0.1178$ 13; $\varepsilon L = 0.01680$ 18; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00483$ 5
(5962 17)	1020.2	3.2 16	0.48 23	6.0	3.7 18	av $E\beta = 2267.1$ 95; $\varepsilon K = 0.1097$ 12; $\varepsilon L = 0.01564$ 17; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00449$ 5
(6062 17)	920.1	11 4	1.5 6	5.5	12 5	av $E\beta = 2314.6$ 95; $\varepsilon K = 0.1042$ 11; $\varepsilon L = 0.01486$ 16;

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{139}Eu ε decay (17.9 s) **1986Re11,1986De35** (continued) ε, β^+ radiations (continued)

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$ [†]	$I\varepsilon$ [†]	Log ft	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$ [†]	Comments
(6195 17)	786.8	6 3	0.8 3	5.8	7 3	$\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00427$ 5 av $E\beta = 2377.8$ 95; $\varepsilon K = 0.0975$ 10; $\varepsilon L = 0.01390$ 14; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00399$ 4
(6261 17)	720.75	18 5	5.2 16	7.2 ^{1u}	23 7	av $E\beta = 2374.1$ 93; $\varepsilon K = 0.1895$ 18; $\varepsilon L = 0.0274$ 3; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00788$ 8
(6295 [‡] 17)	686.7	<4.1	<1.2	>7.8 ^{1u}	<5.3	av $E\beta = 2389.8$ 93; $\varepsilon K = 0.1866$ 18; $\varepsilon L = 0.0269$ 3; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00775$ 8 $I\beta^+, I\varepsilon, I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$: upper limit with 90% confidence level has been estimated by evaluators for $I(\varepsilon + \beta^+) = -1$ 4 (from gamma-ray transition intensity balance).
(6392 [‡] 17)	589.6	<14	<1.7	≥ 5.5	<16	av $E\beta = 2471.6$ 96; $\varepsilon K = 0.0885$ 9; $\varepsilon L = 0.01261$ 13; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00362$ 4 $I\beta^+, I\varepsilon, I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$: upper limit with 90% confidence level has been estimated by evaluators for $I(\varepsilon + \beta^+) = -15$ 4 (from gamma-ray transition intensity balance).
(6525 17)	457.37					av $E\beta = 2534.6$ 96; $\varepsilon K = 0.0831$ 8; $\varepsilon L = 0.01184$ 12; $\varepsilon M^+ = 0.00340$ 4 Measured $E\beta = 5622$ 50. $I(\varepsilon + \beta^+)$: not known since it is time-dependent.

[†] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.[‡] Existence of this branch is questionable. $\gamma(^{139}\text{Sm})$

I_γ normalization: From summed transition intensity balances=100 for levels above the 457-keV isomer. The normalization factor is treated as approximate as the decay scheme seems incomplete.

E_γ	I_γ ^e	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [†]	δ [†]	α ^d	Comments
43.8 ^{‡#} 1	^c	267.29	5/2 ⁺	223.50	(3/2) ⁺	(E2)		57.7 11	ce(L)/($\gamma + \text{ce}$)=0.762 9; ce(M)/($\gamma + \text{ce}$)=0.178 4; ce(N)/($\gamma + \text{ce}$)=0.0387 10; ce(O)/($\gamma + \text{ce}$)=0.00473 12; ce(P)/($\gamma + \text{ce}$)=4.96 $\times 10^{-6}$ 12 Particle normalization/ $T_{1/2} = 0.0434$ 11 $I_{(\gamma + \text{ce})}$: 10.2 15 (1986De35).
111.6 [‡] 2	^{c@}	223.50	(3/2) ⁺	111.92	3/2 ⁺	[M1,E2]		1.41 18	$\alpha(K) = 0.96$ 9; $\alpha(L) = 0.35$ 20; $\alpha(M) = 0.08$ 5; $\alpha(N) = 0.017$ 11; $\alpha(O) = 0.0023$ 13; $\alpha(P) = 5.2 \times 10^{-5}$ 15 I_γ : 12 3 (1986De35).
111.9 [‡] 2	^{c@}	111.92	3/2 ⁺	0.0	1/2 ⁺	M1(+E2)	<0.50	1.26 4	$\alpha(K) = 1.022$ 23; $\alpha(L) = 0.19$ 4; $\alpha(M) = 0.041$ 10; $\alpha(N) = 0.0092$ 21; $\alpha(O) = 0.00131$ 24 $\alpha(P) = 6.3 \times 10^{-5}$ 3 I_γ : 142 16 (1986De35).
132.2 2		589.6	(9/2) ⁻	457.37	11/2 ⁻	(M1)		0.764	$\alpha(K) = 0.648$ 10; $\alpha(L) = 0.0915$ 14; $\alpha(M) = 0.0197$ 3; $\alpha(N) = 0.00446$ 7; $\alpha(O) = 0.000668$ 10 $\alpha(P) = 4.13 \times 10^{-5}$ 6

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{139}Eu ε decay (17.9 s) **1986Re11,1986De35** (continued) $\gamma(^{139}\text{Sm})$ (continued)

E_γ	I_γ^e	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [†]	α^d	Comments
155.3 [‡] 2	<i>c@</i>	267.29	5/2 ⁺	111.92	3/2 ⁺	M1	0.486	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.412$ 6; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.0581$ 9; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.01247$ 18; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.00283$ 4; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.000424$ 7 $\alpha(\text{P})=2.63\times 10^{-5}$ 4 I_γ : 204 22 (1986De35).
189.4 [#] 4	97 22	720.75	(7/2 ⁺)	531.4?	5/2 ⁺	(M1)	0.280 5	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.238$ 4; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.0334$ 5; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.00716$ 11; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.001624$ 25; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.000244$ 4 $\alpha(\text{P})=1.513\times 10^{-5}$ 23 Placement from $^{110}\text{Pd}(^{34}\text{S}, 5n\gamma)$ (evaluators). I_γ : from $I_\gamma(190\gamma)/I_\gamma(454)=0.97$ 22 in $^{110}\text{Pd}(^{34}\text{S}, 5n\gamma)$ and $I_\gamma(453\gamma)=100$ (evaluators).
190.1 [‡] 2	<i>c&</i>	457.37	11/2 ⁻	267.29	5/2 ⁺	E3	1.516	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.650$ 10; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.668$ 10; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.1588$ 24; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.0350$ 6; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.00442$ 7 $\alpha(\text{P})=3.30\times 10^{-5}$ 5 $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$: 417 51 (from intensity balance).
197.2 [#] 4	40 15	786.8		589.6	(9/2 ⁻)	[D,E2]	0.15 10	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.13$ 9; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.027$ 22; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.006$ 5
223.5 [‡] 2	<i>c@</i>	223.50	(3/2 ⁺)	0.0	1/2 ⁺	(M1+E2)	0.161 18	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.129$ 23; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.025$ 5; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.0056$ 11; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.00125$ 22; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.000176$ 22 $\alpha(\text{P})=7.5\times 10^{-6}$ 21 I_γ : 46 10 (1986De35).
(263.9 ^a)	19 ^b 6	(531.4)	5/2 ⁺	267.29	5/2 ⁺	[M1,E2]	0.099 15	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.080$ 17; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.0145$ 11; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.0032$ 3; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.00071$ 6; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.000102$ 4 $\alpha(\text{P})=4.7\times 10^{-6}$ 14
267.3 [‡] 2	<i>c@</i>	267.29	5/2 ⁺	0.0	1/2 ⁺	E2	0.0808	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.0618$ 9; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.01483$ 22; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.00332$ 5; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000738$ 11; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.0001005$ 15 $\alpha(\text{P})=3.25\times 10^{-6}$ 5 I_γ : 204 24 (1986De35).
299.5 [#] 5	25 12	1020.2		720.75	(7/2 ⁺)			
330.5 [#] 7	80 30	920.1		589.6	(9/2 ⁻)			
419.5 [#] 5	20 10	686.7		267.29	5/2 ⁺			
(420.3 ^a)	85 ^b 19	(531.4)	5/2 ⁺	111.92	3/2 ⁺	(M1)	0.0335	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.0286$ 4; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.00391$ 6; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.000838$ 12; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000190$ 3; $\alpha(\text{O})=2.85\times 10^{-5}$ 4 $\alpha(\text{P})=1.79\times 10^{-6}$ 3
437.7 [#] 4	60 25	1158.5		720.75	(7/2 ⁺)			
453.4 2	100	720.75	(7/2 ⁺)	267.29	5/2 ⁺	(M1)	0.0276	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.0235$ 4; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.00321$ 5; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.000688$ 10; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.0001560$ 22; $\alpha(\text{O})=2.35\times 10^{-5}$ 4 $\alpha(\text{P})=1.476\times 10^{-6}$ 21
463.4 [#] 5	15 7	686.7		223.50	(3/2 ⁺)			
^x 486.5 [#] 4								
497.2 3	58 12	720.75	(7/2 ⁺)	223.50	(3/2 ⁺)	[E2]	0.01302	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.01068$ 15; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.00183$ 3; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.000401$ 6; $\alpha(\text{N})=8.98\times 10^{-5}$ 13; $\alpha(\text{O})=1.286\times 10^{-5}$ 19

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{139}Eu ε decay (17.9 s) 1986Re11,1986De35 (continued) $\gamma(^{139}\text{Sm})$ (continued)

E_γ	I_γ^e	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [†]	α^d	Comments
(531.5 ^a)	21 ^b 7	(531.4)	5/2 ⁺	0.0	1/2 ⁺	E2	0.01092	$\alpha(\text{P})=6.14\times 10^{-7}$ 9 Not observed in $^{110}\text{Pd}(^{34}\text{S},5\text{n}\gamma)$. $\alpha(\text{K})=0.00900$ 13; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.001504$ 21; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.000328$ 5; $\alpha(\text{N})=7.37\times 10^{-5}$ 11 $\alpha(\text{O})=1.059\times 10^{-5}$ 15; $\alpha(\text{P})=5.21\times 10^{-7}$ 8
659.5 3	46 10	1380.3		720.75	(7/2 ⁺)			
693.8 [#] 4	40 20	1380.3		686.7				
701.2 4	42 8	1158.5		457.37	11/2 ⁻			
719.0 4	130 20	1176.4		457.37	11/2 ⁻			
^x 741.2 [#] 3								

[†] From Adopted Gammas.[‡] From ^{139}Sm IT decay.[#] Observed clearly only in the coincidence spectrum.[@] From adopted branching ratios, α , and $\Sigma\text{I}(\gamma+\text{ce})$ feeding level. Strong direct feeding of (11/2)⁻ level indicates levels below 457 are not directly fed (evaluators).[&] From $\text{I}(\gamma+\text{ce})$ and α .^a From Adopted Gammas.^b From $\text{I}\gamma(1+\alpha)(189\gamma)$ and adopted branching ratios and α 's.^c Value is not given due to their time-dependency arising from comparable half-lives of the ^{139}Eu parent (17.9 s) and 10.7-s isomer at 457 keV in ^{139}Sm populated in this decay. Apparent values from intensity balances are given under comments.^d Theoretical values from BrIcc code. When $\delta(\text{E2/M1})$ is not given, listed value overlaps those for pure M1 and for pure E2.^e For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by ≈ 0.15 .^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

