

Coulomb excitation

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	N. Nica	NDS 154, 1 (2018)	20-Nov-2018

$^{140}\text{Ce}(\alpha,\alpha')$ E=14-20 MeV ([1963Ha20](#)), 12.60 MeV ([1978Ki09](#)), $^{140}\text{Ce}(d,d')$ E=26 MeV ([1971Ra32](#)), $^{140}\text{Ce}(^{16}\text{O},^{16}\text{O}')$ E=45 MeV ([1966Ec02](#)), $^{140}\text{Ce}(^{32}\text{S},^{32}\text{S}')$ E=110-116 MeV ([1991Ba38](#)).

 ^{140}Ce Levels

E(level)	$J^{\pi\dagger}$	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0	0^+		
1596.0	2^+	0.0926 ps <i>13</i>	B(E2) \uparrow =0.295 4 (1978Ki09) g=0.97 9 (1991Ba38) $T_{1/2}$: from B(E2) \uparrow ; other: 90.1 fs <i>55</i> from half-life measurement (1991Ba38); Other measurements of B(E2) \uparrow : 1960Na13 , 1961An07 , 1966Ec02 , 1971Ra32 .
2470	3^-	0.029 ps <i>15</i>	B(E3) \uparrow =0.76 38 (1963Ha20) $T_{1/2}$: calculated with B(E3) \uparrow =0.76 38 (1963Ha20) and adopted $\Gamma(3-0)/\Gamma(3-2)=0.00141$ <i>14</i> . Note, however, that in (e,e') $T_{1/2}=0.10$ ps <i>i.e.</i> 3 times larger. It may indicate that B(E3) \uparrow from 1963Ha20 is 3 times too small. For similar problems with B(E3) \uparrow measurements in Cd with A=112-116 (1963Ha20) see 1965Mc05 .

\dagger Adopted values.

 $\gamma(^{140}\text{Ce})$

E_γ	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π
1596	1596.0	2^+	0.0	0^+

Coulomb excitationLevel Scheme