

^{140}Gd ε decay 1991Fi03

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

Parent: ^{140}Gd : E=0.0; $J^\pi=0^+$; $T_{1/2}=15.8$ s 4; $Q(\varepsilon)=5200$ 60; % ε +% β^+ decay=100.0

^{140}Gd -E, J^π , $T_{1/2}$: from ^{140}Gd Adopted Levels.

^{140}Gd -Q(ε): from 2017Wa10.

Measured: γ , $\gamma\gamma$, $X\gamma$ (1991Fi03, 1988Tu05); ce (1988Tu05).

 ^{140}Eu Levels

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0	1 ⁺	1.51 s 2	% ε +% β^+ =100
174.59 9	2 ⁺		$T_{1/2}$,% ε +% β^+ : from Adopted Levels.
185.30 20	3 ⁺		E(level): from Fig. 13 – decay scheme (1991Fi03).
191.24 8			
361.3 4			
379.00 10			
417.72 10			
427.92 10			
446.98 13			
453.25 11			
488.1 4			
535.7 4			
546.54 15			
610.99 22			
687.04 22			
722.28 9			
749.94 8	1 ⁺		
882.69 22			
1077.8 4			
1092.6 10			
1131.1 3			
1215.99 22			

[†] From fit of γ 's to levels (GTOL).

[‡] Adopted values.

 ε, β^+ radiations

Strong ε decay to ^{140}Eu g.s.

Level 185 has non-zero I($\varepsilon+\beta^+$) feeding although $\Delta J=3$ and $\Delta\pi=\text{no}$.

E(decay)	E(level)	I β^+ [†]	I ε [†]	Log ft	I($\varepsilon+\beta^+$) [†]	Comments
(3.98×10 ³ 6)	1215.99	0.8 4	0.6 3	5.54 22	1.4 7	av E β =1341 28; εK =0.356 13; εL =0.0515 19; $\varepsilon M+=0.0149$ 6
(4.07×10 ³ 6)	1131.1	0.34 10	0.22 7	5.97 14	0.56 17	av E β =1380 28; εK =0.338 12; εL =0.0490 18; $\varepsilon M+=0.0142$ 6
(4.11×10 ³ 6)	1092.6	0.6 3	0.39 20	5.74 22	1.0 5	av E β =1398 28; εK =0.331 12; εL =0.0479 18; $\varepsilon M+=0.0138$ 5
(4.12×10 ³ 6)	1077.8	0.21 9	0.14 6	6.20 19	0.35 15	av E β =1405 28; εK =0.328 12; εL =0.0475 18; $\varepsilon M+=0.0137$ 5

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{140}Gd ε decay 1991Fi03 (continued) ε, β^+ radiations (continued)

E(decay)	E(level)	I β^+ [†]	I e^+ [†]	Log ft	I($\varepsilon + \beta^+$) [‡]	Comments
(4.32×10 ³ 6)	882.69	0.69 14	0.36 7	5.82 10	1.05 21	av $E\beta=1495$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.292$ 11; $\varepsilon L=0.0423$ 16; $\varepsilon M+=0.0122$ 5
(4.45×10 ³ 6)	749.94	14 2	6.7 10	4.58 7	21 3	av $E\beta=1557$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.271$ 10; $\varepsilon L=0.0391$ 14; $\varepsilon M+=0.0113$ 4
(4.48×10 ³ 6)	722.28	2.3 5	1.0 2	5.39 10	3.3 7	av $E\beta=1569$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.266$ 10; $\varepsilon L=0.0385$ 14; $\varepsilon M+=0.0111$ 4
(4.51×10 ³ 6)	687.04	0.73 15	0.32 7	5.91 10	1.05 21	av $E\beta=1586$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.261$ 10; $\varepsilon L=0.0377$ 14; $\varepsilon M+=0.0109$ 4
(4.59×10 ³ 6)	610.99	0.54 13	0.23 5	6.07 11	0.77 18	av $E\beta=1621$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.250$ 9; $\varepsilon L=0.0361$ 13; $\varepsilon M+=0.0104$ 4
(4.65×10 ³ 6)	546.54	1.9 4	0.77 15	5.56 9	2.7 5	av $E\beta=1651$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.240$ 9; $\varepsilon L=0.0347$ 13; $\varepsilon M+=0.0100$ 4
(4.66×10 ³ 6)	535.7	0.15 11	0.06 4	6.7 4	0.21 15	av $E\beta=1656$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.239$ 9; $\varepsilon L=0.0345$ 13; $\varepsilon M+=0.0100$ 4
(4.71×10 ³ 6)	488.1	0.9 3	0.36 11	5.90 14	1.3 4	av $E\beta=1678$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.232$ 9; $\varepsilon L=0.0336$ 12; $\varepsilon M+=0.0097$ 4
(4.75×10 ³ 6)	453.25	1.8 6	0.65 22	5.65 15	2.4 8	av $E\beta=1695$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.228$ 8; $\varepsilon L=0.0329$ 12; $\varepsilon M+=0.0095$ 4
(4.75×10 ³ 6)	446.98	0.58 18	0.21 7	6.13 14	0.79 24	av $E\beta=1698$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.227$ 8; $\varepsilon L=0.0328$ 12; $\varepsilon M+=0.0095$ 4
(4.77×10 ³ 6)	427.92	2.3 4	0.85 16	5.54 9	3.2 6	av $E\beta=1706$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.224$ 8; $\varepsilon L=0.0324$ 12; $\varepsilon M+=0.0094$ 4
(4.78×10 ³ 6)	417.72	3.0 6	1.1 2	5.43 9	4.1 8	av $E\beta=1711$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.223$ 8; $\varepsilon L=0.0322$ 12; $\varepsilon M+=0.0093$ 4
(4.82×10 ³ 6)	379.00	4.4 9	1.5 3	5.29 10	5.9 12	av $E\beta=1729$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.218$ 8; $\varepsilon L=0.0315$ 12; $\varepsilon M+=0.0091$ 4
(4.84×10 ³ 6)	361.3	0.31 12	0.11 4	6.45 17	0.42 16	av $E\beta=1738$ 28; $\varepsilon K=0.216$ 8; $\varepsilon L=0.0312$ 11; $\varepsilon M+=0.0090$ 4
(5.03×10 ³ [‡] 6)	174.59	2 2	0.7 7	5.7 ² 5	3 3	av $E\beta=1825$ 29; $\varepsilon K=0.194$ 7; $\varepsilon L=0.0280$ 10; $\varepsilon M+=0.0081$ 3 Log ft,I β^+ ,I e^+ : Allowed spectrum assumed for calculations by log ft. I($\varepsilon + \beta^+$): estimated upper limit (90% C.L.) gives 7.39 (method 1) and 7.08 (method 2; see documentation of program GTOL).
(5.20×10 ³ 6)	0.0	36 7	9.6 19	4.56 9	46 9	av $E\beta=1907$ 29; $\varepsilon K=0.176$ 6; $\varepsilon L=0.0254$ 9; $\varepsilon M+=0.0073$ 3

[†] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.[‡] Existence of this branch is questionable. $\gamma(^{140}\text{Eu})$

I γ normalization: Based on I(K x ray)/I γ from 1991Fi03. The normalization value considered by 1994Pe19 from 1991Fi03 (Table XI), 0.70 8, is wrong because it leads to negative ($\varepsilon + \beta^+$) feeding of g.s. (and aberrant net feedings of excited levels). This also happened when I(K x ray)=75 2 from 1991Fi03 (Table XI) was used by evaluator to calculate the normalization. The actual normalization value is from Table IV of 1991Fi03 and it can be obtained by calculation if the I(K x ray) is multiplied by a factor of 2.4.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{140}\text{Gd } \varepsilon$ decay 1991Fi03 (continued) **$\gamma(^{140}\text{Eu})$ (continued)**

E_γ^{\dagger}	$I_\gamma^{\dagger @}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	$\alpha^\#$	Comments
174.8 2	108 19	174.59	2 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	M1	0.381	$\alpha(K)=0.323\ 5; \alpha(L)=0.0458\ 7; \alpha(M)=0.00989\ 15$ $\alpha(N)=0.00227\ 4; \alpha(O)=0.000360\ 6; \alpha(P)=3.56\times 10^{-5}\ 6$ % $I_\gamma=11.9\ 24$, using the calculated normalization. Mult: $\alpha(K)\exp=0.34\ 4; \alpha(L)\exp=0.053\ 12.$ $\alpha(K)=0.193\ 3; \alpha(L)=0.0666\ 10; \alpha(M)=0.01525\ 23$ $\alpha(N)=0.00341\ 5; \alpha(O)=0.000482\ 7; \alpha(P)=1.618\times 10^{-5}\ 24$ % $I_\gamma=1.1\ 3$, using the calculated normalization. $E_\gamma, I_\gamma, \text{Mult.}$: from Fig. 13 – decay scheme (1991Fi03). $\Delta E, \Delta I_\gamma$: assumed by evaluator.
185.3 2	10 2	185.30	3 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	(E2)	0.278	$\alpha(K)=0.193\ 3; \alpha(L)=0.0666\ 10; \alpha(M)=0.01525\ 23$ $\alpha(N)=0.00341\ 5; \alpha(O)=0.000482\ 7; \alpha(P)=1.618\times 10^{-5}\ 24$ % $I_\gamma=1.1\ 3$, using the calculated normalization. $E_\gamma, I_\gamma, \text{Mult.}$: from Fig. 13 – decay scheme (1991Fi03). $\Delta E, \Delta I_\gamma$: assumed by evaluator.
186.7 3	3.8 13	361.3		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=0.42\ 16$, using the calculated normalization.
191.2 1	49 9	191.24		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=5.4\ 13$, using the calculated normalization.
236.7 1	8.9 13	427.92		191.24				% $I_\gamma=0.98\ 22$, using the calculated normalization.
253.3 2	8.9 19	427.92		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=1.0\ 3$, using the calculated normalization.
261.8 2	7.6 13	453.25		191.24		M1	0.1265	$\alpha(K)=0.1074\ 16; \alpha(L)=0.01507\ 22; \alpha(M)=0.00325\ 5$ $\alpha(N)=0.000745\ 11; \alpha(O)=0.0001183\ 17;$ $\alpha(P)=1.179\times 10^{-5}\ 17$ % $I_\gamma=0.84\ 20$, using the calculated normalization. Mult.: $\alpha(K)\exp=0.095\ 30.$
269.0 2	1.9 6	722.28		453.25				% $I_\gamma=0.21\ 8$, using the calculated normalization.
272.4 1	0.9	446.98		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=0.099\ 16$, using the calculated normalization. I_γ : from 1991Fi03; 10.8 in 1988Tu05.
278.4 5	10.1 13	453.25		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=1.11\ 23$, using the calculated normalization.
296.6 2	12.7 13	749.94	1 ⁺	453.25		M1	0.0907	$\alpha(K)=0.0769\ 11; \alpha(L)=0.01076\ 16; \alpha(M)=0.00232\ 4$ $\alpha(N)=0.000532\ 8; \alpha(O)=8.45\times 10^{-5}\ 12;$ $\alpha(P)=8.43\times 10^{-6}\ 12$ % $I_\gamma=1.4\ 3$, using the calculated normalization. Mult.: $\alpha(K)\exp=0.071\ 18.$
304.5 2	1.3 6	722.28		417.72				% $I_\gamma=0.14\ 7$, using the calculated normalization.
313.5 3	12.0 25	488.1		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=1.3\ 4$, using the calculated normalization.
344.5 4	1.9 13	535.7		191.24				% $I_\gamma=0.21\ 15$, using the calculated normalization.
372.0 2	3.8 13	546.54		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=0.42\ 16$, using the calculated normalization.
379.0 1	54 8	379.00		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=5.9\ 13$, using the calculated normalization.
417.7 1	39 4	417.72		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=4.3\ 8$, using the calculated normalization.
427.9 2	11.4 13	427.92		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=1.25\ 25$, using the calculated normalization.
436.4 2	7.0 13	610.99		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=0.77\ 19$, using the calculated normalization.
446.9 3	6.3 19	446.98		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=0.69\ 24$, using the calculated normalization.
453.4 2	19 6	453.25		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=2.1\ 8$, using the calculated normalization.
495.8 2	9.5 13	687.04		191.24				% $I_\gamma=1.04\ 22$, using the calculated normalization.
x532.0 4	9 5							% $I_\gamma=1.0\ 6$, using the calculated normalization. E_γ, I_γ : from 1988Tu05.
546.5 2	20.3 19	546.54		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=2.2\ 5$, using the calculated normalization.
558.7 3	33 3	749.94	1 ⁺	191.24				% $I_\gamma=3.6\ 7$, using the calculated normalization.
575.4 1	39 4	749.94	1 ⁺	174.59	2 ⁺	M1	0.01638	$\alpha(K)=0.01395\ 20; \alpha(L)=0.00191\ 3; \alpha(M)=0.000411\ 6$ $\alpha(N)=9.41\times 10^{-5}\ 14; \alpha(O)=1.497\times 10^{-5}\ 21;$ $\alpha(P)=1.511\times 10^{-6}\ 22$ % $I_\gamma=4.3\ 8$, using the calculated normalization. Mult.: $\alpha(K)\exp=0.016\ 5.$
x686.2 4	6 4							% $I_\gamma=0.7\ 5$, using the calculated normalization. E_γ, I_γ : from 1988Tu05.
708.1 2	9.5 13	882.69		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=1.04\ 22$, using the calculated normalization.
722.3 1	27 4	722.28		0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=3.0\ 7$, using the calculated normalization.
749.9 1	100 6	749.94	1 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=11.0\ 19$, using the calculated normalization. I_γ : 41 12 in 1988Tu05 ($I_\gamma=38$ if $I_\gamma(174.8\gamma)=100$).
x774.6 3								E_γ : from 1988Tu05. Seen only in $\gamma\gamma$.
903.2 3	3.2 13	1077.8		174.59	2 ⁺			% $I_\gamma=0.35\ 16$, using the calculated normalization.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{140}\text{Gd } \varepsilon$ decay 1991Fi03 (continued) **$\gamma(^{140}\text{Eu})$ (continued)**

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^\dagger @$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Comments
918 1	9 4	1092.6		174.59	2 ⁺	%I γ =1.0 5, using the calculated normalization.
^x 982.9 4						E γ : from 1988Tu05. Seen only in $\gamma\gamma$.
1041.4 2	13 6	1215.99		174.59	2 ⁺	%I γ =1.4 7, using the calculated normalization.
1131.1 3	5.1 13	1131.1		0.0	1 ⁺	%I γ =0.56 17, using the calculated normalization.

[†] From 1991Fi03; for many γ 's I γ (1991Fi03) strongly differs from I γ (1988Tu05).

[‡] From $\alpha(K)\exp$ and $\alpha(L)\exp(174.7\gamma)$ (1988Tu05), except where noted.

[#] Additional information 1.

[@] For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.110 15.

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

$^{140}\text{Gd } \epsilon$ decay 1991Fi03Decay Scheme

Legend

Intensities: $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$ per 100 parent decays