

^{146}Ho ε decay (3.32 s) 1982Gu07

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Yu. Khazov, A. Rodionov and G. Shulyak		NDS 136, 163 (2016)	14-Jul-2016

Parent: ^{146}Ho : E=0.0+x; $J^\pi=(6^-)$; $T_{1/2}=3.32$ s 22; $Q(\varepsilon)=11317$ 9; % ε +% β^+ decay=100.0

^{146}Ho - J^π and % ε +% β from 2010Ma37, for details see comment for 2934.5 10⁺ isomer state and ^{146}Ho ‘Adopted Levels’ dataset, Q β from 2012Wa38, $T_{1/2}$ from ^{146}Ho ‘Adopted Levels’.

1981NoZY,1982Gu07: $^{146}\text{Ho}(\varepsilon)$ [from $^{90}\text{Zr}(^{58}\text{Ni},\text{np})$, E=233, 250 MeV]; measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$, $X\gamma$, (ce) γ coin, $\gamma(t)$, $T_{1/2}$.

^{146}Dy ; deduced levels, J^π , $\alpha(\text{exp})$. Ge(Li), Si(Li) detectors, solenoid β spectrometer, pulsed beam.

Level scheme is as proposed by 1982Gu07. In $^{90}\text{Zr}(^{58}\text{Ni},2\text{p})$ reaction (1992De23), the levels at 2635.2, 2987.2, and 3161.4 keV were not fed by prompt transitions and were considered as populated in ε decay of ^{146}Ho . However, these levels are excited in $^{92}\text{Mo}(^{58}\text{Ni},4\text{p})$ reaction (2001Ro15) also; see (HI,xn γ) dataset.

If ε feeding is calculated assuming no ε decay to g.s. 0⁺ and excluding the 2635.2, 2987.2, and 3161.4 keV levels, $\Sigma I\gamma(\text{g.s.})=100$ gives ε branches as 36% 16 to 2936, 10⁺ and 18% 16 to 2809, 7⁻ levels. There is large uncertainty in other $I\gamma$ values which lead to net feedings with large uncertainties that overlap zero. No normalization has therefore been assigned, the level scheme is incomplete; $J^\pi=(6^-)$ for decaying state of ^{146}Ho is identified tentatively.

 ^{146}Dy Levels

E(level) [†]	J^π [#]	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0	0 ⁺		
682.62 3	2 ⁺		
1607.75 21	4 ⁺		
1782.8 3	3 ⁻		
2281.24 23	5 ⁻		
2518.1 4	7 ⁻		
2634.9 [‡] 4	(6 ⁺)		
2808.4 6	(4,5) ⁻		
2934.5 4	10 ⁺	150 ms 20	J^π : 10 ⁺ state is the only possible seniority-two configuration for the $T_{1/2}=150$ ms half-life. Transitions feeding this state are not identified. If the 10 ⁺ state is populated by direct β -feeding the value $\log ft=4.8$ would be typical for an allowed β -transition which corresponds 9 ⁺ , 10 ⁺ , or 11 ⁺ for ^{146}Ho (3.9 s) (1982Gu07). Evaluators suppose this as less probable, see ^{146}Ho ‘Adopted Levels’ dataset. $T_{1/2}$: from $\gamma(t)$ (1982Gu07).
2986.0 [‡] 4	(8 ⁺)		
3160.0 [‡] 4	8 ⁻		

[†] From a least-squares fit to $E\gamma$ data. Where $\Delta E\gamma$ is not known it is assumed to be 1 keV. Normalized $\chi^2=0.09$.

[‡] Suggested by 1992De23; the level is not fed by prompt transitions and is probably populated through ε decay.

From ‘Adopted Levels’, Gammas.

 $\gamma(^{146}\text{Dy})$

E_γ [†]	I_γ [†]	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	α [@]	Comments
127.0 3	1 1	2934.5	10 ⁺	2808.4	(4,5) ⁻	E3	13.34 25	$\alpha(K)\exp=4.6$ 25; $\alpha(L)\exp=8.7$ 17; $\alpha(M)\exp=1.6$ 6 $\alpha(K)=2.16$ 4; $\alpha(L)=8.51$ 17; $\alpha(M)=2.13$ 5 $\alpha(N)=0.481$ 10; $\alpha(O)=0.0569$ 11; $\alpha(P)=0.0001219$ 20
237.2 3	52 7	2518.1	7 ⁻	2281.24	5 ⁻	E2	0.1350	$\alpha(K)\exp=0.07$ 3 $\alpha(K)=0.0957$ 14; $\alpha(L)=0.0304$ 5; $\alpha(M)=0.00708$ 11 $\alpha(N)=0.001602$ 24; $\alpha(O)=0.000206$ 3; $\alpha(P)=4.75\times10^{-6}$ 7

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{146}Ho ε decay (3.32 s) 1982Gu07 (continued) **$\gamma(^{146}\text{Dy})$ (continued)**

E_γ^{\dagger}	I_γ^{\dagger}	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	α^{\circledast}	Comments
289.7 3	29 6	2808.4	(4,5) ⁻	2518.1	7 ⁻	M1+E2	0.10 3	$\alpha(K)\exp=0.09$ 3 $\alpha(K)=0.08$ 3; $\alpha(L)=0.0147$ 5; $\alpha(M)=0.00330$ 5 $\alpha(N)=0.000756$ 15; $\alpha(O)=0.000105$ 8; $\alpha(P)=4.6\times10^{-6}$ 19
352 [#]	6.0 [#] 21	2986.0	(8 ⁺)	2634.9	(6 ⁺)			
353 [#]	3.4 [#] 18	3160.0	8 ⁻	2808.4	(4,5) ⁻			
416.5 3	20 6	2934.5	10 ⁺	2518.1	7 ⁻	(E3)	0.0799	$\alpha(K)\exp=0.06$ 3; $\alpha(L)\exp=0.04$ 2 $\alpha(K)=0.0532$ 8; $\alpha(L)=0.0206$ 3; $\alpha(M)=0.00488$ 7 $\alpha(N)=0.001109$ 16; $\alpha(O)=0.0001434$ 21; $\alpha(P)=3.22\times10^{-6}$ 5
499.0 3	13 7	2281.24	5 ⁻	1782.8	3 ⁻			
642 [#]	2 [#] 2	3160.0	8 ⁻	2518.1	7 ⁻			
673.7 3	55 10	2281.24	5 ⁻	1607.75	4 ⁺			
682.9 3	100	682.62	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺	E2	0.00703	$\alpha(K)=0.00580$ 9; $\alpha(L)=0.000960$ 14; $\alpha(M)=0.000213$ 3 $\alpha(N)=4.90\times10^{-5}$ 7; $\alpha(O)=6.92\times10^{-6}$ 10; $\alpha(P)=3.31\times10^{-7}$ 5
925.3 3	69 14	1607.75	4 ⁺	682.62	2 ⁺			
1027 [#]	14 [#] 3	2634.9	(6 ⁺)	1607.75	4 ⁺			
1100.0 3	13 7	1782.8	3 ⁻	682.62	2 ⁺			

[†] From 1982Gu07, except as noted.[‡] From $\alpha(\exp)$, for 682.9 γ is assumed E2 as the transition $2+\rightarrow0^+$.[#] From 1992De23; I_γ were taken by evaluators from fig. 2 of 1992De23 and normalized to 1982Gu07.

@ Additional information 1.

^{146}Ho ε decay (3.32 s) 1982Gu07Decay Scheme

Legend

Intensities: Relative I_γ 