<sup>163</sup><sub>73</sub>Ta<sub>90</sub>

## <sup>167</sup>**Re** $\alpha$ decay (3.4 s) 1992Me10

History				
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date	
Full Evaluation	C. W. Reich, Balraj Singh	NDS 111, 1211 (2010)	12-Apr-2010	

Parent: <sup>167</sup>Re: E=0.0;  $J^{\pi}=(9/2^{-})$ ;  $T_{1/2}=3.4$  s 4;  $Q(\alpha)=5280$  SY; % $\alpha$  decay $\approx$ 100.0

 $^{167}$ Re-Q( $\alpha$ ): From 2003Au03, 2009AuZZ, the uncertainty associated with this estimate is 40 (2003Au03,2009AuZZ). From

 $E\alpha$ =5015 12, Q(g.s.)=5138 12, assuming that the transition feeds the <sup>163</sup>Ta g.s..

<sup>167</sup>Re-E: Note that the evaluation of 2000Ba65 identifies this activity As an isomeric state In <sup>167</sup>Re.

 $^{167}$ Re-J<sup> $\pi$ </sup>: From systematics (2003Au02). Probable configuration is  $\pi$ 9/2[514]. 2004GoZZ also propose 9/2<sup>-</sup>.

Additional information 1. 1992Me10: <sup>167</sup>Re produced by <sup>141</sup>Pr(<sup>32</sup>S,X) and identified through several cross-bombardment reactions. Measured E $\alpha$ , estimated  $\%\alpha$ . Previous activities assigned to <sup>167</sup>Re  $\alpha$  decay by 1984Sc06, 1978Sc26 and 1982De11 were reassigned by 1992Me10 to other Re isotopes.

## <sup>163</sup>Ta Levels

$\frac{E(level)}{0+x?}$	$\frac{J^{\pi}}{(9/2^{-})}$	Comments E(level): based on the measured E $\alpha$ values, it seems that this May not Be the <sup>163</sup> Ta g.s	
		$\alpha$ radiations	
Εα	E(level)	) Comments	
5015 <sup>†</sup> 12	0+x?	E $\alpha$ : from 1992Me10, the assignment is based on excitation functions of $\alpha$ 's and $\gamma$ 's. Others: 5330 <i>10</i> (1978Sc26) and 5440 <i>3</i> (1982De11), reassigned later (1984Sc06) to <sup>166</sup> Re $\alpha$ decay. 1984Sc06 assign 5136 <i>8</i> to the <sup>167</sup> Re $\alpha$ decay, which was assigned earlier (1978Sc26) to <sup>168</sup> Re $\alpha$ decay. 1992Me10 suggest that 5136 is associated with $\alpha$ decay of W isotopes. if it is assumed that this transition feeds the <sup>163</sup> Ta g.s., the implied energy fit is problematic.	

<sup>†</sup> Existence of this branch is questionable.