

$^{169}\text{Hf } \varepsilon$  decay    1973Me09,1973FoYE

Type	Author	History	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Coral M. Baglin	NDS 109, 2033 (2008)	15-Jun-2008

Parent:  $^{169}\text{Hf}$ : E=0.0;  $J^\pi=5/2^-$ ;  $T_{1/2}=3.24$  min 4;  $Q(\varepsilon)=3360$  28;  $\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+$  decay=100.0

Others: 1969Ar23, 1970At01, 1970Ch17, 1975Gr44.

1973Me09: sources from  $^{170}\text{Yb}(^3\text{He},4n)$ ; Yb oxide targets enriched to 67% in  $^{170}\text{Yb}$ ; measured  $E\gamma$ ,  $I\gamma$  (Compton-suppressed Ge(Li) (FWHM=1.9 keV at 1332 keV), surface-barrier Ge(Li) (FWHM=0.8 keV at 122 keV)),  $I\text{ce}$  (Si(Li)).

1973FoYE: sources from  $^{168}\text{Yb}(\alpha,3n)$  and  $^{170}\text{Yb}(\alpha,5n)$ ; measured  $E\gamma$ ,  $I\gamma$  (Ge(Li), FWHM=1.4 keV at 100 keV, 2.3 keV at 1 MeV); measured  $E\gamma$ ,  $I\gamma$   $\gamma\gamma$  coin; placed 72.9 $\gamma$  and 68.4 $\gamma$ .

1969Ar23: Hf sources from  $^{169}\text{Ta}$  parent decay; measured  $E\gamma$ ,  $I\gamma$ ,  $\gamma(t)$ ,  $\gamma\gamma$  coin using coaxial Ge(Li) and NaI(Tl) detectors, and  $\beta^+$  data using a 2 cm x 2 cm anthracene crystal (14% energy resolution for 624-keV ce line from  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ ).

The decay scheme is tentative and incomplete. the measured  $I(K \text{ x ray})$  cannot Be corrected for K conversion of possible 71 $\gamma$  and 85 $\gamma$  because their intensities are unknown; if significant, this would lower  $\varepsilon K/\beta^+$  and, hence, the calculated  $\varepsilon+\beta^+$  feeding to the 493 level. however, a very large change In feeding to the 493 level would Be required to invalidate the conclusion that this is an allowed, unhindered transition. feeding to the (5/2 $^-$ ) 43 level May Be significant, but is unknown. there May also exist feeding to levels with E>493 that are As yet unknown.

 $^{169}\text{Lu}$  Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^\pi$ <sup>‡</sup>	$T_{1/2}$ <sup>‡</sup>	Comments
0.0	7/2 $^+$	34.06 h 5	
29.0 5	1/2 $^-$	160 s 10	
42.9 6	(5/2 $^-$ )		
97.4 5	(1/2 $^+$ )		$\log f^{1u}t > 8.5$ implies $\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+$ feeding<0.4 to this level.
113.8 6	(3/2 $^+$ )		$\log f t > 5.9$ implies $\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+ < 5$ to this level.
123.49 15	(9/2 $^+$ )		$\log f^{1u}t > 8.5$ implies $\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+$ feeding<0.4 to this level, consistent with intensity balance At this level.
186.7 6	(5/2 $^+$ )		
492.89 10	7/2 $^-$		

<sup>†</sup> From least-squares fit to  $E\gamma$ .

<sup>‡</sup> From Adopted Levels.

 $\varepsilon, \beta^+$  radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$ <sup>†</sup>	$I\varepsilon$ <sup>†</sup>	$\log f t$	$I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ <sup>†</sup>	Comments
$(2.87 \times 10^3$ 3)	492.89	>13	>75	<4.5	>88	av $E\beta=835$ 13; $\varepsilon K=0.709$ 5; $\varepsilon L=0.1130$ 9; $\varepsilon M+=0.0343$ 3 E(decay): 2872 200 from measured $E\beta+=1850$ 200 (1969Ar23). $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ : estimated from $I(K \text{ x ray})=86$ 5 and $I(\gamma^\pm)=33.0$ 15, relative to $I\gamma=100$ for 492.9 $\gamma$ (1973Me09).
$(3.17 \times 10^3$ 3)	186.7	<1	<4	>5.9	<5	av $E\beta=972$ 13; $\varepsilon K=0.652$ 6; $\varepsilon L=0.1035$ 10; $\varepsilon M+=0.0314$ 3 $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ : 6.8 from intensity imbalance; however, uncertainty May Be large (1973FoYE do not state uncertainty In $I(73\gamma)$ ). <5% feeding is expected based on $\log f t > 5.9$ for first-forbidden transition.
$(3.32 \times 10^3$ 3)	42.9					
$(3.36 \times 10^3$ 3)	0.0	<1	<4	>5.9	<5	av $E\beta=1056$ 13; $\varepsilon K=0.614$ 6; $\varepsilon L=0.0973$ 10; $\varepsilon M+=0.0295$ 3 $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ : from $\log f t > 5.9$ for first-forbidden transition.

<sup>†</sup> Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

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

---

**$^{169}\text{Hf } \varepsilon$  decay    1973Me09,1973FoYE (continued)**

---

$\gamma(^{169}\text{Lu})$

I $\gamma$  normalization: from estimate by 1973Me09 that total I( $\gamma+ce$ ) from 492.9 level>88% based on measured I(K x ray)=86 5 and I( $\gamma^\pm$ )=33.0 15 relative to I(493 $\gamma$ )=100; 94% 6 was used to calculate normalization. This normalization should Be considered to Be highly tentative.

I $\gamma$ (K x ray)=86 5, I( $\gamma^\pm$ )=33.0 15, relative to I $\gamma$ =100 for 492.9 $\gamma$  (1973Me09).

E $\gamma$ <sup>†</sup>	I $\gamma$ <sup>†&amp;</sup>	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	J $^\pi_i$	E <sub>f</sub>	J $^\pi_f$	Mult. <sup>‡</sup>	$\alpha^a$	I $_{(\gamma+ce)}$ <sup>&amp;</sup>	Comments
(14.1 <sup>@</sup> 8)		42.9	(5/2 $^-$ )	29.0	1/2 $^-$				
(16.4 <sup>@</sup> 8)		113.8	(3/2 $^+$ )	97.4	(1/2 $^+$ )			≈3.7	I( $\gamma+ce$ ): since negligible $\varepsilon+\beta^+$ feeding of the 97 level is expected ( $\Delta J^\pi=2$ :No, the level scheme implies Ti(16 $\gamma$ )≈Ti(68 $\gamma$ )=3.7.
(29.0 5)		29.0	1/2 $^-$	0.0	7/2 $^+$	E3	$9.4\times10^4$ 11		$\alpha(L)=6.8\times10^4$ 8; $\alpha(M)=2.08\times10^4$ 24; $\alpha(N+..)=5.4\times10^3$ 7 $\alpha(N)=4.9\times10^3$ 6; $\alpha(O)=5.4\times10^2$ 7; $\alpha(P)=0.35$ 4
68.4 <sup>@</sup> 1	1.9 <sup>#</sup>	97.4	(1/2 $^+$ )	29.0	1/2 $^-$	(E1) <sup>@</sup>	0.931		E $\gamma$ , Mult.: from $^{169}\text{Lu}$ IT decay (160 s).
(70.9 <sup>@</sup> 2)		113.8	(3/2 $^+$ )	42.9	(5/2 $^-$ )	[E1]	0.851 14		$\alpha(K)=0.754$ 11; $\alpha(L)=0.1379$ 21; $\alpha(M)=0.0311$ 5; $\alpha(N+..)=0.00815$ 12 $\alpha(N)=0.00716$ 11; $\alpha(O)=0.000951$ 14; $\alpha(P)=3.88\times10^{-5}$ 6
72.9 <sup>@</sup> 2	0.7 <sup>#</sup>	186.7	(5/2 $^+$ )	113.8	(3/2 $^+$ )	[M1,E2]	10.6 15		$\alpha(K)=0.691$ 11; $\alpha(L)=0.1248$ 20; $\alpha(M)=0.0282$ 5; $\alpha(N+..)=0.00738$ 12 $\alpha(N)=0.00648$ 11; $\alpha(O)=0.000864$ 14; $\alpha(P)=3.56\times10^{-5}$ 6
(84.8 <sup>@</sup> 2)		113.8	(3/2 $^+$ )	29.0	1/2 $^-$	[E1]	0.538 9		$\alpha(K)=5$ 3; $\alpha(L)=5$ 4; $\alpha(M)=1.1$ 9; $\alpha(N+..)=0.29$ 22 $\alpha(N)=0.26$ 20; $\alpha(O)=0.032$ 23; $\alpha(P)=0.00034$ 24
123.6 2	4.6 5	123.49	(9/2) $^+$	0.0	7/2 $^+$	M1,E2	1.8 3		$\alpha(K)=0.440$ 7; $\alpha(L)=0.0760$ 12; $\alpha(M)=0.0171$ 3; $\alpha(N+..)=0.00451$ 7 $\alpha(N)=0.00395$ 7; $\alpha(O)=0.000534$ 9; $\alpha(P)=2.32\times10^{-5}$ 4
369.5 2	11.6 10	492.89	7/2 $^-$	123.49	(9/2) $^+$	[E1]	0.01253		$\alpha(K)=1.1$ 6; $\alpha(L)=0.47$ 22; $\alpha(M)=0.11$ 6; $\alpha(N+..)=0.030$ 14 $\alpha(N)=0.026$ 13; $\alpha(O)=0.0034$ 14; $\alpha(P)=8.E-5$ 5 Mult.: from $1.16<\alpha(\text{exp})<4.9$ (1973Me09). $\alpha(K)=0.01054$ 15; $\alpha(L)=0.001548$ 22;

---

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

---

**$^{169}\text{Hf } \varepsilon$  decay    1973Me09,1973FoYE (continued)** $\gamma(^{169}\text{Lu})$  (continued)

$E_\gamma^{\dagger}$	$I_\gamma^{\dagger\&}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Mult. <sup>‡</sup>	$a^a$	Comments
492.86 10	100	492.89	7/2 <sup>-</sup>	0.0	7/2 <sup>+</sup>	E1	0.00651	$\alpha(M)=0.000346$ 5; $\alpha(N+..)=9.35\times 10^{-5}$ 14 $\alpha(N)=8.11\times 10^{-5}$ 12; $\alpha(O)=1.173\times 10^{-5}$ 17; $\alpha(P)=6.64\times 10^{-7}$ 10 $\alpha(K)=0.00550$ 8; $\alpha(L)=0.000792$ 11; $\alpha(M)=0.0001765$ 25; $\alpha(N+..)=4.78\times 10^{-5}$ 7 $\alpha(N)=4.14\times 10^{-5}$ 6; $\alpha(O)=6.04\times 10^{-6}$ 9; $\alpha(P)=3.53\times 10^{-7}$ 5 $\alpha(K)\exp=0.004$ 1 ( <a href="#">1973Me09</a> ).

<sup>†</sup> From [1973Me09](#), except As noted.

<sup>‡</sup> From  $\alpha(K)\exp$ , as deduced from simultaneous measurement of  $I_\gamma$  and  $I_\gamma$ , except where noted (detector calibration assumes  $\alpha(L)=0.0814$  (E2 theory) for  $198.8\gamma$  in  $^{168}\text{Yb}$ ) ([1973Me09](#)).

# From [1973FoYE](#); uncertainty unstated by authors.

@ From Adopted Gammas.

& For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.84 6.

<sup>a</sup> Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code ([2008Ki07](#)) with Frozen orbital approximation based on  $\gamma$ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.

$^{169}\text{Hf}$   $\varepsilon$  decay    1973Me09,1973FoYE