

$^{171}\text{W } \epsilon \text{ decay }$ **1990Me12,1987Sz03**

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Coral M. Baglin, E. A. Mccutchan		NDS 151, 334 (2018)	30-Jun-2018

Parent: ^{171}W : E=0.0; $J^\pi=(5/2^-)$; $T_{1/2}=2.38 \text{ min } 4$; $Q(\epsilon)=4630 \text{ 40}$; % $\epsilon+\beta^+$ decay=100.0

The decay scheme and all data are from [1990Me12](#), except where noted.

1990Me12: sources from ^{36}Ar , ^{38}Ar , ^{40}Ar bombardments of enriched barium fluoride (93% for ^{136}Ba , 99.8% for ^{138}Ba); E(^{36}Ar , ^{38}Ar , ^{40}Ar)=165-205 MeV, helium-jet transport; measured $E\gamma$ (8 lines), $I\gamma$ (intrinsic Ge, Ge(Li) (timed spectra)), fast-slow $\gamma\gamma$ and γX coin, excitation functions.

1987Sz03: sources from $^{165}\text{Ho}(^{14}\text{N},8\text{n})$, E(^{14}N)=118-147 MeV; He-jet recoil transportation, Ge(Li); measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma(t)$, excit.

Normalization for decay scheme is not attempted due to lack of knowledge of ground state to ground state feeding and also possible unobserved additional decay paths of the 52.1-keV level as suggested by intensity balance considerations.

α : [Additional information 1](#).

 ^{171}Ta Levels

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$ [‡]	Comments
0.0	(5/2 ⁺)	23.3 min 3	
52.1 3	(7/2 ⁺)		
182.9 4	(9/2 ⁺)		
236.3 3	(9/2 ⁻)		$g=+0.515 \text{ 3}$ (2001Th23) g: from TDPAD (2001Th23).
530.8 4	(7/2 ⁻)		

[†] From least-squares fit to $E\gamma$.

[‡] From Adopted Levels.

 $\gamma(^{171}\text{Ta})$

E_γ	I_γ [†]	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	α	Comments
52.1 4	51 15	52.1	(7/2 ⁺)	0.0	(5/2 ⁺)	[M1]	4.94 14	$\alpha(L)=3.83 \text{ 11}; \alpha(M)=0.868 \text{ 24}; \alpha(N)=0.208 \text{ 6}; \alpha(O)=0.0328 \text{ 9}; \alpha(P)=0.00227 \text{ 6}$
53.4 4	15 1	236.3	(9/2 ⁻)	182.9 (9/2 ⁺)	E1		0.377 10	$I\gamma(52.1\gamma)$, as observed within the $\approx 1 \mu\text{s}$ coincidence time resolution, is only 15% as intense as expected from intensity balance considerations (1990Me12). This suggests either that $T_{1/2}(52.1 \text{ level})>1 \mu\text{s}$ for this possible $\Delta K=3$ deexcitation or that there are alternative unobserved decay modes for the level, such as proceeding via the 31.2-keV (5/2 ⁻) level known from (HI,xn γ) studies.
^x 113.0 [#]	34 [#]							$\alpha(L)=0.292 \text{ 8}; \alpha(M)=0.0668 \text{ 17}; \alpha(N)=0.0155 \text{ 4}; \alpha(O)=0.00216 \text{ 6}; \alpha(P)=8.80\times 10^{-5} \text{ 20}$
130.8 3	21 1	182.9	(9/2 ⁺)	52.1 (7/2 ⁺)	[M1,E2]	1.7 4		$\alpha(K)=1.10 \text{ 59}; \alpha(L)=0.44 \text{ 18}; \alpha(M)=0.108 \text{ 48}; \alpha(N)=0.025 \text{ 11}; \alpha(O)=0.0036 \text{ 13}; \alpha(P)=9.6\times 10^{-5} \text{ 62}$ Other I γ : 31 (1987Sz03).
^x 171.0 [#]	6.8 [#]							
184.2 3	100	236.3	(9/2 ⁻)	52.1 (7/2 ⁺)	E1		0.0750	$\alpha(K)=0.0623 \text{ 10}; \alpha(L)=0.00988 \text{ 15}; \alpha(M)=0.00224 \text{ 4}; \alpha(N)=0.000528 \text{ 8}; \alpha(O)=7.98\times 10^{-5} \text{ 12}; \alpha(P)=4.50\times 10^{-6} \text{ 7}$ Coincident with K x ray(Ta) (1990Me12).

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{171}W ε decay 1990Me12,1987Sz03 (continued) $\gamma(^{171}\text{Ta})$ (continued)

E_γ	I_γ^{\dagger}	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	α	Comments
236.3 3	4 1	236.3	(9/2 ⁻)	0.0	(5/2 ⁺)	[M2]	1.80	$\alpha(K)=1.396\ 2I; \alpha(L)=0.312\ 5; \alpha(M)=0.0740\ 1I;$ $\alpha(N)=0.0178\ 3; \alpha(O)=0.00277\ 4$ $\alpha(P)=0.000175\ 3$
294.5 4	89 3	530.8	(7/2 ⁻)	236.3 (9/2 ⁻)	[M1,E2]	0.149 63	$\alpha(K)=0.118\ 59; \alpha(L)=0.024\ 3; \alpha(M)=0.0057\ 6;$ $\alpha(N)=0.00135\ 14; \alpha(O)=0.00020\ 4$ $\alpha(P)=1.05\times 10^{-5}\ 59$ Other Iy: 86 (1987Sz03).	
^x 300.0 4	19 1							
478.7 4	83 3	530.8	(7/2 ⁻)	52.1 (7/2 ⁺)	[E1]	0.00751	$\alpha(K)=0.00631\ 9; \alpha(L)=0.000929\ 14;$ $\alpha(M)=0.000209\ 3; \alpha(N)=4.97\times 10^{-5}\ 7;$ $\alpha(O)=7.73\times 10^{-6}\ 11$ $\alpha(P)=5.00\times 10^{-7}\ 7$ Other Iy: 83 (1987Sz03).	

[†] Photon intensity relative to $I_\gamma=100$ for 184.2γ .[‡] From Adopted Gammas.# From [1987Sz03](#); uncertainty unstated by authors. Tentatively assigned to ^{171}W decay, but $\gamma(t)$ data indicate a $T_{1/2}$ which is not consistent with that assignment.^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

^{171}W ε decay 1990Me12,1987Sz03Decay Scheme

Legend

Intensities: Relative I_γ 