

^{174}Lu IT decay (142 d) 1987Va34

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	E. Browne, Huo Junde	NDS 87, 15 (1999)		1-Nov-1998

Parent: ^{174}Lu : E=170.83 5; $J^\pi=(6^-)$; $T_{1/2}=142$ d 2; %IT decay=99.38 2

Additional information 1.

Others: 1959Di44, 1962Dz07, 1965Fu01, 1965Ri05, 1967Gi06, 1969Ka19, 1975Ki06.

^{174}Lu (142 d) produced with ^{40}Ar (E=304 MeV), ^{84}Kr (E=714 MeV), and ^{136}Xe (E=1156 MeV) on tungsten targets (1987Va34). No additional ^{174}Lu isomers with $T_{1/2}>2$ min were observed (1983Zy02).

Measured γ rays (1975Ki06); conversion electrons (1969Ka19, 1967Gi06).

 ^{174}Lu Levels

E(level) [@]	$J^\pi\#$	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0 [†]	(1 ⁻)	3.31 y 5	$T_{1/2}$: from Adopted Levels, gammas.
44.686 [†] 7	(2 ⁻)		
111.747 [†] 9	(3 ⁻)		
170.83 [‡] 5	(6 ⁻)	142 d 2	$T_{1/2}$: from Adopted Levels, gammas.

[†] $K^\pi=(1^-)$ g.s.-rotational band member. Possible Configuration=(π 7/2[404])-(ν 5/2[512]). Experimental $\mu=1.94$ 28 $\gamma(\theta,H,t)$ compares with $\mu=+1.85$ (theory) for this configuration (1975Kr11).

[‡] $K^\pi=(6^-)$ rotational band member. Possible Configuration=(π 7/2[404])+(ν 5/2[512]). Experimental $\mu=1.497$ 10 compares with $\mu=+1.76$ (theory) for this configuration (1975Kr11).

From Adopted Levels.

@ Deduced by evaluator from a least-squares fit to γ -ray energies of 1987Va34.

 $\gamma(^{174}\text{Lu})$

I γ normalization: From decay scheme if no ε feeding to ^{174}Yb g.s. from ^{174}Lu (142 d), and Ti(273 γ , ε decay)+Ti(1264 γ , ε decay)+Ti(44 γ) + Ti(112 γ)=100%.

Measured x-ray intensities are: K α_2 x ray=3840 90, K α_1 x ray=6578 134, K β_1 x ray=2153 117, K β_2 x ray=574 18 (1987Va34).

E γ	I γ ^{†‡}	E i (level)	J $^\pi_i$	E f	J $^\pi_f$	Mult.	δ	$\alpha^{\#}$	Comments
44.683 3	2291 50	44.686	(2 ⁻)	0.0	(1 ⁻)	M1+E2	≈ 0.05	6.9 3	$\alpha(L)= 5.33$ 19; $\alpha(M)= 1.20$ 5
									E $_\gamma$: other values: 44.7 (1967Gi06), 44.65 (1960Ha18), 44.681 20 (1975Ki06), 44.73 2 (1969Ka19).
									I $_\gamma$: other value: 2037 44 (1975Ki06).
									Mult., δ : from ce(L1)+ce(L2)/ce(L3) exp=37.7 40, ce(L1)/ce(L3) exp=28 2 (1969Ka19). Other data reported: ce(L3)/ce(L) exp=0.028 3, ce(L):ce(M):ce(N)+ce(O) exp=2410 50:558 11:128 2 (1967Gi06). Other values: ce(L1):ce(L2):ce(L3) exp=580 10:100:52 2, ce(M1):ce(M2):ce(M3):ce(M4)+ce(M5) exp=1000 100:100:40 10:50 10 (1969Ka19); ce(L1):ce(L2):ce(L3):ce(M):ce(N) exp=1290:160:ap65:350:115 (1960Ha18).
59.08 2	5.3 2	170.83	(6 ⁻)	111.747	(3 ⁻)	M3	3321	$\alpha(L)= 2427$; $\alpha(M)= 688$;	

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{174}Lu IT decay (142 d) 1987Va34 (continued) **$\gamma(^{174}\text{Lu})$ (continued)**

E_γ	$I_\gamma^{\dagger\ddagger}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult.	δ	$a^\#$	Comments
67.058 3	1336 27	111.747	(3 ⁻)	44.686 (2 ⁻)	M1+E2	+0.09 1	12.0		$\alpha(N+..)= 206$ E_γ : from 1969Ka19, 1987Va34. Other values: 59.1 (1967Gi06); 59.05 (1960Ha18). I_γ : from intensity balance, $Ti(59\gamma)=17545 614$, and α (theory,M3)=3320. Mult.: from ce(L1):ce(L2):ce(L3) exp=720 20:100:1630 30 (1969Ka19). Other data reported: ce(M1)/ce(M3) exp=0.7 1 (1969Ka19). Other values: ce(L):ce(M):ce(N)+ce(O) exp=2570:717 20:195 5 s (1967Gi06); ce(L1):ce(L2):ce(L3):ce(M):ce(N) exp=780:<180:1610:670:240 (1960Ha18).
111.762 7	55.0 15	111.747	(3 ⁻)	0.0	(1 ⁻)	E2	2.23		$\alpha(K)= 9.88; \alpha(L)= 1.64; \alpha(M)= 0.370; \alpha(N+..)= 0.106$ E_γ : other values: 67.075 25 (1975Ki06), 67.08 2 (1969Ka19), 67.10 (1969Gu15), 67.1 (1967Gi06), 67.05 (1960Ha18). I_γ : other value: 1107 (1969Gu15). Other: 1975Ki06. δ : from ce(L1)/ce(L3) exp=20 2 (1969Ka19). Sign from $\gamma(\theta,H,t)$ (1975Kr11). Other data reported: ce(L1)/ce(L2) exp=3-10, ce(M1)/ce(M2) exp=2.7 5 (1969Ka19). Other values: ce(K):ce(L):ce(M) exp=1230-2415:335 10:68 3 (1967Gi06); ce(L1)/ce(L)+ce(M) exp=3.4 s (1960Ha18). $\delta>0$ $\gamma(\theta,H,t)$ (1975Kr11). Mult.: from $\alpha(K)\exp=10.25$ 58 (1974Vi05). Other value: 11.01 44 (1975Ki06). This latter measurement was performed using a source produced by $^{175}\text{Lu}(n,2n)$. Although authors have corrected the measured K x ray intensity for x-ray fluorescence in the source, the correction may not have completely removed this contribution, causing an \approx 7% increase in the value of $\alpha(K)\exp$. $\alpha(K)\exp=10.30$ 26 (1987Va34).
126.2	2.8 20	170.83	(6 ⁻)	44.686 (2 ⁻)	[E4]		266		$\alpha(K)= 0.784; \alpha(L)= 1.10; \alpha(M)= 0.270; \alpha(N+..)= 0.0750$ E_γ : other values: 111.66 (1969Gu15), 111.7 1 (1975Ki06), 111.8 (1967Gi06). I_γ : other values: 60 (1969Gu15), 51 3 (1975Ki06), 59 2 (1984Ke13). Mult.: from $\alpha(L)(\exp)=1.5$ 2, calculated by evaluator assuming 67 γ is M1+0.8% E2 using ce(L) from 1967Gi06 and I_γ from 1987Va34.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{174}Lu IT decay (142 d) 1987Va34 (continued) $\gamma(^{174}\text{Lu})$ (continued)

E_γ	$E_i(\text{level})$	Comments
54.2; $\alpha(N+..)=$ E_γ : from 1967Gi06, 1987Va34. I_γ : from intensity balance, $T_i(126\gamma)=754\ 529$, $\alpha(\text{theory}, E4)=266$.	15.6	

[†] Intensities are relative to 100 for 992γ with ε .[‡] For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.00543 12.# Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code (2008Ki07) with Frozen orbital approximation based on γ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified. **^{174}Lu IT decay (142 d) 1987Va34**

Legend

Decay Scheme

Intensities: $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$ per 100 parent decays
%IT=99.38 2

- $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
- $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
- $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
- Coincidence

