

$^{183}\text{Tl}$   $\alpha$  decay (53.3 ms) 2004Ra28,1987To09,1980Sc09

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Coral M. Baglin	NDS 110, 265 (2009)	15-Nov-2008

Parent:  $^{183}\text{Tl}$ :  $E=625$  7;  $J^\pi=(9/2^-)$ ;  $T_{1/2}=53.3$  ms 3;  $Q(\alpha)=6058$  9;  $\% \alpha$  decay=1.5 3

$^{183}\text{Tl}$ - $\% \alpha$  decay: From mother-daughter intensity relations (2006An11). other Branching data: $\approx 1.5\%$  (tentative value based on one correlated  $7000\alpha(^{187}\text{Bi})-6380\alpha(^{183}\text{Tl})$  event) (1999Ba45). 2004Ra28 estimate  $\% \alpha \approx 2$  based on total  $I_\alpha$  compared with  $I_\gamma$  for the delayed  $347\gamma$  feeding the  $9/2^-$  isomer of  $^{183}\text{Tl}$ .

Other: 2006An11.

2004Ra28:  $^{183}\text{Tl}$  from  $^{144}\text{Sm}(^{42}\text{Ca}, p2n\gamma)$  At  $E=195$  and  $200$  MeV using 95% enriched  $^{144}\text{Sm}$  target; RITU gas separator; fusion evaporation residues implanted In Si strip detector In focal plane; 3 NORDBALL- and 2 TESSA-type Ge detectors; measured  $E_\alpha$ ,  $I_\alpha$ ,  $E_\gamma$ ,  $I_\gamma$ , prompt  $\gamma$ - $\alpha(^{183}\text{Tl})$  coin,  $\gamma\gamma$  coin. Supersedes 2002JeZY.

$T_{1/2}(^{183}\text{Tl})=53.3$  ms 3 from fit to time difference between pairs of decay  $\alpha$ 's and recoils, using an exponential fit to the decay curve and assuming an exponential background (2004Ra28). Other: 60 ms 15 from 1980Sc09.

Parent  $J^\pi$  from evaluation In 2002Ba19.

Parent  $E$ : from  $E_\alpha=7612$  5 to  $^{183}\text{Tl}$ (g.s.) and  $E_\alpha=7000$  5 to 53 ms  $^{183}\text{Tl}$  In  $^{187}\text{Bi}(9/2^-)$   $\alpha$  decay (2006An11).

The  $Q(\alpha)=5940$  17 given In 2003Au03 assumed that a  $6449\alpha$  fed the  $^{179}\text{Au}$  g.s. the  $\gamma$  data of 2004Ra28 are inconsistent with this assumption. based on the adopted  $E_\alpha=6338$  6 from 625 7 level In  $^{183}\text{Tl}$  to  $203.6+x$  level In  $^{179}\text{Au}$ ,  $Q(\alpha)=6058+x$  9, where  $x$  is the energy difference, if any, between the  $^{179}\text{Au}$  g.s. and the  $0+x$  level At which the  $52\gamma$ - $89\gamma$ - $62\gamma$  cascade observed by 2004Ra28 In  $\alpha$  decay terminates.

To identify the  $^{183}\text{Tl}$   $\alpha$  decays, 2004Ra28 performed a correlation with subsequent  $^{179}\text{Au}$   $\alpha$  decays within a search time of 1 s; this revealed the existence of a new  $E_\alpha=5810$  15 branch from  $^{179}\text{Au}$ .

 $^{179}\text{Au}$  Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^\pi$ <sup>‡</sup>	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0+x	(1/2 <sup>+</sup> , 3/2 <sup>+</sup> , 5/2 <sup>+</sup> )		$J^\pi$ : 2004Ra28 suggest (5/2 <sup>+</sup> ).
61.8+x 3	(3/2 <sup>-</sup> )		$E(\text{level})$ : an alternative value of 89.4+x is possible because order of $62\gamma$ - $89\gamma$ cascade has not been firmly established.
86+x 13		>100 $\mu\text{s}$	$J^\pi$ : 2004Ra28 suggest (3/2 <sup>-</sup> ). $\%IT=?$ ; $\% \epsilon + \% \beta^+ = ?$ ; $\% \alpha = ?$ $E(\text{level})$ : from difference In adopted values of $E_\alpha$ to this level and $E_\alpha$ to 203.6+x level.
151.2+x 4	(7/2 <sup>-</sup> )		$T_{1/2}$ : from 2004Ra28; No $\gamma$ observed In coincidence with $\alpha$ feeding this level. $J^\pi$ : 2004Ra28 suggest (7/2 <sup>-</sup> ). HF is consistent with a moderate angular momentum change In $\alpha$ decay without underlying structural change; this suggests similar structure for the (7/2 <sup>-</sup> ) and (9/2 <sup>-</sup> ) levels In $^{179}\text{Au}$ .
203.6+x 4	(9/2 <sup>-</sup> )		$J^\pi$ : 2004Ra28 suggest (9/2 <sup>-</sup> ) based on unhindered $\alpha$ decay from (9/2 <sup>-</sup> ) parent.

<sup>†</sup> Based on measured  $E_\gamma$ , except As noted. the energy offset 'x' allows for the possibility that the level fed by the  $62\gamma$  might not be the g.s.

<sup>‡</sup> From Adopted Levels. Authors' suggested values, based on deduced transition multiplicities and an assumption that J values decrease with decreasing level energy, are given In comments on the relevant levels.

 $\alpha$  radiations

$E_\alpha$	E(level)	$I_\alpha$ <sup>†#</sup>	HF <sup>‡</sup>	Comments
6338 6	203.6+x	83 4	1.6 4	$E_\alpha$ : weighted average of 6333 10 (2004Ra28), 6340 15 (1987To09), 6343 10 (1980Sc09). this $E_\alpha$ implies $Q(\alpha)(^{183}\text{Tl})=6058+x$ 9 (cf. 5940 17 In 2003Au03 where the $6453\alpha$ is assumed to feed the $^{179}\text{Au}$ g.s.).
6381 11	151.2+x	16 2	12 3	other $I_\alpha$ : 80 9 (including ce- $\alpha$ sum peaks) (2004Ra28). $E_\alpha$ : weighted average of 6384 16 (2004Ra28), 6378 15 (1980Sc09).

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{183}\text{Tl}$   $\alpha$  decay (53.3 ms) 2004Ra28,1987To09,1980Sc09 (continued) $\alpha$  radiations (continued)

$E_\alpha$	E(level)	$I_\alpha^{\dagger\#}$	HF $^{\ddagger}$	Comments
6453 11	86+x	1.0 3	$3.6 \times 10^2$ 14	other $I_\alpha$ : 16 4 (2004Ra28). E $\alpha$ : weighted average of 6456 15 (2004Ra28), 6449 15 (1980Sc09). other $I_\alpha$ : 4 2 (2004Ra28).

$^{\dagger}$  From 1980Sc09.  $I_\alpha$  data from 2004Ra28 (given in comments) are in excellent agreement, but a little less precise.

$^{\ddagger}$  Assuming  $r_0=1.513$  9 (unweighted average of  $r_0(^{180}\text{Hg})=1.505$  13 and  $r_0(^{178}\text{Pt})=1.522$  5 (1998Ak04)) and  $Q(\alpha)=6058$  9.

$\#$  For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.015 3.

 $\gamma(^{179}\text{Au})$ 

$I_\gamma$  normalization: 0.061 2, assuming  $\text{Ti}(62)/I_\alpha(\text{total})=0.99$ .

$E_\gamma^{\dagger}$	$I_\gamma^{\dagger\#}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^{\pi}$	$E_f$	$J_f^{\pi}$	Mult. $^{\ddagger}$	$\alpha^{\text{@}}$	Comments
52.4 2	109 10	203.6+x	(9/2 $^-$ )	151.2+x	(7/2 $^-$ )	M1	8.58 16	$\alpha(\text{L})=6.60$ 12; $\alpha(\text{M})=1.53$ 3; $\alpha(\text{N}+\dots)=0.456$ 9 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.382$ 7; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.0701$ 13; $\alpha(\text{P})=0.00473$ 9 52 $\gamma$ is in prompt coincidence with both the 89 $\gamma$ and the 62 $\gamma$ . Placement is supported by 6384 $\alpha$ and 6333 $\alpha$ energy difference of 51 19 (2004Ra28). Mult.: $\alpha(\text{exp})=11.5$ 14 (based on $I_\alpha=83\%$ 4 and adopted $\gamma$ normalization) rules out E1 and E2. Observed ce(L)- $\alpha$ summing in spectrum gated by 89 $\gamma$ is consistent with M1 or E2 (2004Ra28).
61.8 3	1233 35	61.8+x	(3/2 $^-$ )	0.0+x	(1/2 $^+$ , 3/2 $^+$ , 5/2 $^+$ )	E1	0.305 6	$\alpha(\text{L})=0.235$ 5; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.0550$ 11; $\alpha(\text{N}+\dots)=0.0157$ 3 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.0134$ 3; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.00223$ 5; $\alpha(\text{P})=8.34 \times 10^{-5}$ 15 Mult.: intensity balance at 62+x level rules out E2 and M1 and higher order multipolarity for the 62 $\gamma$ .
89.4 2	124 11	151.2+x	(7/2 $^-$ )	61.8+x	(3/2 $^-$ )	(E2)	8.37 15	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.682$ 10; $\alpha(\text{L})=5.76$ 11; $\alpha(\text{M})=1.50$ 3; $\alpha(\text{N}+\dots)=0.427$ 8 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.368$ 7; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.0589$ 11; $\alpha(\text{P})=0.0001272$ 20 Mult.: probably E2. Observed shape of summed $\alpha$ spectrum when gated by 52 $\gamma$ is consistent with ce(L)(89)- $\alpha$ summing; E1 would give negligible ce- $\alpha$ summing, M1 would lead to different shape due to dominance of ce(K) over ce(L). also, M1 is ruled out by the observed low I(K x ray) (2004Ra28) and E1 by intensity balance at the 62+x level.

$^{\dagger}$  From 2004Ra28.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

---

$^{183}\text{Tl}$   $\alpha$  decay (53.3 ms)    [2004Ra28](#),[1987To09](#),[1980Sc09](#) (continued)

$\gamma(^{179}\text{Au})$  (continued)

‡ The  $52\gamma$ - $62\gamma$  and  $52\gamma$ - $89\gamma$  coincidences are prompt and none of the  $52\gamma$ ,  $62\gamma$  and  $89\gamma$  appears to be delayed with respect to  $\alpha$ 's, so [2004Ra28](#) conclude that the gammas have multipolarity no higher than E1, M1 or E2.

# For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.00091 *I*<sub>9</sub>.

@ Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code ([2008Ki07](#)) with frozen orbital approximation based on  $\gamma$ -ray energies, assigned multiplicities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.

$^{183}\text{Tl}$   $\alpha$  decay (53.3 ms) 2004Ra28,1987To09,1980Sc09

## Decay Scheme

Intensities:  $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$  per 100 parent decays

## Legend

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

