

^{180}Yb β^- decay **1995Me03,1987Ru04**

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	E. A. Mccutchan	NDS 126, 151 (2015)	1-Feb-2015

Parent: ^{180}Yb : $E=0.0$; $J^\pi=0^+$; $T_{1/2}=2.4$ min 5; $Q(\beta^-)=2080$ SY; $\% \beta^-$ decay=100.0

1995Me03: ^{180}Yb activity from ^{197}Au or ^{136}Xe at 11 MeV/nucleon on targets of natural W or Re. Channel selection using online mass separator, fast tape transport system, and the FEBIAD-B2-C ion source to suppress contamination from ^{180}Lu . Measured E_γ , I_γ , $\gamma\gamma$, $\beta\gamma$, and $I(\text{ce})$ using setups of two Ge detectors and a $4\pi\beta$ counter or a low-energy Ge detector and a mini-orange electron spectrometer.

1987Ru04: ^{180}Yb activity from ^{186}W at 15 MeV/nucleon on targets of natural W or Ta. Channel selection with GSI online mass separator and fast transport tape system. Measured E_γ , I_γ , $\gamma\gamma$, and $\beta\gamma$ using a plastic $4\pi\beta$ detector and γ and γ/X Ge detectors.

The level scheme is that of **1995Me03**. The level scheme proposed by **1987Ru04** is in general agreement, except for the omission of the 13.9-keV level, which results in all the level energies in **1987Ru04** quoted as 13.9-keV lower than those in **1995Me03**.

Configuration assignments are from **1995Me03**.

Total energy release is calculated as 2180 keV 130 by the RADLST code, in general agreement with the Q value of 2080 keV 210, syst. However, due to large uncertainties on I_γ 's, unknown multiplicities, and a difference of 1 MeV between the highest observed level and the decay Q value, the level scheme should be considered incomplete.

α : [Additional information 1](#).

 ^{180}Lu Levels

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$ [‡]	Comments
0.0	5^+	5.7 min 1	Configuration $(\nu 1/2^- [510])(\pi 9/2^- [514])$.
13.9 3	3^-		Configuration $(\nu 1/2^- [510])(\pi 7/2^+ [404])$.
102.83 17	(4^+)		
186.8 3	$(2, 3^+, 1^-)$		
442.27 17	3^+		Configuration $(\nu 3/2^- [512])(\pi 9/2^- [514])$.
453.2 3	2^+		Configuration $(\nu 11/2^+ [615])(\pi 7/2^+ [404])$.
562.0 3	1^+		Configuration $(\nu 9/2^+ [624])(\pi 7/2^+ [404])$.
947.8 4	$1^+\#$		
981.6 4	$1^+\#$		

[†] From a least-squares fit to E_γ 's by the evaluator. $\Delta E_\gamma=0.3$ keV is taken when no uncertainty is given.

[‡] From the Adopted Levels.

[#] Calculated two-quasiparticle spectrum predicts two closely lying 1^+ states around 1 MeV in excitation energy with configurations $(\nu 1/2^- [510])(\pi 1/2^- [514])$ and $(\nu 7/2^- [514])(\pi 9/2^- [514])$.

 β^- radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^-$ ^{†‡#}	Log ft [‡]	Comments
(1098 SY)	981.6	33	≈ 4.9	av $E\beta=456$ 38 $I\beta^-$: other: ≈ 37 in 1995Me03 .
(1132 SY)	947.8	26	≈ 5.3	av $E\beta=470$ 38
(1518 SY)	562.0	32	≈ 5.4	av $E\beta=632$ 39
(1893 @ SY)	186.8	9	≈ 6.3	av $E\beta=794$ 40

[†] From intensity balance at each level and assuming E1 multipolarity for the 172.9 γ .

[‡] Large uncertainties on I_γ 's and unknown multiplicities make a precise determination of $I\beta^-$ difficult. Both $I\beta^-$ and Log ft should be considered approximate.

[#] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

@ Existence of this branch is questionable.

^{180}Yb β^- decay **1995Me03,1987Ru04** (continued) $\gamma(^{180}\text{Lu})$

I_γ normalization: From $\Sigma(I_\gamma+ce)=100$ for 103 γ , 173 γ , 439 γ , and 442 γ and assuming E1 multipolarity for the 173 γ .

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^\ddagger\&$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [@]	α	Comments
(14)		13.9	3 ⁻	0.0	5 ⁺	[M2]	7.11×10^4	$\alpha(\text{L})=5.32 \times 10^4$ 8; $\alpha(\text{M})=1.406 \times 10^4$ 20; $\alpha(\text{N})=3.36 \times 10^3$ 5; $\alpha(\text{O})=463$ 7; $\alpha(\text{P})=20.5$ 3
102.8 [#]	9 2	102.83	(4 ⁺)	0.0	5 ⁺	(M1+E2)	3.21 20	$\alpha(\text{K})=1.9$ 10; $\alpha(\text{L})=1.0$ 6; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.25$ 15; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.06$ 4; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.007$ 4; $\alpha(\text{P})=0.00013$ 9
108.8 3	8 2	562.0	1 ⁺	453.2	2 ⁺	M1(+E2)	2.66 24	$\alpha(\text{K})=1.6$ 8; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.8$ 5; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.19$ 11; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.04$ 3; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.006$ 3; $\alpha(\text{P})=0.00011$ 7 I_γ : other: 12 4 (1987Ru04).
119.7 [#]	16 2	562.0	1 ⁺	442.27	3 ⁺	(E2)	1.698	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.657$ 10; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.794$ 12; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.196$ 3; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.0452$ 7; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.00551$ 8 $\alpha(\text{P})=3.46 \times 10^{-5}$ 5
172.9 2	100 5	186.8	(2,3 ⁺ ,1 ⁻)	13.9	3 ⁻	(E1)	0.0834	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.0695$ 10; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.01082$ 16; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.00243$ 4; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000565$ 9; $\alpha(\text{O})=7.96 \times 10^{-5}$ 12 $\alpha(\text{P})=4.04 \times 10^{-6}$ 6 Mult.: E1 assumed for intensity balance calculations.
266.4 2	15 4	453.2	2 ⁺	186.8	(2,3 ⁺ ,1 ⁻)			I_γ : other: 24 5 (1987Ru04).
339.4 2	47 6	442.27	3 ⁺	102.83	(4 ⁺)			I_γ : other: 44 6 (1987Ru04).
375.2 2	71 10	562.0	1 ⁺	186.8	(2,3 ⁺ ,1 ⁻)			I_γ : other: 87 15 (1987Ru04).
385.8 3	41 10	947.8	1 ⁺	562.0	1 ⁺			I_γ : corrected for contribution from ^{180}Ir . I_γ : other: 25 8 (1987Ru04). I_γ : other: 56 7 (1987Ru04).
419.6 3	52 8	981.6	1 ⁺	562.0	1 ⁺			
439.3 [#]	7 3	453.2	2 ⁺	13.9	3 ⁻			
442.3 [#]	6 2	442.27	3 ⁺	0.0	5 ⁺	[E2]	0.0255	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.0196$ 3; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.00459$ 7; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.001075$ 15; $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000251$ 4; $\alpha(\text{O})=3.42 \times 10^{-5}$ 5 $\alpha(\text{P})=1.302 \times 10^{-6}$ 19
547.9 ^a 4	31 8	562.0	1 ⁺	13.9	3 ⁻			E_γ, I_γ : from 1987Ru04 only. Not observed by 1995Me03 who propose line as originating from summing effects. E_γ : not included in Adopted Gammas.

[†] From 1987Ru04, except where noted. E_γ 's were measured in coincidence with β^- .

[‡] From 1995Me03. Values from 1987Ru04 are included in the comments.

[#] From 1995Me03.

[@] Determined from conversion electron data (1995Me03); no specific details are given by authors.

[&] For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.63 4.

^a Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

$^{180}\text{Yb } \beta^- \text{ decay } \quad 1995\text{Me03,1987Ru04}$

Decay Scheme

Intensities: I_γ per 100 parent decays

Legend

- $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- - - - - γ Decay (Uncertain)

