

$^{190}\text{Tl } \varepsilon$ decay (2.6 min) 1976Bi09, 1991Ko03, 1994De25

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Balraj Singh, ¹ and Jun Chen ²	NDS 169, 1 (2020)		15-Oct-2020

Parent: ^{190}Tl : E=0.0; $J^\pi=2^-$; $T_{1/2}=2.6$ min 3; $Q(\varepsilon)=6999$ 18; % ε +% β^+ decay=100.0

$^{190}\text{Tl-E,J}^\pi,\text{T}_{1/2}$: From ^{190}Tl Adopted Levels.

$^{190}\text{Tl-Q}(\varepsilon)$: From 2017Wa10.

1976Bi09 (also 1974Ha10): Measured γ , $\gamma\gamma$, ce, β^+ , $T_{1/2}$.

1991Ko03: Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$, ce for part of the level scheme related to the population of the excited 0^+ band.

1994De25: Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$. Data for selected transitions and levels.

1975Va20 (also 1970Va27): Measured γ , $\gamma\gamma$, ce, $T_{1/2}$. Source produced by mass separation of products from spallation reaction on Pb with 600 MeV protons, ce data obtained with Si(Li) detector.

See $^{190}\text{Tl } \varepsilon$ decay (3.7 min) for most details of the γ -ray and conversion electron data and the complete level scheme.

The decay scheme seems incomplete (in evaluators' opinion) in view of the large gap of 5.1 MeV between Q value and the highest established level. Feedings to different levels are thus considered as poorly known, and given as limits only.

 ^{190}Hg Levels

E(level) [†]	J [‡]
0.0	0 ⁺
416.38 14	2 ⁺
1041.79 18	4 ⁺
1099.98 17	2 ⁺
1278.68 20	0 ⁺
1558.76 19	2 ⁺
1571.35 18	2 ⁺
1657.08 21	3 ⁺
1975.17 22	4 ⁺

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

[‡] From the Adopted Levels.

 ε, β^+ radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	I β^+ [†]	I ε [†]	Log ft	I($\varepsilon+\beta^+$) [†]	Comments
(5024 [‡] 18)	1975.17	<0.45	<1.4	>8.9 ^{1u}	<1.8	av $E\beta=1758.2$ 79; $\varepsilon K=0.6067$ 22; $\varepsilon L=0.1088$ 4; $\varepsilon M+=0.03507$ 14
(5342 18)	1657.08	<0.77	<0.73	>7.3	<1.5	av $E\beta=1952.3$ 83; $\varepsilon K=0.3935$ 24; $\varepsilon L=0.0685$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.02196$ 14
(5428 18)	1571.35	<0.4	<0.4	>7.6	<0.8	av $E\beta=1991.7$ 83; $\varepsilon K=0.3822$ 24; $\varepsilon L=0.0665$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.02132$ 14
(5440 18)	1558.76	<3.1	<2.7	>6.7	<5.8	av $E\beta=1997.5$ 83; $\varepsilon K=0.3805$ 24; $\varepsilon L=0.0662$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.02123$ 14
(5720 [‡] 18)	1278.68	<0.13	<0.24	>9.9 ^{1u}	<0.37	av $E\beta=2064.5$ 80; $\varepsilon K=0.5228$ 22; $\varepsilon L=0.0931$ 4; $\varepsilon M+=0.02997$ 13
(5899 18)	1099.98	<11	<7.2	>6.4	<18	av $E\beta=2208.9$ 84; $\varepsilon K=0.3248$ 21; $\varepsilon L=0.0564$ 4; $\varepsilon M+=0.01808$ 12
(5957 [‡] 18)	1041.79	<5.1	<7.9	>8.4 ^{1u}	<13	av $E\beta=2169.5$ 80; $\varepsilon K=0.4943$ 22; $\varepsilon L=0.0879$ 4; $\varepsilon M+=0.02827$ 13
(6583 18)	416.38	<45	<20	>6.0	<65	av $E\beta=2526.1$ 84; $\varepsilon K=0.2561$ 16; $\varepsilon L=0.0444$ 3; $\varepsilon M+=0.01421$ 9 E(decay): 6720 400 from $E(\beta^+)=5700$ 400 (1976Bi09).

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

 $^{190}\text{Tl } \varepsilon$ decay (2.6 min) 1976Bi09,1991Ko03,1994De25 (continued)

 ε, β^+ radiations (continued)

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+ \dagger$	$I\varepsilon \dagger$	Log f_t	$I(\varepsilon + \beta^+) \dagger$	Comments
(6999 \ddagger 18)	0.0	<11	<9.3	>8.7 lu	<20	av $E\beta=2635.4$ 8I; $\varepsilon K=0.3784$ 19; $\varepsilon L=0.0668$ 4; $\varepsilon M+=0.02146$ 11

\dagger Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

\ddagger Existence of this branch is questionable.

¹⁹⁰Tl ε decay (2.6 min) 1976Bi09,1991Ko03,1994De25 (continued)

$\gamma(^{190}\text{Hg})$

I_y normalization: from Summed I($\gamma+ce$) to g.s.=90 10. ε, β^+ feeding to g.s. assumed as <20%, for a possible first-forbidden unique transition. 15% uncertainty is assigned to the γ -normalization factor to account for uncertainty in $\beta^++\varepsilon$ feeding to the g.s. and for possible unobserved γ -feedings to the low-lying levels in ¹⁹⁰Hg.

E _y [†]	I _y ^{#b}	E _i (level)	J _i ^π	E _f	J _f ^π	Mult. [#]	$\delta^{\#}$	α^c	I _(γ+ce) ^b	Comments
292.6 ^a 3	0.03 ^a 2	1571.35	2 ⁺	1278.68	0 ⁺	[E2]		0.1147		
403.8 ^{&} 3	0.28 8	1975.17	4 ⁺	1571.35	2 ⁺	E2		0.0462		$\alpha(K)=0.0313~5; \alpha(L)=0.01127~16; \alpha(M)=0.00281~4$ $\alpha(N)=0.000700~10; \alpha(O)=0.0001230~18;$ $\alpha(P)=4.12\times10^{-6}~6$
416.4 2	100	416.38	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺	E2		0.0427		$\alpha(K)=0.0292~5; \alpha(L)=0.01017~15; \alpha(M)=0.00253~4$ $\alpha(N)=0.000630~9; \alpha(O)=0.0001110~16;$ $\alpha(P)=3.85\times10^{-6}~6$
458.7 3	1.0 [@] 1	1558.76	2 ⁺	1099.98	2 ⁺	[M1,E2]		0.07 4		
516.8 3	0.7 [@] 1	1558.76	2 ⁺	1041.79	4 ⁺	[E2]		0.0235		
529.7 3	0.18 7	1571.35	2 ⁺	1041.79	4 ⁺	[E2]		0.0235		
557.0 ^{&} 2	<1.6	1657.08	3 ⁺	1099.98	2 ⁺	E2+M1	3.5 10	0.024 3		$\alpha(K)=0.019~3; \alpha(L)=0.0045~4; \alpha(M)=0.00109~8$ $\alpha(N)=0.000271~19; \alpha(O)=4.9\times10^{-5}~4;$ $\alpha(P)=2.5\times10^{-6}~4$
615.3 ^{&} 3	<1.0	1657.08	3 ⁺	1041.79	4 ⁺	E2+M1	1.3 2	0.030 3		$\alpha(K)=0.024~3; \alpha(L)=0.0046~4; \alpha(M)=0.00109~8$ $\alpha(N)=0.000272~19; \alpha(O)=5.1\times10^{-5}~4;$ $\alpha(P)=3.3\times10^{-6}~4$
625.4 2	14 3	1041.79	4 ⁺	416.38	2 ⁺	E2		0.01602		$\alpha(K)=0.01216~17; \alpha(L)=0.00294~5; \alpha(M)=0.000712~10$ $\alpha(N)=0.0001778~25; \alpha(O)=3.21\times10^{-5}~5;$ $\alpha(P)=1.613\times10^{-6}~23$
683.5 2	11 2	1099.98	2 ⁺	416.38	2 ⁺	E2+M1	2.0 +10-5	0.019 3		$\alpha(K)=0.015~3; \alpha(L)=0.0029~4; \alpha(M)=0.00070~8$ $\alpha(N)=0.000174~20; \alpha(O)=3.2\times10^{-5}~4;$ $\alpha(P)=2.0\times10^{-6}~4$
862.2 3	0.42 3	1278.68	0 ⁺	416.38	2 ⁺	[E2]		0.0081		
933.4 ^{&} 3	0.48 15	1975.17	4 ⁺	1041.79	4 ⁺	E0+M1+E2		0.066 7		Mult., α : from ce data in ¹⁹⁰ Tl ε decay (3.7 min). $\alpha(K)=0.00406~6; \alpha(L)=0.000733~11;$
1099.9 3	9 2	1099.98	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺	E2		0.00502		$\alpha(M)=0.0001722~25$ $\alpha(N)=4.31\times10^{-5}~6; \alpha(O)=8.00\times10^{-6}~12;$ $\alpha(P)=5.32\times10^{-7}~8$
1142.5 3	3.8 [@] 4	1558.76	2 ⁺	416.38	2 ⁺	E2(+M1)	>2	0.0053 7		$\alpha(K)=0.0043~6; \alpha(L)=0.00075~8; \alpha(M)=0.000176~18$ $\alpha(N)=4.4\times10^{-5}~5; \alpha(O)=8.2\times10^{-6}~9; \alpha(P)=5.7\times10^{-7}~8; \alpha(IPF)=8.9\times10^{-7}~7$
1155.0 3	0.69 6	1571.35	2 ⁺	416.38	2 ⁺	E0+M1+E2		0.052 7		
1240.9 ^{&} 3	<0.3	1657.08	3 ⁺	416.38	2 ⁺	(E2)		0.00399		Mult., α : from ce data in ¹⁹⁰ Tl ε decay (3.7 min).

From ENSDF

¹⁹⁰Hg₁₁₀₋₃

¹⁹⁰Hg₁₁₀₋₃

¹⁹⁰Tl ε decay (2.6 min) 1976Bi09,1991Ko03,1994De25 (continued)

 $\gamma(^{190}\text{Hg})$ (continued)

E_γ^{\dagger}	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger b}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [#]	$I_{(\gamma+ce)}^b$	Comments
1278.7 ^a 3	^a	1278.68	0 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺	E0	0.012	$\alpha(K)\exp>0.30$ (1991Ko03) $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$: from I_{ce} (K)=0.01 (1991Ko03).
1558.8 ^{&} 3	1.22 9	1975.17	4 ⁺	416.38	2 ⁺			
1558.9 3	1.0 [@] 1	1558.76	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			
1571.2 3	0.21 12	1571.35	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			

[†] Generally from [1976Bi09](#). Averages taken when values are also available from [1994De25](#). Uncertainty of 0.2 keV for strong γ rays ($I_\gamma \geq 5$) and 0.3 keV for weaker and poorly resolved lines (evaluator).

[‡] Uncertainty $\geq 10\%$ ([1976Bi09](#)). See other details in ¹⁹⁰Tl ε decay (3.7 min).

[#] From ce data (see ¹⁹⁰Tl ε decay (3.7 min) for details). Assignments and values are the same as in the Adopted dataset.

[@] γ with 2.6-min ¹⁹⁰Tl decay or 3.7-min ¹⁹⁰Tl decay. I_γ from a source containing $\approx 90\%$ of 3.7-min isomer and $\approx 10\%$ 2.6-min isomer.

[&] γ mainly belongs with 3.7-min isomer but a small fraction may also be associated with the 2.6-min isomer.

^a From [1991Ko03](#). The γ ray belongs to the decay of either or both the 3.7-min and 2.6-min isomers.

^b For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.79 12.

^c 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.

