(HI,xnγ) **2012Dr02**

History									
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date						
Full Evaluation	M. S. Basunia	NDS 195,368 (2024)	1-Dec-2023						

Adapted/Edited XUNDL data set compiled by W.Murrey (ANL/DePaul U) and F.G. Kondev (ANL), March 9, 2012. Beam=¹³⁶Xe, targets=¹⁸⁶W, ¹⁸⁷Re, ¹⁹²Os.

6.0 MeV/u ¹³⁶Xe pulsed beams, provided by the ATLAS facility at ANL, bombarded three different targets: enriched, metallic ¹⁸⁶W and ¹⁸⁷Re foils, $\approx 6 \text{ mg/cm}^2$ thick with 25 mg/cm² gold foil directly behind them and a pressed 44 mg/cm² enriched ¹⁹²Os target with a 10 mg/cm² gold foil behind it. Gamma rays detected by Gammasphere array (100 HpGe Compton-suppressed Ge detectors). Measured E γ , I γ , $\gamma\gamma\gamma$ coin, $\gamma\gamma(t)$, $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$. Deduced level scheme, J^{π} , T_{1/2}, total conversion coefficients and multipolarity.

A list of numerical values of the total electron conversion coefficients corresponding to those presented in figure 3 of 2012Dr02 was received from the first author (G.D. Dracoulis) on Feb. 28, 2012. These values are listed under comments.

¹⁹¹Ir Levels

E(level) [†]	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	T _{1/2}	Comments		
0.0	3/2+		J^{π} : from Adopted Levels. configuration: $\pi(3/2^+[402])$.		
171.268 [#] 11	11/2-	4.899 s <i>23</i>	%IT=100 Additional information 1. E(level), J^{π} , $T_{1/2}$: from Adopted Levels. configuration: $\pi(11/2^{-}[505])$.		
556.9 [@] 5	$13/2^{-}$		E(level): reported as 566.8 keV in fig. 2 of 2012Dr02, which is likely a typo.		
591.1 [#] 5	$15/2^{-}$				
1036.5 [@] 5	$17/2^{-}$				
1127.2 [#] 6 1503.3 7	19/2 ⁻ (19/2)				
1599.3 [@] 6	$21/2^{-}$				
1645.9 7	$21/2^{(+)}$				
1651.6 7	23/2-	2.22 ns 35	$T_{1/2}$: from τ =3.2 ns 5 in text (2012Dr02) – $\gamma\gamma$ (t).		
1792.5 8	$25/2^{(+)}$				
2047.0 8	25/2-		E(level): observed to be fed in both in-beam and out-of-beam time periods, consistent with the non-isomeric nature.		
2101.0 9	31/2 ⁽⁺⁾	5.75 s 55	T _{1/2} : From τ =8.3 s 8: weighted average of mean lifetimes 8.4 s 9 (using 395γ(t), when gating on 420γ-536γ pair) and 7.9 s 21 (using 308γ(t), when gating on 420γ-519γ pair) (2012Dr02). In text 2012Dr02 also mention T _{1/2} =5.5 s 7 and corresponding τ =7.9 s 10. Also τ =8.2 s 7 in Table I. configuration: possible $\chi(9/2^{-1}5051, 11/2^{+1}6151) \otimes \pi(11/2^{-1}5051)$.		

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

[‡] From 2012Dr02, unless otherwise stated.

[#] Band(A): Member of the $\pi h_{11/2}$ band, $\alpha = -1/2$.

[@] Band(B): Member of the $\pi h_{11/2}$ band, $\alpha = +1/2$.

						(HI,xny)	2012	0r02 (continued)	
γ ⁽¹⁹¹ Ir)									
${\rm E_{\gamma}}^{\dagger}$	I_{γ}^{\dagger}	E _i (level)	${ m J}^{\pi}_i$	E_{f}	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	δ	α [@]	Comments
(34 [#] 1)		591.1	15/2-	556.9	13/2-				E_{γ} : [25] keV listed in fig. 2 of 2012Dr02 seems a misprint.
(52 [#] 1)		1651.6	$23/2^{-}$	1599.3	$21/2^{-}$				
(54.0 [#] 10)	2.20 2	2101.0	31/2 ⁽⁺⁾	2047.0	25/2-	[E3]		3.8×10 ³ 4	$\begin{array}{l} \alpha(\text{L})=2.76\times10^3 \ 32; \ \alpha(\text{M})=8.1\times10^2 \ 10 \\ \alpha(\text{N})=200 \ 24; \ \alpha(\text{O})=29.7 \ 35; \ \alpha(\text{P})=0.037 \ 4 \\ \text{I}_{\gamma}: \text{ inferred from total intensity balance and total electron conversion coefficient. It seems that uncertainty in total conversion coefficient from BrIcc code was not included in the assigned uncertainty of 0.02. \end{array}$
90.6 5		1127.2	19/2-	1036.5	$17/2^{-}$				
95.8 5		1599.3	21/2 25/2(+)	1503.3	(19/2)	EO		1 020 20	$\alpha(K) = 0.266.61 \alpha(L) = 0.507.111 \alpha(M) = 0.1208.27$
140.0 5		1792.3	23/2	1043.9	21/2	E2		1.039 20	$\alpha(\mathbf{K})=0.306\ 0;\ \alpha(\mathbf{L})=0.307\ 11;\ \alpha(\mathbf{M})=0.1298\ 27$ $\alpha(\mathbf{N})=0.0314\ 7;\ \alpha(\mathbf{O})=0.00484\ 10;\ \alpha(\mathbf{P})=3.63\times10^{-5}\ 6$ Mult.: from $\alpha(\exp)=1.14\ 13$, numerical value (fig. 3) was received from the first author of 2012Dr02.
308.5 5	380 18	2101.0	31/2 ⁽⁺⁾	1792.5	25/2 ⁽⁺⁾	M3		3.34 5	 α(K)=2.259 34; α(L)=0.810 13; α(M)=0.2063 33 α(N)=0.0513 8; α(O)=0.00873 14; α(P)=0.000501 8 E_γ: no prompt component observed in 308.5γ(t), consistent with the the proposition that this γ ray directly depopulates an isomer. Mult.: from α(exp)=4.1 6, numerical value (fig. 3) was received from the first author of 2012Dr02.
375.9 5		1503.3	(19/2)	1127.2	19/2-				
385.5 5 395.4 5		556.9 2047.0	13/2 ⁻ 25/2 ⁻	171.268 1651.6	11/2 ⁻ 23/2 ⁻	M1(+E2)	0.6 4	0.110 21	$\alpha(K)=0.089 \ 19; \ \alpha(L)=0.0156 \ 19; \ \alpha(M)=0.0036 \ 4$ $\alpha(N)=0.00089 \ 10; \ \alpha(O)=0.000156 \ 19; \ \alpha(P)=1.08\times10^{-5} \ 24$ Mult.: From $\alpha(\exp)=0.11 \ 2$ (in the text). $\delta(E2/M1)=0.6 \ 4$ based on $\alpha(\exp)$.
419.9 5		591.1	$15/2^{-}$	171.268	$11/2^{-}$				
445.6 5		1036.5	17/2-	591.1	15/2-	M1+E2		0.065 33	$\alpha(K)=0.052\ 29;\ \alpha(L)=0.0098\ 31;\ \alpha(M)=0.0023\ 7$
472.2 5		1599.3	21/2-	1127.2	19/2-	M1+E2		0.055 28	$\alpha(\mathbf{X}) = 0.045 \ 25; \ \alpha(\mathbf{L}) = 0.0083 \ 28; \ \alpha(\mathbf{M}) = 0.0019 \ 6$ $\alpha(\mathbf{N}) = 4.7 \times 10^{-4} \ 15; \ \alpha(\mathbf{O}) = 8.2 \times 10^{-5} \ 28; \ \alpha(\mathbf{P}) = 5.3 \times 10^{-6} \ 31$
479.6 5		1036.5	17/2-	556.9	$13/2^{-}$				
518.7 5		1645.9	21/2 ⁽⁺⁾	1127.2	19/2-	D			Mult.: pure stretched dipole transition (δ <0.05) from $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$. The level scheme requires E1.
524.4 5 536.1 5 562.9 5		1651.6 1127.2 1599.3	23/2 ⁻ 19/2 ⁻ 21/2 ⁻	1127.2 591.1 1036.5	19/2 ⁻ 15/2 ⁻ 17/2 ⁻				

ы

 $^{191}_{77}\mathrm{Ir}_{114}\text{-}2$

$(HI,xn\gamma)$ **2012Dr02** (continued)

$\gamma(^{191}$ Ir) (continued)

[†] From 2012Dr02. ΔEγ are estimated value.
[‡] From γγ(θ) in 2012Dr02, unless otherwise stated. DCO values are not listed by authors. α(exp) was deduced by 2012Dr02 from γ-ray intensity balance.
[#] Implied by γγ coincidences, but not observed directly.
[@] Additional information 2.

ω



 $^{191}_{77}\mathrm{Ir}_{114}$



(HI,xnγ) 2012Dr02

 $^{191}_{77}\mathrm{Ir}_{114}$