

$^{193}\text{Ir}(\text{d,t})$ 1994Ga05,1991Ke10

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Coral M. Baglin		NDS 113, 1871 (2012)	15-Jun-2012

 $J^\pi(\text{target})=3/2^+$.Other: [1983Ch57](#) Instrumentation paper; [1983Ch57](#) only show energy spectrum for $E(\text{d})=14$ MeV, $\theta=45^\circ$.[1991Ke10](#): $E(\text{d})=14, 15, 22$ MeV; 99.5% ^{193}Ir target, Q3d spectrograph with multiwire detector and scin; $\theta(\text{lab})=45^\circ, 120^\circ$; FWHM=3.4 keV or 6-8 keV; measured $E, d\sigma/d\Omega$.[1994Ga05](#): $E(\text{d})=18$ MeV; 98.7% and 99.35% ^{193}Ir targets 30, 45 $\mu\text{gm}/\text{cm}^2$ thick; magnetic spectrograph with photographic plates; $\theta(\text{lab})=6-10^\circ$ (2° steps), 12.5-27.5° (2.5° steps), 30-50° (5° steps), 60° and 70°; FWHM≈5.7 keV (best value 4.5 keV); measured $\sigma(\theta)$. DWBA analysis. **^{192}Ir Levels**

For band structure, supported by spectroscopic strengths in this and other transfer reactions, see Adopted Levels.

E(level) [†]	L [‡]	S [‡]	Comments
56.9 [#] 3	1,3	0.097,0.06	
62 [#] 1			Absent in 1994Ga05 ; peak is probably spurious, so level is not adopted.
66.3 2	3	0.216 8	
72? [#] 2			
83.8 3	5	0.55 4	L,S: L=3 ($S<0.011$) contribution possible (1994Ga05).
104.5 1	1	0.061 2	
115.6 [#] 2			$E=116.5$ 1, $L=1,3$ ($S=0.38$ 2, 0.30 9) for 116+119 doublet (1994Ga05).
118.8 [#] 4			$E=116.5$ 1, $L=1,3$ ($S=0.38$ 2, 0.30 9) for 116+119 doublet (1994Ga05).
128.6 3	1	0.039 2	
131? [#] 2			
143.5 2	1,3	0.010,0.027	
192.6 2	1	0.114 3	
198? [#] 2			
212.6 2	1	0.093 3	
225.7 3	1,3	0.066,0.065	
240.2 3	1	0.089 3	
256.8 2	1,3	0.51 3	L,S: L=1 ($S<0.022$) contribution possible (1994Ga05).
266.8 3	1,3	0.026,0.021	
278.2 10	5	0.34 5	
288.1 [#] 3	1	0.173 5	$E=288.5$ 3 for unresolved 288+294 doublet in 1994Ga05 ; evaluator assigns L and S deduced for doublet to the 288 component because, in 1991Ke10 , the 294 level contributes only 8% and 14%, respectively, to doublet's $d\sigma/d\Omega(15$ MeV, 45°) and $d\sigma/d\Omega(22$ MeV, 120°).
294 [#] 2			
310.5 4	1	0.066 3	
319.7 4	1,3	0.144,0.10	
331.7 4	1	0.159 5	E(level),L,S: for unresolved doublet. $E=331.0$ 2 in 1991Ke10 .
341? [#] 2			
367.2 4	1,3	0.037,0.245	E(level),L,S: for unresolved doublet.
389.5 [#] 5			E(level): resolved only at $E(\text{d})=14$ MeV (1991Ke10). $L=1,3$ and $S=0.046$ 4, 0.096 19 for 390+391 doublet (1994Ga05).
391.4 [#] 5			E(level): resolved only at $E(\text{d})=14$ MeV (1991Ke10). $L=1,3$ and $S=0.046$ 4, 0.096 19 for 390+391 doublet (1994Ga05).
407.3 [#] 10			
415.0 5	1,3	0.015,0.051	
437.6 5	1,3	0.025,0.067	

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{193}\text{Ir}(\text{d,t})$ 1994Ga05,1991Ke10 (continued) ^{192}Ir Levels (continued)

E(level) [†]	L [‡]	S [‡]	Comments
444.6 5	1	0.050 2	
451.9 5	1,3	0.014,0.170	
471.3 5	1,3	0.042,0.194	
480.4 [#] 9			
490.9 6	1,3	0.028,0.122	
508.1 5	1,3	0.053,0.089	
517.2 6	1,3	0.031,0.110	
532.5 6	1,3	0.015,0.123	E(level): 530.6 7 in 1991Ke10.
537.3 [#] 10			
543.4 [#] 10	1	0.022 2	E(level),L: E=540.4 7 in 1994Ga05, suggesting that the 537 and 543 levels are unresolved in 1994Ga05; if so, L and S may be unreliable.
582.6 6	1,3	0.020,0.070	
603.7 7	1	0.019 <i>I</i>	
615.5 7	1	0.014 <i>I</i>	
628.0 7	1,3	0.013,0.209	
646.0 6	1	0.101 3	
662.0 7	1,3	0.049,0.036	
679.0 8	1,3	0.043,0.048	
686.1 8	1,3	0.007,0.131	
702.3 9	1	0.042 2	
712.8 8	1	0.112 4	
737.6 8	1,3	0.046,0.051	
751.9 8	1	0.118 4	
766.0 9	1,3	0.012,0.022	
778.9 9	1	0.023 <i>I</i>	
791.1 9	1	0.024 <i>I</i>	
813.3 9	1,3	0.047,0.121	
825.0 9	1,3	0.027,0.219	
841.7 9	1	0.054 2	
850.3 9	1	0.138 5	
862.7 20	1	0.042 2	
874.1 17	1,3	0.32,0.208	
885.1 16	1,3	0.055,0.40	
901.1 22	1,3	0.020,0.113	
918.0 21	1,3	0.006,0.047	
938.3 16	1	0.013 <i>I</i>	
967.2 22	1	0.017 <i>I</i>	
1001.3 19	1	0.015 <i>I</i>	
1015.0 19	1	0.031 2	
1023.6 24	1,3	0.031,0.048	
1053.3	1,3	0.004,0.067	
1060.5 25			
1078.2 16			
1091.3			

[†] From 1994Ga05, except as noted. Uncertainties include systematic uncertainty arising from spectrograph calibration. Values are relative to E=56.7 for the 57 level.

[‡] From comparison of experimental $\sigma(\theta)$ with $\sigma(\theta)$ (DWBA) (1994Ga05); normalization factor=3.33. See 1994Ga05 for uncertainties in S whenever two S values are listed.

[#] From 1991Ke10; average of authors' data from (d,t) and (d,p).