

**$^{192}\text{Bi } \varepsilon$  decay (39.6 s+34.6 s)    1987Va09**

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

Parent:  $^{192}\text{Bi}$ : E=0.0;  $J^\pi=(3^+)$ ;  $T_{1/2}=34.6$  s 9;  $Q(\varepsilon)=9011$  35; % $\varepsilon$ +% $\beta^+$  decay=88 5Parent:  $^{192}\text{Bi}$ : E=0.0+x;  $J^\pi=(10^-)$ ;  $T_{1/2}=39.6$  s 4;  $Q(\varepsilon)=9011$  35; % $\varepsilon$ +% $\beta^+$  decay=90 3

Others: 1984Va11, 1984Va19, 1990Tr01, 2004An23.

The partial decay scheme and all data are from 1987Va09. Mixed sources from  $^{181}\text{Ta}(^{20}\text{Ne},\text{n})$ , E( $^{20}\text{Ne})<190$  MeV, mass separation (LISOL facility); measured  $E\gamma$ ,  $I\gamma$  (Ge detectors, FWHM=2.0 keV at 1332 keV), x rays (low energy Ge detector, FWHM=580 eV at 122 keV), E(ce), Ice (Si(Li), FWHM=2.5 keV at 624 keV),  $\gamma\gamma$  coin, cey coin, triparameter coin ( $\gamma\gamma\text{-t}$ , ce- $\gamma\text{-t}$ ).

The combined decay scheme shows  $I\gamma$  values for a mixed source. Separate normalizations and  $\varepsilon$  feedings could not be reliably determined. Isomer assignments made from decay curves of  $\gamma$ -ray peaks are indicated. The fraction of the  $\varepsilon$  decay proceeding via the low-spin isomer is assumed to be 30% 10 in 1991Va04, based on an  $\alpha$ -decay study by several of the same authors using similarly prepared sources. This is not inconsistent with evaluator's conclusions based on  $I(\gamma+\text{ce})$  imbalance (indicated in comments on relevant levels); note, however, that these intensity balances could be significantly affected by the unplaced  $I\gamma$  ( $\approx 10\%$  of total observed  $I\gamma$ ).

 **$^{192}\text{Pb}$  Levels**

E(level)	$J^\pi$ <sup>†</sup>	$T_{1/2}$ <sup>†</sup>	Comments
0.0	$0^+$	3.5 min 1	
768.84 23	$0^+$	0.75 ns 10	
853.64 18	$2^+$		intensity imbalance At level: 8 5.
1237.88 22	(2 $^+$ )		Intensity imbalance at level: 7.5 22.
1355.5 3	$4^+$		<a href="#">Additional information 1</a> .
1430.2 3			Intensity imbalance at level: 1.7 5.
1544.09 22	1,2 $^+$		Intensity imbalance at level: 5.2 11.
1859.8 3	(5) $^-$		intensity imbalance At level: 8 5.
1920.8 3	6 $^+$		Intensity imbalance at level: 11 5. Presumed to result from incompleteness of decay scheme; no $\varepsilon$ feeding expected from either isomer.
1983.3 4			Intensity imbalance at level: 3.0 20.
2303.6 4	8 $^+$		<a href="#">Additional information 2</a> .
2323.2 4	(7) $^-$		intensity imbalance At level: 9 5; presumed to result from incompleteness of decay scheme; No $\varepsilon$ feeding expected from either $^{192}\text{Tl}$ isomer.
2507.2 4	(8) $^-$		Intensity imbalance at level: 9.4 23. negligible feeding expected from either isomer if $J^\pi=8^-$ .
2514.3 4	(9) $^-$		Intensity imbalance at level: 12.6 25.
2520.3 4	(8) $^+$		Intensity imbalance at level: [9.3 13 – Ti(61)] $\approx 0$ ; negligible $\varepsilon$ feeding is expected if $J^\pi=8^+$ .
2562.4 4	8 $^+$		Intensity imbalance at level: 4.1 3. negligible feeding expected from either isomer if $J^\pi=8^+$ .
2581.3 5	(10) $^+$	93 ns 11	Intensity imbalance at level: [-0.2 17 + Ti(61)] $=9.1$ 21 (if Ti(61)=9.3 13).
2622.4 6	(2 $^+, 3,4^+$ )		Intensity imbalance at level: 5.9 17.
2623.1?	(10) $^+$		tentatively introduced by evaluator to accommodate 120 $\gamma$ (unplaced by 1987Va09) In accord with Adopted Levels, Gammas. However, neither this level's known deexcitation $\gamma$ nor those of the neighboring 2622.4 level is reported In $\varepsilon$ decay.
2743.9? 6	(11) $^-$		tentatively introduced by evaluator to accommodate 120 $\gamma$ and 163 $\gamma$ (unplaced by 1987Va09) In accord with Adopted Levels, Gammas.
2789.7 4	(9) $^+$		intensity imbalance At level: 3.7 13.
2894.0 5	(7 $^+, 8,9^-$ )		Intensity imbalance at level: 3.0 18 (assuming placement of 929 $\gamma$ from this level by 1987Va09 was incorrect).
			Intensity imbalance at level: 4.0 11.

<sup>†</sup> Adopted values.

<sup>192</sup>Bi  $\varepsilon$  decay (39.6 s+34.6 s)    1987Va09 (continued)

$\gamma(^{192}\text{Pb})$									
$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Mult. <sup>#</sup>	$\delta$	$\alpha^{\dagger}$	Comments
61.0 5		2581.3	(10) <sup>+</sup>	2520.3	(8) <sup>+</sup>	(E2) <sup>@</sup>	61 3		$\alpha(L)=45.5\ 20; \alpha(M)=12.0\ 6; \alpha(N+..)=3.57\ 16$ $\alpha(N)=3.02\ 13; \alpha(O)=0.536\ 23; \alpha(P)=0.0190\ 8$ Intensity determination not possible (1987Va09). However, if $J^\pi(2520)$ is 8 <sup>+</sup> , no significant $\varepsilon$ feeding to that level is expected; $I(\gamma+ce)$ balance at that level then implies $Ti(61)=9.3\ 13$ .
67.0 5	2.0 10	2581.3	(10) <sup>+</sup>	2514.3	(9) <sup>-</sup>	E1 <sup>@</sup>	0.269 7		$\alpha(L)=0.205\ 5; \alpha(M)=0.0488\ 13; \alpha(N+..)=0.0145\ 4$ $\alpha(N)=0.0121\ 3; \alpha(O)=0.00223\ 6; \alpha(P)=0.000155\ 4$
120.8 <sup>b</sup> 2	0.8 4	2743.9?	(11) <sup>-</sup>	2623.1?	(10 <sup>+</sup> )	[E1]	0.273		$\alpha(K)=0.219\ 4; \alpha(L)=0.0420\ 7; \alpha(M)=0.00989\ 15; \alpha(N+..)=0.00298\ 5$ $\alpha(N)=0.00248\ 4; \alpha(O)=0.000468\ 7; \alpha(P)=3.74\times10^{-5}\ 6$ see comment on 2744 level.
<sup>x</sup> 147.7 2	0.3 2								
<sup>x</sup> 150.3 2	0.6 3								
162.6 <sup>b</sup> 2	2.4 10	2743.9?	(11) <sup>-</sup>	2581.3	(10) <sup>+</sup>	E1	0.1302		$E_\gamma$ : matches expected $E_\gamma$ for a 2894 to 2744 transition. $\alpha(K)=0.1052\ 15; \alpha(L)=0.0192\ 3; \alpha(M)=0.00450\ 7; \alpha(N+..)=0.001363\ 20$ $\alpha(N)=0.001129\ 17; \alpha(O)=0.000216\ 3; \alpha(P)=1.82\times10^{-5}\ 3$ see comment on 2744 level.
184.0 2	4.3 10	2507.2	(8) <sup>-</sup>	2323.2	(7) <sup>-</sup>	M1+E2	0.89 15	1.18 10	$\alpha(K)=0.84\ 11; \alpha(L)=0.252\ 6; \alpha(M)=0.0624\ 19; \alpha(N+..)=0.0190\ 5$ $\alpha(N)=0.0158\ 5; \alpha(O)=0.00300\ 7; \alpha(P)=0.000235\ 13$ $\alpha(K)\exp=0.88\ 15; \alpha(L)\exp=0.28\ 10$ (1987Va09) $\delta$ : from Adopted Gammas; $\delta=0.83 +25-22$ from $\alpha(K)\exp$ .
191.1 2	8.6 12	2514.3	(9) <sup>-</sup>	2323.2	(7) <sup>-</sup>	E2	0.502		$\alpha(K)\exp=0.096\ 20; \alpha(L)\exp=0.20\ 5$ (1987Va09) $\alpha(K)=0.187\ 3; \alpha(L)=0.235\ 4; \alpha(M)=0.0615\ 9; \alpha(N+..)=0.0185\ 3$ $\alpha(N)=0.01552\ 23; \alpha(O)=0.00280\ 5; \alpha(P)=0.0001379\ 20$ Mult.: from $\alpha(L)\exp$ . $\alpha(K)\exp$ from 1987Va09 appears to be incorrect.
210.7 2	1.5 7	2514.3	(9) <sup>-</sup>	2303.6	8 <sup>+</sup>	E1+M2 <sup>@</sup>	0.28 4	0.45 11	$\alpha(K)=0.33\ 8; \alpha(L)=0.087\ 22; \alpha(M)=0.022\ 6; \alpha(N+..)=0.0068\ 17$ $\alpha(N)=0.0056\ 14; \alpha(O)=0.0011\ 3; \alpha(P)=0.00011\ 3$ <b>Additional information 4.</b> $\delta$ : from Adopted Gammas.
<sup>x</sup> 264.2 2	1.6 6								
<sup>x</sup> 331.5 2	0.5 2								
382.8 2	8 3	2303.6	8 <sup>+</sup>	1920.8	6 <sup>+</sup>	E2 <sup>@</sup>	0.0579		$E_\gamma$ : matches expected $E_\gamma$ for a 2894 to 2562 transition. $\alpha(K)=0.0372\ 6; \alpha(L)=0.01561\ 22; \alpha(M)=0.00395\ 6;$ $\alpha(N+..)=0.001198\ 17$ $\alpha(N)=0.000999\ 15; \alpha(O)=0.000186\ 3; \alpha(P)=1.285\times10^{-5}\ 19$ <b>Additional information 3.</b> $\alpha(K)\exp=0.026\ 10$ (corrected for contribution from E1 383.9 $\gamma$ of <sup>192</sup> Tl decay, but Ice(K) also includes $\Delta J=(0)$ 383.9 transition in <sup>192</sup> Pb) (1987Va09)); authors favor mult=E1, inconsistent with adopted value.
383.9 4	<1.0	1237.88	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	853.64	2 <sup>+</sup>				
<sup>x</sup> 385.6 2	3.2 10								
402.4 2	3.8 16	2323.2	(7) <sup>-</sup>	1920.8	6 <sup>+</sup>	(E1) <sup>@</sup>	0.01522		$\alpha(K)=0.01253\ 18; \alpha(L)=0.00206\ 3; \alpha(M)=0.000479\ 7;$

<sup>192</sup>Bi  $\varepsilon$  decay (39.6 s+34.6 s)    1987Va09 (continued) $\gamma(^{192}\text{Pb})$  (continued)

$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Mult. <sup>#</sup>	$\delta$	$\alpha^{\ddagger}$	Comments
463.4 & 2	30 3	2323.2	(7) <sup>-</sup>	1859.8	(5) <sup>-</sup>	E2	0.0354		$\alpha(N..)=0.0001467$ 21 $\alpha(N)=0.0001208$ 17; $\alpha(O)=2.36\times 10^{-5}$ 4; $\alpha(P)=2.27\times 10^{-6}$ 4 $\alpha(K)\exp=0.020$ 3; $\alpha(L)\exp=0.005$ 1 (1987Va09) $\alpha(K)=0.0244$ 4; $\alpha(L)=0.00825$ 12; $\alpha(M)=0.00206$ 3; $\alpha(N..)=0.000627$ 9 $\alpha(N)=0.000522$ 8; $\alpha(O)=9.82\times 10^{-5}$ 14; $\alpha(P)=7.41\times 10^{-6}$ 11 $\alpha(K)=0.0238$ 4; $\alpha(L)=0.00792$ 12; $\alpha(M)=0.00198$ 3; $\alpha(N..)=0.000602$ 9 $\alpha(N)=0.000500$ 7; $\alpha(O)=9.42\times 10^{-5}$ 14; $\alpha(P)=7.15\times 10^{-6}$ 10
469.4 3	0.4 3	1237.88	(2) <sup>+</sup>	768.84	0 <sup>+</sup>	[E2]	0.0343		
<sup>x</sup> 471.4 2	1.7 9								
486.1 2	3.0 18	2789.7	(9) <sup>+</sup>	2303.6	8 <sup>+</sup>	D <sup>@</sup>			$\alpha(L)\exp=0.0068$ 10 (1987Va09)
501.8 2	80 4	1355.5	4 <sup>+</sup>	853.64	2 <sup>+</sup>	E2	0.0291		$\alpha(K)=0.0206$ 3; $\alpha(L)=0.00642$ 9; $\alpha(M)=0.001596$ 23; $\alpha(N..)=0.000486$ 7 $\alpha(N)=0.000404$ 6; $\alpha(O)=7.64\times 10^{-5}$ 11; $\alpha(P)=5.97\times 10^{-6}$ 9 Mult.: from $\alpha(L)\exp$ and Adopted Gammas.
504.3 & 2	39 3	1859.8	(5) <sup>-</sup>	1355.5	4 <sup>+</sup>	E1	0.00939 14		$\alpha(K)\exp=0.011$ 2 (1987Va09) $\alpha=0.00939$ 14; $\alpha(K)=0.00777$ 11; $\alpha(L)=0.001248$ 18; $\alpha(M)=0.000290$ 4; $\alpha(N..)=8.90\times 10^{-5}$ 13 $\alpha(N)=7.32\times 10^{-5}$ 11; $\alpha(O)=1.437\times 10^{-5}$ 21; $\alpha(P)=1.410\times 10^{-6}$ 20
535.7 2	2.0 6								
<sup>x</sup> 538.4 2	0.8 4								
565.4 & 2	36 3	1920.8	6 <sup>+</sup>	1355.5	4 <sup>+</sup>	E2	0.0220		$\alpha(K)\exp=0.020$ 2 (1987Va09) $\alpha(K)=0.01608$ 23; $\alpha(L)=0.00449$ 7; $\alpha(M)=0.001106$ 16; $\alpha(N..)=0.000338$ 5
570.8 3	3.9 10	2894.0	(7 <sup>+,8,9</sup> <sup>-</sup> )	2323.2	(7) <sup>-</sup>	[E2]	0.0215		$\alpha(N)=0.000280$ 4; $\alpha(O)=5.33\times 10^{-5}$ 8; $\alpha(P)=4.37\times 10^{-6}$ 7 $\alpha(K)=0.01577$ 23; $\alpha(L)=0.00436$ 7; $\alpha(M)=0.001075$ 16; $\alpha(N..)=0.000328$ 5 $\alpha(N)=0.000272$ 4; $\alpha(O)=5.18\times 10^{-5}$ 8; $\alpha(P)=4.26\times 10^{-6}$ 6
576.6 2	1.7 5	1430.2							
599.5 2	9.1 12	2520.3	(8) <sup>+</sup>	1920.8	6 <sup>+</sup>	E2	0.0193		$\alpha(K)=0.01427$ 20; $\alpha(L)=0.00379$ 6; $\alpha(M)=0.000930$ 13; $\alpha(N..)=0.000284$ 4 $\alpha(N)=0.000236$ 4; $\alpha(O)=4.50\times 10^{-5}$ 7; $\alpha(P)=3.77\times 10^{-6}$ 6
<sup>x</sup> 615.7 2	2.6 10								
641.6 2	4.0 3	2562.4	8 <sup>+</sup>	1920.8	6 <sup>+</sup>	E2	0.01658		$\alpha(K)=0.01245$ 18; $\alpha(L)=0.00313$ 5; $\alpha(M)=0.000766$ 11; $\alpha(N..)=0.000234$ 4 $\alpha(N)=0.000194$ 3; $\alpha(O)=3.72\times 10^{-5}$ 6; $\alpha(P)=3.19\times 10^{-6}$ 5 Mult.: from Adopted Gammas.
<sup>x</sup> 652.1 2	1.2 3								
690.7 2	4.0 10	1544.09	1,2 <sup>+</sup>						
<sup>x</sup> 709.3 2	1.8 4								
<sup>x</sup> 725.7 2	1.3 6								
<sup>x</sup> 733.4 3	1.8 2								
745.4 3	3.0 20	1983.3							
				1237.88	(2) <sup>+</sup>				

<sup>192</sup>Bi  $\varepsilon$  decay (39.6 s+34.6 s)    1987Va09 (continued)

<u><math>\gamma(^{192}\text{Pb})</math> (continued)</u>									
$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Mult. <sup>#</sup>	$\alpha^\dagger$	$I_{(\gamma+ce)}$	Comments
768.5 <sup>a</sup> 4		768.84	0 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	E0		1.7 3	K/L=5.2 7 (1990Tr01). Placement based on absence of coincidences between 853.8 $\gamma$ and 768.5-transition ce. $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$ : $\Sigma$ (Ice(K)+Ice(L)+Ice(M)) (1987Va09). Mult.: from comparison of ce and $\gamma$ -ray spectra in 650-850 keV region (K, L, M ce lines, but no corresponding photopeak, are observed), and coincidences with Pb K x rays.
775.0 2	1.2 3	1544.09	1,2 <sup>+</sup>	768.84	0 <sup>+</sup>				
x791.9 2	0.4 2								
853.8 2	100.0	853.64	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	E2 <sup>@</sup>	0.00911 13		$\alpha(L)\text{exp}=0.0010 2$ (1987Va09) $\alpha=L=0.00911 13$ ; $\alpha(K)=0.00714 10$ ; $\alpha(L)=0.001498 21$ ; $\alpha(M)=0.000360 5$ ; $\alpha(N+..)=0.0001105$ $\alpha(N)=9.11\times10^{-5} 13$ ; $\alpha(O)=1.770\times10^{-5} 25$ ; $\alpha(P)=1.649\times10^{-6} 24$
x926.6 3	2.3 10								
x928.7 3	2.8 10								Placement from 2789 level appears to be incorrect; see comment on 2789 level in Adopted Gammas.
x1101.9 3	2.8 10								
1237.7 <sup>a</sup> 3	9.6 8	1237.88	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	[E2]	0.00443 7		$\alpha=0.00443 7$ ; $\alpha(K)=0.00358 5$ ; $\alpha(L)=0.000645 9$ ; $\alpha(M)=0.0001521 22$ ; $\alpha(N+..)=5.44\times10^{-5} 8$ $\alpha(N)=3.85\times10^{-5} 6$ ; $\alpha(O)=7.58\times10^{-6} 11$ ; $\alpha(P)=7.57\times10^{-7} 11$ ; $\alpha(IPF)=7.52\times10^{-6} 11$ $\alpha(K)\text{exp}<0.0033$ (1987Va09) Mult.: E1 or E2 allowed by $\alpha(K)\text{exp}$ .
1266.9 3	3.4 3	2622.4	(2 <sup>+,3,4<sup>+</sup>)</sup>	1355.5	4 <sup>+</sup>				
x1607.9 4	1.6 4								
1768.9 4	3.5 15	2622.4	(2 <sup>+,3,4<sup>+</sup>)</sup>	853.64	2 <sup>+</sup>				
x1795.3 4	4.4 8								

<sup>†</sup> Additional information 5.<sup>‡</sup> For mixed source; relative intensity normalized so  $I(854\gamma)=100$ .<sup>#</sup> From  $\alpha(K)\text{exp}$  (and K/L), except where noted. The photon and ce intensity scales were normalized assuming  $\alpha(K)(E2 \text{ theory})$  for 501.8 $\gamma$  and 853.8 $\gamma$ .<sup>@</sup> From Adopted Levels, Gammas.<sup>&</sup> Attributed to decay of high-spin <sup>192</sup>Bi (39.6 s) based on measured  $\gamma(t)$  (1987Va09).<sup>a</sup> Attributed to decay of low-spin <sup>192</sup>Bi (34.6 s) based on measured  $\gamma(t)$  (1987Va09).<sup>b</sup> Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.<sup>x</sup>  $\gamma$  ray not placed in level scheme.

**$^{192}\text{Bi} \epsilon$  decay (39.6 s+34.6 s) 1987Va09****Legend****Decay Scheme**Intensities: Relative  $I\gamma$  from mixed source