		History	
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	M. J. Martin	NDS 108,1583 (2007)	1-Jun-2007

1968Cr05 E(p)=16-18 MeV.

1976Fr21 E(p)=24 MeV, E(d)=24 MeV.

1981Di08 E(p)=16.2-17.8 MeV.

1987Ju06 E(p)=17.3 MeV. Data are also quoted In 1990Tr01.

1996Ra07 E(p)=16.5, 17, 17.45, 17.5, 18.5 MeV. E(d)=10 MeV.

1997Ra17 revision of E $\gamma$  data from 1996Ra07 based on new (d,p $\gamma$ ) work.

2005Or02 E(p)=17.3 MeV.

The bombarding energies of 1996Ra07 preferentially populate states of <sup>208</sup>Pb through proton decay of the  $3d_{5/2}$ ,  $4s_{1/2}$ ,  $2g_{7/2}$ , and  $3d_{3/2}$  isobaric analog resonances In <sup>209</sup>Bi. E=18.5 MeV is a non-resonant bombarding energy. 1968Cr05 and 1981Di08 studied decay via the  $3d_{5/2}$ ,  $4s_{1/2}$ , and  $3d_{3/2}$  resonances. For each of the gammas seen by 1968Cr05 these authors tabulate the relative intensity At each resonance.

#### <sup>208</sup>Pb Levels

From the relative  $\gamma$  intensities At different bombarding energies, corresponding to excitation via different analog states, 1996Ra07 determine the neutron particle configuration for several levels. These configurations are given In comments. The  $2g_{7/2}$  and  $3d_{3/2}$  IAR are not resolved.

$E(level)^{\dagger}$	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	Comments
0.0		
2614.5 1	3-	
3197.7 <i>1</i>	5-	
3475.1 <i>1</i>	4-	
3709.2 1	5-	
3920.4 <i>1</i>	6-	
3946.6 <i>1</i>	4-	
3961.7 <i>1</i>	5-	
3995.5 1	4-	
4037.5 1	7-	
4051.3 <i>1</i>	3-	
4085.4 <i>1</i>	2+	
4125.6 <i>1</i>	5-	
4180.9 <i>1</i>	5-	
4206.0 <i>1</i>	6-	
4229.6 <i>1</i>	$2^{-}$	
4254.9 <i>1</i>	3-	
4261.8 <i>1</i>	4-	
4296.7 <i>1</i>	5-	
4324.5 1	4+	
4358.7 <i>1</i>	4-	
4382.6 1	6-	
4423.6 <i>1</i>	6+	
4481.0 <i>1</i>	6-	
4610.6 <i>1</i>	8+	
4698.1 <i>1</i>	3-	
4841.5 <i>1</i>	1-	
4870 <i>3</i>	$0^{+}$	
4936.2 1	3-	configuration= $v3d_{3/2}$ or $v2g_{7/2}$ . The $v2g_{7/2}$ component is confirmed by 2006He21 In (p,p').
4974.2 1	3-	
5037.7 1	3-	$configuration = \nu 3d_{5/2}$ .

# <sup>208</sup>Pb Levels (continued)

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	Comments
5080?	(1 <sup>-</sup> )	E(level), $J^{\pi}$ : reported only by 1968Cr05.
5085.5 1	7-	
5127.4 1	2	$configuration = \nu 3d_{5/2}$ .
5241 5 5245 2 1	0 <sup>-</sup> 3-	
5245.2 1	0-	$configuration = v4s_{1/2}$
5292.1 1	1-	configuration=y4s <sub>1/2</sub>
02/2111	-	$J^{\pi}$ : 1968Cr05 determine $J^{\pi}=1^{-}$ .
5385.6 1	3-	configuration=v3d <sub>5/2</sub> .
5480.8 1	5-	
5490.3 5	4-	$\frac{\text{configuration} = v3d_{5/2}}{\pi}$
5511.9 1	1	$J^{*}$ : 1968Cr05 determine $J^{*}=1$ .
5548.2 I	2-	$configuration = v_{305/2} + v_{481/2}$ .
5601 7 1	$0^{-}1^{-}$	
56302	0,1	F(level): reported only by 1968Cr05
5641.4.5	1 2+	configuration=v3dsp + v4sto
5737.8.3	1,2	configuration= $y_3 d_{s/2}$ .
5777.8 1	$2^{-}.3^{-}$	configuration $-y_3 d_{5/2}$ .
5802.9 8	$1,2^{+}$	$configuration = v4s_{1/2}$ .
5813.1 2	3-	$configuration = v3d_{5/2}^2$ .
5873.7 1	3-	configuration= $v3d_{5/2} + v4s_{1/2} + v3d_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
5885.4 <i>1</i>	3-	$configuration = v3d_{5/2} + v4s_{1/2}$ .
5923.7 <i>1</i>	1-,2-	$configuration = v3d_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
5946.8 <i>1</i>	1-	$configuration = v3d_{3/2}$ .
		configuration= $v3d_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ from (p,p' $\gamma$ ); however, $v3p_{1/2}^{-1}$ for the neutron hole is determined in
		$(d,p\gamma)$ , thus, given $J^{\pi}=1^{-}$ , the $2g_{7/2}$ particle component cannot contribute.
50(0.2.1	4-	$J^{n}$ : 1968Cr05 determine $J^{n}=1^{-}$ .
5969.2 I	4	configuration= $v_{3}a_{2}$ and/or $v_{2}g_{1/2}$ .
6086 9 <i>1</i>	5 1-	configuration= $v4s_{1/2} + v3u_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
6263.6.1	1	$configuration = v4s_{1/2} + v3u_{3/2} and/or v2g_{1/2}$ .
6313.8 /	1-	$configuration = v4s_{1/2}$ .
	-	$J^{\pi}$ : 1968Cr05 determine $J^{\pi}=1^{-}$ .
6361.5 <i>1</i>	1-	
6394 <i>3</i>	3-	$configuration = v3d_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
6444.3 2	3-	$configuration = v_3 d_{3/2}$ and/or $v_2 g_{7/2}$ .
6486.4 2	1-	$J^{n}$ : 1968Cr05 determine $J^{n}=1^{-}$ .
6551.8 <i>I</i>	2-	configuration= $v4s_{1/2} + v3a_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
6657.1.2	5 4+	configuration=>>03/2 and/or v2g7/2.
0057.1 2	4	configuration = $v2g//2$ .
		determined in $(d, p_2)$ so given $I^{\pi} - I^{\pi}$ the 3d so particle component cannot contribute
6682 3 2	$(5^{-})$	configuration $= \sqrt{3}d_{2,0}$ and/or $\sqrt{2}\sigma_{2,0}$
6692.0.5	(5)	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$
6718.4 3	1-	$J^{\pi}$ : 1976Fr21 determine $J^{\pi}=1^{-}$ .
		configuration= $v3d_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
6740.1 <i>1</i>	3-	configuration= $v3d_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
6800.9 <i>20</i>		$configuration = v3d_{3/2}$ and/or $v2g_{7/2}$ .
7062.1 <i>1</i>	1-	$J^{\pi}$ : 1976Fr21 determine $J^{\pi} = (1^+)$ ; however, $P' \gamma(\theta)$ does not rule out the adopted value of $1^-$ .
		the level shows essentially equal $\sigma$ At the $d_{3/2} + g_{9/2} s_{1/2}$ , and $d_{5/2}$ IAR (1981Di08).
7082.7 5	1-	$J^{\pi}$ : 1968Cr05 determine $J^{\pi}=1^{-}$ .
7241 4 3	1-	level shows strong enhancement from $d_{3/2} + g_{9/2}$ IAR (1981Di08).
7241.4 1	1	
/310 ð		

#### <sup>208</sup>Pb Levels (continued)

<sup>†</sup> As given by 1996Ra07 based on their  $E\gamma$  values.

<sup>‡</sup> From Adopted Levels. Assignments from 1976Fr21 based on  $P'\gamma(\theta)$  and from 1968Cr05 based on  $\gamma(\theta)$  At the  $3d_{3/2}$  IAR and observation of a large ground-state  $\gamma$  branch, are given In comments. 1976Fr21 show that the In-plane to out-of-plane intensity ratio for  $\gamma'$ s that decay to the ground state is <1 for  $J^{\pi}=1^-$ , >1 for  $J^{\pi}=2^+$ , and =1 for  $J^{\pi}=1^+$ . In the  $J^{\pi}=1^+$  case, L=0 transfer only is assumed.

## $\gamma(^{208}\text{Pb})$

E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$E_f$	$\mathbf{J}_{f}^{\pi}$	Comments
2614.5	3-	2614.5 1		0.0		
3197.7	5-	583.2 1		2614.5	3-	
3475.1	$4^{-}$	277.3 1	53 <i>3</i>	3197.7	5-	
		860.7 <i>1</i>	100 5	2614.5	3-	
3709.2	5-	233.4 2	24 <i>I</i>	3475.1	$4^{-}$	
		511		3197.7	5-	$E_{\gamma}$ , $I_{\gamma}$ : cannot Be resolved from annihilation radiation. From Adopted
						Gammas, $E\gamma = 510.72$ 7 and $I\gamma/I\gamma(233\gamma + 1095\gamma) = 31.9$ 18.
		1095.0 <i>1</i>	100 5	2614.5	3-	
3920.4	6-	211.7 <i>1</i>	52 <i>3</i>	3709.2	5-	
		722.2 1	100 5	3197.7	5-	
3946.6	4-	748.9 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	
3961.7	5-	253.3 <i>1</i>	37 2	3709.2	5-	
		763.2 1	100 5	3197.7	5-	
3995.5	4-	797.7 <i>1</i>	39 2	3197.7	5-	
		1381.0 <i>I</i>	100 5	2614.5	3-	
4037.5	$7^{-}$	839.8 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	
4051.3	3-	576.1 <i>1</i>	29 1	3475.1	4-	
		1436.8 <i>1</i>	100 5	2614.5	3-	
4085.4	$2^{+}$	4085.4 1		0.0		
4125.6	5-	927.9 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	
4180.9	5-	983.2 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	
4206.0	6-	1008.3 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	
4229.6	2-	1615.2 <i>1</i>	100 5	2614.5	3-	
	_	4229.5 1	20 1	0.0		
4254.9	3-	779.7 1	61	3475.1	4-	
		1640.4 <i>1</i>	100 5	2614.5	3-	
4261.8	4-	787.0 1	56 <i>3</i>	3475.1	4-	
		1647.0 <i>I</i>	100 5	2614.5	3-	
4296.7	5-	586.8 <i>1</i>	63 <b>#</b> 3	3709.2	5-	
		822.3 1	100 <sup>#</sup> 5	3475.1	4-	
4324.5	$4^{+}$	363.0 1	29 1	3961.7	5-	
		1126.5 <i>1</i>	100 5	3197.7	5-	
4358.7	4-	883.6 1	20 <sup>@</sup> 1	3475.1	4-	
		1161.1 2	100 <sup>@</sup> 5	3197.7	$5^{-}$	
4382.6	6-	1184.9 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	
4423.6	$6^{+}$	1225.9 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	$E_{\gamma}$ : multiplet.
4481.0	6-	1283.3 <i>I</i>		3197.7	5-	
4610.6	$8^{+}$	1412.9 <i>1</i>		3197.7	5-	
4698.1	3-	436.4	24 1	4261.8	4-	$E_{\gamma}$ : rounded-off value taken by the evaluator from (d,p $\gamma$ ). Value of 439.0 <i>I</i> reported by 1996Ra07 is a poor fit.
		443.7 1	46 2	4254.9	3-	
		468.8	14 <i>1</i>	4229.6	2-	$E_{\gamma}$ : rounded-off value taken by the evaluator from (d,p $\gamma$ ). Value of 465.2 <i>I</i> reported by 1996Ra07 is a poor fit.
		647.2 <i>1</i>	5 1	4051.3	3-	
		1223.4 <sup>‡</sup> 3	100 <sup>‡</sup> <i>30</i>	3475.1	4-	

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

<sup>208</sup> <b>Pb(p,p</b>	$(\gamma),^{207}$	$Pb(d,p\gamma)$	(continued)
------------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------------

# $\gamma$ <sup>(208</sup>Pb) (continued)

E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$\mathbf{E}_f = \mathbf{J}_f^{\pi}$	Mult.	Comments
4698.1	3-	1500.0 1	33 11	3197.7 5-		
		2083.9 1	36.2	2614.5 3-		
		4698.1 <i>1</i>	61	0.0		
4841.5	1-	4841.5 <i>1</i>		0.0		$I_{\gamma}$ : 1981Di08 report branching=93% 7.
4870	0+	4870 3		0.0	EO	$E_{\gamma}$ ,Mult.: from ce spectrum (1987Ju06). The authors' energy value of 4866 2 has been corrected to 4870 3 (private communication to the evaluator from R. Julin, May, 2004) the E0 character is based on observation of strong ce lines with No corresponding photon transition. K/L=6.4 9 (1990Tr01).
4936.2	3-	2322.8 2	100 5	2614.5 3-		
4074.2	2-	4936.0 1	/ 1	0.0		
4974.2	3	/19.0 /	5I	4254.9 3		
		1500.0 1	21.6	34/5.1 4		
		1776.5 1	94 5	3197.7 5-		
		2359.5 1	100 5	$2614.5  3^{-}$		
		4972.8 <i>3</i>	11	0.0		
5037.7	3-	808.0 1	91	4229.6 2-		
		1562.8 <i>1</i>	12 <i>I</i>	3475.1 4-		
		2423.0 1	100 5	2614.5 3-		
50802	$(1^{-})$	5080 <mark>&amp;</mark>		0.0		E.: reported only by $1968Cr05$ with branching= $67\%$ 21
5085 5	7-	87951		$4206.0 6^{-}$		Ly. reported only by 1900eros with branching 07% 21.
5127.4	2-	1652.3.1	61	$3475 1 4^{-}$		
5127.1	2	2512.8.7	100 5	$2614.5 3^{-1}$		
		5127.5.2	14 1	0.0		
5241	$0^{+}$	2626.6	1   1	2614.5 3-		not seen In $(p,p'\gamma)$ . E is from Adopted Gammas. From a study of $(P,P'ce)$ , 2005Or02 deduce an intensity limit of $I(\gamma+ce)/Ti(5241)$
		5241 3		0.0	E0	$E_{\gamma}$ ,Mult.: from cc spectrum (1987Ju06). The authors' energy value of 5237 2 has been corrected to 5241 3 (private communication to the evaluator from R. Julin, May, 2004) the E0 character is based on observation of strong cc lines with No corresponding photon transition, 2005Or02 report E=5241.1.
5245.2	3-	1770.2 2	8 1	3475.1 4-		I
		2630.7 1	100 5	2614.5 3-		
		5244.4 10	21	0.0		
5280.5	$0^{-}$	439.0 1	36.2	4841.5 1-		
		1051.0 7	100.5	4229.6 2-		
5292.1	1-	5292.17	100 0	0.0		Let 1981Di08 report branching=80% 8
5385.6	3-	1156.3 7	100.5	4229.6 2-		-y
000010	6	2771.1 1	98.30	2614.5 3-		
		5384.5.3	24.2	0.0		
5480.8	5-	1355.2.7	2.2	4125.6 5-		
5490.3	4-	2292.6.5		3197.7 5-		
5511.9	1-	5511.9.7		0.0		L.: 1981Di08 report branching>67%
5548.2	$2^{+}$	2933 7 1	100.5	2614.5 3-		19.19010100 report branching $= 07.70$ .
5510.2	2	5547 9 18	21	0.0		
5563.6	3-	2949 1 1	21	$2614.5 3^{-1}$		
5601.7	$0^{-} 1^{-}$	75773	30.2	4841 5 1 <sup>-</sup>		
5001.7	0,1	1372.6.1	100 5	4220.6 2-		
		1372.01	100 5	4229.0 2		
5630?		5630		0.0		$E_{\gamma}$ : reported only by 1968Cr05 with branching $\geq 49\%$ .
5641.4	$1,2^{+}$	5641.4 5		0.0		
5737.8		1314.2 3		4423.6 6+		
5777.8	2-,3-	3163.3 1	100 5	2614.5 3-		
		5777.8 <i>5</i>	11 <i>1</i>	0.0		
5802.9	$1,2^{+}$	5802.9 8		0.0		
5813.1	3-	2338.3 2	100 5	3475.1 4-		I <sub><math>\gamma</math></sub> : I $\gamma$ (2338 $\gamma$ )/I $\gamma$ (3199 $\gamma$ )=0.85 <i>14</i> In (d,p $\gamma$ ). This suggests that

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

#### $\gamma$ (<sup>208</sup>Pb) (continued)

E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$\mathbf{E}_f = \mathbf{J}_f^{\pi}$	Comments
					part of the 2338 $\gamma$ belongs elsewhere. In (n,n' $\gamma$ ), a 2338 $\gamma$ is placed from a 4953 level. IT is thus possible that this the 4953 level is being populated In (p,p' $\gamma$ ).
5813.1	3-	3198.3 2	56 <i>3</i>	2614.5 3-	
5873.7	3-	2398.6 1		3475.1 4-	
5885.4	3-	3270.9 <i>1</i>		2614.5 3-	
5923.7	1-,2-	678.6 <i>1</i>	26 1	5245.2 3-	
		949.6 <i>1</i>	100 5	4974.2 3-	
		1223.4 <sup>‡</sup> <i>3</i>	30 <sup>‡</sup> 10		
		1668.8 <i>1</i>	25 1	4254.9 3-	
		1694.1 <i>1</i>	10 <i>I</i>	4229.6 2-	
		1872.5 <i>I</i>	50 <i>3</i>	4051.3 3-	
		5923.3 5	13 <i>I</i>	0.0	
5946.8	1-	5946.8 <i>1</i>		0.0	$I_{\nu}$ : 1981Di08 report branching=78% 7.
5969.2	4-	1763.0 <i>1</i>	21 <i>I</i>	4206.0 6-	,
		2260.5 1	41 2	3709.2 5-	
		2771.1 <i>I</i>	100 30	3197.7 5-	
		5968.0 20	2 1	0.0	
6009.8	3-	1924.1 <i>3</i>	31 2	4085.4 2+	
		2534.7 1	100 5	3475.1 4-	
6086.9	1-	1113.1 <i>I</i>	54 <i>3</i>	4974.2 3-	
		1388.4 <i>1</i>	100 5	4698.1 3-	
		1832.2 <i>1</i>	88 4	4254.9 3-	
		1857.3 <i>1</i>	72 4	4229.6 2-	
		2035.7 1	88 4	4051.3 3-	
		3472.2 2	24 1	2614.5 3-	
		6087.1 5	51	0.0	
6263.6	1-	6263.6 1		0.0	$I_{\gamma}$ : 1981Di08 report branching $\geq$ 59%.
6313.8	1-	6313.8 <i>1</i>		0.0	$I_{\gamma}$ : 1981Di08 report branching=85% 8.
6361.5	1-	6361.5 <i>1</i>		0.0	
6394	3-	2433 <i>3</i>		3961.7 5-	
6444.3	3-	2449.2 2	100 5	3995.5 4-	
		6443.7 <i>3</i>	90 <i>5</i>	0.0	
6486.4	1-	6486.4 2		0.0	$I_{\gamma}$ : 1968Cr05 report branching=60 17.
6551.8		3937.3 1	100 5	2614.5 3	
((1= 0	2-	6551.8 2	14 1	0.0	
6617.0	3	2435.9 3	100 5	4180.9 5	
((57.1	4+	4002.7 2	95 5	2614.5 3	
6657.1	4'	4042.6 2		2614.5 3	
6682.3	(5)	4067.8 2		2614.5 3	
6692.0	1 -	2211.0.5		4481.0 6	
6/18.4	1	0/18.4 3		0.0	$I_{\gamma}$ : 1968Cr05 report branching=6.7% 19.
0/40.1	3	2581.4 1		4358.7 4	
0800.9	1-	2304.2 20		4290./ 3	
7002.1	1 1-	7002.1 1		0.0	$1 \cdot 1076\text{Er}^{-11}$ report broughing $-50\%$ 12
7082.7	1 1 <sup></sup>	7082.7 3		0.0	$1_{\gamma}$ . 1970f121 report branching=30% 15.
7241.4	1	1241.4 I		0.0	
/316		/316 8		0.0	$E_{\gamma}$ : 19/6Fr21 report a level At 7316 8 In (p,p') and state that there is an indication of ground-state $\gamma$ strength. The 7316 peak was separated from an <sup>16</sup> O contaminant In the (p,p') data.

<sup>†</sup> The I $\gamma$  are from 1996Ra07. The E $\gamma$  are from 1997Ra17. 1996Ra07 studied (p,p' $\gamma$ ) and (d,p $\gamma$ ), but quote only one set of data for the two experiments. The revised E $\gamma$  data from 1997Ra17 are from a new (d,p $\gamma$ ) experiment. The I $\gamma$  are relative branching ratios

### $\gamma(^{208}\text{Pb})$ (continued)

from each level. Ground-state branching ratios have been determined for some transitions by 1981Di08 based on P' $\gamma$  coincidence data and  $\sigma$  data of 1967Mo25 In (p,p'). These values are given In comments.

- <sup>‡</sup> 1996Ra07 report a multiplet At  $E\gamma$ =1222.2 *3* placed from the 4698 and 5923 levels. A comparison with branching In (d,p $\gamma$ ) for the 5923 level suggests that the placement from that level should Be nearly three times the value shown.  $E\gamma$  for both placements are taken by the evaluator from the energy level difference.
- <sup>#</sup> From  $I\gamma(822\gamma)/I\gamma(588\gamma)=0.57$  8 In (d,p $\gamma$ ) and 0.64 4 In (n,n' $\gamma$ ), compared with  $I\gamma(588\gamma)/I\gamma(822\gamma)=0.63$  5 here suggests that the intensities of the 821 $\gamma$  and 588 $\gamma$  should Be interchanged.

<sup>&</sup> Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(a)</sup> From  $I\gamma(1160\gamma)/I\gamma(884\gamma)=0.39$  7 In (d,p $\gamma$ ) and 0.37 5 In (n,n' $\gamma$ ), compared with  $I\gamma(884\gamma)/I\gamma(1160\gamma)=0.20$  2 here suggests that the intensities of the 884 $\gamma$  and 1160 $\gamma$  should Be interchanged.

Legend

Level Scheme

Intensities: Relative photon branching from each level

 $--- \rightarrow \gamma$  Decay (Uncertain)



 $^{208}_{\ 82} Pb_{126}$ 

Legend

#### Level Scheme (continued)

Intensities: Relative photon branching from each level

 $--- \rightarrow \gamma$  Decay (Uncertain)



 $^{208}_{\ 82} Pb_{126}$ 

#### Level Scheme (continued)

Intensities: Relative photon branching from each level



 $^{208}_{\ 82} \mathrm{Pb}_{126}$