

$^{208}\text{Tl} \beta^-$ decay

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

Parent: ^{208}Tl : $E=0.0$; $J^\pi=5^+$; $T_{1/2}=3.053$ min 4; $Q(\beta^-)=4999.0$ 17; $\% \beta^-$ decay=100.0

 ^{208}Pb Levels

The level scheme is that of [1975Ko02](#) and is based on extensive coincidence data. [2004BeZQ](#) suggest placement of the 808.3 and 835.9 transitions as feeding the 3475 level, giving new levels at 4283.4 and 4311.0. The evaluator has not adopted these placements since the resulting levels have not been seen in any other reaction. These transitions do not fit between any of the known levels below the ^{208}Tl $Q(\beta^-)$ value of 5000. Furthermore, as pointed out by [1997Sc21](#), all the states expected from single-particle-single-hole excitations up to the 8^+ state at 4611 have been identified.

E(level)	J^π	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0	0^+		
2614.529 10	3^-	16.7 ps 3	$g=0.54$ 7 $T_{1/2}$: from Adopted Levels, based on B(E3) in Coulomb excitation and (e,e'). 1962We14 report 32 ps 11 from $\gamma\gamma(t)$. g -factor: weighted average of 1969Bo12 ($\omega\tau/H=5.9\times 10^{-8}$ 15) and 1973ScYX ($\omega\tau/H=6.3\times 10^{-8}$ 9) with $T_{1/2}=16.7$ ps 3 (see Adopted Levels).
3197.717 11	5^-	294 ps 15	$g=0.023$ 5 $T_{1/2}$: weighted average of $\beta\text{ce}(t)$ data of 1971Va24 (286 ps 26) and $\gamma\gamma(t)$ data of 1962We14 (298 ps 18). Others: 1954El07 , 1954El24 . g : from 1969Bo01 based on $\omega\tau/\omega\tau(2614 \text{ level})=0.74$ 12, g -factor(2614 level)=0.54 7, with $T_{1/2}(2614 \text{ level})=16.7$ ps 3 and $T_{1/2}(3197 \text{ level})=294$ ps 15. Other: 1965Jo12 .
3475.088 11	4^-	4 ps 3	$T_{1/2}$: from $\beta\text{ce}(t)$ (1971Va24).
3708.41 7	5^-	<100 ps	$T_{1/2}$: from $\beta\text{ce}(t)$ (1954El24).
3919.78 10	6^-		
3946.42 20	4^-		
3960.93 7	5^-	≤ 18 ps	$T_{1/2}$: from $\beta\text{ce}(t)$ (1971Va24).
3995.6 5	4^-		
4125.28 17	5^-		
4180.38 17	5^-		
4262.0 7	4^-		
4296.28 20	5^-		
4323.4 4	4^+		
4358.44 17	4^-		
4382.9 3	6^-		
4480.5 3	6^-		

 β^- radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^{-\ddagger}$	Log ft	Comments
(518.5 17)	4480.5	0.052 5	6.67 5	av $E\beta=154.43$ 59
(616.1 17)	4382.9	0.017 5	7.4 2	av $E\beta=187.88$ 61
(640.6 17)	4358.44	0.044 5	7.05 5	av $E\beta=196.43$ 60
(675.6 18)	4323.4	0.005 2	8.1 2	av $E\beta=208.79$ 62
(702.7 17)	4296.28	0.101 21	6.83 9	av $E\beta=218.44$ 62
(737.0 18)	4262.0	0.002 1	8.6 2	av $E\beta=230.73$ 67
(818.6 17)	4180.38	0.227 9	6.70 2	av $E\beta=260.44$ 63
(873.7 17)	4125.28	0.175 23	6.92 6	av $E\beta=280.78$ 64
(1003.4 18)	3995.6	0.007 3	8.5 2	av $E\beta=329.64$ 68
(1038.1 17)	3960.93	3.18 6	5.92 1	av $E\beta=342.90$ 66

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

²⁰⁸Tl β⁻ decay (continued)

β⁻ radiations (continued)

E(decay)	E(level)	Iβ ⁻ †‡	Log ft	Comments
(1052.6 17)	3946.42	0.046 3	7.78 3	av Eβ=348.43 66
(1079.2 17)	3919.78	0.63 5	6.68 4	av Eβ=358.70 66
(1290.6 17)	3708.41	24.2 3	5.38 1	av Eβ=441.53 68
(1523.9 17)	3475.088	22.2 5	5.68 1	av Eβ=535.39 70
(1801.3 17)	3197.717	49.1 7	5.61 1	av Eβ=649.48 71

† From I(γ+ce) imbalance for each level.

‡ Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

γ(²⁰⁸Pb)

I_γ normalization: from the decay scheme one has the requirement that the total intensity of the 2614γ, gammas, conversion electrons, and internal pairs, is 100.

γγ(θ): 1961Si11, 1962Wo05, 1964Sp06, 1967Jo17, 1972Ja25, 1976Av03. The following cascades have been studied:

The transitions in parentheses denote intermediate unobserved transitions. From 1), data of 1967Jo17 and 1972Ja25 are consistent with mult(583γ)=Q. Data of 1961Si11 and 1962Wo05 require a small L=3 admixture. The data of 1972Ja25 allow δ(O/Q)<0.008 and negative. From T_{1/2}(3197 level) and the recommended upper limit on γ-ray strengths Q must be E2 with δ(M3/E2)<0.0012.

The evaluator adopts mult=E2 from 2), values of +0.013 11 (1962Wo05), +0.014 12 (1972Ja25), and +0.015 12 (1976Av03) give a weighted average of δ(860γ)=+0.014 8. 1961Si11 report δ=+0.032 6. From 3), data of 1976Av03 yield δ(277γ)=+0.008 11. From 4), data of 1976Av03 yield δ(511γ)=-0.052 45 or -0.68 8. From 5), data of 1976Av03 yield δ(722γ)=+0.31 7. From 6), data of 1976Av03 yield δ(763γ)=-0.01 6 from 7), data of 1961Si11 yield δ(763γ)=-0.16 +9-8. From 8), data of 1972Ja25 yield δ(277γ)=4.8 4, in disagreement with 3) and with ce data. These data of 1972Ja25 are not used. From 9), data of 1972Ja25 yield δ(511γ)≈-0.8, in agreement with the large solution from 4).

- 1) 583γ-2615γ, 2) 860γ-2615γ, 3) 277γ-583γ, 4) 511γ-583γ,
- 5) 722γ-583γ, 6) 763γ-583γ, 7) 763γ-(583γ)-2615γ,
- 8) 277γ-(583γ)-2615γ, 9) 511γ-(583γ)-2615γ.

E _γ †	I _γ ‡α	E _i (level)	J _i ^π	E _f	J _f ^π	Mult.&	δ [#]	a ^b	Comments
211.40 15	0.18 1	3919.78	6 ⁻	3708.41	5 ⁻	M1(+E2)	+0.04 [@] +7-6	1.126 16	α(K)=0.922 16; α(L)=0.1586 23; α(M)=0.0372 6; α(N+..)=0.01153 17 α(N)=0.00945 14; α(O)=0.00188 3; α(P)=0.000201 3 Mult.: from α(K)exp=0.89 (1957Kr56) and α(L1)exp=0.14 (1957Vo22).
233.36 15	0.31 1	3708.41	5 ⁻	3475.088	4 ⁻	M1+E2	≈0.6	≈0.70	α(K)≈0.547; α(L)≈0.1155; α(M)≈0.0277; α(N+..)≈0.00854 α(N)≈0.00704; α(O)≈0.001373; α(P)≈0.0001297 Mult.,δ: α(L1)exp=0.10 2 (1957Vo22) gives δ<0.7, and α(K)exp=0.45 9 (1957Kr56) gives δ=0.9 3. No L2 or L3 lines were seen in the spectrum of 1957Vo22, suggesting mult mainly M1; however, δ=0.6

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{208}\text{Tl}\beta^-$ decay (continued) $\gamma(^{208}\text{Pb})$ (continued)

E_γ [†]	I_γ ^{‡a}	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. &	$\delta^\#$	a^b	Comments
252.61 10	0.78 2	3960.93	5 ⁻	3708.41	5 ⁻	M1(+E2)	-0.35 [@] 10	0.63 3	gives L1:L2:L3=100:27:11, consistent with the non-observation of these lines. $\alpha(\text{K})=0.51$ 3; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.0941$ 19; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.0222$ 4; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=0.00688$ 13 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.00565$ 10; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.001117$ 22; $\alpha(\text{P})=0.000115$ 5 Mult.: from $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.49$ 17 (1978Av01), 0.52 11 (1957Vo22).
277.371 5	6.6 3	3475.088	4 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻	M1+E2	+0.017 11	0.533	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.436$ 7; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.0745$ 11; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.01744$ 25; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=0.00541$ 8 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.00443$ 7; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.000884$ 13; $\alpha(\text{P})=9.45\times 10^{-5}$ 14 E_γ : from the decay scheme (860.557 4 – 583.187 2) (corrected for recoil). 1977Ku25 report 277.351 10. A revision upward to 277.359 10 is required to account for changes in the energies of the calibration lines used by 1977Ku25. Other: 277.35 6 (1952Mu45). Mult.: from $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.36$ 4 (1978Av01), and $\alpha(\text{L})\text{exp}=0.075$ 10 (1963Da11). Other: 1957Vo22.
485.95 15 510.77 10	0.049 4 22.6 2	3960.93 3708.41	5 ⁻ 5 ⁻	3475.088 3197.717	4 ⁻ 5 ⁻	M1+E2	-0.052 45	0.1027 16	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.0842$ 13; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.01419$ 21; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.00332$ 5; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=0.001029$ 15 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000842$ 13; $\alpha(\text{O})=0.0001680$ 25; $\alpha(\text{P})=1.80\times 10^{-5}$ 3 Mult.: $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.080$ 4 (1978Av01) and 0.087 5 (1963Da11) give $\delta<0.39$ and <0.20 , respectively. Other: $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.082$ 17 (1956Kr57). From $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ one gets $\delta=-0.052$ 45 or -0.68 8. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}$ rules out the larger solution. Note, however, that $\delta=-0.52$ +7-5 is reported in (n,n' γ).
583.187 2	85.0 3	3197.717	5 ⁻	2614.529	3 ⁻	E2		0.0205	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.01511$ 22; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.00411$ 6; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.001010$ 15; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=0.000309$ 5 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000256$ 4; $\alpha(\text{O})=4.88\times 10^{-5}$ 7; $\alpha(\text{P})=4.05\times 10^{-6}$ 6

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{208}\text{Tl}\beta^{-}$ decay (continued) $\gamma(^{208}\text{Pb})$ (continued)

E_{γ}^{\dagger}	$I_{\gamma}^{\ddagger a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^{π}	E_f	J_f^{π}	Mult. &	$\delta^{\#}$	α^b	Comments
									E_{γ} : from 2000He14. Mult.: from $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}=0.0152$ 11 (1954E107). $\alpha(\text{K})=0.01511$ (E2 theory). Mult=Q is confirmed by $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$. E_{γ} : from energy level difference.
587.7	0.06 2	4296.28	5 ⁻	3708.41	5 ⁻				
650.1 3	0.05 2	4125.28	5 ⁻	3475.088	4 ⁻				
705.2 3	0.022 4	4180.38	5 ⁻	3475.088	4 ⁻				
722.04 12	0.24 4	3919.78	6 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻	M1+E2	+0.31 7	0.0390 12	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.0320$ 11; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.00539$ 16; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.00126$ 4; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=0.000391$ 11 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000320$ 9; $\alpha(\text{O})=6.38\times 10^{-5}$ 18; $\alpha(\text{P})=6.81\times 10^{-6}$ 21 Mult.: from $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}\approx 0.045$ (1978Av01) and $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$.
748.7 2	0.046 3	3946.42	4 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻				
763.13 8	1.79 3	3960.93	5 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻	M1+E2	-0.12 5	0.0356 6	E_{γ} : from 1969Br24. E_{γ}, I_{γ} : reported only by 1993E108.
^x 808.3 2	0.030 7								
821.2 2	0.041 4	4296.28	5 ⁻	3475.088	4 ⁻				
^x 835.9 2	0.076 11								
860.557 4	12.5 1	3475.088	4 ⁻	2614.529	3 ⁻	M1+E2	+0.014 8	0.0264	E_{γ}, I_{γ} : reported only by 1993E108. $\alpha(\text{K})=0.0217$ 3; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.00360$ 5; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.000839$ 12; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=0.000260$ 4 $\alpha(\text{N})=0.000213$ 3; $\alpha(\text{O})=4.26\times 10^{-5}$ 6; $\alpha(\text{P})=4.57\times 10^{-6}$ 7 E_{γ} : 1979He10 report 860.564 5. The evaluator has decreased this value by 7 eV to correct for the change in energy of the 110m $\alpha\gamma$ calibration line from 884.6852 30 in 1979He10 to 884.6781 13 in 2000He14. Mult.: from $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}=0.0246$ 10 (1978Av01), 0.026 4 (1963Da11), and 0.024 (1957Vo22).
883.3 2	0.031 3	4358.44	4 ⁻	3475.088	4 ⁻				
927.6 2	0.125 11	4125.28	5 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻				
982.7 2	0.205 8	4180.38	5 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻				
^x 1004	<0.005								E_{γ}, I_{γ} : reported only by 1969Pa02 with $I(\gamma)\approx 0.01$. The I_{γ} limit is from 1975Ko02. I_{γ} : other: 0.36 7 (2005VaZZ).
1093.9 2	0.43 2	3708.41	5 ⁻	2614.529	3 ⁻				
1125.7 4	0.005 2	4323.4	4 ⁺	3197.717	5 ⁻				
1160.8 3	0.011 3	4358.44	4 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻				
1185.2 3	0.017 5	4382.9	6 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻				
1282.8 3	0.052 5	4480.5	6 ⁻	3197.717	5 ⁻				
1381.1 5	0.007 3	3995.6	4 ⁻	2614.529	3 ⁻				
1647.5 7	0.002 1	4262.0	4 ⁻	2614.529	3 ⁻				E_{γ} : unplaced by authors. Placed by evaluator on the basis of data in (d, γ) and (n,n' γ).
1744.0 7	0.002 1	4358.44	4 ⁻	2614.529	3 ⁻				
2614.511 10	99.754 4	2614.529	3 ⁻	0.0	0 ⁺	E3		0.00247	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.001712$ 24; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.000293$ 5; $\alpha(\text{M})=6.87\times 10^{-5}$ 10;

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

²⁰⁸Tl β⁻ decay (continued)

γ(²⁰⁸Pb) (continued)

<u>E_γ[†]</u>	<u>I_γ^{‡a}</u>	<u>E_i(level)</u>	<u>J_i^π</u>	<u>E_f</u>	<u>J_f^π</u>	<u>Mult.^{&}</u>	<u>α^b</u>	<u>Comments</u>
								α(N+..)=0.000392 6 α(N)=1.743×10 ⁻⁵ 25; α(O)=3.46×10 ⁻⁶ 5; α(P)=3.62×10 ⁻⁷ 5; α(IPF)=0.000371 6 E _γ : from 2000He14. Mult.: α(K)exp=0.00217 24 (1963Da11), 0.00178 12 (1954El07), 0.00183 26 (1956Kr57, 1957Vo22). The E3 theory value is 0.001712. α: includes internal pair formation. α=0.00210, α(IPF)=0.00037. α(K)=0.00266 4; α(L)=0.000506 7; α(M)=0.0001204 17; α(N+..)=3.73×10 ⁻⁵ 6 α(N)=3.06×10 ⁻⁵ 5; α(O)=6.06×10 ⁻⁶ 9; α(P)=6.24×10 ⁻⁷ 9 E _γ : rounded-off value from E(level). I _γ : from 2005VaZZ. Transition not observed. E _γ : rounded-off value from E(level). I _γ : from 2005VaZZ. Transition not observed. E _γ : rounded-off value from E(level). I _γ : from 2005VaZZ. Transition not observed. E _γ : rounded-off value from E(level). I _γ : from 2005VaZZ. Transition not observed.
3197.7	≤0.007	3197.717	5 ⁻	0.0	0 ⁺	[E5]	0.00333	
3475.1	≤0.003	3475.088	4 ⁻	0.0	0 ⁺			
3708.4	≤0.004	3708.41	5 ⁻	0.0	0 ⁺			
3960.9	≤0.003	3960.93	5 ⁻	0.0	0 ⁺			

[†] From 1975Ko02, except where noted otherwise. Values quoted from 2000He14 are based on E(¹⁹⁸Au γ)=411.80205 17. Others: 1969La23, 1969Pa02, 1973Da38.

[‡] Values given are intensities per 100 disintegrations of ²⁰⁸Tl As recommended by 2004BeZQ, with two corrections made by the evaluator. I_γ(927.6γ) should be 0.125 11 rather than 0.125 1, As reported by 2004BeZQ, and I_γ(2614γ) should be 99.754 4 rather than 99.79 1. In the case of the 2614γ, the authors of 2004BeZQ obtained I_γ from the requirement I_γ=100/(1+α), with α=0.00210 6 taken from 1978Ro22 with an uncertainty of 3% assigned to α. The internal pair formation coefficient cannot be ignored. The requirement should read I_γ=100/(1+α+α(IPF)). With α taken As 0.00210 and α(IPF) taken As 0.00037 (2005KiZT) with a 1.4% uncertainty assigned to these quantities, one gets I_γ(2614γ)=99.754 4. The following sources were used by 2004BeZQ In their evaluation: 1960Em01, 1960Sc07, 1961Si11, 1969Au10, 1969La23, 1969Pa02, 1973Da38, 1972Ja25, 1975Ko02, 1977Ge12, 1978Av01, 1982Sa36, 1983Sc13, 1983Va22, 1984Ge07, 1992Li05, and 1993El08.

From γγ(θ) except where noted otherwise.

@ From (n,n'γ) As given In Adopted Gammas.

& From ce data. Data of 1956Kr57, 1963Da11, and 1978Av01 are normalized to the I_γ data so that α(K)(583γ)=0.01516 (E2 theory). Data of 1957Zh05 and 1957Vo22 are normalized to the data of 1956Kr57. A summary of the data of 1956Kr57, 1957Zh05 and 1957Vo22 is given In 1957Kr56. The α(K)exp values of 1954El07 are from Ice(K)/I_γ with calibrated detectors.

^a Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

^b 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.

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

^{208}Tl β^- decay

Decay Scheme

Intensities: $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$ per 100 parent decays

Legend

- $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_\gamma^{max}$
- $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_\gamma^{max}$
- $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_\gamma^{max}$

