

$^{196}\text{Pt}(^{16}\text{O},4n\gamma)$ **1983Tr03,1981Ho29**

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

1981Ho29 E=85-110 MeV. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\sigma(E,\theta)$, $\gamma\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma(t)$.

1983Tr03 E=89 MeV. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, I_{ce} , $\sigma(\theta)$, $\gamma\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma(t)$.

Other: **1979BaXU**.

 ^{208}Rn Levels

The level scheme is that proposed by **1983Tr03**. Differences between this scheme and that of **1981Ho29**, mainly in the high-lying levels, are discussed by **1983Tr03**. Other: **1979BaXU**.

E(level)	$J^{\pi\dagger}$	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0	0^+		
635.8 2	2^+		
1188.9 2	4^+		
1414.3 2	4^+		
1578.0 4	$(5,6)^+$		
1658.6 3	5^+		
1739.6 3	6^+		
1828.3 4	8^+	487 ns 17	$T_{1/2}$: weighted average of values of 1981Ho29 (473 ns 11) and 1983Tr03 (509 ns 14). Other: 1979BaXU (490 ns 40).
2163.4 4	10^+		
2319.4 4	9^-		
2465.1 4	10^+		
2618.1 4	10^-	11.8 ns 7	$T_{1/2}$: from 1983Tr03 . Others: 1979BaXU (21 ns 5), 1981Ho29 (17 ns 3).
2621.2 4	11^-	3.5 ns 7	$T_{1/2}$: from 1983Tr03 .
2797.4 4	12^+		
2935.2 [‡] 5	13		
2954.5 4	13		
3080.8 [‡] 6	14		
3110.8 4	12^+		
3198.3 4	12^-		
3389.3 4	13^-		
3413.1 [‡] 6	15		
3469.0 4	14^+	3.5 ns 14	$T_{1/2}$: from 1983Tr03 .
3520.7 4	13^-		
3779.1 4	14^-		
3851.7 [‡] 6	16		
3925.2 4	15^-		
4066.4 5	16^-	18.3 ns 4	$T_{1/2}$: from 1983Tr03 . Other: 1981Ho29 (20 ns 2).
4524.6 5	16		
4832.6 5	18^-		
5178.3 5	19^-		
5377.0 5	19		
5930.6 6	21		

[†] From **1983Tr03** based on γ multiplicities, $\gamma(\theta)$ and lifetime data.

[‡] The order of the 138, 146, 332 and 439 has not been established and thus the levels at 2935, 3081, 3413 and 3852 are not uniquely determined.

$^{196}\text{Pt}(^{16}\text{O},4n\gamma)$ **1983Tr03,1981Ho29** (continued)

$\gamma(^{208}\text{Rn})$									
E_γ [†]	I_γ [†]	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	α^c	$I_{(\gamma+ce)}$	Comments
3.1		2621.2	11 ⁻	2618.1	10 ⁻			≈49	E_γ : not observed. Existence inferred from coincidence data. E_γ from energy level differences. Mult.: from decay scheme, multipolarity=M1 or E2. Note that $B(M1)(\text{W.u.})\approx 0.039$, $B(E2)(\text{W.u.})\approx 4.9\times 10^2$ for $\alpha=4.43\times 10^3(M1)$, $1.33\times 10^7(E2)$ (values from 2005KiZT) and $Ti(3.1\gamma)\approx 89\%$. Note that the α values do not include any M-shell conversion since the transition energy is very close to the M-shell binding energies. The $B(M1)(\text{W.u.})$ and $B(E2)(\text{W.u.})$ values are thus upper limits. $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$: $I(\gamma+ce)\approx 53$ from intensity balance At the 2618 level. From intensity balance At the 2621 level one obtains $I(\gamma+ce)\approx 45$.
81		1739.6	6 ⁺	1658.6	5 ⁺			≈6.4	not observed. Existence inferred from coincidence data. $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$: from intensity balance At the 1658 level, $I(\gamma+ce)=6.4$ 7 relative to $I_\gamma(635.8\gamma)=100$.
88.7 2	8.0 10	1828.3	8 ⁺	1739.6	6 ⁺	E2	14.4		Mult.: from measured I_γ and $I(\gamma+ce)$ determined from an intensity balance of delayed components At the 1828 level the authors obtain $\alpha=20$ 4. $\alpha(\text{theory})=14.4$ (E2), 3.8 (M1).
137.8 ^d 3	2.4 7	2935.2?	13	2797.4	12 ⁺	D&			Mult.: $A_2=-0.36$ 8, $A_4=+0.11$ 9.
141.2 2	1.9 5	4066.4	16 ⁻	3925.2	15 ⁻	M1	5.17		Mult.: from measured I_γ and $I(\gamma+ce)$ determined from an intensity balance of delayed components At the 3925 level the authors obtain $\alpha=5.9$ 12. $A_2=-0.11$ 17, $A_4=+0.31$ 19.
145.6 ^d 3	1.7 7	3080.8?	14	2935.2?	13	D&			Mult.: $A_2=-0.52$ 24, $A_4=+0.08$ 23 for the 145.6 + 146.2 transitions. The 146.2 γ has mult=M1.
146.2 3	2.1 7	3925.2	15 ⁻	3779.1	14 ⁻	M1	4.68		Mult.: from measured I_γ and $I(\gamma+ce)$ determined from an intensity balance of delayed components At the 3739 level, the authors obtain $\alpha=4.2$ 13. $\alpha(\text{theory})=4.68$ (M1), 1.74 (E2).
153.0 1	1.4 4	2618.1	10 ⁻	2465.1	10 ⁺	[E1]	0.167		Mult.: $A_2=+0.06$ 9, $A_4=+0.17$ 11.
156.1 2	5.3 5	2621.2	11 ⁻	2465.1	10 ⁺	E1	0.159		Mult.: $A_2=-0.15$ 4, $A_4=+0.06$ 4. From measured I_γ and $I(\gamma+ce)$ determined from an intensity balance of delayed components At the 2465 level, the authors obtain $\alpha=0.56$ 45. $\alpha(\text{theory})=0.16$ (E1), 4.0 (M1).
157.1 2	3.1 5	2954.5	13	2797.4	12 ⁺	D&			Mult.: $A_2=-0.23$ 12, $A_4=+0.09$ 12.
161.6 3	3.5 7	1739.6	6 ⁺	1578.0	(5,6) ⁺				
163.7 5	1.2 5	1578.0	(5,6) ⁺	1414.3	4 ⁺				
191.0 1	1.9 3	3389.3	13 ⁻	3198.3	12 ⁻	D&			Mult.: $A_2=-0.26$ 6, $A_4=+0.15$ 8 gives

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{196}\text{Pt}(^{16}\text{O},4n\gamma)$ **1983Tr03,1981Ho29** (continued) $\gamma(^{208}\text{Rn})$ (continued)

E_γ [†]	I_γ [†]	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	δ	α^C	Comments
225.5 2	1.8 4	1414.3	4 ⁺	1188.9	4 ⁺	M1		1.38	mult=dipole. Placement In the level scheme requires $\Delta\pi=\text{No}$. Mult.: $A_2=-0.08$ 9, $A_4=-0.15$ 11. Mult=M1 from $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}$ In ^{208}Fr ε decay.
258.4 1	13.6 5	3779.1	14 ⁻	3520.7	13 ⁻	D		0.947	Mult.: $A_2=-0.33$ 2, $A_4=+0.01$ 2 give mult=dipole. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}\leq 0.8$ 3 gives mult= E1, E2, or M1. Placement In the level scheme requires $\Delta\pi=\text{No}$.
298.7 1	6.9 4	2618.1	10 ⁻	2319.4	9 ⁻	M1		0.635	Mult.: $A_2=-0.05$ 4, $A_4=+0.03$ 4. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.8$ 3, $\alpha(\text{L})\text{exp}=0.11$ 5.
322.4 1	11.5 6	3520.7	13 ⁻	3198.3	12 ⁻	M1		0.515	Mult.: $A_2=-0.37$ 5, $A_4=+0.02$ 5. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.6$ 3, $\alpha(\text{L})\text{exp}=0.16$ 8.
325.3 1	65 3	1739.6	6 ⁺	1414.3	4 ⁺	E2		0.110	Mult.: $A_2=+0.072$ 7, $A_4=-0.024$ 7. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.062$ 13, $\alpha(\text{L})\text{exp}=0.024$ 8.
332.3 1	6.4 10	2797.4	12 ⁺	2465.1	10 ⁺	(E2) [@]		0.104	
332.3 ^d 1	5.0 10	3413.1?	15	3080.8?	14	(M1) [@]		0.474	
335.1 1	12.0 12	2163.4	10 ⁺	1828.3	8 ⁺	E2 [@]		0.101	
345.7 2	6.1 11	5178.3	19 ⁻	4832.6	18 ⁻	M1		0.426	Mult.: $A_2=-0.27$ 8, $A_4=-0.05$ 9. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.39$ 8.
358.2 2	5.1 5	3469.0	14 ⁺	3110.8	12 ⁺	E2		0.084	Mult.: $A_2=+0.33$ 3, $A_4=-0.09$ 4. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}\leq 0.33$ 10.
389.2 5	1.3 6	1578.0	(5,6) ⁺	1188.9	4 ⁺	E2 [#]		0.067	
389.7 2	9.7 7	3779.1	14 ⁻	3389.3	13 ⁻	M1 [#]		0.308	
438.6 ^d 1	4.3 6	3851.7?	16	3413.1?	15	D ^{&}			Mult.: $A_2=-0.52$ 6, $A_4=+0.01$ 6.
456.2 1	5.4 5	3925.2	15 ⁻	3469.0	14 ⁺	D			Mult.: $A_2=-0.14$ 4, $A_4=-0.04$ 4. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}\leq 0.11$ 3. Placement In the level scheme requires $\Delta\pi=\text{yes}$.
469.7 1	5.4 6	1658.6	5 ⁺	1188.9	4 ⁺	M1		0.187	Mult.: $A_2=+0.02$ 4, $A_4=+0.03$ 4. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.15$ 3.
491.1 1	18.9 6	2319.4	9 ⁻	1828.3	8 ⁺	E1		0.0115	Mult.: $A_2=-0.05$ 2, $A_4=0.00$ 2. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}<0.015$ 3.
535.8 1	7.1 5	3925.2	15 ⁻	3389.3	13 ⁻	E2		0.0302	Mult.: $A_2=+0.10$ 6, $A_4=+0.02$ 6. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}\leq 0.046$ 10.
544.4 2	1.8 8	5377.0	19	4832.6	18 ⁻	D ^{&}			Mult.: $A_2=-0.20$ 10.
553.1 1	15.9 7	1188.9	4 ⁺	635.8	2 ⁺	E2		0.0280	Mult.: $A_2=+0.10$ 2, $A_4=0.00$ 2. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.021$ 4.
577.2 1	26.1 9	3198.3	12 ⁻	2621.2	11 ⁻	M1(+E2)	<0.7	0.094 13	Mult.: $A_2=-0.52$ 2, $A_4=+0.02$ 2. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.083$ 17, $\alpha(\text{L})\text{exp}=0.015$ 5. deexcites level above 2465 level.
^x 594.1 2	4.0 7								
634.0 3	6.7 17	2797.4	12 ⁺	2163.4	10 ⁺	E2 ^b		0.0207	Mult.: $A_2=+0.11$ 7, $A_4=-0.07$ 8.
635.8 2	100.0 21	635.8	2 ⁺	0	0 ⁺	E2 ^b		0.0206	Mult.: $A_2=+0.08$ 1, $A_4=-0.02$ 1.
636.7 2	31.3 25	2465.1	10 ⁺	1828.3	8 ⁺	E2 ^b		0.0205	Mult.: $A_2=+0.21$ 5, $A_4=-0.02$ 5.
645.7 1	8.2 8	3110.8	12 ⁺	2465.1	10 ⁺	E2		0.0199	Mult.: $A_2=+0.25$ 5, $A_4=-0.04$ 4. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}\leq 0.026$ 5.
745.5 2	2.4 5	4524.6	16	3779.1	14 ⁻	Q ^{&}			Mult.: $A_2=+0.27$ 9, $A_4=-0.19$ 8.
752.3 2	1.8 5	5930.6	21	5178.3	19 ⁻	Q ^{&}			Mult.: $A_2=+0.43$ 10, $A_4=-0.19$ 10.
766.2 2	9.1 7	4832.6	18 ⁻	4066.4	16 ⁻	E2 ^a		0.0139	Mult.: $A_2=+0.39$ 2, $A_4=-0.12$ 2.
768.2 2	15.2 8	3389.3	13 ⁻	2621.2	11 ⁻	E2 ^a		0.0139	Mult.: $A_2=+0.19$ 2, $A_4=-0.06$ 2.
778.5 1	77.1 12	1414.3	4 ⁺	635.8	2 ⁺	E2		0.0135	Mult.: $A_2=+0.082$ 6, $A_4=-0.017$ 6. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.010$ 2, $\alpha(\text{L})\text{exp}=0.0019$ 6.
789.7 1	35.5 9	2618.1	10 ⁻	1828.3	8 ⁺	M2		0.116	Mult.: $A_2=0.10$ 1, $A_4=-0.03$ 1. $\alpha(\text{K})\text{exp}=0.078$ 16, $\alpha(\text{L})\text{exp}=0.014$ 4.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{196}\text{Pt}(^{16}\text{O},4\text{n}\gamma)$ **1983Tr03,1981Ho29** (continued) $\gamma(^{208}\text{Rn})$ (continued)

E_γ [†]	I_γ [†]	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	α^c	Comments
899.5 1	9.5 6	3520.7	13 ⁻	2621.2	11 ⁻	E2	0.0101	Mult.: $A_2=+0.24$ 5, $A_4=-0.10$ 5. $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}=0.007$ 2.

[†] From **1983Tr03**. The I_γ are relative photon intensities.

[‡] From relative I_γ and I_{ce} data of **1983Tr03**. Normalization condition not given but $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}$ data are consistent with known multipolarity for the 779 γ . $\gamma(\theta)$ data are also invoked.

The 389.2 and 389.7 γ 's are unresolved in ce spectrum. $A_2=-0.19$ 3, $A_4=+0.02$ 4 for the doublet. From data in ^{208}Fr ε decay, the 389.2 γ , deexciting the 1578 level, has mult=E2. The 389.7 γ must then have mult=M1.

@ The 332.3 (doublet), and 335.1 γ 's are not resolved in the ce spectrum. From I_γ for the three transitions and $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}=0.20$ 8 for the multiplet one can deduce that the 335 γ cannot be M1, and that one member, but not both, of the 332 doublet must be M1. From these observations, along with $A_2=-0.10$ 9, $A_4=-0.06$ 9 for the 332.3 doublet, and $A_2=+0.19$ 2, $A_4=-0.02$ 2 for the 335.1 γ , the authors deduce mult(335 γ)=E2, mult(332 γ)=M1+E2. From the decay scheme, the 332 γ component deexciting the 2797 level must be E2.

& From $\gamma(\theta)$.

^a The 766.2 and 768.2 γ 's are not resolved in the ce spectrum. $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}=0.012$ 3, $\alpha(\text{L})_{\text{exp}}=0.0025$ 8 for the doublet, along with the $\gamma(\theta)$ data are consistent only with E2 multipolarity for both transitions.

^b The 634.0, 635.8 and 636.7 γ 's not resolved in the ce spectrum. $\alpha(\text{K})_{\text{exp}}=0.015$ 3, $\alpha(\text{L})_{\text{exp}}=0.0026$ 11, along with the $\gamma(\theta)$ data are consistent only with mult=E2 for all three transitions.

^c 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.

^d Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

$^{196}\text{Pt}(^{16}\text{O},4n\gamma)$ 1983Tr03,1981Ho29

Legend

Level Scheme

Intensities: Relative I_γ

- $\longrightarrow$ $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
 $\longrightarrow$ $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
 $\longrightarrow$ $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\max}$
 $\longrightarrow$ γ Decay (Uncertain)

