## <sup>236</sup>Np β<sup>-</sup> decay (155×10<sup>3</sup> y) 1981Li30,1983Ah02

History						
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date			
Full Evaluation	Shaofei Zhu	NDS 182, 2 (2022).	1-Apr-2022			

Parent: <sup>236</sup>Np: E=0; J<sup> $\pi$ </sup>=6<sup>(-)</sup>; T<sub>1/2</sub>=1.55×10<sup>5</sup> y *I*; Q( $\beta$ <sup>-</sup>)=4.8×10<sup>2</sup> 5; % $\beta$ <sup>-</sup> decay=12.0 *I* 

 $^{236}$ Np-E,J<sup> $\pi$ </sup>,T<sub>1/2</sub>: From the Adopted Levels of  $^{236}$ Np.

<sup>236</sup>Np-Q(β<sup>-</sup>): From 2021Wa16.

 $^{236}$ Np-% $\beta^{-}$  decay: From the Adopted Levels of  $^{236}$ Np.

Assignment: parent of <sup>236</sup>Pu (1972En06).

1983Ah02: Activity from <sup>238</sup>U(d,4n), E=21 MeV, chemically purified from other reaction products. Measured γ, ce, K x ray, γγ.
1981Li30: Activity from <sup>235</sup>U(d,n), E=16 MeV, chemically purified from other reaction products. Measured α, γ, γγ, ce, mass-spectrometric measurement for <sup>235</sup>U/<sup>236</sup>U ratio to determine T<sub>1/2</sub>.

 $\alpha$ : Additional information 1.

### <sup>236</sup>Pu Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	J <sup>π‡</sup>
0	$0^{+}$
44.63 10	$2^{+}$
147.45 10	4+
305.80 11	$6^{+}$

<sup>†</sup> From  $E\gamma$ .

<sup>‡</sup> From the Adopted Levels.

#### $\beta^{-}$ radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^{-\dagger}$	Log ft	Comments
(1.7×10 <sup>2</sup> 5)	305.80	12.0 <i>I</i>	13.6 5	av E $\beta$ =46 15 I $\beta$ <sup>-</sup> : from <sup>236</sup> Pu $\alpha$ emission and from the intensity of the 158-keV transition, only the 6 <sup>+</sup> level of the <sup>236</sup> Pu ground-state band appears to be populated. From an intensity balance, one obtains $\%$ I $\beta$ <sup>-</sup> =13.4 8, highlighting a discrepancy between the $\%\beta^-$ branch and the I $\gamma$ measurements.
$(3.3 \times 10^2 5)$	147.45	<1.4	>13.3 <sup>1</sup> <i>u</i>	av E $\beta$ =93 16 I $\beta^-$ : deduced from I( $\gamma$ +ce) balance at 147.42-keV level.

<sup>†</sup> Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

 $\gamma(^{236}\text{Pu})$ 

Normalization factor=0.316 10 from I $\gamma$ (160.3 $\gamma$ )=36 1 per 100  $\varepsilon$  decay (1983Ah02) and  $\varepsilon$  branching=0.87.8 2 with I $\gamma$  normalized to I $\gamma$ (160.3 $\gamma$ )=100.

$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\dagger \#}$	$E_i$ (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_f$ J <sup>2</sup>	$\frac{\pi}{f}$	Mult. <sup>‡</sup>	α	Comments
(44.63 10)	0.058 3	44.63	2+	0 0	+	E2	741 13	$\alpha(L)=538 \ 10; \ \alpha(M)=150.1 \ 27; \ \alpha(N)=41.2 \ 7; \ \alpha(O)=9.69 \ 17; \ \alpha(P)=1.515 \ 27; \ \alpha(Q)=0.00326 \ 6 \ I_{\gamma}: deduced from I(\gamma+ce) balance at 44.6-keV level assuming I\beta^{-}=0. \ E_{\gamma}: from Adopted Gammas.$
102.82 2	2.9 2	147.45	4+	44.63 2	+	[E2]	13.87 19	$\alpha'(L)=10.06 \ \hat{14}; \ \alpha(M)=2.82 \ 4; \ \alpha(N)=0.775 \ 11;$

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

#### $^{236}\text{Np}\,\beta^-$ decay (155×10<sup>3</sup> y) 1981Li30,1983Ah02 (continued) $\gamma$ (<sup>236</sup>Pu) (continued) $I_{\gamma}^{\dagger \#}$ $E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$ E<sub>i</sub>(level) $\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$ $\mathbf{J}_{f}^{\pi}$ Mult.<sup>‡</sup> $E_f$ $\alpha$ Comments α(O)=0.1826 26; α(P)=0.0291 4 α(Q)=0.0001055 15 305.80 $6^{+}$ 147.45 4+ $\alpha(K)=0.1927\ 27;\ \alpha(L)=1.413\ 20;\ \alpha(M)=0.394\ 6;$ 158.35 2 13.5 7 E2 2.139 30 $\alpha(N)=0.1084$ 15; $\alpha(O)=0.0256$ 4 $\alpha$ (P)=0.00414 6; $\alpha$ (Q)=2.465×10<sup>-5</sup> 35 E<sub>y</sub>: other: 158.34 (1981Li30).

<sup>†</sup> From 1983Ah02, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>‡</sup> From Adopted Gammas.

<sup>#</sup> For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.316 10.

# $^{236}$ Np $\beta^-$ decay (155×10<sup>3</sup> y) 1981Li30,1983Ah02

