

$^{272}\text{Bh } \alpha \text{ decay (10.5 s)}$     [2004Og03](#),[2013Ru11](#),[2013Og01](#)

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Balraj Singh	NDS 156, 148 (2019)	31-Jan-2019

Parent:  $^{272}\text{Bh}$ : E=0;  $T_{1/2}=10.5$  s +15–11;  $Q(\alpha)=9300$  50; % $\alpha$  decay≈100.0

$^{272}\text{Bh-T}_{1/2}$ : From  $^{272}\text{Bh}$  Adopted Levels.

$^{272}\text{Bh-Q}(\alpha)$ : From [2017Wa10](#).

$^{272}\text{Bh-}\% \alpha$  decay: Assumed % $\alpha$ =100 for  $^{272}\text{Bh}$  decay.

$^{272}\text{Bh}$  produced in  $\alpha$ -decay chain:  $^{288}\text{Mc} \rightarrow ^{284}\text{Nh} \rightarrow ^{280}\text{Rg} \rightarrow ^{276}\text{Mt} \rightarrow ^{272}\text{Bh}$ , where  $^{288}\text{Mc}$  produced in  $^{243}\text{Am}(^{48}\text{Ca},3\text{n})$ .

See  $^{272}\text{Bh}$  Adopted Levels for details of production and half-life of the isotope.

 $^{268}\text{Db Levels}$ 

E(level)	T <sub>1/2</sub>	Comments
0	28 h 3	
≈140	T <sub>1/2</sub> : from Adopted Levels.	

 $\alpha$  radiations

E $\alpha^{\dagger}$	E(level)	I $\alpha^{\ddagger\dagger}$	Comments
$8.93 \times 10^3$ I	≈140	25	
$9.07 \times 10^3$ I	0	75	E $\alpha$ : other: 9.02 MeV 6 ( <a href="#">2004Og03</a> ). Assumed as g.s. to g.s. $\alpha$ transition.

<sup>†</sup> From [2013Ru11](#).

<sup>‡</sup> For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by ≈1.0.

 $\gamma(^{268}\text{Db})$ 

E $\gamma$	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	E <sub>f</sub>	Comments
≈140	≈140	0	E $\gamma$ : from <a href="#">2013Ru11</a> , based on E $\alpha$ values. Authors mention that the simulated $\gamma$ -ray yield is marginal and consistent with an empty spectrum from the Ge detector. Mult.: M1 or E2 suggested by <a href="#">2013Ru11</a> , but no arguments are provided. It is that the $\gamma$ -ray would have been seen clearly if it were E1.

$^{272}\text{Bh}$   $\alpha$  decay (10.5 s)    2004Og03,2013Ru11,2013Og01Decay Scheme