Coulomb excitation 2009Hu03

	History							
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date					
Full Evaluation	M. Shamsuzzoha Basunia	NDS 113, 909 (2012)	1-Jan-2012					

²⁹Na beam was produced in the primary reaction ¹⁸¹Ta(p,X), E_p =500 MeV and bombarded ¹¹⁰Pd target with E=70 MeV; γ -rays were measured using 6 Compton-suppressed clover HPGe detectors; an annular double-sided silicon detector was used for scattered beam and recoiling target particle detection; Coulomb excitation cross section for the 5/2⁺ to 3/2⁺ transition in ²⁹Na was deduced relative to known 2⁺ to 0⁺ transition in ¹¹⁰Pa.

²⁹Na Levels

$\frac{\text{E(level})}{0}$	$\frac{J^{\pi}}{3/2^{+}}$	T _{1/} 44.1 n	2 ns 9	Comments $J^{\pi}, T_{1/2}$: from Adopted Levels.E(level), J^{π} : from 2009Hu03.		
γ ⁽²⁹ Na)						
Eγ	E _i (level)	\mathbf{J}_i^{π}	E_f	\mathbf{J}_f^{π}	Mult.	Comments
72	72	5/2+	0	3/2+	M1+E2	E_{γ} ,Mult.: from 2009Hu03. E2 matrix element (5/2 ⁺ to 3/2 ⁺)=0.237 eb 21, corresponds to B(E2)(W.u.)=17.7 32 (2009Hu03). The statistical uncertainty arising from the measured peak areas, $\approx 16\%$, dominates the quoted $1-\sigma$ error. Other contributions include uncertainties in the beam composition and target purity, $\approx 3\%$ and <0.1% respectively, along with $\approx 6\%$ systematic uncertainty in the magnitudes (and signs) of the matrix elements corresponding to couplings with higher-lying states in ¹¹⁰ Pd (and ²⁹ Na), in addition to the $\approx 2\%$ uncertainty on the relative γ -ray efficiency measurements; all of which are much less significant. The value for the matrix element is consistent with that of 0.232 predicted by shell-model. $O=0.524$ eb 46 is deduced from the

agreement with shell-model prediction of 0.513 eb.

transition matrix element and rotational model (assuming prolate deformation) in

Coulomb excitation 2009Hu03

Level Scheme



 $^{29}_{11}Na_{18}$