

^{31}Al β^- decay (644 ms) [1973Go22,1979De02](#)

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Jun Chen and Balraj Singh		NDS 184, 29 (2022)	24-Jun-2022

Parent: ^{31}Al : $E=0$; $J^\pi=5/2^{(+)}$; $T_{1/2}=644$ ms 25; $Q(\beta^-)=7998.3$ 22; $\% \beta^-$ decay=100.0

^{31}Al - $J^\pi, T_{1/2}$: From Adopted Levels of ^{31}Al .

^{31}Al - $Q(\beta^-)$: From [2021Wa16](#).

[1973Go22](#): ^{31}Al from $^{18}\text{O}(^{18}\text{O},\alpha p)$ and $^{15}\text{N}(^{18}\text{O},2p\gamma)$, $E(^{18}\text{O})=41$ MeV, Brookhaven, measured E_γ , I_γ , $\beta\gamma$ coin, β -spectra, ^{31}Al half-life, level half-lives.

[1979De02](#): ^{31}Al from the decay of ^{31}Mg produced in $\text{U}(p,X)$ $E(p)=24$ GeV, CERN, measured E_γ , isotopic half-life, $\beta\gamma$ coin, $\beta\gamma\gamma$ coin. [1980De26](#) from the same group produced the source using 600 MeV protons, measured E_γ , I_γ , β -delayed $nn(t)$.

 ^{31}Si Levels

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$ [‡]
0.0	$3/2^+$	157.24 min 20
752.20 24	$1/2^+$	0.53 ps 12
1694.83 24	$5/2^+$	0.57 ps 15
2316.70 24	$3/2^+$	38 fs 17
2787.7? 8	$5/2^+$	14 fs 14

[†] From a least-squares fit to E_γ values.

[‡] From Adopted Levels.

 $\gamma(^{31}\text{Si})$

I_γ normalization: Original intensity values per 100 parent decays in [1979De02](#) are deduced by the authors from measured γ intensities and the total number of ^{31}Al , as follows: 1. determine the number of ^{30}Mg from the ^{30}Al activity; 2. determine the number of ^{31}Mg from the number of ^{30}Mg using $\% \beta^- n(^{31}\text{Na})=30$ 8 ([1974Ro31](#)) and assuming $\% \beta^- 2n(^{31}\text{Na})=0$; 3. determine the number of ^{31}Al from the decay of ^{31}Mg assuming $\% \beta^- n(^{31}\text{Mg})=0$.

E_γ [‡]	I_γ #&	E_i (level)	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [@]	δ [@]	α [†]	Comments
621.81 30	5.3 18	2316.70	$3/2^+$	1694.83	$5/2^+$				Additional information 3. I_γ : original $\%I_\gamma=3.0$ 10 (1979De02). I_γ (relative)=9.9 7 (1973Go22).
752.23 30	12.3 35	752.20	$1/2^+$	0.0	$3/2^+$				Additional information 1. I_γ : original $\%I_\gamma=7$ 2 (1979De02). I_γ (relative)=18.5 8 (1973Go22).
1564.49 30	10.9 35	2316.70	$3/2^+$	752.20	$1/2^+$				Additional information 4. I_γ : original $\%I_\gamma=6.2$ 20 (1979De02). I_γ (relative)=17.3 16 (1973Go22).
1694.73 30	19 5	1694.83	$5/2^+$	0.0	$3/2^+$	M1+E2	+4.4 10	0.0001785 29	$\alpha=0.0001785$ 29; $\alpha(K)=9.35 \times 10^{-6}$ 14; $\alpha(L)=6.68 \times 10^{-7}$ 10; $\alpha(M)=4.40 \times 10^{-8}$ 6 $\alpha(\text{IPF})=0.0001684$ 27

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{31}\text{Al} \beta^-$ decay (644 ms) [1973Go22](#),[1979De02](#) (continued) $\gamma(^{31}\text{Si})$ (continued)

E_γ [‡]	I_γ ^{#&}	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [@]	δ [@]	α [†]	Comments
2316.64 40	30 9	2316.70	3/2 ⁺	0.0	3/2 ⁺	M1+E2	+0.41 22	0.000395 14	<p>Additional information 2. I_γ: original %I_γ=10.5 30 (1979De02). $I_\gamma(\text{relative})$=58.9 16 (1973Go22). α=0.000395 14; $\alpha(\text{K})$=4.94×10⁻⁶ 9; $\alpha(\text{L})$=3.53×10⁻⁷ 7; $\alpha(\text{M})$=2.32×10⁻⁸ 4 $\alpha(\text{IPF})$=0.000390 14</p> <p>Additional information 5. I_γ: original %I_γ=17 5 (1979De02). $I_\gamma(\text{relative})$=72.8 18 (1973Go22). α=0.000582 8; $\alpha(\text{K})$=3.68×10⁻⁶ 5; $\alpha(\text{L})$=2.63×10⁻⁷ 4; $\alpha(\text{M})$=1.733×10⁻⁸ 24 $\alpha(\text{IPF})$=0.000578 8</p> <p>E_γ: 1973Go22 state it is unclear if the γ from this level which they detected is unambiguously from the decay of ^{31}Al, 1979De02 do not report this state being populated. I_γ: from $I(2786.6\gamma)/I(2316.6\gamma)$=3.6 15/72.8 18 in 1973Go22 and $I(2316.6\gamma)$=30 9 (1979De02).</p>
2787.6 ^a 8	1.5 8	2787.7?	5/2 ⁺	0.0	3/2 ⁺	M1+E2	+0.20 5	0.000582 8	

[†] [Additional information 6.](#)

[‡] From [1973Go22](#). It is unclear if [1979De02](#) actually measured the energies of the γ -rays they report, there is a confusing footnote (in their table 7) saying the energies come from [1973Go22](#) but they report slightly different values from those in [1973Go22](#).

[#] From [1979De02](#), unless otherwise noted. Original values are deduced by the authors based on % $\beta^-n(^{31}\text{Na})$ =30 8 ([1974Ro31](#)), assuming % $\beta^-2n(^{31}\text{Na})$ =0 and % $\beta^-n(^{31}\text{Mg})$ =0, and the quoted values and uncertainties are obtained (by the evaluators) by scaling original values using the adopted % β^-n =39 5, % β^-2n =0.7 1 for ^{31}Na and adopted % β^-n =6.2 19 for ^{31}Mg . Values reported by [1973Go22](#) given under comments are relative intensities normalized to $I(621.8\gamma)+I(1564.5\gamma)+I(2316.6\gamma)$ =100, and are used to deduce branching ratios in Adopted Gammas because of their higher precisions than values of absolute intensities in [1979De02](#).

[@] From Adopted Gammas.

[&] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

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

^{31}Al β^- decay (644 ms) 1973Go22,1979De02

Decay Scheme

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

Legend

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

