

$^{18}\text{O}(^{18}\text{O},\text{pn}\gamma) \text{E}=20\text{-}44 \text{ MeV}$ [2012Be11](#),[2009Be26](#)

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Ninel Nica, Balraj Singh		NDS 113, 1563 (2012)	28-May-2012

[2012Be11](#): 25 MeV ^{18}O beam produced using the Argonne Tandem-Linac Accelerator System(ATLAS) at Argonne National Laboratory impinged on a $260 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ thick ^{18}O target enriched to 97% with Ta backing surrounded by a nearly 4π array of 95 CsI(Tl) scintillators to detect charged particles. γ -rays detected by Gammasphere array consisting of about 100 HPGe detectors. Measured angular distribution, energy and intensity of γ rays, lifetimes by DSAM. Comparison with shell-model calculations.

Additional information 1.

[2009Be26](#) (superseded by [2012Be11](#)): E=20, 24, 25, 30, 44 MeV. Two experiments were done: 1. at FSU: E=24 and 44 MeV; detector system was an array of 6 single crystal HPGe detectors and 3 four-crystal clover detectors. 2. at LBNL: E=20, 25, 30 MeV; detector system was E- Δ E Si telescope for particles and 5 HPGe clover detectors. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$, (particle) γ coin, angular distributions, lifetimes by DSAM. Comparison with shell-model calculations.

[2011MaZP](#): E=36 MeV; beam produced using the Tandem accelerator at the National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering Bucharest; measured $T_{1/2}$ by γ -ray coincidence fast-timing technique using 8 HPGe detectors and 7 $\text{LaBr}_3:\text{Ce}$ detectors; prompt $\text{LaBr}_3:\text{Ce}$ time resolution FWHM=470 ps *10*; calculated reduced transition probabilities for different M2/E3 mixing ratios and compared with shell model estimates.

This nuclide is of some relevance to "island of inversion".

Unless noted otherwise, the data and level scheme are from [2012Be11](#).

Relative intensities at several beam energies from [2009Be26](#) are given in the table placed at the beginning of the γ (^{34}P) section.

 ^{34}P Levels

E(level) [†]	$J\pi^{\ddagger}$	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0	1^+		
429.11 <i>20</i>	2^+	1.3 ps <i>+6-3</i>	
1608.2 <i>4</i>	1^+	0.52 ps <i>+45-14</i>	
2228.8 <i>4</i>	$2^{(-)}$	>2 ps	
2305.1 <i>4</i>	4^-	2.0 ns <i>1</i>	$T_{1/2}$: From $\gamma\gamma(t)$ (2011MaZP).
2320.6 <i>5</i>	3^-	>7 ps	
3352.6 <i>5</i>	5^-	0.36 ps <i>+12-8</i>	
3752.5 <i>7</i>	$(4,3)^-$	0.26 ps <i>6</i>	
3911.6 <i>11</i>	$(3,4)^-$	0.14 ps <i>7</i>	
3951.4 <i>5</i>	5^-	0.111 ps <i>35</i>	
4446.7 <i>21</i>	$(4)^-$	<0.10 ps	
4630.1 <i>6</i>	6^-	0.30 ps <i>5</i>	
5012.7 <i>21</i>	$(2)^-$	<0.07 ps	
5280.7 <i>21</i>	$(3)^-$	<0.07 ps	
5394.2 <i>6</i>	(6^-)	0.11 ps <i>+8-5</i>	
5726.5 <i>13</i>			
6180.7 <i>21</i>	$(6)^-$	<0.07 ps	
6193.9 <i>11</i>			J^π : (7^+) is suggested (but not adopted) by 2012Be11 based on shell-model arguments, See also 2009Be26 .
6237.4 <i>6</i>	(7^+)	>6.9 ps	
6357.3 <i>9</i>	$(7)^-$	<0.035 ps	
7426.4 <i>21</i>		<0.07 ps	
7920.2 <i>10</i>		>0.35 ps	

[†] From least-squares fit to the $E\gamma$ data.

[‡] As proposed in [2012Be11](#) and [2009Be26](#).

¹⁸O(¹⁸O,pn γ) E=20-44 MeV **2012Be11,2009Be26** (continued)

$\gamma(^{34}\text{P})$

Transition strengths in W.u. have been deduced by evaluators. In cases values are slightly different in **2012Be11**.

E γ (keV)	Relative intensities data				
	20 MeV	24 MeV	25 MeV	30 MeV	44 MeV
429	100	100	100	100	
679	1.0 5	7 1	4 1	7 1	9 2
1047	17 2	37 4	28 2	44 4	36 4
1179	9 2	5 1	6 1	3 1	8 2
1607 a	6 2	11 2	13 2	11 2	
1645	11 2	19 2	31 2	46 4	20 3
1876	37 4	76 4	54 4	64 4	76 6 b
1891	17 2	10 2	15 2	9 1	6 1
2325	2 1	10 2	4 1	10 2	11 2
2839	<1	6 1	2 1	7 1	10 2
2883	<1	5 1	3 1	5 1	11 2

a) doublet b) data at 44 MeV normalized to I γ =76 at 24 MeV

E $_i$ (level)	J $_i^{\pi}$	E γ	I γ	E $_f$	J $_f^{\pi}$	Mult. [†]	δ^{\ddagger}	Comments
429.11	2 ⁺	429.1 2	100	0.0	1 ⁺	(M1(+E2))	+0.11 +13-12	A $_2$ =-0.09 3; A $_4$ =+0.02 4 B(M1)(W.u.)=0.21 +5-10 Additional information 2.
1608.2	1 ⁺	1179.1 4	66 3	429.11	2 ⁺	(M1)		A $_2$ =-0.03 3; A $_4$ =+0.01 4 B(M1)(W.u.)=0.017 +5-15 Additional information 3.
		1608 1	34 3	0.0	1 ⁺	[M1]		B(M1)(W.u.)=0.004 +1-3 Additional information 4.
2228.8	2 ⁽⁻⁾	620.6 4	30 6	1608.2	1 ⁺	(E1(+M2))	+0.07 16	A $_2$ =-0.12 8; A $_4$ =+0.06 10 B(E1)(W.u.)<4 \times 10 ⁻⁴ B(E1)(W.u.)<2.4 \times 10 ⁻⁵ Additional information 5.
		1799.7 6	44 7	429.11	2 ⁺	[E1]		B(E1)(W.u.)<8 \times 10 ⁻⁶
2305.1	4 ⁻	1875.9 4	100	429.11	2 ⁺	(M2)		A $_2$ =+0.32 6; A $_4$ =+0.02 8 B(M2)(W.u.)=0.064 4 δ (E3/M2)=0.00 12. Additional information 6.
2320.6	3 ⁻	1891.4 5	100	429.11	2 ⁺	(E1(+M2))	+0.07 14	A $_2$ =-0.15 7; A $_4$ =+0.03 8 B(E1)(W.u.)<1.4 \times 10 ⁻⁵ Additional information 7.
3352.6	5 ⁻	1031.7 7	2 1	2320.6	3 ⁻	[E2]		B(E2)(W.u.)=4 2 Additional information 8.
		1047.5 4	98 1	2305.1	4 ⁻	(M1(+E2))	+0.02 9	A $_2$ =-0.23 7; A $_4$ =+0.04 8 B(M1)(W.u.)=0.052 +12-18 Additional information 9.
3752.5	(4,3) ⁻	1431.8 6	93 2	2320.6	3 ⁻	(M1(+E2))		B(M1)(W.u.)=0.027 6 δ (E2/M1)=+0.18 +15-14 for (4) ⁻ ; \approx -0.36 for (3) ⁻ (e-mail reply from P.C. Bender, Feb. 29, 2012).
		1446 [#]		2305.1	4 ⁻			
		1523.9 9	7 2	2228.8	2 ⁽⁻⁾	[M1,E2]		B(E2)(W.u.)=2.5 6 if E2, and B(M1)(W.u.)=0.0015 4 if M1 from an earlier communication from authors of

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{18}\text{O}(^{18}\text{O},\text{pn}\gamma) E=20\text{-}44\text{ MeV}$ **2012Be11,2009Be26 (continued)** $\gamma(^{34}\text{P})$ (continued)

$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_γ	I_γ	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [†]	δ^\ddagger	Comments
3911.6	(3,4) ⁻	1591 1	100	2320.6	3 ⁻	[M1,E2]		2012Be11, who list same B(M1)(W.u.) value (for 3 ⁻ to 3 ⁻ transition), and give no value for B(E2)(W.u.). B(M1)(W.u.)=0.040 +26-16 if M1; B(E2)(W.u.)=61 +41-20 if E2 from an earlier communication from authors of 2012Be11, who list same B(M1)(W.u.) value (for 4 ⁻ to 3 ⁻ transition), and give no value for B(E2)(W.u.).
3951.4	5 ⁻	1606 [#] 1631.5 11	4 2	2305.1 4 ⁻ 2320.6 3 ⁻	4 ⁻ 3 ⁻	[E2]		B(E2)(W.u.)=2.7 16 Additional information 10.
		1646.1 4	96 2	2305.1 4 ⁻	4 ⁻	(M1(+E2))	-0.03 18	A ₂ =-0.31 7; A ₄ =+0.01 8 B(M1)(W.u.)=0.043 14 Additional information 11.
4446.7	(4) ⁻	2126 2	100	2320.6 3 ⁻	3 ⁻	[M1]		B(M1)(W.u.)>0.024
4630.1	6 ⁻	678.7 4	35 3	3951.4 5 ⁻	5 ⁻	(M1(+E2))	+0.12 11	A ₂ =-0.05 8; A ₄ =+0.03 8 B(M1)(W.u.)=0.081 16 Additional information 12.
		2325.1 6	65 3	2305.1 4 ⁻	4 ⁻	E2(+M3)	+0.02 +11-10	A ₂ =+0.42 8; A ₄ =-0.05 8 B(E2)(W.u.)=2.8 5 Additional information 13.
5012.7	(2) ⁻	2692 2	100	2320.6 3 ⁻	3 ⁻	[M1]		B(M1)(W.u.)>0.016
5280.7	(3) ⁻	2960 2	100	2320.6 3 ⁻	3 ⁻	[M1]		B(M1)(W.u.)>0.012 Additional information 14.
5394.2	(6 ⁻)	762.9 8	8 3	4630.1 6 ⁻	6 ⁻	[M1]		B(M1)(W.u.)=0.036 +22-30 Additional information 15.
		1442.6 7	54 6	3951.4 5 ⁻	5 ⁻	(M1(+E2))	+0.02 5	A ₂ =-0.24 9; A ₄ =+0.12 10 B(M1)(W.u.)=0.036 +17-27 Additional information 16.
		2042 1	24 5	3352.6 5 ⁻	5 ⁻	(M1(+E2))	+0.05 14	A ₂ =-0.21 12; A ₄ =+0.26 15 B(M1)(W.u.)=0.006 +3-5 Additional information 17.
		3090 2	15 5	2305.1 4 ⁻	4 ⁻	[E2]		B(E2)(W.u.)=0.4 +2-3 Additional information 18.
5726.5		2373.9 15 3421 2	78 6 22 6	3352.6 5 ⁻ 2305.1 4 ⁻	5 ⁻ 4 ⁻			
6180.7	(6) ⁻	2828 2	100	3352.6 5 ⁻	5 ⁻	[M1]		B(M1)(W.u.)>0.014
6193.9		1563.4 14 2841 2	33 7 67 7	4630.1 6 ⁻ 3352.6 5 ⁻	6 ⁻ 5 ⁻			
6237.4	(7 ⁺)	842.5 6	19 4	5394.2 (6 ⁻)	(6 ⁻)	(E1(+M2))	+0.05 14	A ₂ =-0.19 12; A ₄ =-0.02 12 B(E1)(W.u.)<3×10 ⁻⁵ Additional information 19.
		1607.9 5	40 5	4630.1 6 ⁻	6 ⁻	(E1(+M2))	+0.05 9	A ₂ =-0.17 10; A ₄ =+0.11 11 B(E1)(W.u.)<0.9×10 ⁻⁵

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{18}\text{O}(^{18}\text{O},\text{pn}\gamma) E=20-44 \text{ MeV}$ [2012Be11](#),[2009Be26](#) (continued) $\gamma(^{34}\text{P})$ (continued)

$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_γ	I_γ	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [†]	δ^\ddagger	Comments
6237.4	(7 ⁺)	2884.3 7	36 5	3352.6	5 ⁻	(M2(+E3))	+0.11 18	Additional information 20. A ₂ =+0.52 10; A ₄ =-0.05 11 B(M2)(W.u.)<0.8 B(E3)(W.u.)<9
		3932 3	5 3	2305.1	4 ⁻	[E3]		Additional information 21. A ₂ =-0.53 12; A ₄ =-0.57 13 B(E2)(W.u.)>13
6357.3	(7 ⁻)	2405.9 7	43 8	3951.4	5 ⁻	(E2)		Evaluators note that negative A ₂ in 2012Be11 is inconsistent with ΔJ=2, quadrupole transition, which requires positive A ₂ . Additional information 22. B(E2)(W.u.)>5.7 Additional information 23.
		3004 2	57 8	3352.6	5 ⁻	[E2]		
7426.4		1189 2	100	6237.4	(7 ⁺)			
7920.2		1683 1	67 4	6237.4	(7 ⁺)			
		1726 1	33 4	6193.9				

[†] Assignments are mainly from [2012Be11](#), but parentheses or square brackets are added by evaluators since these are determined primarily from parity-insensitive $\gamma(\theta)$ data.

[‡] Sign convention is that of Rose and Brink in [2012Be11](#) (their $\arctan(\delta)$ -listed values are converted to δ values by evaluators). Krane-Steffen convention used in ENSDF required each sign in [2012Be11](#) to be reversed.

[#] Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

¹⁸O(¹⁸O,pn γ) E=20-44 MeV 2012Be11,2009Be26

Legend

Level Scheme

Intensities: % photon branching from each level

-----► γ Decay (Uncertain)

