

[Adopted Levels, Gammas](#)

Type	Author	History
Full Evaluation	Jun Chen	Citation
		Literature Cutoff Date
	NDS 179, 1 (2022)	30-Nov-2021

$Q(\beta^-) = -19740 \text{ SY}$ ;  $S(n) = 18950 \text{ SY}$ ;  $S(p) = 2.73 \times 10^3 \text{ 10}$ ;  $Q(\alpha) = -7.01 \times 10^3 \text{ 11}$     [2021Wa16](#)

$\Delta Q(\beta^-) = 510$ ,  $\Delta S(n) = 510$  (syst, [2021Wa16](#)).

$S(2n) = 35360 \text{ 310}$  (syst),  $S(2p) = 3110 \text{ 90}$ ,  $Q(\varepsilon) = 11290 \text{ 90}$ ,  $Q(ep) = 9270 \text{ 90}$  ([2021Wa16](#)).

Mass measurement:

[2020Fu05](#): measured mass excess =  $-18009 \text{ keV}$  92 at the HIRFL-CSR acceleration complex at Lanzhou, using the isochronous mass spectrometry (IMS) with the experimental cooler storage ring (CSRe).

Other measurements:

[2016Or03](#):  $^{48}\text{Fe}$  was produced in fragmentation of 74.5 MeV/nucleon  $^{58}\text{Ni}$  beam on a 200  $\mu\text{m}$  thick natural Ni target at

LISE3-GANIL facility. Fragments were selected by LISE3 separator and implanted into a double-sided silicon strip detector (DSSSD), surrounded by four EXOGAM Ge clovers for  $\gamma$  ray detection. Implantations were identified by energy loss  $\Delta E$  and time-of-flight (tof) information. Measured  $E_p$ ,  $I_p$ ,  $^{48}\text{Fe}$  half-life, delayed proton decay branches.

[1996Fa09](#):  $^9\text{Be}(^{58}\text{Ni}, X)$   $E=650 \text{ MeV/nucleon}$ . Measured projectile-like fragments at  $0^\circ$ , fragment recoil separator; mag spect,  $\Delta E/E$  counter telescope (Si), tof).

Others: [2016Bi05](#), [2002Pf03](#), [1994Bi10](#), [1993Bu04](#), [1987Po04](#).

Consult Nuclear Science References for theoretical studies.

Level scheme is tentatively proposed by [2021Ya33](#) based on comparisons with that of the mirror nucleus  $^{48}\text{Ti}$ .

[48Fe Levels](#)[Cross Reference \(XREF\) Flags](#)

<b>A</b>	$^{49}\text{Ni} \varepsilon p$ decay
<b>B</b>	$^9\text{Be}(^{49}\text{Fe}, X\gamma)$

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	J <sup>‡</sup>	T <sub>1/2</sub>	XREF	Comments
0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	45.5 ms 8	<a href="#">AB</a>	% $\varepsilon + \%$ $\beta^+ = 100$ ; % $\varepsilon p = 15.3$ 8
				T <sub>1/2</sub> : weighted average of 51 ms 3 ( <a href="#">2016Or03</a> ), 45.3 ms 6 ( <a href="#">2007Do17</a> ), 44 ms 7 ( <a href="#">1996Fa09</a> ).
				% $\varepsilon p$ : weighted average of 14.4 7 ( <a href="#">2016Or03</a> ) and 15.9 6 ( <a href="#">2007Do17</a> ). Other: >3.6 11 for $E(p)=959 \text{ keV}$ 33 ( <a href="#">1996Fa09</a> ).
969.5 5	(2 <sup>+</sup> )		<a href="#">AB</a>	
2253.5? 11	(4 <sup>+</sup> )		<a href="#">B</a>	
2377? 3	(2 <sup>+</sup> )		<a href="#">B</a>	
3197.5? 23	(4 <sup>+</sup> )		<a href="#">B</a>	
3241.5? 21	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		<a href="#">B</a>	
3475? 5	(3 <sup>-</sup> )		<a href="#">B</a>	
3497.5? 20	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		<a href="#">B</a>	
4205? 4	(5 <sup>-</sup> )		<a href="#">B</a>	

<sup>†</sup> From a least-squares fit to  $\gamma$ -ray energies.

<sup>‡</sup> Proposed in [2021Ya33](#) in ( $^{49}\text{Fe}, X\gamma$ ) based on comparisons with mirror nucleus  $^{48}\text{Ti}$  and shell-model predictions.

**Adopted Levels, Gammas (continued)** $\gamma(^{48}\text{Fe})$ 

$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_\gamma^{\dagger}$	$I_\gamma^{\dagger}$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Comments
969.5	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	969.5 5	100	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	$E_\gamma$ : from <a href="#">2007Do17</a> . Other: 971 $I$ from ( $^{49}\text{Fe},X\gamma$ ) ( <a href="#">2021Ya33</a> ).
2253.5?	(4 <sup>+</sup> )	1284 1	100	969.5	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	
2377?	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	1407 3	100	969.5	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	
3197.5?	(4 <sup>+</sup> )	944 <sup>‡</sup> 2	100	2253.5? (4 <sup>+</sup> )		
3241.5?	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	988 3	100	2253.5? (4 <sup>+</sup> )		
3475?	(3 <sup>-</sup> )	2505 5	100	969.5	(2 <sup>+</sup> )	
3497.5?	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	256 1	100 16	3241.5? (6 <sup>+</sup> )		
		1244 2	79 16	2253.5? (4 <sup>+</sup> )		
4205?	(5 <sup>-</sup> )	1951 <sup>‡</sup> 4	100	2253.5? (4 <sup>+</sup> )		

<sup>†</sup> From  $^{49}\text{Fe},X\gamma$  ([2021Ya33](#)), unless otherwise noted.<sup>‡</sup> Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

## Adopted Levels, Gammas

## Legend

## Level Scheme

Intensities: Relative photon branching from each level

→  $\gamma$  Decay (Uncertain)

