

$^{51}\text{V}(\mathbf{d},\alpha),(\text{pol d},\alpha)$ **1984Sh20,1984Na24**

Type	Author	History
Full Evaluation	T. W. Burrows ^a	Citation
		NDS 109, 1879 (2008)

Target $J^\pi=7/2^-$, configuration= $((^{48}\text{Ca } 0^+)(\pi \text{ 1f}_{7/2})_{7/2}^{+3})$.

1984Na24: E=79.4 MeV. Measured $\sigma(\theta)$ and vector-analyzing power (VAP); Q2DM spectrometer (position-sensitive $\alpha(P)$,scin). Vector polarization=+0.55 and -0.59; tensor \leq 0.04. FWHM=50-60 keV. $\theta(\text{C.M.})\approx 5^\circ-50^\circ$. DWBA.

1984Sh20: E=28 MeV. Measured $\sigma(\theta)$; Q3D spectrometer. $\theta=15^\circ, 25^\circ$, and 30° . DWBA.

Others: see [1995Bu23](#).

All data are from [1984Sh20](#) and J^π arguments, from [1984Na24](#); data from [1984Na24](#) and [1984Sh20](#) are In good agreement, except As noted. Both groups also compared their results to (p,π^-) measurements.

 ^{49}Ti Levels

E(level)	J^π [†]	L [‡]	E(level)	J^π [†]	L [‡]
0.	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6	3755 [@] 5		
1382 [@] 5	&	4+6	3833 [@] 5		
1.543×10^3 5		4+6	3.967×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6
1.623×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6	4086 [@] 5		
1761 [@] 5			4.223×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6
2.264×10^3 5	&	4+6	4.386×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻	6
2.470×10^3 ^a 5		4	4.593×10^3 5		
2.504×10^3 ^a 5			5127 [@] 10		
2.664×10^3 5			5606 [@] 10		
2.722×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6	5933 [@] 10		
2.984×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6	6125 [@] 10		
3.048×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6	6231 [@] 10		
3.291×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6	6269 [@] 10		
3.460×10^3 5	7/2 ⁻ to 19/2 ⁻ [#]	4+6	6513 [@] 10		
3617 [@] 5					

[†] Arguments from [1984Na24](#) are based on the empirical observation that pickup In the $(f_{7/2})_{J=7,T=0}^2$ and $(f_{7/2},p_{3/2})_{J=5,T=0}$ couplings are about one order of magnitude stronger than for other couplings. Therefore, high-spin states belonging to the $((^{51}\text{V}^-) f_{7/2}) (f_{7/2})_{J=7,T=0}^2$ should Be strongly excited with characteristic L=6 $\sigma(\theta)$ and J=7 VAP shapes. See [1984Sh20](#) for spin and parity assignments based on DWBA calculations and relative yields.

[‡] From comparison of $\sigma(\theta)$ to empirical curves.

[#] $\sigma(\theta)$ shows predominant L=6 pattern and VAP shows a clear J=7 signature, suggesting significant $((^{48}\text{Ca } 0^+)(\pi \text{ 1f}_{7/2})^2(\nu \text{ 1f}_{7/2})^{-1})$.

[@] From [1984Sh20](#); not identified by [1984Na24](#).

& J^π mixture of J=7 and J=5 patterns.

^a VAP bears No resemblance to J=5 pattern, leading [1984Na24](#) to suggest that more than one member of the 2471, 2504, and 2506 triplet contribute to the observed $\sigma(\theta)$ and VAP.