

^{58}Mn β^- decay (65.4 s) [1974Ti01](#)

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Caroline D. Nesaraja, Scott D. Geraedts and Balraj Singh		NDS 111, 897 (2010)	12-Jan-2010

Parent: ^{58}Mn : $E=71.78$ 5; $J^\pi=4^+$; $T_{1/2}=65.4$ s 5; $Q(\beta^-)=6250$ 30; $\% \beta^-$ decay=100.0

[1974Ti01](#): $E(n)\approx 14$ MeV, $^{58}\text{Fe}(n,p)$. Measured E_γ , I_γ .

[1971Dy01](#): $E(n)\approx 14$ MeV, $^{58}\text{Fe}(n,p)$. Measured E_β , I_β , E_γ , I_γ .

[1969Wa10](#): $E(n)=14.8$ MeV, $^{58}\text{Fe}(n,p)$. Measured E_γ , I_γ , β spectra, $\beta\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$, coincidences, $T_{1/2}$.

[1993ScZS](#) (also [1992ScZS](#)): $E=11.6$ MeV/nucleon, $W(^{86}\text{Kr},X)$, and mass separation. Measured E_γ , I_γ , conversion electron spectra, $T_{1/2}$, $\gamma\gamma$ and $\beta\gamma$ coincidences.

[Additional information 1](#).

The level scheme is from [1974Ti01](#). The 65.4-S activity is assigned to the 71.78 level as determined by [1993ScZS](#).

 ^{58}Fe Levels

$E(\text{level})^\dagger$	$J^\pi^\ddagger$	$E(\text{level})^\dagger$	$J^\pi^\ddagger$	$E(\text{level})^\dagger$	$J^\pi^\ddagger$	$E(\text{level})^\dagger$	$J^\pi^\ddagger$
0.0	0^+	2600.39 4	4^+	3629.57 24	2^+	4530.17 23	1,2
810.770 21	2^+	2876.40 15	2^+	3901.61 7	(3) $^+$	4590.0 4	(2 $^+$,3,4 $^+$)
1674.72 3	2^+	3083.73 20	2^+	4088.47 17	4^+	4833.9 3	1 $^+$,2 $^+$
2076.52 4	4^+	3233.26 6	2^+	4312.91 9	2^+		
2133.89 4	3^+	3243.9 3	0^+	4493.1 3			

† From a least-squares fit to E_γ data.

‡ From 'Adopted Levels'.

 β^- radiations

$E(\text{decay})$	$E(\text{level})$	$I\beta^-^\ddagger$	$\text{Log } ft$	Comments
(1.49×10^3 3)	4833.9	0.106 10	6.50 6	av $E\beta=581$ 14
(1.73×10^3 3)	4590.0	0.20 3	6.49 8	av $E\beta=692$ 14
(1.79×10^3 3)	4530.17	0.19 3	6.57 8	av $E\beta=719$ 14
(1.83×10^3 3)	4493.1	0.92 6	5.92 5	av $E\beta=736$ 14
(2.01×10^3 3)	4312.91	2.24 12	5.71 4	av $E\beta=820$ 14
(2.23×10^3 3)	4088.47	0.24 6	6.87 12	av $E\beta=925$ 15
(2.42×10^3 3)	3901.61	4.25 25	5.77 4	av $E\beta=1013$ 15
(2.69×10^3 3)	3629.57	0.92 6	6.63 4	av $E\beta=1142$ 15
(3.09×10^3 3)	3233.26	3.24 17	6.34 3	av $E\beta=1331$ 15
(3.45×10^3 3)	2876.40	0.158 19	7.86 6	av $E\beta=1503$ 15
(3.72×10^3 3)	2600.39	8.0 4	6.31 3	av $E\beta=1636$ 15
(4.19×10^3 3)	2133.89	76 4	5.56 3	av $E\beta=1862$ 15
				$E(\text{decay})$: 3800 100 (1971Dy01), 3900 200 (1969Wa10). 1974Ti01 suggest that 5100 β observed by 1971Dy01 is in fact $\text{ce(K)}(810\gamma)+\text{ce(K)}(1323\gamma)+4000\beta$ line.
(4.25×10^3 3)	2076.52	3.8 4	6.88 5	av $E\beta=1890$ 15

† From I_γ balance at each level.

‡ Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

$^{58}\text{Mn} \beta^-$ decay (65.4 s) **1974Ti01** (continued) $\gamma(^{58}\text{Fe})$

I_γ normalization: $\Sigma(I(\gamma+\text{ce}) \text{ of } \gamma'\text{'s to g.s.})=100$; assuming that g.s. β^- feeding is zero.

$E_\gamma^\dagger$	$I_\gamma^{#a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. ‡	$\delta^\ddagger$	Comments
458.5 ^{&c}		4088.47	4 ⁺	3629.57	2 ⁺			I_γ : weak G.
459.160 25	24.3 7	2133.89	3 ⁺	1674.72	2 ⁺	(M1)		
466.48 3	1.44 5	2600.39	4 ⁺	2133.89	3 ⁺	(M1)		
523.86 3	4.20 13	2600.39	4 ⁺	2076.52	4 ⁺	M1+E2	-0.15 5	
632.71 10	0.64 6	3233.26	2 ⁺	2600.39	4 ⁺			
810.761 21	100 3	810.770	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺	E2		Calibration energy. See 1974Ti01 . Note that from ^{58}Co decay, this energy is 810.7593 29 (2000He14 evaluation).
863.94 3	16.8 5	1674.72	2 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺	M1+E2	-0.69 5	
925.68 5	1.91 7	2600.39	4 ⁺	1674.72	2 ⁺	E2		
1156.77 7	1.19 5	3233.26	2 ⁺	2076.52	4 ⁺			
1265.74 5	10.3 3	2076.52	4 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺	E2		
1301.10 11	0.78 4	3901.61	(3) ⁺	2600.39	4 ⁺			
1323.09 5	67.3 20	2133.89	3 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺	M1+E2	-0.40 5	
1436.5 ^{@c}	≤ 0.04 [@]	4312.91	2 ⁺	2876.40	2 ⁺			
1446.5 3	0.11 2	4530.17	1,2	3083.73	2 ⁺			
1488.17 20	0.18 4	4088.47	4 ⁺	2600.39	4 ⁺			
1558.71 19	0.58 2	3233.26	2 ⁺	1674.72	2 ⁺			
1674.72 7	13.2 4	1674.72	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺	E2		
1712.2 3	0.08 3	4312.91	2 ⁺	2600.39	4 ⁺			
1767.74 8	3.60 15	3901.61	(3) ⁺	2133.89	3 ⁺			
1789.59 8	3.25 10	2600.39	4 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺	E2		
1825.1 ^{@c}	≤ 0.04 [@]	3901.61	(3) ⁺	2076.52	4 ⁺			E_γ : 1829.6 listed In level-scheme figure of 1974Ti01 seems incorrect.
2011.7 3	<0.18	4088.47	4 ⁺	2076.52	4 ⁺			I_γ : complex peak containing a small contribution from an impurity G.
2065.59 14	0.18 2	2876.40	2 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺	M1+E2	-0.33 +8-11	
2179.08 14	0.54 4	4312.91	2 ⁺	2133.89	3 ⁺			
2226.88 18	0.34 8	3901.61	(3) ⁺	1674.72	2 ⁺			
2236.33 15	0.39 2	4312.91	2 ⁺	2076.52	4 ⁺			
2272.99 23	0.09 2	3083.73	2 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺	M1+E2	-0.05 1	
2422.45 17	1.27 3	3233.26	2 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺			
2433.05 25	0.14 2	3243.9	0 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺			
2513.9 ^{&c} 4	0.06 2	4590.0	(2 ⁺ ,3,4 ⁺)	2076.52	4 ⁺			
2638.15 20	1.51 4	4312.91	2 ⁺	1674.72	2 ⁺			
2699.94 25	0.12 1	4833.9	1 ⁺ ,2 ⁺	2133.89	3 ⁺			
2818.5 ^b 3	0.96 ^b 3	3629.57	2 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺			
2818.5 ^b 3	0.96 ^b 3	4493.1		1674.72	2 ⁺			
2855.2 3	0.07 1	4530.17	1,2	1674.72	2 ⁺			
2876.3 ^{@c}	≤ 0.03 [@]	2876.40	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			
3083.6 ^{@c}	≤ 0.03 [@]	3083.73	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			
3090.7 4	0.11 2	3901.61	(3) ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺			
3233.2 ^{@c}	≤ 0.03 [@]	3233.26	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			
3501.9 8	0.02 2	4312.91	2 ⁺	810.770	2 ⁺			
3629.8 4	0.08 2	3629.57	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			
3681.7 5	0.08 2	4493.1		810.770	2 ⁺			
3778.1 6	0.17 2	4590.0	(2 ⁺ ,3,4 ⁺)	810.770	2 ⁺			
3901.5 ^{@c}	<0.02 [@]	3901.61	(3) ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{58}\text{Mn} \beta^-$ decay (65.4 s) [1974Ti01](#) (continued) $\gamma(^{58}\text{Fe})$ (continued)

<u>E_γ [†]</u>	<u>I_γ ^{#a}</u>	<u>$E_i(\text{level})$</u>	<u>J_i^π</u>	<u>E_f</u>	<u>J_f^π</u>
4312.7 ^{@c}	<0.02 [@]	4312.91	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺
4531.0 <i>15</i>	0.04 <i>2</i>	4530.17	1,2	0.0	0 ⁺

[†] From [1974Ti01](#).

[‡] From 'adopted gammas'.

[#] Values are from [1974Ti01](#), divided by 100 by the evaluators.

[@] γ not observed In [1974Ti01](#), an upper limit of intensity is given.

[&] Existence of this γ is uncertain.

^a For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.88 *4*.

^b Multiply placed with undivided intensity.

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

