

**Adopted Levels, Gammas**

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	M. Shamsuzzoha Basunia		NDS 151, 1 (2018)	1-Apr-2018

Q( $\beta^-$ )=-13455 SY; S(n)=12988 50; S(p)=2836.8 7; Q( $\alpha$ )=-4304.6 10    [2017Wa10](#)  
 $\Delta Q(\beta^-)$ =170 (syst) ([2017Wa10](#)).

No significant change from the ENSDF update by c.m. Baglin (8-Feb-2002) except g.s. half-life.

[Additional information 1.](#)

<sup>59</sup>Zn Levels

Cross Reference (XREF) Flags

- A <sup>58</sup>Ni(p, $\pi^-$ )
- B <sup>40</sup>Ca(<sup>24</sup>Mg, $\alpha n\gamma$ )

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	J $\pi$ <sup>‡</sup>	T <sub>1/2</sub>	XREF	Comments
0.0 <sup>#</sup>	3/2 <sup>-#</sup>	178.6 ms 18	AB	% $\epsilon$ +% $\beta^+$ =100; % $\epsilon$ p=0.10 3 % $\epsilon$ p is weighted average of 0.09% 2 ( <a href="#">1984Ar12</a> ) and 0.23% 8 ( <a href="#">1981Ho19</a> ). $\mu$ : predicted value is -0.57 10 ( <a href="#">2001Bu08</a> ), based on linear correlation between g.s. g-factors and superallowed $\beta$ -decay strengths of mirror nuclei. J $\pi$ : from super-allowed $\epsilon$ decay with log ft=3.71 2 to 3/2 <sup>-</sup> <sup>59</sup> Cu(g.s.). T <sub>1/2</sub> : Weighted ave. of 182.2 ms 18 ( <a href="#">1984Ar12</a> – from $\beta(t)$ with mass-separated source), 210 ms 20 ( <a href="#">1981Ho19</a> ), 173 ms 14 ( <a href="#">2002Lo13,2002B117</a> ), 213 ms 34 ( <a href="#">2014Ro14</a> ), 174 ms 2 ( <a href="#">2017RuZX</a> – same group reports 173.3 ms 33 in <a href="#">2014Ru08</a> ) at 99% level. Uncertainty is the lowest input value.
540? <sup>a</sup> 50			A	
894.2 <sup>@</sup> 10	(5/2 <sup>-</sup> ) <sup>@</sup>		AB	
1320 <sup>a</sup> 50			A	
1397.0? <sup>#</sup> 20	(7/2 <sup>-</sup> ) <sup>#</sup>		B	
1814.4 <sup>&amp;</sup> 12	(7/2 <sup>-</sup> ) <sup>&amp;</sup>		AB	XREF: A(1740).
2333.2 <sup>@</sup> 22	(9/2 <sup>-</sup> ) <sup>@</sup>		B	
2609.4 <sup>&amp;</sup> 16	(9/2 <sup>-</sup> ) <sup>&amp;</sup>		AB	XREF: A(2680).
3386.2 <sup>@</sup> 25	(13/2 <sup>-</sup> ) <sup>@</sup>		B	

<sup>†</sup> From least-squares adjustment of E $\gamma$ , except as noted.

<sup>‡</sup> From (<sup>24</sup>Mg, $\alpha n\gamma$ ); based on analogy with known structure in mirror nucleus, <sup>59</sup>Cu, except as noted.

<sup>#</sup> Energy is close to that of a possible ( $\pi$  p<sub>3/2</sub>) $\otimes$ ( $\nu$  (fp)<sub>0,2,4</sub>)<sup>2</sup> state in the mirror nucleus, <sup>59</sup>Cu ([2002An34](#)). However, configuration in mirror nucleus is believed to be strongly mixed ([2002An20](#)).

<sup>@</sup> Energy is close to that of a possible ( $\pi$  f<sub>5/2</sub>) $\otimes$ ( $\nu$  (fp)<sub>0,2,4</sub>)<sup>2</sup> state in the mirror nucleus, <sup>59</sup>Cu ([2002An34](#)). However, configuration in mirror nucleus is believed to be strongly mixed ([2002An20](#)).

<sup>&</sup> Energy is very close to that of a possible ( $\pi$  f<sub>7/2</sub>)<sup>-1</sup> $\otimes$ ( $\nu$  (fp)<sub>0,2,4</sub>)<sup>2</sup> state in the mirror nucleus, <sup>59</sup>Cu ([2002An34](#)).

<sup>a</sup> From (p, $\pi^-$ ).

Adopted Levels, Gammas (continued) $\gamma(^{59}\text{Zn})$ 

$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_\gamma^\dagger$	$I_\gamma^\dagger$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$
894.2	(5/2 <sup>-</sup> )	894 1	100	0.0	3/2 <sup>-</sup>
1397.0?	(7/2 <sup>-</sup> )	1397 <sup>‡</sup> 2	100	0.0	3/2 <sup>-</sup>
1814.4	(7/2 <sup>-</sup> )	419 <sup>‡</sup> 1	78 52	1397.0? (7/2 <sup>-</sup> )	
		920 1	47 19	894.2 (5/2 <sup>-</sup> )	
		1815 2	100 45	0.0	3/2 <sup>-</sup>
2333.2	(9/2 <sup>-</sup> )	1439 2	100	894.2 (5/2 <sup>-</sup> )	
2609.4	(9/2 <sup>-</sup> )	795 1	100	1814.4 (7/2 <sup>-</sup> )	
3386.2	(13/2 <sup>-</sup> )	1053 1	100	2333.2 (9/2 <sup>-</sup> )	

† From  $^{40}\text{Ca}(^{24}\text{Mg},\alpha n\gamma)$ .

‡ 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)