

^{60}Zn ε decay 1969Ho01,1972Du09

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	E. Browne, J. K. Tuli	NDS 114, 1849 (2013)		31-Dec-2012

Parent: ^{60}Zn : E=0; $J^\pi=0^+$; $T_{1/2}=2.38$ min 5; $Q(\varepsilon)=4170.8$ 16; % ε +% β^+ decay=100.0

^{60}Zn -Q(ε): from 2012Wa38.

Production: Ni($^3\text{He},\text{n}$), E(^3He)<10 MeV, chemical separation. Measured $\gamma(t)$ and $\gamma\gamma$ with NaI, singles spectra with Ge(Li) (1969Ho01).

Production: Ni($^3\text{He},\text{n}$), E(^3He)=15 MeV, mass separation. Measured $\gamma(t)$ with NaI and singles spectra with Ge(Li) (1972Du09).

Production: Ni($^3\text{He},\text{n}$), E(^3He)=15 MeV, chemical separation. Measured $\gamma^\pm\gamma(t)$ (1975Ro25).

Production: Ni(α,xn), E(α)= 50 MeV. On-line isotope separator. Measured β^+ spectra, γ singles, and $\gamma(t)$ (1986Ka38).

The decay scheme is established from $\gamma\gamma$ data from 1969Ho01.

Other: 1955Li39.

 ^{60}Cu Levels

E(level)	J^π	$T_{1/2}$	Comments		
0.0	2^+	23.7 min 4	T _{1/2} :	From Adopted Levels.	
62.0 4	1 ⁺	2.00 ns 10	T _{1/2} :	from 1975Ro25, $\gamma\gamma(t)$.	
335.7 3					
364.6 3	(1 ⁺)				
670.1 3	1 ⁺				
947? 1					

 ε, β^+ radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	I β^+ [†]	I ε [†]	Log ft	I $(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ [†]	Comments
(3223.8 [‡] 19)	947?	0.9 3	0.053 16	6.0 1	1.0 3	av E β =975.4 9; εK =0.04737 12; εL =0.005172 13; εM =0.00090
(3500.7 16)	670.1	70 6	2.8 2	4.4 1	73 6	av E β =1104.9 8; εK =0.03357 7; εL =0.003663 7; εM =0.00064
(3806.2 16)	364.6	3.1 7	0.086 19	5.9 1	3.2 7	av E β =1248.9 8; εK =0.02388 5; εL =0.002605 5; εM =0.0004547 8
(3835.1 [‡] 16)	335.7	<4	<0.1	>5.9	<4	av E β =1262.6 8; εK =0.02317 4; εL =0.002527 5; εM =0.0004411 8
(4108.8 17)	62.0	20 5	0.40 10	5.3 1	20 5	av E β =1392.4 8; εK =0.01763 3; εL =0.001923 3; εM =0.0003356 6

[†] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

[‡] Existence of this branch is questionable.

 $\gamma(^{60}\text{Cu})$

I γ normalization: from $\Sigma I(\gamma+ce)(\text{to g.s.})=100$, assuming zero feeding to g.s. (0⁺ to 2⁺ transition).

E γ [‡]	I γ # @	E _i (level)	J $^\pi_i$	E _f	J $^\pi_f$	Mult.	δ	α [†]	Comments
61.4 6	40 5	62.0	1 ⁺	0.0	2 ⁺	M1(+E2)	<0.11	0.226 24	$\alpha(K)=0.201$ 20; $\alpha(L)=0.022$ 3; $\alpha(M)=0.0030$ 4; $\alpha(N+..)=8.6\times 10^{-5}$ 8 $\alpha(N)=8.6\times 10^{-5}$ 8 B(M1)(W.u.)>0.036?; B(E2)(W.u.)<2.4×10 ² ?

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{60}\text{Zn } \varepsilon$ decay 1969Ho01,1972Du09 (continued) **$\gamma(^{60}\text{Cu})$ (continued)**

E_γ^{\dagger}	$I_\gamma^{\#@\mathcal{I}}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Comments
273.4 4	17 2	335.7		62.0	1 ⁺	Mult., δ : see Adopted Levels, gammas. This value is consistent with the upper limit $\alpha(\exp)<1.9$ from $I(\gamma^\pm)/I(\gamma)$ (1969Ho01).
334.4 1	14 2	670.1	1 ⁺	335.7		
364.6 3	5 1	364.6	(1 ⁺)	0.0	2 ⁺	
^x 572.4 3	4.1 11					E_γ : peak probably due to $511\gamma+61\gamma$ coin summing.
670.3 3	100 5	670.1	1 ⁺	0.0	2 ⁺	I_γ : Uncertainty estimated by evaluators.
947 ^{&} 1	1.6 4	947?		0.0	2 ⁺	E_γ : seen only by 1972Du09.

[†] Additional information 1.[‡] From 1969Ho01, except as noted.[#] Average of values from 1969Ho01 and 1972Du09.[@] For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.64 5.[&] Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

$^{60}\text{Zn} \varepsilon$ decay 1969Ho01,1972Du09