

$^{62}\text{Zn} \varepsilon+\beta^+ \text{ decay (9.197 h)}$ [1974Jo11](#),[1973Gi01](#),[1967An01](#)

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Balraj Singh, Huang Xiaolong, and Wang Xianghan		NDS 204,1 (2025)	30-Jun-2023

Parent: ^{62}Zn : E=0.0; $J^\pi=0^+$; $T_{1/2}=9.197$ h 20; $Q(\varepsilon)=1619.5$ 7; % ε +% β^+ decay=100

$^{62}\text{Zn-T}_{1/2}$: From ^{62}Zn Adopted Levels.

$^{62}\text{Zn-Q}(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$: From [2021Wa16](#).

[1974Jo11](#) (also [1971JoZN](#) thesis): ^{62}Zn from Cu(p,2n),E=25 MeV. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ -coin using Ge(Li) detector with Compton suppression. A total of 31 γ rays from 41 to 1526 keV were assigned to the decay of ^{62}Zn .

[Additional information 1](#).

[1973Gi01](#): ^{62}Zn from Cu(p,2n),E=25 MeV. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$ using Ge(Li) detector. Energies and intensities of 19 γ rays reported.

[1967An01](#): ^{62}Zn from ^{63}Cu (p,2n). Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$ using Ge(Li) detector, conversion electrons and positrons using a double-focusing iron-yoke β spectrometer. Authors present detailed spectra of conversion electron lines for different atomic shells, but the intensities are provided for only the K-shell conversion.

[1969Ho01](#): ^{62}Zn from Ni($^3\text{He},n$),E<10 MeV. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ -coin using Ge(Li) detectors. Energies and intensities of 11 rays from 41 to 637 keV reported. Deduced $\alpha(K)\exp$ from ce data in [1967An01](#) and $I\gamma$ values in their work. Spectra from separated ^{62}Zn activity were measured using an anion exchange column and every five minutes discarding the 9.67-min ^{62}Cu daughter activity.

Others:

[1982Gr10](#): ^{62}Zn from Cu(p,2n),E=15-70 MeV. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, and $T_{1/2}$ of ^{62}Zn decay using Ge(Li) detector. Relative intensities of six γ rays reported.

[1975Ro25](#) (also [1974RoZD](#) thesis): ^{62}Zn from Cu(p,2n),E=25 MeV. Measured $T_{1/2}$ of 41-keV level by $\gamma\gamma(t)$.

[1974Wa09](#): ^{62}Zn from ^{60}Ni ($\alpha,2n$),E not stated. An ion-exchange column was used for separation of ^{62}Zn and ^{62}Cu fractions. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$ using Ge(Li) detector. Relative intensities of ten γ rays from 243 to 637 keV were reported, and that of annihilation radiation. Deduced $I\beta^+$.

[1970BoZE](#): measured g factor of 41-keV level by perturbed angular correlation technique through the 596γ - 41γ cascade.

[1968Ba21](#): measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ -coin, level half-life by $\gamma\gamma(t)$, $T_{1/2}$ of ^{62}Zn decay using Ge(Li) and NaI(Tl) detectors. Eight γ rays reported from 42 to 682 keV. The γ -ray energies are given to nearest keV.

[1967Ro01](#): ^{62}Zn from ^{63}Cu (p,2n),E=25 MeV measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$ of 11 γ rays from 42 to 639 keV using Ge(Li) detector.

[1967Wi20](#): measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$ of 547γ and 590γ using Ge(Li) detector.

[1957Br20](#): measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ -coin, $\beta\gamma$ -coin, $\gamma\gamma(t)$, $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ using NaI(Tl) detectors. Seven γ rays reported from 42 to 700 keV.

[1954Nu27](#): measured conversion electrons for 41-keV transition using magnetic spectrometer.

[1950Ha65](#): measured conversion electrons for 41-keV transition, $E\beta^+$, ε/β^+ ratio using magnetic spectrometer.

Total decay energy of 1637 keV 92 deduced (by RADLIST code) from proposed decay scheme is in agreement with the expected value of 1619.5 keV 7, indicating that decay scheme is complete.

 ^{62}Cu Levels

Levels at 1142 keV and 1281 keV proposed by [1973Gi01](#) simply on the basis of g.s. transitions for both levels are rejected by [1974Jo11](#), since the 1142γ is seen in coincidence with the 247γ , and no evidence was found for the existence of a 1280.8 γ reported by [1973Gi01](#). Note that an 1141.6-keV level is populated in in-beam γ -ray data, but none of the γ rays from this level reported in the reaction data seen in ^{62}Zn decay.

A 682 level reported by [1968Ba21](#) is omitted here as a 682γ reported in this work as g.s. transition is not observed in any other study. The 394γ placed from this level in [1968Ba21](#) is assigned, instead, from 637 level based on $\gamma\gamma$ -coin data.

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$ [‡]	Comments
0.0 40.847 32	1^+ 2^+	9.672 min 8 4.57 ns 18	$g=+0.67$ 6 (PAC, 1970BoZE). $T_{1/2}$: ($507\gamma+596\gamma$)(41γ)(t) (1975Ro25). Others: 4.8 ns 1 (1969BoZR), 2.5 ns 1 (1968Ba21), <8 ns (1957Br20). Additional information 2 .
243.441 25	2^+		

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{62}\text{Zn } \varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) 1974Jo11,1973Gi01,1967An01 (continued) **^{62}Cu Levels (continued)**

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$ [‡]	Comments
287.87 4	2 ⁺		
426.16 7	3 ⁺	>0.16 ps	
548.374 32	1 ⁺	>0.17 ps	
637.484 31	1 ⁺	0.15 ps +28–8	
644.82 6	(2 ⁺)		
698.39 12	(3) ⁺		
915.33 7	2 ⁺		
1221.51 20	(0 to 3) ⁺		J^π : if ε feeding to this level is real, then J=2 and 3 are not possible.
1429.60 7	1 ⁺		
1525.98 17	1 ⁺		

[†] From least-squares fit to E γ data, keeping energy of 40.89-keV level as fixed.

[‡] From the Adopted Levels.

 ε, β^+ radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$ [†]	$I\varepsilon$ [†]	Log ft	$I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ [†]	Comments
(93.5 12)	1525.98		0.0089 14	5.99 7		$\varepsilon K=0.8673$ 2; $\varepsilon L=0.11261$ 15; $\varepsilon M+=0.02006$ 3
(189.9 12)	1429.60		0.101 6	5.59 3		$\varepsilon K=0.8778$; $\varepsilon L=0.10385$ 3; $\varepsilon M+=0.018307$ 6
(398.0 [‡] 13)	1221.51		0.00146 24	8.1 1		$\varepsilon K=0.8827$; $\varepsilon L=0.09981$; $\varepsilon M+=0.01750$
						I ε : weak feeding is considered uncertain. Unobserved weak γ rays feeding the 1221.5 level may be responsible for this feeding.
(704.2 [‡] 12)	915.33		<0.038	>7.2		$\varepsilon K=0.8845$; $\varepsilon L=0.09828$; $\varepsilon M+=0.01719$
						No direct ε feeding is expected from 0 ⁺ parent to a 2 ⁺ level. Apparent ε feeding of 0.0351 24 may be due to an unreported weak 514.3 γ from 1429.6 level, which would be obscured by the 511-keV annihilation radiation.
(974.7 [‡] 12)	644.82		<0.0148	>7.9		$\varepsilon K=0.8852$; $\varepsilon L=0.09773$; $\varepsilon M+=0.01709$
						No direct ε feeding is expected from 0 ⁺ parent to a 2 ⁺ level. Apparent ε feeding of 0.0138 10 may be due to unobserved weak γ rays feeding the 644.8 level.
(982.0 12)	637.484		28.1 12	4.61 2		$\varepsilon K=0.8852$; $\varepsilon L=0.09772$; $\varepsilon M+=0.01708$
(1071.1 12)	548.374		31.3 15	4.63 2	31.3 15	$\varepsilon K=0.8853$; $\varepsilon L=0.09761$; $\varepsilon M+=0.01706$
(1619.5 16)	0.0	8.4 6	33 2	4.98 4	41 3	av $E\beta=255.44$ 30; $\varepsilon K=0.7052$ 6; $\varepsilon L=0.07736$ 7; $\varepsilon M+=0.01351$ 2 Measured $E\beta^+=0.66$ MeV 1 (1950Ha65), which gives $Q(\varepsilon)=1682$ 10.

[†] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

[‡] Existence of this branch is questionable.

$^{62}\text{Zn } \varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) [1974Jo11](#), [1973Gi01](#), [1967An01](#) (continued)

$\gamma(^{62}\text{Cu})$

I γ normalization: From unweighted average of 0.241 12, 0.270 7 and 0.241 9 obtained from three different measurements as follows: 1. 0.241 12 from total activity (in relative units) of decay of ^{62}Zn =415 21, deduced from observed I(γ^\pm)=824 41 ([1974Jo11](#)) in $^{62}\text{Zn}/^{62}\text{Cu}$ transient equilibrium. Observed I(γ^\pm) represents 97.589% 25 β^+ branching in the decay of ^{62}Cu . True intensity of I(γ^\pm) from ^{62}Cu decay is corrected by a factor of $[T_{1/2}(^{62}\text{Zn})-T_{1/2}(^{62}\text{Cu})]/T_{1/2}(^{62}\text{Zn}) = 0.9825\ 21$. 2. 0.270 7 from total activity (in relative units) of decay of ^{62}Zn =370 10 from measured I(γ^\pm)=55.1 27 ([1974Wa09](#)) in separated ^{62}Zn activity by ion-exchange column, theoretical value of I ε /I β^+ (to g.s.)=3.904 35, and summed I($\gamma+ce$) to the g.s. in the present decay scheme. 3. 0.241 9 from measured I($\beta^++\varepsilon$)=43.4 8 ([1969Ho01](#)), and I($\gamma+ce$)(to g.s.) = 56.6 8, in $^{62}\text{Zn}/^{62}\text{Cu}$ transient equilibrium. Measured intensity of the annihilation radiation is not listed by authors.

Measured I(γ^\pm)=824 41 ([1974Jo11](#)), relative to 100 for 597γ , for $^{62}\text{Zn}/^{62}\text{Cu}$ in equilibrium.

Measured I(γ^\pm)=55.10 27 ([1974Wa09](#)), relative to 100 for 597γ , from eluted ^{62}Zn activity. Also measured I γ (1173 γ from ^{62}Cu decay)/I(γ^\pm)=0.416 6 from $^{62}\text{Zn}/^{62}\text{Cu}$ in equilibrium, and 0.354 27 from eluted ^{62}Cu activity; the difference in the two relative intensities attributed ^{62}Zn positron contribution.

Measured I($\beta^++\varepsilon$)=43.4% 8, I(ε_K)/I(β^+)=4.4 9 ([1969Ho01](#)), as given in text without giving measured intensities of I(γ^\pm) and K x-rays; also in the abstract authors quote I($\beta^++\varepsilon$)=43% 5, I(β^+)/I(ε_K)=0.22 1.

$\alpha(K)\exp$ deduced by evaluators from measured Ice(K) values in [1967An01](#), and I γ values recommended in this dataset. Note that [1967An01](#), in their Table 1, listed Ice(K) normalized to theoretical $\alpha(K)$ values for the 40.9 γ and 596.6 γ for mult=M1 for both. Evaluators treat the listed Ice(K) values as relative intensities, and deduced $\alpha(K)\exp$ for γ -ray energies using $\alpha(K)=0.575\ 8$ for the 40.9 γ .

A 1280.8 15 γ reported by [1973Gi01](#) with I γ =0.03 1 is not confirmed by [1974Jo11](#) within an upper limit of I γ <0.005.

A 682 γ , with I γ ≈4 2 reported by [1968Ba21](#) is not observed in any other studies, thus omitted here.

3

E_γ^{\dagger}	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. $\&$	α^b	Comments
40.89 6	99 4	40.847	2 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	M1	0.645 9	%I γ =24.9 14 $\alpha(\text{exp})=0.665\ 30$ $\alpha(K)=0.575\ 8$; $\alpha(L)=0.0607\ 9$; $\alpha(M)=0.00854\ 12$ $\alpha(N)=0.000249\ 4$ $E\gamma=40.85\ 6$, I γ =98 5 (1974Jo11). $E\gamma=40.94\ 6$, I γ =104 10 (1973Gi01). $E\gamma=40.84\ 13$, I γ =99.4 35 (1969Ho01). $E\gamma=40.88\ 9$, I γ =102 (deduced) (1967An01). $E\gamma=41.5\ 2$, I($\gamma+ce$)=192 19 (1967Ro01). $E\gamma=41.3\ 3$ (1954Nu27), 41.8 3 (1950Ha65); both from ce data. Ice(K)=60.2 8 (1967An01 ; K-, L- and M+N-shell lines observed in conversion electron spectra). $\alpha(\text{exp})$ deduced by evaluators from transition intensity balance at at 40.8-keV level. Measured K/(L+M)=8.0 15 (1954Nu27), ≥ 6.4 (1950Ha65). Measured L1/(L2+L3)>10 (1967An01). Theoretical values from BrIcc: K/(L+M)=8.33 for M1, 5.23 for E2, and 9.6 for E1; L1/(L2+L3)=12.3 for M1, 0.88 for E2, and 5.4 for E1.

$^{62}\text{Zn } \varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) [1974Jo11](#),[1973Gi01](#),[1967An01](#) (continued)

$\gamma(^{62}\text{Cu})$ (continued)

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. &	a^b	Comments
202.67 # 6	0.042 # 5	243.441	2 ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺	[M1+E2]	0.025 17	Others: $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.52$ 8 (1954Nu27 , corrected to 0.49 8 by 1957Br20 for the presence of 511-annihilation radiation); $\alpha(\text{exp})=0.65$ 10 (1957Br20 , deduced from decay scheme); Mult.: E1 or M1 from K/(L+M) ratio; M1 from $\alpha(\text{exp})$, $\alpha(K)\text{exp}$, and L-subshell ratio. Using $\alpha(\text{exp})$ and K/(L+M), $\delta(E2/M1)<0.056$ from BrIccMixing code.
243.42 3	10.04 27	243.441	2 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	M1	0.00539 8	%I γ =0.0105 13 %I γ =2.52 12 $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.00452$ 27 $\alpha(K)=0.00483$ 7; $\alpha(L)=0.000488$ 7; $\alpha(M)=6.86\times 10^{-5}$ 10 $\alpha(N)=2.072\times 10^{-6}$ 29 $I\gamma=9.80$ 25 (1982Gr10), 8.36 29 (1974Wa09). $E\gamma=243.36$ 6, $I\gamma=9.7$ 5 (1974Jo11). $E\gamma=243.44$ 3, $I\gamma=11.1$ 5 (1973Gi01). $E\gamma=243.18$ 15, $I\gamma=10.3$ 5 (1969Ho01). $E\gamma=243.40$ 5, $I\gamma\approx 7$ (1967An01); $I\gamma=11.0$ 9 for $243\gamma+247\gamma$. $E\gamma=243.7$ 5, $I\gamma=15.4$ 16 (1967Ro01). Ice(K)=0.0480 14 (1967An01 ; K- and L+M-shell lines observed in conversion electron spectra). $\alpha(K)\text{exp}$ is slightly lower than $\alpha(K)$ for M1. $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.00388$ 25
247.00 4	7.64 25	287.87	2 ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺	M1	0.00520 7	$\alpha(K)=0.00466$ 7; $\alpha(L)=0.000470$ 7; $\alpha(M)=6.62\times 10^{-5}$ 9 $\alpha(N)=1.999\times 10^{-6}$ 28 $I\gamma=7.35$ 19 (1982Gr10), 6.38 23 (1974Wa09). $E\gamma=246.95$ 6, $I\gamma=7.3$ 4 (1974Jo11). $E\gamma=247.04$ 4, $I\gamma=8.3$ 4 (1973Gi01). $E\gamma=246.70$ 10, $I\gamma=8.2$ 3 (1969Ho01). $E\gamma=247.02$ 9, $I\gamma\approx 4$ (1967An01); $I\gamma=11.0$ 9 for $243\gamma+247\gamma$. $E\gamma=247.2$ 5, $I\gamma=11.5$ 12 (1967Ro01). Ice(K)=0.0313 9 (1967An01 ; K- and L+M-shell lines observed in conversion electron spectra).
260.48 6	5.68 16	548.374	1 ⁺	287.87	2 ⁺	M1	0.00456 6	$\alpha(K)\text{exp}$ is lower than $\alpha(K)$ for M1. $\alpha(K)\text{exp}=0.00338$ 30 $\alpha(K)=0.00409$ 6; $\alpha(L)=0.000412$ 6; $\alpha(M)=5.80\times 10^{-5}$ 8 $\alpha(N)=1.754\times 10^{-6}$ 25 $I\gamma=5.35$ 13 (1982Gr10), 3.43 54 (1974Wa09). $E\gamma=260.43$ 7, $I\gamma=5.2$ 3 (1974Jo11). $E\gamma=260.50$ 6, $I\gamma=5.9$ 3 (1973Gi01). $E\gamma=260.32$ 6, $I\gamma=5.9$ 1 (1969Ho01). $E\gamma=260.44$ 10, $I\gamma=2.6$ 5 (1967An01).

$^{62}\text{Zn } \varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) 1974Jo11,1973Gi01,1967An01 (continued)

$\gamma(^{62}\text{Cu})$ (continued)

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. &	δ	α^b	Comments
(272.3 @ 3) 304.92 7	0.0033 1.20 7	698.39 548.374	(3) ⁺ 1 ⁺	426.16 243.441	3 ⁺ 2 ⁺	[M1+E2]		0.006 4	$E\gamma=260.7~5, I\gamma=8.5~9$ (1967Ro01). $\alpha(K)=0.0203~14$ (1967An01); K- and L+M-shell lines observed in conversion electron spectra. $\alpha(K)\exp$ is lower than $\alpha(K)$ for M1. $\%I\gamma=8.3\times10^{-4}$ $\%I\gamma=0.301~21$ $I\gamma=0.61~17$ (1974Wa09). $E\gamma=304.88~9, I\gamma=1.11~6$ (1974Jo11). $E\gamma=305.00~7, I\gamma=1.2~1$ (1973Gi01). $E\gamma=304.60~11, I\gamma=1.32~7$ (1969Ho01). $E\gamma=305.5~10, I\gamma=0.77~8$ (1967Ro01). $\%I\gamma=0.437~33$ $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0037~6$ $\alpha(K)=0.0037~8; \alpha(L)=0.00037~8; \alpha(M)=5.2\times10^{-5}~11$ $\alpha(N)=1.53\times10^{-6}~32$ $I\gamma=0.44~16$ (1974Wa09). $E\gamma=349.60~13, I\gamma=1.73~11$ (1974Jo11). $E\gamma=349.59~7, I\gamma=1.8~1$ (1973Gi01). $E\gamma=349.22~9, I\gamma=1.59~16$ (1969Ho01). $E\gamma=349.69~25, I\gamma\approx1$ (1967An01). $E\gamma=349.5~10, I\gamma=1.54~16$ (1967Ro01). $\alpha(K)=0.0068~10$ (1967An01). $\alpha(K)\exp$ from ce data in 1967An01 gives $\delta(E2/M1)=1.0~+5-4$, but this value gives $B(E2)(W.u.)=400~+800-300$, as compared to RUL=300 for $B(E2)(W.u.)$. $\%I\gamma=0.0171~17$ $E\gamma=385.31~9, I\gamma=0.067~6$ (1974Jo11). $E\gamma=385.2~4, I\gamma=0.08~2$ (1973Gi01). $\%I\gamma=2.26~10$ $\alpha(K)\exp=0.00228~28$ $\alpha(K)=0.00228~29; \alpha(L)=0.000231~29; \alpha(M)=3.2\times10^{-5}~4$ $\alpha(N)=9.6\times10^{-7}~12$ $I\gamma=8.42~23$ (1982Gr10), 7.01~73 (1974Wa09). $E\gamma=394.03~6, I\gamma=8.6~4$ (1974Jo11); $\Delta(I\gamma)=0.04$ in 1974Jo11 seems too low to be realistic, evaluators increase it to 0.4. $E\gamma=394.06~4, I\gamma=9.2~4$ (1973Gi01). $E\gamma=393.84~6, I\gamma=9.16~12$ (1969Ho01). $E\gamma=394.12~18, I\gamma=6.2~10$ (1967An01). $E\gamma=394.5~5, I\gamma=10.8~11$ (1967Ro01). $\alpha(K)=0.0217~24$ (1967An01); K- and L+M-shell lines observed in
349.54 7	1.74 11	637.484	1 ⁺	287.87	2 ⁺	M1+E2	1.0 +5-4	0.0041 9	
385.31 9	0.068 6	426.16	3 ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺				
394.05 4	8.99 18	637.484	1 ⁺	243.441	2 ⁺	M1+E2	0.78 +26-22	0.00255 32	

⁶²Zn $\varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) 1974Jo11,1973Gi01,1967An01 (continued) $\gamma(^{62}\text{Cu})$ (continued)

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. &	δ	α^b	Comments
(455.0 @ 3) 489.17 7	0.0046 0.061 6	698.39 915.33	(3) ⁺ 2 ⁺	243.441 426.16	2 ⁺ 3 ⁺				conversion electron spectra). $\alpha(K)\exp$ from ce data in 1967An01 gives $\delta(E2/M1)=0.78+26-22$, but this value gives $B(E2)(W.u.)=800^{1100-500}$, as compared to RUL=300 for $B(E2)(W.u.)$. For this reason, E2 assigned un 1967An01 is correct.
507.58 10	57 3	548.374	1 ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺	M1+E2	0.86 +24-22	0.00128 11	%I γ =1.16×10 ⁻³ %I γ =0.0153 16 E γ =489.17 7, I γ =0.061 6 (1974Jo11). E γ =489.1 4, I γ =0.06 2 (1973Gi01). %I γ =14.3 10 $\alpha(K)\exp=0.00115 9$ $\alpha(K)=0.00115 10$; $\alpha(L)=0.000115 10$; $\alpha(M)=1.62\times10^{-5} 14$ $\alpha(N)=4.9\times10^{-7} 4$ I γ =65.90 54 (1974Wa09). E γ =507.60 10, I γ =57 3 (1974Jo11). E γ =507.5 4, I γ =58 10 (1973Gi01). E γ =507.2 10, I γ =65 15 (1969Ho01). E γ =507.57 13, I γ =60 15 (1967An01). E γ =507.5 10, I γ =77 8 (1967Ro01). Ice(K)=0.0693 20 (1967An01); K- and L+M-shell lines observed in conversion electron spectra).
548.38 4	60.6 10	548.374	1 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	M1+E2	0.51 15	0.00092 6	%I γ =15.2 7 $\alpha(K)\exp=0.00082 5$ $\alpha(K)=0.00082 5$; $\alpha(L)=8.2\times10^{-5} 5$; $\alpha(M)=1.15\times10^{-5} 7$ $\alpha(N)=3.49\times10^{-7} 21$ I γ =59.7 14 (1982Gr10), 59.1 11 (1974Wa09). E γ =548.35 11, I γ =59 3 (1974Jo11). E γ =548.41 4, I γ =60.8 10 (1973Gi01). E γ =548.33 6, I γ =62.2 9 (1969Ho01). E γ =548.33 22, I γ =54 5 (1967An01). E γ =548.7 5, I γ =65 7 (1967Ro01). Ice(K)=0.0528 12 (1967An01); K- and L+M-shell lines observed in conversion electron spectra).
596.63 4	100	637.484	1 ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺	M1	$6.64\times10^{-4} 9$	%I γ =25.1 10 $\alpha(K)\exp=0.000558 28$	$\alpha(K)\exp$ from ce data in 1967An01 gives $\delta(E2/M1)=0.51 15$, but this value gives $B(E2)(W.u.)<700$, as compared to RUL=300 for $B(E2)(W.u.)$.

⁶²Zn $\varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) 1974Jo11,1973Gi01,1967An01 (continued) $\gamma(^{62}\text{Cu})$ (continued)

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. &	a^b	Comments
627.8 [#] 4	0.003 [#] 1	915.33	2 ⁺	287.87	2 ⁺			$\alpha(K)=0.000596\ 8; \alpha(L)=5.92\times 10^{-5}\ 8; \alpha(M)=8.33\times 10^{-6}\ 12$ $\alpha(N)=2.54\times 10^{-7}\ 4$ $I_\gamma=100$ (1982Gr10), 100 (1974Wa09). $E_\gamma=596.56\ 13, I_\gamma=100$ (1974Jo11). $E_\gamma=596.65\ 4, I_\gamma=100$ (1973Gi01). $E_\gamma=596.60\ 6, I_\gamma=100$ (1969Ho01). $E_\gamma=596.68\ 20, I_\gamma=100\ 8$ (1967An01). $E_\gamma=597.0\ 5, I_\gamma=100\ 10$ (1967Ro01). Ice(K)=0.0590 13 (1967An01); K- and L+M-shell lines observed in conversion electron spectra. Mult.: $\alpha(K)\exp$ in slightly lower than $\alpha(K)$ for M1. $\%I_\gamma=0.00075\ 25$ $\%I_\gamma=0.244\ 18$ $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0015\ 7$ $\alpha(K)=0.00065\ 13; \alpha(L)=6.5\times 10^{-5}\ 14; \alpha(M)=9.1\times 10^{-6}\ 19$ $\alpha(N)=2.8\times 10^{-7}\ 5$ $I_\gamma=0.89\ 9$ (1974Wa09). $E_\gamma=637.41\ 7, I_\gamma=0.98\ 6$ (1974Jo11). $E_\gamma=637.53\ 6, I_\gamma=0.96\ 6$ (1973Gi01). $E_\gamma=637.25\ 6, I_\gamma=3.45\ 25$ (1969Ho01), I_γ is much larger than in other studies as it is not corrected for summing, as pointed out in 1974Jo11; this value is not used in averaging). $E_\gamma=636.9\ 5, I_\gamma\leq 1$ (1967An01). $E_\gamma=638.5\ 10, I_\gamma=1.54\ 16$ (1967Ro01). Ice(K)=0.0015 7 (1967An01).
637.47 6	0.97 6	637.484	1 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	M1+E2	0.00072 15	
644.82 [#] 6	0.055 [#] 3	644.82	(2 ⁺)	0.0	1 ⁺			$\%I_\gamma=0.0138\ 9$
657.5 [#] 5	0.005 [#] 1	698.39	(3) ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺			$\%I_\gamma=0.00126\ 26$
671.84 [#] 9	0.017 [#] 2	915.33	2 ⁺	243.441	2 ⁺			$\%I_\gamma=0.0043\ 5$
731.23 [#] 15	0.0088 [#] 12	1429.60	1 ⁺	698.39	(3) ⁺			$\%I_\gamma=0.00221\ 31$
792.03 [#] 7	0.034 [#] 3	1429.60	1 ⁺	637.484	1 ⁺			$\%I_\gamma=0.0085\ 8$
827.59 [#] 14	0.0115 [#] 14	1525.98	1 ⁺	698.39	(3) ⁺			$\%I_\gamma=0.0029\ 4$
881.4 3	0.056 4	1429.60	1 ⁺	548.374	1 ⁺			$\%I_\gamma=0.0141\ 12$
915.45 16	0.059 4	915.33	2 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺			$E_\gamma=881.4\ 3, I_\gamma=0.056\ 4$ (1974Jo11). $E_\gamma=881.4\ 8, I_\gamma=0.08\ 3$ (1973Gi01). $\%I_\gamma=0.0148\ 12$
1142.21 29	0.133 8	1429.60	1 ⁺	287.87	2 ⁺			$E_\gamma=915.44\ 16, I_\gamma=0.059\ 4$ (1974Jo11). $E_\gamma=915.6\ 6, I_\gamma=0.08\ 3$ (1973Gi01). $\%I_\gamma=0.0334\ 24$
1186.2 [#] 3	0.015 [#] 5	1429.60	1 ⁺	243.441	2 ⁺			$E_\gamma=1141.91\ 11, I_\gamma=0.133\ 8$ (1974Jo11). $E_\gamma=1142.5\ 2, I_\gamma=0.13\ 3$ (1973Gi01). $\%I_\gamma=0.0038\ 13$

⁶²Zn $\varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) [1974Jo11](#), [1973Gi01](#), [1967An01](#) (continued) $\gamma(^{62}\text{Cu})$ (continued)

E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger a}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Comments
1221.5 [#] 2	0.0058 [#] 9	1221.51	(0 to 3) ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	%I γ =0.00146 23
x1321.3 7	0.0026 10					%I γ =0.00065 25
1389.1 4	0.045 3	1429.60	1 ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺	%I γ =0.0113 9 E γ =1389.1 4, I γ =0.045 3 (1974Jo11). E γ =1389.1 5, I γ =0.05 2 (1973Gi01).
1429.9 3	0.111 10	1429.60	1 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	%I γ =0.0279 28 E γ =1429.7 7, I γ =0.106 10 (1974Jo11). E γ =1429.9 3, I γ =0.13 2 (1973Gi01).
1485.1 [#] 5	0.002 [#] 1	1525.98	1 ⁺	40.847	2 ⁺	%I γ =0.00050 25
1525.9 [#] 6	0.022 [#] 5	1525.98	1 ⁺	0.0	1 ⁺	%I γ =0.0055 13

[†] Weighted averages of values from [1974Jo11](#), [1973Gi01](#), [1969Ho01](#) and [1967An01](#), when available in the last three references, otherwise from [1974Jo11](#). Note that in the averaging procedure, 0.2 keV has been added to the values from [1969Ho01](#) in the energy range of 243 and 394 keV, as these appear systematically lower as compared to the values in other studies.

[‡] Weighted averages of values from [1974Jo11](#), [1982Gr10](#), [1973Gi01](#) and [1969Ho01](#), when available in the last three references, otherwise from [1974Jo11](#).

[#] γ from [1974Jo11](#) only.

^a γ from the Adopted dataset, not reported in ⁶²Zn ε decay.

[&] From ce data in [1967An01](#).

^a For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.251 10.

^b Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code ([2008Ki07](#)) with “Frozen Orbitals” approximation based on γ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

$^{62}\text{Zn} \varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (9.197 h) 1974Jo11,1973Gi01,1967An01