

<sup>61</sup>Ni(<sup>3</sup>He,2n $\gamma$ ) 2010A128

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Alan L. Nichols, Balraj Singh, Jagdish K. Tuli		NDS 113, 973 (2012)	15-Apr-2012

2010A128: E=14 MeV, measured E $\gamma$ , I $\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ , level lifetimes by DSAM using HORUS spectrometer consisting of twelve HPGe detectors at the Cologne Tandem accelerator facility. Comparison with shell model and IBM calculations. Identification of multi-phonon excitations and one-phonon mixed-symmetry 2<sup>+</sup> state.

Additional information 1.

<sup>62</sup>Zn Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	J <sup><math>\pi</math></sup>	T <sub>1/2</sub> <sup>‡</sup>	Comments
0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>		
953.84 9	2 <sup>+</sup>		
1804.69 11	2 <sup>+</sup>		
2186.07 13	4 <sup>+</sup>		
2342.1 4	0 <sup>+</sup>		J <sup><math>\pi</math></sup> : from $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ (2010A128).
2384.51 16	3 <sup>+</sup>		
2743.62 16	4 <sup>+</sup>		
2803.08 19	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.146 ps 21	E(level): identified as one component of one-phonon mixed-symmetry 2 <sup>+</sup> state.
2884.0 3	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.132 ps 21	E(level): identified as second component of one-phonon mixed-symmetry 2 <sup>+</sup> state.
3209.88 22	4 <sup>+</sup>	0.250 ps 35	E(level): 2010A128 identify the 3209, 4 <sup>+</sup> state as a good candidate for a two-phonon mixed symmetry state. However, non-observation of expected transition to the one-phonon mixed symmetry 2 <sup>+</sup> state at 2803 keV does not allow confirmed identification of such an excitation. J <sup><math>\pi</math></sup> : from $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ (2010A128). J <sup><math>\pi</math></sup> =3 <sup>-</sup> is ruled out – would give a large quadrupole (M2) admixture for 1023.7 $\gamma$ which is inconsistent with RUL.
3223.5 4	3		
3586.58 24	5 <sup>+</sup>		
3707.5 3	6 <sup>+</sup>	0.250 ps 35	
4008.4 7			
4043.26 24	5 <sup>-</sup>	0.270 ps 42	
4217.6 8			
4347.86 25	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	0.48 ps 13	
4535.4 9			
4904.9 3			
5123.9 6			
5131.1 6			
5143.4 5			
5481.3 7			

<sup>†</sup> From least-squares fit to E $\gamma$  data.

<sup>‡</sup> Effective half-lives from DSAM measurements (2010A128), not corrected for side feedings; should be considered as upper limits.

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

B(M1), B(E2)(W.u.) and B(E1)(W.u.) values are deduced by 2010A128 from effective half-lives, thus should be considered as lower limits.

E <sub>i</sub> (level)	J <sub>i</sub> <sup><math>\pi</math></sup>	E $\gamma$	I $\gamma$	E <sub>f</sub>	J <sub>f</sub> <sup><math>\pi</math></sup>	Mult.	$\delta^{\ddagger}$	Comments
953.84	2 <sup>+</sup>	953.8 1	100	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>			
1804.69	2 <sup>+</sup>	850.8 1	100 5	953.84	2 <sup>+</sup>	M1+E2	-3.6 +7-10	
		1804.8 2	89 9	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	(E2)		Mult.: $\delta(M3/E2)=-0.05$ 11.
2186.07	4 <sup>+</sup>	1232.2 1	100	953.84	2 <sup>+</sup>			

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{61}\text{Ni}(\text{}^3\text{He}, 2n\gamma)$  **2010A128** (continued)

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

$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Mult.	$\delta^\ddagger$	Comments
2342.1	0 <sup>+</sup>	1388.2 4	100	953.84	2 <sup>+</sup>			
2384.51	3 <sup>+</sup>	579.8 2 1430.7 2	64 7 100 6	1804.69 953.84	2 <sup>+</sup> 2 <sup>+</sup>	M1+E2 M1+E2	-1.9 +3-5 +3.4 +9-6	$E_\gamma$ : as per e-mail of 6 Nov 2010 from M. Albers. $E_\gamma=1431.7$ in Table 1 of <a href="#">2010A128</a> is a misprint.
2743.62	4 <sup>+</sup>	359.2 4 557.5 2 938.9 2 1789.7 9	5 2 100 4 79 10 2 1	2384.51 2186.07 1804.69 953.84	3 <sup>+</sup> 4 <sup>+</sup> 2 <sup>+</sup> 2 <sup>+</sup>	(M1+E2) (M1+E2) (E2)	-0.32 22 -0.38 7	Mult.: $\delta(\text{M3/E2})=+0.14$ 13.
2803.08	2 <sup>+</sup>	998.4 4 1849.2 2 (2803.0 5)	9 2 100 7 8 5	1804.69 953.84 0.0	2 <sup>+</sup> 2 <sup>+</sup> 0 <sup>+</sup>	(M1+E2) (M1(+E2)) [E2]	+0.03 16	B(M1) $\downarrow$ <0.029 6; B(E2)(W.u.)<21 6 B(M1)=0.039 6. BE2W=0.11 7. B(E2)(W.u.): deduced by the evaluators. B(E2)(eff)(W.u.)=0.011 3 listed in <a href="#">2010A128</a> is a misprint. $I_\gamma$ : $\gamma$ not observed in <a href="#">2010A128</a> , intensity taken from $I_\gamma(2803)/I_\gamma(1849)=6$ 4/72 6 ( <a href="#">2008Fi07</a> ).
2884.0	2 <sup>+</sup>	1079.4 4 1930.1 4 2884.0 <sup>#</sup> 5	5 2 100 7 <2	1804.69 953.84 0.0	2 <sup>+</sup> 2 <sup>+</sup> 0 <sup>+</sup>	[M1+E2] (M1(+E2)) [E2]	-0.32 +30-36	B(M1)<0.018 5 \$ B(E2)(W.u.)<9 3. B(M1)=0.035 8 \$ B(E2)(W.u.)=0.96 21. $E_\gamma, I_\gamma$ : this $\gamma$ not seen in <a href="#">2010A128</a> , but included in the analysis of transition probabilities using an upper limit of intensity deduced from detection sensitivity. Evaluators assign $I_\gamma<2$ based on quoted B(E2)(W.u.) value in <a href="#">2010A128</a> . B(E2)(W.u.)<0.015 10. B(E2)(W.u.)<293. B(E2)(W.u.)<97. B(M1)=0.10 2 \$ B(E2)(W.u.)=0.10 1. B(E2)(W.u.)=0.74 17.
3209.88	4 <sup>+</sup>	325.7 <sup>†#</sup> 406.7 <sup>†#</sup> 1023.7 2 2256.5 8	<2 <2 100 5 40 8	2884.0 2803.08 2186.07 953.84	2 <sup>+</sup> 2 <sup>+</sup> 4 <sup>+</sup> 2 <sup>+</sup>	[E2] [E2] (M1(+E2)) [E2]	+0.01 18	$\delta$ : -0.07 12 quoted in text is a misprint (as per email of 6 Nov 2010 from M. Albers, first author of <a href="#">2010A128</a> ). $\delta(\text{E2/M1})=-2.5 +10-33$ or -0.38 22. Mult.: $\delta(\text{M3/E2})=-0.06$ 11.
3223.5	3	2269.6 4	100	953.84	2 <sup>+</sup>	D(+Q)	-0.10 19	B(E2)(W.u.)=0.74 17. B(E2)(W.u.)=19 3. B(E2)(eff)(W.u.): deduced by the evaluators. $\delta(\text{M3/E2})=+0.01$ 6.
3586.58	5 <sup>+</sup>	843.0 3 1202.1 3	97 8 100 5	2743.62 2384.51	4 <sup>+</sup> 3 <sup>+</sup>	(M1+E2) E2		
3707.5	6 <sup>+</sup>	1521.5 3	100	2186.07	4 <sup>+</sup>	(E2)		
4008.4		2203.7 7	100	1804.69	2 <sup>+</sup>			
4043.26	5 <sup>-</sup>	833.2 3	10 2	3209.88	4 <sup>+</sup>	[E1]		B(E1)(W.u.)=1.9 $\times$ 10 <sup>-4</sup> 5. B(E1)(W.u.)(eff): deduced by the evaluators.
		1299.4 4	35 4	2743.62	4 <sup>+</sup>	(E1)		B(E1)(W.u.)=1.8 $\times$ 10 <sup>-4</sup> 4. B(E1)(W.u.): deduced by the evaluators. $\delta(\text{M2/E1})=-0.07$ 17.
		1857.5 4	100 7	2186.07	4 <sup>+</sup>	(E1)		B(E1)(W.u.)=1.7 $\times$ 10 <sup>-4</sup> 3. B(E1)(W.u.): deduced by the evaluators. $\delta(\text{M2/E1})=0.00$ 6.
4217.6		2031.5 7	100	2186.07	4 <sup>+</sup>			
4347.86	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	640.4 3 761.7 6 1604.2 3	18 2 <5 100 6	3707.5 3586.58 2743.62	6 <sup>+</sup> 5 <sup>+</sup> 4 <sup>+</sup>	E2		Mult.: $\delta(\text{M3/E2})=(-0.19$ 22).

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{61}\text{Ni}(\text{}^3\text{He}, 2n\gamma)$  2010A128 (continued) $\gamma(^{62}\text{Zn})$  (continued)

$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$	Mult.	$\delta^\ddagger$
4535.4		2349.3 8	100	2186.07	4 <sup>+</sup>		
4904.9		557.4 5	54 10	4347.86	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		
		861.5 3	14 2	4043.26	5 <sup>-</sup>		
		1197.2 5	100 8	3707.5	6 <sup>+</sup>	D(+Q)	-0.01 13
5123.9		1080.6 5	100	4043.26	5 <sup>-</sup>		
5131.1		1087.8 5	100	4043.26	5 <sup>-</sup>	D(+Q)	0.00 20
5143.4		795.6 6	23 3	4347.86	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		
		1556.7 5	100 6	3586.58	5 <sup>+</sup>		
5481.3		1773.7 6	100	3707.5	6 <sup>+</sup>		

† This  $\gamma$  not seen in 2010A128; upper limit of intensity from detection sensitivity used to estimate E2 transition probability. Evaluators assign  $I_\gamma < 2$  based on quoted  $B(E2)(\text{W.u.})(\text{eff})$  value in 2010A128.

‡ From  $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$  data in 2010A128 and RUL.

# Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

$^{61}\text{Ni}(^3\text{He},2n\gamma)$  2010AI28

Level Scheme

Legend

Intensities: Relative photon branching from each level

----->  $\gamma$  Decay (Uncertain)

