

$^{66}\text{Zn}(d,\alpha)$ 1969Pa07

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Balraj Singh and Jun Chen		NDS 178, 41 (2021).	12-Nov-2021

1969Pa07: E(d)=12 MeV, magnetic spectrograph, FWHM=12 keV, $\sigma(\theta)$ (15° to 90°). DWBA calculations. Cross section uncertainty 13%.

 ^{64}Cu Levels

E(level) [†]	L	d σ /d Ω (max) ($\mu\text{b/sr}$)	Comments
0	0(+2)	40	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
158 3	2(+0)	14&	25% L=0, 75% L=2. Poor fit with DWBA.
276 3	2	4.5	
342? 3	@		
361 3	4	44	
573 4	4	17	
606 4	2@	2	
661 4	4	8	
742‡ 4	2(+4)	70&	53% L=2, 47% L=4. Poor fit with calculated distribution.
876? 5	@		
893 5	4	18	
923 5	0(+2)	38	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
1236 6	(2,0+2)	2	For L=0+2, 67% L=0, 33% L=2.
1294 6	0+2	17	40% L=0, 60% L=2.
1349 6	4	10	L: given as 4(+2) in table but L=4 in figure (1969Pa07).
1360? 10	@		
1435 6	0(+2)	2.2	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
1458‡ 10	(3)@	3	
1495 6	(1+3)@	4&	46% L=1, 54% L=3.
1517 7	2(+4)	10&	74% L=2, 26% L=4.
1546‡ 7	(2,1+3)@	6&	Fit with L=1+3 (46% L=1, 54% L=3) not as good as with L=2.
1589‡ 7	4	14	
1607 7	0(+2)	3	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
1678‡ 7	(0+2,1)	3.5	29% L=0, 71% L=2. Fit with L=1 not as good as with L=0+2.
1701 7	(3)	7&	
1737 10	4	20	
1775 7	4	35	
1848 8	4	5.5	
1884 10	(2,3)@	2&	
1900 8	(0+2)	5	29% L=0, 71% L=2.
1939 10	2(+0)	2	25% L=0, 75% L=2.
1980 8	4	50	
2016 8	2@	2	
2050 8	4	14	L: 4(+2) quoted in the table (1969Pa07).
2069 8	3	9&	For L=3+1; 30% L=1, 70% L=3.
2090 8	2(+0)	4&	83% L=2, 17% L=0.
2141 8	4(+2)	12&	78% L=4, 22% L=2.
2191 9	(4)	2.5	
2230 9	4	22	
2249? 10		2&	L: possibly 2 or 1+3.
2265‡ 9		7	L: no agreement with any calculated distribution, probably a mixed-parity doublet.
2294? 10		5	L: possibly 2 or 1+3.
2311 9	4	6	

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{66}\text{Zn}(d,\alpha)$ **1969Pa07** (continued) ^{64}Cu Levels (continued)

E(level) [†]	L	d σ /d Ω (max) ($\mu\text{b/sr}$)	Comments
2354? <i>10</i>	@	5	L: possibly 2 or 3. Fit is better with L=2.
2375 <i>9</i>	0(+2)	2	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
2389 <i>9</i>	0(+2)	2	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
2415?# <i>10</i>	4	35	
2462 <i>9</i>	(1)	4.5&	
2494 <i>9</i>	3	3.5&	
2520?‡ <i>10</i>	(0+2)@	3	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
2534?‡ <i>10</i>	(0+2)	3	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
2550 <i>10</i>	4,4+2	6	78% L=4, 22% L=2.
2581 <i>10</i>	4(+2)	12	78% L=4, 22% L=2.
2596 <i>10</i>	(0+2)	4	71% L=2, 29% L=0.
2611‡ <i>10</i>	4	17	
2622 <i>10</i>	0+2	2.5	71% L=2, 29% L=0.
2634‡ <i>10</i>	0(+2)	20	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
2670? <i>10</i>	(3+1)	3&	82% L=3, 18% L=1.
2692‡ <i>10</i>		30	L: 1(+3) (81% L=1, 19% L=3) and/or 4(+2) (78% L=4, 22% L=2).
2720‡ <i>10</i>		9&	L: (2) or 3(+1) (82% L=3, 18% L=1).
2760‡ <i>10</i>	(3,2+4)	35&	53% L=2, 47% L=4.
2814 <i>10</i>	(0+2)	5	Poorly resolved. 71% L=2, 29% L=0.
2823‡ <i>10</i>	(2,3)	7&	
2854? <i>11</i>	(3)	3&	
2876 <i>11</i>	4	25	
2891 <i>11</i>	0(+2)	5	67% L=0, 33% L=2.
2913 <i>11</i>	(0+2)	8&	75% L=2, 25% L=0.
2931 <i>11</i>	(1+3)	2&	82% L=3, 18% L=1.
2970# <i>11</i>	4	28	

[†] Average of (d,p) and (d, α) data (**1969Pa07**). Uncertainty is based on a random error of 2 keV and a systematic error of 0.3% of the excitation energy (as quoted by **1969Pa07** for (d,p) data.

[‡] Doublet or possible doublet.

Triplet or possible triplet.

@ Weak group.

& Value of cross section is tentative.