

$^{63}\text{Cu}(\alpha, \text{pn}\gamma)$ **1994Ba55**

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Jun Chen	NDS 202,59 (2025)	25-Feb-2025

1994Ba55: $E\alpha=30$ MeV from the Variable Energy Cyclotron Centre, Calcutta. Targets were a natural Cu foil for lifetime measurement and >98% enriched ^{63}Cu for other measurements. γ rays were detected with three large-volume HPGe detectors. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ -coin, $\gamma(\theta)$, Doppler-shift attenuation. Deduced levels, J , π , $T_{1/2}$, γ -ray branching ratios, multipolarities, mixing ratios.

The level scheme in [1994Ba55](#) is based on their data and the $(\alpha, n\gamma)$ data from earlier work.

 ^{65}Zn Levels

E(level) ^{†‡}	J^π [#]	$T_{1/2}$ [@]	Comments
0.0	5/2 ⁻		
53.8 3	1/2 ⁻		
115.2 3	3/2 ⁻		
206.9 3	3/2 ⁻		
768.6 3	5/2 ⁻		
864.2 3	7/2 ⁻		J^π : spin=7/2 from $\gamma(\theta)$ of 864 γ (1994Ba55).
867.0 6	1/2 ⁻		
1047.4 4	5/2 ⁻		
1065.6 4	9/2 ⁺		J^π : spin=9/2 from $\gamma(\theta)$ of 201 γ (1994Ba55).
1252.5 3	7/2 ⁻		
1263.4 4	9/2 ⁻		
2053.5 6	13/2 ⁺		J^π : spin=13/2 from $\gamma(\theta)$ of 988 γ (1994Ba55).
2137.9 5	11/2 ⁺		
2923.0 6	13/2 ⁽⁺⁾		
2932.2 6	(13/2 ⁻)		
3228.0 7	17/2 ⁺	0.30 ps +12-10	J^π : spin=17/2 from $\gamma(\theta)$ of 1174 γ .
3473.5 6	(15/2 ⁺)		
3785.9 7	17/2 ⁽⁺⁾	≥ 0.28 ps	J^π : $\gamma(\theta)$ of 1733 γ favors $J=17/2$, but $J=13/2$ cannot be ruled out. $T_{1/2}$: 0.12 ps $\leq T_{1/2} \leq 0.21$ ps.
4078.9 8	(13/2, 15/2)		J^π : from $\gamma(\theta)$ of 1156 γ , assuming that $J(2923)=13/2$; inconsistent with (17/2 ⁺) in Adopted Levels.
4889.1 9			
4938.4 9	(21/2 ⁺)		J^π : $\gamma(\theta)$ of 1710 γ favors both $J=17/2$ and 21/2; the authors reject $J=17/2$ because if the 1710 γ is assumed to be a 17/2 to 17/2 transition, $B(E2)$ (W.u.) is ≤ 0.3 which is small compared to other transitions in the same cascade.
5066.8 9	(21/2 ⁺)		
5413.4 10	(23/2 ⁺)		
5773.4 13	(25/2 ⁺)		

[†] Additional information 1.

[‡] From a least-squares fit to γ -ray energies, assuming $\Delta E\gamma=0.5$ keV for values quoted to nearest tenth keV and 1.0 keV for integer values.

[#] From Adopted Levels, unless otherwise noted. Supporting arguments from $\gamma(\theta)$ in this dataset are given in comments where available.

[@] From DSAM in [1994Ba55](#).

$^{63}\text{Cu}(\alpha, \text{pny})$ 1994Ba55 (continued) $\gamma(^{65}\text{Zn})$ A₂ and A₄ values under comments are from 1994Ba55.

E _γ †	I _γ †	E _i (level)	J _i ^π	E _f	J _f ^π	Mult.‡	δ‡	Comments
53.7		53.8	1/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻			
61.3		115.2	3/2 ⁻	53.8	1/2 ⁻			
≈92		206.9	3/2 ⁻	115.2	3/2 ⁻			
95.6 @		864.2	7/2 ⁻	768.6	5/2 ⁻			
115.2	57 3	115.2	3/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻			
153.0	12.1 6	206.9	3/2 ⁻	53.8	1/2 ⁻			
201.4	110 # 5	1065.6	9/2 ⁺	864.2	7/2 ⁻	D+Q	0.02 1	%Branching ratio=95.6 46. A ₂ =-0.21 2, A ₄ =+0.02 4.
206.9	3.1 4	206.9	3/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻			
346.6	4.3 5	5413.4	(23/2 ⁺)	5066.8	(21/2 ⁺)			
399.2	1.4 2	1263.4	9/2 ⁻	864.2	7/2 ⁻			
483.9	1.6 3	1252.5	7/2 ⁻	768.6	5/2 ⁻			
557.6	5.3 # 11	3785.9	17/2 ⁽⁺⁾	3228.0	17/2 ⁺			%Branching ratio=25 5.
≈606	≈4	4078.9	(13/2,15/2)	3473.5	(15/2 ⁺)			%Branching ratio=56.
653.5	3.2 4	768.6	5/2 ⁻	115.2	3/2 ⁻			
657.4	0.7 # 2	864.2	7/2 ⁻	206.9	3/2 ⁻			%Branching ratio=0.6 2.
714.9	0.7 1	768.6	5/2 ⁻	53.8	1/2 ⁻			
749.1	11.9 # 24	864.2	7/2 ⁻	115.2	3/2 ⁻			%Branching ratio=10.6 21.
751.8	7.6 9	867.0	1/2 ⁻	115.2	3/2 ⁻			
768.6	4.5 5	768.6	5/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻			
785.0	7.8 # 9	2923.0	13/2 ⁽⁺⁾	2137.9	11/2 ⁺			%Branching ratio=63.9 76.
835		5773.4	(25/2 ⁺)	4938.4	(21/2 ⁺)			
864.2	100 # 6	864.2	7/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻	D+Q	-2.33 20	%Branching ratio=88.8 51. A ₂ =-0.53 6, A ₄ =+0.22 7.
932		1047.4	5/2 ⁻	115.2	3/2 ⁻			
987.9	75 4	2053.5	13/2 ⁺	1065.6	9/2 ⁺	Q+O	-0.02 10	A ₂ =+0.29 12, A ₄ =-0.22 13.
993.7		1047.4	5/2 ⁻	53.8	1/2 ⁻			
1045.5	4.3 5	1252.5	7/2 ⁻	206.9	3/2 ⁻			
1047.4		1047.4	5/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻			
1065.6	5.0 # 10	1065.6	9/2 ⁺	0.0	5/2 ⁻			%Branching ratio=4.4 9.
1072.3	17 1	2137.9	11/2 ⁺	1065.6	9/2 ⁺			
1137		1252.5	7/2 ⁻	115.2	3/2 ⁻			
1155.9	3.2 4	4078.9	(13/2,15/2)	2923.0	13/2 ⁽⁺⁾	D+Q		%Branching ratio=44. δ: -0.6 5 if J=13/2, +0.22 17 if J=15/2.
1174.1	34.5 17	3228.0	17/2 ⁺	2053.5	13/2 ⁺	E2(+M3)	-0.07 8	A ₂ =+0.04 19, A ₄ =-0.11 21. Mult.: Q+O from $\gamma(\theta)$; M2+E3 ruled out by RUL. A ₂ =+0.26 6, A ₄ =-0.14 8.
1252.6		1252.5	7/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻			
1263.4	45.7 23	1263.4	9/2 ⁻	0.0	5/2 ⁻			
1280.9		5066.8	(21/2 ⁺)	3785.9	17/2 ⁽⁺⁾			
1335.5		3473.5	(15/2 ⁺)	2137.9	11/2 ⁺			
1419.9		3473.5	(15/2 ⁺)	2053.5	13/2 ⁺			
1661.1	1.0 1	4889.1		3228.0	17/2 ⁺			
1668.7	8.7 10	2932.2	(13/2 ⁻)	1263.4	9/2 ⁻			
1710.4	7.3 9	4938.4	(21/2 ⁺)	3228.0	17/2 ⁺	Q+O	-0.03 15	A ₂ =+0.34 11, A ₄ =-0.07 12.
1732.7	16 # 4	3785.9	17/2 ⁽⁺⁾	2053.5	13/2 ⁺	Q(O)	-0.13 25	%Branching ratio=75 20. A ₂ =+0.39 14.
1857.3	4.4 # 10	2923.0	13/2 ⁽⁺⁾	1065.6	9/2 ⁺			%Branching ratio=36.1 83.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

 $^{63}\text{Cu}(\alpha,\text{pn}\gamma)$ 1994Ba55 (continued) **$\gamma(^{65}\text{Zn})$ (continued)**

[†] From 1994Ba55. Quoted intensities are relative values and no uncertainties are reported in 1994Ba55. The authors give a general statement that uncertainties are typically less than 5% for strong gammas with intensities more than 10; and 5%–12% for most of the weaker lines, for which the evaluator has taken 12%, unless indicated otherwise.

[‡] From 1994Ba55, based on $\gamma(\theta)$, with magnetic or electric characters determined based on RUL and measured $T_{1/2}$ where available.

[#] Uncertainties from % branching ratios in 1994Ba55, as given under comments.

[@] Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

$^{63}\text{Cu}(\alpha, \text{pn}\gamma) \quad 1994\text{Ba55}$

Legend

Level Scheme

Intensities: Relative I_γ

- $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_{\gamma}^{\max}$
- $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_{\gamma}^{\max}$
- $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_{\gamma}^{\max}$
- - - ► γ Decay (Uncertain)

