

$^{65}\text{Cu(d,p)}$ 1969Da09

Type	Author	History	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	E. Browne, J. K. Tuli	Citation NDS 111, 1093 (2010)	3-Mar-2009

Target $J^\pi=3/2^-$.

1969Da09: E(d)=12 MeV, FWHM=8 keV; measured $\sigma(\theta)$, $\theta \approx 0^\circ - 50^\circ$; magnetic spectrograph, DWBA analysis.

1967Hj02: E(d)=15 MeV, FWHM=15-50 keV; measured $\sigma(\theta)$, $\theta=9^\circ - 50^\circ$; magnetic spectrograph, DWBA analysis.

1958De32: E(d)=6.00-6.55 MeV, FWHM \approx 25 keV; measured p spectrum at $\theta=20^\circ, 30^\circ, 45^\circ$ and 90° ; magnetic spectrograph.

Data are mostly from 1969Da09, also from 1967Hj02 and 1958De32.

Other: 1962Ne15.

 $^{66}\text{Cu Levels}$

E(level) [†]	L [‡]	(2J+1)C ² S [#]	Comments
0	1+3	0.16+0.32	
185 1	1+3	0.09+1.50	
274 1	3	2.92	(2J+1)C ² S: 0.04+2.0 for L=1+3 (1967Hj02).
383 2	1	1.17	
462 2	1	1.72	
588 2	3	2.01	(2J+1)C ² S: 0.009+1.5 for L=1+3 (1967Hj02).
727 3	1	0.06	
819 3	1	0.80	
1013 4	1+(3)	0.57+(0.40)	E(level): the level mainly populated in this reaction probably corresponds to the level observed at 1017.1 2 in thermal $^{65}\text{Cu}(n,\gamma)$ (1969Da09).
1048 4	1	0.18	
1151 5	4	9.63	J=(6) favored because of large L=4 strength (1969Da09).
1208 5	1	0.35	
1247 5	2+4	0.55+1.84	(2J+1)C ² S: 0.50+4.0 for L=1+(4) (1967Hj02).
1339 5	1	0.85	
1434 6	1	0.39	
1543 6	1	0.04	
1555 6	1	0.05	
1573 6	1	0.11	
1630? @ 25	0 ^{&}	0.002 ^a	
1679 7	1	0.04	
1697 7	1	0.03	
1713 7	(1)	(0.08)	
1730 7	4	3.10	
1815 7	1+3	0.05+0.19	
1894 8	0	0.005	
1922 8	1	0.07	
1977 8	0+2	0.029+0.10	
2017 8	1+3	0.08+0.18	
2120 8	0+4	0.022+1.63	E(level): strong L=0 and L=4 components suggest this level is a negative-parity doublet (1969Da09).
2158 9	2	0.39	
2173? 9			
2195 9	2+(3,4)	0.04	(2J+1)C ² S: 0.06 for L=3 or 0.11 for L=4 (1969Da09).
2266 9	2	0.35	
2329 9	2	0.46	
2361 9	2	0.28	
2391 10	(1)+(3)	(0.08+0.55)	
2449 10	2	0.41	
2501 10	(1)	(0.04)	
2525 10	2	0.12	
2557 10	0	0.008	
2581 10	0	0.057	

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{65}\text{Cu(d,p)}$ **1969Da09** (continued) ^{66}Cu Levels (continued)

E(level) [†]	L [‡]	(2J+1)C ² S [#]	Comments
2604 10	0	0.028	
2630 11			
2644 11	(0)+2	(0.013)+0.08	
2660 11	0	0.057	
2682 11	(1)	(0.04)	
2743 11	2	0.34	
2793 11	0+(2)	0.006+(0.01)	
2812 11	0	0.008	
2837 11	0	0.008	
2863 11	(0)&	(0.004) ^a	
2903 12	(1)	(0.03)	
2944 12	0+2	0.018+0.05	(2J+1)C ² S: 0.04+0.05+0.32 for L=0+2+4 (1967Hj02).
2964 12	2+(0)	0.05	
2986 12	(2)	(0.03)	
3007 12	(3)	(0.77)	
3037 12	0+2	0.053+0.19	
3080 12	0+2	0.068+0.16	
3106 8			
3150 [@] 25	(2)&	(0.495) ^a	
3238 8			
3282 8			
3328 8	(1)&	(0.32) ^a	
3393 8			
3429 8			
3497 8			
3533 8			
3559 8	2&	0.38 ^a	
3581 8			
3636 8	0+2&	0.02+0.11 ^a	
3701 8	2&	0.28 ^a	
3741 12			
3774 12			
3820 25	0+2&	0.015+0.11 ^a	
3900 25	(0)&	(0.044) ^a	
3958 25	(0)+(2)&	(0.02+0.24) ^a	
4010 25			
4050 25	2+(0)&	0.2 ^a	
4150 25			E(level): multiplet (1967Hj02).
4250 25	2+(0)&	0.304 ^a	
4300 25			
4460 25	2+(0)&	0.385 ^a	
4520 25	2+(0)&	0.366 ^a	

[†] Except as noted, from 1969Da09 for E(level)<3100, from 1958De32 for E(level) between 3100 and 3800; and from 1967Hj02 E(level)>3800. 1969Da09 quote a single set of values from $^{65}\text{Cu(d,p)}$ and $^{68}\text{Zn(d,\alpha)}$ data without specific uncertainties. The quoted E(level) values are a weighted mean of $^{65}\text{Cu(d,p)}$ and $^{68}\text{Zn(d,\alpha)}$ data whenever the two measurements are within 5 keV. Uncertainties in E(level) have been taken to be 0.4%, quoted by 1969Da09 as an upper limit for the $^{65}\text{Cu(d,p)}$ data.

[‡] From DWBA analysis of $\sigma(\theta)$ (1969Da09), except as noted.

[#] From 1969Da09, except as noted. Authors take average value of p_{1/2} and p_{3/2} shells for L=1 transfer and assume d_{5/2}, f_{5/2}, and g_{9/2} for L=2, 3, and 4 transfers, respectively.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

 ${}^{65}\text{Cu}(\text{d,p})$ **1969Da09** (continued) ${}^{66}\text{Cu}$ Levels (continued)

@ From [1967Hj02](#).

& From DWBA analysis of $\sigma(\theta)$ ([1967Hj02](#)).

^a From [1967Hj02](#). Stripping to $p_{3/2}$ and $d_{5/2}$ shells has been assumed for L=1 and L=2 transfers, respectively.