

^{68}Se ε decay [1994Ba50](#)

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	E. A. Mccutchan	NDS 113, 1735 (2012)	1-Mar-2012

Parent: ^{68}Se : $E=0$; $J^\pi=0^+$; $T_{1/2}=35.5$ s 7; $Q(\varepsilon)=4705$ 2; $\% \varepsilon + \% \beta^+$ decay=100.0

^{68}Se parent from $\text{Zr}(p,X)$, $E(p)=600$ MeV followed by mass separation by the ISOLDE facility. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, ce , $\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\gamma$ coincidences, and $T_{1/2}$ using a 4π β counter, a 2% Ge(Li) detector, 2 Ge detectors (33% and 70%) and a cooled Si detector.

The evaluator considers this decay scheme to be incomplete based on the large $Q(\varepsilon)$ value of 4.7 MeV and the highest observed state at 426 keV. Thus, the $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$'s should be taken as upper limits and the $\log ft$'s as lower limits.

[1994Ba50](#) placed the 314 γ -111 γ cascade among the 426, 111, and ground states. In an earlier progress report by the same authors of [1994Ba50](#), the cascade is placed among the 426, 315, and ground states. The latter placement is supported by the observation of a 314 level in $^{40}\text{Ca}(^{32}\text{S},3pny)$ ([2005St08](#)), $^{12}\text{C}(^{58}\text{Ni},pn\gamma)$ ([1998So23](#)), and $^{54}\text{Fe}(^{16}\text{O},pn\gamma)$ ([1997Ba24](#)) and thus adopted here.

However, this leads to a severe intensity imbalance (−36%) for the 315 level in ^{68}Se ε decay, using the intensities given in [1994Ba50](#). Taking intensities derived from the adopted branching ratios (in particular for the 49.5 γ) improves, but does not completely resolve this issue, with a −9% feeding to the 315 level.

Other: [2004Wo16](#): β -endpoint energy measurement giving $Q(\varepsilon)=4710$ 200. Confirmed transitions observed by [1994Ba50](#), however, no level scheme given.

α : [Additional information 1](#).

 ^{68}As Levels

E(level) [‡]	J^π [†]	$T_{1/2}$ [#]	Comments
0.0	3 ⁺	151.6 [†] s 8	$\% \varepsilon + \% \beta^+ = 100$
(158.06 [†] 5)	3 ⁺		
160.81 18	(2 ⁺)	<10 ns	
314.5 3	3 ⁺		
353.0 3	1 ⁺		
363.8 3	1 ⁺		
425.85 23	1 ⁺	107 ns +23−16	

[†] From the Adopted Levels.

[‡] From a least-squares fit to $E\gamma$'s by evaluator, except where noted.

[#] From delayed $\gamma\gamma$ coincidence measurement, except where noted.

 ε, β^+ radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$ ^{†#}	$I\varepsilon$ ^{†#}	$\log ft$	$I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ ^{‡#}	Comments
(4279.1 20)	425.85	91 4	2.6 1	4.145 21	94 4	av $E\beta=1475.40$ 96; $\varepsilon K=0.02463$ 5; $\varepsilon L=0.002779$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.0005302$ 1 $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$: depends strongly on mult of 73 γ . Value given corresponds to M1 transition, whereas an E2 transition would result in a 112 5% branch.
(4341.2 20)	363.8	5.2 16	0.14 4	5.43 14	5.3 16	av $E\beta=1504.94$ 97; $\varepsilon K=0.02331$ 5; $\varepsilon L=0.002630$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.0005018$ 9
(4352.0 20)	353.0	<5	<0.1	>5.5	<5	av $E\beta=1510.09$ 97; $\varepsilon K=0.02309$ 4; $\varepsilon L=0.002605$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.0004970$ 9 $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$: depends strongly on mult of 73 γ . Value given corresponds to a pure M1 transitions, whereas an E2 transition would result in a −14 5% branch.
(4544.2 [@] 20)	160.81	<6	<0.1	>5.5	<6	av $E\beta=1601.81$ 96; $\varepsilon K=0.01960$ 4; $\varepsilon L=0.002211$ 4; $\varepsilon M+=0.0004218$ 7

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

 ^{68}Se ε decay [1994Ba50](#) (continued)

 ε, β^+ radiations (continued)

[†] From $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ and theoretical β^+/ε ratios.

[‡] From $I(\gamma+\text{ce})$ imbalance at each level.

Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

@ Existence of this branch is questionable.

68Se ε decay 1994Ba50 (continued)γ(68As)

I_γ normalization, I(γ+ce) normalization: From Σ(I_γ+ce)(to g.s.)=100% (direct ε feeding of the g.s. is not expected since ΔJ=3).

E_γ	$I_\gamma^{\dagger\#}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	$\delta^{\ddagger}$	α	$I_{(\gamma+ce)}^\#$	Comments
49.5 3	0.45 30	363.8	1 ⁺	314.5	3 ⁺	[E2]		10.6 3		$\alpha(K)=8.62$ 22; $\alpha(L)=1.70$ 6; $\alpha(M)=0.256$ 8; $\alpha(N+..)=0.0154$ 5 I _γ : from adopted branching ratios and I _γ (202γ)=5.9 18. I _γ : Other: The authors report 6.3 10, however, this leads to a large intensity imbalance (−36%) for the 315 level. The intensity derived from the adopted branching ratios improves, but does not resolve this issue, with a −9% feeding to the 315 level.
72.6 5	19 3	425.85	1 ⁺	353.0	1 ⁺	(M1)		0.218 6		$\alpha(K)=0.193$ 5; $\alpha(L)=0.0211$ 5; $\alpha(M)=0.00323$ 8; $\alpha(N+..)=0.000243$ 6 Mult.: from the Adopted Levels, mult is M1,E2. From the decay scheme, the requirements that I(ε+β ⁺)≤100 and ≥0 for the 425 and 353 levels, leads to δ(73γ)≤1.0 and ≤1.5, respectively. The evaluator adopts mult=M1, which gives Σ I(ε+β ⁺)≈100%.
111.4 2	100	425.85	1 ⁺	314.5	3 ⁺	E2		0.527 9		$\alpha(K)=0.458$ 8; $\alpha(L)=0.0592$ 10; $\alpha(M)=0.00894$ 14; $\alpha(N+..)=0.000611$ 10 $\alpha(\text{exp})=0.43$ 10 from I(ceK)/I _γ . Mult.: from α(exp).
(155.1 [‡] 1)	20 3	314.5	3 ⁺	158.06?	3 ⁺	(M1+E2)	−0.07 2	0.0284 6		$\alpha(K)=0.0253$ 5; $\alpha(L)=0.00271$ 6; $\alpha(M)=0.000414$ 9; $\alpha(N+..)=3.13\times 10^{-5}$ 7 I _γ : from adopted branching ratios and I _γ (315γ)=113 7 (evaluator).
158.1 [‡] 1	21 3	(158.06)	3 ⁺	0.0	3 ⁺	M1+E2	−1.3 +5−16	0.10 3	23 3	$\alpha(K)=0.09$ 3; $\alpha(L)=0.010$ 4; $\alpha(M)=0.0016$ 5; $\alpha(N+..)=0.00011$ 4 I _(γ+ce) : from ΣI _γ (1+α)(to 158) (evaluator). I _γ : from I(γ+ce) and α (evaluator).
160.8 2	81 4	160.81	(2 ⁺)	0.0	3 ⁺	(M1+E2)	−1.49 30	0.100 12		$\alpha(K)=0.088$ 10; $\alpha(L)=0.0104$ 12; $\alpha(M)=0.00157$ 19; $\alpha(N+..)=0.000112$ 13
192.2 5	19.8 23	353.0	1 ⁺	160.81	(2 ⁺)	(M1+E2)		0.04 3		$\alpha(K)=0.038$ 24; $\alpha(L)=0.004$ 3; $\alpha(M)=0.0006$ 5; $\alpha(N+..)=5.E-5$ 3
202.7 5	5.9 18	363.8	1 ⁺	160.81	(2 ⁺)	(M1+E2)		0.035 22		$\alpha(K)=0.031$ 19; $\alpha(L)=0.0035$ 22; $\alpha(M)=0.0005$ 4; $\alpha(N+..)=3.9\times 10^{-5}$ 24
(205.6 [‡] 4)	2.0 5	363.8	1 ⁺	158.06?	3 ⁺	[E2]		0.0539 9		$\alpha(K)=0.0476$ 8; $\alpha(L)=0.00543$ 9; $\alpha(M)=0.000824$ 13; $\alpha(N+..)=5.94\times 10^{-5}$ 10 I _γ : from adopted branching ratios and I _γ (203γ)=5.9 18 (evaluator).

68Se ε decay 1994Ba50 (continued)

γ(68As) (continued)

E_γ	$I_\gamma^{\dagger\#}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. ‡	$\delta^{\ddagger}$	α	Comments
265.0 3	47 4	425.85	1 ⁺	160.81	(2 ⁺)	[M1,E2]		0.014 8	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.013\ 7$; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.0014\ 8$; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.00021\ 11$; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=1.6\times 10^{-5}\ 8$
314.5 3	113 7	314.5	3 ⁺	0.0	3 ⁺	M1+E2	-0.067 15	0.00468 7	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.00417\ 6$; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.000439\ 7$; $\alpha(\text{M})=6.70\times 10^{-5}\ 10$; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=5.09\times 10^{-6}\ 8$
352.6 5	13.0 13	353.0	1 ⁺	0.0	3 ⁺	[E2]		0.00793 12	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.00704\ 11$; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.000765\ 12$; $\alpha(\text{M})=0.0001163\ 18$; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=8.62\times 10^{-6}$
426.1 4	13 3	425.85	1 ⁺	0.0	3 ⁺	E2		0.00423 6	$\alpha(\text{K})=0.00376\ 6$; $\alpha(\text{L})=0.000404\ 6$; $\alpha(\text{M})=6.14\times 10^{-5}\ 9$; $\alpha(\text{N}+..)=4.58\times 10^{-6}\ 7$

[†] Relative intensity normalized to $I_\gamma(111\gamma)=100$.
[‡] From the Adopted Gammas.
[#] For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.397 15.

^{68}Se ε decay 1994Ba50**Decay Scheme****Legend**

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

Intensities: $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$ per 100 parent decays