

$^{80}\text{Sr } \varepsilon$  decay (106.3 min)    1973Br32

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Balraj Singh	NDS 105, 223 (2005)	22-Jun-2005

Parent:  $^{80}\text{Sr}$ : E=0;  $J^\pi=0^+$ ;  $T_{1/2}=106.3$  min 15;  $Q(\varepsilon)=1865$  10; % $\varepsilon$ +% $\beta^+$  decay=100.01973Br32: Measured  $\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma$ ,  $T_{1/2}$ . Source produced by  $^{65}\text{Cu}(^{20}\text{Ne},5\text{n})^{80}\text{Y}$ .  $^{80}\text{Y}$  decays by  $\varepsilon$  to  $^{80}\text{Sr}$ .1961Ho13, measured  $\gamma$ ,  $T_{1/2}(^{80}\text{Sr})$ . $^{80}\text{Rb}$  Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^\pi$ <sup>‡</sup>
0.0	$1^+$
174.9 4	( $2^-$ )
236.1? 8	
553.5 4	$1^+$
589.0 4	$1^+$

<sup>†</sup> From least-squares fit to  $E\gamma$ 's.<sup>‡</sup> From 'Adopted Levels'. $\varepsilon, \beta^+$  radiations

E(decay)	E(level)	$I\beta^+$ <sup>†</sup>	$I\varepsilon$ <sup>†</sup>	Log ft	$I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ <sup>†</sup>	Comments
(1276 10)	589.0	0.14 3	42 5	4.32 6	42 5	av $E\beta=115.9$ 43; $\varepsilon K=0.8720$ 5; $\varepsilon L=0.10280$ 8; $\varepsilon M+=0.02174$ 2
(1312 10)	553.5	0.070 13	12.0 13	4.89 5	12.1 13	av $E\beta=131.0$ 43; $\varepsilon K=0.8700$ 7; $\varepsilon L=0.1025$ 1; $\varepsilon M+=0.02168$ 3
(1629 <sup>‡</sup> 10)	236.1?	0.27 5	2.8 5	5.70 7	3.1 5	av $E\beta=266.2$ 43; $\varepsilon K=0.800$ 5; $\varepsilon L=0.0938$ 5; $\varepsilon M+=0.01983$ 11
(1690 10)	174.9	0.32 15	2.4 11	5.81 21	2.7 13	av $E\beta=292.5$ 43; $\varepsilon K=0.772$ 5; $\varepsilon L=0.0906$ 6; $\varepsilon M+=0.01914$ 13
(1865 10)	0.0	9.2 16	31 5	4.79 8	40 7	av $E\beta=368.2$ 44; $\varepsilon K=0.674$ 7; $\varepsilon L=0.0789$ 8; $\varepsilon M+=0.01667$ 16 $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$ : from $I\gamma(589\gamma)$ (absolute)=39 3 (1973Br32) deduced from intensities of annihilation radiation, $617\gamma$ and $589\gamma$ when $^{80}\text{Sr}$ and $^{80}\text{Rb}$ were in equilibrium.

<sup>†</sup> Absolute intensity per 100 decays.<sup>‡</sup> Existence of this branch is questionable. $\gamma(^{80}\text{Rb})$ I $\gamma$  normalization: from  $I\gamma(589\gamma)$ (absolute)=39 3 deduced by 1973Br32 from  $I(\gamma^\pm)/I\gamma(617\gamma)$  from  $^{80}\text{Rb } \varepsilon$ =7.95,  $I\gamma(617\gamma)$  and  $I\gamma(589\gamma)$  when  $^{80}\text{Sr}$  and  $^{80}\text{Rb}$  were in equilibrium.

$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma$ <sup>†</sup>	$E_i$ (level)	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$
175.0 5	26 3	174.9	( $2^-$ )	0.0	$1^+$
235.9 <sup>‡</sup> 8	10.7 11	236.1?		0.0	$1^+$
316.0 <sup>‡</sup> 15	2.7 3	553.5	$1^+$	236.1?	
378.8 5	10.7 11	553.5	$1^+$	174.9	( $2^-$ )

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

---

 **$^{80}\text{Sr } \varepsilon$  decay (106.3 min)    1973Br32 (continued)**

---

 **$\gamma(^{80}\text{Rb})$  (continued)**

$E_\gamma$	$I_\gamma^{\dagger}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	$J_i^\pi$	$E_f$	$J_f^\pi$
414.1 5	8.3 8	589.0	1 <sup>+</sup>	174.9	(2 <sup>-</sup> )
553.4 5	17.6 18	553.5	1 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	1 <sup>+</sup>
589.0 5	100 10	589.0	1 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	1 <sup>+</sup>

<sup>†</sup> For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.39 3.

<sup>‡</sup> Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

$^{80}\text{Sr } \varepsilon$  decay (106.3 min) 1973Br32