

$^{86}\text{Kr}(\alpha, p)$ 1983StZQ

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Balraj Singh	NDS 114, 1 (2013)	20-Oct-2012

E=26 MeV. Enriched (99.6%) target, FWHM \approx 65 keV. Measured $\sigma(\theta)$ and compared with DWBA analysis. Absolute cross sections are accurate to 5-10%. Model calculations of energy levels and spectroscopic factors.

Results given here are from thesis by 1983StZQ.

 ^{89}Rb Levels

E(level) [†]	J $^{\pi}$ [#]	L ‡	$\sigma(\text{exp})/\sigma(\text{DWBA})$ [@]	Comments
0	3/2 ⁻	(1)	1.10	J $^{\pi}$: from Adopted Levels.
227 \approx 500	(5/2 ⁻)	(3)	0.29	E(level): estimated (evaluator) for a weak unlabelled group in figure VIII-5 (1983StZQ). This may correspond to 497 known from ^{89}Kr β^- decay.
\approx 600		(1)	1.15	E(level): peak labeled as 497 in figure VIII-5 (1983StZQ) is incorrect in energy. The evaluator estimates the energy of this peak at \approx 600. This group may correspond to 577, 586 doublet known from ^{89}Kr β^- decay. $\sigma(\text{exp})/\sigma(\text{DWBA})$: for L=1, J $^{\pi}$ =1/2 ⁻ .
856	(1/2 ⁻)	(1)	8.41	
991	(7/2, 9/2 ⁺)	(3, 4)	0.34, & 0.32	$\sigma(\text{exp})/\sigma(\text{DWBA})$: 0.18 for L=4, J=9/2 ⁺ .
1186	(7/2, 9/2 ⁺)	(3, 4)	8.6, & 7.8	$\sigma(\text{exp})/\sigma(\text{DWBA})$: 4.3 for L=4, J=9/2 ⁺ .
1345	(7/2, 9/2 ⁺)	(3, 4)	0.24, & 0.23	$\sigma(\text{exp})/\sigma(\text{DWBA})$: 0.13 for L=4, J=9/2 ⁺ .
1515	(3/2)	(1, 2)	2.7, 2.2	
1694	(5/2)	(2, 3)	3.5, 6.5	
1833	(5/2)	(2, 3)	2.2, 4.4	
2004	(7/2, 9/2 ⁺)	(3, 4)	9.1, & 8.4	$\sigma(\text{exp})/\sigma(\text{DWBA})$: 4.7 for L=4, J=9/2 ⁺ .
2168	(5/2)	(2, 3)	5.2, 2.6	
2395	(1/2)	(0, 1)	11.5, 19.9	
2512	(5/2)	(2, 3)	2.7, 5.6	
2614	(3/2)	(1, 2)	3.9, 2.9	
2842	(11/2)	(5, 6)	1.8, 2.1	
3020	(3/2)	(1, 2)	10.7, 9.2	

[†] Uncertainty is not given. From comparison with E(level) from ^{89}Kr β^- decay, it is expected to be \approx 10 keV.

[‡] As suggested by J $^{\pi}$ assignments of 1983StZQ. These values are considered tentative (evaluator).

[#] From 1983StZQ for excited states. The assignments are considered (evaluator) tentative since the L(α, p) assignments and J-dependence from $\sigma(\theta)$ data and DWBA calculations do not seem firm as presented in figures VIII.18 to VIII.20 (1983StZQ).

[@] Two values correspond to L-values and corresponding J $^{\pi}$ values.

& First value for 7/2⁻ and second for 7/2⁺.