## $^{76}$ Ge( $^{19}$ F,4n $\gamma$ ) 2010He15

History										
Туре	Author	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date							
Full Evaluation	Coral M. Baglin	NDS 114, 1293 (2013)	1-Sep-2013							

 $E(^{19}F)=80$  MeV from the HI-13 tandem accelerator at the China Institute of Atomic Energy; 96% enriched, 2.2 mg/cm<sup>2</sup> thick <sup>76</sup>Ge target evaporated onto 10 mg/cm<sup>2</sup> Pb backing; 14 Compton-suppressed HPGe detectors (four at 90°, five at 48° and five at 132°); measured Ey, Iy, yy coin,  $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ (DCO) (DCO values unstated in 2010He15).

Theoretical interpretation is given in terms of weak coupling between a  $g_{9/2}$  proton and  ${}^{90}$ Zr core states (for low E), and multi-particle excitations for high-energy states.

#### <sup>91</sup>Nb Levels

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	T <sub>1/2</sub>	Comments
0.0@	$9/2^{+}$		
2034.0 8	$(17/2^{-})$	3.76 µs 12	$J^{\pi}, T_{1/2}$ : from Adopted Levels.
0			deexcitation of this isomer not studied by 2010He15.
2290.4 <sup>@</sup> 3	$13/2^{+}$		
3110.0 <sup>@</sup> 5	$17/2^{+}$		
3466.4 <sup>@</sup> 6	$21/2^{+}$		
4096.5 7	19/2-		
4350.9 <sup>@</sup> 6	$21/2^{+}$		
4848.0 <sup>@</sup> 7	$23/2^{+}$		
5034.0 <sup>@</sup> 8	$(25/2^+)$		
5183.9 <mark>&amp;</mark> 6	$(23/2^+)$		
5455.3 <sup>@</sup> 8	$(27/2^+)$		
5543.0 <sup>a</sup> 6	$(21/2^{-})$		
6087.9 <mark>&amp;</mark> 7	$(25/2^+)$		
6273.3 <sup>a</sup> 7	$(25/2^{-})$		J <sup><math>\pi</math></sup> : inconsistent with proposed D 730 $\gamma$ deexcitation to (21/2 <sup>-</sup> ) 5543. J=(19/2 to 23/2) if
			J(5543) is correct.
6518.3 <sup>@</sup> 8	$(29/2^+)$		
6918.8 <sup><i>a</i></sup> 8	$(27/2^{-})$		
7437.6 <sup>@</sup> 8	$(31/2^+)$		
8099.2 <sup>@</sup> 9	$(33/2^+)$		
8630.2? <sup>#</sup> 13			
8846.2 <sup>@</sup> 13	$(37/2^+)$		
9437.2? <sup>#</sup> 17			
10137.2 20			

<sup>†</sup> From least-squares fit to  $E\gamma$  (by evaluator), assigning 1 keV uncertainty to all data; no uncertainty was stated by the authors.

<sup>‡</sup> Authors' proposed values. Based on measured DCO ratios and comparison with neighboring odd-a nuclides.

<sup>#</sup> Order of the  $531\gamma$ - $807\gamma$ - $700\gamma$  cascade is not established, thus, alternative energy values are possible for the intermediate levels if the order differs from that shown in the level scheme in figure 1 of 2010He15.

<sup>@</sup> Band(A): sequence based on g.s..

& Band(B): sequence based on  $(23/2^+)$ .

<sup>*a*</sup> Band(C): sequence based on  $(21/2^{-})$ .

## <sup>76</sup>Ge(<sup>19</sup>F,4nγ) **2010He15** (continued)

# $\gamma(^{91}\text{Nb})$

$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$\mathbf{E}_{f}$	$\mathbf{J}_f^{\pi}$	Mult. <sup>‡</sup>	Comments
185.8 <i>3</i> 254.4 <i>3</i>	17 9 23 5	5034.0 4350.9	(25/2 <sup>+</sup> ) 21/2 <sup>+</sup>	4848.0 4096.5	23/2 <sup>+</sup> 19/2 <sup>-</sup>	D D	Mult.: (D) from DCO=0.6 <i>3</i> . authors propose M1. Mult.: D from DCO=0.56 <i>18</i> . M1 given in the authors' email reply, but E1 is implied by authors' level scheme.
356.4 <i>3</i> 421.1 <i>3</i>	57 8 36 8	3466.4 5455.3	21/2 <sup>+</sup> (27/2 <sup>+</sup> )	3110.0 5034.0	17/2 <sup>+</sup> (25/2 <sup>+</sup> )		Mult.: (Q) from DCO=1.3 <i>6</i> ; authors propose E2. Mult.: DCO=1.8 <i>9</i> . E2 indicated in the authors' email reply, but AJ=1 In their proposed level scheme.
497.1 <i>3</i>	82 9	4848.0	$23/2^+$	4350.9	21/2+		Mult.: DCO=1.3 7. authors propose M1.
531 <del>"</del> 607.5 <i>3</i>	15 9	8630.2? 5455.3	(27/2 <sup>+</sup> )	8099.2 4848.0	$(33/2^+)$ $23/2^+$		Mult.: DCO=2.5 <i>10</i> . authors propose E2. coincident with 356 $\gamma$ , 884 $\gamma$ and 919 $\gamma$ , but not with 421 $\gamma$ .
645.5 <i>3</i> 661.6 <i>3</i> 700 <sup>#</sup>	9 <i>3</i> 528	6918.8 8099.2	(27/2 <sup>-</sup> ) (33/2 <sup>+</sup> )	6273.3 7437.6	(25/2 <sup>-</sup> ) (31/2 <sup>+</sup> )	D	Mult.: D from DCO=0.62 24. authors propose M1.
730.3 <i>3</i>	10 3	6273.3	(25/2 <sup>-</sup> )	5543.0	(21/2 <sup>-</sup> )		Mult.: D from DCO=0.58 24. authors propose M1, but their level level scheme requires a $\Delta J=2$ transition, inconsistent with DCO.
747 <sup>#</sup> 807 <sup>#</sup>		8846.2 9437-22	$(37/2^+)$	8099.2 8630.22	$(33/2^+)$		
819.6 <i>3</i> 884.5 <i>3</i>	100 <i>10</i> 33 6	3110.0 4350.9	17/2 <sup>+</sup> 21/2 <sup>+</sup>	2290.4 3466.4	13/2 <sup>+</sup> 21/2 <sup>+</sup>		Mult.: DCO=1.6 5; authors propose E2. DCO=0.8 3 Mult.: E1 chourn in the authors' amail raphy, but a $\Delta I=0$
904.0 <i>3</i>	5.7 23	6087.9	(25/2+)	5183.9	(23/2+)	(Q+D)	Mult. ET shown in the authors' entail repry, but a $\Delta 3 = 0$ , $\Delta \pi = \text{No}$ transition is implied by authors' level scheme. Mult.: DCO=1.3 3. E2 shown in the authors' email reply, but M1+E2 seems more likely based on authors' level scheme (where $\Delta I=1$ , $\Delta \pi = \text{No}$ )
919.4 <i>3</i>	27 5	7437.6	(31/2+)	6518.3	(29/2+)		Mult.: E2 listed in the authors' email reply, but $\Delta J=1$ from authors' level scheme, so M1+E2 seems more likely. DCO=1.2 6 is too imprecise to enable a definitive assignment
1063.0 <i>3</i>	15 7	6518.3	(29/2+)	5455.3	(27/2+)	D	Mult.: D from DCO=0.48 <i>16</i> . authors propose M1.
1717.4 <i>3</i> 1982.1 <i>3</i>	10 <i>5</i> 67 <i>8</i>	5183.9 7437.6	$(23/2^+)$ $(31/2^+)$	3466.4 5455.3	21/2 <sup>+</sup> (27/2 <sup>+</sup> )	D	<ul> <li>Mult.: D from DCO=0.35 <i>17</i>. authors propose M1.</li> <li>Mult.: D from DCO=0.43 <i>20</i>. however, M1 is shown in the authors' email reply and E2 is required by authors' level scheme.</li> <li>coincident with 356γ, 422γ and 884γ, but not with 919γ</li> </ul>
2062.5 3	21 5	4096.5	19/2-	2034.0	(17/2 <sup>-</sup> )		DCO=1.4 6 Mult.: DCO=1.4 6. E2 shown in the authors' email reply, but their level scheme indicates a $\Delta J=1$ transition, making M1+E2 more likely.
2076.5 3	15 4	5543.0	(21/2 <sup>-</sup> )	3466.4	21/2+	D	Mult.: D from DCO=0.40 <i>15</i> . M1 shown in the authors' email reply, but E1 required by authors' level scheme. However, DCO seems far too low for a D, $\Delta J=0$ transition.
2290.4 <i>3</i>	89 9	2290.4	$13/2^{+}$	0.0	9/2+	Q	Mult.: Q from DCO=1.2 3; authors propose E2.

<sup>†</sup> From e-mail reply on Oct 24, 2010 from C. He (first author of 2010He15), unless otherwise stated.

<sup>‡</sup> DCO values correspond to  $48^{\circ}(132^{\circ})$  and  $90^{\circ}$  geometry with gates on  $\Delta J=2$ , Q transitions. Expected ratios are $\approx 1.0$  for  $\Delta J=2$ , Q and $\approx 0.6$  for  $\Delta J=1$ , D transitions. assignments are taken from e-mail reply of Oct 24, 2010 from C. He (first author of 2010He15), except as noted; based on indicated DCO ratios, but those data cannot determine  $\Delta \pi$  and many have such large uncertainties that even  $\Delta J$  assignments become difficult. IT should also be noted that several assignments given in the email reply

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

#### $^{76}$ Ge( $^{19}$ F,4n $\gamma$ ) 2010He15 (continued)

 $\gamma$ (<sup>91</sup>Nb) (continued)

are inconsistent with the authors' level scheme (as noted here for the relevant transitions). <sup>#</sup> From level-scheme Figure 1 of 2010He15. Order of the  $531\gamma$ -80 $\gamma$ 7-700 $\gamma$  cascade is not established.





# <sup>76</sup>Ge(<sup>19</sup>F,4nγ) 2010He15



 $^{91}_{41}\rm{Nb}_{50}$