

⁹¹Zr(p,n γ) 1973Ma02,1977Sc28

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

Others: 1971Ma47, 1971Ma48.

1977Sc28: E=3.6-4.9 MeV. 89.2% ⁹¹Zr target. Ge(Li) detectors, FWHM=2.1 keV and 2.8 keV at 1.33 MeV. Measured I γ , $\gamma(\theta)$, T_{1/2} from DSA.

1973Ma02: E=3.25-5.51 MeV (30 keV steps). 90.9% enriched target (1971Ma47). Ge(Li) detectors, FWHM=4 keV at 3 MeV. Most of the data are also reported in 1971Ma47.

1971Ma48: E=3.0-6.3 MeV. 90.88% ⁹¹Zr target. Ge(Li) detectors, FWHM=3.0-3.5 keV at 1.0 MeV. Measured E γ , I γ , excit, $\gamma\gamma$ coin.

⁹¹Nb Levels

E(level) [†]	J π [‡]	T _{1/2} [#]	Comments
0	9/2 ⁺		J π : from Adopted Levels.
104.18 25	1/2 ⁻		J π : from Adopted Levels.
1186.76 20	5/2	>2.1 ps	J π : IAR: 5/2 ⁻ .
1312.54 22	3/2 ⁻	0.104 ps +28-21	J π : IAR: 3/2 ⁻ .
1580.97 20	7/2 ⁺	0.55 ps +28-17	J π : IAR: 7/2 ⁺ , 9/2 ⁺ .
1612.4 3	3/2 ⁻	54 fs +14-10	J π : IAR: 3/2 ⁻ .
1637.1 3	9/2 ⁺		J π : IAR: 7/2 ⁺ , 9/2 ⁺ .
1790.60 19	11/2 ⁻	>1.5 ps	J π : IAR: 9/2 ⁻ .
1844.7 3	5/2	>1.5 ps	J π : IAR: 5/2 ⁻ .
1963.3 3	5/2	0.20 ps +7-4	J π : IAR: 3/2 ⁺ , 5/2 ⁺ .
1984.58 21	13/2, 15/2	>0.4 ps	J π : IAR: 1/2 ⁺ , 11/2 ⁺ , \geq 13/2. γ to 9/2 ⁺ g.s. disfavors J=15 and favors $\pi=+$.
2120.84 19	5/2, 7/2 ⁻	>1.0 ps	J π : IAR: 7/2 ⁻ .
2292.0 3	13/2, 15/2	0.12 ps +4-3	J π : IAR: 1/2 ⁺ , 11/2 ⁺ , \geq 13/2.
2324.50 24	5/2, 7/2 ⁻	0.18 ps +6-4	J π : IAR: 5/2 ⁻ .
2330.2 3	11/2	0.104 ps +28-21	J π : IAR: 1/2 ⁺ , 11/2 ⁺ , \geq 13/2. $\pi=+$ based on mult(2330 γ).
2345.1 3	3/2	0.104 ps +21-14	J π : IAR: 3/2 ⁻ .
2389.8 3	3/2 ⁺ , 5/2	1.0 ps +24-5	J π : IAR: 1/2 ⁻ , 3/2 ⁺ , 5/2 ⁺ .
2413.51 24	11/2 ⁻ , 13/2 ⁻	0.62 ps +35-21	J π : IAR: 9/2 ⁻ , 11/2 ⁻ .
2531.6 3	11/2	0.9 ps +5-3	J π : IAR: 7/2 ⁺ , 9/2, 11/2 ⁻ .
2579.6 3	5/2	0.55 ps +35-14	J π : IAR: 3/2 ⁺ , 5/2 ⁺ .
2612.7 3	5/2, 7/2 ⁻ , 9/2 ⁻	0.090 ps +21-14	J π : IAR: 1/2 ⁻ , 7/2 ⁻ .
2632.2 3	9/2	0.125 ps +35-21	J π : IAR: not (1/2 ⁻ to 7/2 ⁻).
2792.56 24	5/2, 7/2		J π : IAR: not (1/2 ⁻ , 7/2 ⁻ , 3/2, 5/2).
2881.8 4			
2911.8 3			
2969.9 3			
2991.1 4			
3028.2 3			
3065.0 4			
3126.02 24			
3149.2 3			
3179.3 3			
3187.4 3			
3273.5 3			
3328.6 3			
3434.4? 10			
3461.6? 10			
3559.9? 10			
3634.5 6			
3697.2? 10			
3835.4 6			
3886.3 6			

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

⁹¹Zr(p,n γ) 1973Ma02,1977Sc28 (continued)

⁹¹Nb Levels (continued)

E(level)[†]
 3915.6 10
 4023.5 10
 4180.3 8
 4237.1 10

[†] From least-squares fit to E γ , assigning $\Delta E_\gamma=1$ keV to E γ values for which the authors did not state the uncertainty.

[‡] From Hauser-Feshbach analysis of excitation functions (1973Ma02). Limits on J $^\pi$ deduced by the same authors from IAR neutron yields are given under comments.

[#] From DSA (1977Sc28). The uncertainty includes both the statistical error and 15% uncertainty in the stopping power.

		$\gamma(^{91}\text{Nb})$						
E _i (level)	J _i $^\pi$	E γ [†]	I γ [‡]	E _f	J _f $^\pi$	Mult. [#]	δ [#]	Comments
104.18	1/2 ⁻	(104.18 25)	100	0	9/2 ⁺			Not observed in this experiment; E γ from level energy difference.
1186.76	5/2	1082.5 3	100	104.18	1/2 ⁻			
1312.54	3/2 ⁻	1208.2 3	100	104.18	1/2 ⁻	D(+Q)		$\delta: -2.5 \leq \delta \leq +0.15$. A ₂ =+0.04 3 (1977Sc28).
1580.97	7/2 ⁺	1581.2 3	100	0	9/2 ⁺			
1612.4	3/2 ⁻	425.6 ^{&}	0.8 ^a 1	1186.76	5/2			
		1508.1 3	99.2 ^a 1	104.18	1/2 ⁻			A ₂ =+0.01 3 (1977Sc28).
1637.1	9/2 ⁺	1637.1 3	100	0	9/2 ⁺			
1790.60	11/2 ⁻	603.7 3	3.3 5	1186.76	5/2			
		1790.6 3	96.7 5	0	9/2 ⁺	D(+Q)	-0.15 15	$\delta: -0.15 15$ or +1.10 4; larger solution improbable since level scheme implies $\Delta\pi$ =yes. A ₂ =+0.12 4; A ₄ =-0.02 4 (1977Sc28).
1844.7	5/2	657.9 3	34.9 25	1186.76	5/2			
		1740.5 3	65.1 25	104.18	1/2 ⁻			
1963.3	5/2	1963.3 3	100	0	9/2 ⁺			
1984.58	13/2,15/2	194.1 3	49.0 30	1790.60	11/2 ⁻			
		1984.4 3	51.0 30	0	9/2 ⁺	(M2+E3)	-0.15 5	A ₂ =+0.18 4; A ₄ =-0.13 4 (1977Sc28). Mult.: from $\gamma(\theta)$ and level scheme. $\delta(D,Q)=-0.25 \leq \delta \leq +0.2$ or <-3 or >+10. A ₂ =-0.19 4; A ₄ =-0.01 5 (1977Sc28).
2120.84	5/2,7/2 ⁻	330.0 3	42.3 15	1790.60	11/2 ⁻			
		808.4 3	9.0 15	1312.54	3/2 ⁻			
		934.1 3	38.5 15	1186.76	5/2			$\delta: -0.04 \leq \delta \leq +0.3$ or <-6 or >+33. A ₂ =0.00 3; A ₄ =0.00 3 (1977Sc28).
2292.0	13/2,15/2	2120.8 3	10.1 15	0	9/2 ⁺			
2324.50	5/2,7/2 ⁻	2292.0 3	100	0	9/2 ⁺	Q(+O)	-0.03 7	A ₂ =+0.30 6; A ₄ =-0.10 8 (1977Sc28). E γ : corrected value (1973Ma02) for 741.8 γ of 1971Ma47.
		743.5 3	3.9 15	1580.97	7/2 ⁺			
		1012.0 3	45.1 15	1312.54	3/2 ⁻			
		1137.7 3	51.0 15	1186.76	5/2			
2330.2	11/2	2330.2 3	100	0	9/2 ⁺	M1+E2	-10 +3-27	A ₂ =-0.14 4; A ₄ =+0.07 3 (1977Sc28). Mult.: from $\gamma(\theta)$ and RUL.
2345.1	3/2	732.6 3	9.2 15	1612.4	3/2 ⁻			
		1032.6 3	35.8 15	1312.54	3/2 ⁻			
		1158.3 3	17.5 15	1186.76	5/2			
		2241.1 3	37.4 15	104.18	1/2 ⁻			
2389.8	3/2 ⁺ ,5/2	1203.1 3	33.0 20	1186.76	5/2			

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{91}\text{Zr}(p,n\gamma)$ **1973Ma02,1977Sc28** (continued)

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

$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_γ^\dagger	I_γ^\ddagger	E_f	J_f^π	Mult.#	$\delta^\#$	Comments
2389.8	$3/2^+, 5/2$	2285.6 3	67.0 20	104.18	$1/2^-$			
2413.51	$11/2^-, 13/2^-$	428.9 3	33.0 20	1984.58	$13/2, 15/2$	M1+E2		Mult., δ : $-0.27 \leq \delta \leq -0.14$ or $-4.8 \leq \delta \leq -3$; E1+M2 excluded by RUL, even for the smallest of these δ values.
		2413.5 3	67.0 20	0	$9/2^+$	D(+Q)	0.00 4	$A_2=+0.09$ 5; $A_4=-0.02$ 4 (1977Sc28). $A_2=-0.19$ 4; $A_4=-0.03$ 4 (1977Sc28).
2531.6	$11/2$	410.4&	12.5 20	2120.84	$5/2, 7/2^-$			
		2531.6 3	87.5 20	0	$9/2^+$	D+Q	+0.22 3	$A_2=+0.07$ 4; $A_4=0.00$ 4 (1977Sc28).
2579.6	$5/2$	998.6 3	31.8 18	1580.97	$7/2^+$			
		1267.0 3	68.2 18	1312.54	$3/2^-$			
		2578.8@		0	$9/2^+$			I(2579 γ):I(1267 γ):I(999 γ)=3.0:16.9:5.0 (1971Ma48).
2612.7	$5/2, 7/2^-, 9/2^-$	2612.7 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
2632.2	$9/2$	1051.5&d	4.2 20	1580.97	$7/2^+$			
		2632.1 3	95.8 20	0	$9/2^+$			$A_2=-0.08$ 4; $A_4=0.00$ 4 (1977Sc28).
2792.56	$5/2, 7/2$	1605.8 3	45 ^b	1186.76	$5/2$			
		2792.5 3	55 ^b	0	$9/2^+$			
2881.8		1569.2 3	100	1312.54	$3/2^-$			
2911.8		2911.7 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
2969.9		2969.8 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
2991.1		1804.4 3	100	1186.76	$5/2$			
3028.2		3028.1 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3065.0		1273.7@	33 ^c	1790.60	$11/2^-$			
		2960.8 3	67 ^c	104.18	$1/2^-$			
3126.02		1545.4 3	34 ^b	1580.97	$7/2^+$			
		3125.6 3	66 ^b	0	$9/2^+$			
3149.2		3149.1 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3179.3		1866.6 3	39 ^b	1312.54	$3/2^-$			
		3075.3 3	61 ^b	104.18	$1/2^-$			
3187.4		3187.3 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3273.5		3273.4 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3328.6		3328.6 3	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3434.4?		3434.3@d	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3461.6?		3461.5@d	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3559.9?		3559.8@d	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3634.5		1309.9@	54 ^c	2324.50	$5/2, 7/2^-$			
		2320.5@		1312.54	$3/2^-$			
		3636.0@	45 ^c	0	$9/2^+$			
3697.2?		3697.1@d	100	0	$9/2^+$			
3835.4		1991.3@		1844.7	$5/2$			
		2253.1@	53 ^c	1580.97	$7/2^+$			
		3836.1@	46 ^c	0	$9/2^+$			
3886.3		558.7@		3328.6				
		1764.4@	17 ^c	2120.84	$5/2, 7/2^-$			
		3886.3@	82 ^c	0	$9/2^+$			
3915.6		3915.5@	100	0	$9/2^+$			
4023.5		4023.4@	100	0	$9/2^+$			
4180.3		1189.8@		2991.1				

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

${}^{91}\text{Zr}(\text{p},\text{n}\gamma)$ **1973Ma02,1977Sc28 (continued)** $\gamma({}^{91}\text{Nb})$ (continued)

$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_γ^\dagger	I_γ^\ddagger	E_f	J_f^π	Comments
4180.3		4179.6 [@]		0	9/2 ⁺	
4237.1		4237.0 [@]	100	0	9/2 ⁺	Observed for E(p)=8.0 MeV only.

[†] From [1973Ma02](#) when available; ΔE_γ is from [1971Ma47](#). [1977Sc28](#) determined E_γ only for lines which were not measured by [1973Ma02](#). The energy calibration of [1977Sc28](#) was based on the energies of adjacent peaks known from [1973Ma02](#); no uncertainties are given by [1977Sc28](#).

[‡] Branchings for each level at $\theta=55^\circ$ as determined by [1977Sc28](#). Data of [1973Ma02](#) essentially support these results. Relative intensities at 90° for E(p)=6.3 MeV are reported by [1971Ma48](#).

[#] From $\gamma(\theta)$ ([1977Sc28](#)).

[@] From [1971Ma48](#). ΔE_γ unstated by authors; however, authors quote E(level) to ± 1 keV.

[&] From [1977Sc28](#). No ΔE_γ given by authors.

^a [1977Sc28](#) give 99% and 1% in their fig.3, 99.7% and 0.8% in table 3 for the 1509 γ and 426 γ , respectively. The evaluator assumes that 99.7% is a misprint (since branching would not sum to 100% in that case).

^b From [1973Ma02](#). Uncertainty not given by the authors.

^c From $I_\gamma(90^\circ)$ in [1971Ma48](#); reliability of value depends on the anisotropy of the γ (possibly 5% to 10% ([1971Ma48](#))). Note that branchings implied by $I_\gamma(90^\circ)$ data are in only fair to poor agreement with branching data from [1973Ma02](#) and [1977Sc28](#), where comparisons are possible.

^d Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

$^{91}\text{Zr}(p,n\gamma)$ 1973Ma02,1977Sc28

Legend

Level Scheme (continued)

Intensities: % photon branching from each level

-----▶ γ Decay (Uncertain)
 ● Coincidence

