

$^{92}\text{Mo}(\text{p},\text{p}'\gamma)$ 1975Pa19,1973DoZB

Type	Author	History Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Coral M. Baglin	NDS 113, 2187 (2012)	15-Sep-2012

Others: 1966Di01, 1968Li10, 1969Li11, 1971Co08, 1972Mo36, 1974Cu04.
 1968Li10: E(p)=7.96 MeV; $\theta=30^\circ-140^\circ$; via ^{93}Tc IAR. $\gamma(\theta)$.
 1972Mo36: E(p)=8,11 MeV; FWHM=4 keV; measured E(ce); ΔE , I(ce) unstated.
 1973DoZB: E(p)=7 MeV; E_γ , branching, $\text{p}'\text{-}\gamma$ coin.
 1975Pa19: E(p)=7.0, 7.6, 8.5 MeV; E_γ , branching, $\gamma(\theta)$, $\gamma(t)$ (DSA).

 ^{92}Mo Levels

The level scheme is from 1975Pa19 and agrees closely with that from 1973DoZB. The 480 γ , at one time assigned to a level at 3572 keV, actually deexcites the 3007-keV level (1975Pa19).

E(level) [†]	J^π [‡]	$T_{1/2}$ [#]	Comments
0.0	0 ⁺		
1509.48 3	2 ⁺	0.36 ps +8-5	
2282.64 8	4 ⁺	>3.4 ps	J^π : from 773 $\gamma(\theta)$, J=4, J \neq 2,3,5.
2519.71 8	0 ⁺	>3.4 ps	
2527.10 10	5 ⁻	1.55 [@] ns 4	
2613.5 4	6 ⁺		
2849.74 5	3 ⁻	0.34 ps +18-9	J^π : from 1340 $\gamma(\theta)$, J=2,3, J \neq 4; however, J=2 would imply large δ .
3007.11 16			
3064.19 11	(4 ⁻)		J^π : J=3,4,5 from 537 $\gamma(\theta)$, but δ unreasonably large if $J^\pi=5^+$ or 3. Absence of level in (α,α') may suggest unnatural π , favoring a 4 ⁻ assignment. adopted $J^\pi=(5^-)$.
3091.33 22	2 ⁺	35 fs 3	$T_{1/2}$: 1975Pa19 obtain 21 fs 6. J^π : from 3091 $\gamma(\theta)$, J=2, J \neq 3,4.
3369.16 14	4	>3.4 ps	J^π : 1086 $\gamma(\theta)$ allows J=4,5, not 3. Magnitude of δ rules out 5 ⁻ . Possible branch to 2 ⁺ .
3542.00 11	2 ⁺	0.090 ps +42-28	$T_{1/2}$: 1975Pa19 obtain 0.061 ps +24-17. J^π : 2033 $\gamma(\theta)$ allows J=2,3, not 1. Mult(3541 γ)=E1,M1,E2, from $T_{1/2}$. γ rays to 2 ⁺ , 0 ⁺ levels.
3580.38 17		>0.21 ps	J^π : 1053 $\gamma(\theta)$ allows J=3,4,5.
3621.2 4		>0.21 ps	
3688.00 13		>0.69 ps	
3813.9 3		>0.48 ps	
3841.2 4	0 ⁺	>0.21 ps	
3876.1 5			
3925.0 4	2 ⁺	17 fs +16-10	$T_{1/2}$: 1975Pa19 obtain 20 fs +20-12.
3942.5 4	1,2 ⁺	10 fs +10-3	$T_{1/2}$: 1975Pa19 obtain 21 fs +20-12.
3962.38 20		>0.21 ps	

[†] From least-squares fit to E_γ .

[‡] J^π values shown for levels above 2 MeV were proposed by 1975Pa19 based on $\gamma(\theta)$, assuming adopted values for g.s. and 1509 level.

[#] Evaluator adopts values from DSA measurements of 1973DoZB using Winterbon attenuation factors, because they are in better agreement with other half-life measurements than are the DSA values obtained by 1975Pa19 using Blaugrund attenuation factors (see also comment in 1977Me01).

[@] From $\text{p}'\text{-}244\gamma$ delayed measurements (1971Co08).

$^{92}\text{Mo}(p,p'\gamma)$ **1975Pa19,1973DoZB** (continued)

$\gamma(^{92}\text{Mo})$								
$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_γ^\dagger	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger d}$	E_f	J_f^π	Mult.#	$\delta^{\textcircled{a}}$	Comments
1509.48	2 ⁺	1509.47 3	100	0.0	0 ⁺			
2282.64	4 ⁺	773.10 8	100	1509.48	2 ⁺	Q(+O)	-0.12 +22-14	$A_2=+0.22$ 4, $A_4=-0.20$ 4 (1975Pa19).
2519.71	0 ⁺	1010.22 7	100	1509.48	2 ⁺			
2527.10	5 ⁻	244.47 7	100	2282.64	4 ⁺			$A_2=-0.22$ 5 (1968Li10); implies $\Delta J=0,1$.
2613.5	6 ⁺	330.9 ^a 4	100	2282.64	4 ⁺			
2849.74	3 ⁻	567.05 12	16 2	2282.64	4 ⁺			
		1340.26 4	84 2	1509.48	2 ⁺	D+Q	-0.09 +5-21	δ : from table 4 (summary of observed electromagnetic transition rates) of 1975Pa19; δ misprinted in table 3 (summary of $\gamma(\theta)$ analyses). $A_2=-0.35$ 2, $A_4=-0.03$ 3 (1975Pa19); $A_2=-0.28$ 5 (1968Li10).
3007.11		480.12 14	100	2527.10	5 ⁻			
3064.19	(4 ⁻)	537.07 4	100	2527.10	5 ⁻			$A_2=-0.44$ 10, $A_4=-0.08$ 11 (1975Pa19). δ is ≥ 1.2 if J=5; +0.5 to +2.8 if J=3; +0.25 +25-11 or +5 +14-3 if J=4.
3091.33	2 ⁺	1581.9 3	19 2	1509.48	2 ⁺	D+Q	+0.63 ^c 11	$A_2=+0.50$ 12, $A_4=-0.05$ 13 (1975Pa19). Mult.: Q from $\gamma(\theta)$; RUL disallows M2.
		3091.2 3	81 2	0.0	0 ⁺	E2		$A_2=+0.32$ 4, $A_4=-0.09$ 5 (1975Pa19).
3369.16	4	304.8 2	35 3	3064.19	(4 ⁻)			
		362.3 2	17 2	3007.11				
		842.1 2	37 2	2527.10	5 ⁻			
		1086.4 2	11 2	2282.64	4 ⁺	D+Q	+0.27 +51-24	$A_2=+0.47$ 5, $A_4=+0.12$ 6 (1975Pa19).
		1859.5 ^{&e}		1509.48	2 ⁺			
3542.00	2 ⁺	2032.5 1	86 5	1509.48	2 ⁺	E2+M1	-1.7 +9-26	$A_2=-0.30$ 8, $A_4=-0.04$ 8 (1975Pa19). Mult.=D+Q, but δ too large for E1+M2 transition.
		3541.4 9	14 5	0.0	0 ⁺			
3580.38		1053.4 2	57 4	2527.10	5 ⁻	Q(+O)	-0.12 +19-32	$A_2=+0.18$ 7, $A_4=-0.10$ 8 (1975Pa19).
		1297.6 2	43 4	2282.64	4 ⁺			
3621.2		2111.7 4	100	1509.48	2 ⁺			
3688.00		838.3 3	48 3	2849.74	3 ⁻			
		2178.48 13	52 3	1509.48	2 ⁺			
3813.9		750.8 ^{&e}		3064.19	(4 ⁻)			
		807.7 ^{&e}		3007.11				
		964.5 5	45 3	2849.74	3 ⁻			
		2304.3 3	55 3	1509.48	2 ⁺			
3841.2	0 ⁺	2331.7 4	100	1509.48	2 ⁺			
3876.1		1593.3 5	38 7	2282.64	4 ⁺			
		2367.0 7	62 7	1509.48	2 ⁺			
3925.0	2 ⁺	2415.5 5	35 5	1509.48	2 ⁺			
		3924.9 5	65 5	0.0	0 ⁺			
3942.5	1,2 ⁺	3942.4 4	100	0.0	0 ⁺			
3962.38		594.9 ^{&e}		3369.16	4			
		898.0 2	49 4	3064.19	(4 ⁻)			
		1113.2 4	27 3	2849.74	3 ⁻			
		2453.4 7	24 3	1509.48	2 ⁺			

[†] From 1975Pa19, unless noted otherwise.[‡] Branching, from 55° data of 1975Pa19. 1973DoZB report different branching for 3369, 3814 and 3962 levels to accommodate γ rays which they alone observe, as follows: 3369 level: I(304 γ):I(362 γ):I(842 γ):I(1086 γ):I(1860 γ)=70:15:5:10:5; 3814 level: I(751 γ):I(808 γ):I(965 γ):I(2304 γ)=5:5:45:45; 3962 level: I(595 γ):I(898 γ):I(1113 γ):I(2453 γ)=25:15:30:10.[#] Based on $\gamma(\theta)$ from 1975Pa19.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{92}\text{Mo}(\text{p},\text{p}'\gamma)$ **1975Pa19,1973DoZB (continued)**

$\gamma(^{92}\text{Mo})$ (continued)

[@] From $\gamma(\theta)$, [1975Pa19](#), assuming J(parent level)=adopted J. See [1975Pa19](#) for additional δ values corresponding to other plausible J values.

[&] Reported by [1973DoZB](#) only. For branching, see comment on I γ .

^a Given as 333.9 keV in [1975Pa19](#), but level energy difference is 330.9 and $E\gamma=329.76$ is associated with this level in ($\alpha,2n\gamma$); $E\gamma=333.9$ is assumed to be a misprint.

^b From ce data of [1972Mo36](#). ΔE not stated by authors.

^c From table 4 (summary of observed electromagnetic transition rates) of [1975Pa19](#); table 3 (summary of $\gamma(\theta)$ analyses) quotes 0.7 +5-4. Reason for discrepancy not evident.

^d Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

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

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

