

$^{92}\text{Zr}(^3\text{He},\text{p}2\text{n}\gamma)$ 1985Ru08

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

$E(^3\text{He})=33.8$ MeV; Ge(Li), high purity Ge; $\theta(\text{lab})=20^\circ-90^\circ$.
 Measured: $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ coin (detailed information not given), $\gamma(\theta)$.

 ^{92}Nb Levels

E(level)	E(level)	E(level)	E(level)
0	480	1473	2289
136	501	1647	3000
227	1312	1945	3330
286	1409	2087	3801
357	1414	2203	
391	1423	2237	

 $\gamma(^{92}\text{Nb})$

A_2 and A_4 values from $\gamma(\theta)$ data of 1985Ru08 are given in comments.

$E_\gamma^\dagger$	$I_\gamma^\ddagger$	$E_i(\text{level})$	E_f	Mult. [#]	Comments
91	97	227	136	D	$A_2=+0.02$ 1, $A_4=+0.06$ 2.
116	24	2203	2087		$A_2=-0.02$ 7, $A_4=+0.05$ 9; very different from $\gamma(\theta)$ from ($^7\text{Li},3\text{n}\gamma$) which implies a Q transition.
123	31	480	357	D	$A_2=-0.17$ 4, $A_4=-0.06$ 7.
150 ^d	70 ^d	286	136		$A_2=-0.11$ 1, $A_4=-0.02$ 2 for doublet.
150 ^d	70 ^d	2237	2087		$A_2=-0.11$ 1, $A_4=-0.02$ 2 for doublet.
164	64	391	227	D	$A_2=-0.26$ 3, $A_4=-0.04$ 4.
194	81	480	286		
330 [@]	246	3330	3000		$A_2=-0.02$ 1, $A_4=-0.05$ 2 for doublet.
357 [@]	94	357	0		$A_2=-0.03$ 2, $A_4=-0.05$ 3 for doublet.
471 [@]	45	3801	3330		$A_2=+0.78$ 7, $A_4=+0.42$ 10 for doublet.
501	91	501	0	D	$A_2=-0.27$ 3, $A_4=+0.12$ 5.
711	83 ^a	3000	2289		
763	21 ^a	3000	2237	D	$A_2=-0.49$ 11, $A_4=-0.21$ 16.
908	64	1409	501	D	$A_2=-0.17$ 7, $A_4=-0.21$ 10.
921	14	1312	391		
934 ^{&}	66	1414	480	D	$A_2=-0.24$ 4, $A_4=+0.05$ 6.
1032	6	1423	391		
1082	24	1473	391		
1128	43	1414	286		
1146 ^b	7	1647	501		
1444	<5	1945	501		
^x 1507 ^c	<5				
2087	100	2087	0		$A_2=-0.10$ 3, $A_4=-0.06$ 4; very different from $\gamma(\theta)$ from ($^7\text{Li},3\text{n}\gamma$) which leads to the adopted Q+O assignment.
2289 [@]	115	2289	0		E_γ : from fig. 5 of 1985Ru08; 2287 In table I.

[†] Uncertainty not stated by authors. Detector resolution ≈ 1.0 keV FWHM for $E_\gamma=1$ MeV. E_γ deviates from value established in other reactions by ≤ 1 keV, except for 1128 γ , 1146 γ and 330 γ (1.6- to 3-keV energy difference).

 $^{92}\text{Zr}(^3\text{He},\text{p}2\text{n}\gamma)$ **1985Ru08** (continued)

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

[‡] Relative intensity at 90°, normalized to 100 for 2087 γ .

[#] Assigned by evaluator on basis of $\gamma(\theta)$ data.

[@] Doublet.

[&] 934 γ placed by evaluator on basis of energy difference and level scheme from (p,n γ). Since the 1324 level is not excited in this reaction (1098 γ absent), the 934 γ is presumed not to be a doublet in this reaction; however, I(934 γ)/I(1129 γ)=1.5 here, cf. 1.03 in (p,n γ), (α ,xn γ).

^a I(711 γ)/I(763 γ) differs grossly from result in (^7Li ,3n γ) reaction. See Adopted Gammas.

^b Evaluator assumes this γ ray corresponds to 1149.0 γ reported in (p,n γ).

^c Placed by **1985Ru08** between 1647 and 136 levels. Evaluator rejects this placement due to very poor energy fit and absence of such a branch in other reactions known to excite this level.

^d Multiply placed with undivided intensity.

^x γ ray not placed in level scheme.

$^{92}\text{Zr}(^3\text{He},\text{p}2\text{n}\gamma)$ 1985Ru08

Level Scheme

Intensities: Relative I_γ
& Multiply placed: undivided intensity given

Legend

- $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$
- $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_\gamma^{\text{max}}$

