## <sup>159</sup>Tb(<sup>36</sup>S,fxng) 2002St06

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

2002St06: <sup>159</sup>Tb(<sup>36</sup>S,fxng), E=165 MeV; GAMMASPHERE detector array (93 Compton-suppressed Ge detectors In 17 angular rings, preceded by Ta and Cu absorbers to attenuate x rays); measured Eγ, Iγ, γγγ coin, DCO ratios (triple angular correlations); shell-model calculations ( $\pi$  f<sub>5/2</sub>, p<sub>3/2</sub>, p<sub>1/2</sub>, g<sub>9/2</sub> and  $\nu$  p<sub>1/2</sub>, g<sub>9/2</sub>, d<sub>5/2</sub> orbitals relative to <sup>66</sup>Ni core).

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^{\pi \ddagger}$	Comments
0.0#	$0^{+}$	$J^{\pi}$ : from Adopted Levels.
814.5 <sup>#</sup> 5	2+	$J^{\pi}$ : from Adopted Levels.
1672.9 <sup>#</sup> 7	$(4^{+})$	
2184.5 7	(3-)	
2765.2 7	(5 <sup>-</sup> )	
2924.3 9		
3014.1 <sup>@</sup> 8	(4+)	J <sup><math>\pi</math></sup> : authors note that 5 <sup>-</sup> or 6 <sup>+</sup> cannot be totally excluded, but favor 4 <sup>+</sup> . possible dominant configuration: $\pi$ (1p <sup>-1</sup> <sub>3/2</sub> 1p <sub>1/2</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> $\nu$ (1d <sup>4</sup> <sub>5/2</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ) (2002St06). possible configuration: $\pi$ (1p <sup>-1</sup> <sub>3/2</sub> 1p <sub>1/2</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> $\nu$ (1d <sup>4</sup> <sub>5/2</sub> ) <sub>4</sub> ) (2002St06).
3128.3 9	$(6^{+})$	possible configuration: $\pi (1p_{3/2}^{-1} \ 1p_{1/2})_2 \ \nu(1d_{5/2}^4)_4) \ (2002St06).$
3361.9 7	(5 <sup>-</sup> )	
3558.0 9	$(7^{-})$	$J^{\pi}$ : authors note that 6 <sup>-</sup> cannot be totally excluded.
3785.4 <sup>@</sup> 8	(6+)	$J^{\pi}$ : authors note that 7 <sup>-</sup> cannot be totally excluded. Possible dominant configuration: $\pi (1p_{3/2}^{-1} 1p_{1/2})_2 \nu(1d_{5/2}^4)_4$ (2002St06) if J=6; however, adopted $\pi$ =- and shell-model calculations predict the second 6 <sup>+</sup> state At somewhat higher energy.
4020.8 8	$(7^{-})$	
4927.9 9		
5056.1 10		
5726.6 <sup>@</sup> 11		
6527.1? <sup>@</sup> 12		

<sup>†</sup> From least-squares fit to  $E\gamma$ .

<sup>‡</sup> Authors' tentative values, except As noted. Consistent with observed DCO ratios, but assigned primarily by analogy with <sup>90</sup>Sr. <sup>#</sup> Band(A):  $\pi$ =+ sequence. Based on 0<sup>+</sup> g.s. principal configuration:  $\nu \, 1d_{5/2}^4$  (2002St06).

 $(^{92}Sr)$ 

<sup>@</sup> Band(B): sequence based on 3014 level.

$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\ddagger}$	$E_i$ (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$\mathbf{E}_f  \mathbf{J}_f^{\pi}$	Mult. <sup>#</sup>	Comments
235.4 5	8.1 3	4020.8	(7 <sup>-</sup> )	3785.4 (6+)	(D)	$E_{\gamma}$ , $I_{\gamma}$ : contaminated by strong 235γ from <sup>190</sup> Tl. Mult.: DCO=0.63 <i>17</i> , ΔJ=2 858γ In gate.
580.7 5	21.0 6	2765.2	(5 <sup>-</sup> )	2184.5 (3 <sup>-</sup> )		Mult.: DCO=1.5 6 for $\Delta J=1$ 1370 $\gamma$ In gate.
658.9 <i>5</i>	13.6 5	4020.8	$(7^{-})$	3361.9 (5 <sup>-</sup> )		
771.3 5	6.3 <i>3</i>	3785.4	$(6^{+})$	3014.1 (4+)		$E_{\gamma}$ : contaminated by a <sup>191</sup> Tl line.
792.8 5		3558.0	(7 <sup>-</sup> )	2765.2 (5 <sup>-</sup> )		$E_{\gamma}$ : contaminated by a <sup>191</sup> Tl line. Mult.: DCO=1.5 5 for $\Delta J$ =1 1092 $\gamma$ In gate; May be unreliable due to <sup>191</sup> Tl contamination of G.
798.7 <i>5</i>	7.96	5726.6		4927.9		
800.5 <sup>@</sup> 5 814.55	4.3 <i>3</i> 149 2	6527.1? 814.5	2+	5726.6 0.0 0 <sup>+</sup>		
858.4 <i>5</i> 1020.2 <i>5</i>	100 <i>I</i> 26.6 7	1672.9 3785.4	$(4^+)$ (6 <sup>+</sup> )	814.5 2 <sup>+</sup> 2765.2 (5 <sup>-</sup> )	Q	Mult.: see comment on 1092 $\gamma$ . E <sub><math>\gamma</math></sub> ,I <sub><math>\gamma</math></sub> : possibly an unresolved doublet, so I $\gamma$ May be

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

<sup>159</sup> Tb( <sup>36</sup> S,fxng) <b>2002St06</b> (continued)							
$\gamma$ ( <sup>92</sup> Sr) (continued)							
$E_{\gamma}^{\dagger}$	$I_{\gamma}^{\ddagger}$	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	$\mathbf{J}_i^{\pi}$	$E_f$	$\mathbf{J}_f^{\pi}$	Mult. <sup>#</sup>	Comments
							overestimated. Mult.: DCO=1.0 3 for $\Delta J=1$ 1092 $\gamma$ In gate; May be unreliable due to complex nature of G. Interpreted by authors As $\Delta J=2$ transition.
1035.3 5	10.1 6	5056.1		4020.8	$(7^{-})$		
$x \approx 1037$							assignment to <sup>92</sup> Sr is uncertain.
1092.3 5	36.2 8	2765.2	(5 <sup>-</sup> )	1672.9	(4+)	D	DCO= $0.56\ 15$ , Q $858\gamma$ In gate; consistent with pure stretched D for $1092\gamma$ and stretched Q for $858\gamma$ .
1142.5 5	10.3 4	4927.9		3785.4	$(6^{+})$		, , ,
1177.4 5	14.3 4	3361.9	$(5^{-})$	2184.5	$(3^{-})$		
1251.4 5	5.8 5	2924.3		1672.9	$(4^{+})$		
1341.2 5	5.8 <i>3</i>	3014.1	(4+)	1672.9	(4 <sup>+</sup> )		$E_{\gamma}$ : contaminated by a 1345γ of unknown origin. Mult.: DCO=1.0 4, Q 858γ In gate; however, result May be unreliable due to contamination of this transition by an impurity G. interpreted by authors As $\Delta J$ =0 transition.
1370.0 5	34.2 7	2184.5	$(3^{-})$	814.5	2+		
1455.4 5	11.0 6	3128.3	$(6^+)$	1672.9			Mult.: DCO=1.1 6, $\Delta J=2$ 858 $\gamma$ In gate.
1689.0 5	5.2 3	3361.9	(5-)	1672.9	(4+)		, , ,
1799.6 <sup>@</sup> 5	3.2 3	4927.9		3128.3	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		

<sup>†</sup> Authors state that uncertainties range from 0.1 keV to 0.5 keV; evaluator has conservatively assigned 0.5 keV for all transitions.

<sup>±</sup> Relative intensity from spectrum gated on the 814.5 $\gamma$  and normalized so I(858 $\gamma$ )=100.

<sup>#</sup> Based on measured DCO ratio; expected DCO ratios are 0.9-1.1 for  $\Delta J=2$  (or D  $\Delta J=0$ )  $\gamma$  gated by  $\Delta J=2 \gamma$  or  $\Delta J=1 \gamma$  gated

by  $\Delta J=1 \gamma$ , 0.6-0.8 for pure D  $\gamma$  gated by  $\Delta J=2 \gamma$ , and 1.25-1.67 for  $\Delta J=2$  (or D  $\Delta J=0$ )  $\gamma$  gated by pure D transition.

<sup>@</sup> Placement of transition in the level scheme is uncertain.

 $x \gamma$  ray not placed in level scheme.

 ${}^{92}_{38}{
m Sr}_{54}{
m -}3$ 









