

$^{93}\text{Ru } \varepsilon+\beta^+ \text{ decay (10.8 s)}$ [1976De37](#)

Type	Author	History	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Coral M. Baglin	NDS 112,1163 (2011)	15-Dec-2010

Parent: ^{93}Ru : $E=734.4$ I ; $J^\pi=(1/2)^-$; $T_{1/2}=10.8$ s 3 ; $Q(\varepsilon)=6391$ 6 ; $\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+$ decay=78.0 23

$^{93}\text{Ru}-\%\varepsilon+\%\beta^+$ decay: From $Iy\pm=390$ 50 , $\%\varepsilon p=0.027$ 5 ([1983Ay01](#)) and $Iy(^{93}\text{Ru} 734)=55.6$ 26 (relative to $I(1396\gamma)=100$), assuming $\alpha(734)=0.0287$ (M4 theory) and $I\varepsilon/I\beta$ (theory).

Others: [1983Ay01](#), [1976DiZP](#), [1972Do04](#).

[1976De37](#): Ge(Li) detectors; measured $E\gamma$, Iy , $\gamma\gamma$ coin (time resolution 50 ns).

The level scheme is from [1976De37](#), with the addition of the 2481p-emitting 6595 level from [1983Ay01](#). Note, however, that At least five more proton-emitting levels between 6.0 and 6.8 MeV are fed (weakly) by $^{93}\text{Ru } \varepsilon$ decay (10.8 s). In the FWHM=20 keV spectrum of fig. 1 of [1983Ay01](#), at least six proton groups are evident. The evaluator estimates $E(p)$ values of 1.93, 2.07, 2.25, 2.48, 2.56 and 2.65 MeV for these, implying ^{93}Tc levels At 6.04, 6.18, 6.36, 6.59, 6.67 and 6.77 MeV, only one of which is otherwise known. [1983Ay01](#) mention prominent p groups At 2481 5, 2534 and 2557 only, and calculate $E(^{93}\text{Tc})$ for only the 2481p emitting level. if a 2534p exists, it is unresolved from the 2557p In fig. 1 and could hardly Be described As ‘prominent’, so this $E(p)$ May contain a typographical error. In view of the uncertain $E(p)$ data, only the level emitting the strongest P group has been ADOPTED.

 ^{93}Tc Levels

$E(\text{level})^\dagger$	$J^\pi\ddagger$	Comments
0	9/2 ⁺	
392.65 <i>10</i>	1/2 ⁻	
1408.59 <i>14</i>	(5/2 ⁻)	
1503.80 <i>14</i>	1/2 ⁻ ,3/2 ⁻	
1788.87 <i>14</i>	1/2 ⁻ ,3/2 ⁻	
2431.87 <i>17</i>	(1/2,3/2) ⁻	
6595 5	(3/2) ⁻	E(level): from $E(p)=2481$ 5 for strong delayed proton group (1983Ay01) and $S(p)=4086.5$ <i>10</i> (2003Au03).

[†] From least-squares fit to $E\gamma$, except As noted.

[‡] From Adopted Levels.

 ε, β^+ radiations

$E(\text{decay})$	$E(\text{level})$	$I\beta^+\ddagger$	$I\varepsilon\ddagger$	$\log ft$	$I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)\ddagger$	Comments
(530 8)	6595	≥ 0.008	≤ 4.7	≥ 0.008	≥ 0.008	$\varepsilon K=0.8626$ 2; $\varepsilon L=0.1113$ <i>1</i> ; $\varepsilon M+=0.02611$ 3 $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)$: 0.008% given In fig. 4 of 1983Ay01 is presumed by the evaluator to Be a lower limit since the authors give $\log ft$ As an upper limit. $I(2481p)$ is significantly less than $\Sigma[I(\text{delayed p})]=0.027$ % 5 (1983Ay01) (which would lead to $\log ft=4.1$); the evaluator estimates that the $E(p)=2481$ proton group to $^{92}\text{Mo(g.s.)}$ constitutes roughly half the total delayed $I(p)$ in the spectrum of fig. 1 in 1983Ay01 .
(4694 6)	2431.87	11.3 6	0.69 4	4.72 3	12.0 6	av $E\beta=1674.9$ 29; $\varepsilon K=0.05027$ 24; $\varepsilon L=0.00610$ 3; $\varepsilon M+=0.001418$ 7
(5337 6)	1788.87	36.7 12	1.39 5	4.526 19	38.1 12	av $E\beta=1981.9$ 29; $\varepsilon K=0.03182$ 13; $\varepsilon L=0.003857$ 16; $\varepsilon M+=0.000897$ 4
(5622 6)	1503.80	23.8 13	0.75 4	4.84 3	24.5 13	av $E\beta=2118.7$ 29; $\varepsilon K=0.02650$ 10; $\varepsilon L=0.003211$ 12; $\varepsilon M+=0.000747$ 3
(6733# 6)	392.65	<12	<0.20	>5.6	<12 [†]	av $E\beta=2655.6$ 30; $\varepsilon K=0.01420$ 5; $\varepsilon L=0.001719$ 6; $\varepsilon M+=0.0003997$ 1

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

^{93}Ru $\varepsilon+\beta^+$ decay (10.8 s) 1976De37 (continued) **ε, β^+ radiations (continued)**

[†] $I(\varepsilon+\beta^+)(\text{g.s.}+393 \text{ level})=9.25$ from $I\beta^+(\text{total})=195.25$ (relative to $I(1396\gamma)=100$) and intensity imbalance for $E(\text{level})>393$ assuming $I\varepsilon/I\beta$ from theory; thus, $\%(I\varepsilon+I\beta^+)=3.10$ to ($\text{g.s.}+393$). Since decay to $J^\pi=1/2^-, 3/2^-$ level at 1788 keV is allowed, decay to $9/2^+$ g.s. is at least first forbidden unique, so $(I\varepsilon+I\beta^+)(\text{g.s.})<1.2\%$ (from $\log ft>8.5$), leaving $(I\varepsilon+I\beta^+)=2\% 10$ for 393 level.

[‡] Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

[#] Existence of this branch is questionable.

 $\gamma(^{93}\text{Tc})$

$I\gamma$ normalization: From $I\gamma=390.50$, $\%\varepsilon p=0.027.5$ (1983Ay01) and $I\gamma(^{93}\text{Ru} 734)=55.6.26$ (relative to $I(1396\gamma)=100$), assuming $\alpha(734)=0.0287$ (M4 theory) and $I\varepsilon/I\beta(\text{theory})$.

1976De37 detect no additional γ rays with $E\gamma \leq 5000$ and $T_{1/2} \approx 10.8$ s.

E_γ^{\dagger}	$I_\gamma^{\ddagger \ddagger}$	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult.	$\alpha^{\#}$	Comments	
392.65 10		392.65	$1/2^-$	0	$9/2^+$	M4	0.325	$\alpha(K)=0.271.4$; $\alpha(L)=0.0449.7$; $\alpha(M)=0.00840.12$; $\alpha(N+..)=0.001381.20$ $\alpha(N)=0.001309.19$; $\alpha(O)=7.23 \times 10^{-5}.11$ Mult.: from Adopted Gammas.	
642.9 5	1.2 3	2431.87	$(1/2, 3/2)^-$	1788.87	$1/2^-, 3/2^-$				
928.3 2	4.3 4	2431.87	$(1/2, 3/2)^-$	1503.80	$1/2^-, 3/2^-$				
1015.9 1	1.8 7	1408.59	$(5/2^-)$	392.65	$1/2^-$	[E2]	0.000798 12	$\alpha(K)=0.000701.10$; $\alpha(L)=8.02 \times 10^{-5}.12$; $\alpha(M)=1.450 \times 10^{-5}.21$; $\alpha(N+..)=2.46 \times 10^{-6}$ $\alpha(N)=2.30 \times 10^{-6}.4$; $\alpha(O)=1.526 \times 10^{-7}.22$	
1023.0 3	1.8 3	2431.87	$(1/2, 3/2)^-$	1408.59	$(5/2^-)$				
1111.2 1	68.0 27	1503.80	$1/2^-, 3/2^-$	392.65	$1/2^-$				
1396.2 1	100	1788.87	$1/2^-, 3/2^-$	392.65	$1/2^-$				
2039.1 2	23.9 10	2431.87	$(1/2, 3/2)^-$	392.65	$1/2^-$				

[†] From 1976De37. $I\gamma$ is intensity relative to $I(1396\gamma)=100$.

[‡] For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 0.385.

[#] Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code (2008Ki07) with Frozen orbital approximation based on γ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.

^{93}Ru ϵ decay (10.8 s) 1976De37