

$^{98}\text{Mo}(\alpha,4n\gamma)$ **1981Du06**

Type	Author	Citation	History Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	Jun Chen, Balraj Singh	NDS 164, 1 (2020)	15-Feb-2020

1981Du06: E=35-55 MeV alpha beams were produced from the 280-cm AVF cyclotron of the University of Groningen. Targets were 97% enriched metallic ^{98}Mo . γ rays were detected with Ge(Li) and NaI detectors and conversion electrons were detected with the mini-orange spectrometer. Measured $E\gamma$, $I\gamma$, ce, I(ce), $\gamma\gamma$ -coin, $\gamma(\theta)$. Deduced levels, J, π , conversion coefficients, γ -ray multipolarities, transition strengths. Comparisons with IBA calculations. Levels deduced up to 7621 keV.

All data are from [1981Du06](#).

 ^{98}Ru Levels

E(level) [†]	J [‡]	Comments
0.0	0 ⁺	
652.8 4	2 ⁺	
1398.4 5	4 ⁺	
1415.0 4	2 ⁺	
1797.7 4	(3) ⁺	
2013.7 4	3 ⁺	
2223.3 6	6 ⁺	
2267.5 5	(4) ⁺	
2547.9 6	(4 ⁺ ,5,6 ⁺)	J^π : $\gamma(\theta)$ and mult(1149.6 γ) from ce data suggest 6 ⁺ .
2658.0 6	(5 ⁻)	J^π : proposed by 1981Du06 based on possible band structure and theoretical predictions. It is in disagreement with (3,5 ⁺) based on $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ and γ -decay pattern in a recent measurement of ($^3\text{He},2n\gamma$) by 2016Gi05 .
3127.6 6	8 ⁺	
3191.4 6	(8) ⁺	
3284.9 6	(7) ⁻	
3540.1 6	(6 ⁺ ,7,8 ⁺)	
3852.6 7	9 ⁻	
4002.1 7	(10) ⁺	
4007.5 6	(6 ⁺ ,7 ⁺ ,8 ⁺)	
4224.6 7	(+)	
4673.7 8	(11) ⁻	
4847.9 8		
4915.3 8	(12) ⁺	
4989.7 8	(12) ⁺	
5521.7 9	(13) ⁻	
5889.5 9		
6591.6 10	(15) ⁻	
7622.2 11		

[†] From a least-squares fit to γ -ray energies.

[‡] From [1981Du06](#) based on $\gamma(\theta)$ and ce data, unless otherwise noted.

 $\gamma(^{98}\text{Ru})$

A₂ and A₄ values are from data at E(α)=45 MeV ([1981Du06](#)).

E _{γ}	I _{γ} [†]	E _i (level)	J _{i} ^π	E _f	J _{f} ^π	Mult. [‡]	$\delta^{\#}$	Comments
253.9 4	1.0 1	2267.5	(4) ⁺	2013.7	3 ⁺	(E2+M1)	+3.5 +20-12	A ₂ =-0.43 8; A ₄ =+0.36 15 Mult.: large $\delta(E2/M1)$ favors M1+E2 rather than E1+M2 admixture.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{98}\text{Mo}(\alpha, 4n\gamma)$ **1981Du06 (continued)** $\gamma(^{98}\text{Ru})$ (continued)

E_γ	I_γ^\dagger	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	$\delta^\#$	Comments
382.7 4	0.8 1	1797.7	(3) ⁺	1415.0	2 ⁺	(M1+E2)	+0.4 +17-3	$A_2=-0.73$ 15; $A_4=+0.05$ 2; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0035$ 25 Mult.: $\alpha(K)\exp$ is too low to be consistent with M1 or E2, it is in agreement with E1, but results of other experiments do not support E1.
412.3 4	1.3 1	3540.1	(6 ⁺ , 7, 8 ⁺)	3127.6 8 ⁺				δ : from $\gamma(\theta)$ data.
469.7 4	4.6 4	2267.5	(4) ⁺	1797.7 (3) ⁺		M1+E2	-0.8 +3-6	$A_2=+0.33$ 9; $A_4=+0.03$ 2 $A_2=+0.34$ 7; $A_4=-0.09$ 3; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0069$ 15 Note that negative A_4 is inconsistent with $\Delta J=1$ transition. The $\alpha(K)\exp$ value agrees with E2, and only marginally with M1.
599.0 4	2.1 2	2013.7	3 ⁺	1415.0 2 ⁺		E2+M1	+2.8 12	$A_2=-0.45$ 8; $A_4=+0.26$ 9; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0027$ 10
615.1 4	1.0 1	2013.7	3 ⁺	1398.4 4 ⁺		(E2+M1)		$\alpha(K)\exp=0.0055$ 20 Mult.: $\alpha(K)\exp$ is high for M1 or E2. $I\gamma(615\gamma)/I\gamma(598\gamma)=0.48$ (1981Du06).
Additional information 1.								
626.8 4	1.5 2	3284.9	(7) ⁻	2658.0 (5) ⁻				$A_2=+1.17$ 30; $A_4=+0.38$ 40
652.6 4	100.0	652.8	2 ⁺	0.0 0 ⁺		E2		$A_2=+0.27$ 5; $A_4=-0.04$ 3; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0022$ 5
661.3 4	0.7 2	3852.6	9 ⁻	3191.4 (8) ⁺				$A_2=0.00$ 4; $A_4=+0.14$ 6
722.7 4	5.9 5	4007.5	(6 ⁺ , 7 ⁺ , 8 ⁺)	3284.9 (7) ⁻				$A_2=-0.32$ 6; $A_4=+0.15$ 5; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0009$ 3
724.9 4	17.1 13	3852.6	9 ⁻	3127.6 8 ⁺		E1(+M2)	+0.2 2	
745.5 4	96 5	1398.4	4 ⁺	652.8 2 ⁺		E2		$A_2=+0.28$ 5; $A_4=-0.08$ 3; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0016$ 4
762.2 4	3.9 4	1415.0	2 ⁺	652.8 2 ⁺				$A_2=+0.17$ 16; $A_4=-0.19$ 6
810.5 4	8.2 6	4002.1	(10) ⁺	3191.4 (8) ⁺		E2		$A_2=+0.26$ 5; $A_4=-0.18$ 6; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0014$ 4
821.1 4	19 3	4673.7	(11) ⁻	3852.6 9 ⁻		E2		$A_2=+0.51$ 9; $A_4=-0.34$ 14; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0018$ 6
824.9 4	83 4	2223.3	6 ⁺	1398.4 4 ⁺		E2		$A_2=+0.31$ 5; $A_4=-0.09$ 3; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0012$ 2
840.4 4	5.3 4	4847.9		4007.5 (6 ⁺ , 7 ⁺ , 8 ⁺)	Q			$A_2=+0.33$ 6; $A_4=-0.14$ 5
848.0 4	13.0 10	5521.7	(13) ⁻	4673.7 (11) ⁻	(E2)			$A_2=+0.15$ 3; $A_4=+0.02$ 2; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0014$ 3
874.6 4	17.8 14	4002.1	(10) ⁺	3127.6 8 ⁺		E2		$A_2=+0.25$ 5; $A_4=-0.08$ 3; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0014$ 3
879.8 4	5.0 4	4007.5	(6 ⁺ , 7 ⁺ , 8 ⁺)	3127.6 8 ⁺		E2+M1		$A_2=+0.16$ 10; $A_4=-0.18$ 15; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0010$ 3
899.8 4	1.8 2	5889.5		4989.7 (12) ⁺				$A_2=+0.27$ 4; $A_4=-0.11$ 6;
904.1 4	50 4	3127.6	8 ⁺	2223.3 6 ⁺		E2		$\alpha(K)\exp=0.0012$ 2
913.2 4	10.0 7	4915.3	(12) ⁺	4002.1 (10) ⁺		E2		$A_2=+0.29$ 6; $A_4=-0.07$ 5; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0010$ 3
968.0 4	23.4 17	3191.4	(8) ⁺	2223.3 6 ⁺		E2		$A_2=+0.35$ 7; $A_4=-0.09$ 3; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0009$ 3
987.6 4	6.8 5	4989.7	(12) ⁺	4002.1 (10) ⁺		(E2)		$A_2=+0.47$ 9; $A_4=+0.09$ 7; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0006$ 2

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{98}\text{Mo}(\alpha,4n\gamma)$ **1981Du06 (continued)** $\gamma(^{98}\text{Ru})$ (continued)

E_γ	I_γ^\dagger	$E_i(\text{level})$	J_i^π	E_f	J_f^π	Mult. [‡]	$\delta^\#$	Comments
992.3 4	1.6 2	3540.1	(6 ⁺ ,7,8 ⁺)	2547.9	(4 ⁺ ,5,6 ⁺)			
1030.6 4	4.1 4	7622.2		6591.6	(15) ⁻			
1033.2 4	6.8 5	4224.6	(⁺)	3191.4	(8) ⁺			$A_2=+0.18$ 4; $A_4=-0.19$ 6 Additional information 2 .
1061.8 4	5.2 5	3284.9	(7) ⁻	2223.3	6 ⁺	E1		$A_2=-0.26$ 5; $A_4=-0.01$ 5; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.00023$ 10 $\delta(M2/E1)=0.0 +50-1$.
1069.9 4	6.4 5	6591.6	(15) ⁻	5521.7	(13) ⁻	(E2)		$A_2=+0.17$ 1; $A_4=-0.01$ 15; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.00052$ 15
1096.9 4	5.8 5	4224.6	(⁺)	3127.6	8 ⁺	M1,E2		$A_2=+0.04$ 6; $A_4=-0.27$ 10; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0005$ 2
1145.0 4	4.1 4	1797.7	(3) ⁺	652.8	2 ⁺	M1+E2	<-0.2	$A_2=+0.07$ 3; $A_4=+0.01$ 5; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0007$ 3
1149.6 4	5.5 5	2547.9	(4 ⁺ ,5,6 ⁺)	1398.4	4 ⁺	E2		$A_2=+0.22$ 5; $A_4=-0.19$ 6; $\alpha(K)\exp=0.0006$ 3
1259.4 4	3.4 3	2658.0	(5) ⁻	1398.4	4 ⁺	D(+Q)	>-0.1	$A_2=-0.22$ 5; $A_4=-0.15$ 7 Note that negative A_4 is inconsistent with $\Delta J=1$ transition.
1415.1 4	1.4 1	1415.0	2 ⁺	0.0	0 ⁺			

[†] Values are for $\gamma(\theta)$ data at $E(\alpha)=52$ MeV ([1981Du06](#)).

[‡] From $\gamma(\theta)$ and ce data in [1981Du06](#). For most cases, $\alpha(K)\exp$ value within the uncertainties is in agreement with M1 or E2.

From $\gamma(\theta)$ data ([1981Du06](#)).

⁹⁸Mo($\alpha, 4n\gamma$) 1981Dut06

Level Scheme

Intensities: Relative I_γ

Legend
 —————— $I_\gamma < 2\% \times I_{\gamma}^{\max}$
 —————— $I_\gamma < 10\% \times I_{\gamma}^{\max}$
 —————— $I_\gamma > 10\% \times I_{\gamma}^{\max}$

