

$^{98}\text{Y} \beta^-$  decay (2.32 s) 2017Ur03,1994St31,1977Si05

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

Parent:  $^{98}\text{Y}$ : E=465.7 7;  $J^\pi=(7^+,6^+)$ ;  $T_{1/2}=2.32$  s 8;  $Q(\beta^-)=8992$  12;  $\% \beta^-$  decay=90 10

$^{98}\text{Y}$ -E, $J^\pi$ , $T_{1/2}$ : From  $^{98}\text{Y}$  Adopted Levels.

$^{98}\text{Y}$ -Q( $\beta^-$ ): From 2017Wa10.

$^{98}\text{Y}$ - $\% \beta^-$  decay:  $\% \beta^-$ =90 10, assuming  $\%IT < 20$  (or 10% 10) for the decay of the 2.32-s isomer from  $^{98}\text{Y}$  Adopted Levels.

2017Ur03:  $^{98}\text{Y}$  source obtained as a fission fragment and using Lohengrin separator. Measured  $E_\gamma$ ,  $I_\gamma$ ,  $\beta\gamma$ -coin  $\gamma\gamma$ -coin, using two clover Ge detectors for  $\gamma$  detection and three  $\beta$  detectors. The A=98 ions were deposited on a tape whose movement was correlated with the beam ON and beam OFF cycles. Deduced levels,  $J^\pi$ ,  $\beta$  feedings, multipolarities, mixing ratios. Angular correlation measurements were made in the study of prompt  $\gamma$  rays from  $^{235}\text{U}(n,\text{F}\gamma)$  and  $^{252}\text{Cf}$  SF decay. Polarization measurement for a  $\gamma$ -ray cascade with 1801.6-keV  $\gamma$  ray was also made in  $^{235}\text{U}(n,\text{F}\gamma)$ . See these two datasets for data from Table IX in 2017Ur03.

1994St31 (also 1988StZS):  $E_\gamma$ ,  $I_\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$  using JOSEF separator at Julich.

1977Si05: measured  $E_\gamma$ ,  $I_\gamma$ ,  $\gamma\gamma$ -coin,  $\beta$ ,  $\beta\gamma$ -coin, (ce) $\gamma(t)$ . Two independent measurements of  $E_\gamma$  and  $I_\gamma$  were made, one using JOSEF separator at Julich and the other LOHENGRIN at Grenoble. Separate  $E_\gamma$  and  $I_\gamma$  data, as well as averages of the two were reported by 1977Si05.

2010Be30: A=98 nuclei produced by thermal neutron-induced fission out of a  $400 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$   $^{235}\text{U}$  target and selected by the Lohengrin mass separator at the high-flux reactor of the Institut Laue-Langevin in Grenoble, France. Detector array of a thin plastic scintillator, a LaBr<sub>3</sub>(Ce) scintillation detector (LaBr) and a high-purity germanium clover detector (HPGe). Measured  $\beta\gamma\gamma$ -timing, lifetimes of both yrast and non-yrast states.

Others:

1979Bo26: measured  $E_\gamma$ ,  $I_\gamma$ .

$T_{1/2}$ : 1983Re10, 1981En05, 1979En02.

$\beta\gamma$ -coin,  $Q^-$  measurement: 1988GrZX, 1978St02.

 $^{98}\text{Zr}$  Levels

Level scheme is based on the works of 1977Si05 and 1994St31, and extended significantly by 2017Ur03.

E(level) <sup>†</sup>	$J^\pi$ <sup>‡</sup>	$T_{1/2}$	Comments
0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>		
854.09 9	0 <sup>+</sup>		
1222.97 8	2 <sup>+</sup>		
1590.83 8	2 <sup>+</sup>		
1806.23 8	3 <sup>-</sup>		
1843.47 8	4 <sup>+</sup>	20 ps 6	$J^\pi$ : $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ (1988StZS,1994St31) suggests J=3. $T_{1/2}$ : from $\beta\gamma(t)$ (2010Be30). Other: 28 ps 12 (quoted by 1994ST31 from thesis by M. Liang, University of Cologne (1992).
2047.76 10	4 <sup>+</sup>		
2276.98 9	(4 <sup>+</sup> )		
2491.03 8	6 <sup>+</sup>	<10 ps	$J^\pi$ : $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ (1988StZS,1994St31) suggested J=4. $T_{1/2}$ : from $\beta\gamma(t)$ (2010Be30).
2800.25 10	5 <sup>-</sup>		
3065.14 13	5 <sup>(-)</sup>		E(level): level proposed by 2017Ur03.
3117.14 12	(6 <sup>+</sup> )		
3216.34 22	8 <sup>+</sup>		E(level): level proposed by 2017Ur03.
3249.05 23	(5,6,7 <sup>-</sup> )		E(level): level proposed by 2017Ur03.
4278.85 13			
4292.46 11	6 <sup>+</sup>		$J^\pi$ : $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ (1988StZS,1994St31) suggests J=6.
4545.86 15	(7 <sup>+</sup> )		E(level): level proposed by 2017Ur03.
6415+x			E(level): x<3043 15 from $Q(\beta^-)$ ( $^{98\text{m}}\text{Y}$ )-S(n)( $^{98}\text{Zr}$ ), where $Q(\beta^-)=9458$ 12 for $^{98}\text{Y}$ isomer decay, and S(n)=6415 8.

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

$^{98}\text{Y}$   $\beta^-$  decay (2.32 s) 2017Ur03,1994St31,1977Si05 (continued) $^{98}\text{Zr}$  Levels (continued)† From a least-squares fit to  $E\gamma$  data.

‡ From the Adopted Levels.

 $\beta^-$  radiations

<u>E(decay)</u>	<u>E(level)</u>	<u><math>I\beta^-</math>†@</u>	<u>Log <math>ft</math>‡</u>	<u>Comments</u>
( $1.5 \times 10^3$ <sup>a</sup> 15)	6415+x	3.44 95		$I\beta^-$ : from $\% \beta^- n = 3.44$ 95 for decay of $^{98}\text{Y}$ isomer.
(4912 12)	4545.86	1.6 4	6.3 1	av $E\beta = 2178.4$ 58
(5165 12)	4292.46	43 6	5.0 1	av $E\beta = 2300.2$ 58
(5179 12)	4278.85	3.9 7	6.0 1	av $E\beta = 2306.8$ 58
(6209 12)	3249.05	1.0 3	6.9 2	av $E\beta = 2802.3$ 58
(6241 12)	3216.34	1.0 3	7.0 2	av $E\beta = 2818.0$ 58
(6341 12)	3117.14	2.9 10	6.5 2	av $E\beta = 2865.8$ 58
(6393 12)	3065.14	1.3 6	6.9 2	av $E\beta = 2890.8$ 58
(6657 12)	2800.25	4.4 11	6.4 1	av $E\beta = 3018.3$ 58
(6967 12)	2491.03	20 4	5.9 1	av $E\beta = 3167.1$ 58
(7181 & 12)	2276.98	2.1 ‡ 8	6.9 2	av $E\beta = 3270.1$ 58
(7410 & 12)	2047.76	7.5 ‡ 14	6.4 1	av $E\beta = 3380.4$ 58
(7651 & 12)	1806.23	1.8 ‡ 13	7.1 4	av $E\beta = 3496.6$ 58

† Deduced by evaluators from  $\gamma$ +ce intensity balances. Deduced  $I\beta^-$  values to 0, 854, 1223, 1590 and 1843 levels are consistent with no feeding to these levels, as expected from  $\Delta J^\pi$  involved.‡ No  $\beta$  feeding is expected to this level if  $J^\pi(^{98}\text{Y isomer}) = (7^+, 6^+)$ . Apparent feeding reflects incomplete decay scheme.

# Deduced by evaluators using the LOGFT code.

@ Absolute intensity per 100 decays.

&amp; Existence of this branch is questionable.

<sup>a</sup> Estimated for a range of levels.

γ(<sup>98</sup>Zr)

I<sub>γ</sub> normalization: Deduced by evaluators from summed intensity of γ+ce to g.s. equal to 96.6 10 from %β<sup>-</sup>n=3.44 95 of the 2.32-s isomer. [2017Ur03](#) give γ-normalization factor=2.45 36 by using absolute intensities of high-energy γ rays from <sup>98</sup>Y isomer decay in a previous ENSDF evaluation published by [2003Si07](#).

A γ with E<sub>γ</sub>=1267.8, I<sub>γ</sub>=0.3 reported by [1994St31](#) is omitted here as a 6<sup>+</sup> to 2<sup>+</sup> transition is unlikely.

E <sub>γ</sub> <sup>†</sup>	I <sub>γ</sub> <sup>†&amp;</sup>	E <sub>i</sub> (level)	J <sub>i</sub> <sup>π</sup>	E <sub>f</sub>	J <sub>f</sub> <sup>π</sup>	Mult. <sup>@</sup>	α <sup>a</sup>	Comments
204.3 1	0.5 1	2047.76	4 <sup>+</sup>	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>	[M1+E2]	0.01222	α(K)=0.01078 16; α(L)=0.001199 17; α(M)=0.000207 3 α(N)=2.91×10 <sup>-5</sup> 5; α(O)=1.96×10 <sup>-6</sup> 3 I <sub>γ</sub> : 0.4 1 in <a href="#">2017Ur03</a> (Table VIII) is probably the total intensity from the two activities in <sup>98</sup> Y. Evaluators have subtracted 0.044 12 units to account for contribution from the 0.548-s g.s. decay obtained from intensity balance at 1806 level in <sup>98</sup> Y β <sup>-</sup> decay (0.548 s).
215.5 2	0.36 10	1806.23	3 <sup>-</sup>	1590.83	2 <sup>+</sup>	[E1]		
241.5 1	3.6 3	2047.76	4 <sup>+</sup>	1806.23	3 <sup>-</sup>	[E1]		E <sub>γ</sub> =241.7, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =241.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =5.6 ( <a href="#">1984Be50</a> ), assigned incorrectly to the decay of <sup>98</sup> Y g.s. E <sub>γ</sub> =241.5 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 5 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ).
252.7 2	0.4 1	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>	1590.83	2 <sup>+</sup>	[E2]	0.0392	α(K)=0.0340 5; α(L)=0.00434 7; α(M)=0.000754 11 α(N)=0.0001038 15; α(O)=6.08×10 <sup>-6</sup> 9 E <sub>γ</sub> =253.1 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =1.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ), γ could also correspond to the proposed placement of a 253.4γ from 4545 level in <a href="#">2017Ur03</a> .
253.4 1	0.6 1	4545.86	(7 <sup>+</sup> )	4292.46	6 <sup>+</sup>	[M1+E2]	0.028 11	α(K)=0.024 10; α(L)=0.0030 13; α(M)=0.00052 23 α(N)=7.E-5 3; α(O)=4.5×10 <sup>-6</sup> 16
367.8 1	0.24 <sup>‡</sup> 3	1590.83	2 <sup>+</sup>	1222.97	2 <sup>+</sup>	[M1+E2]		E <sub>γ</sub> =367.1, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.4 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =367.6 2 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ).
368.8 1	0.76 <sup>‡</sup> 7	1222.97	2 <sup>+</sup>	854.09	0 <sup>+</sup>	[E2]	0.01087	α(K)=0.00950 14; α(L)=0.001145 16; α(M)=0.000199 3 α(N)=2.77×10 <sup>-5</sup> 4; α(O)=1.749×10 <sup>-6</sup> 25 E <sub>γ</sub> =368.6, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.7 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =368.5 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.5 2 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =433.7, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.8 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
433.5 1	0.5 1	2276.98	(4 <sup>+</sup> )	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>			
448.8 2	0.4 1	3249.05	(5,6,7 <sup>-</sup> )	2800.25	5 <sup>-</sup>			
456.8 2	0.4 1	2047.76	4 <sup>+</sup>	1590.83	2 <sup>+</sup>	[E2]		E <sub>γ</sub> =456.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.2 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
583.258 <sup>#</sup> 30	5.34 22	1806.23	3 <sup>-</sup>	1222.97	2 <sup>+</sup>	E1		E <sub>γ</sub> =583.2 1 ( <a href="#">2017Ur03</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =583.3, I <sub>γ</sub> =4.6 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =583.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =6.5 5( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). I <sub>γ</sub> : 6.0 2 in <a href="#">2017Ur03</a> (Table VIII) is probably the total intensity from the two activities in <sup>98</sup> Y. Evaluators have subtracted 0.66 10 units to account for contribution from the 0.548-s g.s. decay obtained from intensity balance at 1806 level in <sup>98</sup> Y β <sup>-</sup> decay (0.548 s).
620.505 <sup>#</sup> 19	23.0 7	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>	1222.97	2 <sup>+</sup>	E2		E <sub>γ</sub> =620.5 1 ( <a href="#">2017Ur03</a> ).

<sup>98</sup>Y β<sup>-</sup> decay (2.32 s) [2017Ur03](#),[1994St31](#),[1977Si05](#) (continued)

γ(<sup>98</sup>Zr) (continued)

<u>E<sub>γ</sub><sup>†</sup></u>	<u>I<sub>γ</sub><sup>†&amp;</sup></u>	<u>E<sub>i</sub>(level)</u>	<u>J<sub>i</sub><sup>π</sup></u>	<u>E<sub>f</sub></u>	<u>J<sub>f</sub><sup>π</sup></u>	<u>Mult.<sup>@</sup></u>	<u>δ<sup>@</sup></u>	<u>I<sub>(γ+ce)</sub><sup>&amp;</sup></u>	<u>Comments</u>
647.580 <sup>#</sup> 30	22.4 7	2491.03	6 <sup>+</sup>	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>	E2			E <sub>γ</sub> =620.7, I <sub>γ</sub> =27.6 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =620.5 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =27.0 20 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). (620γ)(1223γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =-0.09 3 ( <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> : note that value from <a href="#">1979Bo26</a> is in disagreement with 647.1 I from <a href="#">2017Ur03</a> by ≈3 σ. E <sub>γ</sub> =647.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =23.2 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =647.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =20.0 20 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). (647γ)(620γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =-0.04 7. (647γ)[620γ](1223γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =-0.06 3 ( <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =685.6, I <sub>γ</sub> =1.9 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
686.2 I	1.4 I	2276.98	(4 <sup>+</sup> )	1590.83	2 <sup>+</sup>				E <sub>γ</sub> =736.7 2 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =752.7, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.0 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =752.6 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =824.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.9 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =839.7, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.3 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =840.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ), but assigned to the decay of <sup>98</sup> Y g.s.
725.3 2	0.4 I	3216.34	8 <sup>+</sup>	2491.03	6 <sup>+</sup>	E2			E <sub>γ</sub> =824.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.9 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =839.7, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.3 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =840.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ), but assigned to the decay of <sup>98</sup> Y g.s.
736.8 I	0.30 <sup>‡</sup> 3	1590.83	2 <sup>+</sup>	854.09	0 <sup>+</sup>	[E2]			E <sub>γ</sub> =840.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ), but assigned to the decay of <sup>98</sup> Y g.s.
752.5 I	2.4 2	2800.25	5 <sup>-</sup>	2047.76	4 <sup>+</sup>				E <sub>γ</sub> =840.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ), but assigned to the decay of <sup>98</sup> Y g.s.
824.8 2	1.0 I	2047.76	4 <sup>+</sup>	1222.97	2 <sup>+</sup>	E2			E <sub>γ</sub> =840.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ), but assigned to the decay of <sup>98</sup> Y g.s.
840.1 I	1.8 2	3117.14	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	2276.98	(4 <sup>+</sup> )				E <sub>γ</sub> =840.3 2, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 10 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ), but assigned to the decay of <sup>98</sup> Y g.s.
854.09 9		854.09	0 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	E0		1.1 <sup>‡</sup> I	Energy of E0 transition from level energy difference. I <sub>(γ+ce)</sub> : from intensity balance.
956.6 2	0.3 I	2800.25	5 <sup>-</sup>	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>				E <sub>γ</sub> =994.0, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.7 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1053.8, I <sub>γ</sub> =1.6 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> : 1174.2 2 in <a href="#">2017Ur03</a> fits poorly in the level scheme. Value of 1174.9 from <a href="#">1994St31</a> with an assigned uncertainty of 0.3 keV is used here, instead.
994.0 I	0.9 2	2800.25	5 <sup>-</sup>	1806.23	3 <sup>-</sup>				E <sub>γ</sub> =1174.9, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.0 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
1053.9 I	1.4 I	2276.98	(4 <sup>+</sup> )	1222.97	2 <sup>+</sup>				E <sub>γ</sub> =1222.8, I <sub>γ</sub> =35.0 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
1174.9 3	1.2 2	4292.46	6 <sup>+</sup>	3117.14	(6 <sup>+</sup> )				E <sub>γ</sub> =122.8 2 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ).
1222.9 I	30.2 <sup>‡</sup> 8	1222.97	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	E2			E <sub>γ</sub> =1492.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =1.5 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1590.7, I <sub>γ</sub> =2.5 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1590.7 2, I <sub>γ</sub> ≈1 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1787.1, I <sub>γ</sub> =1.9 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1787.3 5, I <sub>γ</sub> =1.5 3 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1801.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =17.4 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1801.6 5, I <sub>γ</sub> =16.5 15 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). (1801γ)(647γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =-0.07 4; (1801γ)[647γ](620γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =-0.03 5; (1801γ)[647γ][620γ](1223γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =+0.08 7 ( <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
1258.9 I	0.5 2	3065.14	5 <sup>(-)</sup>	1806.23	3 <sup>-</sup>	Q			E <sub>γ</sub> =1801.5, I <sub>γ</sub> =17.4 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ). E <sub>γ</sub> =1801.6 5, I <sub>γ</sub> =16.5 15 ( <a href="#">1977Si05</a> ). (1801γ)(647γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =-0.07 4; (1801γ)[647γ](620γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =-0.03 5; (1801γ)[647γ][620γ](1223γ)(θ): A <sub>2</sub> =+0.08 7 ( <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
1273.7 2	0.5 2	3117.14	(6 <sup>+</sup> )	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>	Q			E <sub>γ</sub> =2015.6, I <sub>γ</sub> =0.9 ( <a href="#">1994St31</a> , <a href="#">1988StZS</a> ).
1492.0 2	1.5 2	4292.46	6 <sup>+</sup>	2800.25	5 <sup>-</sup>				
1590.9 I	2.04 <sup>‡</sup> 17	1590.83	2 <sup>+</sup>	0.0	0 <sup>+</sup>	[E2]			
1787.8 I	1.5 2	4278.85		2491.03	6 <sup>+</sup>				
1801.6 I	13.0 4	4292.46	6 <sup>+</sup>	2491.03	6 <sup>+</sup>	M1+E2	+0.17 8		
2015.4 2	0.7 I	4292.46	6 <sup>+</sup>	2276.98	(4 <sup>+</sup> )				

4

<sup>98</sup>Y  $\beta^-$  decay (2.32 s) 2017Ur03,1994St31,1977Si05 (continued)

$\gamma(^{98}\text{Zr})$  (continued)

<u><math>E_\gamma</math><sup>†</sup></u>	<u><math>I_\gamma</math><sup>†&amp;</sup></u>	<u><math>E_i(\text{level})</math></u>	<u><math>J_i^\pi</math></u>	<u><math>E_f</math></u>	<u><math>J_f^\pi</math></u>
2244.0 4	0.2 1	4292.46	6 <sup>+</sup>	2047.76	4 <sup>+</sup>
2448.8 2	0.4 1	4292.46	6 <sup>+</sup>	1843.47	4 <sup>+</sup>

<sup>†</sup> From 2017Ur03, unless otherwise stated. Quoted values of  $I_\gamma$  are relative to  $I_\gamma(1222.9)=100$ , the total intensity from the two activities in <sup>98</sup>Y.

<sup>‡</sup> Assigned by evaluators from intensity balances and using branching ratios from intensity data in Table VII of 2017Ur03.

<sup>#</sup> Precise  $E_\gamma$  from 1979Bo26 (curved-crystal data).

<sup>@</sup> From the Adopted Gammas. Assumed assignments given in square brackets are from  $\Delta J^\pi$  in this dataset.

<sup>&</sup> For absolute intensity per 100 decays, multiply by 2.6 3.

<sup>a</sup> Total theoretical internal conversion coefficients, calculated using the BrIcc code (2008Ki07) with Frozen orbital approximation based on  $\gamma$ -ray energies, assigned multipolarities, and mixing ratios, unless otherwise specified.

$^{98}\text{Y}^{-}$  decay (2.32 s) 2017Ur03,1994St31,1977Si05

Decay Scheme

Intensities:  $I_{(\gamma+ce)}$  per 100 parent decays

Legend

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

