# Configurations of the low-lying states in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ 
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#### Abstract

The low-lying states of ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ populated in the decay of the $9^{+}$isomer were studied. The $\gamma$-ray intensities were reanalyzed employing germanium detectors, and the lifetimes of the $6_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-}$states were measured using the mirror symmetric centroid difference (MSCD) method with fast-timing $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ scintillator detectors. The $B(M 1)$ values of the $6_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$transitions were deduced, and all observed states were interpreted as members of the $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplets. In particular, the $5_{1}^{-}$level is shown to be dominated by the $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ configuration, solving the discrepancy in its configuration assignment proposed in previous works. These experimental results were compared with the shell model calculations using several different effective interactions. The systematics of low-lying structure in the $N=83$ isotones ${ }^{142} \mathrm{Pr},{ }^{144} \mathrm{Pm}$, and ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ was established.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Nuclei with few valence nucleons with respect to a core are among the best candidates to constrain the single-particle potential and the effective residual interaction employed in shell model calculations [1-4]. Experimentally, a lot of multiplets in odd-odd nuclei around doubly closed shell nuclei have been identified [5-10], and their excitation energies were used to extract the neutron-proton ( $n-p$ ) interaction [2,5,11]. Several investigations pointed out that the ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$ nucleus can be considered as a doubly closed shell nucleus, despite the shell closures not being as pronounced as in ${ }^{208} \mathrm{~Pb}$ [12-15]. Thus, the odd-odd nuclei around ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$ are expected to offer opportunities to study the $n-p$ interaction in this mass region. On the other hand, it is often difficult to match the experimentally observed levels with the calculated ones due to the uncertainty in the shell model calculations, especially for the odd-odd nuclei which have higher level densities. To pin down

[^0]the level configurations, detailed experimental information, in particular reduced transition probabilities, is needed.

Lifetime is an essential observable for extracting the reduced transition probability, and directly reflects the overlap between the wave functions of the initial and final states [16,17]. Although many experiments have been performed to study the low-lying levels in the $A \approx 140$ region, data on lifetimes and transition moments are still rare. Among these studies, the fast timing method is commonly applied in $\beta$-decay experiments, but states populated by $\beta$ decay are limited due to the selection rules. The Doppler-shift attenuation method (DSAM) [18] and recoil distance Doppler-shift (RDDS) method [19] are able to measure lifetimes in the picosecond range, and are mainly applied in in-beam experiments, but are hampered by the presence of $\mu \mathrm{s}$ isomers originated from the $\pi h_{11 / 2}$ orbital in this mass region [20].

The low-lying states in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$, resulting from the coupling of one neutron particle to one proton hole with respect to the ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$ core, provide the opportunity to study the $n-p$ interaction in this mass region. These states have been investigated in several experiments [21-25], where the $J^{\pi}$ of the levels below the $9^{+}$isomer were determined. So far, only the lifetimes
of the $2^{-}$and $3^{-}$levels have been reported [21]. For the $5_{1}^{-}$state, a $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ configuration was proposed by Ercan et al. [22,24], while a $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ configuration was suggested based on a shell model calculation by Bhattacharjee et al. [21]. In Refs. [22,24], the first and second $6^{-}$levels were assigned to the $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplets, respectively. But the reduced transition probabilities between the $9^{+}$isomer and these two $6^{-}$levels were found to differ by a factor of 5 [22,24], a discrepancy with the similar reduced transition probabilities from the $7^{-}$state to the two $6^{-}$states [22,26].

In the present work, the fusion-evaporation residues of the ${ }^{124} \mathrm{Sn}\left({ }^{27} \mathrm{Al}, 5 n\right)$ reaction were delivered to the focal plane of a gas-filled recoil separator and the nuclear states of interest were populated by isomeric decay. The $\gamma$-ray intensities were reextracted employing germanium detectors, and the lifetimes of the $6_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-}$states were measured using the MSCD method with fast-timing $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}$ detectors. The $B(M 1)$ values of the $6_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$transitions were deduced. All observed states can be experimentally interpreted as members of the $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplets, and this conclusion was compared with the shell model calculations. In particular, the main configuration of the first $5^{-}$state is determined as $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$, different from that proposed in Ref. [21].

## II. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

The ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ isotope was produced in the ${ }^{124} \mathrm{Sn}\left({ }^{27} \mathrm{Al}, 5 n\right)$ reaction with an isotopically enriched (96.96\%) ${ }^{124}$ Sn target. The ${ }^{27} \mathrm{Al}$ beam was accelerated to 127 MeV by the SectorFocusing Cyclotron (SFC) of the Heavy Ion Research Facility in Lanzhou (HIRFL). The target consisted of Au foils with a thickness of $2.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ facing the beam, a $300-\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}-$ thick ${ }^{124} \mathrm{Sn}$ metal layer, and a ${ }^{124} \mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ layer of thickness $160 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$.

Evaporation residues (ERs) were separated by the gasfilled recoil separator, Spectrometer for Heavy Atoms and Nuclear Structure (SHANS) [27], and implanted in a $50 \times$ $50 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}$ size and $300-\mu \mathrm{m}$-thick single silicon detector (SSD). The time of flight (TOF) of the ERs in SHANS is about $1 \mu \mathrm{~s}$. To minimize the interference from scattered light ions in the implantation SSD, one Si detector of $50 \times 50 \mathrm{~mm}^{2}$ size was placed behind the implantation SSD detector to serve as a veto detector. The implantation and veto detectors were both placed inside an aluminum collection chamber. Around the chamber, five $\gamma$-ray detectors were installed, including three fast-timing $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ scintillator detectors, one coaxial high-purity germanium detector (HPGe), and one segmented clover-type HPGe detector. A schematic view of the detection system is presented in Fig. 1. The energy, time, as well as relative efficiency calibrations were carried out using a ${ }^{152} \mathrm{Eu} \gamma$ source. The typical energy resolutions (FWHM) of Ge and $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}$ detectors for the $344-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray of ${ }^{152} \mathrm{Eu}$ are about 3 and 31 keV , respectively. The typical $\gamma-\gamma$ timing resolution of the $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ detectors is 330 ps for coincidence between the 344- and $779-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions of ${ }^{152} \mathrm{Eu}$. The lifetimes of the levels were obtained using the $\gamma-\gamma$ fast-timing technique employing the $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ detectors. The HPGe and clover


FIG. 1. A schematic view of the detection system, which consists of one single silicon detector, one veto, three $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ scintillator detectors, and two Ge detectors.
detectors were used to identify the characteristic $\gamma$ rays and extract the $\gamma$-ray intensities.

Typical implantation rate in the SSD detector was about 2000 particles/s. For the isomeric decay with a lifetime shorter than $500 \mu$ s, the $\gamma$ background can be reduced by choosing an appropriate time window between the $\gamma$ rays and implantations.

The lifetimes of the excited levels of interest were measured employing the mirror symmetric centroid difference (MSCD) method with $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ detectors as proposed by Régis et al. [28-30]. The obtained time centroid difference $\Delta C_{\text {gross }}$ is a linear combination of time centroid difference of full-energy peaks and that of the corresponding background:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta C_{\mathrm{gross}}=\frac{\Pi \Delta C+\Delta C_{\mathrm{B}}}{1+\Pi} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Pi$ is the peak-to-background ratio, $\Delta C_{\mathrm{B}}$ is the time centroid difference of the background underneath the fullenergy peaks, and $\Delta C$ is the true centroid difference. Then the background-corrected lifetime is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau=\frac{1}{2}\left[\Delta C_{\text {gross }}+\frac{\Delta C_{\text {gross }}-\Delta C_{\mathrm{B}}}{\Pi}-\Delta \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{P})\right] \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

For any energy combination $\Delta E_{\gamma}=E_{\text {feeder }}-E_{\text {decay }}$, the prompt centroid difference $\Delta C(\mathrm{P})$ can be obtained from the energy dependent PRD curve, generated from the $\Delta C(\mathrm{P})$ plot against $E_{\gamma}$ using a prompt $\gamma$ source. It is worth noting that $\Delta C_{\mathrm{B}}$ was obtained by linear interpolation of the background time centroid differences.

## III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

To validate the present experimental setup, we extracted the lifetime of the $2^{+}$state in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Sm}$ using the MSCD method. The $\gamma$-ray intensities in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ were re-extracted, and the lifetimes of the first and second $6^{-}$states were measured.

## $A$. The prompt response difference ( PRD ) curve

The PRD curve obtained by using the ${ }^{152} \mathrm{Eu}$ source is shown in Fig. 2(a). Data points correspond to transitions


FIG. 2. (a) The PRD curve of the $\gamma-\gamma$ fast timing setup obtained using the ${ }^{152} \mathrm{Eu}$ source. (b) Fitted residuals of the PRD curve. The dashed lines indicate a $3 \sigma$ deviation corresponding to 8 ps , which represents the uncertainty of time calibration.
depopulating prompt states in ${ }^{152} \mathrm{Sm}$ and ${ }^{152} \mathrm{Gd}$. The function fitted to the data has the form [29]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{PRD}\left(E_{\gamma}\right)=\frac{a}{\sqrt{\left(b+E_{\gamma}\right)}}+c E_{\gamma}+d \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a, b, c$, and $d$ are the fit parameters. Figure 2(b) shows the uncertainty of the PRD, represented by the dashed lines corresponding to three standard deviations $(\sigma)$.

## B. Validation of the present setup with ${ }^{146} \mathbf{S m}$

The excited states of ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Sm}$ were populated in the $\beta$ decay of ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$. The lifetime of the first $2^{+}$state in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Sm}$ was determined using the MSCD method. Figure 3 shows the HPGe and $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ spectra gated by the $747-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray, which shows that the 633- and $634-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions were well populated, while the $665-$, $701-$, and $702-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ rays of ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Sm}$ were also recorded. The delayed (decay transition taken as stop signal) and antidelayed (feeding transition detected as stop signal) time spectra are shown in Fig. 4, and the corresponding time centroid difference is $\Delta C_{\text {gross }}=-21(4) \mathrm{ps}$. The background correction procedure is applied using Eq. (2), in which the $\Delta C_{\mathrm{B}}$ was estimated by linear interpolation of the background time centroid differences from the coincidences between the $747-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray and two background gates (shown in Fig. 3), and found to be $\Delta C_{\mathrm{B}}=-39(13) \mathrm{ps}$. The resulting true centroid difference is derived as $\Delta C_{2_{1}^{+}}=-18(5) \mathrm{ps}$. Then the background-corrected lifetime of the $2_{1}^{+}$state was deduced as $\tau_{2_{1}^{+}}=2_{-2}^{+5} \mathrm{ps}$, in agreement with the previous value of $7.3_{-7.3}^{+3.0}$


FIG. 3. Coincident $\gamma$-ray spectra gated by 747 keV . The histogram in black is the $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}$ spectrum, and the blue one is the Ge spectrum. The inset shows the partial level scheme of ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Sm}$ [31] relevant to the present measurement.
ps reported by Rozak et al. using the recoil distance method (RDM) [32].

## C. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$-ray intensity extraction

The excited states in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ studied here were populated by isomer decay. Figure 5 shows the excited states below the $9^{+}$ isomer [24] observed in the present experiment, and Fig. 6 presents the relevant $\gamma$ spectra. The coincident spectra were measured between 10 and $700 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ after the residuals were implanted in the SSD. From the $\gamma$ signals recorded by the HPGe detectors and implantation signals recorded by the SSD, the half-life of the $9^{+}$isomer was extracted to be $230(6) \mu \mathrm{s}$, in agreement with the evaluated value of 235(3) $\mu \mathrm{s}$ [33]. The $\gamma$-ray intensities of the 294 - and $316-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions, together with the summed intensities of the $275-$ and $358-\mathrm{keV}$ doublets, were deduced and normalized to intensity of the $377-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray, consistent with the literature value [22]. In the


FIG. 4. Delayed and antidelayed time-difference spectra for the first $2^{+}$state in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Sm}$.


FIG. 5. The relevant level scheme below the $9^{+}$isomer of ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ [24]. The widths of the arrows are proportional to the intensities extracted in the present work (see Table I). The half-life of the $9^{+}$isomer comes from Ref. [33]. Dashed lines indicate the transitions that were adopted in Ref. [24] but not observed in the present experiment.


FIG. 6. Panel (a) presents the singles spectrum detected by clover and coaxial HPGe detectors. Panels (b) and panel (c) show the coincident $\gamma$-ray spectra gated on the 316 - and $294-\mathrm{keV}$ peaks, respectively. The coincident spectra were collected between 10 and $700 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ after the residuals were implanted in the SSD. Time distribution of the $377-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray is shown in the inset. The peaks from the scattering of $511-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray in panels (b) and (c) were marked with diamond symbols.
$316-\mathrm{keV}$ gated spectrum, the $275-\mathrm{keV}$ peak only comes from the upper $275-\mathrm{keV}$ transition, and the $\gamma$-ray intensity ratio between the upper 275- and the $294-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions should be the same as that in the singles spectrum. Thus, the $\gamma$-ray intensity of the upper $275-\mathrm{keV}$ transition was obtained as the product of this ratio and the $\gamma$-ray intensity of the $294-\mathrm{keV}$ transition in the singles spectrum, while the $\gamma$-ray intensity of the lower $275-\mathrm{keV}$ transition was obtained by subtracting that of the upper $275-\mathrm{keV}$ transition from the doublet $275-\mathrm{keV}$ transition. Similarly, the $\gamma$-ray intensity of the lower $358-\mathrm{keV}$ transition was obtained by comparing the intensities of the $316-$ and $358-\mathrm{keV}$ peaks in the $294-\mathrm{keV}$ coincident spectrum, while the intensity of the $316-\mathrm{keV}$ transition was extracted in the singles spectrum. For the $\gamma$-ray intensities extracted in the coincident spectra, random coincidences were considered, and GEANT4 simulations were performed to correct coincidence efficiencies originating from angular correlation. The $\gamma$-ray intensities extracted in the present experiment and those from Ref. [22] are presented in Table I.

## D. The lifetimes of the $\mathbf{6}_{1}^{-}$and $\mathbf{6}_{2}^{-}$states in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$

The lifetime of the $6_{1}^{-}$state in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ was extracted through the coincidence between the 377- and $275-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions. As shown in Fig. 7, the 358- and $377-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ rays cannot be separated by the $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ detector in the $275-\mathrm{keV}$ gated spectrum. Bi-Gaussian plus linear functions were used to fit the gated spectrum near 370 keV , and the standard deviations of these two Gaussian functions are both about 13 keV . The influence of the $358-\mathrm{keV}$ transition can be effectively reduced by choosing an appropriate energy gate based on the distributions of the 358 - and $377-\mathrm{keV}$ peaks. Thus we set one gate at $395 \pm 5 \mathrm{keV}$ (area $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ in Fig. 7) and another gate at $275 \pm 15 \mathrm{keV}$ for $\gamma-\gamma$ coincidence to analyze the lifetime of the $6_{1}^{-}$state, where the $275-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray is taken as a decay transition. The delayed and antidelayed time-difference distributions are shown in Fig. 8(a). A similar background-timing correction procedure (see Sec IIIB) is applied, and the true time centroid difference for the $395-275 \mathrm{keV}$ combination was found to be $\Delta C_{6_{1}^{-}}(395-275)=58(5) \mathrm{ps}$. The lifetime of the $6_{1}^{-}$state was determined as $\tau_{6_{1}^{-}}=3_{-3}^{+5} \mathrm{ps}$, i.e., $\tau_{6_{1}^{-}} \leqslant 8 \mathrm{ps}$.

The lifetime of the $6_{2}^{-}$state was also extracted in the same way. Similarly, we set one gate at $275 \pm 15 \mathrm{keV}$, and another gate at $340 \pm 5 \mathrm{keV}$ (area $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ in Fig. 7) to avoid the influence of the $377 \mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray, where the $275-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray is considered as feeding transition. Figure 8(b) presents the delayed and antidelayed time distributions. After the background-timing correction, the true centroid difference is $\Delta C_{\text {total }}(275-340)=$ 19(5) ps. The subscript "total" denotes that this centroid difference contains the lifetime information of the $6_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-}$ states. We derived the true centroid difference of the $6_{2}^{-}$state for the 275-340 keV combination following

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta C_{6_{2}^{-}}=(1+\alpha) \Delta C_{\text {total }}-\alpha \Delta C_{6_{1}^{-}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta C_{6_{1}^{-}}$for the 275-340 keV combination was calculated as $\Delta C_{6_{1}^{-}}=-40(13) \mathrm{ps}$ according to Eq. (2) using the PRD and lifetime of the $6_{1}^{-}$state, while $\alpha$ is the $\gamma$ coincidence intensity ratio between the $358 \rightarrow 275$ and $275 \rightarrow 358$ cascades.

TABLE I. Relevant $\gamma$ transitions below the $9^{+}$isomer in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$. The BRICC code [34] was employed to obtain the internal conversion coefficient (ICC) from the mixing ratio ( $\delta$ ) or vice versa.

| $\gamma$ (keV) | $J_{i}^{\pi} \rightarrow J_{f}^{\pi}[24]$ | Multipolarity | $\|\delta\|$ | ICC | $\gamma$-ray intensity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Ref. [22] | Present work |
| 14.5(1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $5_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 4^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ | $<0.035^{\text {d }}$ | 74(26) ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | 3(1) |  |
| 56.2(1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{2}^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ | $<0.35^{\text {d }}$ | $9.7(13)^{\mathrm{f}}$ | 0.23(3) |  |
| 83.2(2) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ |  | 4(1) ${ }^{\text {g }}$ | $\leqslant 0.2$ |  |
| 275.0(2) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ | $<0.55{ }^{\text {e }}$ | $0.109_{-7}^{+4 \mathrm{~h}}$ | 32(16) | 62(8) ${ }^{\text {i }}$ |
| $275.0(2)^{\text {b }}$ | $6_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ | $<0.55^{\text {e }}$ | $0.109_{-7}^{+4 \mathrm{~h}}$ | 170(16) | $147(20){ }^{\text {i }}$ |
| 293.5(2) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $9^{+} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}$ | $E 3^{\text {c }}$ |  | 0.254(4) | 3.9(2) | $3.9(4)^{\text {j }}$ |
| 316.2(2) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $5_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 4^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ | $<0.6{ }^{\text {e }}$ | $0.074_{-6}^{+4 \mathrm{~h}}$ | 2.3(2) | 2.3(2) ${ }^{\text {j }}$ |
| 358.2(2) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ | $<0.5{ }^{\text {e }}$ | $0.054_{-4}^{+2 \mathrm{~h}}$ | 75(18) | 31(6) ${ }^{\text {i }}$ |
| 358.2(2) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$ | $M 1+E 2$ | $<0.5{ }^{\text {e }}$ | $0.054_{-4}^{+2 \mathrm{~h}}$ | 36(18) | $81(15)^{\text {i }}$ |
| $377.0(1)^{\text {b }}$ | $9^{+} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$ | $E 3^{\text {c }}$ |  | 0.099(2) | 100 | $100^{\text {j }}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Energy reported in Ref. [22].
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Energy measured in the present work.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Pure $E 3$ transition according to the measured $\alpha_{K}$ value reported in Ref. [22].
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ The upper limit of mixing ratio was estimated based on the total ICC.
${ }^{\text {e }}$ The upper limit of mixing ratio was estimated based on the experimental $\alpha_{K}$ value [22].
${ }^{\mathrm{f}}$ Total ICC deduced from intensity balance.
${ }^{\text {g }}$ The average of $M 1$ and $E 2$ ICC values, and its uncertainty covers the pure $M 1$ and $E 2$ ICC values.
${ }^{\mathrm{h}}$ The central value of ICC was obtained by taking the mixing ratio as half of its upper limit. Its upper (lower) uncertainty corresponds to the difference between $\operatorname{ICC}(\delta=0)[\operatorname{ICC}(\delta=$ upper limit $)]$ and the central value.
${ }^{i}$ Intensity deduced from the $\gamma-\gamma$ coincidence spectra.
${ }^{\mathrm{j}}$ Intensity deduced from the singles spectrum.

The $\gamma$ coincidence intensity of each cascade was obtained as the product of intensity of the feeding $\gamma$ ray and the branching ratio of decay $\gamma$ ray, where all decay routes, including $\gamma$ decay and internal conversion, were considered (the adopted ICC values were listed in Table I). Using the $\gamma$-ray intensities extracted in the present work, $\alpha$ was deduced as $\alpha=0.49$ (12). Then the true centroid difference of the $6_{2}^{-}$state was obtained


FIG. 7. Coincident $\gamma$-ray spectra gated on the $275-\mathrm{keV}$ peak measured between 10 and $700 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ after the ERs were implanted in the SSD. The histogram in black is the $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ spectrum, and the histogram in blue is the HPGe spectrum, The red lines are the fitted curves. A linear background underneath the photopeak was considered.
as $\Delta C_{6_{2}^{-}}(275-340)=48(12) \mathrm{ps}$, and the lifetime of the $6_{2}^{-}$ state was extracted to be $\tau_{6_{2}^{-}}=41(7) \mathrm{ps}$.


FIG. 8. Panel (a) presents the delayed and antidelayed timedifference spectra for the $6_{1}^{-}$state in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$. Panel (b) shows the delayed and antidelayed time-difference spectra of the $340-275 \mathrm{keV}$ combination, containing the lifetime information of the $6_{1}^{-}$and the $6_{2}^{-}$states in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$.

TABLE II. The results of the shell model calculations using KH5082, CWG, and CW5082 interactions are compared with the experimental data. The superscript $e(o)$ indicates that the orbital is occupied by an even (odd) number of nucleons. The calculated levels were matched to the experimental one based on the reduced transition probabilities.

| Expt. |  | KH5082 |  | CWG |  | CW5082 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Energy (keV) | $J^{\pi}$ | Energy (keV) | Configuration | Energy (keV) | Configuration | Energy (keV) | Configuration |
| Dominated by $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | $4_{1}^{-}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (80.59 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (8.10 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (61.65 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (10.89 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ 68.05 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (7.27 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 14.4 | $5{ }_{1}$ | 59 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (72.61 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (10.19 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 16 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (56.08 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (24.49 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 31 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (72.84 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (9.54 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 289.3 | $6_{1}^{-}$ | 404 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (89.55 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (2.49 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 230 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (80.06 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (4.14 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 208 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (51.92 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (33.64 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Dominated by $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 316.6 | $5_{2}^{-}$ | 130 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (77.54 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \end{gathered}$ <br> (7.87\%) | 60 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (51.56 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (24.71 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 138 | $\left.\left.\begin{array}{c} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (65.23 \%) \\ + \end{array}\right] \pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] .$ <br> (10.2\%) |
| 372.6 | $6_{2}^{-}$ | 136 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (86.63 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (2.31 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 98 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (76.34 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (4.28 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 151 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (45.93 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (35.60 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| 647.5 | $7{ }_{1}^{-}$ | 511 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (86.84 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (2.19 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 475 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (78.46 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (2.56 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 423 | $\begin{gathered} {\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{o}, d_{5 / 2}^{e}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right]} \\ (77.48 \%) \\ +\left[\pi\left(g_{7 / 2}^{e}, d_{5 / 2}^{o}\right) v\left(f_{7 / 2}^{1}\right)\right] \\ (1.18 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## IV. DISCUSSION

The previous studies of Refs. [22,24] have pointed out that the low-lying states below the $9^{+}$isomer in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ result from the coupling of the one proton hole to one neutron particle outside the ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$ core. Among these states, it is apparent that the $7^{-}$and $9^{+}$states are the maximum aligned members of the $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi h_{11 / 2} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplets, respectively. In the present measurements, the reduced transition probability of the $9^{+} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$transition is five times larger than that of the $9^{+} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}$transition, in agreement with the previous work [24]. The main components of the $6_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-}$states were suggested to be $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$, respectively, since that spin-flip transition is less favored than non-spin-flip one. It is worth noting that the priority of the $\pi h_{11 / 2} \rightarrow \pi d_{5 / 2}$ can be attributed by another mechanism, that is the possible enhanced $E 3$ transition between two orbitals with $\Delta l=\Delta j=$ 3 . The $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$transition is expected to be significantly hindered due to the $l$-forbidden mechanism [35], with a typical $B(M 1)$ value of $10^{-2}-10^{-3} \mathrm{~W} . \mathrm{u}$. in this mass region, while $B(M 1)$ would be close to $1 \mathrm{~W} . \mathrm{u}$. for the $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}$transition connecting members of the same multiplet. Thus, one expects that the $B(M 1)$ value of the latter transition is significantly
larger than that of the former. However, the $B(M 1)$ values for the two transitions were found to be almost equal in the previous experiment by Ercan et al. [22]. Unfortunately, the experimental proofs supporting the reported intensities were absent in Ref. [22], preventing further comparison. Based on the $\gamma$-ray intensities measured in the present work, the extracted $B(M 1)$ values for the $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}$and $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$ transitions differ by a factor of 4.4, in agreement with the suggested configuration assignments. Additionally, the $B(M 1)$ ratio between these two transitions should be about $10^{2}$ if the configurations of these two $6^{-}$states are pure. Thus, the small ratio of 4.4 indicates considerable configuration mixing.

As mentioned earlier, there is a discrepancy on the configuration assignment to the $5_{1}^{-}$state in the previous works [21,22,24]. In the present work, the reduced $M 1$ transition probabilities of the $6_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$transitions in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ are extracted to be $B\left(M 1 ; 6_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}\right)>0.135$ W.u. and $B\left(M 1 ; 6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}\right)=0.015(4)$ W.u., respectively. The $B(M 1)$ values indicate that the $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$transition indeed has the nature of an $l$-forbidden $M 1$ transition, and thus the dominant configuration of the $5_{1}^{-}$level is $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$, in agreement with Refs. [22,24]. In addition, the energy of the $2_{1}^{+}$state in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$


FIG. 9. The results of the shell model calculations using the KH5082, CWG, and CW5082 interactions, the experimental data was also presented. In each level scheme, the levels were divided on the left and right sides by the multiplet they belong to. The widths of the arrows are proportional to the reduced transition probabilities, which were marked near the arrow in Weisskopf units (W.u.).
is 1.97 MeV [12], suggesting that core excitation does not have a considerable contribution to the low-lying states. The $302-\mathrm{keV}$ energy gap between the two $5^{-}$states [24] indicates a relatively pure configuration for each of them. Thus, the main configuration component of $5_{2}^{-}$level is expected to be $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$.

Large-scale shell model calculations were performed using the CWG [36], KH5082, and CW5082 [37] interactions, taking ${ }^{132} \mathrm{Sn}$ as the doubly closed core. The model space consists of the $\pi\left(1 g_{7 / 2}, 2 d_{5 / 2}, 2 d_{3 / 2}, 3 s_{1 / 2}, 1 h_{11 / 2}\right)$ and $\nu\left(2 f_{7 / 2}, 1 h_{9 / 2}, 2 f_{5 / 2}, 3 p_{3 / 2}, 3 p_{1 / 2}, 1 i_{13 / 2}\right)$ single-particle orbitals. Table II lists the experimental and theoretical energies as well as the corresponding main configuration components of the low-lying states in ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$. Figure 9 shows the reduced transition probabilities deduced from the present experiment in comparison with the corresponding shell model results. Due to the limited predictive power of the shell model in excitation energies, especially for odd-odd nuclei, the ordering of levels given by the shell model calculations is not necessarily consistent with that of experiment. In fact, it is the reduced transition probability that can probe the nuclear structure of the initial and final states, and we matched the calculated level to the experimental one by comparing the reduced transition probabilities. As listed in Table II, the main configuration components given by all employed effective interactions are in agreement with the present experimental expectations.

In the shell model calculations, a nonzero $B(M 1)$ value between the $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplets is understood to result from configuration mixing, and the amplitude of configuration mixing is inversely proportional to the energy gap. The ratio between $B\left(M 1 ; 7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}\right)$and $B\left(M 1 ; 7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}\right)$is extracted based on the experimental $\gamma$-ray intensities. In the present theoretical results, this ratio mainly depends on the amplitude of configuration mixing between the two $6^{-}$levels, because all interactions give a relatively pure configuration component for the $7^{-}$state. The CWG and KH5082 inter-
actions give a much larger $B(M 1)$ ratio between these two transitions, which reflects an underestimation of configuration mixing between the two $6^{-}$states. The CW5082 interaction gives a $B(M 1)$ ratio of about 2.2 , which reflects the considerable mixing of the $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ configurations, and reproduces the experimental result best. The experimental $B(M 1)$ ratio between the $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$and $6_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$transitions was also calculated. This $B(M 1)$ ratio given by the three interactions was found to be of the same order of magnitude as the experimental one, while CWG and CW5082 give relatively large ratios.

In the ${ }^{142} \mathrm{Pr},{ }^{144} \mathrm{Pm}$, and ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ isotones, similar decay patterns were observed for the $7^{-}, 6^{-}$, and $5^{-}$states. These states in ${ }^{142} \mathrm{Pr}$ and ${ }^{144} \mathrm{Pm}$ are interpreted in terms of configuration mixing of the $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ and $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplets [40-42], but the main configuration components were not clear. Based on the similarity of the level structure as well as the $B(M 1)$ ratio between the $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}$and $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$transitions, the dominant configurations can be assigned respectively to the low-lying states in ${ }^{142} \mathrm{Pr}$ and ${ }^{144} \mathrm{Pm}$, as shown in Fig. 10. In the three isotones, the energies of the $7^{-}$levels and the energy differences between two $6^{-}$states increase with proton number, which can be attributed to the increase of the energy gap between the $2 d_{5 / 2}$ and $1 g_{7 / 2}$ proton orbitals. For ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$, the largest $B(M 1)$ ratio between the $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{2}^{-}$and $7^{-} \rightarrow 6_{1}^{-}$ transitions is observed due to the largest energy differences between the two $6^{-}$states. A common feature for these three isotones is that the energies of the $5^{-}$and $6^{-}$states belonging to the $\pi g_{7 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplet are higher than those of the $5^{-}$and $6^{-}$states belonging to the $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ multiplet. However, it is not reproduced by the shell model calculations performed for ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$ in the present work. This discrepancy might be due to the complicated two-body interaction between the 13 protons with respect to the ${ }^{132} \mathrm{Sn}$ core in the shell model calculation. Better descriptions of nuclei in the vicinity of ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$ would be achieved by taking ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$ as the core and allowing certain


FIG. 10. The systematics of level structure in ${ }^{142} \mathrm{Pr},{ }^{144} \mathrm{Pm}$, and ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Eu}$. The known reduced transition probabilities in W.u. were marked near the arrows. The $B(M 1)$ ratios in ${ }^{142} \mathrm{Pr}$ and ${ }^{144} \mathrm{Pm}$ were calculated based on the relevant $\gamma$-ray intensities reported in Refs. [38,39], respectively, assuming pure $M 1$ character for simplicity.
core excitations, in case all the necessary nucleon-nucleon interactions are extracted from the nuclei close to ${ }^{146} \mathrm{Gd}$.

## V. SUMMARY

In the present work, the lifetimes of the $6_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-}$levels were measured employing the MSCD method with fast-timing $\mathrm{LaBr}_{3}(\mathrm{Ce})$ detectors, and the $\gamma$-ray intensities of the 275-and $358-\mathrm{keV}$ doublet transitions were re-analyzed using HPGe detectors. The $B(M 1)$ values of the $6_{1}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$and $6_{2}^{-} \rightarrow 5_{1}^{-}$ transitions were deduced, and the configurations of the $6^{-}$and $5^{-}$levels are proposed by comparing the experimental results with the shell model calculations. In particular, our results clearly show that the $5_{1}^{-}$state has a dominant $\pi d_{5 / 2}^{-1} \nu f_{7 / 2}$ configuration, solving the discrepancy in its configuration assignment proposed in previous works.
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