



## UWS Academic Portal

### Erratum

Scheck, M.; Choudry, S.N.; Elhami, E.; McEllistrem, M.T.; Mukhopadhyay, S.; Orce, J.N.; Yates, S.W.

*Published in:*  
Physical Review C

*DOI:*  
[10.1103/PhysRevC.95.039908](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.95.039908)

Published: 27/03/2017

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

#### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Scheck, M., Choudry, S. N., Elhami, E., McEllistrem, M. T., Mukhopadhyay, S., Orce, J. N., & Yates, S. W. (2017). Erratum: Pauli blocking in the low-lying, low-spin states of  $^{141}\text{Pr}$  [Phys. Rev. C **78**, 034302 (2008)]. *Physical Review C*, *95*(3), [039908]. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.95.039908>

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [pure@uws.ac.uk](mailto:pure@uws.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Erratum: Pauli blocking in the low-lying, low-spin states of  $^{141}\text{Pr}$  [Phys. Rev. C **78**, 034302 (2008)]**

M. Scheck, S. N. Choudry, E. Elhami, M. T. McEllistrem, S. Mukhopadhyay, J. N. Orce, and S. W. Yates  
(Received 11 October 2016; revised manuscript received 16 January 2017; published 27 March 2017)

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.95.039908](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.95.039908)

Table III of our original article contains erroneous  $B(M1) \downarrow$  transition rates. In the calculation of these values the conversion formula was erroneously handled. Instead of the correct prefactor 56.8 as should have been used, a value of 5.68 was used. Consequently, the  $B(M1) \downarrow$  values as stated are ten times too small and the actual  $B(M1) \downarrow$  strengths are a factor ten higher than the values given in Table III of our original article. Apart from the 1608-keV level, the physics interpretation is not affected. The 1608-keV level  $J^\pi = 3/2^+$  has been identified as dominated by a  $d_{3/2}$  single-particle component and the transition to the  $d_{5/2}$  dominated  $J^\pi = 5/2^+$  ground state corresponds to the expected strong  $M1$  spin-flip transition. The corrected  $B(M1) \downarrow \leq 0.854\mu_N^2$  for the 1608-keV transition connecting this level and the ground state is in the order of magnitude that can be expected from a simple shell-model approach for a  $d_{3/2} \rightarrow d_{5/2}$  spin-flip transition. The interpretation of the other levels below 2-MeV excitation energy is based on the observed  $E2$  transition strength and, therefore, not affected.

Furthermore, the phase convention used to extract the sign of the multipole-mixing ratios  $\delta$  as given in Table III follow the phase convention of Steffen and Alder [1] and not, as stated, the Rose-Brink convention [2].

The authors acknowledge the contribution of E. E. Peters to correcting the erroneous  $B(M1) \downarrow$  values.

---

[1] R. M. Steffen and K. Alder, *The Electromagnetic Interaction in Nuclear Spectroscopy*, edited by W. D. Hamilton (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975), p. 505.

[2] H. J. Rose and D. M. Brink, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **39**, 306 (1967).