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#### Abstract

Excited states in ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ were populated in fragmentation of an $850-\mathrm{MeV} / \mathrm{u}{ }^{124} \mathrm{Xe}$ beam on a $4-\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ Be target. Three new high-spin isomers were identified and the structure of the populated states was investigated. The level scheme of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ was established, and a spin parity of $\left(13^{-}\right),\left(15^{+}\right)$, and $\left(19^{+}\right)$was assigned to the new isomeric states. Shell-model calculations were performed in various model spaces, including $\pi v\left(p_{1 / 2}, g_{9 / 2}, f_{5 / 2}, p_{3 / 2}\right)$ and the large-scale shell-model space $\pi \nu(g d s)$, to account for the observed parity changing $M 2$ and $E 3$ transitions from the ( $13^{-}$) isomer and the $E 2$ and $E 4$ transitions from the $\left(19^{+}\right)$core-excited isomer, respectively. The calculated level schemes and reduced transition strengths are found to be in very good agreement with the experiment.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

There are many isomeric states predicted and observed near the doubly magic ${ }^{100} \mathrm{Sn}$ nucleus [1,2]. Their existence and properties are governed by the strong proton-neutron $(\pi v)$ interaction between identical orbitals, and in particular the high-spin $\pi g_{9 / 2}$ and $\nu g_{9 / 2}$ orbits. Detailed shell-model calculations provide the tool to probe specific aspects of the nuclear residual interaction through comparison with key experimental data. Of particular interest are cases in the ${ }^{100} \mathrm{Sn}$ region where core-excited high-spin isomeric states may be discovered, as there is a limited number of ways of forming these states. The first and so far only known case of such a state was identified in ${ }^{98} \mathrm{Cd}$ [3]. In fact, this state has a counterpart in the $\mathcal{N}=3$ harmonic oscillator shell in ${ }^{54} \mathrm{Fe}$ and ${ }^{54} \mathrm{Ni}$ [4]. In the present work we report on the discovery of three isomeric states in the ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ nucleus, one of which is a core-excited isomer.

Experimentally there is little known about ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$. The existence of an isomeric state was indicated by Grzywacz et al. [5], reporting two $\gamma$-ray transitions. In the experiment presented here, the power of the Rare Isotope Spectroscopic

[^0]Investigation at GSI (RISING) setup [6] was used to perform detailed isomer spectroscopy of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$.

## II. EXPERIMENT AND RESULTS

The experiment was part of the "stopped beam campaign" of the RISING project [7]. A ${ }^{124} \mathrm{Xe}$ beam with energy of $850 \mathrm{MeV} / \mathrm{u}$ and an intensity of $10^{9}$ particles per second was produced at the GSI accelerator complex. The fragmentation reaction on a $4-\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}{ }^{9} \mathrm{Be}$ target was employed to produce the excited ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ residues, which were thereupon selected with the FRagment Separator (FRS) [8] using the $B \rho-\Delta E-B \rho$ technique. An event-by-event identification was performed with various detectors positioned at the middle (S2) and final (S4) focal planes of the FRS (see, e.g., Fig. 1 of Ref. [9] for the schematic setup). The nuclear charge $Z$ was measured with two multisampling ionization chamber detectors at S 4 . The mass-over-charge ratio $(A / Q)$ was determined from the measured time of flight between scintillators positioned at S2 and S4. Corrections for different trajectories through the FRS were performed based on position measurements with pairs of time-projection chambers, mounted at S2 and S4. The measured $Z$ and $A / Q$ were corrected for drifts in electronics


FIG. 1. (Color online) $Z$ versus $A / Q$ identification plot (see text for details).
and temperature and atmospheric-pressure changes during the experiment.

The fragments, including ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$, were slowed down with an Al degrader and implanted into an array of nine doublesided silicon strip detectors (DSSSDs), $5 \times 5 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ each, with $16 \times 16 x-y$ segmentation. The detectors were arranged in three rows with three detectors in each row. The DSSSDs were surrounded by the RISING HPGe detector array, with a layout described in Ref. [7]. The absolute efficiency of the Ge array in this configuration was $10 \%$ at 1.3 MeV . DGF-4C [10] modules were used to process the signals from the Ge array within $90 \mu$ s after the arrival of an ion at S4. The shortest observed half-lives were limited by the flight time through the separator, about $0.33 \mu \mathrm{~s}$, and by the background from the prompt bremsstrahlung radiation arising from the implantation of the reaction products in the DSSSDs.

The fragment identification plot obtained in this measurement is shown in Fig. 1 with $2 \times 10^{5}{ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ nuclei identified. The correct reconstruction of $Z$ and $A / Q$ was verified by observing the known $\gamma$-ray transitions populated in the isomer decays of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Pd}$ [11] and ${ }^{98} \mathrm{Cd}[3]$.

The delayed ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag} \gamma$-ray spectrum acquired up to $90 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ after implantation is shown in Fig. 2, where the $\gamma$-ray energies


FIG. 2. A $\gamma$-ray spectrum observed from 0.075 to $90 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ after implantation of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$. The $\gamma$ rays associated with ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ are marked by their energies. The inset highlights the region around 4 MeV acquired in 0.075 to $0.6 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ after implantation.
of the ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ transitions are marked. All $\gamma$-ray transitions were observed for the first time in this measurement, except for the $470-\mathrm{keV}$ and $668-\mathrm{keV}$ lines seen by Grzywacz et al. [5]. The inset highlights the region around 4 MeV acquired in $0.6 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ after the implantation.

A $\gamma-\gamma$ coincidence analysis of the ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ data resulted in the level scheme shown in Fig. 3. The isomeric states identified in this experiment are drawn in bold. The level energies, $\gamma$-ray energies, $E_{\gamma}$, relative intensities, $I_{\gamma}$, coincidence relations, isomeric ratios [12], $R$, and the half-lives, $T_{1 / 2}$, of the measured time distributions are summarized in Tables I and II, respectively. The half-lives for the $2643+x-\mathrm{keV}$ and $2461-\mathrm{keV}$ levels were obtained by maximum likelihood fit of the sum of the time distributions for the 470-, 1506-, $1249-$, $743-$, $257-$, $1719-$, and $486-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ rays (where " $x$ " is the energy of the unobserved transition; see below) with two exponential decay curves. They are consistent with the time distributions of the $630-, 667-$, and $743-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions. The half-life of the $6908+x$ level was obtained by a fit of the sum of the time distributions for the $4167-\mathrm{keV}$ and $4265-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ rays with a single exponential decay curve. The summed time distributions are shown in Figs. 4(a) and 4(b), together with the fits. The ordering of the 470-, 1719-, 1976-, and $2461-\mathrm{keV}$ levels is fixed by the cross-over transitions. A $\gamma$-ray spectrum in coincidence with the $667-\mathrm{keV}$ transition and a coincidence time window of $\Delta T_{c}=0.15 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ is shown in Fig. 5(a). Because of the narrow coincidence window the $\gamma$ transitions above the


FIG. 3. Proposed level scheme of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$. The isomeric states identified in this experiment are drawn in bold (see text for details).

TABLE I. Level energies, $\gamma$-ray energies, relative intensities, and observed prompt coincidences.

| $E_{x}(\mathrm{keV})$ | $E_{\gamma}(\mathrm{keV})$ | $I_{\gamma}$ | Prompt coincidence transitions(keV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $469.9(2)$ | $470.0(2)$ | $100.0(15)$ | $257,486,630,667,743$, |
|  |  |  | 1249,1506 |
| $1718.7(2)$ | $1248.8(2)$ | $37.7(12)$ | $257,470,630,667,743$ |
|  | $1718.5(4)$ | $3.4(5)$ | $257,667,743$ |
| $1975.6(2)$ | $256.8(2)$ | $12.2(8)$ | $470,486,630,667,1249,1719$ |
|  | $1505.7(2)$ | $67.1(15)$ | $470,486,630,667$ |
| $2461.2(3)$ | $485.7(3)$ | $5.8(6)$ | $257,470,1506$ |
|  | $742.7(2)$ | $26.6(9)$ | $470,1249,1719$ |
| $2605.7(3)$ | $630.1(2)$ | $18.0(8)$ | $257,470,1249,1506$ |
| $2643.0(3)$ | $667.4(2)$ | $60.4(12)$ | $257,470,1249,1506,1719$ |
| $6810(2)+\mathrm{x}$ | $4167(2)$ | $2.9(5)$ | 98 |
| $6908(2)+\mathrm{x}$ | $98(3)$ |  | 4167 |
|  | $4265(2)$ | $0.7(3)$ |  |

$1.56 \mu$ s isomer are not visible in this spectrum. In Fig. 5(b) a part of the coincidence spectrum is shown, when $\Delta T_{c}$ is increased to $3 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ and one of the $\gamma$ rays was detected within $0.6 \mu$ s of implantation. The $4167-\mathrm{keV}$ and $4265-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions are marked. This indicates the presence of an isomeric state, with a half-life given in Fig. 4(b), which decays into the state at $2643+x \mathrm{keV}$.

A coincidence spectrum of the $1249-\mathrm{keV}$ transition with $\Delta T_{c}=0.15 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ is shown in Fig. 5(c). The 743-keV transition depopulating the $2461-\mathrm{keV}$ level is clearly visible. The $486-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$ ray is not seen, due to the branching ratios and the observational limit of the RISING array. The $486-\mathrm{keV}$ transition is seen in coincidence with the $257-\mathrm{keV}$ transition. Therefore, it is placed in the level scheme shown in Fig. 3.

The existence of three isomers in ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ decaying with high $\gamma$ multiplicity and partially common cascades, indicates population of high-spin yrast states. In the isotones of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$, ${ }^{94} \mathrm{Rh}$, and ${ }^{92} \mathrm{Tc}$, low-lying yrast $\left(8^{+}\right)$states were observed. These are identified as the ground state or as an isomer at low excitation energy [13,14]. The shell-model calculations in this work and in Ref. [15] predict a low-lying $8^{+}$state in ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$, consistent with the systematics of the $\left(8^{+}\right)$states in ${ }^{94} \mathrm{Rh}$ and
${ }^{92} \mathrm{Tc}$. Hence, we have assumed that the lowest state populated by the high-spin yrast cascade in Fig. 3 has $I^{\pi}=\left(8^{+}\right)$.

The spins of the excited states are assigned assuming the observed transitions follow an yrast decay. Based on the coincidence analysis, the $1719-\mathrm{keV}$ transition is parallel to the $470-\mathrm{keV}$ and the $1249-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions. Hence, it is likely that the $1719-\mathrm{keV}$ transition has an $E 2$ character while the $470-\mathrm{keV}$ and $1249-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions have a $M 1$ character. Similarly, the $1249-\mathrm{keV}$ and $257-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions form a parallel branch to the $1506-\mathrm{keV}$ transition. There is no isomeric state in between, suggesting $E 2, M 1$, and $M 1$ character for the 1506,1249 , and 257 keV transitions, respectively. Therefore, the spins of the $470-\mathrm{keV}, 1719-\mathrm{keV}$, and $1976-\mathrm{keV}$ levels are assigned as $\left(9^{+}\right),\left(10^{+}\right)$, and $\left(11^{+}\right)$. The $630-\mathrm{keV}$ and $667-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions are parallel [see missing coincidence in Fig. 5(a)]. They are in prompt coincidence with the discussed $\gamma$ rays, and have $T_{1 / 2}$ of 1.52(5) and 1.54(15) $\mu \mathrm{s}$, respectively. Hence, the $2606-\mathrm{keV}$ and $2643-\mathrm{keV}$ states (see Fig. 3), are fed by the $1.56-\mu$ s isomer. The isomer half-life is compatible only with $E 2$ multipolarity and a transition energy close to or below the observational limit of 50 keV . Parallel primary decay branches from the isomeric state to the $2606-\mathrm{keV}$ and $2643-\mathrm{keV}$ levels

TABLE II. Half-lives, $T_{1 / 2}$, of isomeric states in ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$, isomeric ratios, $R$, and reduced transition probabilities, $B(\sigma \lambda)$, of $E 2, M 2, E 3$, and $E 4$ transitions observed in their decay. One Weisskopf unit (W.u.) corresponds, respectively, to $26.11 e^{2} \mathrm{fm}^{4}, 34.59 \mu_{N}^{2} \mathrm{fm}^{2}, 547.4 e^{2} \mathrm{fm}^{6}$, and $12144 e^{2} \mathrm{fm}^{8}$ for $E 2, M 2, E 3$, and $E 4$ transitions. Electric transitions are calculated with two sets of effective charges for protons/neutrons: (1.5/0.5) $e$ (a) and (1.72/1.44) e (b).

| $\mathrm{J}_{i}{ }^{\text {r }}$ | $E_{x}(\mathrm{keV})$ | $T_{1 / 2}(\mu \mathrm{~s})$ | $R(\%)$ | $J_{f}^{\pi}$ | $\sigma L$ | $E_{\gamma}(\mathrm{keV})$ | $B(\sigma \lambda)$ (W.u.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Expt. | GF |  | FPG |  | GDS <br> (a) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (a) | (b) | (a) | (b) |  |
| $\left(19^{+}\right)$ | $6908+x$ | 0.16(3) | 2.0(12) | $\left(17^{+}\right)$ | E2 | 98 | 4.7(10) |  |  |  |  | 3.572 |
|  |  |  |  | $\left(15^{+}\right)$ | E4 | 4265 | 0.9(6) |  |  |  |  | 0.697 |
| $\left(15^{+}\right)$ | $2643+x$ | 1.56(3) | 10.9(6) | $\left(13^{+}\right)$ | E2 | $x=50$ | 2.45(6) | 2.989 | 4.270 | 2.983 | 4.259 | 3.831 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $x=25$ | 6.57(16) |  |  |  |  |  |
| (13-) | 2461 | 100(10) | 9.0(14) | $\left(11^{+}\right)$ | $M 2{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 486 | $9.6(14) \times 10^{-5}$ |  |  | $3.57 \times 10^{-5}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $E 3^{\text {a }}$ |  | 0.62(9) |  |  | 0.527 | 0.689 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\left(10^{+}\right)$ | E3 | 743 | 0.145(17) |  |  | 0.0574 | 0.128 |  |

[^1]

FIG. 4. (a) Summed time distributions for the 470-, 1506-, 1249-, 743-, 257-, 1719-, and $486-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$-ray transitions. (b) Sum of the time distributions of the $4167-\mathrm{keV}$ and $4265-\mathrm{keV} \gamma$-ray transitions, depopulating the state at $6908+x \mathrm{keV}$. Half-lives are shown, extracted with the maximum likelihood method.
would imply identical spin parity for these states, which is not observed in any of the $N=49$ odd-odd isotones. Therefore, an $M 1$ and $E 2$ multipolarity is assigned for the $630-\mathrm{keV}$ and $667-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions, respectively, suggesting a parallel $M 1$ cascade of a nondetectable $37-\mathrm{keV}$ transition followed by the


FIG. 5. (a) and (b) Coincidence spectra with the $667-\mathrm{keV}$ transition within time windows of $\Delta T_{c}=0.15 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ and $\Delta T_{c}=3 \mu \mathrm{~s}$, respectively. (c) A spectrum in coincidence with the $1249-\mathrm{keV}$ transition within a time window of $\Delta T_{c}=0.15 \mu \mathrm{~s}$.
$630-\mathrm{keV}$ transition. This assignment is compatible with the measured intensity ratio. Hence, the tentative spin and parity of the $2606-\mathrm{keV}, 2643-\mathrm{keV}$, and $2643+x \mathrm{keV}$ levels [where " $x$ " is the energy of the unobserved $E 2$ transition connecting the $1.56-\mu$ s isomer to the $\left(13^{+}\right)$state] are $\left(12^{+}\right),\left(13^{+}\right)$, and $\left(15^{+}\right)$, respectively.

The core-excited $0.16-\mu$ s isomer decays by competing $98-\mathrm{keV} E 2$ and $4265-\mathrm{keV} E 4$ transitions, similar to the core-excited state in ${ }^{98} \mathrm{Cd}$ [16]. This is consistent with the observation of a prompt coincidence between the 98- and $4167-\mathrm{keV}$ transitions. A lower multipolarity for the highenergy transitions is incompatible with the observed half-life and the level scheme. Hence, spins of $\left(17^{+}\right)$and $\left(19^{+}\right)$are assigned to the $6810+x-\mathrm{keV}$ and $6908+x$-keV levels.

The long decay time of the $100-\mu$ s isomer and the transition energy indicate a parity changing transition. If the $2461-\mathrm{keV}$ state had a positive parity or the isomer was because of an unobserved low energy $M 1$ or $E 2$ transition, the $2461-\mathrm{keV}$ state would have been fed from the $2643+x-\mathrm{keV}$ level. Hence, the data points to a $2461-\mathrm{keV}\left(13^{-}\right)$state, which decays by $743-\mathrm{keV} E 3$ and $486-\mathrm{keV} M 2$ transitions. The strength of the $E 3$ transition of 0.147 (17) W.u. is similar to the $B\left[E 3 ;\left(19^{-}\right) \rightarrow\left(16^{+}\right)\right]=0.3$ W.u. transition strength observed in ${ }^{94} \mathrm{Pd}$ [17].

## III. DISCUSSION

The standard shell-model approach to nuclei "southwest" of ${ }^{100} \mathrm{Sn}$ employs empirically fitted interactions in the ( $p_{1 / 2}, g_{9 / 2}$ ) proton ( $\pi$ )-neutron ( $v$ ) model space (GF) assuming a ${ }_{38}^{76} \mathrm{Sr}_{38}$ core [18-20]. As this model space does not allow calculation of $M 2$ and $E 3 \gamma$-ray transition strengths an extension including the $\pi v\left(p_{3 / 2}, f_{5 / 2}\right)$ orbits below $Z=N=38$ is necessary. Recently the GF space was extended to the $\pi v\left(f_{5 / 2}, p, g_{9 / 2}\right)$ space FPG [17] by implementing the GF two-body matrix elements (TBME) [18] with realistic interaction TBME obtained from the CD-Bonn nucleon-nucleon potential [21]. To the latter, core polarization corrections were applied assuming $\mathrm{a}_{28}^{56} \mathrm{Ni}_{28}$ core following the many-body approach of Ref. [22]. Details of tuning to experimental single-particle energies and correction to the GF TBME to avoid double counting of interaction strength are given in Ref. [17]. These approaches, however, cannot account for core excitations across the $N=Z=50$ shell closure. Therefore, in a third approach the $\pi \nu(g, d, s)$ space GDS with a realistic interaction inferred according to Refs. [21,22] for a ${ }_{40}^{80} \mathrm{Zr}_{40}$ core was used, as detailed in Refs. [3,16]. However, such a model space cannot describe odd-parity states.

The model spaces and the respective effective interactions employed in the present work in the following are denoted by GF, FPG, and GDS. Shell-model (SM) calculations for GF and FPG were carried out with the code OxBASH [23] while the large-scale shell-model (LSSM) results in the GDS space, allowing for up to $5 p-5 h$ excitations (truncation level $t=5$ ), were obtained with the codes ANTOINE and NATHAN [24,25]. Results are shown in Fig. 6 and Table II. Two sets of effective charges were used for electric transitions, namely standard values for large model spaces $e_{\pi}=1.5 e, e_{\nu}=0.5 e$ (a) and


FIG. 6. Experimental and shell-model level schemes for ${ }_{47}^{96} \mathrm{Ag}_{49}$. See text for details of the shell-model approaches.
$e_{\pi}=1.72 e, e_{\nu}=1.44 e(\mathrm{~b})$, which was found to be optimum for the small GF model space [20]. For magnetic transitions quenched single-particle $g_{s}$ factors with $g_{s}=0.7 g_{s}^{\text {free }}$ were assumed.

The experimental level scheme is very well reproduced by the three approaches within their scope and predictive accuracy. Extension of the GF to the FPG model clearly improves the positions of the $10^{+}, 11^{+}$, and $13^{-}$levels. The LSSM approach accounts very well for positive parity states and reproduces both the excitation energy and correct order of the $(12-15)^{+}$states including the core-excited isomer. However, it fails in the correct $17^{+}-19^{+}$sequence which may be because of details of the interaction. A similar effect was observed in ${ }^{98} \mathrm{Cd}$ for the $12^{+}-14^{+}$states [16]. Inspection of the wave functions reveals that the core-excited states in ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ are dominated by neutron excitations across the $N=50$ gap. Therefore, the excitation energy of the isomer is an indirect measure for the ${ }^{100} \mathrm{Sn} N=50$ neutron gap. The extracted value of $6.70(15) \mathrm{MeV}$ is in fair agreement with the value of 6.46 (15) MeV determined for ${ }^{98} \mathrm{Cd}$ [3], which establishes a robust $N=50$ shell closure for ${ }^{100} \mathrm{Sn}$. The error in the gap size is an estimate of the systematic uncertainties in the residual interaction.

Electromagnetic transition rates were extracted using the half-lives and intensities listed in Tables I and II and the
conversion coefficients of Ref. [26]. The $1.56-\mu$ s isomer can be understood as a yrast trap, where a $15^{+}$state, the highest spin which can be obtained in the $\pi^{-3} v^{-1}\left(g_{9 / 2}, p_{1 / 2}\right)$ space, decays by a low-energy $E 2 \gamma$-ray transition. For the experimentally nonobserved $\left(15^{+}\right) \rightarrow\left(13^{+}\right)$transition two values are given in Table II. The experimental observational limit of 50 keV and the value of 25 keV , below which the total conversion coefficient increases as $\alpha(E 2) \sim E_{\gamma}^{-5}$, which makes the extracted reduced strength independent from the transition energy. Within these experimental limits good agreement with the various shell-model approaches is obtained. The parity-changing transitions, which are forbidden in the GF space, are remarkably well reproduced in the FPG approach if $E 3$ multipolarity is adopted for the $\left(13^{-}\right) \rightarrow\left(11^{+}\right)$transition. In the extended FPG model space the fairly large $E 3$ width is because of excitations from the proton $p_{3 / 2}$ orbit across the $Z=38$ subshell. The LSSM results in the GDS space using standard effective charges account well for transition strengths between even-parity states including the core-excited $\left(19^{+}\right)$isomer. The agreement is better than that observed for ${ }^{98} \mathrm{Cd}$ [3]. In contrast to ${ }^{98} \mathrm{Cd}$, in ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ the low-energy $\left(19^{+}\right) \rightarrow\left(17^{+}\right) E 2$ dominates over the direct $\left(19^{+}\right) \rightarrow\left(15^{+}\right) E 4$ transition owing to the larger $E 2$ transition energy and the relative reduced transition strengths.

## IV. SUMMARY

In summary, three new high-spin isomers with half-lives of $0.16(3) \mu \mathrm{s}, 1.56(3) \mu \mathrm{s}$, and $100(10) \mu \mathrm{s}$ were discovered in ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$. The level scheme of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ was built based on coincidence analysis. The $0.16(3)-\mu$ s isomer was identified as the second known core-excited isomer in the ${ }^{100} \mathrm{Sn}$ region. The $100(10)$ $\mu$ s isomer is determined as a decay from a negative-parity state, giving a second data point for an $E 3$ transition probability in the region. Shell-model calculations were performed in the model space $\pi \nu\left(p_{1 / 2}, g_{9 / 2}, f_{5 / 2}, p_{3 / 2}\right)$, necessary to reproduce the observed $E 3, M 2$ transition probabilities, proving excitations across the $Z=38$ subshell. A large-scale shell-model calculation within the $\pi v(g d s)$ model space was performed to study the new data on $Z=N=50$ core excitation. The general features of ${ }^{96} \mathrm{Ag}$ were reproduced, and the excitation
energies and the transition probabilities are well described; furthermore, the robustness of the ${ }^{100} \mathrm{Sn}$ shell gap is confirmed. Fine tuning of the residual particle-hole interaction is needed to reproduce the observed $\left(17^{+}\right),\left(19^{+}\right)$level sequence.
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