

$^{14}\text{N}(\text{d}, ^3\text{He})$

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	J. H. Kelley, C. G. Sheu and J. E. Purcell		NDS 198,1 (2024)	1-Aug-2024

1968Ga13: $^{14}\text{N}(\text{d}, ^3\text{He})$ E=28 MeV; measured $\sigma(\theta)$ to g.s.; DWBA analysis for comparison of (d, ^3He),(d,t) cross sections.

1968Hi01: $^{14}\text{N}(\text{d}, ^3\text{He})$ E=52 MeV; measured $\sigma(\text{E}(^3\text{He}),\theta)$, ^{13}C deduced levels, J, π , S. Natural targets.

1970PiZV: $^{14}\text{N}(\text{d}, ^3\text{He})$ E=20.13 MeV; measured $\sigma(\theta)$; deduced optical model parameters.

1974Lu06: $^{14}\text{N}(\text{pol. d}, ^3\text{He})$ E=15 MeV; measured $\sigma(\text{E}(^3\text{He}),\theta)$, A(θ). ^{13}C g.s. deduced S, J-dependence, J-admixtures. DWBA analysis. Natural, enriched targets.

1981Ma14: $^{14}\text{N}(\text{pol. d}, ^3\text{He})$ E=52 MeV; measured $iT_{11}(\text{E}(^3\text{He}),\theta)$ for $^{13}\text{C}^*(0,7.55 \text{ MeV})$. Enriched targets. DWBA, Nilsson model analyses.

 ^{13}C Levels

E(level)	J^π [†]	C^2S	Comments
0^{\ddagger}	$1/2^-$	0.63	L=1 (1974Lu06).
3.09×10^3 [#]			
3.68×10^3	$3/2^-$	0.16	E(level): The 3.85 MeV; $J^\pi=5/2^+$ state is not resolved from the 3.68 MeV state, but it is reasonable to assume only a small contribution to the 3.7 MeV group with regard to the weak excitation of the other positive-parity states (1968Hi01).
6.87×10^3 [#]		1.55	
7.55×10^3	$5/2^-$	0.63	
8.85×10^3	$1/2^-$		The sum of the cross section of the $^{13}\text{C}^*(8.85+9.51)$ states is identical with the angular distribution of the unresolved states that appear at $^{13}\text{N}^*(9.2)$.
9.51×10^3	$(3/2^-)$	0.13	J^π : $9/2^+$ is accepted in the Adopted Levels. J^π : In (1968Hi01), the known $^{13}\text{N}^*(8.9+9.4 \text{ MeV})$ states are unresolved, but their angular distributions and cross section sum are compared with the resolved $^{13}\text{C}^*(8.9+9.5 \text{ MeV})$ states. The authors first indicate the $^{13}\text{C}^*(9.5 \text{ MeV})$ state does not have a "pick-up pattern" as would be expected, and later they suggest a complex configuration that can explain the spectroscopic factor. The discussion shows reservations, and their conclusions are based on comparison with an unresolved group of states in ^{13}N .
11.90×10^3	$15 \quad 3/2^-$	0.95	

[†] From comparison of (d, ^3He) and (d,t) mirror states in (**1968Hi01**) $\Delta E \approx 100 \text{ keV}$. C^2S is from Figure 7 of (**1968Hi01**).

[‡] See also (**1974Lu06**). The spectroscopic factors, C^2S , extracted for the reaction $^{14}\text{N}(\text{d}, ^3\text{He})^{13}\text{C}_{\text{g.s.}}$ agree within 5% to those for the reaction $^{14}\text{N}(\text{d}, \text{t})^{13}\text{N}_{\text{g.s.}}$.

[#] Weakly populated.