

Adopted Levels

Type	Author	History	Citation	Literature Cutoff Date
Full Evaluation	J. E. Purcell [#] , C. G. Sheu [*]		NDS 130 1 (2015)	30-Jun-2015

$Q(\beta^-)=18.5906\ 32$; $S(n)=6257.233\ 2$ [2012Wa38](#)

The discovery of hydrogen isotope ${}^3\text{H}$ with an estimate of its mass was reported in 1934; see ([2012Th01](#)) for a historical review.

In ([1947BI31](#),[1947BI32](#)) it is shown that the spin of ${}^3\text{H}$ is 1/2 and the ratio of the magnetic moment of ${}^3\text{H}$ to that of the proton is found to be 1.067 1. For the ${}^3\text{H}$ spin, see also ([1949Di31](#)).

Calculations show that the ground state wave functions of ${}^3\text{H}$ and ${}^3\text{He}$ consist of a spatially symmetric S state ($\approx 90\%$), a D state ($\approx 9\%$), a mixed symmetry S' state ($\approx 1\%$) and a small P state ($<0.1\%$). See ([1979Sa15](#),[1986Is01](#),[1987Er07](#),[1993Wu08](#),[2002Ho09](#)).

The ratio η_t of the asymptotic D state to S state of ${}^3\text{H}$ is $-0.0418\ 31$. This value is the inverse square of the uncertainty weighted average of the two most recent measurements ([1993Ge04](#),[1994Ko29](#)). The following table lists references reporting values for η_t :

Also see ([1988Fr01](#)) where it was noted that there is a strong correlation between the triton and deuteron asymptotic ratios. Using several models, they obtained $\eta_t/\eta_d=1.68\ 4$. Using this ratio value and $\eta_d=0.0256\ 4$ from ([1990Ro02](#)) gives $\eta_t=-0.0430\ 12$.

The charge and magnetic rms radii for ${}^3\text{H}$ are $r_c=1.755\ \text{fm}\ 86$ and $r_m=1.840\ \text{fm}\ 181$ ([1994Am07](#)). See ([2005Go26](#)) for electric and magnetic form factors for ${}^3\text{H}$ and ${}^3\text{He}$ as well as isoscalar and isovector versions and comparison with theory. Also see the reaction ${}^3\text{H}(e,e){}^3\text{H}$ below for more details.

Triton magnetic moment, $\mu_t=+2.978962467\ 26\ \mu_N$. This value is obtained from a measurement of the ratio of the triton to proton magnetic moments $\mu_t/\mu_p=1.0666399151\ 30$ ([2011Ne15](#)) and the value of the proton magnetic moment $\mu_p=+2.792847356\ 23\ \mu_N$ reported in ([2014OI01](#)). Also see Table XLI of ([2012Mo42](#)) which gives $\mu_t=2.978962448\ 38$.

Reference	η_t	Comments
1981Bo04	$-0.048\ 7$	${}^2\text{H}(\text{pol d,p}){}^3\text{H}$, $E_d=13\ \text{MeV}$
1982Bo06	$-0.051\ 5$	${}^2\text{H}(\text{pol d,p}){}^3\text{H}$, $E_d=7-13\ \text{MeV}$
1989Vu01	$-0.050\ 6$	${}^4\text{He}(\text{pol d},{}^3\text{He}){}^3\text{H}$, $E_d=32-50\ \text{MeV}$
1992Da01	$-0.043\ 2$	DWBA analysis of sub-Coulomb (pol d,t) reactions; also see (1992Ge05), who argue that the uncertainty should be 0.004, not 0.002
1993Ge04	$-0.0431\ 25$	DWBA analysis of sub-Coulomb (pol d,t) reactions
1994Ko29	$-0.0411\ 18$	DWBA analysis of sub-Coulomb (pol d,t) reactions

 ${}^3\text{H}$ LevelsCross Reference (XREF) Flags

A	${}^1\text{H}({}^6\text{He},\alpha)$	D	${}^3\text{H}(\gamma,n),(\gamma,nn)$
B	${}^2\text{H}(n,\gamma)$ E=thermal	E	${}^3\text{H}(e,e)$
C	${}^2\text{H}(n,n)$		

E(level)	J^π	$T_{1/2}$	XREF	Comments
0.0	$1/2^+$	12.32 y 2	AB	$\% \beta^- = 100$ $\mu = +2.978962467\ 26$ μ : from $\mu_t/\mu_p=1.0666399151\ 30$ (2011Ne15) and $\mu_p=+2.792847356\ 23\ \mu_N$ (2014OI01). ${}^3\text{H}$ mass excess: 14949.8061 keV 22 (2012Wa38). ${}^3\text{H}$ binding energy: 8481.7986 keV 24; $S(n)=6257.2327\ \text{keV}\ 22$ using mass excess values from (2012Wa38). $T_{1/2}$: 12.32 y 2=4500 d 8=3.888 $\times 10^8$ s 7. $T_{1/2}$: The half-life value given here comes from (2000Ch01 , 2000Lu17). (2000Ch01) analyzed 16 measurements between 1940 and 1991 of ${}^3\text{H}$ half-life, rejected 3 and averaged the rest that ranged from 12.1 y to 12.58 y. They obtained a half-life of 12.32 y 2. The authors of (2000Lu17) recommend using the day as the time unit since it is

Continued on next page (footnotes at end of table)

Adopted [Levels](#) (continued)

^3H Levels (continued)

<u>E(level)</u>	<u>Jπ</u>	<u>T_{1/2}</u>	<u>XREF</u>	Comments
exactly defined in terms of the second. The same data were reanalyzed using a different method as reported in (2006Ma57) resulting in T _{1/2} =4497 d 4 or 12.31 y <i>I</i> .				