ANALYSIS OF SPIN CORRELATIONS IN THE
BETA DECAY OF THE LAMBDA HYPERON

Augusto Garcia

The Enrico Fermi Institute
and the Department of Physics
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

DECEMBER, 1970

Contract No. AT (11-1)-264

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

EFI 70-75

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

ANALYSIS OF SPIN CORRELATIONS IN THE
BETA DECAY OF THE LAMBDA HYPERON⁺⁺

Augusto Garcia

DECEMBER, 1970

The Enrico Fermi Institute

and the Department of Physics

The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

ABSTRACT

Recent experimental data on lambda β -decay are analysed. Integrated expressions for the measured quantities in terms of form factors are given up to second order in the parameter $\beta = (m_\Lambda - m_p)/m_\Lambda$. The sensitivity of these experimental quantities as functions of specific form factors is studied in detail and it is exhibited in a form which is useful for the analysis of present experiments and for the planning of future ones. Within the framework of V-A theory, the possibility is explored that the data require the presence of an induced pseudo-tensor form factor. Qualitative discussions of the q^2 dependence of some form factors and of possible admixtures of scalar and tensor interactions are also given.

⁺Supported in part by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

^{*}Submitted to the Department of Physics, The University of Chicago, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph. D. degree.

I. INTRODUCTION

New experimental evidence on lambda β -decay^{1),2)} is currently becoming available. In comparison with neutron β -decay, lambda β -decay

$$\Lambda \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}$$

differs by the change in strangeness ($\Delta S \neq 0$) and the non-negligible magnitude of the Q-value. Because our knowledge of $\Delta S \neq 0$ hyperon semileptonic decays is so limited, the analysis of this evidence is particularly interesting. We want to obtain information that might improve our picture of $\Delta S \neq 0$ decays.

In a previous paper³⁾, which we shall refer to as I, a preliminary analysis was given. It was seen there that new complications might arise; in particular, some sum rules were introduced that allowed us to see that a violation of time reversal invariance in lambda β -decay could not alone bring better agreement with experiments, and that, instead, second class currents might be required.

In the present paper we assume time reversal invariance and neglect radiative corrections. We study the possible restrictions the lambda β -decay data impose on second class currents, on the q^2 variation of some form factors and on possible admixtures of scalar and tensor interactions to the V-A picture. We compare the restrictions imposed by the lambda β -decay alone with the predictions of Cabibbo's model which relates the β -decays of all the hyperons and whose experimental support had come previously only from partial decay rates and electron-neutrino correlations. In section II, we give expressions for the measured quantities, namely, the partial decay rate, the electron-neutrino correlation and the electron,

neutrino and proton- Λ spin asymmetries, in terms of form factors integrated over the range of the invariant momentum transfer squared, q^2 . We then study qualitatively the restrictions that the experimental data impose on the integrated form factors. In section III, we assume that no second class currents⁴⁾ are present and we make a detailed comparison with the predictions of Cabibbo's model⁵⁾. In section IV, we consider the influence of the q^2 dependence of some form factors. In section V, we give a detailed study of the restrictions that the experimental data impose on second class currents. In section VI, we show how sensitive our results are to the actual value of the ν -asymmetry, which is likely to improve in precision in the near future. Finally, in section VII, we give a qualitative discussion of possible admixtures of scalar or tensor interactions to the V-A theory.

II. EXPRESSIONS FOR THE PARTIAL DECAY RATE, THE $e-\nu$ CORRELATION AND THE ASYMMETRIES.

We assume that the interaction responsible for Λ β -decay is of the current-current form, with both vector and axial vector contributions,

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}} j_{\mu}^h j_{\mu}^l + h.c. \quad (1)$$

The matrix element of the vector part of the hadronic current, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p | j_{\mu}^{h,V} | \Lambda \rangle &= \left(\frac{m_p m_{\Lambda}}{E_p E_{\Lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{u}(p) \left[f_1(q^2) \gamma_{\mu} + f_2(q^2) \frac{\sigma_{\mu\nu} q_{\nu}}{m_{\Lambda}} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + f_3(q^2) \frac{q_{\mu}}{m_{\Lambda}} \right] u(\Lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and for the axial vector part as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p | j_{\mu}^{h,A} | \Lambda \rangle &= \left(\frac{m_p m_{\Lambda}}{E_p E_{\Lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{u}(p) \left[g_1(q^2) \gamma_{\mu} + g_2(q^2) \frac{\sigma_{\mu\nu} q_{\nu}}{m_{\Lambda}} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + g_3(q^2) \frac{q_{\mu}}{m_{\Lambda}} \right] \gamma_5 u(\Lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $q^2 = (p_{\Lambda} - p_p)^2 = (p_e + p_{\nu})^2$ is the invariant four-momentum transfer and has a maximum value of $(0.16 \text{ BeV})^2$. Our conventions for the γ matrices and the metric are those of ref. (6).

The lepton current has the matrix element

$$\langle e | j_\mu^L | \nu \rangle = \bar{u}(e) \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) u(\nu) \quad (4)$$

The form factors $f_3(q^2)$ and $g_2(q^2)$ correspond to second class currents³⁾. Since the mass of the electron is very small compared to m_Λ , we can neglect it. This means that $f_3(q^2)$ and $g_3(q^2)$ can be ignored because they appear multiplied by m_e in the transition amplitude. We are then left with four form factors.

In the Λ -rest frame, the transition rate can be expressed in the form⁶⁾

$$dW = \frac{G^2}{(2\pi)^5} \frac{m_p}{m_\Lambda} \frac{e^2 v^3}{E - e} |m|^2 de d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu \quad (5)$$

with $|m|^2$ given by

$$|m|^2 = \sum \left[1 + a \hat{e} \cdot \hat{\nu} + A \hat{e} \cdot \langle \vec{\sigma}_\Lambda \rangle + B \hat{\nu} \cdot \langle \vec{\sigma}_\Lambda \rangle + A' (\hat{e} \cdot \hat{\nu}) (\hat{e} \cdot \langle \vec{\sigma}_\Lambda \rangle) + \right. \\ \left. + B' (\hat{e} \cdot \hat{\nu}) (\hat{\nu} \cdot \langle \vec{\sigma}_\Lambda \rangle) + D \langle \vec{\sigma}_\Lambda \rangle \cdot \hat{e} \times \hat{\nu} \right]. \quad (6)$$

e is the electron energy and E is its maximum value

$$E = \frac{m_\Lambda^2 - m_p^2}{2 m_\Lambda}. \quad (7)$$

ν is the neutrino energy, which by energy-momentum conservation, is a function of e and $\hat{e} \cdot \hat{\nu}$

$$\nu = \frac{E - e}{1 - \frac{e}{m_\Lambda} (1 - \hat{e} \cdot \hat{\nu})} \quad (8)$$

$\hat{e}$ and $\hat{\nu}$ are unit vectors along the directions of the electron and neutrino, respectively. $\langle \vec{\sigma}_\Lambda \rangle$ is the polarization of the Λ , G^2 is an overall coupling constant, which is chosen to be the μ -decay coupling constant and the proportionality factors absorbed into the f 's and g 's. The coefficients in eq. (6) are linear functions of e and ν and quadratic functions of the form factors.

If the q^2 dependence of the form factors is either neglected or parameterized, say, linearly, the decay rate, eq. (5) can be integrated over angles and energy. Our interest lies mainly in calculating expressions that can be compared readily to the experimental numbers. What is usually measured in hyperon leptonic decays is the total decay rate, or branching ratio, the electron-neutrino correlation and the electron, neutrino and proton asymmetries.

The e - ν correlation is defined as

$$\alpha_{e\nu} = 2 \frac{N(\theta_{e\nu} < \frac{\pi}{2}) - N(\theta_{e\nu} > \frac{\pi}{2})}{N(\theta_{e\nu} < \frac{\pi}{2}) + N(\theta_{e\nu} > \frac{\pi}{2})}$$

where $N(\theta_{e\nu} < \frac{\pi}{2})$ is the number of e - ν pairs that make an angle $\theta_{e\nu}$ smaller than 90° , and the electron asymmetry is defined as

$$\alpha_e = 2 \frac{N(\theta_e < \frac{\pi}{2}) - N(\theta_e > \frac{\pi}{2})}{N(\theta_e < \frac{\pi}{2}) + N(\theta_e > \frac{\pi}{2})}$$

where θ_e is the angle between the e-direction and the polarization of the Λ . α_v and α_p are defined similarly.

We have calculated^{7),8)} expressions for the measured quantities, ignoring the q^2 dependence of the form factors and keeping terms proportional up to β^2 , with β defined as

$$\beta = \frac{m_\Lambda - m_p}{m}$$

$$R = G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60\pi^3} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\beta + \frac{6}{7}\beta^2\right) |f_1|^2 + \left(\frac{4}{7}\beta^2\right) |f_2|^2 + \right. \\ \left. + \left(3 - \frac{9}{2}\beta + \frac{12}{7}\beta^2\right) |g_1|^2 + \left(\frac{12}{7}\beta^2\right) |g_2|^2 + \right. \\ \left. + \left(\frac{6}{7}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } f_1 f_2^* + (-4\beta + 6\beta^2) \text{Re } g_1 g_2^* \right\} \quad (9)$$

$$R \times \alpha_{ev} = G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60\pi^3} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{5}{2}\beta + \frac{11}{7}\beta^2\right) |f_1|^2 + \left(-\frac{2}{7}\beta^2\right) |f_2|^2 + \right. \\ \left. + \left(-1 - \frac{3}{2}\beta + \frac{25}{7}\beta^2\right) |g_1|^2 + \left(-2\beta^2\right) |g_2|^2 + \right. \\ \left. + \left(-\frac{2}{7}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } f_1 f_2^* + (4\beta - 2\beta^2) \text{Re } g_1 g_2^* \right\} \quad (10)$$

$$R \times \alpha_e = G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60\pi^3} \left\{ \left(-\frac{1}{3}\beta + \frac{3}{14}\beta^2\right) |f_1|^2 + \left(-\frac{4}{21}\beta^2\right) |f_2|^2 + \right. \\ \left. + \left(-2 + \frac{8}{3}\beta - \frac{9}{14}\beta^2\right) |g_1|^2 + \left(-\frac{4}{3}\beta^2\right) |g_2|^2 + \right. \\ \left. + \left(-\frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{14}{21}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } f_1 f_2^* + \left(2 - \frac{11}{3}\beta + \frac{15}{7}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } f_1 g_1^* + \right. \\ \left. + \left(-\frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{32}{21}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } f_1 g_2^* + \left(-\frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{32}{21}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } f_2 g_1^* + \right. \\ \left. + \left(\frac{16}{21}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } f_2 g_2^* + \left(\frac{10}{3}\beta - \frac{94}{21}\beta^2\right) \text{Re } g_1 g_2^* \right\} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 R \times \alpha_v &= G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60\pi^3} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{3}\beta - \frac{3}{14}\beta^2 \right) |f_1|^2 + \left(\frac{4}{21}\beta^2 \right) |f_2|^2 + \right. \\
 &\quad + \left(2 - \frac{8}{3}\beta + \frac{9}{14}\beta^2 \right) |g_1|^2 + \left(\frac{4}{3}\beta^2 \right) |g_2|^2 + \\
 &\quad + \left(\frac{2}{3}\beta - \frac{14}{21}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_1 f_2^* + \left(2 - \frac{11}{3}\beta + \frac{15}{7}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_1 g_1^* \\
 &\quad + \left(-\frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{32}{21}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_1 g_2^* + \left(-\frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{32}{21}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_2 g_1^* + \\
 &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{16}{21}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_2 g_2^* + \left(-\frac{10}{3}\beta + \frac{94}{21}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } g_1 g_2^* \right\} \quad (12)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 R \times \alpha_p &= G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60\pi^3} \frac{5}{2} \left\{ \left(-1 + \frac{11}{6}\beta - \beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_1 g_1^* + \right. \\
 &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{3}\beta - \frac{5}{6}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_1 g_2^* + \left(\frac{2}{3}\beta - \frac{7}{6}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_2 g_1^* + \\
 &\quad \left. + \left(-\frac{2}{3}\beta^2 \right) \text{Re } f_2 g_2^* \right\} \quad (13)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta m = m_\Lambda - m_p$.

Of these expressions, eq. (9) for the rate was given by Desai⁹⁾ without the second class terms; his and our common terms agree. In eqs. (9-13) the polarization of the decaying Λ is not shown explicitly, therefore, these expressions must be compared with data that have been normalized to unit polarization. Notice that eqs. (11) and (12) satisfy a theorem given by Weinberg¹⁰⁾. In our case in which m_e is neglected, it says that when the e and ν variables are interchanged, the f and g interference terms are symmetric, while the others are antisymmetric.

An important remark is that g_2 contributes to some in these expressions through the terms $\text{Re } g_1 g_2^*$ with coefficients comparable to those of f_1^2 . A similar remark had already been made for the electron energy spectrum and the partial decay rate¹¹⁾.

In order to develop some feeling for the restrictions that the experimental numbers, given in Table I, impose on the form factors, we have plotted in Figs. (1-8) the e - ν correlation and the three asymmetries as functions of g_1/f_1 for different values of f_2/f_1 and g_2/f_1 .

TABLE I. Experimental Data on Λ β -Decay

R	$\alpha_{e\nu}$	α_e	α_ν	α_p
3.35 ± 0.14 $\times 10^6 \frac{1}{\text{sec}}$ (Ref. 2,12)	-0.01 ± 0.08 (Ref.1,2,13-17)	0.13 ± 0.07 (Ref.1,2,15,18)	0.74 ± 0.16 (Ref.1,15)	-0.51 ± 0.08 (Ref.1,2)

When g_2/f_1 is zero, Figs. (1-4) show that

- a) α_{ev} is symmetric in g_1/f_1 and favors values of g_1/f_1 in a fairly narrow range around ± 0.70 , within 0.10. It has little sensitivity to f_2/f_1 .
- b) α_e favors positive g_1/f_1 . The bounds from α_{ev} now indicate that for negative f_2/f_1 , g_1/f_1 has two allowed ranges, one around 0.8 and another one around 0.1. Positive values of f_2/f_1 are within the error bars if f_2/f_1 is not too close to + 2.
- c) α_v favors g_1/f_1 around 0.13, within 0.15, for positive f_2/f_1 .
- d) α_p for negative f_2/f_1 favors g_1/f_1 around 0.25 quite narrowly, within 0.10 or in a wide range towards values past 1.0. For positive f_2/f_1 , values around 0.6 are preferred.

Thus, when $g_2 = 0$, we expect the following situation. α_{ev} selects g_1/f_1 narrowly around 0.7. In α_e this range of g_1/f_1 selects f_2/f_1 negative. Then this range of f_2/f_1 in α_p selects g_1/f_1 narrowly around 0.3. α_v shows a marked preference for g_1/f_1 around 0.4. We can see that α_{ev} and α_v oppose each other and that α_p aided by α_e also oppose α_{ev} . Then two different values for g_1/f_1 are implied

by the four correlations, one around 0.7 and another around 0.30. If future experiments confirm the experimental values we are using, and only the error bars are reduced, then this effect would turn into a real ambiguity.

When g_2/f_1 is allowed to be different from zero, then Figs. (5-8) together with Figs. (1-4) show that

- a) α_{ev} induces either g_1/f_1 to move from around 1.3 to smaller values, say, of 0.3 as g_2/f_1 varies from 2 to -2 or it induces g_1/f_1 to move from small negative to large negative values as g_2/f_1 varies from 2 to -2. It has little sensitivity to f_2/f_1 .
- b) α_e induces a similar behavior of g_1/f_1 as α_{ev} does, except that the previous negative range of g_1/f_1 is now a rather narrow range from small positive to small negative values of g_1/f_1 . This asymmetry is sensitive to f_2/f_1 , preferring negative values for f_2/f_1 , when g_2/f_1 goes to -2.
- c) α_v clearly selects positive values of g_1/f_1 in a fairly narrow range, say within 0.15 and 0.5 as g_2 goes from -2 to 2. It shows little sensitivity to f_2/f_1 .
- d) α_p also selects positive values of g_1/f_1 only. Here the value of f_2/f_1 does not matter, for $g_2/f_1=2$ there are two ranges for g_1/f_1 , still not very sensitive to f_2/f_1 .

but, as g_2/f_1 tends toward -2, f_2/f_1 imposes rather strict bounds on g_1/f_1 ; specifically, for f_2/f_1 from -1 to 2, g_1/f_1 is either very small, around 0.10, or quite large.

Thus, the ν -asymmetry requires smaller values of g_1/f_1 , around 0.2. With this restriction the $e-\nu$ correlation selects large negative values of g_2/f_1 , around -2, and then the p -asymmetry requires f_2/f_1 to be between -2 and -1. Lastly the e -asymmetry confirms these choices. We can see that, in this case, when the restriction of null g_2 is dropped, there does seem to be a common solution to the combined requirements of the three asymmetries and the $e-\nu$ correlation on the form factors.

III. CABIBBO'S MODEL AND Λ β -DECAY

This model consists of the following assumptions⁵⁾

- i) The interaction is V-A and the vector current belongs to the same SU_3 octet as the electromagnetic current does.
- ii) The axial vector current belongs to another SU_3 octet.
- iii) The universality of the leptonic weak coupling constant is modified through the introduction of an angle parameter θ in the hadronic current as follows

$$j_{\mu}^h = \cos \theta \, j_{\mu}^{\Delta S=0} + \sin \theta \, j_{\mu}^{\Delta S \neq 0}.$$

Assumption iii) is designed to parametrize the observed depression in the transition rates of the $\Delta S \neq 0$ relative to the $\Delta S=0$ semileptonic decays. Assumption i) is the extension of CVC to $\Delta S \neq 0$ processes, and in the limit of exact SU_3 asymmetry the vector $\Delta S \neq 0$ current would be conserved. Assumption ii) provides a frame work to relate the properties of the axial vector current in different processes.

The spirit of the model is that the symmetry limit gives a good approximation to nature, that is, that the symmetry breaking effects are small. This is supported to some extent by the Ademollo-Gatto theorem¹⁹⁾. Still it is interesting to see how accurate the predictions of Cabibbo's model are, since any small deviation could serve as a guide to incorporate

symmetry breaking into the model.

There is no theoretical basis for evaluation of the angle parameter, its value has been determined by fits to the experimental data of many hyperon decays. One is faced with several possible interpretations²⁰⁾ of this value. Either θ is a pure weak effect and its value will not be affected by symmetry breaking due to strong interactions or θ will have to be refitted once a breaking mechanism is introduced. To avoid this ambiguity we prefer not to give our results using the angle parameter explicitly, but instead to give them using the form factors directly.

In the past, the experimental data on hyperon decay have consisted mainly of transition rates and some correlations. Such data have been compared with Cabibbo's model by making certain assumptions in order to reduce the number of parameters used in the fits to the data. These assumptions are that the q^2 dependence of the form factors can be neglected or taken small and parametrized linearly, that, as mentioned above, the matrix elements do not differ much from their symmetry value and that no second class currents contribution is substantial. In an SU_3 model the g_2 contribution is zero in the symmetry limit. The hadronic part of the transition amplitude for $\Lambda \rightarrow p$ decay then is²¹⁾

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p | j_\mu^h | \Lambda \rangle = & \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \sin \theta \bar{u}(p) \left[\gamma_\mu + \frac{\mu_p}{2m_\Lambda} \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu + \right. \\ & \left. + (F + \frac{1}{3} D) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \right] u(\Lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where μ_p is proton magnetic moment,

$\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}$ is a Clebsch-Gordan coefficient, and F and D represent the mixture of symmetric and antisymmetric octet in the reduced matrix element of the axial vector current. The relations to the form factors of eqs. (9-13) are

$$f_1 = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \sin \theta \quad (15)$$

$$f_2 = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \sin \theta \frac{\mu p}{2} \quad (16)$$

$$g_1 = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \sin \theta \left(F + \frac{1}{3} D \right) \quad (17)$$

Similar expressions obtain for the other hyperon decays again in terms of θ , F and D.²¹⁾ These parameters are then determined by fits to the relevant data and eqs. (15-17) give us the values of the form factors. The predictions of Cabibbo's model for Λ -B decay are given²²⁾ in Table II, together with the corresponding values for the asymmetries, the e- ν correlation and the partial decay rate.

TABLE II. Predictions of Cabibbo's Model for Λ -B Decay

f_1	f_2	g_1	g_1 / f_1	g_2
0.29	0.29	0.21	0.72	0.0
R	$\alpha_{e \nu}$	α_e	α_ν	α_p
3.31 $\times 10^6 \frac{1}{\text{sec}}$	0.02	0.03	0.98	-0.59

Using only the data on Λ β -decay we have performed a χ^2 fit with f_1 , f_2 and g_1 as parameters, assuming that their q^2 dependence can be ignored, that no g_2 is present, and that radiative corrections can also be ignored.

The fitted values we obtained are given in Table III, normalized to the μ decay coupling constant.

TABLE III. Fitted Values of the Form Factors When $g_2 = 0$ and Corresponding Values of the Measured Quantities.

f_1	f_2	g_1	g_1/f_1	
0.30 ± 0.02	0.25 ± 0.25	0.21 ± 0.01	0.70 ± 0.06	
R	$\alpha_{e \nu}$	α_e	α_ν	α_p
3.35	0.04	0.04	0.97	-0.60
$\times 10^6 \frac{1}{\text{sec}}$				
χ^2_{min}	Prob	Degrees of Freedom		
4.94	9%	2		

The minimum of χ^2 is 4.94, corresponding to a probability of 9%. The values of the asymmetries, and the rate, for Λ -B decay, calculated with the fitted values of the form factors are also shown in Table III. We see that the somewhat large $\chi^2_{\min}$ obtained, corresponds to the fact that the values of the e , ν and p asymmetries are off their experimental counterparts by one standard deviation each. In Fig. (9) the contours corresponding to one standard deviation, in the sense of χ^2 changing by one from its minimum, are drawn.

Comparing Tables II and III we see that Cabibbo's model predictions and our fit agree. The large value of $\chi^2_{\min}$ of our fit can be traced to the opposing tendencies of $\alpha_{e\nu}$ and the α_e, α_ν pair, as discussed in Section II. And this, in turn, conforms with the fact that Cabibbo's model predictions for the three asymmetries are each one standard deviation off their experimental counterparts.

IV. q^2 DEPENDENCE OF THE FORM FACTORS

The experimental data do not allow us to make a thorough check of the q^2 dependence of the Λ - β decay form factors, so, once again, in the expectation that such a dependence is small, we approximate it by a linear form as follows

$$f_1(q^2) = f_1(0) + \frac{q^2}{m_\pi^2} \lambda_1^f$$

$$g_1(q^2) = g_1(0) + \frac{q^2}{m_\pi^2} \lambda_1^g$$

In this form the q^2 dependence contribution is of order β^2 , so we can handle this contribution consistently only if the slopes λ_1^f , and λ_1^g , are small, otherwise our formulas (9-13) would have to be corrected to higher order in β and the q^2 dependence of f_2 and g_2 should be considered as well. With these restrictions in mind, eqs. (9-13) gain the terms (9' - 13') respectively.

$$R: \quad G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} \left(\frac{4}{7} \beta^2 \right) \left[f_1 \lambda_1^f + 5 g_1 \lambda_1^g \right] \quad (9')$$

$$R \propto \alpha_{ev}: \quad \frac{G^2 \Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} \left(\frac{24}{7} \beta^2 \right) \left[-g_1 \lambda_1^g \right] \quad (10')$$

$$R \propto \alpha_e: \quad \frac{G^2 \Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} \left(\frac{4}{7} \beta^2 \right) \left[g_1 \lambda_1^f + f_1 \lambda_1^g - 4 g_1 \lambda_1^g \right] \quad (11')$$

$$R \propto \alpha_\nu: \quad \frac{G^2 \Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} \left(\frac{4}{7} \beta^2 \right) \left[g_1 \lambda_1^f + f_1 \lambda_1^g + 4 g_1 \lambda_1^g \right] \quad (12')$$

$$R \propto \alpha_p: \quad \frac{G^2 \Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} \left(-\frac{5}{6} \beta^2 \right) \left[f_1 \lambda_1^g + g_1 \lambda_1^f \right] \quad (13')$$

where $f_1(0) \equiv f_1$ and $g_1(0) \equiv g_1$.

Since there are only five experimental numbers, we made two fits, first taking λ_1^g zero and second taking λ_1^f zero. The only result of interest, with our restrictions, appear in Table IV, normalized to the μ decay coupling constant. Since we discuss the q^2 contribution of the form factors qualitatively, we do not quote error bars.

TABLE IV. Fitted Values of the Form Factors and the Slope of g_1 When $g_2=0$.

f_1	f_2	g_1	g_1/f_1	g_2	λ_1^f	λ_1^g
0.35	0.23	0.12	0.34	0	0	4.54
χ^2	Prob.		Degrees of Freedom			
2.77	10%		1			

For λ_1^f nonzero, no acceptable fit was found, only very large slopes were obtained.

The χ^2 found in table IV is no appreciable improvement from the χ^2 found before, when no q^2 dependence was considered, but now the constant parts of the form factors differ from what we had before and the predictions of Cabibbo's model, especially the g_1/f_1 ratio.

For comparison one can estimate the slope of $g_1(q^2)$ assuming that its q^2 dependence is dominated by the nearest pole, which corresponds to $m_{KA}^2 = 1.54 \text{ BeV}^2$;

$$g_1(q^2) = \frac{g_1(0)}{1 - \frac{q^2}{m_{KA}^2}} \approx$$

$$\approx g_1(0) + \frac{g_1(0)}{m_{KA}^2} q^2$$

The slope λ_1^g would then be given by

$$\lambda_1^g = \frac{g_1(0)}{m_{KA}^2} m_\Lambda^2$$

If the fitted value of $g_1(0)$ were used, then

$$\lambda_1^g = 0.90$$

which is rather small compared to the value in Table IV.

The experimental data are not adequate to determine the combined effect of the q^2 dependence of both form factors. But, by comparing Tables I and II and using eqs. (11'-13'), we can see that for small slopes, such a combined effect can not bring better agreement between the three asymmetries predicted by Cabibbo's model and the experimental ones. Indeed, to match both the proton and the neutrino asymmetries, respectively, negative λ_1^g and λ_1^f are favored by eqs. (12') and (13'), while to match the electron asymmetries negative λ_1^g and positive λ_1^f are favored.

We can conclude then that a small q^2 variation of the form factors does not improve the agreement between Cabibbo's model and the Λ - β decay data.

V. SECOND CLASS CURRENTS

We want to study the restrictions that the Λ β -decay data impose on second class currents. They contribute, in the approximation we are using, through g_2 . In this section we ignore the q^2 dependence of the form factors. In section II, the different quantities measured experimentally were plotted as functions of the form factors and, it was qualitatively argued, that a non zero contribution of g_2 is favored by the data. We want to extend this kind of analysis by looking at two particular sum rules that were introduced in I.

The two sum rules are defined in terms of the measured quantities as follows:

$$\Sigma = \frac{\langle \xi \rangle \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \beta (1+a) \right) (\alpha_\nu - \alpha_e) - (1-a) \right]}{\langle \xi \rangle (1+a)}$$

$$\Pi = \frac{\langle \xi \rangle \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \beta (1-a) \right) (\alpha_\nu + \alpha_e) \right]}{\langle \xi \rangle (1+a)}$$

where $a = \frac{\alpha_{ev} + \frac{3}{2} \beta}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \beta \alpha_{ev}}$, $\langle \xi \rangle = \frac{R}{1 - \frac{1}{2} \beta a}$ and $\beta = \frac{m_\Lambda - m_p}{m_\Lambda}$

These definitions are valid to first order in β , so we restrict the analysis of Σ and Π to this order. In terms of the form factors, the sum rules are

$$\langle \xi \rangle (1+a) \Sigma = \frac{2}{3} \beta \left\{ |f_1|^2 + |g_1|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} f_1 f_2^* + 2 \operatorname{Re} g_1 g_2^* \right\} \quad (18)$$

$$\langle \xi \rangle (1+a) \Pi = 4 \operatorname{Re} f_1 g_1^* + \frac{4}{3} \beta \operatorname{Re} (2 f_1 g_1^* - g_1 f_2^* - f_1 g_2^*) \quad (19)$$

where $\langle \xi \rangle (1+a) = 2(1+\beta)(|f_1|^2 + |g_1|^2)$

The experimental values of Σ and Π are

$$\Sigma = -0.18 \pm 0.16 \quad (20)$$

$$\Pi = 0.75 \pm 0.12 \quad (21)$$

The usefulness of these sum rules lies in the fact that they are very sensitive to the form factors and that Σ is independent of any time reversal violating phase between axial vector and vector form factors. They permit one to appreciate readily the second class contribution favored by the experimental data. In figs. (10-15) we have plotted Σ and Π for ranges of interest of the form factors. The experimental values for Σ and Π are also displayed.

One can easily see from these plots how the experimental value of Π forces g_1/f_1 to be positive and how for positive g_1/f_1 the experimental value of Σ prefers g_2/f_1 and f_2/f_1 towards -2. It is clear that the main feature of Σ and Π is that they are so sensitive to changes in the different form factors that they reduce the masking effects of the experimental errors.

This discussion, together with the one of Section II, enables one to interpret more clearly the numerical evaluation of the form factor. We now wish to consider such an evaluation.

We have made a χ^2 fit to the five experimental numbers, using eqs. (9-13), allowing g_2 to be present. The results are shown in Table V. The corresponding values of the rate and asymmetries are also shown.

TABLE V. Fitted Values for the Form Factors and Corresponding Values of the Measured Quantities when $g_2 \neq 0$.

f_1	f_2/f_1	g_1/f_1	g_2/f_1	
0.36 ± 0.012	$-1.40^{+1.02}_{-1.19}$	$0.19^{+0.13}_{-0.14}$	$-2.51^{+0.80}_{-0.84}$	
R	α_{ev}	α_e	α_v	α_p
3.35	0.00	0.10	0.69	-0.55
$\times 10^6 \frac{1}{\text{sec}}$				
χ^2	Prob.	Degrees of Freedom		
0.56	47%	1		

We obtained a reasonable fit as was expected from the discussion of the various graphs. The higher probability is, of course, also reflected in the fact that the values of the asymmetries calculated with the fitted form factors lie quite close to the experimental ones, as can be seen by comparing Tables V and I.

Inasmuch as a scale transformation of the form factors changes the rate but not the correlations, the ratios f_2/f_1 , g_1/f_1 , and g_2/f_1 cannot depend on the rate and may be fit to the correlations alone. The errors in the above ratios of form factors can be shown by drawing one standard deviation contours in the sense that χ^2 increases by one from its minimum value. This is done in Fig. 16.

Since the fit we have obtained is a fairly good one, we see then that, restricting oneself to Λ -B decay data, the assumptions that second class currents are absent or present are crucial to the agreement between Cabibbo's model predictions and Λ -B decay data. The fitted values, given in Table V, show that f_1 does not change much from the value it had when $g_2 = 0$, but f_2 changes so much, that if the vector current is still in an SU_3 octet, then its connection with the SU_3 properties of the electromagnetic current is masked by too large a symmetry breaking.

The presence of g_2 can be made compatible with assumption ii) of Section III only as a symmetry breaking effect, but the fitted value of g_2 is so large compared to the one of g_1 , that, if this fit is taken seriously, then it might not be easily reconciled with assumption ii) whose main usefulness is to give certain group properties to the axial vector current. Since the g_2 term corresponds to an SU_3 symmetry breaking term, we see then that Λ -B decay data favor it to be a very large symmetry breaking term.

VI. SENSITIVITY OF THE FIT TO THE VALUE OF α_ν

The ν -asymmetry will be known more precisely in the near future. In order to appreciate how sensitive the fitting procedure is to the experimental value of the ν -asymmetry, we have repeated the fitting assuming different values for α_ν , taking its error as the one corresponding to approximately 700 events. Table VI contains the results.

The main conclusion is, that for ν -asymmetry values very close to unity, the $g_2 \neq 0$ and $g_2 = 0$ fits are comparable, and as the ν -asymmetry grows smaller, the $g_2 \neq 0$ fit gradually imposes itself upon the $g_2 = 0$ fit. Thus, the ν -asymmetry provides interesting information concerning the possible existence of second class currents.

f_1	f_2	g_1	g_2	g_1/f_1	χ^2	Degrees of Freedom	Prob.	α_v
0.30	0.20	0.21	0.0	0.70	3.24	2	20%	0.89 ± 0.10
0.34	-0.10	0.14	-0.50	0.40	1.58	1	21%	✓
0.30	0.20	0.21	0.0	0.70	3.92	2	15%	0.84 ± 0.10
0.35	-0.20	0.12	-0.61	0.35	1.21	1	26%	✓
0.30	0.20	0.20	0.0	0.69	6.37	2	4% ^a	0.75 ± 0.10
0.35	-0.41	0.08	-0.80	0.24	0.65	1	40% ^a	✓
0.30	0.20	0.20	0.0	0.67	10.38	2	1%	0.65 ± 0.10
0.36	-0.65	0.05	-1.00	0.14	0.24	1	64%	✓
0.30	0.19	0.20	0.0	0.65	15.9	2	<1%	0.56 ± 0.10
0.36	-0.85	0.02	-1.15	0.06	0.04	1	85%	✓

^{a)} This is the result of previous sections modified by a smaller error in α_v

TABLE VI. Dependence of the fits on α_v .

VII. SCALAR AND TENSOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Another possibility we want to explore is the presence of scalar and tensor admixtures to the V-A interaction. We only give a qualitative discussion, because the presently available data do not permit a definite settlement of the structure of the interaction that governs Λ β -decay. We would nevertheless like to have some indications of the effects of scalar and tensor contributions. For our purpose then, it seems sufficient to consider these contributions to zeroth order, but, of course, better formulae²³⁾ will be needed to make quantitative determinations.

We shall follow reference (24). We assume that the emitted neutrino can be considered a two component object and that time reversal invariance remains valid. The following terms must be added to the interaction lagrangian, eq. (1).

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} : \quad \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}} S^h S^e + \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}} T_{\lambda\mu}^h T_{\lambda\mu}^e + h.c. \quad (1')$$

The matrix elements of the hadronic scalar and tensor parts of the interaction are

$$\langle p | S^h | \Lambda \rangle = f_s \left(\frac{m_\Lambda m_p}{E_\Lambda E_p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{u}(p) u(\Lambda)$$

$$\langle p | T_{\lambda\mu}^h | \Lambda \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f_T \left(\frac{m_\Lambda m_p}{E_\Lambda E_p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} u(p) \sigma_{\lambda\mu} u(\Lambda)$$

where all the induced terms are left out. The corresponding matrix

elements of the leptonic parts are

$$\langle e | S^L | \nu \rangle = \bar{u}(e)(1 + \gamma_5) u(\nu)$$

$$\langle e | T_{\lambda\mu}^L | \nu \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{u}(e) \sigma_{\lambda\mu} (1 + \gamma_5) u(\nu)$$

The following terms must be added to eqs. (9-13)

$$R: G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} [|t_s|^2 + 3 |t_T|^2] \quad (9'')$$

$$R \times \alpha_{e\nu}: G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} [- |t_s|^2 + |t_T|^2] \quad (10'')$$

$$R \times \alpha_e: G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} [2 |t_T|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} t_s t_T^*] \quad (11'')$$

$$R \times \alpha_\nu: G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} [2 |t_T|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} t_s t_T^*] \quad (12'')$$

$$R \times \alpha_p: - G^2 \frac{\Delta m^5}{60 \pi^3} \left[\frac{5}{2} |t_T|^2 \right] \quad (13'')$$

The sum rule Σ , which we introduced in Section V, was designed so that it would vanish to zeroth order in β . Scalar and tensor couplings do, however, give zeroth order contributions:

$$\langle \xi \rangle (1+a) \Sigma = -4 \operatorname{Re} f_s f_T^* - 2 |f_s|^2 - 2 |f_T|^2 + \mathcal{O}(\beta) \quad (18')$$

$$\langle \xi \rangle (1+a) \Pi = 4 |f_T|^2 + 4 \operatorname{Re} f_1 g_1^* + \mathcal{O}(\beta) \quad (19')$$

Comparing with eqs. (18) and (20), we see that a negative value of Σ can easily occur as a result of a scalar or tensor admixture.

We have performed a χ^2 fit to the experimental data using eqs. (9-13) and (9"-13"), taking the scalar and tensor contributions one at a time. The results are shown in Table VII. No error bars are quoted, because our discussion is qualitative.

The fit improves noticeably from that obtained in Section III, as expected. The scalar admixture shows the interesting feature that the V-A part remains close to what was obtained in previous fits and to the Cabibbo's model predictions. The price paid is a rather large scalar contribution. In contrast, the introduction of a tensor admixture favors a strong change in the f_2/f_1 ratio, too large to correspond to a small symmetry breaking deviation from Cabibbo's model. For the purpose of comparison, the discussion of ref. 25 about the contribution of S and T interactions to neutron β -decay can be consulted. There it was found that the A and V interactions predominate with a probable maximum contribution of about 30% of S and T interactions.

TABLE VII. Fitted Values of the Form Factors Allowing Scalar or Tensor

Admixtures.

f_1	f_2	g_1	g_2	f_s	f_T	χ^2	Degrees of Freedom	Prob.
0.31	0.15	0.17	0	0.18	0	0.02	1	88%
0.21	1.10	0.13	0	0	0.16	0.16	1	69%

VIII. FINAL REMARKS

We have studied the restrictions imposed by the Λ β -decay data under different assumptions. Our findings can be summarized as follows

a) There is a solution with $g_2 = 0$, near Cabibbo's predictions for g_1/f_1 and f_2/f_1 , but with low probability due to deviations of the ν -and e -asymmetries from the Cabibbo values.

b) Within the V-A framework, there is another solution which has $g_2 \neq 0$, this time with high probability, but with values of g_1 and f_2 which deviate considerably from Cabibbo's predictions.

c) The Λ β -decay data favors $g_2 \neq 0$ contributions that cannot be reconciled with small symmetry breaking, even when reasonable changes in the experimental value of the neutrino-asymmetry are considered.

d) Allowing some modifications to the pure V-A picture, it is interesting that the deviations between the ν -and e -asymmetries and the SU_3 scheme are rather naturally accounted for by an added scalar interaction.

It should be kept in mind that our conclusions are valid in as much as radiative corrections can be neglected.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express his gratitude to Professor R. Oehme for his invaluable help and patience. He would also like to thank Professor R. Winston for innumerable very useful discussions and suggestions and for providing him with data of Ref. 1 prior to publication, Professor W.K. Tung for discussions and A. Ferber and A. Hacinliyan for their kind assistance in the numerical computations. The author is indebted to SEDICT, Instituto Politecnico Nacional, Mexico for partial support.

REFERENCES

- 1) Argonne-Chicago-Ohio State-Washington University collaboration, paper submitted to the XVth International Conference on High Energy Physics, Kiev, August 26 - September 4, 1970.
- 2) CERN-Heidelberg collaboration, paper submitted to the XVth International Conference on High Energy Physics, Kiev, etc.
- 3) R. Oehme, R. Winston and A. Garcia, to be published in Phys. Rev.
- 4) S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. 112, 1375 (1958); N. Cabibbo, Phys. Letters 12, 137 (1964).
- 5) N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Letters 10, 531 (1963); M. Gell-Mann and M. Levy, Nuovo Cimento 16, 706 (1960); M. Gell-Mann, Physics 1, 63 (1964).
- 6) D. R. Harrington, Phys. Rev. 120, 1482 (1960); J. M. Watson and R. Winston, Phys. Rev. 181, 1907 (1969). These papers contain many further references.
- 7) The expression for the proton asymmetry is due mainly to R. Winston, the author thanks him for his generosity.
- 8) The very complete expressions of V. Linke, Nuclear Phys. B12, 669 (1969) should be consulted.
- 9) P. S. Desai, Phys. Rev. 179, 1327 (1969).
- 10) S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. 115, 481 (1959).
- 11) I. Bender, V. Linke and H. J. Rothe, Z. Physik 212 (1968) 190.
- 12) Barbaro-Galtieri, et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 42 87 (1970).

References (continued)

- 13) J. E. Maloney and B. Sechi-Zorn, Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 425 (1969).
- 14) R. J. Loveless, J. Canter, J. A. Cole, J. Lee-Franzini, P. Franzini, Bulletin Am. Phys. Soc. 14, 519 (1969).
- 15) V. G. Lind, T. O. Binford, M. L. Good and D. Stern, Phys. Rev. 135, B 1483 (1964).
- 16) C. Baglin, V. Brisson, A. Rousset, J. Six, H. H. Bingham et. al., Nuovo Cimento 35, 977 (1965).
- 17) M. Baggett, N. Baggett, F. Eisele, H. Filthuth, H. Frehse, V. Hepp, R. Howard, E. Leitner, G. Zech, Heidelberg preprint (to be published).
- 18) J. Barlow, J. M. Blair, G. Conforto, M. I. Ferrero, C. Rubbia, J. C. Sens, P. J. Duke, A. K. Mann, Phys. Letters 18, 64 (1965).
- 19) M. Ademollo and R. Gatto, Phys. Rev. Letters 13, 264 (1964).
- 20) R. Oehme and G. Segré, Phys. Letters 11, 94 (1964)
- 21) H. Filthuth, Talk at the Topical Conference on Weak Interactions, CERN, Geneva, 1969.
- 22) Ebenhöh, F. Eisele, H. Filthuth, W. Föhlisch, V. Hepp, E. Leitner, W. Presser, H. Schneider, T. Thouw, G. Zech, contributed paper to the XVth International Conference on High Energy Physics, Kiev. etc... and F. Eisele et. al. Z. Physik 225, 383 (1969).
- 23) P. H. Frampton and W. K. Tung, Enrico Fermi Institute report 70-65; and W. K. Tung, Enrico Fermi Institute report 70-65 (addendum) to be published.

References (cont.)

- 24) J. D. Jackson, S. B. Treiman and H. W. Wyld, Phys. Rev. 106, 517,
(1957).
- 25) M. T. Burgy, V. E. Krohn, T. B. Novey, G. R. Ringo and V. L. Telegdi,
Phys. Rev. 120, 1829 (1960).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Fig. 1. Electron-neutrino correlation as a function of g_1/f_1 and f_2/f_1 when $g_2 = 0$.
- Fig. 2. Electron asymmetry as a function of g_1/f_1 and f_2/f_1 when $g_2 = 0$.
- Fig. 3. Neutrino asymmetry as a function of g_1/f_1 and f_2/f_1 when $g_2 = 0$.
- Fig. 4. Proton asymmetry as a function of g_1/f_1 and f_2/f_1 when $g_2 = 0$.
- Fig. 5. Electron-neutrino correlation as a function of g_1/f_1 , f_2/f_1 and g_2/f_1 .
- Fig. 6. Electron asymmetry as a function of g_1/f_1 , f_2/f_1 , and g_2/f_1 .
- Fig. 7. Neutrino asymmetry as a function of g_1/f_1 , f_2/f_1 , and g_2/f_1 .
- Fig. 8. Proton asymmetry as a function of g_1/f_1 , f_2/f_1 , and g_2/f_1 .
- Fig. 9. Contours of $\chi^2 = \chi^2_{\min} + 1$ when $g_2 = 0$.
- Fig. 10. Dependence of Σ on g_1/f_1 , and f_2/f_1 when $g_2/f_1 = 2$.
- Fig. 11. Dependence of Σ on g_1/f_1 , and f_2/f_1 when $g_2/f_1 = 0$.
- Fig. 12. Dependence of Σ on g_1/f_1 , and f_2/f_1 when $g_2/f_1 = -2$.
- Fig. 13. Dependence of Π on g_1/f_1 and f_2/f_1 when $g_2/f_1 = 2$.
- Fig. 14. Dependence of Π on g_1/f_1 , and f_2/f_1 when $g_2/f_1 = 0$.
- Fig. 15. Dependence of Π on g_1/f_1 , and f_2/f_1 when $g_2/f_1 = -2$.
- Fig. 16. Contours of $\chi^2 = \chi^2_{\min} + 1$ when $g_2 \neq 0$.

Fig.1

Fig.2

Fig.3

Fig.4

Fig.5

Fig.6

Fig.7

Fig.8

Fig. 9

Fig.10

Fig.II

Fig.12

Fig.13

Fig.14

Fig.15

Fig.16