

# Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

## Recent Work

### Title

APPLICATION OF GENERAL THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES TO EXPERIMENTS - LECTURE 9  
ASYMMETRY OF STRANGE PARTICLE DECAYS, on the Assumption of Conservation of Parity

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3pb1b38g>

### Author

Goebel, Charles J.

### Publication Date

1956-07-17

UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA

*Radiation  
Laboratory*

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

*This is a Library Circulating Copy  
which may be borrowed for two weeks.  
For a personal retention copy, call  
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 5545*

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal 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 its 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, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Radiation Laboratory  
Berkeley, California

Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

APPLICATION OF GENERAL THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES TO  
EXPERIMENTS - LECTURE 9

ASYMMETRY OF STRANGE PARTICLE DECAYS.

on the Assumption of Conservation of Parity

Charles J. Goebel

July 17, 1956

on the Assumption of Conservation of Parity.

Charles J. Goebel

July 17, 1956

If a system of two particles is in an eigenstate of parity, its internal wave function satisfies  $\Psi(-\vec{x}) = \Psi(\vec{x})$  and therefore  $|\Psi(-\vec{x})|^2 = |\Psi(\vec{x})|^2$ , i.e., the angular distribution of the state is inversion-symmetric. Thus lack of inversion symmetry, ("asymmetry" for short) can result only from a state that is not a parity eigenstate. Such a state is not in general an eigenstate of energy, because in general energy is nondegenerate with respect to parity. Thus the state is a superposition of energy eigenstates, i.e.,  $\Psi = \alpha \Psi_0 + \beta \Psi_e$  where  $\Psi_{0,e}$  are eigenstates of both parity and energy. The phase between the two states rotates with a frequency  $E_0 - E_e (\hbar = 1)$ , thus the asymmetry averages to zero over a time long compared to  $(E_0 - E_e)^{-1}$ ; a condition then on the observability of an asymmetry is that the energy difference between the parity eigenstates be small compared with the (time of observation)<sup>-1</sup> (i.e., for a decay, the decay width.)

Lee and Yang have suggested, as a solution to the  $\tau - \theta$  difficulty, that "the K meson" (and therefore all particles with strangeness  $\pm 1$ ) is really a parity doublet, i.e., it consists of two states with opposite parity, which are degenerate with respect to the strong and electromagnetic interactions. They are, however, split by the weak decay interaction: the two parity-states decay into different states of ordinary particles, and these different states, when serving as virtual intermediate states, produce different self-energy shifts. One expects, then, that the energy difference between the parity states is of the same order as their lifetime; thus it is possible that asymmetric decay from strange particles would be observable. (Below we will see qualitatively the effect on the asymmetry of the ratio of energy differences between the two parity states.) We have also other factors necessary

for observable asymmetry, let us look in detail at a particular process:

$$K^- e p \rightarrow \pi^+ \Sigma^+$$

Choose the axis of quantization, the "z-axis," to be along the line of flight of the  $\Sigma$ , then we have  $m_z = 0$  (for if  $m_z \neq 0$ , the  $\Sigma$  could not be going along the z-axis:  $P_{\ell}^{m_z \neq 0}(\cos \theta = \pm 1) = 0$ ). Therefore  $m_j = m_s = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ , if for simplicity we take  $s_{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2}$ . Write, when  $m_j = \frac{1}{2}$ , the  $\Sigma$  state function as  $\Psi_{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} = h_0 \Psi_{\Sigma_0}^{\frac{1}{2}} + h_e \Psi_{\Sigma_e}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  ( $|h_0|^2 + |h_e|^2 = 1$ ), i.e.,  $h_{0(e)}$  is the amplitude for a  $\Sigma_{0(e)}$  to be going along the z axis. To conserve parity, the  $\Sigma_0$  decays to  $\pi N$  in an S state, with wave function  $\delta_0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  where  $\delta_0$  is proportional to the matrix element for decay (this is discussed in more detail below); the  $\Sigma_e$  decays to  $\pi N$  in a P state, with wave function

$$\delta_e \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus the state  $\Psi_{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}$  decays into

$$\Psi_{\pi N}^{\frac{1}{2}} = h_0 \delta_0 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + h_e \delta_e \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_0 + \omega_e \cos \theta \\ \omega_e \sin \theta e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\omega = h\delta$ . The angular distribution therefore is

$$\left| \Psi_{\pi N}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 = |\omega_0|^2 + |\omega_e|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(\omega_0^* \omega_e) \cos \theta,$$

which exhibits the asymmetry. The question now is, will this asymmetry persist when we average over initial spin  $m_j = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ ? To answer this, we must find  $\Psi^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , if  $\Psi^{+\frac{1}{2}}$  is given. Lee and Yang constructed  $\Psi^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  by a reflection, say  $Y \rightarrow -Y$ . This reverses  $J_z$  (e.g.,

$$L_z = xP_y - yP_x \rightarrow x(-P_y) - (-Y)P_x = -L_z$$

and thus turns  $m_j = \frac{1}{2}$  into  $m_j = -\frac{1}{2}$ , but leaves  $\theta$  and therefore the angular distribution  $|\Psi|^2$  unchanged.

However, we have made an implicit assumption, that the amplitudes  $h_{0,e}$  did not change under the reflection, i.e., that they transform like scalars; a pseudoscalar would change sign under the reflection (which is inversion times a proper rotation). As an example of the latter situation, consider the following model for the production of the  $\Sigma$ : The K-capture reaction goes through a single orbital channel, so that  $\Sigma_0$  comes only from the capture of a  $K_0$ , and a  $\Sigma_e$  comes from a  $K_e$  (or vice versa). Now, under reflection, the wave functions of the initial states change sign relative to each other, since they are of opposite parity; thus the wave functions of the  $\chi_{\Sigma_{0,e}}$  states must change sign relative to one another, i.e., the coefficients  $h_{0,e}$ . Thus in this case the asymmetry reverses under the reflection, so that averaging over initial spin destroys the asymmetry. In general, interference between states of different parity does not yield an asymmetric  $\Sigma$ -decay.

Thus we consider the  $\Sigma_{0,e}$  to come from the same state (or at least from states of the same parity); this of course requires that the  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Sigma_e$  come out in different orbital states, to conserve parity.

Note: this implies that the scheme of coupling the K mesons to other particles is not the most economical possible. The latter would be the coupling of K to baryon in a single orbital state; i.e., (taking as above  $s_\Sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $s_K = 0$ )

$$\begin{array}{l}
 N \rightarrow \Sigma_0 K_0, \quad N \rightarrow \Sigma_e K_e \\
 \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{or} \\ N \rightarrow \Sigma_e K_e \end{array} \right) \quad \text{in an S state or} \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{or} \\ N \rightarrow \Sigma_0 K_0 \end{array} \right) \quad \text{in a P state,}
 \end{array}$$

but not both. As we see, an asymmetry in the  $\Sigma$  decay would imply the existence of both couplings (and therefore of a  $K_0 K_e \pi^+$  coupling, as recommended by Schwinger.)

For example, if the reaction  $K^- P \rightarrow \pi \Sigma^+$  goes through a  $j^{P\pi}$  state where  $j = \frac{1}{2}$  is even the  $\Sigma_{e(0)}$  must be in an odd (even) orbital state, i.e.,  $0 \rightarrow 1$  (or  $1 \rightarrow 0$ ). We can avoid questions of parity here by deriving

from  $\psi^{+\frac{1}{2}}$ , not by reflection, but by application of the standard lowering operator  $J_x - iJ_y$ . The essential point is that the coefficients  $\eta_{0(e)}$  are proportional to the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients  $C_{j+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}(j, \frac{1}{2}; 0, \frac{1}{2})$ ; under the lowering operation, the  $\eta_{0,e}$  become  $\eta'_{0,e}$ , proportional to

$$C_{j-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}(j, -\frac{1}{2}; 0, -\frac{1}{2}) = (-)^{j-\frac{1}{2}} C_{j+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}(j, \frac{1}{2}; 0, \frac{1}{2})$$

so that the relative sign of the  $\eta'_{0,e}$  is opposite to the relative sign of the  $\eta_{0,e}$ . Since under the lowering operation we have

$$\chi_{\pi N}^{+\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_0 + \eta_e \cos \theta \\ \eta_e \sin \theta e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \chi_{\pi N}^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta'_e \sin \theta e^{-i\phi} \\ \eta'_0 - \eta'_e \cos \theta \end{pmatrix},$$

the asymmetry is the same for both initial spin states.

As we said above,  $\delta_{0,e}$  is proportional to the matrix element for decay; in the somewhat symbolic way we have been writing things, we have

$$\delta_0 = e^{i\zeta_0} \sqrt{\lambda_0} e^{-\frac{\lambda_0 t}{2} + im_0 t} \quad (\text{similarly for } e), \text{ so that}$$

$$|\chi_{\pi N}|^2 = \lambda_0 e^{-\lambda_0 t} \text{ is the flux of decay states: } \int |\chi|^2 dt = 1.$$

The matrix element for decay is real, except for the phase shift due to final-state interaction between the  $\pi$  and  $N$ , just as in photo-production (see Takeda, Phys. Rev. 101, 1547 (1956)); we here ignore the phases  $\zeta_{0,e}$  considering them to be lumped in with the  $\eta_{0,e}$ , which are unknown anyway. The time dependence of the  $\delta_{0,e}$  would be irrelevant if the lifetimes and masses of the  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Sigma_e$  were equal. The qualitative effect of their inequality is clear: if one decays quickly and the other slowly, there won't be much interference between the two; if the mass difference is large compared with the decay width, the phase between the  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Sigma_e$  states averages to zero, as discussed above.



If the angular distribution is written as  $A + 2B \cos \theta$ , the asymmetry, defined by

$$a \equiv \frac{(\text{no. fore}) - (\text{no. aft})}{(\text{no. fore}) + (\text{no. aft})}, \text{ equals } \frac{B}{A}.$$

We have

$$A(t) = |\omega_o|^2 + |\omega_e|^2 = |h_o|^2 \lambda_o e^{-\lambda_o t} + |h_e|^2 \lambda_e e^{-\lambda_e t},$$

$$B(t) = \text{Re}(\omega_o^* \omega_e) = \text{Re}(h_o^* h_e e^{i\Delta t}) \sqrt{\lambda_o \lambda_e} e^{-\bar{\lambda} t}$$

where

$$\Delta = E_o - E_e \approx m \epsilon_o - m \epsilon_e$$

$$\bar{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda_o + \lambda_e}{2}$$

Writing

$$\phi = \arg h_e - \arg h_o, \text{ we have}$$

$$B(t) = |h_o h_e| \cos(\phi + \Delta t) \sqrt{\lambda_o \lambda_e} e^{-\bar{\lambda} t}.$$

These are fluxes; integrating over time gives us

$$A = |h_o|^2 + |h_e|^2 \equiv 1,$$

$$B = |h_o h_e| \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_o \lambda_e} (\bar{\lambda} \cos \phi - \Delta \sin \phi)}{\bar{\lambda}^2 + \Delta^2} = a.$$

Here  $a$  is a maximum when  $h_o = h_e$ ,  $\lambda_o = \lambda_e$ , and  $\Delta = 0$ :  $a \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ; this is consistent with the intuitive discussion above, and with the fact that the asymmetry results from the interference between the reaction going through the two channels.

The  $\Sigma^-$  decays into  $\pi^- n$ ; if we take the angle between the lines of flight of the  $\pi^-$  and the  $\Sigma^-$  to define the asymmetry, the question arises what choice of the angle for  $\pi^+ n$  and  $\pi^0 p$

will yield the same asymmetry? This question amounts to asking for the relative signs of the decay matrix elements; in terms of i-spin eigenstates we have

$$\psi_{\Sigma^-} \rightarrow \delta_3 \psi_{\pi^- n}$$

$$\psi_{\Sigma^+} \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{2} \delta_3 - \delta_1}{3} \psi_{\pi^0 p} + \frac{\delta_3 + \sqrt{2} \delta_1}{3} \psi_{\pi^+ n}$$

If the spin of the  $\Sigma$  is not  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the analysis is the same as above, except that in addition to the average over  $m_j = \pm |m_j|$  (which, as above, is trivial:  $|\psi^{m_j}|^2 = |\psi^{-m_j}|^2$ ) we must average over

$|m_j| = \frac{1}{2}, \dots, j$ . For example, if  $s_{\Sigma} = 3/2$ , then we have

$$\sum_{o(e)} \rightarrow (\pi N)_{\text{state}} \text{ (P state)}.$$

For

$$|m_j| = 3/2 : \psi^{3/2} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \omega_0^3 \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \cos \theta e^{i\phi} \\ \sin^2 \theta e^{2i\phi} \end{pmatrix} + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \omega_e^3 \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \theta e^{i\phi} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$|\psi^{3/2}|^2 = \frac{3}{2} \sin^2 \theta \left[ |\omega_0^3|^2 + |\omega_e^3|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\omega_0^{3*} \omega_e^3) \cos \theta \right]$$

For

$$|m_j| = \frac{1}{2} : \psi^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}} \omega_0 \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2 \theta - \frac{1}{3} \\ \sin \theta \cos \theta e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix} + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \omega_e \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \frac{-\sin \theta e^{i\phi}}{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$|\psi^{\frac{1}{2}}|^2 = \frac{3}{2} \left[ (|\omega_0|^2 + \left| \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}} \omega_e \right|^2) (\cos^2 \theta + \frac{1}{3}) \right.$$

$$\left. + 2 \operatorname{Re}(\omega_0^* \sqrt{\frac{3}{4}} \omega_e) \left( \frac{5}{3} - 2 \cos^2 \theta \right) \cos \theta \right]$$