### **Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory**

**Recent Work**

#### **Title**

Absolute Decay Rate from K2O -->  $pi + pi$ - pio and the bar DELTA I over --> bar = 1/2 Rule

**Permalink** <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5s62s31b>

**Journal** Physical Review Letters, 12(16)

#### **Authors**

Stern, Donald Binford, Thomas O. Lind, V. Gordon [et al.](https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5s62s31b#author)

### **Publication Date**

1964-02-04

## University of California

# Ernest O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory

ABSOLUTE DECAY RATE FROM  $K_2^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^- + \pi^0$ <br>AND THE  $|\Delta \vec{l}| = 1/2$  RULE

#### **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** 

Rept. submitted for pub. in the Physical Review Letters.

UCRL-11247

#### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Berkeley, California

AEC Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

# ABSOLUTE DECAY RATE FROM  $K_2^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^- + \pi^0$ <br>AND THE  $|\Delta \vec{l}| = 1/2$  RULE

Donald Stern, Thomas O. Binford, V. Gordon Lind, Jared A. Anderson, Frank S. Crawford, Jr., and Robert L. Golden

February  $4.1964$ 

*t* 

### **ABSOLUTE DECAY RATE FOR**   $\Delta \overline{M} = 1/2$  **I**

Donald Stern. \* **Thomas 0.** Binford, and V. Gordon Lind University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

**and** 

Jared A. Anderson. **Frank** S. Crawford. Jr.. and Robert L. **Golden** 

**Lawrence** Radiation Laboratory. **University** of California Berkeley, California

February 4. 1964

In this Letter **wc** describe a measurement of **the** absolute decay rate  $\Gamma_2$  (+-0)  $\equiv \Gamma$  (K<sub>2</sub><sup>0</sup>  $\rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^0$ ). Our result is based on 16 events of the type  $\int_0^{\infty} p \cdot A K^0$  followed by  $A \rightarrow p\pi^*$  and  $K_{\infty}$ <sup>4</sup>  $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ , and 2608 double-vee events  $\pi^* p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$  with  $\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^*$  and  $K_i^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-.$  We find

$$
\Gamma_2 (+ - 0) = (2.90 \pm 0.72) \times 10^6 \text{ sec}^{-1}
$$
 (1)

This result can be compared with the prediction of the  $|\tilde{\Delta I}| = 1/2$  rule for  $\text{nonleptonic decays. that } \Gamma_{\alpha}(\textbf{+}\textbf{-}0) \text{ and } \Gamma(\textbf{+}00) \equiv \Gamma(\text{K}^{\dagger} \textbf{-} \textbf{-} \textbf{n}^{\dagger} \textbf{-} \textbf{n}^0) \text{ are } \Gamma(\textbf{+}0)$ **i** <sup>I</sup> related by<sup>1</sup>

 $\Gamma_2(+\cdot 0) = 2(1.032) \Gamma(+00)$  , (2)

where **the** factor 1.032 corrects for small **mass** differences. Equation (2) holds for any linear combination of the three  $I = 1$  three-pion states.<sup>1, 2</sup> Taking  $\Gamma$ (+00) from a compilation of  $K^+$  branching ratios and lifetimes, <sup>3</sup>  $\mathbb{R}^2$ one obtains the prediction of the  $|\Delta I| = 1/2$  rule,

$$
\Gamma_2(+0) = (2.87 \pm 0.23) \times 10^6 \text{ sec}^{-1}.
$$
 (3)

The excellent agreement between our experimental result **(i)** and the prediction (3) shows that the  $|\Delta \vec{l}| = 1/2$  rule is well satisfied.<sup>4</sup>

The ratio  $\Gamma_2$ (+ - 0)/ $\Gamma$  (+ 00) affords a sensitive test of the  $|\Delta \vec{I}| = 1/2$ rule. To exhibit this sensitivity we parameterize the effect of a small  $|\Delta \overline{I}| = 3/2$  amplitude  $A_{3/2}$  for  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$  under the assumption that the dominant A 1 = 2 amplitude **leads** to the symmetrical I = **i** three-pion  $\overline{C}$ state, but with no such restriction on the  $|\Delta I| = 3/2$  amplitude. Then, if  $\left| \frac{A_{3/2}}{A_{4/2}} \right|^2$  is neglected, our experimental result expressed in the notation of reference 2 becomes

$$
\sqrt{2} \text{ Re } (A_3/2 / A_1/2) = \frac{2(1.032) \Gamma(+00) - \Gamma_2(+0)}{4(1.032) \Gamma(+00) + \Gamma_2(+0)}
$$
 (4)

$$
= 0.00 \pm 0.09 \cdot \tag{5}
$$

he remainder of this paper is concerned with experimental details.

The Alvarez 72-inch hydrogen bubble chamber **was** exposed to **a**beams with momenta bstween 1035 and **1325 ~eV/c.** All film was scanned for single and double vees which were analyzed using the least-squares fitting program **KICK.** For tho present experiment events of the **type**   $\pi^* p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$  were used;  $\pi^* p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^0$  events were not used. All single- $\Lambda$  events were rescanned along the direction of the unobserved  $K^0$ , as predicted by the fitting program. We believe that the resulting overall efficiency for finding associated K decaya is nearly 100%. \

Most of the double vees fit the hypothesis  $\pi^* p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$  with  $\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^-$  and **t- K: -w** a . Those within **the** fiducid volume that fail because the assumption  $\mathbf{x}_1^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-.$  Those within the fiducial volume that fail because the assumption<br> $\mathbf{x}_2^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-.$  fails are analyzed as follows. The fitted parameters for the decay  $\Lambda$ +p $\pi$ <sup>\*</sup> are propagated to the production vertex. At the production vertex we perform a 3-constraint (3-C) fit using the decay-fitted  $\Lambda$ , the incident  $\pi^*$ ,

and the measured direction of the K<sup>0</sup> as determined from the two-point neutral track. We accept events with production  $\chi^2$  (3-C) < 25.<sup>6</sup> The K<sup>0</sup> **momentum** vector **is then well known and** is **used as** input information for **the**  following hypotheses:

**2**. **K**<sup>o</sup>  $\div \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^0$  (1-C,  $\pi^0$  unseen). For  $\chi^2$  (1-C) < 10, the decay is a  $\tau^0$ candidate. About five events having an obvious  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$  track are discarded. There are then 20 candidates.

**B.**  $K_4^0 \rightarrow 2\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+e^- \gamma \pi^0$ . We assume that the charged tracks are electrons and calculate their invariant mass  $m(e^+e^-)$ . For  $m(e^+e^-) < 85$  MeV, the **event** is to be discarded, **udese we can** prove by other **means** that this hypotheeis is wrong. We **expect** a total of about 32 Dalitz **decays** in the entirg experiment, and of these we expect  $99\%$  to have  $m(e^+e^+)$  < 85 MeV.<sup>7</sup> None of **the** candidates **is** discarded,

**2**. <u>K<sup>o</sup> +  $\pi_1 v$ </u>,  $\pi e v$ , or  $\pi \pi y$  (1-C fit). Candidate 1720440 has  $\chi^2(\pi^+ e^- v) = 2.6$  $2 \tan \frac{x^2}{\pi} \pi^+ \pi^-\pi^0$ ) = 2.9; candidate 1739122 has  $\chi^2(\pi^+ e^- \nu) = 0.3$ ,  $\chi^2(\pi^+ \pi^-\pi^0) = 6.2$ . Gap counting on the negative track unambiguously proves these events both are  $x^2(\mu^+\pi^-\nu) = 0.0$  and  $\chi^2(\pi^+\pi^-\nu) = 3.8$ ; gap-counting does not resolve the ambiguity. From our  $1-C \chi^2$  distribution.  ${\mathbf r}$  **f (reference 8)** we bet 14 to 2 against  ${\pi^{\dagger}} {\pi^{\dagger}} {\pi^0}$ . In addition, any completely **ambiguous 3**-body decay would have a priori about  $5/4$  odds against  $\pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^0$  on the basis of known branching ratio's. **We should perhaps** count **thie as** 1/35 **event; instead we discard the candidate,** Candidate 1458048 **ia nearly unmeasurable and is** completely **ambfguoua.** It **should** perhaps count **aa** 0.2 events, but we discard it. None of the remaining  $16 \tau^6$  candidates is ambiguous.

**D.**  $K_4^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ ;  $\pi^+$  (or  $\pi^+$ ) suffers a small (unobserved) scatter. We delete the  $\pi^+$  (or  $\pi^2$ ) and fit (1-C) to the hypothesis  $K_1^0 - \pi^+$  (unmeasured)  $+ \pi$ <sup>2</sup> (measured) (and also with the signs reversed). For  $\chi^2(1-C) < 10$ , the

 $-3-$ 

**1 I** 

**event is a possible Coulomb scatter.** However, we do not reject the event as **a**  $\tau^0$  candidate unless the **"scattered"** pion satisfies  $(\mathbf{p}\beta)_{\text{fitted}}$   $\theta$  fitted  $\theta$  measured  $|\leq 2000$  (MeV/c) deg. This condition is chosen **after considering the** form **wd ~n;;gnituda of tho Rutherford-scattering cross**  section, so that out of 3000 normal double vees, only a calculated 0.3 off. This cutoff also eliminates  $K_A^0 \sim \pi^+ \pi^-$  decays followed by a small-angle  $K_4^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$  decays followed by a single Coulomb scatter will fail to be cut decay  $\pi^2 + \mu^2 \nu$  in flight. Small-angle nuclear scatters are also eliminated, but in any case they are estimated to be negligible. None of the  $16 \tau^0$ candidates are rejected by this cutoff.

We are left with  $16 \tau^0$  events. There are no correction factors for lost I **or cutoff events.** *The* **charactarintico of the events are exhibited in Tabla I.,',**  Their time distribution is shown in Fig. 1. There is no evidence for an enhanced  $\tau^0$  decay rate within the first  $K_i^0$  mean life. This agrees with the expectation that the rate for  $K_4^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$  is negligible compared to that for  $K_2^0 - \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ . <sup>9</sup> We therefore use all of the  $\tau^0$  decays, including those within a few  $K_A^0$  mean lives.

The **rate**  $\Gamma_2$ (+-0) is equal to 1.014 N(+-0)/ $T_2$ , where  $T_2$  is the total of the  $K_2^0$  flight times in the fiducial volume, and  $N(+-0) = 16$  is the **number of observed**  $\tau^0$  **decays.<sup>10</sup>** We obtain  $T<sub>2</sub>$  by using the 2608 **acceptable normal double vees.** The acceptance criteria for  $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi$  are **independent of the K** decay mode. For a given acceptable  $\Lambda$ , the probability of obtaining an acceptable  $K_f^0 + \pi^+ \pi^-$  decay and hence an acceptable double vee is given by  $P = (1/2) B [\exp(-t_0/\tau_1) - \exp(-t_1/\tau_1)].$ Here the factor  $1/2$  arises from  $||K^0||^2 = (1/2) ||K_1^0||^2 + (1/2) ||K_2^0||^2$ , B is  $\Gamma(K_1^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)/\Gamma(K_2^0 \rightarrow \text{all } 2\pi) = 0.725$ ,  $^{11} \tau_1$  is  $0.90 \times 10^{-10}$  sec, <sup>12</sup> and **t<sub>0</sub>** and **t<sub>1</sub>** are the minimum and maximum acceptance times for

 $K_4^0$  +  $\pi^+ \pi^*$ .<sup>13</sup> Corresponding to an accepted normal double vee, the average number of acceptable  $\Lambda$ 's is  $1/P$ , and their expected contribution to  $T_2$  is  $(1/2)$   $(1/P)$   $t<sub>1</sub>$ ,  $^{14}$  We then obtain  $T<sub>2</sub>$  by summing over all acceptable normal double vees,  $T_2 = \Sigma (1/2) (1/P) t_1 = B^{-1} \Sigma [\exp(-t_0/\tau_1) - \exp(-t_1/\tau_1)]^{-1} t_1$ . <sup>15</sup> We find B T<sub>2</sub> =  $4.06 \times 10^{-6}$  sec. Our final result is  $\Gamma_2$ (+-0) = (1.014) 16/[4.06 × 10<sup>-6</sup>/0.725] = (2.90 ± 0.72) × 10<sup>6</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup>.

**It is a pleasure to acknowledge the advice and encouragement of Luis W. Alvarez. We are indebted to** Gideon **Alexander and Silyerio P. Almeida**  *5*  for their contributions to the experiment, and to our scanners and measurers **for their excellent work.** 

#### **FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES**



5. The decay rate  $\Gamma_2$ (+-0) can also be obtained indirectly by combining the **K**<sub>2</sub><sup><sup>0</sup> lifetime  $\tau_2$  with the branching ratios  $v = \Gamma_2(000)/\Gamma_2(\text{ch})$  and</sup>

 $-7-$ 

 $\lambda = \Gamma_2$ (+ - 0)/ $\Gamma_2$ (ch), under the assumption that there are no additional unobserved neutral modes, like  $K_2^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ . R. H. Dalitz, Proc. Brookhaven Conf. on Weak Interactions (Brookhaven National Laboratory, September 1963), has combined the available data on  $r_2$ ,  $v_1$ , and  $\lambda$ from eight different experiments, to obtain  $\Gamma_2(+0) = (1.93 \pm 0.35) \times 10^6 \text{ sec}^{-1}$ . This result differs by 2.3 standard deviations from the prediction of Eq. (3). In the notation of Eq. (4), it corresponds to

 $\sqrt{2}$  Re  $(A_{3/2}/A_{1/2}) = 0.12 \pm 0.06$ .

 $6.$ 

- The 3-C production  $\chi^2$  distribution for the final 16  $\tau^0$  events is as follows:  $x^2 = 0$  to 3.67, 8 events (we expect 11.20); 3.67 to 7.82, 5 events (we expect 4.00); 7.82 to 16.27, 3 events (we expect 0.78); > 16.2, zero events (we expect 0.02). Thus the expected and observed  $\chi^2$  distributions are in excellent agreement. Since  $\Lambda$  production and decay occurs only about once in 30 pictures, there is only one chance in 900 of finding a 3-body  $K^0$ decay with a possibly ambiguous origin. (We do not use single-vee  $3$ -body  $K^0$  decays.)
- N. P. Samios, Phys. Rev. 121, 275 (1961).
- 8. The 1-C decay  $\chi^2$  distribution for the 16 final  $\tau^0$  events is as follows: for  $\chi^2 = 0$  to 1.07, 7 events (we expect 11.2); 1.07 to 3.84, 7 events (expect 4.00); 3.84 to 6.63, 2 events (expect 0.64); > 6.63, zero events (expect 0.02).
- The decay  $K_1^0 \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^0$  is forbidden for totally symmetric  $3\pi$  states, 9. and the contribution from nonsymmetric states is expected to be small because of angular-momentum barrier effects. See for instance, S. Treiman and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. 116, 239 (1959).
- The mean decay distance for  $K_2$  is large compared to the bubble chamber.  $10.$ A small correction factor of 1.014 arises from the total attenuation by

decay of the K<sub>2</sub><sup>'s</sup>. The attenuation by interaction in the hydrogen is even **less Important and** is neglected.

- 11, This **ie** our **weighted average** of **the** compilation by M, Chretien, V. K. Fischer, H. R. Crouch, Jr., R. E. Lanou, Jr., J. T. Massimo, **A.** M, Shapiro, **J. P.** Averell, A, **E, Brenner,** D. **R.** Firth, L. **G. Hymrm,** M. **E. Law, R, W.** Milburn, E. **E,** Ronat, K. Strauch, **J.** C. **Strsot, J. J.** Sayrnanolci, **L.** Guerriero, I. A. Ploss, L. Rosenson, **and**  Hyman, M. E. Law, R. H. Milburn, E. E. Ronat, K. Strau<br>Street, J. J. Szymanski, L. Guerriero, I. A. Pless, L. Ro<br>G. A. Salandin, in Phys. Rev. 131, 2208 (1963), Table IV.<br>This is our weighted average of the compilation by
- 12, **Thie** is our **weighted** average of **the** compilation by **Frank** S. Crawford, Jr., in **Proceedings** of **the** 1962 International Conference on High-Energy-**Physics** at **CERN (CERN,** Geneva, 1962), p. 839.
- 13. In the film analyzed at Wisconsin  $t_0 = 0$  was used. At Berkeley  $t_0$ corresponded to a cutoff at  $0.8$  cm. The time  $t<sub>1</sub>$  is the potential proper time corresponding to **the** decay fiducial volume. **The** production fiducial volume is **slightly smaller than the** decay fiducial volume, **so that** large values of  $1/P$  are excluded.
- 14. We impose no  $t_0$  cutoff for  $\tau^0$  decays.
- 15. In reference 3, the procedure was to use all of the acceptable  $\Lambda$  decays, irrespective of whether there is an acceptable  $K_1^0$  decay, and sum over the calculated potential  $K^0$  times. In that case one need not use the value of B, However, B is extremely well **known,'** 80 that **the** two methods are equivalent. **Thie** was verified by comparing **the** methods in the film analyzed at Berkeley (75% of the total).

**<sup>2</sup>Table** I, **Details of the decays. IX**<sup>2</sup> Details of the accays.  $X_n$ **is for the production (3-C),**   $X_d^2$  is for the decay (1-C);  $P_K \circ (\text{lab})$  is obtained from the production fit;  $t_{K^0}$  is the  $K_{2^0}$  proper time from production to **decay. T+, T-. and To are the decay pion** ,?-' ay.  $T_{+}$ ,  $T_{-}$ , and  $T_{0}$  are the decay pion<br>inetic energies in the  $K_{2}^{0}$  rest frame.



 $-10-$ 

'

#### **FIGURE LEGEND**

**Fig.** 1. Proper time distribution of  $K_2^0 + \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$  events. The vertical **lines.givc the individual times of the 16 eventa. The ernooth curve is their expected tima distribution: its ehape is entirely deierminad by <sup>r</sup> the fiducid' volume and the** ' **KO momentum distribution, because**  attenuation of the  $K_2^0$  by decay is almost negligible.<sup>10</sup> The histogram **of the 16 evente has the same normalization aa the smboth curve. <sup>L</sup>**

I **,I P,** 



This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or
- B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.