UCRL 8580
cy 3

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.

For publication in Phys Rev. Letters

UCRL-8580

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California

Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

EXPERIMENTAL DETERMINATION OF THE Λ SPIN

Frank S. Crawford, Jr., Marcello Cresti, Myron L. Good
M. Lynn Stevenson, and Harold K. Ticho

December 30, 1958

Printed for the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

EXPERIMENTAL DETERMINATION OF THE Λ SPIN*

Frank S. Crawford, Jr., Marcello Cresti,† Myron L. Good
M. Lynn Stevenson, and Harold K. Ticho §

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California

December 30, 1958

Lee and Yang have recently proposed a method of determining the Λ spin.[1] In this Letter we apply their method to a sample of 614 decays of the type

$$\Lambda \rightarrow \pi^- + p. \qquad (1)$$

The Λ's were produced in our 10-inch liquid hydrogen bubble chamber via the reaction

$$\pi^- + p \rightarrow K^0 + \Lambda, \qquad (2)$$

by incident pions of momenta 1.23 Bev/c (184 events), 1.12 Bev/c (253 events), 1.09 Bev/c (53 events), 1.03 Bev/c (94 events), and 0.95 Bev/c (30 events.).

The beauty of the Lee-Yang method is that it makes possible an absolute determination of the Λ spin <u>without</u> <u>assumptions</u> other than that angular momentum is conserved in the Λ decay.[2] This can be contrasted with the method of Adair,[3] in which details of the production reaction (2) must be considered in order to reach a conclusion about the Λ spin. In particular, assumptions must be made as to the final orbital angular-momentum states present in the $K^0 + \Lambda$ system. Similarly, assumptions must be made about the K^0 spin, and a selection of the data made accordingly; the lower the assumed K^0 spin, the more data one can use. For instance, F. Eisler et al.[4] have applied the Adair analysis to their associated production data and have concluded that the Λ spin is 1/2, provided that the K^0 spin is zero, and provided that only S, P, and D waves are important in the $K^0 + \Lambda$ system.

The disadvantage of the Lee-Yang method is that a very large amount of data is needed in order to achieve conclusive results.[5]

* This work was performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.
† Now at Istituto di Fisica, Universita di Padova, Padova, Italy.
§ Now at University of California at Los Angeles.

The Lee-Yang method depends for its success upon the very large up-down asymmetry found[6, 7, 8] in the parity-nonconserving decay (1) of Λ's produced in Reaction (2). In principle, one starts with any collection of Λ's, chooses a quantization direction in any way that is independent of the decay (1), and then examines the decay distribution $W(\xi)d\xi$, where ξ denotes the cosine of the angle between the (negative) decay pion and the quantization direction-all in the Λ rest frame. For a Λ spin J, $W(\xi)$ is in general a polynomial with powers up to and including ξ^{2J}. One might suppose that a given experimental ξ distribution could always be more easily fitted to large spin J than to small spin, since then more coefficients are available for "curve fitting." However, angular-momentum conservation severely constrains the coefficients. In fact, a very large up-down decay asymmetry cannot be achieved with a large spin. (This can be understood qualitatively through the observation that, classically, the disintegration of a system of high spin tends to yield fragments moving in the equatorial plane rather than towards the poles.)

The constraints on the shape of $W(\xi)$ can be summarized through the Lee-Yang test functions $T_{J,M}(\xi)$, all of which satisfy the inequality

$$\langle T_{J,M} \rangle \leq 1, \tag{3}$$

where the bracket denotes averaging over the decay distribution $W(\xi)$, and where $M = J, J-1, \ldots, -J$.

For spin $J = 1/2$, the decay distribution is

$$W(\xi)d\xi = \frac{1}{2}d\xi(1 + a\xi). \tag{4}$$

The test functions are $T_{1/2, \pm 1/2} = \pm 3\xi$, so that one has $\langle T_{1/2, \pm 1/2} \rangle = \pm a$, and the Lee-Yang inequality (3) reduces to $-1 \leq a \leq 1$.

For Λ spn $J = 3/2$, the decay distribution is a cubic in ξ. The four test functions are

$$T_{3/2, 3/2} = 9P_1(\xi) + 5P_2(\xi) - (7/3)P_3(\xi), \tag{5}$$

$$T_{3/2, 1/2} = 3P_1(\xi) - 5P_2(\xi) + 7P_3(\xi), \tag{6}$$

and $T_{3/2, -3/2}$ and $T_{3/2, -1/2}$, which are obtained by substituting $-\xi$ for ξ in Eqs. (5) and (6). The $P_k(\xi)$ are Legendre polynomials. Similar test functions are constructed for spin 5/2, 7/2, etc.

To illustrate the method, suppose the Λ spin were really 1/2, and that we had a decay sample with the maximum possible asymmetry, that is with $a = 1$. Then we would find (with enough data so that statistical fluctuations were negligible) $\langle T_{3/2, \pm 3/2} \rangle = \pm 3a = \pm 3$, and $\langle T_{3/2, \pm 1/2} \rangle = \pm a = \pm 1$. The first of these fails to satisfy the inequality (3), and spin 3/2 would thereby be ruled out. The other three spin-3/2 test functions satisfy the inequality and yield no information. We notice that a sample of spin-1/2 Λ's having $|a| \leq 1/3$ would satisfy all four of the spin-3/2 Lee-Yang inequalities, and therefore would be useless for application of the method.

We now consider the way in which the sample of Λ decays is obtained. For the method to succeed, the preceding example shows that one needs a sample with a large asymmetry with respect to the quantization axis. On the other hand, in order to obtain an unbiased sample it is of primary importance not to select the Λ's or the quantization axis in a manner which involves "peeking" at the decay ξ values. With these considerations in mind, we naturally choose a priori a quantization axis perpendicular to the production plane of Reaction (2), along $\vec{P}(\pi \text{ incident}) \times \vec{P}(\Lambda)$. We naturally exclude, a priori, from our sample any Λ's produced via $\pi^- + p \rightarrow K^0 + \Sigma^0$, $\Sigma^0 \rightarrow \gamma + \Lambda$. The question arises whether we should include the entire range of c.m. angles in the production Reaction (2), or, as suggested by Lee and Yang,[1] include only a region centered at 90° (c.m.), where the polarization might be expected to be largest. We believe that it is very difficult to justify such a limitation, since in order to decide on the range of angles to be included one becomes involved either in a posteriori "peeking at the data," or in making implicit a priori assumptions as to the maximum angular complexity and thus as to the maximum number of partial waves involved in the $K^0 + \Lambda$ state. The former biases the distribution, and the latter spoils the beauty of the assumption-free Lee-Yang method. We therefore include the entire range of production angles. Similarly, the question arises whether we should include all incident-pion production energies, or only those in which the decay asymmetry appears to be largest. Since we have no a priori knowledge as to the energy dependence of the Λ polarization, we would be at the mercy of statistical fluctuations, with a consequent large chance for bias, if we excluded some datum because of its small observed up-down asymmetry. We therefore include, a priori, all production energies.

Finally we present the results. For each event, ξ is obtained from detailed dynamical analysis. Then $T_{3/2,\ 3/2}(\xi)$ is calculated for each event, by using Eq. (5). Then (omitting the 3/2, 3/2 subscripts), $\langle T \rangle = (1/N)\,\Sigma T(\xi) \pm \left[(1/N)(\langle T^2 \rangle - \langle T \rangle^2)\right]^{1/2}$, where $\langle T^2 \rangle = (1/N)\,\Sigma T^2(\xi)$, and N = 614 is the total number of events. The other test functions are calculated analogously. Our 614 events yield

$$\langle T_{1/2,\,1/2} \rangle = 0.57 \pm 0.066,$$
$$\langle T_{3/2,\,3/2} \rangle = 1.77 \pm 0.244,$$
$$\langle T_{5/2,\,5/2} \rangle = 2.99 \pm 0.408.$$

Thus a Λ spin of 1/2 easily satisfies the Lee-Yang inequality $\langle T_{J,M} \rangle \leq 1$, while spin 3/2 fails to satisfy it by (1.77-1)/(0.244) = 3.16 standard deviations, and spin 5/2 fails by 4.88 standard deviations.[9]

In addition to satisfying the spin-1/2 Lee-Yang inequality, $3\langle \xi \rangle \leq 1$, the ξ distribution must be linear (Eq. (4)), for spin 1/2. Figure 1 shows a histogram of the experimental distribution. The straight line is a least-squares best fit and corresponds to the slope a = 0.57. Application of the χ^2 test to the fit yields $\chi^2 = 6.70$, with an "expected" value of 10 - 2 = 8. This corresponds to a χ^2 probability of 57% for a fit this bad or worse. The data thus fit a linear distribution (4) very well indeed.

Lastly, we have performed a control experiment, in order to search for possible hidden systematic errors in our determination of the Λ decay ξ distribution. Namely, we have determined, in exactly the same way as for the Λ's, the "ξ distribution" of a sample of 547 K^0 decays of the type $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^-$. This sample includes substantially all our K^0 charged decays, from all production energies and from K^0's produced in association with Σ^0's as well as with Λ's. Figure 2 shows the results. As expected, if there are indeed no biases, the ξ distribution is flat.[10]

We finally conclude, free from assumptions, that the Λ spin is 1/2.

We are indebted to Frank T. Solmitz for many fruitful discussions, to George R. Kalbfleisch and Roger L. Douglas for their help in analyzing much of the data, and to Luis W. Alvarez for his continued guidance and support.

REFERENCES AND FOOTNOTES

1. T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. 109, 1755 (1958). An extension to include the polarization of the decay proton is discussed by L. Durand III, L. F. Landovitz, and J. Leitner, Phys. Rev. 112, 273 (1958).
2. The decay proton and pion spins are assumed to be 1/2 and zero. For a Λ spin of 1/2, the final state in Decay (1) is an interfering mixture of states $S_{1/2}$ and $P_{1/2}$, for spin 3/2 a mixture of $P_{3/2}$ and $D_{3/2}$, etc.
3. R. K. Adair, Phys. Rev. 100, 1540 (1955).
4. F. Eisler et al., Nuovo cimento 7, 222 (1958).
5. At the 1958 Annual International Conference on High Energy Physics at CERN we reported a Lee-Yang type analysis of 237 of our events at 1.12 Bev/c, plus a total of 162 events obtained by private communications from M. Schwartz and D. Glaser. The result was that the evidence against spin 3/2 was not conclusive.
6. Crawford, Cresti, Good, Gottstein, Lyman, Solmitz, Stevenson, and Ticho, Phys. Rev. 108, 1102 (1957).
7. Eisler, Plano, Prodell, Samios, Schwartz, Steinberger, Bassi, Borelli, Puppi, Tanaka, Woloschek, Zoboli, Conversi, Franzini, Mannelli, Santangelo, Silvestrini, Brown, Glaser, Graves, and Perl, Phys. Rev. 108, 1353 (1957).
8. L. B. Leipuner and R. K. Adair, Phys. Rev. 109, 1358 (1958).
9. Higher spins than 5/2 fail by an even larger margin. Also, as was expected from the illustrative example, the other spin-3/2 test functions do satisfy the Lee-Yang inequality, and therefore yield no information.
10. Application of the χ^2 test to the horizontal straight line drawn through the experimental points yields $\chi^2 = 7.66$, where 10 - 1 = 9 is "expected." This corresponds to a χ^2 probability of 56%, and is thus a very good fit.



Fig. 1. "Up-down" decay distribution for $\Lambda \rightarrow \pi^- + p$.



Fig. 2. Control experiment: Up-down decay distribution for $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^- + \pi^+$.