

KFK-313

**KERNFORSCHUNGSZENTRUM
KARLSRUHE**

März 1965

KFK 313

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik
Gesellschaft für Kernforschung m. b. H.
Karlsruhe

The charge dependent nuclear interaction and Fermi matrix
elements of β decay

10. Mai 1965

H. Schopper



GESELLSCHAFT FÜR KERNFORSCHUNG M. B. H.

KARLSRUHE

KERNFORSCHUNGSZENTRUM KARLSRUHE

März 1965

KFK 313

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik

The charge dependent nuclear interaction and Fermi matrix
elements of β decay

H Schopper

Gesellschaft für Kernforschung m. b. H. Karlsruhe

The charge dependent nuclear interaction and Fermi matrix
elements of β decay

If charge independence of nuclear forces were valid the Fermi matrix elements M_F of $\Delta T = \pm 1$ β transitions would vanish. Therefore deviations from charge independence can be found by determining M_F from β - γ circular polarization correlation or β asymmetries from polarized nuclei.

Blin Stoye and Le Tourneux [1] have introduced the charge dependent nuclear potential

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_n = \sum_{i < j = 1}^A & \left\{ p(\vec{\tau}_3^{(i)} + \vec{\tau}_3^{(j)}) + q\vec{\tau}_3^{(i)}\vec{\tau}_3^{(j)} + \right. \\ & \left. [r(\vec{\tau}_3^{(i)} + \vec{\tau}_3^{(j)}) + s\vec{\tau}_3^{(i)}\vec{\tau}_3^{(j)}] \vec{\sigma}^{(i)}\vec{\sigma}^{(j)} \right\} V_0 e^{-Br_{ij}^2} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Charge independence implies $p = q = r = s = 0$ and for charge symmetry $p = r = 0$. If the potential is spin independent one has $r = s = 0$.

With this potential Blin-Stoye and Novakovic [2], [3] derived the following expressions for Fermi matrix elements

$$\text{Na}^{24}: \quad M_F = 0,012 - 1,57 p + 3,57 r \quad (2)$$

$$\text{A}^{41}: \quad M_F = 0,49 (p-q) + 0,93 (r-s) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Sc}^{44}: \quad M_F = 0,25 (p-q) - 0,40 (r-s) \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Mn}^{52}: \quad M_F = 0,015 - 0,62 (p+q) + 1,17 (r+s) \quad (5)$$

In addition Novakovic [3] has related p and r to the mass difference between Al^{24} and Na^{24} and obtains

$$- 222,1 p + 17,9 r = 1,370$$

New precise measurements of the β - γ circular polarization correlation of Na^{24} and A^{41} by Behrens and Schopper [4] together with older data for Sc^{44} and Mn^{52} (see the Table) make a determination of p, q, r and s possible. This can be achieved in the following way. Combining eq. (1) and (6) one obtains

$$10^3 p = -6.7 \pm 0.02, \quad 10^3 r = \begin{cases} -5.9 \pm 0.3, & M_F(\text{Na}^{24}) > 0 \\ -6.7 \pm 0.3, & < 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The ambiguity originates from the fact that experimentally only the sign of M_F/M_{GT} can be determined. Since the sign of M_{GT} is not known also the sign of M_F remains undetermined. Theoretical calculations [5] indicate that the signs of M_F for Sc^{44} and Mn^{52} are both negative. This will be taken for granted for the subsequent analysis.

Adding and subtracting eq. (3) and (5) yields

$$p - 1.9r = \begin{cases} 7 \pm 6 \\ 25 \pm 6 \end{cases} \times 10^{-3}, \quad \begin{matrix} M_F(\text{A}^{41}) > 0 \\ < 0 \end{matrix} \quad (8)$$

$$q - 1.9s = \begin{cases} 25 \pm 6 \\ 7 \pm 6 \end{cases} \times 10^{-3}, \quad \begin{matrix} M_F(\text{A}^{41}) > 0 \\ < 0 \end{matrix} \quad (9)$$

If $p = -6.7 \times 10^{-3}$ is inserted into the first relation one finds

$$10^3 r = \begin{cases} -7 \pm 3 & M_F(\text{A}) > 0 \\ -17 \pm 3 & < 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The value $10^3 r \approx -7$ is in very good agreement with r as deduced from the Na^{24} data whereas $10^3 r = -17$ is too small. This implies that $M_F(\text{A}^{41}) > 0$. It would be very interesting to explain this empirical result by nuclear model calculations.

In order to determine q and s separately the data for Sc^{44} must be included. Combining eq. (4) and (5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} q &= 0.056 \pm 0.007 \\ s &= 0.015 \pm 0.004 \end{aligned}$$

As a check the value of s may be put into eq. (9) and one obtains

$$q = \begin{cases} 0,054 \pm 0,009 & M_F(A) > 0 \\ 0,036 \pm 0,009 & < 0 \end{cases}$$

The upper value agrees with that deduced from Sc^{44} and corroborates that $M_F(A^{41})$ is positive.

Summarizing one can state that all data are consistent and a reasonable set of parameters would be

$$\begin{aligned} 10^3 p &= -6,7 \pm 0,02 & 10^3 r &= -6,7 \pm 0,3 \\ 10^3 q &= 55 \pm 6 & 10^3 s &= 15 \pm 4 \end{aligned}$$

These numbers show that there is a definite deviation from charge independence. Also charge symmetry is violated although to a lesser degree (since $|p| < |q|$, $|r| < |s|$).

In addition an appreciable spin dependence is found, since r and s are of the same order of magnitude than p and q .

Altman and MacDonald [6] have derived p , r , q , and s from the energy level shifts and the ft values of the O^{14} , N^{14} , C^{14} system. Data of the p - p and n - p scattering are also used. Our values of p and r agree nicely with their case II. These authors, however, find negative values for q and s . It is not quite clear if this discrepancy can be ascribed to a sign ambiguity.

Of course, the quantitative results for the parameters p , q , r and s should not be taken too serious since eq. (2) to (6) have been derived on the basis of a particular nuclear model. However, it seems that the Fermi matrix elements cannot be explained entirely by ordinary Coulomb effects.

Table Experimental data used in the analysis

| Nucleus | β - γ circ. pol asymmetry $\frac{pci}{A}$ | $M_P \times 10^3$ | Reference |
|------------------|---|--------------------|---|
| Na ²⁴ | $0,100 \pm 0,004$ | $1,7 \pm 0,4$ | Behrens and Schopper[4] |
| A ⁴¹ | $0,063 \pm 0,02$ | 9 ± 6 | Behrens and Schopper[4] |
| Sc ⁴⁴ | $-0,131 \pm 0,013$ | $(-), \pm 3$ | Bloom et al. [7] Mann et al. [8] |
| Mn ⁵² | $-0,029 \pm 0,003$ | $(-), 5,1 \pm 0,6$ | Postma et al. [9] Ambler et al. [10] Daniel et al. [11] Mann et al. [12] |

Literature

- [1] R.J.Blin-Stoyle, J.Le Tourneux, Phys.Rev.123, 627 (1961)
- [2] R.J.Blin-Stoyle, L.Novakovic, Nucl.Phys. 51, 133 (1964)
- [3] L.Novakovic, Nucl.Phys. 60, 161 (1964)
- [4] H.Behrens, H.Schopper, to be published
- [5] P.S.Kelly and S.H.Moszkowski, Z.Phys.153 04 (1960)
- [6] A.Altman and W.M.MacDonald, Nucl.Phys.35, 593 (1962)
- [7] S.D.Bloom et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 5, 326 (1960)
- [8] L.G.Mann et al., Bull.Am.Phys. Soc. II 9, 395 (1964)
- [9] H.Postma et al., Physica 23, 259 (1957)
- [10] E.Ambler et al., Phys. Rev. 110, 77 (1956)
- [11] H.Daniel et al., Phys.Rev. 125, 261 (1962)
- [12] L.G.Mann et al., Phys.Soc. II 9, 395 (1964)