AC

ITERA IETP 93.350
5003404
IC/93/350

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
THEORETICAL PHYSICS**

**CHARM-CONSERVING STRANGENESS-CHANGING
TWO BODY HADRONIC DECAYS
OF CHARMED BARYONS**

Mohinder P. Khanna

**INTERNATIONAL
ATOMIC ENERGY
AGENCY**

**UNITED NATIONS
EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL
ORGANIZATION**

MIRAMARE-TRIESTE

International Atomic Energy Agency

and

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS

CHARM-CONSERVING STRANGENESS-CHANGING TWO BODY HADRONIC DECAYS OF CHARMED BARYONS

Mohinder P. Khanna ¹

International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy.

ABSTRACT

The charm-conserving strangeness-changing two body hadronic decays of charmed baryons are examined in the SU(4) symmetry scheme. In addition to the $20'^1$ -Hamiltonian, we consider a 15-piece of the weak Hamiltonian which may arise due to SU(4) breaking or due to some non-conventional dynamics. The numerical estimates for decay widths of some of the modes are presented.

MIRAMARE - TRIESTE

October 1993

¹Permanent address: Centre for Advanced Study in Physics, Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh-160014, India.

1 Introduction

The hyperon non-leptonic weak decays have so far evaded their complete understanding [1]. It is expected that the hadronic decays of the charmed and heavier baryons will be simpler and their study would help in the understanding of the non-leptonic decay processes, in general. Recently, the study of hadronic two body decays of the charmed baryons has gained some attention [2]. It is primarily due to the fact that some data on these decays has already started coming and more experimental information on these decays is expected in the near future. The scarce data [3] which is available at present is already beginning to discriminate between the models.

In this paper, we study the heavy flavor conserving weak decays of charmed baryons like $\Xi_c \rightarrow \Lambda_c \pi$, $\Xi_c' \rightarrow \Lambda_c \pi$ and $\Omega_c \rightarrow \Xi_c \pi$. These decays are singly Cabibbo-suppressed. But, since the enhancement of the strangeness changing Hamiltonian is more than the one for the charm changing decays the suppression of the charm non-changing strangeness changing decays of the charmed baryons may not be as much as given by the Cabibbo factor and so these decays may be observed in near future as more data comes from ARGUS and CLEO collaborations as well as from CERN and FERMI-LAB experiments. Further, these decays could be of theoretical interest, as they are described by the same Hamiltonian which is responsible for the hyperon decays and may throw some light on the dynamics of the hyperon decays. Cheng et. al [4] have studied these decays in the heavy quark approximation with the help of chiral perturbation theory. They have assumed that c quark does not participate in the weak interaction and acts as a spectator. We feel that their approximation is far from realistic. We study these decays in the framework of SU(4) symmetry, a limit opposite to the one considered by Cheng et. al. In the SU(4) limit c quark and u quark play role at the same footing. The reality will be some where in between. We also study some of the charm changing decays in the same frame-work with the hope to learn about their departure from SU(4) symmetry considerations. The amplitudes we obtain are of the same order of magnitude as in ref. [4], though some numbers are different.

2 Weak Hamiltonian

The hadronic part of the weak left handed quark current

$$J_\mu = \bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)(d\cos\theta + s\sin\theta) + \bar{c}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)(s\cos\theta - d\sin\theta) \quad (1)$$

transforms like the 15 representation of SU(4). The general weak current x current weak Hamiltonian

$$H_W = \frac{G}{2\sqrt{2}}(J^\mu J_\mu + h.c.) \quad (2)$$

may thus belong to the SU(4) representation present in the direct product

$$15 \times 15 = 1 + 15_\Lambda + 15_S + 20' + 45 + 45^* + 84 \quad (3)$$

Because of the symmetric nature of the Hamiltonian, the only representations 1 , 15_S , $20'$, and 84 contribute. The singlet cannot contribute to the strangeness or charm-changing decays. It is also a specific property of the GIM Hamiltonian that bilinears in currents

do not contain adjoint representation in the exact $SU(4)$ limit. Therefore, 15 does not contribute also. The GIM Hamiltonian thus transforms like

$$H_W^{GIM} = H_W^{20'} + H_W^{84} \quad (4)$$

2.1 Hyperon decays

The experimental data on hyperon decays implies that the non-leptonic Hamiltonian is dominated by the octet of $SU(3)$ where as the current x current picture assigns equal strength to the 8 and 27 representations of $SU(3)$. Further, within the framework of the conventional theory it has not been possible to fit the s- wave and p- wave hyperon decay amplitudes simultaneously in any consistent manner, even if the octet dominance is assumed. The enhancement of the octet piece due to the renormalization caused by the strong interaction has been proved [5, 6], but the numerical estimate of the enhancement factor is below the required value. The solution to the problem seems to require the addition of a new non-conventional $SU(3)$ -octet piece of the weak Hamiltonian for non-leptonic decays. Several attempts to generate new piece through Higgs-scalar meson exchange [7], introduction of right-handed currents [8] and specific spontaneous symmetry break down [9] have been made in the past. In these attempts it has been assumed that the new non-conventional octet dominates the non-leptonic Hamiltonian for the parity violating part. It has also been suggested [10] that there may be a $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ parity violating quark tadpole piece of the Hamiltonian due to an s—d self energy (W-loop) transition, which can not be transformed away.

We believe that the effective Hamiltonian for the non-leptonic decays must contain both the current - current theory octet and a non-conventional octet. At the $SU(4)$ level, since the 15 representation of $SU(4)$ is not contained in the current- current Hamiltonian [11], the enhanced octet must be a part of $20'$ representation of $SU(4)$. A non-conventional octet piece is phenomenologically equivalent to a tadpole model [12] and hence belongs to the 15 representation of $SU(4)$. This octet cannot contribute to the parity-conserving process because the tadpole term in the Hamiltonian can be transformed away [12]. Hence the only term contributing to the parity-conserving baryon decays is the enhanced conventional octet belonging to the $20'$ of $SU(4)$. The parity violating decays, however, can obtain contribution, in general, from both the conventional and non-conventional octets belonging to the $20'$ and 15 representations of $SU(4)$ respectively.

2.2 Charmed baryon decays

In the very first work on the nonleptonic weak interactions in $SU(4)$ [13], it was observed that the $20'$ dominance works upto about 40 %. The $SU(4)$ breaking thus plays important role at least in the parity violating mode. The 15s representation may reappear through the $SU(4)$ breaking [14] or as argued above through other considerations. We shall include the admixture of 15 in the weak interaction. The most general weak Hamiltonian for $B_i \rightarrow B_f + P$ decays is then given by

$$H_W^{GIM} = H_W^{20'} + H_W^{84} + H_W^{15} \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_W^{20'} = & a_1 \bar{B}_{[a,b]}^c B_{[a,b]}^{[n,d]} P_n^m H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + a_2 \bar{B}_{[a,b]}^m B_{[a,b]}^{[c,d]} P_n^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + a_3 \bar{B}_{[a,b]}^m B_{[a,b]}^{[c,d]} P_n^m H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + \\ & a_4 \bar{B}_{[n,b]}^m B_{[a,d]}^{[c,d]} P_n^m H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + a_5 \bar{B}_{[n,a]}^m B_{[a,d]}^{[c,d]} P_n^m H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + a_6 \bar{B}_{[m,n]}^c B_{[a,b]}^{[c,d]} P_a^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + \\ & a_7 \bar{B}_{[n,a]}^m B_{[a,b]}^{[c,d]} P_b^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} \end{aligned} \quad (5a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_W^{84} = & b_1 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} P_b^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + b_2 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} P_c^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + b_3 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} P_c^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + \\ & b_4 \bar{B}_{[a,b]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} P_c^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + b_5 \bar{B}_{[a,b]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} P_c^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + b_6 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} P_c^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} + \\ & b_7 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} P_c^d H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]} \end{aligned} \quad (5b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_W^{15} = & A_1 \bar{B}_{[n,a]}^m B_{[a,d]}^{[c,d]} P_n^m H_b^a + A_2 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^m B_{[a,d]}^{[c,d]} P_n^b H_b^a + A_3 \bar{B}_{[a,d]}^m B_{[a,d]}^{[c,d]} P_n^c H_b^a + \\ & A_4 \bar{B}_{[n,a]}^b B_{[c,d]}^{[a,d]} P_n^m H_b^a + A_5 \bar{B}_{[m,d]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,d]} P_n^m H_b^a + A_6 \bar{B}_{[m,a]}^c B_{[c,d]}^{[a,d]} P_n^m H_b^a + A_7 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^m B_{[c,d]}^{[a,d]} P_n^b H_b^a \\ & + A_8 \bar{B}_{[c,d]}^b B_{[c,d]}^{[a,d]} P_n^m H_b^a + A_9 \bar{B}_{[a,d]}^m B_{[a,d]}^{[c,d]} P_c^b H_b^a + A_{10} \bar{B}_{[a,d]}^b B_{[a,d]}^{[c,d]} P_n^m H_b^a \end{aligned} \quad (5c)$$

where $B_{[a,b]}^{[c,d]}$, P_a^b and $H_{[c,d]}^{[a,b]}$ denote $20'$ baryon, 15 meson and $20'$, 84, 15 weak spurions respectively. CP dominance demands

$$a_1 = -a_4, a_2 = -a_5, a_3 = a_6 = a_7 = 0. \quad (6a)$$

$$b_4 = -b_5, b_6 = -b_7, b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = 0. \quad (6b)$$

$$A_1 = A_{10}, A_2 = -A_8, A_5 = A_9, A_3 = A_4 = A_6 = A_7 = 0. \quad (6c)$$

for the PV mode and

$$a_1 = a_4, a_2 = a_5. \quad (7a)$$

$$b_4 = b_5, b_6 = b_7. \quad (7b)$$

$$A_1 = -A_{10}, A_2 = A_8, a_5 = -A_9 \quad (7c)$$

for the PC mode. We ignore the 84- piece of the weak hamiltonian because for the $\Delta S = 1$ decays it is not enhanced. For $\Delta C = 1$ decays also it is usually ignored though it may contribute in those processes. But we do not consider them here in detail.

3 Decay Amplitudes And Decay Rates

The matrix element for the baryon decay process is written as

$$M = -\langle B_f | P | H_W | B_i \rangle = \bar{u}_{B_f} (A + \gamma_5) u_{B_i} \phi_P, \quad (8)$$

where A and B are parity violating and parity conserving amplitudes respectively. For the Cabibbo allowed ($\Delta C = \Delta S = 1$) mode the effective weak Hamiltonian is

$$H_W^{eff} = \frac{G}{2\sqrt{2}} \cos^2 \theta_c [\bar{u} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) d] [\bar{s} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) c] \quad (9)$$

where as for the $\Delta C = 0, \Delta S = 1$ mode which we are considering, it is

$$H^{\pi l} = \frac{G}{2\sqrt{2}} \cos\theta_c \sin\theta_c [\bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d][\bar{s}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)u]$$

$$-\frac{G}{2\sqrt{2}} \cos\theta_c \sin\theta_c [\bar{c}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d][\bar{s}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)c] \quad (10)$$

Therefore, only $H_{12}^{\pi l} = -H_{24}^{\pi l}$ is nonzero in $\Delta C = 0, \Delta S = 1$ processes. The decay width is computed from

$$\Gamma = C_1 ||A|^2 + C_2 |B|^2] \quad (11)$$

where

$$C_1 = \frac{|q|}{8\pi} \frac{(m_l + m_f)^2 - m_p^2}{m_l^2} \quad (11a)$$

$$C_2 = \frac{(m_l - m_f)^2 - m_p^2}{(m_l + m_f)^2 + m_p^2} \quad (11b)$$

$$|q| = \frac{1}{2m_l} \sqrt{(m_l^2 - (m_f - m_p)^2)[m_l^2 - (m_f + m_p)^2]} \quad (11c)$$

m_l and m_f are the masses of the initial and final baryons and m_p is the mass of the emitted meson. For the decays under consideration C_2 is very small so that the contribution to the width from the parity conserving mode may be ignored. We, therefore, need to consider only the parity violating decays.

4 Results and Conclusion

The expressions for the decay amplitudes in terms of the parameters are given in Tables I, II and III. The values of the parameters ($2a_1 - A_1$), ($2a_2 - A_2$) and A_2 are calculated from the experimental values of the hyperon decay amplitudes which we have taken from reference [15] and have listed in the last column of Table I. They are then used to estimate the decay amplitudes for the charm conserving strangeness changing decays of charmed baryons. The computed values are given in the last column of Table II. We are able to give here only a very rough estimate of the decay amplitude for the charm changing decays in the 4th column of Table III. It is because the contribution to the charm changing decays comes only from the $20'$ part of the weak Hamiltonian and we are not able to disentangle its contribution from that of 15 piece in the hyperon decays. We estimate these amplitudes by assuming that the hyperon decays are dominantly described by the $20'$ - Hamiltonian, which as already recognised [13] very early is a bad approximation. Also we feel that these values are over-estimated because the enhancement of the $20'$ -piece of the weak Hamiltonian due to the strong interaction renormalization for the charm-changing decays would be less than that for the strangeness changing decays. Further, in the charm changing decays, the factorizable contributions are important. The factorizable contributions are explicitly symmetry breaking and so cannot be calculated from symmetry considerations. We do not discuss the charm-changing decays here. They have been already extensively analyzed recently, particularly, by Cheng and Tseng, Kerner and Kramer, Xu and Kamal in ref.[2]. Further analysis will be called for when data becomes more precise, as there are several competing terms and only data will be able to decide on their importance. The

factorizable contributions for the hyperon decays and for the $\Delta C = 0, \Delta S = 1$ charmed baryon decays are, however, expected to be negligible as they are proportional to the mass difference of the initial and final baryons. So we feel that our considerations for strangeness changing decays are reasonable. Our estimates for these decay widths are:

$$\Gamma(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^0) = 0.5 \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}. \quad (12a)$$

$$\Gamma(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^0) = 40 \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}. \quad (12b)$$

$$\Gamma(\Omega \rightarrow \Xi_c^+ \pi^-) = 1.5 \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}. \quad (12c)$$

The phase space for the decay $\Omega \rightarrow \Xi_c^+ \pi^-$ is too small for it to have any significant width. The order of magnitude of these numbers is same as in ref. [4], though, some numbers are different.

5 Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Professor Abdus Salam, the International Atomic Energy Agency and UNESCO for hospitality at the International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste.

Table I
PV decay amplitudes for hyperons. Each entry displays the appropriate co-efficient.
Expt. value is in unit of 10^{-7} .

Decay	$-(2a_1 + A_1)$	$(2a_2 - A_2)$	A_2	Expt. Value
$\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$	0	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}$	$-\frac{4}{\sqrt{6}}$	3.25 ± 0.03
$\Sigma^+ \rightarrow n\pi^+$	1	0	0	0.14 ± 0.03
$\Sigma^- \rightarrow n\pi^-$	1	1	0	4.27 ± 0.01
$\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\pi^0$	0	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	0	-3.29 ± 0.11
$\Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda\pi^-$	0	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}$	$-\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}$	4.49 ± 0.02

Table II
 $\Delta C = 0, \Delta S = 1$ PV decay amplitudes for charmed baryons. Each entry displays the appropriate co-efficient. Computed value is in unit of 10^{-7} .

Decay	$(2a_1 - A_1)$	$(2a_2 - A_2)$	A_2	Comp. Value
$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{5}{6}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	-4.1
$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^0 \pi^0$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{12}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{12}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$	1.8
$\Omega_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi_c^+ \pi^-$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}$	-2.5
$\Omega_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi_c^0 \pi^0$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	-4.4

Table III
 $\Delta C = \Delta S = 1$ PV decay amplitudes for charmed baryons. Each entry displays the appropriate co-efficient and is to be multiplied by $\cos\theta_c$. Computed value is in unit of 10^{-7} .

Decay	a_1	a_2	Comp. Value
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0$	0	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}$	10
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda\pi^+$	0	0	0
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+\pi^0$	0	$\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$	15
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+$	1	0	0.5

REFERENCES

- [1] R. E. Marshak, Riazuddin, and C. R. Ryan, *Theory of Weak interactions in Particle Physics*, (Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1969); L. S. Brown and C. M. Sommerfield, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 16, 751 (1966); H. Georgi, *Weak Interactions and Modern Particle Physics*.
- [2] H. Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, *Phys. Rev. D* 46, 1042 (1992); Q. P. Xu and A. N. Kamal, *ibid.* D46, 270(1992); Y. Kohara, *ibid.* D44, 2799(1991); S. M. Sheikhholeslami, R. C. Verma and M. P. Khanna, *ibid.* D43, 170 (1991); J. G. Korner and H. Kramer, *Z. Phys. C* 55, 659 (1992). G. Turan and J. O. Eeg, *ibid.* C51, 599(1991); G. Kaur and M. P. Khanna, *Phys. Rev. D* 44, 182 (1991); S. Pakvasa, S. F. Tuan, and S. P. Rosen, *ibid.* D42, 3246 (1990); D. Ebert and W. Kalles, *Z. Phys. C* 29, 643 (1985); F. Hussain and K. Khan, *Nuovo Cimento* 88A, 213 (1985); F. Hussain and M. D. Scadron, *ibid.* 75A, 248 (1984). For a review of charmed baryons and earlier references see J. G. Korner and H. W. Siebert, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 41, 511 (1991).
- [3] ARGUS Coll, H. Albrecht et. al; *Phys. Lett.* 207B, 109 (1988); B247, 121 (1990); B274, 239 (1992); CLEO Coll, P. Avery et. al; *Phys. Rev. D* 43, 3599 (1991); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 65, 2842 (1990), CLEO Coll. Preprint CLNS 93/1231, CLEO-93-10 (1993).
- [4] H. Y. Cheng, C. Y. Cheung, G. L. Lin, Y. C. Lin, T. M. Yan and H. Lai Yu, *Phys. Rev. D* 46, 5050 (1992).
- [5] M. K. Gaillard and B. W. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 33, 108 (1974).
- [6] G. Altarelli, and L. Maiani, *Phys. Lett.* B52, 351 (1975).
- [7] B. W. Lee and S. B. Treiman, *Phys. Rev D* 7, 1211 (1973).
- [8] For example, H. Fritsch and P. Minkowski, *Phys. Lett.* B61, 275 (1976).
- [9] J. K. Bajaj and A. K. Kapoor, *Phys. Rev. D* 16, 2226 (1977).
- [10] R. E. Karlsen, W. H. Ryan, M. D. Scadron, *Phys. Rev D* 43, 157 (1991).
- [11] M. B. Einhorn and C. Quigg, *Phys. Rev. D* 20, 2015 (1975).
- [12] S. Coleman and S. L. Glashow, *Phys. Rev* 134 B670 (1964).
- [13] Y. Iwasaki *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 34, 1407 (1975); 35, 149 (1975); G. Altarelli, N. Cabibbo, L. Maiani, *Phys. Lett.* B57, 149 (1975).
- [14] Y. Igarashi and M. Shin-Mura, *Nucl. Phys. B* 129, 483 (1977); M. Shin-Mura, *Prog. theor. Phys.* 59, 912 (1977).
- [15] B. Stech and Q. P. Xu, *Z. Phys.* C49, 491 (1991).