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I. THE INTERACTIONS OF FREE HYPERONS
THE INTERACTIONS OF FREE HYPERONS

F.R. Stannard,
University College, London.

The short lifetimes of the hyperons make it exceedingly difficult to accumulate data on scattering processes. It is well known that almost all our knowledge of hyperon-nucleon forces comes instead from studies of hyperfragments. In fact, I suspect the only reason I have been asked to give this short talk is to give delegates a sense of well-being at the start of the conference.

The following describes the experimental situation.

1. A interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>No. of events</th>
<th>Cross-section for momentum range 400 to 1500 MeV/c</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) $\Lambda^0 + p \rightarrow \Lambda^0 + p$</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$27 \pm 5$ mb</td>
<td>1), 2), 3), 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) $\Lambda^0 + p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 + p$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$8.5 \pm 4.9$ mb</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) $\Lambda^0 + p \rightarrow \Sigma^+ + n$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30 \pm 20$ mb</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross-section for reaction (A) applies to scattering through angles greater than about 20° in the c.m.s. Within the wide limits allowed by the poor statistics, no change in the cross-section with energy has been detected.

The 72" hydrogen chamber group at Berkeley expect to publish the remaining two-thirds of their data for reaction (A) in the next few months, and have still to report on reaction (C).
The 80 cm hydrogen chamber of the Ecole Polytechnique was recently exposed to $10^6$ stopped $K^{-}$ mesons, and work is to start soon on scanning for $\Lambda$-particle interactions. Data from this film will be especially valuable as the momenta of the $\Lambda$ particles will be small, about 200 MeV/c, and will more readily allow a comparison with theory.

The angular distribution for elastic scattering is almost isotropic, the forward-backward ratio being 27:34.

$\Sigma$ interactions

1) In flight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>No. of events</th>
<th>Cross-sections for momentum ranges:</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300 to 1500 MeV/c</td>
<td>&lt; 200 MeV/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) $\Sigma^+ + p \rightarrow \Sigma^+ + p$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$38 \pm 18 \text{ mb}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) $\Sigma^- + p \rightarrow \Sigma^- + p$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$10 \pm 6 \text{ mb}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) $\Sigma^- + p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 + n$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$170 \pm 80 \text{ mb}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) $\Sigma^- + p \rightarrow \Lambda^0 + n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The angular distributions give forward to backward ratios of 5:7 and 8:0 for reactions (D) and (E), respectively.

Thirteen examples of $\Sigma$ scatterings on complex nuclei have been observed in nuclear emulsion\(^9\). Based on a study of the other prongs emitted with the $\Sigma$ particle in eight of these events, reactions (D) and (E) are found to have cross-sections in the ratio of 6:2.
11) At rest

$\Sigma^-$ hyperons at rest interact through reactions (F) and (G). The following ratio has been observed for $\Sigma^-$ particles stopped in hydrogen$^{10}$

$$\frac{\Sigma^0}{\Sigma^- + \Lambda^0} = 0.33 \pm 0.05 .$$

In deuterium the ratio is$^{11}$

$$\frac{\Sigma^0}{\Sigma^- + \Lambda^0} = 0.037 \pm 0.022 .$$

The lack of reliable guidance from experiment has necessarily made theoretical work rather speculative.

One may begin from the standpoint of the Doublet Approximation$^{12}$ which groups the $\Lambda$ and $\Sigma$ particles into two doublets:

$$N_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma^+ \\ (\Lambda^0 - \Sigma^0/\sqrt{2}) \end{pmatrix} \quad N_3 = \begin{pmatrix} (\Lambda^0 + \Sigma^0)/\sqrt{2} \\ \Sigma^- \end{pmatrix} .$$

Assuming that $N_2$ and $N_3$ are coupled with the same strength to the pion field, one may immediately relate the $\Lambda N$ and $\Sigma N$ cross-sections. In particular,

$$2[\sigma(\Lambda) + \sigma(B)] = [\sigma(D) + \sigma(E)] ,$$

where $\sigma(\Lambda)$ refers to the elastic cross-section for $\Lambda$ energies above the threshold for $\Sigma^0$ production. Experimentally, the values of the left- and right-hand sides of the equation are found to be $(57 \pm 18)$ mb and $(48 \pm 17)$ mb, respectively.

The Global Symmetry hypothesis$^{13}$ is more restrictive, requiring the coupling of $N_2$ and $N_3$ to be the same as that of the nucleon doublet $N_1$. One may now relate the $\Lambda N$ and $\Sigma N$ cross-sections to the
NN cross-sections. At first sight this would appear to offer definitive predictions for hyperon scattering as the NN scattering data can be accurately reproduced by various potential models. However, the hyperons are unaffected by the Pauli exclusion principle and so can explore regions of the potential that play only minor roles in p-\(p\) scattering, and are consequently not well understood.

de Swart and Dullemond\(^{14}\) find cross-sections of about 30 mb for reaction (A), 50 mb for (D), and 33 mb for (E) at momenta of about 600 MeV/c. They require a forward/backward ratio for reaction (A) of 1.5:1, which is not in very good agreement with experiment. They successfully reproduce the strong forward peaking observed for (E), but then also require a 2:1 forward peaking for reaction (D) which is not indicated by the present data. Ferrari and Fonda\(^{15}\), on the other hand, show that if instead of using a Signell-Marshall potential, one adopts the Gemmel-Thaler potential, an essentially isotropic distribution is obtained for the latter reaction.

Global symmetry predicts that the ratio \(\Sigma^-/(\Sigma^- + \Lambda^-)\) for \(\Sigma^-\) interactions at rest in hydrogen should have a value of 0.40\(^{14}\). The low value found for the ratio in deuterium can be explained in terms of there being only a small energy release, about 0.9 MeV, in the process producing the \(\Sigma^-\)\(^{16}\).

An alternative approach is that of Kovacs and Lichtenberg\(^{17}\) who calculate cross-sections for reaction (A) from potentials derived from the binding energies of hyperfragments. The difficulty here is that spin-orbit terms, while having little effect on the binding energies, may be quite important in scattering processes. Cross-sections of 32 mb and 21 mb are obtained with and without spin-orbit corrections.

* * *
REFERENCES
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II. NUCLEAR EMULSION STUDIES
IDENTIFICATION METHODS FOR HYPERFRAGMENTS * )

R.G. Ammar,
Physics Department, Northwestern University,
Evanston, Ill., USA.

I. INTRODUCTION

Information relevant to the identification of hyperfragments may be classified into three general categories accordingly as it is derived from the configuration at production, from that at decay, or from information regarding charge and mass supplied by direct measurements on the tracks themselves. In order to obtain a unique identification for an event it is obviously necessary to impose a sufficient number of constraints to rule out all but one hypothesis regarding its interpretation. Thus, although the three categories will be discussed separately it should be borne in mind that information of more than one type is often used in the analysis of a single event.

For purposes of orientation as regards the energy released at production and decay, some typical reactions are given in Table 1, together with their corresponding energies. These values will, of course, be modulated by effects arising from the binding of the particles involved in any particular reaction, an appreciable effect for the \( \pi^- \) decays. Nevertheless, the relative magnitudes of these energies give some indication as to the type of problems which one might expect to encounter in the different processes.

In the ensuing discussion of the various methods of identification I shall confine my remarks primarily to hyperfragments produced in nuclear emulsion, as other talks have been scheduled which will deal with work performed in bubble chambers.

*) Research supported by the National Science Foundation.
Table 1
Some characteristic reaction energies in \( \Lambda \) production and decay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Energy release (MeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( K^- + 2p \rightarrow \Lambda + p )</td>
<td>316.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K^- + n \rightarrow \Lambda + \pi^- )</td>
<td>178.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Lambda + p \rightarrow n + p )</td>
<td>175.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Lambda \rightarrow p + \pi^- )</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. PRODUCTION CONFIGURATION

Kinematic considerations at production have already been used by many authors\(^1{-}^7\) as an auxiliary method in the identification of hyperfragments produced by \( K^- \) and \( \Xi^- \) capture in emulsion. In addition, systematic investigations have been made relating to this production process, establishing the fact that hypernuclei with charge \( Z \geq 3 \) are primarily from the light elements (C, N, O) of the emulsion\(^8{-}^{12}\).

The power of this method tends to increase with the mass number \( A \) of the hyperfragment produced (for \( A \leq 16 \)), since the permissible production reactions become simpler. It is therefore ideally suited to augment the analysis of the \( \pi^- \) decays of hypernuclei with \( 5 < A \leq 16 \) where the information at decay is usually less complete than for those with \( A \leq 5 \) (see Section III). In addition, a particularly good illustration of the usefulness of this approach may be found in the problem of identifying non-mesic decays where the large energy release and the emission of neutrons makes a decay analysis by itself
rather unreliable. At present a systematic investigation of such
decays of hypernuclei with $Z \geq 3$ is under way in our laboratory using
production kinematics as a tool$^{13,14}$. To facilitate the analysis,
only those hyperfragments produced in association with a charged $\pi$
from $K^-$ captures are considered. Thus events produced with a $\pi^0$ or
with no pion and which are somewhat more difficult to analyse, are
excluded from the sample. The production process under considera-
tion is, however, not necessarily confined to the second of the reac-
tions in Table 1 since an appreciable fraction ($\approx 7\%$) of the charged
pions are $\pi^+$ and cannot be produced in association with a $\Lambda$ via $K^-$
capture on a single nucleon.

Figure 1 shows a photomicrograph of an event analysed in
this manner. The primary $\pi^-$ is brought to rest after $\approx 2.8$ cm and
the production reaction is most likely given by

$$K^- + C^{12} \rightarrow \Lambda Be^9 + H^1 + H^1 + n + \pi^-$$

although one cannot rigorously rule out the possibility that some
other isotope of $\Lambda Be$ is produced with more than one neutron. The de-
day, however, is ambiguous and although consistent with that of $\Lambda Be^9$,
is also consistent with many other interpretations.

The dimensions of the stack ($\approx 10$ cm $\times$ 15 cm $\times$ 10 cm) used
in this work was designed primarily to stop pions from the decay reac-
tion. Thus, because of the much larger energy release at production,
$\approx 60\%$ of the pions could not be followed to rest in the stack. In
such cases, ionization measurements on the pion can still yield much
useful information in the analysis of the event.

III. DECAY CONFIGURATION

The analysis of the $\pi^-$-mesic decays of hypernuclei with $A \leq 5$
is fairly straightforward and has been discussed, for example, in
Refs. 15 and 16. For such events, the decay prongs are comparatively
well defined and the concept of coplanarity and colinearity of tracks is meaningful, in contrast to the case for \( A > 5 \), so that the application of momentum conservation is frequently sufficient to yield a unique interpretation. Even so, for short recoils, misidentification of events can take place as may be seen with reference to Fig. 2 showing a recoil range versus momentum, taken from Ref. 16. Such misidentification may introduce systematic errors in the measured binding \(^{17}\) since, for example, \( ^{\Lambda} He^5 \) has a higher binding than \( ^{\Lambda} He^4 \) and if misinterpreted as the latter, will tend to increase the measured binding for \( ^{\Lambda} He^4 \).

For the heavier hypernuclei, the problem of identification is somewhat more difficult. A large number of the decays (e.g. \( \sim 50\% \) of the events presented in Ref. 5) consist of only a \( \pi^- \) and a stub, usually too short to permit a precise measurement of its range and direction. Thus the recoil can not usually be identified from momentum balance. Information bearing on the recoil identity can be obtained by observing whether it undergoes \( \beta \) decay with a half-life short compared with the sensitive time of the detector. Figure 3 shows an event interpreted as \( ^{\Lambda} B^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + C^4 \) in which a \( \beta \) is associated with the recoil. In exceptional cases the identity of the recoil may be inferred from its decay (e.g. a "hammer track" configuration). Such an event, interpreted as \( ^{\Lambda} Li^6 \rightarrow \pi^- + H^4 + Li^6 \), is shown in Fig. 4. For this event the interpretation of the "hammer track" as \( E^8 \) can be ruled out by detailed considerations \(^5\). Examples of both types of events were already presented in Ref. 5.

Information regarding the \( (\pi^- - r) \) decay mode of hypernuclei with \( 6 \leq A \leq 16 \), already presented in Refs. 4 and 5, is summarized in Fig. 5. Not all the species shown in this figure are known to exist. Their decays are separated into two groups depending on whether or not a \( \beta \) is expected to be seen from the recoil. The \( (\pi^- - r) \) mode is, however, not the only one which can give rise to this type of configuration. Table 2 presents a list of values for \( Q_0 \) (the energy release assuming zero binding for the \( \Lambda \)), as well as the expected energy release
Table 2

Characteristics of $(\pi^- - n - r)$ decays for hypernuclei with mass number $\leq 16$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypernucleide</th>
<th>$Q$ (MeV)</th>
<th>$\sim Q$ (MeV)</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Decay</th>
<th>Half-life (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^4$</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>He$^3$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^7$</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>Li$^6$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^8$</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>Be$^7$</td>
<td>K capture</td>
<td>$4.6 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^9$</td>
<td>52.80</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>Be$^8$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$&lt; 2 \times 10^{-14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{10}$)</td>
<td>50.89</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>Be$^9$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^{11}$</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>B$^8$</td>
<td>Hammer</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{11}$)</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>B$^{10}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{12}$)</td>
<td>48.27</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>B$^{11}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^{11}$</td>
<td>33.02</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>C$^{10}$</td>
<td>$\beta^+$</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^{12}$</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>C$^{11}$</td>
<td>$\beta^+$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{13}$)</td>
<td>50.17</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>C$^{12}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{14}$)</td>
<td>50.23</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>C$^{13}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^{13}$</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>N$^{12}$</td>
<td>$\beta^+$</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^{14}$</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>N$^{13}$</td>
<td>$\beta^+$</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{15}$)</td>
<td>36.95</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>N$^{14}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{16}$)</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>N$^{15}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda^{15}$</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>O$^{14}$</td>
<td>$\beta^+$</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($\Lambda^{16}$)</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>O$^{15}$</td>
<td>$\beta^+$</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The species in parenthesis have not been uniquely identified. In calculating $Q$, $B_\Lambda$ has been inferred from the trend of the $B_\Lambda$ versus $A$ curve.
Q, for various \((\pi^--n+r)\) decay modes. For the more massive species, these decays will present the same appearance as the \((\pi^-+r)\) events. In addition, so can more complex decay modes involving three charged particles. Some of these are shown in Table 3 which lists only those for which both heavy particles in the final state have \(Z \geq 3\).

### Table 3

Complex decays of hypernuclei with mass number \(\leq 16\) which may simulate the \((\pi^-+r)\) mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decay</th>
<th>(Q_0) (MeV)</th>
<th>(\sim Q) (MeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{B^{12}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^6+\text{Li}^6)</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{B^{13}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^6+\text{Li}^7)</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{B^{14}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^7+\text{Li}^7)</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{C^{13}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^6+\text{Be}^7)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{C^{14}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^7+\text{Be}^7)</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{C^{15}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^6+\text{Be}^9)</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{C^{16}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^6+\text{Be}^{10})</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{C^{16}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^7+\text{Be}^{10})</td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{N^{14}} \to \pi^-+\text{Be}^7+\text{Be}^7)</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{N^{16}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^6+\text{B}^{10})</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{N^{16}} \to \pi^-+\text{Be}^7+\text{Be}^{10})</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_{O^{16}} \to \pi^-+\text{Li}^6+\text{C}^{10})</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>2.3 (\beta^+) expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The species in parenthesis have not been uniquely identified. In calculating \(Q\), \(B_\Lambda\) has been inferred from the trend of the \(B_\Lambda\) versus \(A\) curve.
Fortunately the energy carried by the $\pi^-$ in the majority of the decays shown in these tables, tends to be on the low side and does not cause too much confusion with the $(\pi^--\nu)$ decays of hypernuclei with $A \leq 16$, tending instead to simulate the decay of heavier ones.

If the hyperfragments are produced under conditions where the hypothesis of production in C, N, O is valid, then quite often only the conservation of charge and baryons need be invoked in order to rule out various competing interpretations from the decay, although at other times a more detailed analysis is necessary. Without such information at production, the problem of identification is very difficult indeed.

It should also be remarked that the presence of excited states in the recoil may contribute to the misidentification of events and thereby introduce systematic errors into the measured value of $B^*_A$.

As mentioned earlier, the non-mesic decay modes are not usually easy to identify. In some cases however, additional information regarding the decay tracks can be of considerable help in the analysis. Such an example is shown in Fig. 6 which is interpreted as the decay

$$\Lambda^9\text{Be} \rightarrow \text{Li}^6 + \text{H}^1$$

in which the "hammer track" identifies the recoil as Li$^6$, B$^8$ being ruled out by considering the maximum Z possible at production. The proton appears to scatter inelastically and it is not possible to obtain a good binding energy from the event.

IV. DIRECT MASS AND CHARGE DETERMINATION

As an aid to analysis, one can also perform profile measurements to determine the charge of tracks of interest (usually that of the hyperfragment). In addition it is sometimes possible to obtain the mass by making gap-length measurements. This is of particular importance for the non-mesic decay mode of $\Lambda^3\text{H}^4$. These events consist
of the hyperfragment decaying into only one charged particle and may be confused with \( \Sigma^- \) capture or \( \Sigma^+ \) decay via the proton mode. However, for sufficiently long connecting tracks, it is possible to distinguish a factor of \( \sim 3 \) in mass and thereby separate the non-mesic \( \Lambda H^2, H^4 \) from the background. Such an analysis is under way in our laboratory\(^{13}\).

In doing this we require flat tracks with \( \geq 1 \) mm range and use the parameter \( \eta \) described by Ammar et al.\(^{13}\).

Figure 7 shows a photomicrograph of an event which has been analysed in this manner. Mass measurement on the connecting track favours the interpretation that it is due to a particle of greater than baryonic mass. As seen from Table 4, the observed range of 4.2 mm for the secondary excludes the possibility that it comes from either of the two-body modes \( \Lambda H^2 \rightarrow H^2 + n \) or \( \Lambda H^3 \rightarrow H^2 + n \) which require a unique range of 5.5 mm and 7 mm, respectively. Mass determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-mesic decay modes of ( \Lambda H^2 ) and ( \Lambda H^4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Lambda H^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H^2 + n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_d = 7 ) mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H^1 + 2n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on the secondary also favours its interpretation as a particle of greater than baryonic mass. The event can therefore most likely be interpreted as

\[
\Lambda H^2 \rightarrow H^2 + 2n .
\]
It should be emphasized, however, that events analysed in this manner are subject to far more uncertainty than those identified entirely by kinematic considerations, and as a result their significance rests more on a statistical basis than on an individual one.

Although the yield is low, it is hoped that by the accumulation of such events, normalized to the appropriate number of \( \pi^- \) decays of \( A^{3+4} \), one can determine a precise value of the non-mesic to \( \pi^- \)-mesic ratio for these hyperfragments directly.

***
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Fig. 1. - Photomicrograph of event interpreted as $K^- + C^{12} \rightarrow \Lambda Be^9 + \pi^- + H^1 + H^1 + n$. 

Fig. 2. - Range vs. momentum curves for recoils from hyperfragment decays.
Fig. 3. - Photomicrograph of event interpreted as $\nu B^{11} + \pi + C^{11}$.

Fig. 4. - Photomicrograph of event interpreted as $\nu Li^{9} + \pi + H^{1} + Li^{9}$.
\[ \Delta^A \rightarrow (Z+1)^A + \pi^- \]

\[ 6 \leq A \leq 16 \]

1) NO \( \beta \) EXPECTED TO BE SEEN

PION ENERGY (Mev)

2) \( \beta \) EXPECTED

PION ENERGY (Mev)

Fig. 5. - \((\pi^- - \pi^-)\) Configurations displayed in two groups according as the lifetime for \( \beta \) decay of the recoil is long or short compared with the sensitive time of the emulsion. Several species shown have not been actually observed and for these the \( B_\beta \) used in calculating the energy release has been estimated from the trend of the \( B_\Delta \) vs. \( A \) curve. Events denoted by x have recoils which decay into heavy particles.
Fig. 6. - Photomicrograph of event interpreted as $\Delta \text{Be}^9 \rightarrow \text{Li}^8 + \text{H}^1$.

Fig. 7. - Photomicrograph of event interpreted as $\Delta \text{H}^4 \rightarrow \text{H}^2 + 2\text{n}$.
HYPERNUCLEI

R. Levi-Setti,
Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago.

I. BASIC DEFINITIONS AND NOMENCLATURE

A hypernucleus: a hyperon bound to a nuclear core

\[(\Lambda + H^3) \rightarrow \Lambda H^3\]

\[(\Lambda + H^4) \rightarrow \Lambda H^4, \text{ etc.}\]

The nuclear core need not be a stable nucleus; examples of hypernuclei in which the core in its ground state is a nuclear resonant state are e.g. \((A + Be^8) \rightarrow \Lambda Be^9\), where ordinary Be\(^8\) would disintegrate Be\(^8\) \rightarrow 2He\(^4\) + 0.1 MeV. Occasionally the \(\Lambda\)-nucleon attraction provides sufficient binding to form hypernuclei out of a completely unbound core, e.g. \((A + Be^6) \rightarrow \Lambda Be^7\) where ordinarily Be\(^6\) \rightarrow 2p + He\(^4\) + 1.4 MeV.

The \(\Lambda\)-binding energy \(B_\Lambda\) is defined as usual from

\[\Lambda(A,Z) = (A-1,Z) + \Lambda - B_\Lambda\]

and can be measured, since \(\Lambda(A,Z) = \Sigma_{ij}(A_i^j,Z_j^i) + Q\)

\[B_\Lambda = Q_0 - Q, \text{ where } Q_0 = (A-1,Z) + \Lambda - \Sigma_{ij}(A_i^j,Z_j^i).\]

Hypernuclear disintegrations in which \(\Lambda \rightarrow \pi^- + p\) are called mesonic decays; those where \(\Lambda + n,p \rightarrow n + n,p\) are called non-mesonic decays. Common abbreviations for decay modes are

\[(\pi^- - r) \text{ e.g. } \Lambda H^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + He^3, \text{ } \Lambda Li^7 \rightarrow \pi^- + Be^7, \text{ etc.},\]

\[(\pi^- - p - r) \text{ e.g. } \Lambda He^5 \rightarrow \pi^- + p + He^4, \text{ etc.},\]

\[(\pi^- - n - r) \text{ e.g. } \Lambda H^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + n + He^3, \text{ } \Lambda Li^9 \rightarrow \pi^- + n + Be^8, \text{ etc.}\]

*) This talk was also given at the 1963 Easter School for Emulsion Physicists.
Note that $Q_0$ for $(\pi,p,r)$ decays is always $Q_{\Lambda} = 37.58$ MeV. $B_{\Lambda}$ can be measured best from mesonic or mesic decays in view of the low energy release, usually in the range 25-55 MeV. For non-mesic decays $Q \approx 176$ MeV-$B_{\Lambda}$.

II. OBSERVATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF HYPERNUCLEI

Although hyperfragments can originate any time a $\Lambda$ is created within a nucleus, and therefore from reactions such as

$$\pi^- + p \to \Lambda + K^0, \ p + p \to \Lambda + K^+ + p, \ etc.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

the most copious source of h.f. are $K^-$ induced reactions in nuclear matter, where the elementary reactions are

$$K^- + n, p \to \Lambda + \pi^- \pi^0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

The reason is obvious; while reactions of type (3) have a high threshold and small cross-section, reactions of type (4) are exothermic and occur very frequently. The big step of creating strangeness is separated, in Eq. (4), from that of producing h.f.'s. Typical production rates of h.f.'s from $K^-$ absorbed at rest in light nuclei are $\sim 2-5\%$. In the processes of production, survival, and decay of a hyperfragment we find the means of observation and identification of particular hypernuclear species. It would be desirable, of course, to be able to compare the observables on the three steps simultaneously. This is, however, seldom possible.

1. Identification at production

Identification at production is particularly reliable in two-body reactions

$$K^- + He^4 \to \Lambda He^4 + \pi^- \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

$$\Lambda H^4 + \pi^0.$$
These reactions are obviously exclusive domain of the He bubble chamber. Similar reactions have been observed in nuclear emulsion, such as:

\[ K^- + C^{12} \rightarrow \Lambda B^{12} + \pi^0 \]
\[ \Sigma^- + C^{12} \rightarrow \Lambda B^{12} + n. \]

(6)

In this case, however, the uncertainty as to the target nucleus detracts from the evidence. The requirements of energy and momentum balance can only be checked approximately in Eq. (6), where the only observable of the production process is a very short (~ 4 \( \mu \text{m} \)) h.f. track. Hopefully, reactions such as in lithium-loaded emulsion should yield an independent clear-cut identification of production

\[ K^- + Li^7 \rightarrow \Lambda Li^7 + \pi^- \]
\[ \Lambda Ho^7 + \pi^0. \]

(7)

Occasionally it is possible to obtain a satisfactory energy, momentum, charge and mass balance of more complicated production reactions in nuclear emulsion. Very seldom, however, is such information independent from that supplied by the decay process. This method is in all cases a very powerful tool; very likely the only method to give a reliable identification of relatively heavy hypernuclei. As we shall see, some decay modes (\( \pi^- \)) of heavy hypernuclei become completely non-characteristic and a combined analysis of production and decay reaction is called for, e.g.

\[ K^- + O^{16} \rightarrow \Lambda C^{14} + 2H^1 + \pi^-; \quad \Lambda C^{14} \rightarrow \pi^- + N^{14}. \]

(8)
The use of small emulsion stacks for h.f. work prevents, in general, the observation of the production pion in its entire range, and its sign determination. On the other hand, at this stage in h.f. work, this information is quite fundamental.

2. Identification during survival

Hyperfragments can be identified during their survival namely from measurements on the h.f. track itself. If the h.f. comes to rest and it has sufficient range, any of the conventional means of determining mass and charge in emulsion apply. Thus, direct mass measurements can occasionally identify $\Lambda^3$ and $\Lambda^4$ when several millimeters of track are available. $Z$ determinations usually require more than ~50 $\mu$m of h.f. track to be reliable. Thickness measurements in various ways, as well as gap-length measurements have been used. A direct determination of $Z$ often determines the identity of a h.f., when its decay offers certain alternatives, e.g., for $\Lambda^4$, $\Lambda^4\text{He}^4$, when in the $\pi-p-r$ mode of decay the recoil has a very short range, insufficient for direct distinction from range-momentum curves. Identification from h.f. decay is still the most widely attained.

3. Identification at decay

A blind approach to this problem is that of feeding input data, such as ranges and angles into a computer programmed to try all permutations of prong identities until a good fit is obtained. Then, amongst the output reactions, one chooses the one which yields the lowest momentum unbalance $\Delta P$. Although this procedure is necessary for the analysis of complicated decays, it may often hide some relevant information. Thus, a few remarks are in order.

($\pi-r$) events

The pion momentum uniquely determines the recoil momentum and comparison with P-R curves immediately identifies the event. This is true, of course, for recoils which are long enough to afford discrimination.
In order to improve the fit, collinearity may be imposed, when justified. The direction of the recoil is, in fact, seldom well-defined, in particular its dip angle. One can obtain a better recoil range estimate by measuring its projected range, and inferring its dip angle from the knowledge of the π direction.

Note This is a procedure which should be used with caution. There is a point in measuring accurately ΔP and deviations from collinearity even for species as common and typical as $\Lambda H^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + He^4$. In fact, if species such as $\Lambda H^5$, $\Lambda H^6$ should exist, their decays

$$\Lambda H^5 \rightarrow \pi^- + n + He^4, \quad \Lambda H^6 \rightarrow \pi^- + 2n + He^4$$

(9)

could very well simulate $\Lambda H^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + He^4$, with some departure from collinearity. Furthermore, a decay

$$\Lambda H^6 \rightarrow He^6 + \pi^-$$

(10)

would look like an anomalous π - r decay of $\Lambda H^4$, with a recoil somewhat shorter ($\sim 5.4 \mu m$) than usual (8.1 μm).

Some of the possible pitfalls in identifying π - r events are worth mentioning. Even $\Lambda H^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + He^3$ is not exempt from simulators. In fact,

$$\Lambda Li^9 \rightarrow \pi^- + n + 2He^4$$

(11)

can occur in a configuration similar to $\Lambda H^3$ (π - r). In such a case, however, the h.f. track should tell the difference unless too short (as usually the case for $\Lambda Li^9$). The real difficulties arise from π - r decays of heavier species, when the discriminating power of the recoil range is lost (as well as the possibility of ascertaining collinearity!).

The trouble begins very soon. We are very likely unable to tell the difference between

$$\Lambda He^6 \rightarrow \pi^- + Li^6 \quad (\text{if it exists}),$$

and

$$\Lambda Li^7 \rightarrow \pi^- + Be^7.$$  

(12)
Both decays yield (or are expected to) \( \pi \) ranges of \( \sim 2.2 \text{ cm} \) and recoil ranges in the neighbourhood of \( 2 \mu \text{m} \). If \( \Lambda \text{He}^8 \) should exist, its decay

\[
\Lambda \text{He}^8 \rightarrow \pi^- + n + \text{Li}^7
\]  

(15)

would have an overwhelming chance of being confused with

\[
\Lambda \text{Be}^7 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{Li}^7. \tag{14}
\]

From \( \Lambda \text{Be}^{10} \) on, all recoils have a range of \( 1 \mu \text{m} \) or less. On the other hand, the \( \pi \) ranges from many different species overlap. The properties of the recoils may then help, like their \( \beta \) decay

\[
\Lambda \text{B}^{11} \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{C}^{11}, \text{recoil } \beta^+, \text{range } \sim 2.07 \text{ cm}
\]  

(15)

\[
\Lambda \text{Be}^{10} \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{B}^{10}, \text{recoil stable, } \pi \text{ range } \sim 2.0 \text{ cm.}
\]

The failure to observe the decay \( \beta \) will automatically involve misidentification. Even when the recoil is unstable like \( \text{Li}^8 \), a pitfall is open. Take

\[
\Lambda \text{Be}^8 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{B}^8, \text{B}^8 \rightarrow \beta^+ + \nu + \text{Be}^6^*, \text{Be}^6^* \rightarrow 2\text{He}^4. \tag{16}
\]

If the \( \beta^+ \) were overlooked, the event may be interpreted in a very complicated way, perhaps even as

\[
\Lambda \text{Li}^7 \rightarrow \pi^- + n + 2\text{He}^4. \tag{17}
\]

The same would hold for a hypothetical decay

\[
\Lambda \text{He}^8 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{Li}^8. \tag{18}
\]
All this is further complicated by the possibility that heavy recoils be emitted in excited states, or that the hypernucleus decays from an isomeric state. For these reasons, identifications based on π-p-r events of heavy h.f. should always be taken with great caution and in general are not as clear-cut as those based on other all-charged decay modes. The importance of a combined analysis production-decay vertices for these events cannot be stressed any further.

(π-p-r) events

After checking for consistency with coplanarity, it is, in general, useful to impose coplanarity by inferring the recoil direction from that of the resultant momentum \( \vec{P}_{\pi p} = \vec{P}_\pi + \vec{P}_p \). Next it is useful to plot \( |\vec{P}_{\pi p}| \) versus the corrected recoil range \( R_{rec} \). Range momentum curves can be constructed experimentally in this way for various isotopes. Errors and anomalies can easily be spotted. Below certain recoil ranges it becomes impossible to discriminate among neighbouring isotopes. Thus, below \( \sim 3 \mu m \), it becomes meaningless to accept a discrimination between Hs\(^3\) and Hs\(^4\). Problem cases of this type are frequently encountered for all species, \( \Lambda^H^3, \Lambda^H^4, \Lambda^H^5, \Lambda^L^7 \), etc. For the lighter species, however, a good fraction of the events yield recoils in the sensitive region. For the heavier species, problem cases become the rule because the recoil ranges, usually very short, become increasingly insensitive to the momentum \( \vec{P}_{\pi p} \). Obviously in this region, one cannot even assess that the decay is indeed of the π-p-r type, nor that neutrons are emitted. Analysis in conjunction with the production kinematics becomes once more crucial. In discussing π-p-r events of even the lighter hypernuclloi, one should bear in mind that the recoil co-ordinates in the P-R plot have considerable spread. In certain regions
of the plot, in particular when an abundant species \( \Lambda^1 \text{He}^8 \) is next to a less abundant one \( \Lambda^4 \text{He}^4 \), some overlap of the distributions will always occur, so that some contamination of one species with another may be present. With increased statistics one can attempt to 

**purify** a collection of events of a given species by imposing a progressively increasing range cut-off on the recoil in order to accept events only in a region of the \((P-R)\) plots where no overlap can occur.

**Remark** A procedure as outlined above is the only method to eliminate from a sample of a given species possible contaminations. Such contaminations introduce systematic biases in the determination of, for example, binding energies. The addition of small or large samples of identified h.f. to the world statistics becomes a worthless proposition if only \( B_A \)'s or worse, \( B_{\bar{A}} \) 's are given. The raw data are instead needed in order to attempt an elimination of the intrinsic, systematic errors due to contamination.
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\[ \text{Fig. 5} \]

Again, some features of the recoil may help, when the recoil itself is too short. For example, in the decay

\[ \Lambda^7 \text{Li}^9 \rightarrow \pi^- + p + \text{Li}^8, \text{Li}^8 \rightarrow \beta^- + \bar{\nu} + \text{Be}^6^\alpha, \text{Be}^6^\alpha \rightarrow 2\text{He}^4; \]

\( (19) \)

watch out, however, for the very similar decay

\[ \Lambda^9 \text{Be}^9 \rightarrow \pi^- + p + \text{Be}^8, \text{Be}^8 \rightarrow \beta^+ + \nu + \text{Be}^6^\alpha, \text{Be}^6^\alpha \rightarrow 2\text{He}^4. \]

\( (20) \)

Incidentally, the range energy curves obtained from h.f. recoil in nuclear emulsion are quite certainly the best available in the approximate range 2-40 \( \mu \)m.

\((\pi-n-r)\) and complex decays

These events are best analysed with computer programmes. However, the following example illustrates some auxiliary method to improve the over-all reliability in the identification of a certain class of events.
The decay

\[ ^\Lambda\text{Li}^9 \rightarrow \pi^- + n + 2\text{He}^4 \]  

(21)

may easily be confused with

\[ ^\Lambda\text{Li}^8 \rightarrow \pi^- + 2\text{He}^4 \]  

(22)

when the neutron momentum is \(|\vec{P}_n| \leq 40 \text{ MeV/c}\). The \(\Delta P\) distribution for three-body charged decays, in fact, extends up to this approximate value, due to measurement errors. If the energy release \(Q\) is plotted against the missing momentum \(P_n\) (or \(\Delta P\)), a separation between \(^\Lambda\text{Li}^8\) and \(^\Lambda\text{Li}^9\) can be achieved on an entire body of events, and some statistical method may be used to cut off a possible contamination of \(^\Lambda\text{Li}^8\) events amongst \(^\Lambda\text{Li}^9\).

A general comment is required concerning all decays involving neutron emission, when considering \(B_\Lambda\). Such events will yield systematically underestimated estimates of \(B_\Lambda\). In fact, while the momentum unbalance \(\Delta P\), due to exp. errors is neglected in decays involving only charged particles, \(\Delta P\) will contribute to the estimate of the neutron momentum, as

\[ (P_n)_{\text{exp}} = (P_n)_{\text{true}} + \frac{(\Delta P)^2}{3(P_n)_{\text{true}}} \]  

(23)

Thus, the neutron energy will be overestimated, and so will \(Q\), giving a corresponding underestimate of \(B_\Lambda\). Of course, this effect will be felt at small \((P_n \approx \Delta P)\) neutron momenta and is in general small. However, since average \(B_\Lambda\)'s for some species, or even individual decay modes, have errors (statistical) smaller than 0.1 MeV, even an effect of this kind should not be neglected. Whenever possible, it may be best to base binding energy estimates on decay modes involving charged particles only.
4. Identification on the basis of $B_A$

This is the last remedy, resort to which is obviously very dangerous. It is difficult, of course, to assess the extent to which it is practiced. To some extent it is always used, if nothing else, when one rejects an identification leading to a negative $B_A$. It should be realized, however, that an identity, giving a $B_A$ in agreement with a known value is by no means an identification. Pitfalls may be wide open when a species is "expected" to have a certain $B_A$, and an event is attributed to that species on this basis. This is particularly the case with $(\pi - p - r)$ events, where the interpolated $B_A$ is the only basis on which to predict the configuration. The only situation in which this approach seems justified is encountered in the determination of branching ratios between various decay modes of a certain species, e.g. the separation between the $(\pi - p - r)$ decays of $\Lambda^3$ and $\Lambda^4$, where the recoil is invisible. Careless use of this method will, on the other hand, produce non-Gaussian distributions of $B_A$, will cut off interesting tails, and will hide possible splittings in $B_A$ due to excited initial or final states.

5. Experiments with known target nuclei

Some have been mentioned previously. It may be that even accurate $B_A$ estimates may be obtained from the measurement of the $\pi$ range following

$$K^- (A, Z) \rightarrow \Lambda (A, Z) + \pi^- + Q$$ \hspace{1cm} (24)

where $Q = B_A - B_n + 176$ MeV, and $B_n$ is the binding of the last neutron in $(A, Z)$. This approach carries the identification at production to its logical extreme, that of producing particular h.f. species. It may be valuable for $A \geq 3 - 10$. It offers the advantage that techniques other than nuclear emulsion may be used advantageously, such as bubble chambers, spark chambers, etc.
III. INFORMATION DERIVED FROM HYPERNUCLEAR PROPERTIES

What does one learn from the study of hypernuclei, study which is based so far on a sample of perhaps 2000 mesic decays analysed in nuclear emulsion and several hundreds in the He bubble chamber? Several basic answers have been given to properties of the strong and weak interaction of the Λ hyperon with nucleons, as well as to intrinsic questions regarding strange particles properly.

A brief summary of the main results is the following.

1. Strong Λ- n interaction
   a) The Λ-nucleon interaction is charge symmetric as substantiated by the well-established existence of hypernuclear charge multiplets. Such multiplets correspond to those for the nuclear cores since the Λ has isospin T = 0.
   b) The Λ-nucleon interaction is strong with coupling constant of the order of unity. This follows from an analysis of the Λ-binding energies for light hypernuclei. A measure of this strength is given (following Dalitz) by the volume integral of a Λ-nucleon central potential of appropriate shape for a particular spin state S. In these terms one can compare the Λ-n to the n-n interaction, e.g.

   \[ ^3S_1, \text{n-p volume integral } U \approx 1400 \text{ MeV } \text{f}^3 \]

   \[ ^1S_0, \text{Λ-p volume integral } U \approx 380 \text{ MeV } \text{f}^3. \]

Since the range of Λ-nucleon force is much shorter (at least two π exchange) than that of the n-n force, the over-all Λ-n binding is weaker than the corresponding nucleon-nucleon binding, even though the interactions have comparable strengths\(^1\). Alternatively, the interaction can be described in terms of singlet and triplet scattering lengths. (See Dalitz, following lecture.)
c) The $\Lambda$-nucleon interaction is strongly spin-dependent. This follows from an analysis of both the $\Lambda$-binding energies and the direct determination of the spin of several hypernuclei ($^3\Lambda^n_1$, $^4\Lambda^H_1$, $^8\Lambda^Li_1$). Indirect information stems also from the measurement of hypernuclear lifetimes. The $^1S_0$ $\Lambda$-n interaction is more attractive than that in the $^3S_1$ state, opposite to the nucleon-nucleon case$^2$.

For the sake of illustration, recall that the Fermi scattering lengths are, for:

\begin{align*}
 n-p & \quad \Lambda-p \, \text{(See Dalitz, next lecture)}.
 a_s = -2.34 \times 10^{-12} \, \text{cm} & a_s \approx -2.4 \times 10^{-13} \, \text{cm} \\
 a_t = 0.52 \times 10^{-12} \, \text{cm} & a_t \approx -0.6 \times 10^{-13} \, \text{cm}
\end{align*}

\[\text{Fig. 7}\]

\[\text{n-p \quad \Lambda-n \quad n-p} \]

\[\text{no bound state \quad \text{no bound state}}\]

\[\text{bound state can exist \quad \text{bound state can exist}}\]

\[\text{no bound state \quad \text{no bound state}}\]

\[-U_0 \quad \text{(almost bound)} \quad -U_0 \quad \text{(almost bound)}\]

\[R \quad R\]

\[a_t \quad a_s \quad a_t \quad a_s\]

\[\text{d) The well-depth experienced by a $\Lambda$ particle in nuclear matter is } \approx 30 \, \text{MeV}. \text{ This result stems from the determination of } B_\Lambda \text{ for heavy hypernuclei as well as from theoretical calculations.}\]

e) The $K^-$ is a pseudoscalar particle. This follows from the study of the reaction $K^- + ^4\text{He} \rightarrow \Lambda^H + \pi^0$ in the He bubble chamber, knowing that $J(\Lambda^H) = 0$.\]
2. Weak $\Lambda - n$ interaction

a) Several checks of the validity of the $|\Delta T| = \frac{1}{2}$ rule in
$\Lambda$-pionic decay modes have been given from the study of branching ratios in
the decay modes of some light hypernuclei. Perhaps the most significant
result is the determination of the ratio $p_0/s_0$ between the $p$- and $s$-wave
amplitudes in $\Lambda$-decay via the $\pi^0$ mode obtained by the He bubble chamber
group. The prediction of the $|\Delta T| = \frac{1}{2}$ rule, that $p_0/s_0 = p/s$ seems
well satisfied.

b) Information on the strength of the weak interaction leading
to $\Lambda + n \rightarrow n + n$. This is obtained from the branching ratios non-mesic/mesic
for the decay modes of individual hypernuclear species. Very little is
known on this subject. One would like to know whether, for instance, this
interaction is spin-dependent or not.

3. Nuclear physics

A variety of final state interaction effects can be found in
hypernuclear decays. Typical examples $^4_\Lambda$He$^5 \rightarrow \pi^- + Li^5$; $Li^5 \rightarrow p + He^4$
($P_\Lambda$ resonance dominant) $^6_\Lambda$Li$^8 \rightarrow \pi^- + Be^{8*}$; $Be^{8*} \rightarrow \pi^- + 2He^4 (0^+, 2^+$
intermediate states present). These properties, as we shall see, may
be very useful for specific purposes, like spin determination. Occasionally,
new information on low energy nuclear physics problems may be gained as a
by-product.

We will now try to justify some of the above results by
presenting the evidence in some detail.

IV. A BINDING ENERGIES

The enclosed tabulation contains up-to-date averages of $B_\Lambda$ for
established species. When relevant, $E_\Lambda$ are given separately for the
most abundant decay modes of the same species. Several features are
exhibited by a plot of $B_\Lambda$ versus mass number $A$. 
These are:

i) the presence of charge multiplets reflecting the isospin structure of the core nuclei;

ii) an over-all monotonic increase of $B_\Lambda$ as a function of $A$;

iii) a discrete structure within the multiplets which is to be attributed to spin-dependent effects.

$^\Lambda_\Lambda H^3$ is the lightest hypernucleus known. It is attributed $T = 0$ since there is no evidence for the other members of a $T = 1$ state, $^\Lambda_\Lambda n^3$ and $^\Lambda_\Lambda He^3$. Its $B_\Lambda$ is very small, $(0.31 \pm 0.15)$ MeV and the $B_\Lambda$ distribution for this species is rather broad, somewhat more than expected from range-straggling alone.
$^\Lambda H^4$, $^\Lambda He^4$ are mirror hypernuclei ($T = \frac{1}{2}$) and have very similar $B_\Lambda$'s (2.14 ± 0.03) MeV and (2.47 ± 0.09) MeV respectively as required from charge symmetry. One may comment that these values, due to the small errors, are almost in disagreement. The $\bar{B}_\Lambda$ determination of $^\Lambda H^4$ requires some more detailed investigation. As can be seen from Table 1, $\pi - r$ events yield for $\bar{B}_\Lambda$ the value (2.40 ± 0.12) MeV, very close to $^\Lambda He^6$. $n$ events give a very low $\bar{B}_\Lambda$, (1.75 ± 0.1) MeV and perhaps should not be included in the average for the reasons discussed above. Finally, ($\pi - p - r$) events for which $\bar{B}_\Lambda = (2.00 ± 0.14)$ MeV could contain a contamination of $^\Lambda H^3$ which would lower $\bar{B}_\Lambda$. On the other hand, $^\Lambda He^4$ could well contain a contamination of $^\Lambda He^5$, which would increase $\bar{B}_\Lambda$, in the sense of emphasizing a difference between $^\Lambda H^4$ and $^\Lambda He^4$ which may not be real at all. The one way to improve the situation here is not a mere increase in statistics, but a more severe selection of the events as pointed out in the section on identification problems.

The $B_\Lambda$ distribution for the $\pi - r$ decays of $^\Lambda H^4$ is somewhat skew at the higher end. This could be due on one side to the inclusion of events in which the long pion (4 cm) may have lost energy in undetected interactions. On the other hand, a contamination of still hypothetical decays:

$$^\Lambda H^5 \to \pi^- + n + He^4, \quad ^\Lambda H^6 \to \pi^- + 2n + He^4$$

(25)

cannot be ruled out and should perhaps be kept in mind.

$^\Lambda He^5$. It is the most abundant hypernucleus. It decays essentially by the $\pi - p - r$ mode only. Its $\bar{B}_\Lambda$, (3.10 ± 0.05) MeV, is the best known and the $B_\Lambda$ distribution is the closer to a Gaussian than any of the others.

($^\Lambda He^6$, $^\Lambda Li^6$). No clear cut evidence for the existence of these hypernuclei has been reported, nor the large number of $^\Lambda He^5$ giving decays also compatible with

$$^\Lambda He^6 \to \pi^- + p + n + He^4$$

(26)
is a valid argument to support the existence of $^\Lambda\text{He}^6$. The decay

$$^\Lambda\text{He}^6 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{H}^3 + \text{H}^3, \quad Q_0 = 26.44 \text{ MeV} \quad (27)$$

would provide good evidence.

See fig.10

$^\Lambda\text{He}^7$, $^\Lambda\text{Li}^7$, $^\Lambda\text{Be}^7$. $^\Lambda\text{Li}^7$ has $T = 0$ while $^\Lambda\text{He}^7$ and $^\Lambda\text{Be}^7$ are members of a $T = 1$ state. The $B_\Lambda$ for $^\Lambda\text{Li}^7$ is well-established, $(5.52 \pm 0.12)$ MeV from decays other than $\pi^- \gamma$. Only two examples of $^\Lambda\text{Be}^7$ are known, yielding $B_\Lambda = (4.9 \pm 0.5)$ MeV while for $^\Lambda\text{He}^7$ an average of 14 $B_\Lambda$ values would give $B_\Lambda = (3.96 \pm 0.24)$ MeV.

See fig.11
Two effects are present here. On one side, the $\overline{B}_\Lambda$ of $^7\Lambda$Li is higher than either of the $\overline{B}_\Lambda$ of $^7\Lambda$He or $^7\Lambda$Be, and this can be understood in terms of the spin dependence of the $\Lambda$-nucleon interaction. On the other side, the $\overline{B}_\Lambda$'s for $^7\Lambda$He and $^7\Lambda$Be which should be identical, are indeed in disagreement. A suggestion made by Danysz and Pniewski\textsuperscript{3)}, is the following. $^7\Lambda$He may decay from an isomeric state ($^6\Lambda$He has a level at 1.6 MeV in the continuum) and the observed $B_\Lambda$ distribution may contain, in fact, two groups of $B_\Lambda$'s. That this should be the case is substantiated by the very existence of $^7\Lambda$Be. In fact, the condition for the stability of $^7\Lambda$Be against break up

$$^7\Lambda\text{Be} \rightarrow 2p + ^5\Lambda\text{He},$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

is that its $B_\Lambda$ be greater than 4.5 MeV. Thus even with only two $^7\Lambda$Be events, we know that $B_\Lambda(^7\Lambda\text{Be})$ must exceed 4.5 MeV. From charge symmetry one would then expect that the ground state $^7\Lambda$He should have $B_\Lambda$ also $> 4.5$ MeV. Thus, considerable interest is attached to an increase in the statistics of $^7\Lambda$He events. At present it is difficult to detect a splitting in the $B_\Lambda$ distribution. The reasons to expect such splitting are, however, plausible, as will be further illustrated by Dalitz (these lectures).

$^8\Lambda$Li, $^8\Lambda$Be. Another well-established pair of mirror hypernuclei. Their $\overline{B}_\Lambda$'s are in very close agreement.

See fig.12
\( ^{\Lambda} \text{Li}^9, ^{\Lambda} \text{Be}^9, (\text{B}^9) \). The binding energy of \( ^{\Lambda} \text{Li}^9 (T = 1) \) is about 1.5 MeV greater than that of \( ^{\Lambda} \text{Be}^9 (T = 0) \). This is of course a point of great interest because if this difference is to be attributed to spin dependence only, it may be incompatible with the results from the mass 7 hypernuclei. Unfortunately the \( B_A \) distribution for \( ^{\Lambda} \text{Li}^9 \) is not one of the most satisfactory. \( ^{\Lambda} \text{B}^9 \) has never been reported. Its decay \( (\pi - p - r) \) could be confused, as remarked before, with that of \( ^{\Lambda} \text{Li}^9 \). This misidentification would not, however, affect the observed large difference in \( B_A \) between the \( T = 0 \) and \( T = 1 \) states. For heavier species, the plot shows how little is known. The spread \( \sigma \) of the \( B_A \) distributions is shown as a function of \( Q \) in the following plot. The over-all monotonic increase of \( B_A \) versus \( A \) can be understood in a rather simple way. The \( \Lambda \) particle, not obeying the Pauli principle in a single \( \Lambda \) hypernucleus, occupies the lowest \( s \) state. Thus, no saturation effects are expected until the \( \Lambda \) will reach the bottom of the potential well, for a very heavy hypernucleus.

See fig.13

As the radius \( R \) of the region of interaction increases, with increasing \( A \), the \( \Lambda \) will progressively "sink" to a lower energy state in the well. This can be seen as follows. Consider for simplicity the \( \Lambda \) in a square potential well of depth \( U(r) = -D_A \), radius \( R \).
The standard solution of the Schrödinger equation for this problem, after matching the wave functions at the boundary R is:

\[ K \cot KR = -\gamma, \text{ or } \sqrt{\frac{2M}{\hbar^2}} (D_A - B_A) \cot \sqrt{\frac{2M}{\hbar^2}} (D_A - B_A) R = - \sqrt{\frac{2M}{\hbar^2}} B_A \]  

(29)

\[ \cot \sqrt{\frac{2M}{\hbar^2}} (D_A - B_A) R = - \frac{B_A}{\sqrt{D_A - B_A}}. \]  

(30)

One can now find approximate solutions for convenient asymptotic cases. Take for example \( B_A \approx D_A \), then

\[ \sqrt{\frac{2M}{\hbar^2}} (D_A - B_A) R \approx \pi; \quad B_A \approx D_A - \frac{\pi^2 \hbar^2}{2M \alpha r_0^2 A^{7/3}}. \]  

(31)

Equation (31) expresses explicitly how \( B_A \) depends on \( A \) for heavy hypernuclei. This equation suggests a method for the determination of \( D_A \). In fact, a plot of \( B_A \) versus \( A^{-7/3} \) for heavy hypernuclei should be, in the zeroth approximation, a linear plot. Extrapolation to \( A \to \infty \) will give a value for \( D_A \). This has indeed been accomplished at least partially from the knowledge of an upper limit of \( B_A \) for hypernuclei in the mass range \( 60 < A < 100 \). The result is that \( D_A \lesssim 30 \text{ MeV} \). The upper limit of \( B_A \) for \( 60 < A < 100 \) hypernuclei was obtained from the upper limit in the energy release of mesic and non-mesic disintegrations of "spallation hyperfragments".
An attempt is being made at present to obtain a lower limit of $B_\Lambda$ for bromine hypernuclei following the measurement of the energy release in the reaction at rest

$$K^- + Br^{79} \rightarrow \Lambda Br^{79} + \pi^-,$$

if such a reaction is found to occur to the ground state or some low lying state of $\Lambda Br^{79}$. This study is made in a large CF$_3$Br bubble chamber where $K^-$ mesons have been brought to rest. Even when $B_\Lambda$ for heavy hypernuclei is known more accurately, the crude linear extrapolation to $D_\Lambda$ will have to be improved, making use of a better approximation of Eq. (31). This will take into account a more realistic shape for the potential and indications are (Dalitz) that the correct functional dependence of $B_\Lambda$ versus $A^{-2/3}$ is not linear but possesses some curvature (the slope increases slightly with $A$).
V. THE SPINS OF A HYPERNUCLEI

Spin assignments have been obtained so far for $^\Lambda\text{H}^3$, $^\Lambda\text{H}^4$, and $^\Lambda\text{Li}^6$. The spin of species with spinless core, such as $^\Lambda\text{He}^3$ can be inferred as being equal to the $\Lambda$ spin, $J = \frac{1}{2}$. We can distinguish several approaches to this problem.

i) Determination by direct methods. It implies the production or selection of an aligned sample of hypernuclei. It is based on the study of angular correlations of the decay products with respect to some axis of quantization.

ii) Determination from branching ratios of different decay modes. Conservation of angular momentum may favour certain final states over others.

iii) More indirect approaches, e.g. based on hypernuclear lifetimes. These are, however, not independent of (ii).

Take, for example, $^\Lambda\text{H}^4$. A direct spin determination has been obtained by the He bubble chamber group from a study of the sequence of reactions

$$K^- + \text{He}^4 \to ^\Lambda\text{H}^4 + \pi^0; \quad ^\Lambda\text{H}^4 \to \pi^- + \text{He}^4.$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

All particles in these reactions are spinless except possibly $^\Lambda\text{H}^4$ which can have at the most $J = 0$ or $1$. If $^\Lambda\text{H}^4$ has $J = 0$, the decay $^\Lambda\text{H}^4 \to \pi^- + \text{He}^4$ is then necessarily isotropic. Note that in such a case, since the orbital angular momentum $L$ in the initial state must equal the orbital angular momentum $L$ in the final state, the observation of Eq. (33) implies that the intrinsic parity $\omega_K = \omega_\pi = -1$ or ($\omega_\Lambda = +1$ by convention) that the $K$ is *pseudoscalar*. Consider now the case of $J = 1$, and $K^-$ capture from an s-orbital (there are good arguments in favour of this assumption). Then $L = 1$ in the final state which implies that $\omega_K = +1$, a *scalar* $K$ meson. As to the angular distribution in the decay of $^\Lambda\text{H}^4$, take the direction of $^\Lambda\text{H}^4$ as the axis $Z$ of quantization. Only the projection $J_Z = m(\Lambda\text{H}^4) = 0$ is allowed in the final state.
This, in turn, implies that in the rest system of $\pi$, $\text{He}^4$, $l_\pi = 1$, $m_\pi = 0$. Then the angular distribution is characterized by the spherical harmonic $Y^l_0(\Theta)$ only and $P(\Theta) \propto \cos^2 \Theta$. The exp. distribution found by Block et al.\textsuperscript{6}) is isotropic, strongly suggesting that $J(\Lambda, \text{He}^4) = 0$ and that the $K$ is pseudoscalar. Prior to this direct determination, $J = 0$ for $\Lambda, \text{He}^4$ had already been assigned as a result of an emulsion experiment.

Fig. 17

The spin assignment in question follows:

a) the original argument given by Dalitz\textsuperscript{7}) and also Dalitz and Liu\textsuperscript{8}) which relates the branching ratio $R_4 = \frac{\pi^- + \text{He}^4}{\text{all modes}}$ to the spin $J$ and to the p/s ratio in $\Lambda$ decay;

b) an exp. determination of $R_4$ in nuclear emulsion\textsuperscript{9});

c) the accurate determination of the p/s ratio in $\Lambda$ decay by Beall et al.\textsuperscript{10}) and by Cronin et al.\textsuperscript{11}).

The argument in its essence is the following: the decay $\Lambda \to \pi^- + p$ violates parity conservation and can proceed through both
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s- and p-wave pion emission (see Dalitz, following lecture). Since the decay $\Lambda^+ H^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + He^4$ involves spinless particles in the final state, the spin $J$ of $\Lambda^+ H^4$ equals the orbital angular momentum $L$ in the final state.

Thus, if $J(\Lambda^+ H^4) = 0$, the $\pi^- r$ decay will be favoured if s-wave pion emission predominates in $\Lambda$ decay, being forbidden for zero s-wave amplitude. Conversely, $J(\Lambda^+ H^4) = 1$, the $\pi^- r$ decay is forbidden for zero p-wave amplitude and enhanced otherwise.

The experimental value of $R_4$ found in emulsion is $0.67 \pm 0.06$. This combined with the value $\frac{P^2}{(s)^2 + (p)^2} = 0.11 \pm 0.03$, and on the basis of the curves calculated by Dalitz and Liu, clearly determines $J(\Lambda^+ H^4) = 0$. A more recent determination of $R_4$ has recently been reported by the He bubble chamber group. Their value, $0.68 \pm 0.04$, is in substantial agreement with that mentioned above.

By an entirely similar reasoning $J = \frac{1}{2}$ has been assigned to $\Lambda H^{12}\).

Both angular correlation among the decay products and branching ratios among different final states have enabled a determination of the spin of $\Lambda Li^8$. This is the first hypernucleus of the nuclear p-shell for
which such information is available. The ground state of Li\textsuperscript{7} has
\( J = \frac{3}{2} \) while the first excited state of 0.475 MeV has \( J = \frac{1}{2} \). The \( \Lambda \)
can couple to form \( \Lambda\text{Li}\textsuperscript{8} \) to either of these states so that a priori
the spin of \( \Lambda\text{Li}\textsuperscript{8} \) could be \( 0^- \), \( 1^- \) or \( 2^- \). The solution of the problem
hinges on evidence that the dominant decay

\[
\Lambda\text{Li}\textsuperscript{8} \rightarrow \pi^- + 2\text{He}\textsuperscript{4} \tag{34}
\]

indeed proceeds through intermediate \( \text{Be}\textsuperscript{8*} \) states

\[
\Lambda\text{Li}\textsuperscript{8} \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{Be}\textsuperscript{8*}; \quad \text{Be}\textsuperscript{8*} \rightarrow 2\text{He}\textsuperscript{4} \tag{35}
\]

The information on the spin is derived from:

i) the existence of transitions to discrete \( \text{Be}\textsuperscript{8*} \) states and a comparison
of the observed with the predicted partial rates for particular
final states\textsuperscript{13});

ii) the study of the angular correlation between the \( \pi^- \) direction and
the \( 2\text{He}\textsuperscript{4} \) direction in their centre of mass.

Values of \( E_{\text{rel}} \) and \( \cos \theta \) have been calculated for about
43 events\textsuperscript{14}). A plot of \( E_{\text{rel}} \) shows a remarkable grouping of events for
\( E_{\text{rel}} \) values of \( \sim 0.1 \) MeV, \( \sim 3 \) MeV and \( \sim 17 \) MeV corresponding to all known
levels of \( \text{Be}\textsuperscript{8*} \).

\[ \text{See fig. 19} \]
A very small continuum background seems to contribute. The theoretical predictions by Dalitz are based on the following assumptions (simplified here).

a) The A-decay interaction is dominantly s interaction and therefore has odd parity. Thus, any transition via π⁻ emission to a final state of even parity [like the 0⁺, 2⁺ (T = 0), 2⁺ (T = 1) levels detected here] requires ℓₚ = odd. Very likely only ℓₚ = 1 contributes significantly.

b) The continuum in the Eᵣₑᵣ distributions is neglected.

c) The calculations are based on appropriate intermediate-complying nuclear wave functions.

The predictions and the expt. results can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Expt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If J = 2⁻</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Very small transition rate to Be⁸⁺ (2⁺, 3.0 MeV) or P(θ) ≈ sin²θ for (2⁺) events</td>
<td>Very large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Ratio 2⁺(T = 1) at 17 MeV / 2⁺(T = 0) 3 MeV ≈ 4.5</td>
<td>4/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If J = 1⁻</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) 2⁺(T = 0) 3.0 MeV → 2.7 - 6.4</td>
<td>32/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0⁺(T = 0) 0.09 MeV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) 2⁺(T = 1) 17 MeV / 2⁺(T = 0) 3 MeV ≈ 0</td>
<td>4/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) P(θ) ≈ 1 + 3 cos²θ for (2⁺) events</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 20

![Graph showing the distribution of events with respect to cosine of θ, with different curves for different functions.](5666/NP/smg)
Theory

If \( J = 0^- \) Transitions to \( 0^+, 2^+ \) states Both observed forbidden by angular momentum conservation

In conclusion the over-all evidence favours \( J = 1 \) for \( \Lambda Li^6 \). This shows that even in the p-shell hypernuclei, as well as in the s-shell ones like \( \Lambda H^3, \Lambda H^4 \),

\[
J(\text{HF}) = |(J_\perp - 1/2)|
\]

where \( J_\perp \) = spin of the core in its ground state. Purely as an exercise, a calculation of the angular correlation in \( \Lambda Li^6 \) decay, assuming \( f_\pi = 1 \) is appended. This is valid for transitions to the \( 2^+, 3.0 \text{ MeV} \) state of \( \text{Be}^8 \).

As mentioned previously, the study of hypernuclear lifetimes provides us with another check on the spin assignments. Lifetime estimates of some significance are available for \( \Lambda H^3 \) and \( \Lambda H^4 \). For \( \Lambda \text{He} \) hypernuclei some data have been collected; for heavier hypernuclei no information is available at all. Dalitz and Rajasekharan\(^{13}\) have shown that if \( \Lambda H^3 \) has spin \( J = 1/2 \), the total decay rate is enhanced considerably. A similar situation occurs if \( J(\Lambda H^4) = 0 \). This can be understood qualitatively as due to the fact that if \( J(\Lambda H^3) = 1/2 \) and \( J(\Lambda H^4) = 0 \), the s-channel decay is enhanced by both the Pauli principle, since it leads predominantly to allowed spin configurations, and by the energetic \( (\pi^- + \text{He}^3) \) and \( (\pi^- + \text{He}^4) \) final states respectively. A good estimate of the \( \Lambda H^3 \) lifetime is available from the \( \text{He} \) bubble chamber group experiment\(^{16}\). An estimate of the lifetime of \( \Lambda H^4 \) has been reported by Crayton et al.\(^{17}\) from an emulsion experiment.

A comparison of the theoretical expectation with the experimental data is given in the following table.
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\[ \tau(\Lambda^3) \quad J = \frac{1}{2} \quad J = \frac{3}{2} \]

Theory \( (1.79 \pm 0.10) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec} \quad (2.40 \pm 0.03) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec} \)
(\( \tau_\Lambda = 2.35 \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec} \))

Exp. \( (1.05^{+0.20}_{-0.18}) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec} \quad (36 \text{ events of which 29 in flight}) \)

\[ \tau(\Lambda^4) \quad J = 0 \quad J = 1 \]

Theory \( 1.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec} \quad > 2.7 \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec} \)

Exp. \( (1.2^{+0.6}_{-0.3}) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec} \quad (52 \pi - \rho \text{ events of which 9 in flight}) \)

The predicted enhancement of the total decay rate for the \( \Lambda - n \) anti-parallel spin orientation has been observed. As a matter of fact the enhancements seem to be even greater than expected at least for \( \Lambda^3 \), and this may have to be explained.

Examples of \( \Lambda^4 \) decays in emulsion by the \( \pi - \rho \) mode are shown:

Fig. 21

\[ \Lambda^4 \rightarrow \pi^- \quad \text{a} \]

\[ \Lambda^4 \rightarrow \pi^- \quad \text{b} \]

He\(^4\)
In a recent study by Ammar et al.\textsuperscript{18}) out of 59 $\pi^-$ mesic decay of $^4\Lambda\text{He}$,\textsuperscript{5} five were found to occur in flight. This yields $\tau(\Lambda\text{He}^4,^5) = (1.2^{+1.0}_{-0.4}) \times 10^{-10}$ sec. A result in substantial agreement\textsuperscript{19}) based on 51 $^4\Lambda\text{He}$ events of which only four in flight, is again $\tau(\Lambda\text{He}^4,^5) = (1.4^{+1.8}_{-0.5}) \times 10^{-10}$ sec.

**REFERENCES**


* * *
Angular correlation in the decay $\Lambda\text{Li}^8 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{Be}^8$

$$\Lambda\text{Li}^8 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{Be}^8$$

$J \rightarrow 1 \ 0 \ 2$

**Fig. 22**
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**Fig. 23**
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$\omega(\Theta) = \sum |C(\ell_p, m_p, \ell_q, m_q | J, m) \gamma_{\ell_p}^m(\vec{p}) \gamma_{\ell_q}^m(\vec{q})|^2$

$\ell_p \ell_q$

$\cos \Theta_p = 1 \ \cos \Theta_q = \cos \Theta$

$\gamma_{\ell_p}^m(1) = 0 \ \gamma_{\ell_p}^0(1) = 1$
\[
\omega(\Theta) \sim \sum_{\ell_p, \ell_q} \left| C(\ell_p, \ell_q, m_j, m_j) \right|^2 Y_{\ell_p}^m (\cos \Theta) \]

\[\ell_p = 1, \quad \ell_q = 2, \quad j = 1, \quad \Delta m_j = 0\]

\[
\omega(\Theta) \sim 2 |<1,0,2,1|1,1> Y_2^1 (\cos \Theta)|^2
\]

\[M = m = m_q\]

\[\bar{M} = m_p + m_q\]

\[
\omega(\Theta) \sim |<1,0,2,1|1,1> Y_2^1|^2 + |<1,0,2,0|1,0> Y_2^0|^2 + |<1,0,2,-1|1,-1> Y_2^{-1}|^2
\]

\[<1,0,2,1|1,1> = \sqrt{\frac{(j + 3)(j + 3 + 1)}{2j + 3}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (j + 1) = \sqrt{\frac{j + 1}{2}}\]

\[<1,0,2,0|1,0> = \sqrt{\frac{(j + 3)(j + 3 + 1)}{2j + 3}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\]

\[<1,0,2,-1|1,-1> = \sqrt{\frac{(j + 3)(j + 3 + 1)}{2j + 3}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\]

\[Y_2^0 = \sqrt{\frac{5}{16\pi}} (3 \cos^2 \Theta - 1)\]

\[Y_2^{\pm 1} = \frac{\sqrt{15}}{8\pi} \sin \Theta \cos \Theta e^{\mp i\phi}\]

\[Y_2^{\pm 2} = \sqrt{\frac{15}{32\pi}} \sin^2 \Theta e^{\pm 2i\phi}\]
\[ \omega(\theta) = 2 \frac{1}{2} \frac{15}{8} \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta + 2 \frac{5}{3} \frac{5}{16} (9 \cos^4 \theta - 6 \cos^2 \theta + 1) = \]
\[ \frac{15}{8} \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta + \frac{15}{8} \cos^4 \theta - \frac{30}{24} \cos^2 \theta + \frac{5}{24} = \frac{5}{24} (1 + 3 \cos^2 \theta). \]

Case 2 \rightarrow 2

\[ \omega(\theta) = 2 |\langle 1, 0, 2, 2 | 2, 2 \rangle Y_2^2 |^2 + 2 |\langle 1, 0, 2, 1 | 2, 1 \rangle Y_2^1 |^2 + |\langle 1, 0, 2, 0 | 2, 0 \rangle Y_2^0 |^2 \sim \sin^2 \theta. \]

* * *
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Table 1
Binding energies from uniquely identified mesonic decays†
March, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Decay mode</th>
<th>$E_A$ (MeV)</th>
<th>$\sigma_{sv}$ a) (MeV)</th>
<th>$\sigma$ (MeV)</th>
<th>No. of events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{H}^3$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$1.05 \pm 0.16$</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all other</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>$0.80 \pm 0.15$</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{H}^4$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>$0.99 \pm 0.10$</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>$0.82 \pm 0.13$</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all other</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>$0.71 \pm 0.10$</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{He}^4$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>$0.61 \pm 0.008$</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{He}^5$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>$0.57 \pm 0.04$</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{He}^7$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.9 \pm 0.2$</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{Li}^9$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1.0 \pm 0.3$</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all other</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>$0.45 \pm 0.08$</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{Li}^8$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>$1.06 \pm 0.12$</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{Li}^9$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all other</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{Be}^7$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{Be}^8$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{Be}^9$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>$0.30 \pm 0.06$</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{Be}^{10}$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1.0 \pm 0.4$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all other</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{B}^{10}$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1.0 \pm 0.3$</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{B}^{11}$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.6 \pm 0.2$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all other</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{B}^{12}$</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>$0.6 \pm 0.15$</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{C}^{13}$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{C}^{14}$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^\Lambda\text{N}^{14}$</td>
<td>$\pi-r$</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>inferred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Possible systematic errors (± 0.2 MeV) have not been included.
†) Computed from the data contained in the enclosed references.
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* * *

5666/NP/sm
Fig. 2. Example of $^{4}\text{He}^{7} \rightarrow \text{Li}^{7} + \pi^{-}$

Fig. 3. Example of $\Delta^{11} \rightarrow \pi^{-} \Delta^{11} + \beta^{+}$

Fig. 4. Plot of recoil momentum against range.
Fig. 6. Energy release $Q$ versus missing momentum $(\Delta p)$ for $^7\text{Li}$ and $^9\text{Li}$ events.

Fig. 8. Binding energy versus Mass Number.

Fig. 9. Binding energies of $^3\text{He}$, $^4\text{He}$, $^4\text{H}$, and $^5\text{He}$. 
Fig. 10. Binding energies of $^7\text{Be}^\circ$, $^7\text{Li}^\circ$, $^7\text{He}^\circ$, $^8\text{Be}^\circ$ and $^8\text{Li}^\circ$.

Fig. 11. Energy level diagram.

Fig. 12. Binding energies of Li, Be, B, C, and H hypernuclei.
Fig. 13. Spread of $B_A$ distributions as a function of the energy release $Q$.

Fig. 18. The branching ratio $R = (\lambda e^4 + \pi^+)/\text{(all } \pi^+ \text{ modes)}$ for $\Lambda^4 H\Lambda^4$ decay is compared with the calculated ratios for $\Lambda^4 H\Lambda^4$ spin $J = 0$ and $J = 1$, and with the measured value $p^+/(p^+ + e^+) = 0.3 \pm 0.03$.

Fig. 19. Plot of $\text{He}^4 - \text{He}^4$ relative energy for $\text{Li}^3 + e^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ + \text{He}^4 + \text{He}^4$. 

Fig. 15. $B_A$ versus $A^{-2/3}$.
NON-MESONIC DECAY MODES

J. Sacton,
Institut de Physique,
Université de Bruxelles, Belgium.

The decay of a $\Lambda^0$ hyperon bound to a nuclear fragment does not always proceed by the emission of a pion; it is well known that with increasing mass of the nuclear core the non-mesonic mode rapidly begins to be the dominant decay process. The non-mesonic decay of hypernuclei is considered to be the result of the stimulated decay of the $\Lambda^0$ hyperon in the presence of nucleons. As suggested by Cheston and Primakoff$^1$), the decay proceeds through an intermediate step involving a virtual pion which is subsequently re-absorbed by a neighbouring nucleon.

The reactions are as follows:

\begin{align}
\Lambda^0 + p &\rightarrow (p + \pi^-) + p \rightarrow p + n \\
&\rightarrow (n + \pi^0) + p \rightarrow n + p \\
\Lambda^0 + n &\rightarrow (n + \pi^0) + n \rightarrow n + n
\end{align}

the energy release being of the order of 180 MeV ($m_{\Lambda^0} - m_n$).

These stimulation processes have been analysed in some detail by different authors$^{2-5}$ and, in particular, their matrix elements have been estimated taking account of the contributions from the interactions involving either one or more exchange pions, or a K meson, and including the possibility of the existence of the $\Lambda$ in a virtual $\Sigma$ state when in the presence of nucleons. It is not within my competence to discuss here these studies; I will restrict myself to trying to give a summary of what has been done from the experimental point of view. You will easily see that the situation is particularly
confused due to the experimental difficulties one meets in the study of the non-mesonic decays.

Two problems have been particularly investigated.

i) The variation of $Q$, the non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio as a function of the HF charge.

Ruderman and Karplus$^2$ have shown that the ratio $Q$ is very sensitive to the angular momentum of the pion emitted in the free $\Lambda$ decay. The study of the variation of $Q$ with the HF charge has been used as a means to determine the spin of the $\Lambda^0$ hyperon. However, extensive studies of the free $\Lambda^0$ hyperon have now provided definite information concerning the spin of the $\Lambda^0$ hyperon. More recently, it was pointed out by Dalitz and Liu$^5$ that the determination of $Q$ could give us with good accuracy the value of the ratio $p/s$ of the $p$- and $s$-channel amplitudes of the decay of the free $\Lambda^0$ hyperon. Recent experiments carried out by Beall et al.$^6$, and Cronin et al.$^7$, have clearly established that the $s$ interaction is dominant. The results of Cronin et al. indicate that $p/s = 0.36^{+0.5}_{-0.8}$. Dalitz and Rajasekharan$^8$ have suggested that definite predictions of the lifetimes of light hyperfragments would require a better knowledge of the interaction $\Lambda + n \to n + n$.

ii) The ratio of proton to neutron stimulation

This could provide useful information concerning the $\Lambda^0$-nucleon interaction$^4$.

The detailed study of both these problems involves the detection of all hyperfragment decay modes and the elaboration of an unbiased charge distribution. It is, however, well known that the experimental study of the non-mesonic decays presents great difficulties, both in the classification of the events as definite hyperfragments and in the subsequent interpretation of their identity from decay kinematics. The energy release in such a decay is $\sim 175$ MeV, so that in the case of
light hyperfragments this will normally lead to a more or less complete
break-up of the nuclear core followed by the emission of fragments and
of neutrons. The absence among the decay products of an easily identi-
fi ed particle like the $\pi^-$ meson in the mesonic decays, makes the kine-
matic analysis extremely difficult and leads, in general, to confusion
with other phenomena such as slow pions, $K^-$ or $\Sigma^-$ captures, collision
of moderately energetic particles, etc. Moreover, typical decay modes,
such as those involving only one charged particle, are practically un-
detectable because they are overwhelmed by scatterings. These diffi-
culties have led to the use of selection criteria which were not always
perfectly adapted to the problem. In particular, any selection criteria
on the decay characteristics must undoubtedly lead to biased statistics.
This was clearly pointed out by Zakrzewski and St. Lorentz\(^9\) in their re-
view analysis of work published in 1962. In some cases the use of
measurements of the track of the hyperfragments has been of great im-
portance. However, these measurements are only useful on long-range
hyperfragments which are very rare especially in $K^-$ meson absorptions
at rest, the richest source of hyperfragments actually used, and also the
only one for which the contamination due to other events is rather
easily eliminated by applying some selection criteria on the parent
star.

The kinematic analysis of non-mesonic decays proceeds generally
as follows. The computer runs each possible combination of the decay
products under each of the assumptions:

a) no neutral particles
b) a $\pi$ meson
c) a neutron
d) two neutrons (not in all cases).

The machine is instructed to derive $B_A$. The $B_A$ values are compared
with those obtained for mesonic hyperfragments, taking into account the
large errors.
That this type of analysis is insufficient was clearly demonstrated by Silverstein\textsuperscript{10} who compared, for "uniquely" identified events, the energy distributions of both the neutrons and the protons resulting from the decays and found them completely different, the neutrons being shifted systematically to higher energy. Such a shift is due to a systematic underestimate of the number of neutrons involved in the decays leading to an overestimate of the energy imparted to each of them.

Another proof of the weakness of this type of analysis is obtained from the comparison of the range distribution of both the non-mesonic and mesonic hyperfragments of a given charge identified in the same experiment. In most cases it was found that the range distribution of the non-mesonic hyperfragments was more concentrated in the region of shorter ranges (background of heavy hyperfragments).

Keeping all these restrictions in mind we will now try to look at the experimental results.

1. \( \text{NM/M as a function of Z} \)

Most of the information comes from Silverstein\textsuperscript{10}, Sackett\textsuperscript{11}, Gorge et al.\textsuperscript{12}, and more recently from Bhowmik\textsuperscript{13} and Block\textsuperscript{14}. The hyperfragments are produced in \( K^- \) absorptions at rest except in Silverstein's experiment where the hyperfragments are produced in high-energy \( \pi^- \) interactions.

The problem here is to get a true idea of the charge distribution of the hyperfragments, both mesonic and non-mesonic. The charge distribution of \( M \) hyperfragments produced in \( K^- \) absorption at rest has been determined with large statistics by Abeledo et al.\textsuperscript{15} and is as follows: \( Z = 1, 26\%; Z = 2, 45\%; Z = 3, 22\%, \) and \( Z > 3, 7\%. \)

Concerning the non-mesonic decays, the statistics are not only poorer but also less homogeneous: 131 events have been collected in three different laboratories using different selection criteria (Brussels, 55; Delhi, 54; Bern, 22). The charge distribution of these hyperfragments is established as follows.
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1) **Uniquely identified events**

These are events for which only one interpretation leads to an acceptable value for the \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperon binding energy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( Z = )</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>( \geq 5 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large discrepancies are observed between these results. (In the Bombay experiment the emission of two neutrons was not considered.)

ii) **Non-uniquely identified events**

For the remaining events for which the charge is not uniquely determined, a rather similar analysis was used by all the authors to get a true idea of the charge distribution; for such events, all the possible interpretations were assumed to be equally probable and normalized in each case to unity. Combining all these events, one obtains the following distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( Z = )</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>( \geq 5 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** I have excluded the DC events which are probably very heavy hyperfragments.
Using the results of Abeledo et al.\(^5\)) for the \(M\) hyperfragments, one obtains for the non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio the values given in Table 3. These values must be taken with great care.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Z)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>(\geq 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>(\sim 3)</td>
<td>(\sim 50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed, I would remind you that almost all the decays into a single charged particle have not been recorded so that the values quoted here are surely underestimated.

In the case of hyperhelium, another approach has been made by Schlein\(^6\)) in 4.5 GeV/c \(\pi^-\) meson interactions, and led to the value \(Q = 1.5 \pm 0.4\). The theoretical values to which these results are to be compared are as follows:

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Z)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(\geq 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\ell = 0)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.3 ((H^3))</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8 ((H^4))</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>((He^5))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\ell = 1)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.5 ((H^3))</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6 ((H^4))</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>((He^5))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is concluded that the ratio \(p/s\) is definitely smaller than 1 in agreement with the information obtained by Cronin and Overseth\(^7\)) for free \(\Lambda\) hyperons. It is, however, too early to get any information of the type asked of the experimentalists by Dalitz and Rajasekharan\(^8\)).
ii) n/p ratio in stimulated decay

The other point I should like to discuss is the question of the stimulated decay of the $\Lambda^0$ hyperon. My task in this case is considerably reduced due to the fact that a careful and critical re-examination of the published work was made recently by Zakrzewski and St. Lorant\textsuperscript{9}). Several attempts have been made to study this problem. All of them are based on the examination of the energy spectrum of fast protons emitted from non-mesonic decay hyperfragments. Most of the remarks and criticisms which I have put forward previously must be kept in mind in the analysis of the experimental results.

The method of analysis first proposed by Baldo-Ceolin et al.\textsuperscript{17}) is based on the following assumptions:

i) the one-nucleon stimulated decays are dominant;

ii) the nucleons emitted as a result of these processes and, in particular, the proton resulting from reaction (1) have a momentum above a certain cut-off which has to be determined;

iii) the nucleons do not lose so much energy by collisions that all memory of their origins disappears.

The bottle-neck in this type of analysis is the estimate of the cut-off energy at which the two processes merge. This is made from consideration of the energy distribution of all charged particles emitted in the non-mesonic decay stars. A typical such distribution appears to consist of two energy groupings: one contains the protons of energy less than $30\text{ MeV}$; the other constitutes the tail of the distribution extending to $\sim 140\text{ MeV}$. The low-energy part is interpreted as being due to the break-up of the residual nucleus following the emission of the two fast nucleons from the stimulation process. The fast protons are attributed to the initial stimulation process by protons. The total energy release in a stimulated decay (180 MeV) is shared equally between the two nucleons resulting from the reaction (in the $\Lambda$-n rest frame). Outside the nucleus, the energy is slightly reduced due to binding energy of $\Lambda$ and nucleon. Assuming that the effect of
the Fermi momentum of the stimulating nucleons is to introduce a symmetrical spread around a mean value, the cut-off can be obtained experimentally from the energy distribution of all charged particles. In this way, Baldo-Ceolin et al.\textsuperscript{17} and Silverstein\textsuperscript{10} have obtained 30 and 40 MeV (240 MeV/c and 275 MeV/c), respectively. All the events containing a proton of energy greater than this limit are attributed to a proton-stimulated process.

It is very difficult, for the reasons given before, to study the n/p ratio for a particular species of hyperfragment, so that in the beginning no attempts were made to separate the hyperfragments according to their charges. The results of different experiments lead to n/p ranging from 1 to 2. Selection criteria and scanning losses seem, however, to play an important role in these results.

Moreover, Zakrzewski and St. Lorant\textsuperscript{9} have suggested that in some cases the sample of events could be artificially enriched in very heavy hyperfragments for which it is to be expected that the criteria used to study the stimulation processes could be less reliable. This is especially true for the hyperfragments produced in high-energy interactions and for very short-range hyperfragments (< 2µ ) produced in K\textsuperscript{-} absorption at rest.

The stimulation processes have recently been studied by Bhowmik et al.\textsuperscript{13}. The hyperfragments were produced by stopping K\textsuperscript{-} and Σ\textsuperscript{-}. The results of this work are:

\[
\text{for He : } \frac{P}{n} = \frac{15}{4} = 3.8
\]

\[
\text{for } Z \geq 3 : \frac{P}{n} = \frac{10}{4} = 2.5
\]

The result is to be compared to that of Block et al.\textsuperscript{14} for helium hyperfragments:

\[
\sim 5 = \frac{P}{n} (A_{He^4} 2p 1n).
\]
It seems that for helium, p/n is clearly > 1, which following Ferrari and Fonda implies that the stimulated decay takes place when the hyperon is in the Λ state.

It is to be noted that the p/n ratio could be drastically dependent on nucleon structure or on different distributions of p and n inside the nucleus.

As a conclusion, I should say that practically everything remains yet to be studied. Even if many competing processes are likely to contribute to the production of HF, it seems that valuable experimental information could be obtained with rather clean statistics selected on the basis of the production rather than on the decay processes. At the present time, it seems that K⁻ absorptions at rest are best suited for such a study, even if most of the hyperfragments with Z ≥ 3 are of such short range that no measurements are possible on the tracks themselves.

* * *
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III. BUBBLE CHAMBER STUDIES
HYPERFRAGMENT STUDIES IN THE HELIUM BUBBLE CHAMBER

M.M. Block, R. Gessaroli, J. Kopelman, S. Ratti and M. Schneeberger, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., USA.
L. Grimellini, T. Kikuchi, L. Lendinara and L. Monari, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.
W. Becker and E. Harth, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., USA.

I. INTRODUCTION

The $K^- + He^4$ reactions which are capable of producing hyperfragments are

$$K^- + He^4 \rightarrow \Lambda He^4 + \pi^- \quad (a)$$
$$\rightarrow \Lambda H^4 + \pi^0 \quad (b)$$
$$\rightarrow \Lambda H^3 + \pi^- + p \quad (c)$$
$$\rightarrow \Lambda H^3 + \pi^0 + n \quad (d)$$
$$\rightarrow \Lambda H^3 + n \quad (e).$$

We have not observed any cases of (e). For experimental reasons, we have confined our attention exclusively to reactions (a)-(c). Our studies were performed using the helium bubble chamber, $20 \times 10 \times 12.5$ cm$^3$, operated in a magnetic field of 14 kgauss. The spatial resolution is such that tracks of 0.5 mm range can be measured to an accuracy of $\sim 0.1$ mm.

Figure 1 shows the signature for the reactions $K^- + He^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda He^4$, $\Lambda He^4 \rightarrow \pi^0 + He^4$. The hyperfragment range is 0.53 mm, the production pion momentum is 256 MeV/c and, of course, the two tracks are co-linear. The decay recoil has too low an energy to produce a visible bubble, so that we
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†) Now at University of Bologna.
‡‡) NATO Science Fellow; now at University of Milan.
+) Now at Northwestern University.
see "nothing" at the decay. This is by far the most typical type of \( \Lambda \text{He}^4 \) event. Figure 2 shows the signature for the reaction \( K^- + \text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^0 + \Lambda \text{H}^4 \), \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4 \). The \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \) range is 2.2 mm, and the decay pion momentum is 137 MeV/c. The recoil \( \pi^- \) particle has too low an energy to be visible. We have limited our acceptance to only those \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \) that undergo \( \pi^- \) decay (either two-body or multi-body decays). This allows us to have a sample of \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \) in which background corrections are minor. We have accepted \( \Lambda \text{H}^3 \) events only in the case where the \( \Lambda \text{H}^3 \) undergoes \( \pi^- \) decay. The signature for (c) is shown in Fig. 3.

The distinct advantages of the helium bubble chamber for studying light hyperfragments are the following:

i) All hyperfragments are completely identified by production kinematics. The magnetic field allows us to make momentum and charge measurements. Conservation laws of charge, baryons, etc., allow complete and certain identification.

ii) Hyperfragments are produced copiously in an exposure to stopping \( K^- \) mesons. Approximately 3% of all \( K^- \) stars produce hypernuclei.

iii) The hypernuclei are produced in a very symmetric nucleus, i.e. \( \text{He}^4 \) has spin zero and isotopic spin zero. This allows us to employ general symmetry arguments, such as conservation of angular momentum, parity, and isospin, for the analysis of the production reactions. In particular, isospin conservation leads to a 2:1 branching ratio for reactions (a) to (b), as well as for (c) to (d).

The motivation for these studies was twofold; first, the determination of the relative K-\( \Lambda \) parity, and second, the systematic description of the properties of the light hypernuclei.

II. K-\( \Lambda \) PARITY AND SPIN OF \( \Lambda \text{H}^3 \), \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \), \( \Lambda \text{He}^4 \)

If we assume that the spin of \( \Lambda \text{He}^4 \) (or \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \)) is zero, then it is easily shown that the conservation of parity requires that the reactions (a) and (b) be forbidden if the \( K^- \) is scalar, and be allowed if
the $K^-$ is pseudoscalar (with respect to the $\Lambda^0$, conventionally assumed to be scalar), independent of what atomic state from which the $K^-$ is absorbed. If we adopt the argument of Day and Snow\(^1\) that the $K^-$ is absorbed from an $s$-state Bohr orbital, then we can make an argument which immediately tells us about both the spin of the $\Lambda^\text{He}^4$ (or $\Lambda^\text{H}^4$) and the K parity. This is as follows. Consider reaction (b), where we look at only those decays where $\Lambda^\text{H}^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4$. If our quantum axis is taken as the $\Lambda^\text{H}^4$ direction, and total $J = 0$, then $J_z = 0 = S_z$, where $S_z$ is the $z$ component of the spin of the $\Lambda^\text{H}^4$. Thus, the wave function for the two-body decay $\Lambda^\text{H}^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4$ is $P_0^0(\cos \theta)$ or $P_2^0(\cos \theta)$, depending on whether the $\Lambda^\text{H}^4$ has a spin of 1 or 0, respectively. Table 1 summarizes the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K parity</th>
<th>Spin of $\Lambda^\text{H}^4$</th>
<th>Angular distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>case (a)</td>
<td>pseudoscalar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>scalar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>pseudoscalar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>scalar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To date, 347 cases of reaction (a) and 154 cases of (b) have been identified in an exposure of our bubble chamber to a stopping $K^-$ beam from the Berkeley Bevatron. Of the 154 cases of (b), 96 cases are the two-body mode $\Lambda^\text{H}^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4$. The angular distribution of these decay pions is shown in Fig. 4. The data obviously correspond to case (a) of Table 1, indicating that the $K^-$ is pseudoscalar and the spin of $\Lambda^\text{H}^4$ is zero. Since $\Lambda^\text{H}^4$ and $\Lambda^\text{He}^4$ are isotopic doublets, this also indicates that the spin of $\Lambda^\text{He}^4$ is zero. The evidence strongly favours the antiparallel $\Lambda$-nucleon spin orientation as the more strongly bound state. Thus, we would expect that the spin of $\Lambda^\text{H}^3$ would therefore be $S = \frac{1}{2}$, and not $S = \frac{3}{2}$.
Dalitz and Liu\(^1\) have outlined methods of determining the spin of \(\Lambda^4 H^4\) and \(\Lambda^3 H^3\) from a study of \(\pi^-\) decay branching ratios, using the ratios

\[
R_4 = \frac{\Lambda^4 H^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4}{\Lambda^4 H^4 \rightarrow \text{all } \pi^-} \quad \text{and} \quad R_3 = \frac{\Lambda^3 H^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^3}{\Lambda^3 H^3 \rightarrow \text{all } \pi^-},
\]

respectively. The argument for \(\Lambda^4 H^4\) is as follows.

i) An impulse model of the hyperfragment decay is assumed, using the parameters of the free \(\Lambda^0\) decay.

ii) For the decay \(\Lambda^4 H^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4\), the rate of decay is proportional to \(s^2\), if \(S = 0\), because both the pion and \(\pi^0\) are spin zero particles. The amplitudes of the free \(\Lambda^0\) decay are \(s\) and \(p\), corresponding to the \(I = 0\) and \(I = 1\) channels, respectively. Conversely, the rate of two-body decay is proportional to \(p^2\) if \(S = 1\). Since the ratio \(p^2/s^2 = 0.12 \pm 0.03\), as measured by Beall et al.\(^3\), we expect \(R_4\) to be large if \(S = 0\) and small if \(S = 1\). Similar arguments pertain to \(\Lambda^3 H^3\).

We have plotted \(R_4\) for 148 \(\Lambda^4 H^4\) in Fig. 5. Also shown there is the theoretical curve of Dalitz and Liu\(^2\). Our value, \(R_4 = 0.68 \pm 0.04\), along with the experimental values of \(p^2/s^2\), is shown in Fig. 5. It is clear that the data strongly indicate \(S = 0\). We have measured \(R_3 = 0.39 \pm 0.07\) for \(\Lambda^4 H^4\) cases of \(\Lambda^3 H^3\). The data are shown in Fig. 6, along with the theoretical results of Dalitz and Liu using a binding energy of \(\Lambda H^3\), \(\varepsilon = 0.21\) MeV. The measured value is \(\varepsilon = 0.21 \pm 0.20\) MeV\(^4\). Since the calculated result is proportional to \(\sqrt{\varepsilon}\), it is clear that the theoretical uncertainty is quite large. However, the data strongly favour \(S = \frac{1}{2}\). It is amusing perhaps to reverse the argument, assume \(S = \frac{1}{2}\), the measured value of \(R_3\), and the theoretical structure, and then deduce the binding energy. This leads us to a redetermination of \(\varepsilon\), albeit indirect, of \(\varepsilon = 0.16 \pm 0.06\) MeV. The results for \(R_4\) and \(R_3\) are in agreement with emulsion results\(^5,6\) of lower statistical weight.
In summary, all methods of spin determination of \( \Lambda H^2 \) and \( \Lambda H^4(H^4) \) agree that the antiparallel \( \Lambda \)-nucleon spin state is more strongly bound. Thus, we must conclude that the ground state spin of \( \Lambda H^3 \) is \( \frac{1}{2} \), and that the spins of \( \Lambda He^4 \) and \( \Lambda H^4 \) are zero.

If it were not for the possibility of an excited state for \( \Lambda H^4(\Lambda He^4) \), the parity argument for the \( K^- \) would be unassailable. However, the possibility has been advanced that what really happens is that the hyperfragment is produced in an excited spin 1 state, which rapidly \( \gamma \)-decays to the ground state of spin zero, and that what we observe is the spin zero ground state. Dalitz and Downs \(^7\) have estimated that if such an excited state exists, its binding energy is \( \lesssim 0.1 \) MeV, whereas the ground state is bound by \( \sim 2 \) MeV. This large difference in binding energies should lead to a measurable difference in the rate of production of hypernuclei in reactions (a) and (b), i.e., the rate should be very low if the excited state is formed, because of the low binding. The ratio

\[
R = \frac{(\Lambda He^4 + \pi^-)}{(\Lambda He^4 + \pi^-) + (\Lambda^0 + He^3 + \pi^-)}
\]

should be proportional to \( \sqrt{\epsilon} \), where \( \epsilon \) is the binding energy of the type of \( \Lambda He^4 \) produced. In particular, the ratios \( R \) should differ by a factor of \( \sim 4.5 \) for the ground and excited states. Originally, Dalitz and Downs calculated the ratio \( R \) using an impulse model and the reaction chain,

\[
K^- + He^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda^0 + He^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda He^4.
\]

Their result was \( R = 22\% \). More recently, the Helium Bubble Chamber Group \(^8\) has demonstrated strong evidence for the formation of \( Y^* \) as an intermediate state. Thus, one must calculate the reaction chain

\[
K^- + He^4 \rightarrow Y^*_1 \rightarrow He^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda^0 + He^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda He^4.
\]

M.M. Block \(^9\) has calculated the ratio \( R \) assuming an intermediate \( Y^* \) state. The calculation uses an impulse model, and is quite sensitive to the spin
and parity assignment of the $Y_1^*$. The predictions, along with our experimental result $R = 0.20 \pm 0.02$, are summarized in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R(\epsilon = 2.2$ MeV)</th>
<th>$R(\epsilon = 0.10$ MeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple impulse model</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>(\lesssim 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_1^*$ $S_{1/2}$</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>(\lesssim 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_1^*$ $P_{3/2}$</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>(\lesssim 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_1^*$ $P_{1/2}$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>(\lesssim 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>0.20 (\pm 0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently, two groups\(^{10,11}\) have determined the spin of the $Y_1^*$ to be $S = \frac{3}{2}$, and Shafer et al.\(^{11}\) have preliminary evidence favouring $P_{3/2}$. Our experimental data strongly favour the assignment $P_{3/2}$, and at the same time indicate that the hyperfragment was produced via the ground state and not the excited state. Thus, the conclusion is reinforced that the $K^-$ is pseudoscalar.

### III. LIFETIME OF $\Lambda H^3$

The $\Lambda H^3$s have a mean length before decay of $\sim 0.5$ cm which is a convenient and accurately measured distance in the helium chamber. Of the $69 \Lambda H^3$, 36 satisfied our selection criteria:

a) decay length longer than 0.5 mm;
b) decay occurring further than 1 cm from chamber boundaries;
c) $\chi^2$ from kinematics fitting programmes were acceptably small.

These criteria were used to eliminate possible biases, and to provide accurate measurements.
A maximum likelihood function of these 36 events (seven decayed at rest), is shown in Fig. 7. The lifetime obtained was \( \tau_3 = 1.0^{+0.20}_{-0.18} \times 10^{-10} \) sec, a value considerably smaller than the free \( \Lambda^0 \) lifetime, \( \tau_\Lambda = 2.36 \pm 0.06 \times 10^{-10} \) sec \(^{12}\). Dalitz and Rajasekharan\(^ {13} \) have made estimates of \( \tau_3 \) for various assumptions of the spin of \( \Lambda^+ \). They find \( \tau_3(S = \frac{1}{2}) = 1.79 \pm 0.10 \times 10^{-10} \) sec, and \( \tau_3(S = \frac{3}{2}) = 2.40 \pm 0.03 \times 10^{-10} \) sec. The calculations both seem in disagreement with experiment, but the experimental value is in much less disagreement with the assignment \( S = \frac{1}{2} \).

**IV. MEASUREMENT OF \( p^0 / p^0 + s^0 \) RATIO FOR \( \Lambda^c \to n + \pi^0 \)**

The impulse model predicts that the dominant decay modes of the \( \Lambda^c \) hypernucleus are

\[
\begin{align*}
\Lambda^c \text{He}^4 &\to \pi^0 + n + \text{He}^3 \\
\text{and} \quad \Lambda^c \text{He}^4 &\to \pi^- + p + \text{He}^3.
\end{align*}
\]

Further, the final state interactions between \( \text{He}^3 \) and \( n \) will often cause reaction (1) to appear as

\[
\Lambda^c \text{He}^4 \to \pi^0 + \text{He}^4,
\]

i.e., a bound state of \( n - \text{He}^3 \) which enhances the reaction rate. The corresponding reaction (2) between \( p \) and \( \text{He}^3 \) does not lead to a bound state and hence is not enhanced. We assume spin 0 for \( \Lambda^c \)He\(^4\); since the \( \pi^0 \) and \( \text{He}^4 \) are also spin zero, reaction (3) can only go via the s-wave channel of \( \Lambda^0 \) decay \( (\Lambda^0 \to \pi^0 + n) \). Thus the ratio

\[
R_0 = \frac{\Lambda^c \text{He}^4 \to \text{all } \pi^0 \text{ modes}}{\Lambda^c \text{He}^4 \to \text{all } \pi^- \text{ modes}}
\]

will depend sensitively on the ratio \( p^0 / p^0 + s^0 \), where \( p_0 \) and \( s_0 \) are the amplitudes of the \( p \) and \( s \) channels, respectively, for the free decay \( \Lambda^0 \to n + \pi^0 \). In particular, assuming the experimental value
\[ \frac{p^2}{p^2 + s^2} = 0.12 \pm 0.03 \] for the charged decay mode (\( \Lambda^0 \to \pi^- + p \)), and
\[ p^2 + s^2 = 2(p_0^2 + s_0^2) \], along with the formula derived by Dalitz and Liu\(^2\),

\[
R_0 = \frac{1.96 \, s_0^2 + 0.35 \, p_0^2}{0.40 \, s^2 + 0.32 \, p^2},
\]

we obtain the expression

\[
R_0 = 2.51 - 2.06 \, \frac{p^2}{p^2 + s^2}.
\]

Table 3 is a summary of the decay modes (corrected for background and geometrical detection efficiency) of a sample of 317 observed \( \Lambda^0 \)\( \text{He}^4 \). From Table 3 we obtain \( R_0 = 2.49 \pm 0.34 \). Figure 8 shows the result of Eq. (5) and our experimental determination. We obtain \( \frac{p^2}{p^2 + s^2} = 0.01 \pm 0.17 \), a value in good agreement with the value of \( 0.12 \pm 0.03 \) predicted by the \( \Delta I = \frac{1}{2} \) law. This result is in agreement with the asymmetry parameter ratio \( \alpha_0/\alpha_- = 1.10 \pm 0.27 \) of Cork et al.\(^{14} \). However, it should be pointed out that their experiment yielded two solutions for \( \frac{p^2}{p^2 + s^2} \), whereas this experiment also selects the proper solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decay mode</th>
<th>( \pi^0 ) modes</th>
<th>( \pi^- ) modes</th>
<th>Non-massic modes</th>
<th>( \pi^+ ) modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topological description</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>( \pi^- )</td>
<td>( \pi^- )</td>
<td>( \pi^- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background corrections</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometrical corrections</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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V. DECAY MODES OF $^{6}$He

Table 3 summarizes the decay modes for $^{6}$He. We observe that $R_{N} = (\text{non-mesonic modes}/\pi^{-} \text{ modes})$ is given by $R_{N} = 0.52 \pm 0.10$. Further, $R_{o} = 2.49 \pm 0.34$. We also note a quite high ratio of $\pi^{+}/\pi^{-}$ decays, i.e. $\approx 3\%$. The two $\pi^{+}$ decays definitely identified both had the $\pi^{+}$ stopping in the chamber, undergoing the characteristic $\pi^{+} \rightarrow \mu^{+} \rightarrow e^{+}$ decay chain. The uncertain event had too short a decay track to rule out the "proton" hypothesis. The mean $\pi^{+}$ momentum is very low ($\approx 65 \text{ MeV/c}$), which is to be contrasted with a typical $\pi^{-}$ decay, which has a momentum $\sim 90 \text{ MeV/c}$.

Ferrari and Fonda$^{15}$ have noted that the basic force between $\Lambda^{0}$ and nucleons could be due to an intermediate $\Sigma$ state as shown in Fig. 9a. Deloff et al.$^{16}$ have calculated the formation of $\pi^{+}$, using as a model the decay of the intermediate $\Sigma$, as shown in Fig. 9b. They find that the ratio of $\pi^{+}/\pi^{-}$ can be as high as several percent, and further, that the $\pi^{+}$ decay momentum would be quite low for the decay $\Lambda^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+} + n + H$. The non-mesonic events broke up into two categories, i.e. 10 "p" and 32 "pp" events. It was estimated that of the 10 "p" events, 4 were really $\Lambda^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{0} + \Lambda + n$, where the $\Lambda$ recoils produced a visible track. Either the direct four-fermion interaction

$$\Lambda^{0} + p \rightarrow p + \pi^{0} \quad (6)$$

or the reabsorption of a virtual pion by a nucleon,

$$\Lambda + N \rightarrow (N + \pi) + N \rightarrow N + N \quad (7)$$

can be responsible for the non-mesonic decay of the $\Lambda^{0}$ hypernucleus.

The direct four-fermion interaction, however, forbids in principle

$$\Lambda + n \rightarrow n + n + \pi^{0}$$

because of the absence of neutral currents in the Fermi interaction (it can still be permitted in practice by absorption and emission of virtual pions).
On the other hand, the \((\Lambda^0 p)\) interactions

\[ \Lambda^0 + p \rightarrow (p + \pi^-) + p \rightarrow p + n \]  \hspace{1cm} (8a) 
\[ \Lambda^0 + p \rightarrow (n + \pi^0) + p \rightarrow n + p \]  \hspace{1cm} (8b)

or the \((\Lambda^0 n)\) interactions,

\[ \Lambda^0 + n \rightarrow (p + \pi^-) + n \rightarrow n + n \]  \hspace{1cm} (9a) 
\[ \Lambda^0 + n \rightarrow (n + \pi^0) + n \rightarrow n + n \]  \hspace{1cm} (9b)

can occur.

It is clear that if the non-mesonic decay occurs via either (6) or (8), it involves the emission of a fast proton \((\approx 400 \text{ MeV}/c)\) due to the rather large energy release in the interaction, while if the decay goes via reactions (9a) or (9b), there are two fast neutrons, and visible protons can come only from the evaporation process in the residual nucleus. If the proton had a momentum of \(\geq 250 \text{ MeV}/c\), we arbitrarily decided to call the event de-excitation off a proton. All of the "p" events had a momentum less than 250 MeV/c. Of the 32 "pp" events, only 6 had both protons \(< 250 \text{ MeV}/c\). Thus, an estimate of the ratio of non-mesonic de-excitation off the proton to that off the neutron is

\[ \frac{A - p}{A - n} = 2.2 \pm 0.8 \]

Since \(\Lambda\text{He}^4\) has twice as many protons as neutrons, the ratio per pair is \(1.1 \pm 0.4\). The number is too crude, however, to be more than an indication that the basic de-excitation mechanism for non-mesonic decay is about the same with either the proton or neutron.

VI. NON-MESONIC DECAYS OF \(\Lambda\text{H}^4\)

If we accept charge independence in the production of \(\Lambda\text{H}^4\) and \(\Lambda\text{He}^4\), we observe that the number of \(\Lambda\text{H}^4\) produced is one-half the number of \(\Lambda\text{He}^4\) produced. Although we observe only \(\Lambda\text{H}^4 \rightarrow \pi^-\), we can, using the production argument, find out how many \(\Lambda\text{H}^4\) decayed via either \(\pi^0\)
modes or non-mesonic decays. Further, if we assume the $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ law for the decay of $\Lambda H^4$ and $\Lambda He^4$, then the ratio we obtained for $\Lambda He^4$, i.e.

$$R_o = \frac{\Lambda He^4 \rightarrow \pi^0}{\Lambda He^4 \rightarrow \pi} = 2.49,$$

is related to the same ratio for $\Lambda H^4$, i.e.

$$R_o(\Lambda He^4) \times R_o(\Lambda H^4) = \frac{1}{4},$$

as shown by Dalitz and Liu. Thus

$$R_o(\Lambda H^4) = \frac{\Lambda H^4 \rightarrow \pi^0}{\Lambda H^4 \rightarrow \pi} = 0.10.$$

Putting these numbers together, after using a restricted sample where all events have been measured, and allowing for corrections for detection efficiency, background, etc., we find that we predict (from the $\Lambda He^4$ rate) that $163 \pm 10 \Lambda H^4$ were produced, compared to $120 \pm 11 \Lambda H^4 \rightarrow \pi^-$. Thus, $132 \pm 12 \Lambda H^4$ decayed either via $\pi^-$ or $\pi^0$ modes. The remainder, attributed to non-mesonic decays, is therefore $31 \pm 15$. Thus, the ratio of (non-mesonic)/(p$^-$ mesic) for $\Lambda H^4$ is found to be $26 \pm 13\%$.

* * *
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Fig. 1. Schematic Drawing of Reaction $K^- + \text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4 + \Lambda$, $\Lambda\text{He}^3 \rightarrow \pi^0 + \text{He}^6$.

Fig. 2. Schematic Drawing of Reaction $K^- + \text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^0 + \Lambda\text{He}^4 + \Lambda\text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4$.

Fig. 3. Schematic Drawing of Reaction $K^- + \text{He}^4 \rightarrow p + \pi^- + \Lambda\text{He}^3$, $\Lambda\text{He}^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^3$. 
Fig. 4. - The Angular Distribution of the $\pi^-$ from 96 Decays
$\Lambda^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4$, for Hyperfragments Produced in the
Capture Reaction $K^- + \text{He}^4 + p \rightarrow \Lambda + \text{He}^4$.

Fig. 5. - $R_4$, the Ratio of $\Lambda^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4$ to $\Lambda^4 \rightarrow$ all
$\pi^-$ modes, as a function of $p^2/p^0 * s^0$. The
Theoretical Curves are the Calculated $R_4$ of
Dalitz and Liu for $S = 0$ and $S = 1$. 
Fig. 6. - $R_3$, the Ratio of $^3\pi^+ + ^3\text{He}^3$ to $^3\text{H}^3 \to$ all $\pi^+$ modes as a Function of $p^2/p^2_d + s^2$. The Theoretical Curves are the Calculated $R_3$ of Dalitz and Liu for $S = \frac{1}{2}$ and $S = \frac{3}{2}$.

Fig. 7. - The Likelihood Function in Arbitrary Units, for $36^3 \text{H}^3$ Decays, as a Function of the $\frac{1}{3}\text{H}^3$ Lifetime.
Fig. 8. - $R_0$, the Ratio of $\Lambda\text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^0$ modes to $\Lambda\text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^-$ modes, as a Function of $p_0^2/p_0^2 - s^2$.

(a) \hspace{7cm} (b)

Fig. 9. - Feynman Diagrams of Intermediate States.
PART III.2

A METHOD FOR DETERMINING THE SPIN AND PARITY OF THE $Y^*_{1}$

M.M. Block,
Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., USA.

The helium bubble chamber group$^1$ has presented evidence for the presence of the mass 1385 MeV $Y^*_{1}$ state in the absorption at rest of $K^-$ mesons in $He^4$. They find that the reaction channel

$$K^- + He^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda^0 + He^3 \quad (1)$$

is dominated by

$$K^- + He^4 \rightarrow Y^*_{1}^- + He^3, \quad Y^*_{1}^- \rightarrow \Lambda^0 + \pi^- \quad (2)$$

Also, this group$^2$ has reported a large yield of helium hypernuclei from the reaction

$$K^- + He^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda He^4 \quad (3)$$

Delitz and Downs$^3$ have successfully analysed hypernuclear states by considering, for example, that $\Lambda He^4$ is a bound state of a real $He^3$ core, surrounded by a loosely bound ($\sim 2.2$ MeV) $\Lambda^0$. This implies that the hypernuclei in Eq. (3) are created by the strong final state interactions causing binding between the $\Lambda^0$ and $He^3$ from reaction (1). Since the $Y^*$ mechanism dominates (2), this implies that hypernuclear formation in (3) is due to the reaction chain

$$K^- + He^4 \rightarrow Y^*_{1}^- + He^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda He^4 \quad (4)$$

This note will investigate the rate of hyperfragment production in (4) as a function of three level assignments for $Y^*_{1}$, i.e. $s_{1/2}$, $p_{1/2}$ and $p_{3/2}$.

$^\dagger$ This research was supported by the US Office of Naval Research.
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It is convenient to introduce the ratio

\[ R = \frac{(\pi^- + \Lambda^0 He^4)}{(\pi^- + \Lambda He^4)} + (\pi^- + \Lambda^0 + He^3), \]

where the symbols represent the rates of the indicated reactions. The dependence of \( R \) on the \( Y^* \) spin and parity can be most clearly qualitatively seen as follows. We adopt the co-ordinate system sketched in Fig. 1, and make the following assumptions:

a) only a pure \( Y^* \) state is found in reaction (1);
b) the \( K^- \) is absorbed from an s-state atomic orbit 4); 
c) the \( K^- \) is pseudoscalar 2).

Since the total angular momentum \( J = 0 \), and parity is conserved in (2), it is readily seen that \( \ell = L \), independent of the \( Y^* \) spin or parity. If we let \( J_Y \) be the spin of the \( Y^* \), then \( J_Y = \ell + \frac{1}{2} \). For the level assignment \( s_1/2 \), we then have \( \ell = 0, L = 0, \) and \( J_Y = 1/2 \); for \( p_{1/2} \), \( \ell = 1, L = 1, J_Y = 1/2 \); and for \( p_{3/2} \), \( \ell = 1, L = 1, J_Y = 3/2 \). Thus, there is only one possible state produced in reaction (2), and it is uniquely determined by the \( Y^* \) quantum numbers. A convenient axis of quantization is the normal to the production plane of (1), since \( \mathbf{P}_\pi + \mathbf{P}_\Lambda + \mathbf{P}_3 = 0 \). If we rewrite the wave function of the system, not in terms of \( J_Y, L \), and \( s_3 \), but rather in terms of \( \ell, L \) and \( \mathbf{S} = \mathbf{s}_\Lambda + \mathbf{s}_3 \), we obtain

\[ \chi = a_0 \cos \varnothing |S = 0, S_z = 0 > + a_1 \sin \varnothing |S = 1, S_z = 0 > \]  

where \( \varnothing \) is the angle between \( \mathbf{P}_\Lambda \) and \( \mathbf{P}_3 \). The relative \( \Lambda-\pi \) momentum is given by \( \mathbf{P}_{\Lambda\pi} = m_{\pi} \mathbf{p}_\pi - m_{\Lambda} \mathbf{p}_\Lambda / m_{\Lambda} + m_{\pi} \), and the spinors |\( S = 0, S_z = 0 > \) and |\( S = 1, S_z = 0 > \) refer to the total spin \( S \) of the system, i.e. \( S = 0 \) or 1. For \( s_{1/2} \), we have \( a_1 = 0 \); for \( p_{1/2} \), \( |a_0|^2 = |a_1|^2 \); for \( p_{3/2} \), \( |a_0|^2 = 4|a_1|^2 \). The corresponding angular distributions are shown in Table 1. Although the angular distributions for \( s_{1/2} \) and \( p_{1/2} \) are the same, they yield very different hyperfragment production rates. The spin of \( \Lambda He^4 \) has been shown to be zero 2). Hence, only those states with \( S = 0 \) can form hypernuclei. The probability for \( S = 0 \) is also
Table 1
Hyperfragment production rate R, as a function of the Y* state, for capture of a pseudoscalar K- meson in an s-state orbit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y* level</th>
<th>Spin</th>
<th>Parity</th>
<th>Angular distribution</th>
<th>Probability of S = 0</th>
<th>R (hyperradial rate), in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>isotropic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>isotropic</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p3/2</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1 + 3 cos² ø</td>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

shown in Table 1. It is clear that, all other factors being equal, the s1/2 state will yield the most hypernuclei. A detailed quantitative estimate is made below.

We will calculate the rate for the continuum reaction

\[ K^- + He^4 \rightarrow Y^*_1 + He^3 \rightarrow \pi^- + \Lambda^0 + He^3, \]

(5)

using the impulse model. The final state wave function is taken to be

\[ \psi_K(\vec{r}_\Lambda - \vec{r}_3)e^{i \vec{p}_\pi \cdot \vec{r}_\pi} \left( \frac{\vec{p}_\pi - \frac{m_3 \vec{r}_\Lambda + m_3 \vec{r}_3}{m_3 + m_\Lambda}}{m_3 + m_\Lambda} \right), \]

i.e. a plane wave pion and a continuum \( \Lambda^0 - He^3 \) wave function \( \psi_K \), labelled by its internal momentum \( \vec{k} \). The coordinate system and coupling scheme used is illustrated in Fig. 2, where

\[ \vec{k} = \frac{m_3 \vec{r}_\Lambda - m_\Lambda \vec{r}_3}{m_\Lambda + m_3}. \]

The wave function for \( \Lambda^0 He^4 \) is taken as a gaussian, that is

\[ \phi He^4 = N_1 \exp \left( - \beta \sum_{i,j} (\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j)^2 \right) \]
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where \( \beta \) is fitted to the charge radius deduced from the Hofstalter\(^s\) electron scattering experiments. The initial wave function for our process, \( u(r) \), is thus the decomposition of the He\(^4\) wave function into the relative motion of nucleon 1 (which is later transformed into a \( \Lambda \)) and the centre-of-mass of the He\(^3\)-like core. Thus

\[
u(r) = N \exp \left( -a(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_3)^2 \right),
\]

where \( N \) is the normalization factor. In units where \( \hbar = c = 1 \), we find that \( \sqrt{a} = 89 \text{ MeV/c} \). Let \( T \) be defined as the transition operator for the elementary reaction \( K^- + N \rightarrow Y^* \), operating on the final state wave function. Since the appropriate impulse operator also includes the contact interaction terms \( \delta(\vec{r}_\pi - \vec{r}_\Lambda) \delta(\vec{r}_\Lambda - \vec{r}_1) \), the matrix element for the transition of reaction (5) is given by

\[
M = \left[ T v_K(r) \right]^* e^{-i\vec{p} \cdot \vec{r}} u(r) d\vec{r},
\]

where

\[
\vec{p} = \frac{m_3}{m_\Lambda + m_3} \vec{p}_\pi.
\]

If a pure \( Y^* \) state is formed, the transition operator \( T \) in the \( p_{\Lambda\pi}, p_3 \) language (see Fig. 1) is completely specified. It is in cases (a) and (b):

\[ T = A_0 p_{\Lambda\pi} \cdot p_3 + A_1 (p_{\Lambda\pi} \times p_3) \cdot \sigma_\Lambda, \]

if \( p_{3/2} \) or \( p_{1/2} \);

\[ \text{case (c)}: \quad T = B_0, \]

if \( s_{1/2} \),

with \( A_0 = a_0 / (p_{\Lambda\pi}^2 / 2\mu - p_{\Lambda\pi}^{s_2} / 2\mu) + i\Gamma / 2,\)

\[ A_1 = a_1 / (p_{\Lambda\pi}^2 / 2\mu - p_{\Lambda\pi}^{s_2} / 2\mu) + i\Gamma / 2, \]

5683/NP/kw
and \( B_0 = b_0 / (p_{\Delta_\pi}^2 / 2 \mu - p_{\Delta_\rho}^2 / 2 \mu) + i \Gamma / 2 \), i.e. the coefficients are given by Breit-Wigner resonance amplitudes, with \( p_{\Delta_\pi}^2 / 2 \mu \) being the resonant energy \( (\mu = m_{\pi} m_{\rho} / m_{\pi} + m_{\rho}) \), and \( \Gamma / 2 \) being the level half-width. We assume the \( a \)'s and \( b \)'s are constants, and for \( p_{3/2} \), \( |a_0|^2 = 4|a_1|^2 \), and for \( p_{1/2} \), \( |a_0|^2 = |a_1|^2 \).

In order to discuss hypernuclear formation, we must use the co-ordinate scheme of Fig. 2. We carry out this co-ordinate change by transforming the transition operator \( T \) to the \( \vec{k}, \vec{p}_\pi \) language by noting that

\[
\vec{p}_{\pi \Lambda} = -\frac{m_3}{m_\pi + m_\Lambda} \vec{k} + \left[ 1 - \frac{m_3}{(m_\pi + m_\Lambda)(m_3 + m_\Lambda)} \right] \vec{p}_\pi \tag{7a}
\]

and

\[
\vec{p}_3 = -\vec{k} - \frac{m_3}{m_3 + m_\Lambda} \vec{p}_\pi \tag{7b}
\]

Since \( m_\pi \) is small, we simplify our relations (7a), (7b) to be

\[
\vec{p}_{\pi \Lambda} = \vec{p}_\pi \tag{8a}
\]

\[
\vec{p}_3 = -\vec{k} - \frac{m_3}{m_3 + m_\Lambda} \vec{p}_\pi \tag{8b}
\]

Using Eqs. (8a) and (8b) we obtain the transformed \( T \) operator,

**cases (a) and (b):** \( T = -A_0 \left[ \frac{m_3}{m_3 + m_\Lambda} p_{\pi}^2 + \vec{p}_\pi \cdot \vec{k} \right] - A_4 \left[ \vec{p}_\pi \times \vec{k} \right] \cdot \vec{c}_\Lambda \),

for \( p_{3/2} \) or \( p_{1/2} \), where \( \vec{k} \) represents the gradient operator on the relative co-ordinate \( \vec{r}_\Lambda = \vec{r}_3 \);  

**case (c):** \( T = B_0 \),  

for \( s_{1/2} \).
Using partial integration, it can be readily shown that the matrix element of (6) is given by

\[ M = -A_0 p_\pi \int v_k^*(r) e^{-ip \cdot \hat{r}} \cos \theta \frac{d}{dr} u(r) dr \]

\[ -A_0 p_\pi \int v_k^*(r) e^{-ip \cdot \hat{r}} \sin \theta \frac{d}{dr} u(r) dr, \]

where \( \theta \) is the angle between \( \hat{p}_\pi \) and \( \hat{r} \) for the \( p_{1/2} \) and \( p_{3/2} \) cases. For \( s_{1/2} \) we obtain

\[ M = B_0 \int v_k^*(r) e^{-ip \cdot \hat{r}} u(r) dr. \]

To evaluate Eqs. (9) and (10), we employ closure. We calculate the total transition rate which is proportional to

\[ \int \int |M|^2 dk \, dp_\pi \]

by allowing \( k \) to range from zero to infinity (ignoring momentum conservation) and replacing the integration over \( p_\pi \) by its maximum value, i.e., the value of \( p_\pi \) corresponding to \( K^- + \text{He}^4 \to \pi^- + \text{He}^4 \). This procedure in general tends to overestimate the rate, an effect which can reasonably be neglected if the allowed region of integration is dominated by the final state interactions. Thus we use the relation

\[ \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} v_k^*(r)v_k^*(r') \frac{d}{dr} \delta(r - r') = v_B^*(r)v_B^*(r'), \]

where \( v_B \) is the bound state singlet hyperfragment wave function. We thus obtain

\[ R = \left| \int v_B(r) e^{-ip \cdot \hat{r}} \cos \frac{d}{dr} (r) dr \right|^2 \left[ 1 + 2 \left| \frac{a_0}{a_c} \right|^2 \right] < q^2 > \]
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for \( p_{1/2} \) and \( p_{3/2} \), where \( \langle q^2 \rangle \)

\[
\langle q^2 \rangle = \int u^*(r) \frac{d^2}{dr^2} u(r) dr = 3\alpha.
\]

In a similar way, for \( s_{1/2} \),

\[
R = |I|^2,
\]

where

\[
I = \int v_B^*(r) e^{-i \vec{p} \cdot \vec{r}} u(r) dr.
\]

Dalitz and Downs\(^3\) have numerically evaluated \( I \) as a function of \( p \), using the gaussian wave function for \( u(r) \) and a numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation for \( v_B \), i.e.

\[
I(p) = N \int v_B^*(r) e^{-i \vec{p} \cdot \vec{r}} e^{-\alpha r^2} dr.
\]

Letting

\[
J(p) = \int v_B^*(r) e^{-i \vec{p} \cdot \vec{r}} \cos \theta \frac{d}{dr} u(r) dr,
\]

we note that

\[
J(p) = \frac{2\alpha}{1} \frac{dI}{dp}.
\]

Table 1 gives the numerical evaluation of the three cases. We observe the large difference between the rates for \( s_{1/2} \) and \( p_{1/2} \), in spite of their identical angular distribution.

Angular distributions can be markedly changed from these predictions by a small admixture of background terms, e.g., terms arising from the strong \( \Lambda^0 - {He}^3 \) interactions. This is clear because interference terms, etc., arise from the amplitudes, whereas \textit{rates} go as the square of amplitudes and hence are rather insensitive to small admixtures.
of contamination terms. Thus, one should expect to have much greater
confidence in the predictive powers of a rate calculation than in
angular distributions. The large difference predicted between the
three cases of Y* level assignments should provide us with a valuable
tool for assigning these quantum numbers.

In order to check the sensitivity of the calculation to the
assumption of p-state capture, the following transition operators were
used:

cases (a) and (b): \[ T = A_0 \vec{P} \cdot \nabla \phi(0) + A_1 \left[ \nabla \phi(0) \times \vec{P} \right] \cdot \sigma \]

\[ + C_0 \vec{P} \cdot \nabla \phi(0) + C_1 \vec{P} \left[ \nabla \phi(0) \times \vec{P} \right] \cdot \sigma \]  

(17)

where \( \nabla \phi(0) \) is the gradient of the \( K^- - He^4 \) atomic wave function,
evaluated at the origin. It is now assumed that the C terms will
be neglectable, since they correspond to \( L = 2 \) recoil terms and are
probably suppressed by the angular momentum barrier. Therefore,

\[ T \to A_0 \vec{P} \cdot \nabla \phi(0) + A_1 \left[ \nabla \phi(0) \times \vec{P} \right] \cdot \sigma \]  

(18)

where again the A's are resonant amplitudes. The corresponding oper-
ator for \( s_{1/2} \) is given by

\[ \text{case (c): } T \to B_0 \vec{P} \cdot \nabla \phi(0) \]  

(19)

The rates for hyperfragment production are given by

\[ R = \frac{\left| J \right|^2}{1 + 2 |a_0|^2} \]  

(20)

where \( |a_0|^2 = \left| a_1 \right|^2 \) for \( p_{1/2} \),

and \( |a_0|^2 = 4 \left| a_1 \right|^2 \) for \( p_{3/2} \),

and \( R = \frac{|J|^2}{<q>^2} \) for \( s_{1/2} \).  

(21)
Table 2 summarizes these rates, which are approximately equal to those of s-state capture.

**Table 2**

Hyperfragment production rate for pseudoscalar K capture in p-wave and scalar K capture in s-wave states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y* level</th>
<th>Spin</th>
<th>Parity</th>
<th>R (hypernuclear rate in %) for p-wave capture, pseudoscalar K</th>
<th>R (hypernuclear rate in %) for s-wave capture, scalar K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s_{1/2}</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>≤ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_{1/2}</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>≤ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_{3/2}</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>≤ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We further test the hypothesis that the K⁻ is scalar, and is captured in an s-state. This would require that the hyperfragment be produced in a spin 1 excited state, and decay into the spin zero ground state. Dalitz and Downs\(^3\) have estimated that if such an excited state is found, its binding energy is ≤ 0.1 MeV.

The matrix elements for the transition are given by

\[
T = A_1 \vec{p}_{\Delta} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{\Lambda} \text{ for } p_{1/2} \text{ and } p_{3/2},
\]

and

\[
T = B_1 \vec{p}_{s} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{\Lambda} \text{ for } s_{1/2}.
\]

The corresponding rates are given by

\[
R = |I'|^2 \text{ for } p_{1/2} \text{ and } p_{3/2},
\]

and

\[
R = |J'|^2 < q^2 > .
\]

The primes refer to the hyperfragment wave function corresponding to 0.1 MeV binding energy.
For our purposes, it is sufficiently accurate to assume that both $I$ and $J$ are proportional to $E^{1/2}$, where $E$ is the binding energy. This proportionality comes from the normalization of the hypernuclear wave function, which for sufficiently small $E$, satisfies the above. These numerical results are indicated in Table 2. In summarizing, we see from Tables 1 and 2 that hypernuclear production is severely limited if the $K$ is scalar, whereas the rates are insensitive to whether pseudoscalar $K$ is captured from either an $s$ or a $p$ orbit.

* *

The author would like to acknowledge stimulating discussions with Dr. M. Peshkin of the Argonne National Laboratory, and with Dr. L. Brown, Dr. F. Singer, and Dr. W. Wada of Northwestern University.
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PART III.3

LIFETIME MEASUREMENTS OF $^3\text{He}^+$ AND $^4\text{He}^+$

L. Fortney *

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

(Presented by W.F. Fry)

Hyperfragments were produced by $^\pi^-$ mesons at rest in the Berkeley 30" heavy liquid bubble chamber of Professor W. Powell. The chamber was filled with a mixture of propane and freon. The separated $^\pi^-$ beam from the Berkeley bevatron gave about five stopping $^\pi^-$ mesons per picture. About 90,000 pictures were scanned for hyperfragments. Hydrogen hyperfragments which are produced with a momentum greater than 75 MeV/c per nucleon, travel more than 0.75 mm in the liquid before coming to rest. This length of track can generally be observed if it is not obscured by other tracks or steep in the chamber.

The two-body mesonic decays

\[ ^3\text{He}^+ \rightarrow ^3\text{He}^+ + \pi^- + \sim 42 \text{ MeV} \]
\[ ^4\text{He}^+ \rightarrow ^4\text{He}^+ + \pi^- + \sim 55 \text{ MeV} \]

can generally be identified by kinematics, both when in flight and at rest. The lifetime measurements are restricted to these two-decay modes. For analysis considerations, the mesonic hyperfragments were separated into two classifications:

i) hydrogen hyperfragments which decay in flight with more than 80 MeV/c per nucleon, at the time of decay, can yield a visible nuclear recoil ($^3\text{He}$ or $^4\text{He}$) of length greater than 0.75 mm; these events are called two-prong decays;

* Supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and in part by the University of Wisconsin Research Committee with funds provided by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation.
ii) hyperfragments which decay either in flight or at rest and do not have a visible recoil are called one-prong events. Only those events are accepted where the angle between the pion direction and the hyperfragment is less than 35°, in order to eliminate Σ⁻ decays in flight from the sample.

Each event of class (i) was subject to a three constraint kinematic fitting programme under the hypotheses that the event was

a) \( \Lambda^H_3 \) two-body decay,

b) \( \Lambda^H_4 \) two-body decay,

c) or a free \( \Lambda \) decay from the \( K^- \) origin with the \( \Lambda \) vertex superimposed on a nuclear track. This category also includes three-body decays, since they will fit a free \( \Lambda \) decay in some cases.

The accepted two-body events were required to fit (a) or (b) with a \( \chi^2 \leq 10 \) and to not fit (c) \( (\chi^2 \geq 10) \). The sample of group (a) is subject to some contamination of three-body decays which have only one visible nuclear track. This contamination is probably small.

Five \( \Lambda^H_3 \) and five \( \Lambda^H_4 \) decays were found by this method of analysis. The maximum likelihood method using this sample of decays in flight only give

\[
\tau_{\Lambda^H_3} = 0.70^{+0.9}_{-0.3} \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec}
\]

\[
\tau_{\Lambda^H_4} \geq 1.9 \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec}.
\]

Events of type (ii) were analysed by assuming that the events with \( P_\pi \) (lab) greater than 130 MeV/c and less than about 150 MeV/c are \( \Lambda^H_4 \) two-body decays; and events with \( P_\pi \) (lab) greater than 110 MeV/c and less than 130 MeV/c are \( \Lambda^H_2 \) two-body decays. Background studies show that other phenomena leading to pions of these momenta are unimportant.
This method yielded five $A^3H^3$ decays at rest and four in flight decays.

Ten $A^3H^4$ decays at rest and three $A^4H^4$ decays in flight were found. A maximum likelihood method of analysis for these one-prong events yields the following lifetimes

$$\tau_{A^3H^3} = (0.6^{+0.4}_{-0.3}) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec}$$

$$\tau_{A^4H^4} = (2.0^{+2.0}_{-1.0}) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec}.$$

A third method of analysis was used to combine the in-flight decays of class (i) with the decays at rest and in flight of class (ii). Assuming that there are equal numbers of decays at rest with pions backward, with respect to the hyperfragment, as there are forward, the maximum likelihood method for the four $A^3H^3$ two-body decays in flight, and five at rest, yield

$$\tau_{A^3H^3} = (0.63^{+0.5}_{-0.3}) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec}.$$  

The four $A^3H^4$ events in flight and the ten at rest yield a lifetime of

$$\tau_{A^3H^4} = (2.4^{+1.9}_{-0.9}) \times 10^{-10} \text{ sec}.$$  

The good agreement of these three largely independent methods of determining the mean life of $A^3H^3$ suggests that the background of three-body decays in the two-body sample, is small.
IV. PRODUCTION OF HYPERFRAGMENTS
I. INTRODUCTION

1. General

In this talk we shall make a brief survey of the experimental results on hyperfragment production. Most of these results have come from work with nuclear emulsion, although interesting studies have also been made with the use of bubble chambers\textsuperscript{1,2}). Nuclear emulsion is in this field of research an important experimental technique because of the very high spatial resolution of which it is capable. It can resolve events separated by distances of the order of 0.5 \( \mu \) or even less and record observable tracks of charged particles of very low energy. On the other hand, the complex composition of nuclear emulsion bears significantly on the experimental results. We shall pay particular attention to this problem in the following.

In the remaining part of this section we shall outline the general conditions in which hyperfragments can be produced. Section II will be devoted to the discussion of those aspects of nuclear emulsion technique that are relevant to the observation of hyperfragment production. Finally, in Section III, we shall discuss the main experimental results obtained, mostly in recent work in which a systematic approach to this problem has been made.

2. Conditions of hyperfragment production

The formation of a hyperfragment\textsuperscript{3}) requires the binding in a nuclear fragment of a \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperon, i.e. a particle with a negative strangeness

\textsuperscript{3}) Only the production of ordinary hyperfragments, i.e. nuclear structures containing one bound \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperon, is discussed in this lecture. The observation of a double hyperfragment, i.e. a structure containing two bound \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperons, has been the subject of a separate talk\textsuperscript{3}).
\((S = -1)\). In practice, this condition is realized by the bombardment of atomic nuclei with particles having such properties that their strong interactions can lead to the appearance of negative strangeness \((S = -1)\) inside the struck nuclei. A \(\Lambda^0\) hyperon produced at some stage of such an interaction can be emitted from the struck nucleus, free or bound in a light nuclear fragment, or else it can become trapped in a residual nucleus, i.e. the heaviest "splinter" of all the disintegration products of the reaction.

A negative strangeness can appear inside the atomic nucleus as a result of the interaction of:

i) a non-strange particle (e.g. a \(\pi\) meson or a nucleon) with energy above the threshold for associated production of strange particles;

ii) a strange particle with a negative strangeness (e.g. a \(K^-\) meson or a \(\Sigma^-\) hyperon) interacting at rest or in flight.

Experimental results show that the cross-section for hyperfragment production in processes of type (ii) is about an order of magnitude higher than that of processes of type (i). As a result, exhaustive studies of hyperfragment production under various experimental conditions became possible only with the advent of separated beams of \(K^-\) mesons of both high intensities and purities and of various energies.

II. EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS

1. Nuclear emulsion as a target

In studying the production of hyperfragments, nuclear emulsion constitutes at the same time a "target" and a "detector". The atomic composition of the target must therefore be taken into account in any interpretation of the experimental results since a hyperfragment may originate from the interaction of an incident particle with any complex
nucleus of the main emulsion constituents*, C, N, O, Br or Ag (we neglect here the less abundant elements S and I).

In connection with the presence in nuclear emulsion of two distinct groups of complex nuclei, i.e. "light" nuclei with mass number $A \leq 16$ (C, N, O) and "heavy" nuclei with $A >> 16$ (Br, Ag), we introduce the following phenomenological definitions. We shall refer to a hypernucleus as "light" or "heavy" if its mass number is $A \leq 16$ or $A > 16$, respectively. These definitions correspond to the fact that the most massive hypernucleus that can be produced in emulsion from known interactions of incident particles with light nuclei has a mass number $A = 16$. It will follow in practice that the atomic number of a "light" or a "heavy" hypernucleus is $Z \leq 8$ or $Z > 8$, respectively.

2. Nuclear emulsion as a detector

A hyperfragment is observed in emulsion as a double star resulting from the registration of the interaction of an incident particle with an emulsion nucleus and of the decay of the produced hyperfragment. The smallest separation between the centres of these two stars (i.e. the shortest range of a hyperfragment) that can be observed under ordinary experimental conditions is $1 \pm 0.5 \mu$. If the centres of the two stars cannot be resolved (i.e. the hyperfragment decays practically at the point of its production) then we speak of the formation of a "cryptofragment". It is clear that the difference between a "hyperfragment" and a "cryptofragment" is of purely phenomenological nature. Different methods must be applied for investigation of cryptofragments as the basic criterion of hyperfragment selection, i.e. the observation of a double star, is missing in this case.

Recently the Amsterdam group5 have used a new method to detect and to measure the very closely spaced double stars. The $x$ and $y$ coordinates of the grains of the prongs near the centre of a star were

* Most of the results available at present come from nuclear emulsion of normal composition. Emulsion loaded with various elements may be used in order to study hyperfragment production from other nuclei and some efforts have been made already in this direction*).
determined with a special apparatus and straight lines were then fitted to them. The intersection of these lines defined a centre of the star. By this method it was possible to determine the distance between the two centres with an error of about 0.07 μ (or even less), the smallest separation observed being about 0.25 μ.

3. Identification of hyperfragments

Methods of hyperfragment identification have been fully discussed at the conference\textsuperscript{6,7}. In this talk we are only concerned with the problem of how to select a possibly unbiased sample of all the hyperfragments produced in a given interaction, keeping in mind the fact that the ranges of most of the observed hyperfragments are too short, i.e. less than about 20 μ, to assist in their identification. Mesonic hyperfragments\textsuperscript{8) are readily identified as such and their identity can often be uniquely established from the kinematical analysis of their production and decay processes. The unique identification of non-mesonic hyperfragments is, however, rare because their decays usually involve the emission of neutrons and nuclear fragments of low energy (i.e. short range). Attempts were made to identify individual events by assuming the emission of a single neutral particle and by permuting charged particle identities in the kinematic analysis computer programme. This procedure may often lead to serious misinterpretations as some of the decay configurations of non-mesonic heavy hyperfragments may resemble, and be interpreted as, the decay of much lighter hypernuclei. This is illustrated in Fig. 1, which shows range distributions of Li\textsuperscript{8} fragments, mesonic \( \Lambda \) hyperfragments and so-called non-mesonic \( \Lambda \) events\textsuperscript{9). The difference in their range distributions is apparent. The effects of this and other similar misinterpretations are far reaching and have led to many conclusions which should be questioned\textsuperscript{6,9}. Most of the non-mesonic hyperfragments must, therefore, remain individually unidentified and some sort of statistical approach is required to identify such events. This approach should be based solely on

\textsuperscript{8) It is customary to use the term "mesonic" only for those hyperfragments whose decay involves the emission of charged π mesons.
consideration of the characteristics of the production process and
on the observed hyperfragment range distribution\(^{8,9}\). In this manner
it should be possible:

i) to make a statistical division of all the hyperfragments into
two classes of light and heavy ones; and

ii) to estimate independently the experimental losses and biases
for these classes.

4. Biases

There are other phenomena caused by the interactions of charged
particles emitted from the primary disintegrations whose appearance in
emulsion is often very similar to that of hyperfragment decay in that
they also lead to the formation of double stars. The following phenomena
are to be taken into account:

i) interactions in flight of secondary charged particles (including
single scattering events);

ii) captures at rest of negative particles, e.g. \(\pi^-\) and \(K^-\) mesons, and
\(\Sigma^-\) hyperons;

iii) decay of unstable ordinary fragments, e.g. \(\text{Li}^8\), \(\text{Li}^9\), \(\text{B}^8\), and \(\text{C}^{12}\);

iv) decay of unstable elementary particles, e.g. \(\Lambda^+\) hyperons.

Some of these events may simulate, by their configuration,
the decay of non-mesonic hyperfragments\(^{*}\). If the length of the connecting
tracks is too small (say, less than about 20 \(\mu\)) then, in general, such
events cannot be individually identified. Statistical arguments must,
therefore, be used to estimate the contamination of the selected sample
of double stars, chosen for a given range cut-off, with these background
phenomena. It is clear that such an analysis must be carried out separately

\(^{*}\) The confusion with background phenomena, mainly single scattering events,
is particularly pronounced for those types of non-mesonic hyperfragment
decay which lead to the emission of a single charged particle (one-
pronged decay).
for each experiment as the contribution from various background phenomena may differ for various experimental conditions.

III. GENERAL FEATURES OF PROCESSES IN WHICH HYPERFRAGMENTS ARE PRODUCED

1. Introduction

Table 1 lists the particles of various energies that have been used to produce hyperfragments in nuclear emulsion. It also gives the observed fractions of interactions yielding hyperfragments and the non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratios taken from published work. The compilation of data from various experiments is made difficult by the fact that often different criteria of selection of non-mesonic hyperfragments were adopted and different corrections were introduced by various authors; sometimes these conditions were not clearly specified in the publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Fraction of interactions yielding HF (%)</th>
<th>Non-mesonic to mesonic HF decay ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^-$ mesons</td>
<td>3.0 GeV</td>
<td>$0.090 \pm 0.012$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^-$ mesons</td>
<td>4.5 GeV</td>
<td>$0.18 \pm 0.03$</td>
<td>$5.0 \pm 1.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^-$ mesons</td>
<td>17.2 GeV</td>
<td>$0.3 \pm 0.05$</td>
<td>$\sim 6.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protons</td>
<td>3.0 GeV</td>
<td>$0.096 \pm 0.019$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protons</td>
<td>6.0 GeV</td>
<td>$0.07$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protons</td>
<td>25.0 GeV</td>
<td>$0.3 \pm 0.05$ (≈0.5)</td>
<td>$\sim 5.9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ mesons</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>$4.7 \pm 0.3$</td>
<td>$3.2 \pm 0.8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ mesons</td>
<td>85 MeV (mean)</td>
<td>$3.9 \pm 0.8$</td>
<td>$7.5 \pm 5.6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ mesons</td>
<td>225 MeV</td>
<td>$6.3 \pm 2.5$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ mesons</td>
<td>450 MeV</td>
<td>$5.3 \pm 0.3$</td>
<td>$11.5 \pm 2.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ mesons</td>
<td>750 MeV</td>
<td>$2.4 \pm 0.4$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ mesons</td>
<td>900 MeV</td>
<td>$4.2 \pm 0.2$</td>
<td>$15.5 \pm 2.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ mesons</td>
<td>1.07 GeV</td>
<td>$4.1 \pm 0.2$</td>
<td>$13.3 \pm 1.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Xi^-$ mesons</td>
<td>1.85 GeV</td>
<td>$2.4 \pm 0.2$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma^-$ hyperons</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>$2.5 \pm 0.8$</td>
<td>$5.2 \pm 2.0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For instance, it appears that the contamination with background phenomena of a sample of short range heavy hyperfragments resulting from the interactions of energetic $K^-$ mesons is much smaller than in the case of $\pi^-$ mesons.
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2. Fractions of interactions yielding hyperfragments

Table 1 shows that:

i) the observation frequency of hyperfragments is much lower for the interactions of $\pi^-$ mesons and protons (0.1 - 0.5%) than for those of $K^-$ mesons and $\Sigma^-$ hyperons (2 - 5%);

ii) there appears to be a tendency for this frequency to increase with the energy of the incident $\pi$ mesons and protons: such an increase could be explained if with the increase of the incident particle energy, most of the $\Lambda^0$ production occurred in secondary collisions inside the struck nuclei, in particular those of $\pi$ mesons on nucleons$^{12}$;

iii) in the case of $K^-$ mesons, the observation frequency seems to stay near 5% for both interactions at rest and in flight at least up to 450 MeV;

iv) for $\Sigma^-$ hyperons the fraction of captures at rest giving rise to hyperfragments is less than that for $K^-$ mesons: this may be ascribed to the fact that the nuclear absorption of $\Sigma^-$ hyperons is more peripheral than that of $K^-$ mesons$^{13}$.

The fractions of interactions leading to the binding of $\Lambda^0$ hyperons in emulsion nuclei may actually be higher than the values given in Table 1 because of the formation of cryptofragments.

Several estimates of the frequency of cryptofragment formation in the capture at rest of $K^-$ mesons were made from an analysis of the total balance of strangeness in such interactions. With the use of nuclear emulsion, Davis et al.$^{14}$ found for this frequency $(30 \pm 7)\%$ (upper limit), Cester et al.$^{15}$ $(0 - 15)\%$ and Filipkowski et al.$^{16}$ $(13^{+22}_{-24})\%$.

Recently Knight et al.$^{17}$ have performed an experiment in which $K^-$ mesons were stopped in the 30" Berkeley heavy liquid bubble chamber in a 50%-50% mixture by volume of CF$_2$Br and C$_2$H$_4$. The result was that $(22.5 \pm 1.7)\%$ of the interactions did not emit a strange particle and so presumably involved the trapping of a $\Lambda^0$ hyperon. This observation, together with that of Davis et al., led to the conclusion that the
frequency of $\Lambda^0$ trapping in light and heavy nuclei of the emulsion is 
$(18.5 \pm 3.5)\%$ and $(51 \pm 14)\%^{17}$, respectively.

Cryptofragment formation from the capture at rest of $\Sigma^-$ hyperons in emulsion was investigated by Saxon et al.$^{13}$). From a study of the energy released in capture stars, they estimated that the frequency of cryptofragment formation is $(9 \pm 3)\%$.

Theoretical estimates of the probability of $\Lambda^0$ trapping in heavy emulsion nuclei, following the absorption at rest of $K^-$ mesons and $\Sigma^-$ hyperons calculated by Martin$^{18}$), are in agreement with the emulsion results quoted above.

3. Non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio

It is seen from Table 1 that the non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio increases markedly when we pass from hyperfragments produced by $K^-$ meson capture at rest ($\sim 3$) to those produced by $K^-$ mesons interacting in flight ($\sim 12$).

This ratio strongly varies with the range of hyperfragments originating from the interactions of energetic $K^-$ mesons. This is illustrated in Table 2 in which the combined results obtained in the study of hyperfragment production from the interactions of 1.3 and 1.5 GeV/c $K^-$ mesons were used$^{19}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HF range in $\mu$m</th>
<th>0 - 10</th>
<th>10 - 100</th>
<th>&gt; 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio</td>
<td>$\sim 100$</td>
<td>$\sim 3.5$</td>
<td>$\sim 1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The variation of the non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio for hyperfragments produced in the interactions of 1.3 and 1.5 GeV/c $K^-$ mesons
From these results it is clear that short-range hyperfragments originating from the interactions of energetic particles (in particular $K^-$ mesons) are much heavier than those produced from the capture of $K^-$ mesons at rest. In fact, detailed analysis shows\cite{8,10,19-21} that most of the short-range hyperfragments produced in the interactions of energetic particles are residual spallation products of heavy nucleus disintegrations containing a trapped $\Lambda^0$ hyperon. When such heavy spallation hyperfragments receive sufficient momenta in the interaction they yield, visible tracks in emulsion and thus their decay can be distinguished from the primary disintegrations. In the case of $K^-$ mesons interacting at rest, the momenta transferred to the heavy residual nuclei are, in general, too low so that heavy cryptofragments are formed instead of resolvable double stars.

4. Range distribution of hyperfragments

A typical range distribution of hyperfragments\cite{19} produced in the interactions of energetic particles is shown in Fig. 2. It is seen that the range distributions of mesonic and non-mesonic hyperfragments are strikingly different. The range distribution of non-mesonic hyperfragments exhibits a maximum between 2 and 5 $\mu$ and then sharply decreases. On the other hand, the distribution in range of the mesonic hyperfragments shows no such feature. Combining this observation with the previous one concerning the variation of the non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio with range (see Table 2), one can divide all the hyperfragments into three categories in a natural manner: those with ranges less than 10 $\mu$, between 10 and, say, 100 $\mu$, and greater than 100 $\mu$, respectively. The hyperfragments of range less than 10 $\mu$ are in the main the residual spallation products of the heavy emulsion nuclei containing trapped $\Lambda^0$ hyperons which received sufficient momentum to record visible tracks in emulsion. Those of range greater than about 100 $\mu$ are mainly very light ($A < 5$) hyperfragments as indicated by their low non-mesonic to mesonic decay ratio. The events from the range region of $\sim 10$ to $\sim 100$ $\mu$ are probably a mixture of very light ($A < 5$) and medium light ($A \geq 5$) hyperfragments and perhaps some heavy hyperfragments from the tail of their range distribution. In fact, if one
knew the identities of the light mesonic hyperfragments and the non-
mesonic to mesonic ratio as a function of $Z$, then using the range dis-
tribution of such identified mesonic hyperfragments, one could construct
the range distribution of the corresponding non-mesonic hyperfragments.
By this indirect method, it would be possible to establish statistically
the composition of the sample of non-mesonic hyperfragments of intermediate
range, apart from any direct methods of establishing their identity.

In connection with the shape of the range distribution of
hyperfragments (Fig. 2), the following remark should be made. From
considerations presented in Section II.2 it follows that the short-
range end of this distribution may be biased against the detection of
very closely spaced double stars (i.e. hyperfragments of ranges less
than about 1 $\mu$). The Amsterdam group demonstrated by the application
of their method (see Section II.3), that such a loss may indeed exist.
For instance, they found nine double-centred events among 179 stars
which on first inspection did not appear to be double-centred$^3)$. The
range distribution in 0.25 $\mu$ intervals of a sample of double stars measured
by their method is shown in Fig. 3.

The Warsaw group$^{22}$) have attempted to determine what is the
minimum momentum transfer to a heavy hypernucleus that leads to a separa-
tion between the two centres which can be recognized under normal
conditions. For this purpose observations were made on the scattering
in Ilford K2 emulsion of argon ions. Figure 4 shows the preliminary
results of this work, i.e. the relation between the momentum imparted to
the struck emulsion nucleus (determined from the kinematics) and its
observed range in emulsion defined as the distance between the point of
scattering and the tangent to the last grain of the recoil track. It is
seen that the experimental points lie in two regions, I and II. Region II
corresponds to the scattering on light nuclei, C, N, O, whereas region I
corresponds to the scattering on heavy nuclei, Br, Ag. It is seen that
the struck heavy nuclei start recording visible tracks in the emulsion
when the momenta imparted to them are $> 0.5$ GeV/c. Now heavy spallation
hyperfragments observed in the interactions of particles with momentum up
to several GeV/c possess mass numbers between $A = 40$ and $A = 100$. This observation may help to understand the reason for the high average momentum of the order of 1 GeV/c found for the spallation hyperfragments when the incident $K^-$ momentum was only 0.8 GeV/c\textsuperscript{23}. If the argument given above is correct the spallation heavy hyperfragments of low momentum would not be observed.

5. The nuclei from which hyperfragments originate

The range distribution of hyperfragments changes with the increase of incident particle momentum. In Table 3 the fractions of hyperfragments of range less than 5 \( \mu \)m are shown for several values of the momentum of the incident particles. There is an increase of this fraction when we pass from K interactions at rest to those at 0.8 GeV/c; then we observe a slow decrease with increasing momentum of the incident particles. Such a variation is presumably a reflection of the complex composition of our target, i.e. nuclear emulsion.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Particle and & \( K^- \) & \( K^- \) & \( K^- \) & \( K^- \) & \( \pi^- \) & \( \pi^- \) & \( p \) \\
momentum & at rest & 0.3 & 0.8 & 1.5 & 2.3 & 4.5 & 17 & 25 \\
(in GeV/c) & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
Fraction of HF of ranges < 5 \( \mu \)m & \( \sim 63 \) & \( \sim 60 \) & \( \sim 88 \) & \( \sim 71 \) & \( \sim 64 \) & \( \sim 27 \) & \( \lesssim 25 \) & \( \lesssim 8 \) \\
(\%) & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The variation of the fraction of non-mesonic hyperfragments of range less than 5 \( \mu \)m with the incident particle momentum}
\end{table}
Indeed, most of the mesonic hyperfragments produced as a result of the capture of $K^-$ mesons at rest come from the light nuclei of the emulsion and this effect becomes more marked as the atomic number, $Z$, of the hyperfragment increases. This is illustrated in Table 4. Similar studies have not been made for the non-mesonic hyperfragments. However, using the non-meson to mesonic decay ratio given in Ref. 24 and assuming that the same proportions of production by light nuclei are applicable to those hyperfragments which decay non-mesonically, one can estimate that the majority ($\geq 80\%$) of non-mesonic hyperfragments must have originated from light nuclei as well.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atomic number $Z$ of mesonic HF</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>$\geq 4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower limit for the proportion of light nucleus production (%)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, most of the hyperfragments produced from interactions of particles in flight come from the heavy nuclei of the emulsion. This is illustrated in Table 5 which shows the proportion of hyperfragment production in heavy nuclei for several reactions.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle and momentum (GeV/c)</th>
<th>$K^-$ at rest</th>
<th>$K^-$ 0.8</th>
<th>$K^-$ 1.5</th>
<th>$K^-$ 2.3</th>
<th>$\pi^-$ 4.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of heavy nucleus production (%)</td>
<td>$&gt; 13$</td>
<td>$&gt; 63$</td>
<td>$&gt; 82$</td>
<td>$&gt; 84$</td>
<td>$\geq 90$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, the explanation is that with the increase of the incident particle momentum, heavy cryptofragments start recording visible tracks in the emulsion and so the observed yield of short-range non-mesonic hyperfragments increases. However, as the incident particle momentum is further increased, the heavy spallation hyperfragments will, on average, be of slightly lower mass. This conclusion follows from the observation of the mean prong number, $\bar{N}_h$, of the hyperfragment parent stars. The increase of $\bar{N}_h$ with the incident particle momentum is clearly seen from Table 6 and indicates that the residual hypernuclei will have correspondingly lower masses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle and momentum (GeV/c)</th>
<th>$K^-$</th>
<th>$K^-$</th>
<th>$K^-$</th>
<th>$K^-$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{N}_h$</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, if the average momentum transfer does not decrease the fact that the heavy spallation hyperfragments have lower masses implies that they will have larger range; the number of events with range less than 5 μ will decrease. It should be added that an increase in the mean range of the heavy hyperfragments might also be due to an increase in the momentum imparted to the struck nucleus.

The mesonic hyperfragments resulting from the interactions of $K^-$ mesons in flight are, in general, of longer ranges than those coming from the $K^-$ meson captures at rest. This observation is illustrated in Fig. 5, which shows: a) range distribution of the mesonic hyperfragments from the interactions of $K^-$ mesons of 800 MeV/c momentum; and b) range distribution of the mesonic hyperfragments from the interaction of $K^-$ mesons at rest.
The average size of a star with a hyperfragment is in general larger than that of a single star. For illustration, the results obtained by the Brussels and Warsaw groups in the study of hyperfragment production by 800 MeV/c K^- mesons\(^{23}\) are presented in Fig. 6. It shows the distributions of heavy prong number \(N_h\) for stars containing hyperfragments of range \(\leq 5\ \mu\), i.e., heavy spallation hyperfragments (class I: \(\bar{N}_h = 6.3 \pm 0.3\)) and of range \(\geq 5\ \mu\) (class II: \(\bar{N}_h = 5.3 \pm 0.5\)) and for single stars with one or more short tracks of range \(\leq 5\ \mu\) (class III: \(\bar{N}_h = 4.8 \pm 0.2\)) and without such short tracks (class IV: \(\bar{N}_h = 4.9 \pm 0.2\)). These short tracks in single stars can be attributed to recoiling heavy residual nuclei; consequently both the events of class I and of class III must have originated from heavy emulsion nuclei. The range distribution of recoils in single stars (class III) is almost identical with that of heavy hyperfragments (class I) [see Ref. 23 for discussion].

6. Charge distribution of mesonic hyperfragments

It has been shown above that for the captures of K^- mesons at rest, the hyperfragments observed come predominantly from light nuclei whereas for the interactions of particles in flight they come from heavy nuclei. It is interesting, therefore, that the observed charge distributions of mesonic hyperfragments are similar in both cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atomic number Z of mesonic hyperfragment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K^- at rest, 192 events, %</td>
<td>33.8 ± 4.2</td>
<td>42.7 ± 4.9</td>
<td>15.6 ± 2.9</td>
<td>5.2 ± 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K^- at 0.8 GeV/c, 73 events, %</td>
<td>39.7 ± 7.4</td>
<td>42.5 ± 7.6</td>
<td>13.7 ± 4.3</td>
<td>4.1 ± 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\pi^-) at 4.5 GeV/c, 65 events, %</td>
<td>33.8 ± 7.2</td>
<td>53.9 ± 9.1</td>
<td>7.7 ± 3.5</td>
<td>4.5 ± 2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Only events with uniquely determined Z have been used.
Table 7 shows the charge distribution of mesonic hyperfragments resulting from \( \bar{K}^- \) captures at rest\(^{24}\) and from the interactions of 0.8 GeV/c \( \bar{K}^- \) \(^{25}\) and 4.5 GeV/c \( \pi^- \) mesons\(^{26}\). It is not clear whether this similarity is a real effect or a fluctuation due to poor statistics and different scanning biases which may affect both samples of events; this problem is certainly worth investigating.

Knowing the non-mesonic to mesonic ratio for the various hypernuclear species, the Chicago group\(^ {24}\) estimated the hyperfragment emission probabilities for \( \bar{K}^- \) meson captures at rest (defined as the ratio of the number of hyperfragments to the number of bound plus unbound \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperons produced) for the light hyperfragments. These estimates are given in Table 8. The emission probability is seen to increase with the mass of the hypernucleus (see Section III.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypernuclide</th>
<th>( \Lambda^H )</th>
<th>( \Lambda^L )</th>
<th>( \Lambda^B )</th>
<th>( \Lambda^C )</th>
<th>( \Lambda^B, \Lambda^C )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average emission probability ( \times 10^3 )</td>
<td>0.14( \pm )0.06</td>
<td>0.43( \pm )0.15</td>
<td>0.45( \pm )0.10</td>
<td>1.4( \pm )0.3</td>
<td>3.4( \pm )1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Angular and energy correlations

Hyperfragments originating from the interactions of particles in flight are preferentially ejected in the forward direction with respect to that of the incident particles. This observation is illustrated with the results from the Brussels-Warsaw work\(^ {23}\). Figure 7 shows the angular distributions of hyperfragments and of recoils in single stars with respect to the line of flight of the incident \( \bar{K}^- \) mesons. The short-range hyperfragments \( \leq 5 \mu \) are seen to be strongly peaked in the forward direction, their forward to backward ratio being \( F/B = 3.3 \pm 0.7 \). The angular
distribution of long-range hyperfragments (> 5 μ) is more isotropic (R/B = 1.8 ± 0.6); and similarly so is that of recoils observed in single K stars (R/B = 1.5 ± 0.3)⁸).

For ordinary fragments emitted from high-energy nuclear reactions, a marked anisotropy of their direction of emission is also observed. It is seen that their forward collimation increases with the energy of the emitted fragments, i.e. with their ranges. This is shown in Table 9 for Li⁸ fragments emitted from 4.5 GeV/c π⁻ meson interactions²⁷). A similar increase in the forward collimation with energy has also been observed for light identified hyperfragments²⁸).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Li⁸ (μ)</th>
<th>&lt; 101</th>
<th>101 - 134</th>
<th>134 - 232</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F/B ratio</td>
<td>1.03 ± 0.2</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values of the over-all forward to backward ratios for light hyperfragments are, in general, slightly lower than those for heavy ones; the same is true also for ordinary light fragments and recoils²⁹); this is illustrated in Table 10.

There are some indications that both the angular and energy distributions of ordinary fragments and light hyperfragments are similar²⁵,²⁷,²⁸,³⁰), but certainly more work is needed to clarify the situation in this respect. Of course one should compare respective distributions only for those ordinary fragments and hyperfragments which at least possess the same atomic number Z. The easiest approach

---

⁸) The low value of this F/B ratio might be due to a strong bias against the detection in single K⁻ stars of short recoils projected in the forward direction. However, no reason for such a bias could be found.
Table 10

Forward to backward ratios for light fragments and hyperfragments and for recoils and heavy hyperfragments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident particle and energy (GeV)</th>
<th>Protons</th>
<th>K⁻ mesons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light fragments</td>
<td>1.5±0.2</td>
<td>1.8±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recoils</td>
<td>3.1±0.6</td>
<td>1.8±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light hyperfragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy hyperfragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

consists of investigating \( \Lambda \) Li mesonic hyperfragments and Li⁸ fragments; both types of events can be identified by their decay characteristics and any experimental biases will be considerably reduced in this case.

In fact, such a comparison has been performed by the Chicago group in a detailed study of the capture of K⁻ mesons at rest. The results show that range distributions of both \( \Lambda \) Li and \( \Lambda \) He hyperfragments are respectively very similar to those of ordinary Li⁸ and He nuclei. In Fig. 8 the normalized range distributions of \( \Lambda \) Li and Li⁸ events are displayed as an illustration.

---

*) One can extend this type of investigation to other types of fragments by using, for instance, less sensitive types of emulsion exposed to the same beam of particles to which normal emulsions have been exposed. Then one can study the emission of hyperfragments in the normal emulsion, and that of ordinary fragments in the less sensitive emulsions where it is much easier to identify the charges of fragments from observations on their tracks.

**) It has been shown that the lower limit of the proportion of Li⁸ production in light nuclei is 75%; see also Table 4.

†) Particles and light fragments were observed in addition to a recoil in a primary disintegration.
Hyperfragments originating from interactions of \( K^- \) mesons at rest are emitted preferentially in the opposite direction to that of accompanying \( \pi \) mesons or fast protons; an angular correlation of the same type is also observed for \( \Lambda^0 \) fragments\(^{24}\). A possible reason for this observation is discussed in Section III.8.

3. **Models of hyperfragment production**

1) Hyperfragments produced in the capture at rest of \( K^- \) mesons and \( \Sigma^- \) hyperons

Two models for the production of hyperfragments following \( K^- \) meson captures at rest in emulsion nuclei have been proposed\(^{24}\).

In the first, the "trapped \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperon" model, it is suggested that the \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperon, either created directly in the initial \( K^- \) meson interaction or as a result of \( \Sigma \) hyperon conversion, becomes trapped in the potential well of the excited struck nucleus and is subsequently emitted as a hyperfragment in the ensuing de-excitation stage. This model accounts satisfactorily for the observed preponderance of hyperfragment emission from the light nuclei of the emulsion following \( K^- \) meson captures at rest. The small amount of excitation energy available, less than 100 MeV, is sufficient to cause a complete break-up of a light nucleus, as a result of which a \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperon may sometimes remain in one of the disintegration products to form a recognizable hyperfragment. However, a multiply-charged hyperfragment would rarely receive sufficient energy to surmount the Coulomb barrier of a bromine or silver nucleus. Thus, when a \( \Lambda^0 \) hyperon is trapped in a heavy nucleus, it will remain there after the completion of the de-excitation phase to form a cryptofragment. On this model it is to be expected that a similarity should exist between the energy spectra of hyperfragments and those of corresponding ordinary fragments emitted from \( K^- \) captures at rest.

The angular correlations between the direction of the hyperfragment emission and that of a fast proton or a \( \pi \) meson is also accounted for by this model since the prompt emission of a fast proton or a \( \pi \) meson
will impart to the residual nucleus a momentum of around 200 MeV/c and the resulting hyperfragment emission direction is that expected from a moving nucleus.

In the second, the "prompt hyperfragment" model, it is suggested that the \(K^-\) meson interacts with a cluster of nucleons to produce a hyperfragment directly. There are several examples in which this model seems operative, notably the observation of \(\Lambda^4\)He and \(\Lambda^4\)H production in a helium bubble chamber:

\[
\begin{align*}
K^- + \text{He}^4 &\rightarrow \Lambda^4\text{He} + \pi^-, \\
&\rightarrow \Lambda^4\text{H} + \pi^0,
\end{align*}
\]

and in emulsion the production of \(\Lambda^{12}\)B both from \(K^-\) meson and \(\Sigma^-\) hyperon captures on carbon \(^{31}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
K^- + C^{12} &\rightarrow \Lambda^{12} + \pi^0, \\
\Sigma^- + C^{12} &\rightarrow \Lambda^{12} + n.
\end{align*}
\]

However, whilst this model cannot be excluded in such cases, several features of the observed results suggest that this is not the dominant process in hyperfragment production. First, the angular correlations between the hyperfragment direction and those of \(\pi\) mesons and fast protons are not so marked as might be expected from considerations of the model. Secondly, the observed similarities of the spectra of hyperfragments and of stable nuclei are not easily understood. Finally, there is the objection that a \(K^-\) meson interaction with a large aggregate of nucleons has to be a rather frequent process.

\(^{31}\) Recently an event has been observed \(^{31}\) which is interpreted as the production of a \(\Lambda^{14}\)C hyperfragment in the capture at rest of a \(\Sigma^-\) hyperon on \(N^{14}\) nucleus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Sigma^- + N^{14} &\rightarrow \Lambda^{14} + n, \\
\Lambda^{14} &\rightarrow N^{14} + \pi^-.
\end{align*}
\]
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ii) Hyperfragments produced in the interactions in flight

A so-called "recoil" model was originally proposed for hyperfragment production by 0.8 GeV/c K⁻ meson interactions in flight¹⁰,²⁰,²¹; recently it has been shown to be operative for other high-energy interactions as well⁸.

In this model it is assumed that a high-energy particle on entering a heavy nucleus initiates a nuclear cascade as a result of which fast mesons and baryons are ejected. A fast hyperfragment may occasionally be ejected at this stage but from the experimental data it appears that such emission is infrequent. Often a Λ° hyperon produced in the initial phase at sufficiently low energy, or degraded to a low energy in subsequent cascade collisions, remains in the highly excited nucleus. In the ensuing evaporation phase, nucleons or clusters of nucleons are emitted. Sometimes these clusters may contain the Λ° hyperon forming a light hyperfragment. However, in the majority of cases of hyperfragment formation the Λ° hyperon is not evaporated but remains within the residual nucleus forming a heavy spallation hyperfragment. In collisions of this kind the average recoil momentum may be of the order of the incident momentum which in this case allows it to produce an observable track in the emulsion. Since it contains a trapped Λ° hyperon, it subsequently decays leading to the formation of a double star with a short interconnecting track. In this model, the forward collimation of short-range heavy hyperfragments is to be explained as a result of the development of a nuclear cascade which eventually leads to the Λ° trapping within a residual nucleus⁸. Light hyperfragments of longer range are expected to have a smaller forward to backward ratio if they are mainly evaporated from a slowly moving nucleus. The similarity of the energy distributions of light hyperfragments to those predicted by evaporation theory has been, in fact, demonstrated before²⁸. Several investigations that have been performed recently also suggest that the emission of light hypernuclei from heavy emulsion nuclei occurs mostly during the evaporation process²⁸.

---

* Detailed discussion of this problem is given in Ref. 23.
This "recoil" model is equivalent to the "trapped $\Lambda^0$ hyperon" model discussed above in that both are based on the assumption that $\Lambda^0$ hyperons are capable of becoming trapped in the residual excited nuclei, their fate being then determined by the subsequent nuclear de-excitation processes developing in these nuclei.
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CAPTIONS TO FIGURES DRAWN ON STENCIL

Fig. 1  Range comparison of:
   a) $^{7}\text{Li}$, 191 events $R < 100 \, \mu$, 81 events $R > 100 \, \mu$;
   b) mesonic $^{6}\text{Li}$ hyperfragments, 6 events;
   c) non-mesonic $^{6}\bar{\text{Li}}$ events, 16 events.

Fig. 2  Range distribution of mesonic and non-mesonic hyperfragments
produced by $K^-$ mesons of 1.3 and 1.5 GeV/c momentum.

Fig. 3  Distribution of the distance between the two centres of
54 double centred stars which are between 0.25 and 1.5 $\mu$
apart.

Fig. 5  a) Range distribution of the mesonic hyperfragments from
the interactions of $K^-$ mesons of 800 MeV/c momentum.
b) Range distribution of the mesonic hyperfragments from
the interaction of $K^-$ mesons at rest.

* * *
Fig. 4. - Relation between the transverse momentum, $p_T$, imparted to the struck emulsion nucleus and its observed range, $R$, in emulsion.

Fig. 6. - Distribution of the heavy prong number, $N_h$, for stars containing a hyperfragment and for single stars.
Fig. 7. Angular distributions of the hyperfragments and recoils with respect to the line of flight of the incident $K^-$ mesons.

Fig. 8. Range distribution for $Li$ and $Li^8$ events, normalized to the same area.
HEAVY HYPERFRAGMENTS

D.H. Davis,
Physics Department, University College, London.

It has been shown that the bulk of the hyperfragments produced by the interactions of fast $K^-$ mesons with emulsion nuclei are the residual spallation products of silver and bromine and possess mass values in the range $A = 50$ to $A = 100^{1,2}$. Thus one is able to obtain a sample, by a selection using a range criterion alone, typically $R \leq 5 \mu m$, which consists almost entirely of these heavy hyperfragments. That they are indeed heavy is effectively demonstrated by Fig. 1 which shows the range distribution of the secondary particles from their non-mesonic disintegrations. The sharp fall-off of tracks of lengths less than $32 \mu m$ (corresponding to an a partial energy of 7 MeV) is attributed to the Coulomb barrier effect present in the decay of a heavy hypernucleus.

With such a sample of heavy hypernuclei it is possible to estimate their $B_A$ values, the non-mesonic to $\pi$-mesonic ratio and the neutron to proton stimulation ratio.

The upper limit of their $B_A$ has been deduced from the observed energy releases in both their non-mesonic and mesonic disintegrations$^3$).

Figure 2 shows the visible energy release distribution for 470 non-mesonic disintegrations of these 'spallation hypernuclei'. The visible energy release in a decay has been computed as the sum of the kinetic and binding (8 MeV/particle) energies of the emitted charged particles, all of which were assumed to be protons. The available energy in decays of this kind is $M_A - M_n - B_A + B_n = (184 - B_A)$. Therefore the observation of total energy releases close to 150 MeV allows us to put an upper limit of about 35 MeV on the $B_A$ of this sample.
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Details of 17 $\pi^-$-mesonic decays\textsuperscript{3-5)}, which are attributed to the same class of hypernuclei, are set out in Table 1.

These are assumed to be heavy using the same considerations which have been applied to the sample which decay non-mesonically. However, it should be borne in mind that for no individual event is the identity ascertained. The estimates quoted for $B_\Lambda$ are upper limits since the emission of a neutron or the excitation of the final recoil nucleus will escape detection.

Figure 3 shows the $B_\Lambda$ versus $A_{\text{core}}^{-2/3}$ distribution obtained by the EFINS - Brussels group\textsuperscript{3,6}), the low mass points being from a recent compilation by Ammar et al.\textsuperscript{6}). The masses of the spallation hypernuclei have been roughly estimated from the number of charged particles emitted in the primary interaction, bearing in mind that no distinction can be made between either silver ($A = 108$) or bromine ($A = 80$) as the target nucleus. However, as can be seen, this uncertainty on the $A_{\text{core}}^{-2/3}$ plot is not too serious and thus it is suggested by extrapolation to infinite $A$ from these results, that $B_\Lambda$, the $\Lambda$-nucleus potential well depth, cannot much exceed 30 MeV.

In order to obtain a lower limit for $B_\Lambda$ for this type of hypernucleus an attempt\textsuperscript{7}) has been made to study the reaction

\begin{equation}
K^- + \text{Br} \rightarrow _A^\Lambda\text{Br} + \pi^-
\end{equation}

by stopping $K^-$ mesons in the Ecole Polytechnique heavy liquid bubble chamber containing pure freon (CF$_3$, Br) and looking at the high-energy end of the resulting $\pi^-$ meson spectrum. The highest energy $\pi^-$ meson which can result from a $K^-$ meson capture at rest in freon would be that in reaction (1) and would correspond to the production of $^\Lambda\text{Br}$ in its ground state. At the present time no $\pi^-$ meson has been found of sufficient energy that it could only be attributed to reaction (1).

\textsuperscript{*} The new values for the upper limit of $B_\Lambda$ are in very good agreement with those found in Ref. 3.
A compilation\(^9\) yields the value 3800/17 for the non-
mesonic to \(\pi^\pm\)-mesonic ratio in the decay of heavy spallation hyper-
fragments. This figure may be somewhat low if an appreciable
number of non-mesonic disintegrations involve the emission of
neutrons only and thereby pass unnoticed.

The neutron to proton stimulation ratio for the weak
A-hyperon interaction in these heavy hypernuclei has been estimated,
using Monte Carlo calculations, as \(~1.6 - 2\)\(^9\) and \(4\)\(^10\). However,
the n/p stimulation ratio obtained by this procedure would be an
overestimate if the multinucleon stimulation of the A-hyperon was
significant.

* * *
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event No.</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>HF range (μm)</th>
<th>HF decay products</th>
<th>Assumed decay mode</th>
<th>Upper limit of $S_A$ (MeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFINS 1</td>
<td>RK$^-$</td>
<td>~1</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFINS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>~1</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - \pi$</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFINS 3</td>
<td>800 MeV/c K$^-$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx 1</td>
<td>1.5 GeV/c K$^-$</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bx 46/1608</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wars. 188/188</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West. 95/98</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD 65/15</td>
<td>1.5 GeV/c K$^-$</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL 76/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL 71/444</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL T61/23/11</td>
<td>RK$^-$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAS 51/1435</td>
<td>1.3 GeV/c K$^-$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha 1</td>
<td>1.5 GeV/c K$^-$</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$\pi - p - \pi$</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Range distribution of the secondary particles from non-mesonic decays of hyperfragments with $R \leq 5 \mu m$.

Fig. 2. The visible energy release for 470 non-mesonic disintegrations of "spallation hypernuclei".

Fig. 3. $B_A$ versus $A^{2/3}_{core}$ distribution obtained by EFINS-Bruxelles group.
A DOUBLE HYPERFRAGMENT EVENT

J. Pniewski,
Institute of Experimental Physics,
University of Warsaw, Poland.

This is a report on the work done by the European $K^-$ collaboration$^1$ concerning the production and decay of a double hyperfragment. The event was found in a systematic search by the collaborating groups for events of double strangeness in a stack of Ilford K.5 nuclear emulsion exposed to the 1.3 and 1.5 GeV/c $K^-$ beam at CERN. Altogether some 50,000 interactions of $K^-$ mesons were observed, and among them several double strangeness events were recognized. In one case, the production of a $\Xi^-$ hyperon on an emulsion nucleus according to the reaction

$$K^- + n = \Xi^- + K^0$$

was observed.

The $\Xi^-$ hyperon comes to rest and is absorbed by a light nucleus of the emulsion—most likely by carbon 12. In this capture a double hyperfragment is produced. It could be recognized by the mesonic cascade decay. The most likely interpretations of the double hyperfragment are those in terms of either $\Lambda^\Lambda\Lambda^\Lambda$Be$^{10}$ or $\Lambda\Lambda^\Lambda^\Lambda$Be$^{11}$. A photomicrograph and explanatory schematic drawing of the event are given in Fig. 1.

The four stars were interpreted as follows:

star A - interaction of a 1.5 GeV/c $K^-$ meson with the production of a $\Xi^-$ hyperon (track 1);

star B - capture of the $\Xi^-$ hyperon with the production of a double hyperfragment (track 6);

star C - decay of the double hyperfragment with the emission of a $\pi^-$ meson (track 7) and an ordinary hyperfragment (track 9);
star D - decay of the ordinary hyperfragment with the emission of
a \( \pi^- \) meson (track 10).

The \( \pi^- \) mesons gave capture stars observed in other pellicles.
The ranges of both the double hyperfragment and the ordinary hyperfrag-
ment resulting from its decay are very short and therefore the analysis
of the event presents serious difficulties. In particular, the most
important feature of the analysis was the demonstration that one of the
two \( \pi^- \) meson tracks originated in star C and the other in star D. One
could discard all interpretations other than the production and subse-
quent mesonic cascade decay of a double hyperfragment. The probability
of a chance coincidence of a background star (star D) has been estimated
to be less than \( 10^{-10} \) per each interacting \( K^- \); on the other hand, the
probability of the production of a slow \( E^- \) hyperon followed by the dis-
cussed sequence of events seems to be reasonable in our experimental
conditions. One may notice that the production of a double hyperfrag-
ment in a \( E^- \) capture star is energetically favoured and that the competing
reactions of the type

\[
C^{12} + E^- \rightarrow \Lambda B^{12} + \Lambda^0, \quad \text{or} \quad C^{12} + E^- \rightarrow B^{14} + 2\Lambda^0
\]

do not suppress the production of a double hyperfragment.

For the identification of the event, at first the ordinary
hyperfragment was analysed only by kinematical considerations concerning
its decay products (star D). The possible identities and decay schemes
of the double hyperfragment were assigned from a study of both the pro-
duction and decay processes (stars B and C). In particular, the
Coulomb barrier argument was used to establish the fact that the \( E^- \)
hyperon capture occurred on a light nucleus of the emulsion. The final
results of this analysis are summarized in the table.

From a comparison of the binding energy \( B_{\Lambda\Lambda} \) of the two \( \Lambda^0 \)
hyperons in double hyperfragments with \( B_{\Lambda} \) for ordinary hyperfragments,
one can expect to obtain information not only on the strength of the
\( \Lambda^0 - \Lambda^0 \) interaction but also on the spin-dependent part of the \( B_{\Lambda} \) in or-
dinary hyperfragments\(^2\). The value of \( \Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda} = B_{\Lambda}(\Lambda\Lambda) - B_{\Lambda}(\Lambda^A_{-1}) \)
presented in column 6 of the table is the net contribution of the \( \Lambda^0-\Lambda^0 \) interaction and the reduction due to the spin-dependent part of the \( \Lambda^0-\text{core} \) interaction, provided that core distortion effects may be neglected. In the case of \( \Lambda^0_\Lambda \text{Be}^{10} \), when the spin of the core is zero, \( \Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda} \) gives the contribution of the \( \Lambda^0-\Lambda^0 \) interaction only. On the other hand, in the case of \( \Lambda^0_\Lambda \text{Be}^{11} \) the spin of the core differs from zero and the spin-dependent part of the \( \Lambda^0-\text{core} \) interaction must be taken into account. In this case, using the recent data of \( \Lambda^0 \)-binding energies for ordinary hyperfragments, one can evaluate the pure contribution of the \( \Lambda^0-\Lambda^0 \) interaction to be approximately 1 MeV higher than \( \Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda} \).

From all the interpretations presented in the table, those in terms of lithium are less probable as they require the assumption that in star B an additional invisible prong exists. One of the three other interpretations in terms of beryllium involves the emission of a neutron in the decay of the double hyperfragment. On purely experimental grounds there is no reason to exclude this decay mode. If a neutron is really emitted in the decay of the double hyperfragment, then one can obtain less information from the present event concerning the \( \Lambda^0-\Lambda^0 \) interaction.

For two other decay schemes of beryllium double hyperfragments:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Lambda^0_\Lambda \text{Be}^{10} & \to \Lambda^0 \text{Be}^9 + \text{H}^1 + \pi^- \\
\Lambda^0_\Lambda \text{Be}^9 & \to 2\text{Be}^4 + \text{H}^1 + \pi^- 
\end{align*}
\]

\( \Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda} = 4.5 \pm 0.4 \text{ MeV} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\Lambda^0_\Lambda \text{Be}^{11} & \to \Lambda^0 \text{Be}^{10} + \text{H}^1 + \pi^- \\
\Lambda^0_{\Lambda \text{Be}^{10}} & \to 2\text{Be}^4 + \text{H}^2 + \pi^- 
\end{align*}
\]

\( \Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda} = 3.2 \pm 0.6 \text{ MeV} \)

the values of \( \Delta B_{\Lambda\Lambda} \) are well determined and give the same sign and approximately the same quantitative estimate of the strength of the \( \Lambda^0-\Lambda^0 \) interaction, provided that the spin-dependent part of the \( \Lambda^0-\text{core} \) interaction in \( \Lambda_\Lambda \text{Be}^{11} \) is taken into account.

* * *

5683/\text{HF/kw}
REFERENCES


"The identification of a double hyperfragment", to be published in Nuclear Physics.


*   *   *

5683/NP/kw
### Results of the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star C</th>
<th>Star D</th>
<th>( \Delta B_{\Delta \Delta} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decay mode of the double HF</td>
<td>Binding energy of a ( \Lambda^0 ) hyperon in the double HF ( B_\Lambda(\Lambda \Lambda Z) ) (MeV)</td>
<td>Binding energy of the 2 ( \Lambda^0 ) hyperons in the double HF ( B_\Lambda(\Lambda \Lambda Z^A) = B_\Lambda(\Lambda \Lambda Z^A) + B_\Lambda(\Lambda Z^{A-1}) ) (MeV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Lambda^{10} \rightarrow \Delta \Lambda^9 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
<td>11.0 ± 0.4</td>
<td>7.2 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Lambda^{11} \rightarrow \Delta \Lambda^9 + H^1 + n + \pi^- )</td>
<td>&lt; 7.6 ± 0.7</td>
<td>( \Lambda \Lambda^{10} \rightarrow 2 \Lambda \Lambda^9 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Lambda^{11} \rightarrow \Delta \Lambda^{10} + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
<td>11.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>( \Lambda \Lambda^{10} \rightarrow 2 \Lambda \Lambda^9 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Lambda^{11} \rightarrow \Delta \Lambda^9 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
<td>10.8 ± 0.4</td>
<td>( \Lambda \Lambda^{10} \rightarrow H^2 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Lambda^{11} \rightarrow \Delta \Lambda^9 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
<td>10.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>( \Lambda \Lambda^{10} \rightarrow H^2 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Lambda^{11} \rightarrow \Delta \Lambda^9 + H^1 + n + \pi^- )</td>
<td>&lt; 7.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>( \Lambda \Lambda^{10} \rightarrow H^2 + H^1 + \pi^- )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** For calculation of \( \Delta B_{\Delta \Delta} \) given in column 6, the best known values of \( B_\Lambda(\Lambda Z) \) have been used.

All references are given in Ref. 1).
A schematic drawing of the event. A \( \Xi^- \) hyperon produced by a 1.5 GeV/c \( K^- \) meson comes to rest and is absorbed by a light nucleus /C,N,O/ of the emulsion. In this capture a double hyperfragment is produced, which is identified from the mesonic cascade decay.
V. ORDINARY FRAGMENTS
EMISSION OF LIGHT FRAGMENTS FROM THE DISINTEGRATION OF HEAVY NUCLEI IN PHOTOGRAPHIC EMULSION CAUSED BY HIGH-ENERGY PARTICLES: FIRST COMPARISON WITH HYPERFRAGMENT EMISSION.

P. Gler,
Département de Physique Corpusculaire,
Centre de Recherches Nucléaires, Strasbourg-Cronenbourg.

In high-energy physics, fragmentation is the best means of liaison between nuclear physicists and the physicists studying strange particles. The former excite the nucleus to higher and higher energies in order to obtain, after fragments, unstable hyperfragments which they would like to be able to consider as convenient indicators of fragmentation, whereas the strange particle physicists view these hyperfragments simply as a means of studying the hyperon-nucleon, or even hyperon-hyperon, forces.

Fragmentation is a very complicated history of the disintegration of a nucleus. In principle, a fragment consists entirely of nucleonic matter ejected from a nucleus in a state of excitation or broken. Therefore, every case must be studied with the utmost care, if possible on a given nucleus with a given projectile at a given energy.

In this preliminary study, which is mainly to clear up a little the clouds surrounding the comparison between the emission of fragments and of hyperfragments, we confine ourselves to examples of fragments well identified by us. For convenience, the comparisons which follow were made for fragments with charge 3, 4 and 5, especially Li$^3$, Be$^4$, and B$^5$. Since the proportion of Li$^3$ and of B$^5$ amongst the fragments is only a few per cent, we have studied in particular the emission of Li$^3$ and Be$^4$, which allows us to connect our results with the work carried out at a lower energy, especially by the groups of Perfilov and Lozshkin in Leningrad, and of Pniowski in Warsaw (energy range several hundred MeV to 9 GeV). The global comparisons were made, in this first
stage, with the emission of all hyperfragments of charge 3 and 4. In the absence of standardization between the different schools which investigate fragments and hyperfragments, which would be most desirable, the fragments and hyperfragments tabulated are those obtained by our own group during the last two years.

These results were obtained by Drs. H. Braun and G. Baumann of our Laboratory from a study of emulsion stacks exposed at CERN, thanks to the courtesy of Drs. Lock and Combe, either stacks exposed especially for the Strasbourg Group or CERN co-operation stacks (for example, for the π⁻ mesons of 17.2 GeV/c) or stacks exposed with Hamburg for the K⁻ of 1.5 GeV/c, thanks to the kindness of Professor Toucher of Hamburg and of Dr. Wenzeler of Bern.

As an initial indication for the classification of these phenomenological comparisons one can choose the evaporation characteristics without evident prejudice of the fundamental mechanism. This choice is based, however, on previous results and also on the general tendency of most of the results obtained. The chosen fragments of Li⁸ and Be⁶, as well as the hyperfragments, are related to heavy nuclei disintegrations so that all comparisons are statistically valid. The presentation of the results is given in the order in which they were obtained, namely as incident particle protons of 24 GeV, π⁻ mesons of 17.2 GeV, protons of 14 GeV, K⁻ of 1.5 GeV, and some results from stopping π⁻ mesons.

The emission of fragments of charge greater than 2 is a nuclear phenomenon which is important at these incident high energies because in this field we obtain a ratio of Li⁶ / Li⁶ + Li⁷ of the order of some per cent and the proportion of stars containing Li⁸ also of the order of 1 to 2%. It is therefore probable that several fragments of Z ≥ 3 are emitted during the course of only one inelastic interaction of a high-energy particle with a nucleus of silver or bromine. The relative proportion of hyperfragments is an important fraction, in general, of the emission of Li⁸, mainly in the case of K⁻ when their
production becomes a quantitatively comparable phenomenon, even greater for slow $K^-$ than the emission of ordinary fragments.

In order to facilitate these quantitative experimental comparisons with the classical nuclear theory, the energy spectra have been measured as well as the angular distribution which could give a preliminary indication of the emission mechanism.

The identification of Li$^8$, thanks to hammer tracks, is immediate; those of Be$^8$ were made from the two $\alpha$ particles emitted with a small calculable correlation angle; this identification is evidently only possible for the ground state. The comparison is therefore only applicable to the fundamental levels of fragments and hyperfragments. It seems, in any case, in agreement with other studies, that until now one can only observe a very small production (if any) of excited states.

If the fragmentation theory was definitely known, that of hyperfragmentation would certainly be facilitated. However, actually nuclear physicists and particle physicists count on each other, to some extent, the one hoping to find indications in the hyperfragmentation, and the particle physicist trying to invoke the more or less known mechanisms of fragmentation which they have a strong tendency to consider as certain.

Our experimental results are not decisive enough to choose between the 7 or 8 mechanisms which are proposed to explain and to calculate the characteristics of fragmentation of an excited nucleus by high-energy particles. Sometimes the production of nuclear hot points is invoked, sometimes an almost complete mechanical dissociation of the nucleus with the help of fission phenomena, which are due to the secondary interactions of the cascade. Several mechanisms seem to play a part. We believe that the hypothesis of the pick-up or the coalescence of similar particles, which are close together and of high energy, is worth investigation as well as the simultaneous interaction of particles near each other on the same nucleon or group of nucleons for which a theory has still to be developed.
With the statistics which we have at present, a certain number of results, in the chosen phenomenological terminology, seem to be definitely established. The parameters for the evaporation curves give the best fit to the results with a temperature, T, of 8 to 10 MeV, a potential barrier of 5 to 10 MeV, and a velocity for the centre of gravity of about 0.01 c.

These parameters are evidently not critical except for T and have been empirically adjusted. This adjustment is not very sensitive to the velocity of the centre of mass, and therefore to the inelasticity factor. This is favourable for the important presentation of the angular distributions in the C-system which do not vary much from those in laboratory system.

It is evidently quantitatively possible to invoke several temperatures during the same process in order to explain the global aspect of the experimental results. On the other hand, the graphs of the fragmentation distribution as a function of the number of star prongs of different energies confirms that which was already reported by other experimentalists, that the correlation of the emission of fragments and hyperfragments is not directly with the "shower" but with the cascade.

The two extreme interpretations which have been invoked, that is, pure evaporation at low energies or secondary interactions provoked by the cascade, are both compatible with most of the results. Nevertheless, some important nuclear remarks are necessary: the temperature seems too high (greater than the binding of a nucleon) to indicate a normal mechanism of evaporation from a thermodynamic equilibrium which is due to the many secondary interactions. The fragment does not seem to arise from a primary interaction because the angular distribution of most of the fragments or hyperfragments does not reflect it, except for those of high-energy or those emitted from a light nucleus.
As many experimental results (for emission from heavy nuclei) seemed phenomenologically compatible with some kind of evaporation mechanism, we have looked to see if this morphology of the presentation of results was too gross and too global, and if it did not contain, in fact, several different mechanisms.

With this in mind, we used some recent results obtained in our laboratory on the interactions of slow \( \pi^- \) mesons with light nuclei; in particular, those which have interested us for a long time, because of their possible temporary sub-structures, namely \( \text{C}^{12}, \text{N}^{14} \) and \( \text{O}^{16} \) giving \( \text{Li}^8 \). If we study carefully a certain number of favourable reactions, then by a detailed study of the energy and momentum balances we can determine the detailed mechanism of the interaction, and especially the transition via (\( \text{Be}^{10} \)) and (\( \text{B}^{12} \)) giving us, respectively, \( \text{d} \) or \( \alpha \) by transition to ground state \( \text{Li}^8 \). In this precise case we evidently know that the evaporation theory is badly applicable or not at all applicable. The excited levels are not numerous enough, and the number of nucleons is too small. The energy distribution of the \( \text{Li}^8 \) fragments is, however, compatible with the evaporation curve with parameters which seem reasonable for this excitation energy and no barrier for these recoil fragments of \( \text{Li}^8 \).

A certain reserve should therefore be shown towards the presentation of the results in the form of evaporation, and the parameters which may differentiate between the different mechanisms which occur remain to be determined.

We think that the detailed and comparative study of nuclear balances with the identification of the initial nucleus (loaded emulsions), all the other conditions remaining identical between the fragments and the hyperfragments of the same nature, would soon enable us to give a more concrete reply on the exact mechanism of their production. But already it seems well established that there is no basic difference between the production of fragments and of hyperfragments.
Table 1
Number of Li$^9$ or Li$^9$ fragments emitted per star for different primary particles of varying energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident particle energy</th>
<th>Frequency of emission of fragments of Li$^9$ or Li$^9$</th>
<th>Authors and Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.7 GeV</td>
<td>$0.013 \pm 0.001$</td>
<td>Goldsack et al. (1957) [Birmingham]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n_h \geq 5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 GeV</td>
<td>$0.0188 \pm 0.0018$</td>
<td>Gajewski et al. (1962) [Warsaw]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n_h &gt; 8$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 GeV</td>
<td>$0.015 \pm 0.0016$</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all $n_h$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 GeV</td>
<td>$0.015 \pm 0.002$</td>
<td>Warsaw and Strasbourg (1962)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all $n_h$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 GeV</td>
<td>$0.014 \pm 0.002$</td>
<td>Milwaukee (1962)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n_h \geq 7$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at rest</td>
<td>$0.0049$</td>
<td>Alumkal and Barkow (1960) [Milwaukee]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sim 0.002$</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^-$</td>
<td>$0.0046 \pm 0.0010$</td>
<td>Skjeggestad (1959) [Oslo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7 \leq n_h \leq 17$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 GeV</td>
<td>$0.031 \pm 0.011$</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n_h &gt; 17$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 GeV/c</td>
<td>$0.015 \pm 0.002$</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all $n_h$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^-$ 1.5 GeV/c</td>
<td>$\sim 0.01$</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all $n_h$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editorial note

The figures show data on fragment and hyperfragment emission from stars caused by protons of 25 GeV (Figs. 1 to 8), \( \pi^- \) mesons of 17.2 GeV/c (Figs. 9 and 10), protons of 14 GeV (Figs. 11 and 12), \( K^- \) mesons of 1.5 GeV/c (Figs. 13 and 14), and \( \pi^- \) mesons at rest (Fig. 19). Figures 15, 16 and 17 show data on the size of the stars which emit fragments or hyperfragments for different primary particles. Figure 18 shows the spatial distribution of pairs of fragments.

* * *
Fig. 1. - Energy spectrum of
a) $^6\text{Li}$, $^7\text{Li}$ fragments
b) $^9\text{Be}$ fragments
c) hyperfragments of charge $Z = 3$ and 4

Fig. 2. - Energy spectrum of $^6\text{Li}$ and $^7\text{Li}$ fragments in the centre of mass system with $v = 0.01c$. 
Fig. 3. - Energy spectrum of $^8\text{Li}$ and $^9\text{Li}$ fragments for
a) $7 < N_h < 17$

b) $N_h > 17$.

Fig. 4. - Energy spectrum of $^8\text{Li}$ and $^9\text{Li}$ fragments divided in two groups: forward emission and backward emission.
EMISSIONS DES FRAGMENTS $^8\text{Li}$ et $^9\text{Li}$ DANS LES ETOILES
AVEC $N_0 < 7$
PROTONS 25 GeV

DISTRIBUTION ANGLAIRE

--- avant correction
--- après correction

$\theta^*$ Laboratoire

SPECTRE DE L'ENERGIE

$N[E, dE]/S\text{MeV}$

--- avant correction
--- après correction

$E \text{ en MeV}$

Fig. 5. - Energy and angular distribution of $^8\text{Li}$ and $^9\text{Li}$ fragments for $N_0 < 7$ (corrected for scanning loss)
$\theta = \text{space angle between the direction of the incident proton and that of the fragment}$

DISTRIBUTION ANGLAIRE

$E \leq 40 \text{ MeV}$
PROTONS 25 GeV

--- avant correction
--- après correction

$^8\text{Li}, ^9\text{Li}$

$\theta^*$ Laboratoire

$\frac{dN}{d\omega}$

Fig. 6. - Angular distribution of fragments
a) $^8\text{Li}, ^9\text{Li}, E(Li^8, Li^9) \leq 40 \text{ MeV}$
b) $^8\text{Be}, E(Be^8) \leq 40 \text{ MeV}$
**Fig. 7.** - Angular distribution of fragments in the centre of mass system with $v = 0.01 \, c$.

- a) $\text{Li}^6$, $\text{Li}^3$ \[ E(\text{Li}^6, \text{Li}^3) \leq 40 \, \text{MeV} \]
- b) $\text{Be}^8$ \[ E(\text{Be}^8) \leq 40 \, \text{MeV} \]

**Fig. 8.** - Angular distribution of fragments

- a) $\text{Li}^6$, $\text{Li}^3$ \[ E(\text{Li}^6, \text{Li}^3) \geq 40 \, \text{MeV} \]
- b) $\text{Be}^8$ \[ E(\text{Be}^8) \geq 40 \, \text{MeV} \]
**SPECTRE DE L'ENERGIE**

\[ \pi^- \sim 17.2 \text{ GeV/c} \]

\[ \frac{^8\text{Li},^9\text{Li}}{- T = 8 \text{ MeV}, V = 7 \text{ MeV}, \nu = 0.01 \text{c}} \]

**Fig. 9.** - Energy spectrum of
a) \(^8\text{Li},^9\text{Li}\) fragments
b) hyperfragments of charge \(Z = 3\) and \(Z = 4\)

**DISTRIBUTION ANGULAIRE**

\[ \pi^- \sim 17.2 \text{ GeV/c} \]

**Fig. 10.** - Angular distribution of
a) \(^8\text{Li},^9\text{Li}\) fragments \(E(\text{\(^8\text{Li},^9\text{Li}\}) \leq 40 \text{ MeV}\)

b) \(^8\text{Li},^9\text{Li}\) fragments \(E(\text{\(^8\text{Li},^9\text{Li}\}) > 40 \text{ MeV}\)

c) hyperfragments (all charges)
Fig. 11. - Energy spectrum of $^8\text{Li}$, $^9\text{Li}$ fragments.

Fig. 12. - Angular distribution of fragments

a) $^8\text{Li}$, $^9\text{Li}$, $E(\text{Li}^8, \text{Li}^9) \geq 40$ MeV
b) $^8\text{Li}$, $^9\text{Li}$, $E(\text{Li}^8, \text{Li}^9) < 40$ MeV
c) $^8\text{Li}$, $^9\text{Li}$ Total
SPECTRE DE L'ENERGIE

$P_{K^+} \sim 1.5 \text{ GeV}/c$

$^8\text{Li}, ^9\text{Li}$

$T=8\text{ MeV}; \ V=7\text{ MeV}; \ v=0.01c$

DISTRIBUTION ANGLAIRE

$P_{K^+} \sim 1.5 \text{ GeV}/c$

Fig. 13. - Energy spectrum

a) of $^8\text{Li}, ^9\text{Li}$ fragments

b) hyperfragments of charge $Z=3$ and $Z=4$

Fig. 14. - Angular distribution of

a) $^8\text{Li}, ^9\text{Li}$ fragments $E(E_{^8\text{Li}}, E_{^9\text{Li}}) > 40\text{ MeV}$

b) $^8\text{Li}, ^9\text{Li}$ fragments $E(E_{^8\text{Li}}, E_{^9\text{Li}}) \leq 40\text{ MeV}$

c) mesonic hyperfragments with $R > 5\mu$

d) non-mesonic hyperfragments with $R > 5\mu$
**Fig. 15.** - Distribution of the number of heavy prongs $n_b$ for the stars emitting Li$^8$, or Li$^9$ fragments or hyperfragments for:

a) protons of 25 GeV as primary particles

b) $\pi^-$ mesons of 17.2 GeV/c as primary particles.

**Fig. 16.** - Distribution of the number of heavy prongs $n_b$ of the parent stars produced by K$^-$ mesons of 1.5 GeV/c for the emission of:

a) Li$^8$ or Li$^9$ fragments

b) hyperfragments of range $< 5\mu$

c) hyperfragments of range $> 5\mu$

d) mesonic-hyperfragments.
Fig. 17. - Distribution of the number of shower particles $n_b$ of the parent stars
a) Interactions of $K^-$ mesons of 1.5 GeV/c
b) Interactions of protons of 14 GeV
c) Interactions of $\pi^-$ mesons of 17.2 GeV/c.
Fig. 18. - Spatial distribution of pairs of fragments
  
  a) double hammers
  b) all fragments (Leningrad curve).

Fig. 19. - Energy spectrum of $^8$Li fragments produced by the interaction of $\pi^-$-mesons at rest with the nuclei of $^{12}$C, $^{14}$N, and $^{16}$O.
PART V.2

PRODUCTION OF FRAGMENTS WITH CHARGE NUMBER $Z = 4 - 9$
 IN THE INTERACTIONS OF PROTONS WITH HEAVY NUCLEI

O.V. Lozhkin and N.A. Perfilov,
V.G. Khlopin Radium Institute of the Academy of
Sciences of the USSR, Leningrad.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is hardly possible to give a detailed account of all
the investigations of the fragmentation process done in the Radium
Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. We restrict
ourselves to the presentation of those features of the fragmentation
which are essential for the mechanism of the process and are related
simultaneously with hyperfragments. The main emphasis will be on
the experimental part of the investigations. Moreover, we consider
here mainly the emission of fragments with charge number $Z \geq 4$ and
energy $E \geq 2$ MeV per nucleon.

II. CROSS-SECTIONS OF THE PRODUCTION OF FRAGMENTS

One of the characteristic features of fragmentation is the
dependence of the yield of fragments on the energy of the incident
particles. As typical for high-energy reactions, Fig. 1 shows the
cross-sections for the emission of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ and $Li^3$
in the interactions with heavy nuclei, $Ag$ and $Br$ in the incident particle
energy interval $100$ MeV - $9$ GeV \(^{1,2}\). One sees that the cross-section
for fragmentation increases strongly with increasing energy of protons,
the growth being particularly steep in the energy interval $\sim 1$ GeV.
Beginning at about $100$ MeV with the value of the cross-section for
$Z \geq 4$, fragments less than $0.1\%$ of the total inelastic cross-section
up to the energy $E_p \approx 2$ GeV, the cross-section for fragmentation increases
by three orders of magnitude. A further increase of the incident particle energy does not lead to a strong increase of the cross-section. It is interesting that the total cross-section for fragmentation, including the fragments with the charge number $Z = 3$ in the energy interval of several GeV of the incident protons, is equal to about 25% of the total inelastic cross-section; thus fragmentation plays an essential role in the process of the disintegration of nuclei.

An analysis of nuclear disintegrations leading to fragment emission has shown that these disintegrations take place for a much higher energy transfer to the target nuclei as compared with usual disintegrations. The energy transfer to the target nucleus was characterized by the number of heavily ionizing charged particles $n_{ap}$ (black and grey tracks). From the point of view of the cascade-evaporation model, the number is determined by the degree of the development of the intranuclear cascade and by the excitation energy of the residual nucleus as well.

Figure 2 shows the $n_{ap}$-spectrum for normal disintegrations and for the disintegrations with fragment emission in the interactions of 9 GeV and 660 MeV protons with Ag and Br nuclei$^{1,9}$. The average number of charged particles in stars with fragment emission is greater by a factor 1.8 than the average $n_{ap}$-number in normal disintegrations, the relation being the same in the wide energy interval of the incident particles: from 460 MeV to 9 GeV. From the analysis of the spectrum one finds that the probability of fragment emission in a disintegration increases strongly with the increase of the number of particles emitted. This can be seen in Fig. 3 which shows the dependence of fragment emission

$$\frac{N_p}{N_{\rho}} = \frac{N_p}{N_{\rho} + N_{norm}}$$

on the $n_{ap}$-number for different energies of the incident protons$^{3,5,6-8}$. The curves in Fig. 3 also show interesting features of fragment emission: the high probability of disintegration with fragment emission for a given
number and a more steep increase of the probability with the increase of \( n_{ap} \) for higher energies of the incident protons. As in the paper by Ostroumov\(^2\), it has been shown that a given \( n_{ap} \)-number is related to the smaller excitation energy of the residual nucleus for higher energy of an incident proton, the last observation shows the connection between the probability of fragment emission with the total number of cascade particles, i.e. with the development of the intranuclear cascade. This is supported by the observation that after exclusion of black tracks, which according to the cascade-evaporation model are evaporated, one gets the increase of the emission probability of fragments with an increase of the number of cascade particles (grey tracks)\(^6\),\(^8\). One does not observe, on the other hand, any dependence of the probability \( W^\rho \) on the number of shower particles (thin tracks) in the incident proton energy interval of several GeV. This indicates that the character of the first collisions in the target nucleus is irrelevant for the fragmentation process.

The above-described specific feature of the fragmentation process, the necessity of a high-energy transfer to the nucleus for the appearance of the fragment emission, is connected with the observation that the emission of fragments not accompanied by other charged particles is a very rare phenomenon. Consequently we concluded that the increase of the fragmentation cross-section is related with the increase of the fraction of high-energy transfers with the increase of the energy of the incident protons\(^3\),\(^21\). The last statement follows from observations of the track distributions for different energies of the incident protons. The strong increase of the fragmentation cross-section in the energy interval 600 - 1,000 MeV can probably be related to the appearance of the additional mechanism of high-energy transfer, namely to the production and re-absorption of pions in the nuclei\(^3\). In the energy interval above 1 GeV the increase of the fraction of high-energy transfers is relatively weaker. Also the fragmentation cross-section changes little in this energy region. The energy transfers to the nuclei are
characterized by the total number of charged particles created in the disintegrations and with the increase of the proton energy \( E_p \) the number of cascade particles in the total \( n_{cp} \) number increases. Thus the increase of the fragmentation cross-section with the increase of the energy \( E_p \) can again be attributed to the degree of the development of the intranuclear cascade in the nucleus.

The dependence of the fragmentation cross-section on the mass number of the target nucleus is an essential feature of the fragmentation. This dependence has not at present been sufficiently investigated. Up until now the measurements of the cross-sections for the emission of fragments with \( Z \geq 4 \) and energy \( E \geq 2 \) MeV per nucleon have been done for the \( C,N,O \) nuclei in emulsion, for Bi and U in loaded emulsions, and for \( C,Al,Cd \) and Pb in the experiments with thin foils in emulsions\(^{2,10-13}\).

The measurements at \( E_p = 660 \) MeV have shown that the fragmentation cross-section increases with the mass number of the target nuclei roughly proportional to the geometrical cross-section of the nuclei: the cross-sections for \( C,Ag,Br,Bi \) and U are equal to \( 1,4,10,25 \) and \( 22 \) mb respectively [errors about 30\%]\(^4\).

However, this relation is probably accidental as it was shown that the fragmentation cross-section of light nuclei changes only little with energy\(^{2-4,22}\) whereas the cross-section for heavy nuclei increases strongly in the energy interval \( \sim 1 \) GeV.

### III. NATURE OF FRAGMENTS

The mass and charge distribution of fragments emitted in nuclear disintegrations has not at present been thoroughly investigated. By means of emulsion we have investigated the charge distribution of fragments for disintegrations of silver and bromine nuclei at the proton energies 100, 660, 230 and 9,000 MeV\(^1,3,6-8\). The main conclusion is the lack of any marked dependence of the form of the charge distribution on the proton
energy. Figure 4 shows the charge distribution of fragments at \( E_p = 9 \text{ GeV} \). Analogous charge distributions are observed at other proton energies. The majority of fragments observed in disintegrations are the stable isotopes of light nuclei. An investigation of the \( \beta \) radioactivity of fragments with \( Z \geq 4 \) in electron-sensitive emulsion has shown that 90% or more of fragments are stable against the \( \beta \) decay with \( \tau_{\beta} \leq \text{ five hours} \). This is supported by the data on the relative yield of the Li\(^{6}\) and Be\(^{6}\) among the fragments with \( Z = 3 \) and 5. The ratio of the cross-sections for Li\(^{6}\) to Li\(^{7}\) is 0.012 for \( E_p = 930 \text{ MeV} \) and for Be\(^{6}\) to Be\(^{10};^{11};^{12}\) is \( \approx 0.025 \) for \( E_p = 9 \text{ GeV} \). Analogous relative cross-sections are found \(^{3}\) by comparison of the data on the emission of fragments with charge numbers 4, 6 and 9 with the cross-sections for Be\(^{7}\), C\(^{11}\), F\(^{19}\) obtained in investigations using radiochemical methods.

In the analysis of the nature of fragments some conclusions were reached concerning the excitation state of the emitted fragments and concerning the most probable n/p ratio in the emitted fragments. The presence among the fragments of the rather unlikely (for a given Z) isotopes of light nuclei with a sole state stable against the emission of nucleons (such as Li\(^{8}\), Li\(^{9}\) and Be\(^{9}\)) show that the conditions of fragment emission are of such a kind that fragments do not get high excitations and can be emitted in ground states. The analysis of events of the emission of Be\(^{8}\) fragments decaying into two \( \alpha \) particles also indicates the strong likelihood of emission in the ground state. A comparison of the cross-section of the Be\(^{8}\) emission in the ground state with the cross-sections for the Li\(^{8}\) and Be\(^{8}\) emission has indicated a more frequent emission of the Be\(^{8}\) isobar in spite of the fact that the total cross-section for fragments with \( Z = 4 \) is smaller than that for \( Z = 3 \).\(^{3}\)

Considering these observations one could conclude that the high probability of the emission of fragments in low excited states and the preference for some definite ratios (near unity) in the fragments emitted are characteristic for the fragmentation process. However, it is clear that problems of this kind require a further experimental investigation.
As already mentioned no marked dependence in the charge distribution on the incident proton energy has been found. This is somewhat surprising as we know that many essential features of the fragmentation process (cross-section, multiplicity, angular distribution) depend on the energy of incident particles. In connection with this the investigation of the charge distribution of fragments was done for the disintegrations at the same incident proton energy but for the following different conditions of the emission of fragments:

i) for large and small energy transfers to the target nuclei;
ii) for different emission angles of fragments;
iii) for different numbers of fragments emitted in one disintegration.

The investigation, done at $E_p = 9$ GeV, has shown that in all cases the charge distributions were practically the same.\(^{12}\)

Investigation of the fragment emission in the disintegrations of the Bi and U nuclei at $E_p = 660$ MeV\(^{10,12}\), lead to the conclusion that even for such heavy nuclei the charge distribution of fragments probably does not differ markedly to that observed for Ag and Br nuclei. The small statistics of the observations did not permit the determination of the charge distribution of the fragment emission from Bi and U nuclei; one can only say that the average charge number for fragments with $Z \geq 4$ is 5 and 6 for Bi and U respectively. The data obtained are too scanty, however, to reach a definite conclusion.

IV. ANGULAR AND ENERGY DISTRIBUTION OF FRAGMENTS

The angular distribution of fragments investigated in the energy interval of the incident protons from 100 MeV to 9 GeV\(^{1,3-8}\) is characterized by a marked anisotropy in the laboratory system with respect to the direction of flight of the incident protons. Figures 5 and 6 show the angular distributions of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ at $E_p = 660$ MeV and 9 GeV and the dependence of the forward to backward ratio $F/B$ on the proton energy. One sees that the anisotropy of the angular distribution decreases
strongly with the increase of the energy of the incident protons. It is also found that the anisotropy of the angular distribution is greater for faster fragments, the relative number of them increasing with the increase of the incident proton energy. However, the anisotropy of the fast fragments probably also decreases with the increase of incident proton energy. This could explain the dependence of the F/B ratio on the incident proton energy as seen in Fig. 6. This follows from the results of measurements of angles of long range fragments: the F/B ratio at $E_p = 660$ MeV for fragments with range $R > 80 \mu m$ is 5.6 whereas at $E_p = 9$ GeV for fragments with $R > 100 \mu m$ it is 3.6. It is necessary to note that no significant dependence of the angular distribution of fragments on the magnitude of the energy transfer to the nuclei has been found for a given $E_p^3$.

An interesting problem is the dependence of the angular distribution of fragments on the mass number of the target nucleus. The available data on the emission of fragments from Bi and U nuclei at $E_p = 660$ MeV show that the anisotropy of the angular distribution increases when passing from Ag and Br nuclei to the heavy nuclei (F/B ratio being $\approx 3$ and $\approx 5$ respectively). It is possible that in this case the same effect is operating which leads to the increase of the anisotropy of the angular distribution in the case of Ag and Br nuclei when the incident proton energy is decreasing.

A more marked increase of the anisotropy of the angular distribution of fragments is seen in the case of light nuclei. The forward to backward ratio for fragments with $Z \geq 4$ and range $R > 20 \mu m$ in the disintegrations of carbon nuclei at $E_p = 660$ MeV is $\geq 15^{13)$. An investigation of the energy distribution of fragments emitted in the disintegrations of nuclei like Ag with different Z numbers and at different $E_p$-values, shows that the most probable value of the energy of fragments is near to the nominal value of the Coulomb barrier. A specific feature of the distributions is their broadness and a long tail in the energy part much higher than the energies of the Coulomb repulsion, the tail being present also in the part of the fragments emitted in the
backward hemisphere). It is interesting that among the fragments with $E \gg E_{\text{Coul}}$, in Ag and Br disintegrations at $E_p = 660$ MeV events have been observed with momentum comparable or even exceeding that of the primary protons $p_0 = 1,290$ MeV/c. Their relative frequency with respect to all fragments with $Z \geq 4$ is about $1/15$. On the low-energy part, the energy spectrum contains a considerable fraction of fragments with energies smaller than the nominal values of the Coulomb barrier. For large variation of the incident proton energy, the most probable value of the energy of fragments hardly changes. A change in the spectrum is mainly due to the increase of the relative fraction of the fragments with $E \gg E_{\text{Coul}}$. Figure 7 shows the range distributions of fragments for different energy values of incident protons. Taking into account that the charge spectra are conserved for this $E_p$-interval, one can see well the above-described features of the energy distribution of fragments.

An investigation of fragment emission from Bi and U nuclei has shown that the relative fraction of "sub-barrier" fragments is greater as compared with Ag and Br disintegrations.

V. MULTIPLICITY OF FRAGMENTATION

An interesting feature of the fragmentation process is the emission of two or more fragments from a single disintegration. The existence of this phenomenon leads by itself directly to the conclusion that the conditions necessary for fragment emission can often be realized in the development of a process of interaction of an incident particle with a nucleus. An investigation of the specific features of disintegrations of this kind and an analysis of the relative correlations of charges, energies and emission angles in the multiple fragment emission, give additional information on the mechanism of fragment emission.

The multiplicity of fragment emission was investigated in the energy interval of incident protons ranging from 660 to 9,000 MeV. The excitation function of the Ag and Br disintegrations, accompanied by the emission of two or more fragments, in shown in Fig. 8. It has an analogous
dependence on the incident proton energy as in the case of single fragment emission. The cross-section for the emission of two or more fragments is about 4% of the total fragmentation cross-section at $E_p = 660$ MeV and about 16% at $E_p = 9,000$ MeV.

Figure 9 shows the frequency distribution of multiplicities of fragment emission at $E_p = 660$ MeV and $E_p = 9$ GeV. One sees the steep decrease of the cross-section for an increasing number of fragments emitted in a single disintegration.

An analysis of disintegrations, leading to the emission of two or more fragments, has shown that the size of the disintegrations is still more shifted towards a large number of prongs in the stars as compared with single fragment emission events. Thus they are related to still higher energy transfers to the target nuclei. The average number (excluding fragments) in such disintegrations is more than twice the corresponding number for usual disintegrations. An investigation of the charge and energy distributions in the disintegrations with the emission of two or more fragments leads to the result that the distributions are analogous in the case of single fragment emission. The analysis of the relative probabilities of different multiplicities of fragment emission (Fig. 9) and of the relative probabilities of different charges, $Z_1$ and $Z_2$, in the events with two fragment emission (Fig. 10), supports the hypothesis that fragments are independently emitted.

In an apparent contradiction with this assumption is the observation of a strong angular correlation of fragments in the two and three fragment events. Figure 11 shows the observed distribution of angle between two fragments compared with that obtained from the assumption of an independent emission. A marked angular correlation is clearly seen: the fragments are emitted preferentially with an angle greater than 120° between them. An analogous correlation (a preference for large angles) has been found for disintegrations with three fragments. It is interesting that no connection between the angular correlation of fragments and the magnitude of their charges has been observed: for different values of the sum of the charges of fragments the average value of the angle between fragments has the same value.
The explanation of the angular correlation in multiple emission of fragments, without rejecting the assumption of the independent emission, requires definite models to be invoked related either to the structure of nuclei or to the mechanism of formation of fragments in the disintegration \(^{16}\).

VI. FEATURES OF THE FRAGMENTATION CAUSED BY HIGH-ENERGY PIONS

An investigation of the fragmentation process in the case of the incident particles being pions is particularly interesting as, contrary to the proton case, a small momentum is transferred to the target nucleus, fast nucleons being formed in the nucleus as a result of interactions (scattering and absorption) of pions with nucleons. This enables us to check some considerations arising in the study of fragmentation.

In the investigations of the fragmentation caused by 80 and 280 MeV positive pions \(^{18-20,31}\) the following features of the process have been found.

i) The cross-section of the production of fragments with \(Z \geq 4\) in the disintegrations of Ag and Br nuclei is \(1.2 \pm 0.5\) mb at \(E_{\pi} = 80\) and \(1.4 \pm 0.5\) mb at \(E_{\pi} = 280\) MeV.

ii) The energy distributions of fragments are approximately the same for both values of \(E_{\pi}\) and are similar to those obtained in the case of protons.

iii) The angular distribution of fragments is more anisotropic at \(E_{\pi} = 280\) MeV \((F/B = 2.8 \pm 0.6)\) than at \(E_{\pi} = 80\) MeV \((F/B = 1.3 \pm 0.3)\).

iv) An angular correlation between the directions of emission of a fragment and a fast proton \((E > 50\) MeV) has been observed: preferential emission occurs for angles of \(120^\circ - 180^\circ\) between the particles.

v) Similar to the disintegrations induced by protons, the disintegrations with fragment emission are characterized by higher numbers of prongs when compared with usual disintegrations.
The results obtained were interpreted from the point of view of fragment production exclusively by fast protons generated in elastic collisions of pions and their absorption by nucleon pairs in the nuclei. The angular distribution of fragments calculated on that basis (using the angular distribution of protons in the reaction \( \pi^+ + d \rightarrow p + p \) and the angular distribution of fragments produced in emulsion nuclei by protons with energy about 200 MeV) shows a good agreement with the observed distribution for both values of energy of the \( \pi^+ \) mesons (Fig. 12). In the case of the higher energy of pions, nucleons from the elastic scattering of pions in the nucleus were also taken into account. The nucleons have a strong forward collimation, therefore they contribute largely to the difference of angular distributions of fragments at \( E_\pi = 280 \) MeV and \( E_\pi = 80 \) MeV.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Considering the fragmentation process as a whole, one can see that many features of the nuclear disintegrations accompanied by the emission of multicharged particles (angular and energy distributions of protons and \( \alpha \) particles, their relative yield, angular and energy distributions of residual nuclei) do not contradict the basic assumptions of the cascade-evaporation model\(^3\)). The analysis of the specific features of the production of fragments with \( Z \geq 4 \) from the point of view of this model\(^5-7,8,9\)) leads us to the conclusion that the concept of the emission of fragments at the first stage of an interaction of a fast particle with a nucleus (i.e., during the development of the intranuclear cascade) enables us to give a more complete explanation of the characteristic features of fragmentation known from experiment.

A comparison of the characteristic features of fragmentation with that of the production of \( \alpha \) particles with energies greater than 30 MeV for disintegrations of Ag and Br nuclei supports this point of view. As has been shown\(^25-27\)) the angular and energy distributions of a particles with energy above 30 MeV can be explained by the process of quasi-elastic...
knock-on of a clusters from the nucleus by the cascade nucleons. It was also shown that the specific features of the disintegrations with emission of fast a particles and the angular distribution of a particles are analogous to that concerning the production of fragments with $Z \geq 4$.\textsuperscript{28)}

Therefore, retaining the point of view of the cascade excitation of nuclei, we should consider the mechanism of fragmentation as some kind of direct nuclear reaction leading to the ejection of rather large aggregates of nucleons (of the order of ten) with high energies which are sometimes even higher than the binding energy of the nucleons constituting the clusters. Independently of the mechanism of the energy transfer to the nucleon aggregates, it is necessary in this picture to assume the existence of nucleon clusters correlated in space in the nucleus\textsuperscript{29)}.

At present we cannot completely reject a possibility of some contribution to the production of fragments from the process of de-excitation of a highly excited nucleus. Although in its present form the evaporation theory leads to contradiction with experimental data, if one takes into account, however, the indirect evaporation mechanism (evaporation of single particles accompanied by their association inside a nucleus), the agreement with experiment can be improved. The calculations of the indirect evaporation of the $A^3$ nuclei, carried out in our laboratory\textsuperscript{30)}, give rise to some hope concerning this problem.

In conclusion, a few words about the connection of the processes of production of fragments and hyperfragments. To us it seems reasonable not to invoke any specific mechanism of hyperfragment production differing from that of the ordinary fragments. Conditions for fragment production do exist for relatively low energies of the incident protons (of the order of 100 MeV) and with the increase of the proton energy the mechanism of the fragment production probably remains the same; only the relative contributions of several possible mechanisms change.
At proton energies high enough for the production of strange particles, some fraction (a very small one, of the order of 0.5% at \( E_p = 9 \) GeV) of fragments is emitted with a \( \Lambda^0 \) particle, accidentally coming into the given aggregate of nucleons. This point of view is convincingly verified by comparison of the charge, angle and energy distributions of fragments and hyperfragments.

***
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Figure Captions

Fig. 1 Dependence of the cross-section for the production of fragments with $Z \geq 4$, and of Li$^8$ fragments, on the incident proton energy.

Fig. 2 Distributions of the number of charged particles $n_{\text{np}}$ (without fragments) in the usual disintegrations (dotted line) and disintegrations with fragment emission (continuous line).

Fig. 3 Dependence of the probability of disintegrations with fragment emission for a given $n_{\text{np}}$ -number on the $n_{np}$ -number.

Fig. 4 Charge distribution of fragments in the disintegrations of Ag and Br nuclei by 9 GeV protons.

Fig. 5 Angular distribution of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ emitted in Ag and Br disintegrations by protons at: 0 - 100 MeV; 0 - 660 MeV; 0 - 9 GeV.

Fig. 6 Dependence of the F/B ratio on the proton energy for production of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ in Ag and Br nuclei.

Fig. 7 Range distribution of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ in emulsions for different incident proton energies.

Fig. 8 Dependence on the incident proton energy of the cross-section for disintegrations with two and more fragments emitted.

Fig. 9 Frequency distribution of multiplicities of fragment emission in a disintegration.

Fig. 10 Dependence of the relative probabilities of the occurrence of the given pairs of charges, $Z_1$ and $Z_2$, for disintegrations with two fragment emission. Continuous line corresponds to the distribution calculated from the assumption of an independent emission of fragments.

Fig. 11 Distribution of space angles between fragments. Continuous line corresponds to the assumption of the independent emission.

Fig. 12 Angular distributions of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ for the disintegrations of Ag and Br nuclei by positive pions. The continuous line corresponds to the calculated distribution. (See text.)
Fig. 1. Dependence of the cross-section for the production of fragments with $Z \geq 4$, and of Li$^8$ fragments, on the incident proton energy.

Fig. 2. Distributions of the number of charged particles $n_{\pi p}$ (without fragments) in the usual disintegrations (dotted line) and disintegrations with fragment emission (continuous line).
Fig. 3. Dependence of the probability of disintegrations with fragment emission for a given $n_{\text{ap}}$ -number on the $n_{\text{ap}}$ -number.

Fig. 4. Charge distribution of fragments in the disintegrations of Ag and Br nuclei by 9 GeV protons.

Fig. 5. Angular distribution of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ emitted in Ag and Br disintegrations by protons of $\geq 0-100$ MeV; 0-660 MeV; 0-9 GeV.

Fig. 6. Dependence of the F/B ratio on the proton energy for production of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ in Ag and Br nuclei.
Fig. 7. Range distribution of fragments with 2, 3, 4 in emulsions for different incident proton energies.

Fig. 8. Dependence on the incident proton energy of the cross-section for disintegrations with two and more fragments emitted.
Fig. 9. Frequency distribution of multiplicities of fragment emission in a disintegration.

Fig. 10. Dependence of the relative probabilities of the occurrence of the given pairs of charges $Z_1$ and $Z_2$ for disintegrations with two fragment emission. Continuous line corresponds to the distribution calculated from the assumption of an independent emission of fragments.

Fig. 11. Distribution of space angles between fragments. Continuous line corresponds to the assumption of the independent emission.

Fig. 12. Angular distributions of fragments with $Z \geq 4$ for the disintegrations of $\text{Ag}$ and $\text{Br}$ nuclei by positive pions. The continuous line corresponds to the calculated distribution. (see text)
VI. THEORY
THE STRONG AND WEAK INTERACTIONS OF BOUND A PARTICLES

R.H. Dalitz,
The Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies and Department of Physics, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

I. THE NUCLEAR INTERACTIONS OF THE A PARTICLE

1. The s-wave A-N interaction

The binding of A particles to the s-shell nuclei H², H³, He³ and He⁴ is due dominantly to the s-wave A-N interactions V_s for the singlet (S = 0) and triplet (S = 1) configurations. From the spin determinations for ³⁵H² (J = ½) and for ³⁷H³ (J = 0), we know that the singlet interaction V₀ is more attractive than the triplet interaction V₁. Our knowledge of their strengths depends on quantitative calculations on the structure of these light hypernuclei, as discussed below. However, the conclusion that the triplet interaction V₁ is attractive depends on rather qualitative considerations. The mean A-N attraction in ³⁵H² is given by \( \frac{1}{4}(3V_0 + V_1) \), dominated by the singlet interaction; hence calculations on ³⁵H² alone provide a lower limit on the strength of V₀. In ³⁷He⁵, on the other hand, the mean A-N attraction \( \frac{1}{4}(3V_1 + V_0) \) arises dominantly from the triplet interaction; owing to its small weighting, the singlet interaction cannot provide sufficient attraction to account for the ³⁷He⁵ binding and we must conclude that V₁ is also attractive.

In order to estimate the strength of the A-N interaction, we must make a definite assumption about its range. We shall assume that this interaction has the same intrinsic range (1.5 fm) as a Yukawa potential of range parameter \( (2m_n)^{-1} \). This corresponds to the assumption that the

*) This talk was also given at the 1963 Easter School for Emulsion Physicists.
\( \Lambda N \) potential arises dominantly from the exchange of pions; charge symmetry for the \( \Lambda \) particle (which has isospin \( I = 0 \)) forbids one pion exchange, but the two-pion-exchange potential is allowed and is expected to be strong, in view of our current belief (based on the existence of a \( p_{1/2} \) \( \pi\Lambda \) resonance analogous to the \( \pi N \) resonance, for example) that the \( \pi\Lambda \) coupling has strength comparable with that of the pion-nucleon coupling. This value for the intrinsic range is quite close to the values obtained for the Yukawa potentials which are equivalent (in the sense of having the same zero-energy scattering length \( a_s \) and effective range \( r_s \)) to the meson-theoretic \( \Lambda N \) potentials calculated recently by de Swart and Iddings\(^1\). In fact, in view of the low binding energies of the light hypernuclei, it is reasonable to expect that these will not be greatly sensitive to the details of the potentials \( V_0 \) and \( V_1 \), but that they will be determined primarily by the low-energy scattering parameters, \( (a_0, r_0) \) and \( (a_1, r_1) \), of these potentials. As we shall see, the detailed calculations which have been made to date (but always with central potentials) do bear out this expectation.

\[ \Lambda^3 \] is the lightest hypernucleus, with \( \Lambda-d \) separation energy \( B_\Lambda = 0.21 \pm 0.2 \) MeV, and is known to be a singlet state, with isospin \( I = 0 \) and spin \( J = \frac{1}{2} \). This np\( \Lambda \) system is sufficiently simple to allow quite detailed and accurate variational calculations, even with hard-core potentials. For its space wave-function, Downs, Smith and Truong\(^2\) have recently used a ten-parameter trial function,

\[ \psi = f(r_{AN}) f(r_{AP}) g(r_{np}), \quad (1) \]

where \( f, g \) both have the general form,

\[ \left[ \exp[-\alpha(r-d)] - \exp[-\beta(r-d)] \right] + x \left[ \exp[-\mu(r-d)] - \exp[-\nu(r-d)] \right]. \quad (2) \]

This calculation used a \( \Lambda N \) potential of the exponential form

\[ V_{AN}(r) = \bar{U} \exp[-3.54(r-d)/(b-2)d]], \quad r \geq d \quad (3) \]
outside the hard core radius \( a \). The intrinsic range is given by \( b = 1.5 \, \text{f} \). For \( d = 0.4 \, \text{f} \), their result was \( \bar{U} = 1144 \, \text{MeV} \), which corresponds to a mean well-depth parameter \( \bar{a} = 0.810 \). The scattering length which corresponds to this mean \( \Lambda-N \) potential is \( \bar{a} = -1.82 \, \text{f} \).

Calculations were also made for \( d = 0.2 \, \text{f} \) and \( 0.6 \, \text{f} \), leading to scattering lengths \( \bar{a} = -1.75 \, \text{f} \) and \( -2.11 \, \text{f} \), respectively. It is also of interest to compare these results with the value \( \bar{a} = -1.55 \, \text{f} \) which was obtained in an earlier calculation\(^3\) of comparable complexity, for Yukawa potentials of the same intrinsic range, without hard cores. These results illustrate the insensitivity of the low-energy parameters obtained (for fixed intrinsic range) for the mean potential to the shape assumed for this potential. We may also compare this result of Downs et al. with that from their earlier calculation\(^2\) using a four-parameter trial function of the form (1), with \( f, g \) of the form (2) with \( x = 0 \), which gave \( \bar{U} = 1202 \, \text{MeV} \). The more elaborate trial function led only to 4.8\% improvement in the value obtained for \( \bar{U} \), so that we may assume their final value to be rather close (better than 1\%) to the true value.

Müller\(^4\) has also made calculations on \( \Lambda^3 \) for exponential hard-core potentials, using an eight-parameter trial function of the form (1). He assumed a potential of greater intrinsic range, of the form \( \bar{U} \exp[-2.38(r-d)] \) outside hard-core radius \( d \), and obtained \( \bar{U} = 228.2 \, \text{MeV} \). The corresponding calculation of Downs et al.\(^2\), for potential shape \( \bar{U} \exp[-2.36(r-d)] \), gave \( \bar{U} = 226.1 \, \text{MeV} \), so that their results are in good agreement. The scattering length for this potential is \( \bar{a} = -2.7 \, \text{f} \); we note that the scattering length obtained does increase with the potential range assumed, as is reasonable.

For \( \Lambda^5 \), it is a reasonable assumption to neglect the distortion of the \( \Lambda^4 \) core by the presence of the \( \Lambda \) particle, in view of the tight binding of \( \Lambda^4 \). Since the form of \( \Lambda^4 \) is known from electron-scattering experiments, the strength of the mean \( \Lambda-N \) potential in \( \Lambda^5 \) may be deduced directly, for an assumed \( \Lambda-N \) potential shape without hard core. This calculation was done quite early\(^3\) for \( \Lambda-N \) potentials of Gaussian form, and was combined with the results of calculations for \( \Lambda^3 \) to give the results shown in the first column.
of Table 1. For later reference, we quote here the volume integrals of the singlet and triplet potentials obtained by this way:
\[ \tilde{V}_0 = 386 \text{ MeV f}^3, \quad \tilde{V}_1 = 170 \text{ MeV f}^3. \]
The errors quoted in the Table are those derived from the uncertainties in the \( B_\Lambda \) values and in the radius of \( \Lambda \text{He}^4 \).

With hard-core potential shapes, calculations have been made for \( \Lambda \text{He}^5 \) and \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \) (with charge symmetry, \( \Lambda \text{He}^4 \) is the mirror hypernucleus to \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \), with the same structure and the same \( B_\Lambda \) value, as is consistent with the data) by Dietrich et al.\(^6\) and by Gutsch\(^7\), using a method proposed by Hwang and Wild\(^8\) for light nuclei. This method takes into account accurately the two-body correlations in these light nuclei, rather in the spirit of the Brueckner method as developed for the discussion of nuclear matter, although the detailed justification of the method for these light nuclei depends on quite different physical factors (essentially on the large spacing of the one-particle states for the oscillator potential determined self-consistently) than does its justification (the Pauli principle and the high Fermi momentum) for the problem of nuclear matter. To date, these calculations have used square-well potentials of width \( (b-2d) \) outside hard-core radius \( d \); the results available for \( d = 0.2 \text{ f} \) and \( d = 0.4 \text{ f} \), with intrinsic range \( b = 1.484 \text{ f} \), are given in Table 1. It is of interest to note the insensitivity of the conclusion to the hard-core radius assumed; for orientation, we remark that, for \( d = 0 \), the increase from \( a_0 = 2.4 \text{ f} \) to \( a_0 = 4.2 \text{ f} \) requires an increase by only 10% in the potential strength of \( V_0 \). For \( d = 0.4 \text{ f} \), the scattering length \( a_0 \) corresponds to a well-depth parameter \( s = 0.8 \) for the \( ^1S_0 \) potential, so that there is no reason to expect a bound state for the \( \Lambda - \text{N} \) system.

Dietrich et al.\(^6\) and Gutsch\(^7\) have also made calculations for \( \Lambda \text{H}^3 \), using the same method. For \( d = 0.4 \text{ f} \), Gutsch finds that the observed \( B_\Lambda \) requires a mean well-depth \( \tilde{V}_3 = 170 \text{ MeV} \) for the cuter square-well potential; the value \( \frac{1}{4}(3V_0 + V_1) \) given by the potentials \( V_0 \) and \( V_1 \) obtained from the discussion of \( \Lambda \text{H}^4 \) and \( \Lambda \text{He}^5 \) is 168.0 MeV. The scattering length corresponding to this value \( \tilde{V}_3 \) is \( \tilde{a} = 2.5 \text{ f} \). This is appreciably larger than the value \( (2.0 \text{ f}) \) found from the variational calculations mentioned.
above, and corresponds to a well-depth parameter about 12% too large; this is probably due to the fact that the Haeufel-Wild method is least accurate for small binding energies, as it does not give a correct account of the asymptotic region (which is of particular importance for small $B_{\Lambda}$). However, the internal comparisons between all of these calculations for the $s$-shell hypernuclei are rather satisfactory, in view of their approximate nature and the range of potential forms which have been used.

Finally, we consider whether there exists a $J = 1$ particle-stable state for the hypernuclei $^{\Lambda}H_3^*$ and $^{\Lambda}He_4^*$. This question is of great interest in view of its bearing on the interpretation of the $^{\Lambda}H_3$ and $^{\Lambda}He_4$ hypernuclei observed following $K^-$-He$^4$ capture events, whether these are produced directly (which would imply that the $K\Lambda$ parity is odd) or whether they result from $\gamma$ decay of such directly-produced excited states, with direct production of the ground state hypernuclei being forbidden. The situation is summarized in Table 1. The calculations$^{3,15}$ for $d = 0$ (corrected to the $He_3$ r.m.s. radius recently measured by Hofstadter and Collard) do indicate the existence of a bound state with $B_{\Lambda}^* \approx 1.3$ MeV, corresponding to a well-depth parameter of about 1.25 for the $J = 1$ configuration. The more recent calculations$^6,7$ carried out for hard-core potentials do not allow the existence of a $J = 1$ bound state. The attraction predicted for the $J = 1$ configuration actually decreases with increasing hard-core radius, the well-depth parameter of the $\Lambda$-He$^3$ attraction being only 0.63 in this state for $d = 0.4$ F. Further calculations along these lines for outer potential shapes more realistic than the square well, and which can be compared directly with the more accurate variational calculations on the $^{\Lambda}H_3$ system, would be rather desirable at this point.

The interpretation of these potentials $V_0$ and $V_1$, together with the data available on the ratio $R = (\Sigma^3n)/(\Sigma n)$ for $\Sigma^-p$ capture from rest, has been extensively discussed in terms of the pion-hyperon interactions $\Sigma\Sigma$ and $\Sigma\Lambda$ by de Swart and Iddings$^1$. Their calculations are based on a two-channel approach, in which the $\Lambda N$ and $\Sigma N$ channels are treated on the same footing in view of the relatively small mass difference $(m_{\Sigma} - m_{\Lambda}) \approx 80$ MeV. We confine our attention here to their essential conclusions for the case of
even ΣΛ parity. The 'S_0 potential depends primarily on the coupling f_{ΣΛ} and its strength requires that f_{ΣΛ} be comparable in magnitude with the pion-nucleon coupling f_{NN}'. The 'S_1 potential strength and the ratio R both depend quite strongly on f_{ΣΣ} and an adequate fit to all three data requires f_{ΣΣ} ≈ 0.1, taking the hard-core radius to be d = 0.5 f, as required for the corresponding NN potentials.

For small f_{ΣΣ}, the coupling between the AN and EN channels is not of major importance in the 'S_0 state, and the dominant interaction is the two-pion exchange potential in the AN channel, which depends only on the Σωω coupling. In the 'S_1 state, the one-pion exchange potential linking AN and EN channels is very strong and of the tensor form; there is a strong f_{ΣΣ} dependence both because of the importance of the Σωω coupling in the EN channel and because f_{ΣΣ} contributes to the fourth-order potential V(AN,EN) which interferes with the strong one-pion exchange term in this potential. However, the low-energy AN scattering wave-function does not have a large D-state, so that the tensor component of the effective AN potential is expected to be of relatively minor importance, in contrast with the situation for the NN system.

2. The s-wave Λ-Λ interaction

Very recently Danysz et al. have reported the first example of a double Λ hypernucleus, for which the most probable interpretation is ΛΛBe^10, with separation energy B_{ΛΛ} = 17.5 ± 0.5 MeV relative to Λ+Λ+Be^8 (g.s.). Since B_{Λ} = 6.5 ± 0.15 MeV ΛBe^8, B_{ΛΛ} exceeds 2B_{Λ}(Be^8) by 4.5 ± 0.6 MeV, so that we conclude that the Λ-Λ interaction is attractive. Since both particles are in the ground s-orbit relative to the nuclear core, the Pauli principle requires that their spins be coupled in the singlet configuration, so that B_{ΛΛ} is determined predominantly by the 'S_0 Λ-Λ potential.

An estimate of the Λ-Λ potential strength may be obtained using a simple product wave-function,\)

\[ \psi = \varphi(\| \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{R} \|) \varphi(\| \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{R} \|) (u_1v_2 - v_1u_2)/\sqrt{2}, \]  

(4)
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where \( R \) denotes the c.m. position of the Be\(^9\) core. If \( E_\Lambda(\varphi) \) denotes the separation energy of \( \Lambda \) Be\(^9\) [relative to \( \Lambda + \text{Be}^8 \) (g.s.)] calculated for the wave-function \( \varphi \), then

\[
-B_{\Lambda\Lambda} \geq -2E_\Lambda(\varphi) + \langle V_{\Lambda\Lambda} \rangle. \tag{5}
\]

We take the potential \( V_{\Lambda\Lambda} \) to be of Gaussian form \(-V_{\Lambda\Lambda}(\lambda/\pi)^{3/2} \times \exp(-\lambda r^2)\), with \( \lambda = 2.0604/\text{b}^2 \) and intrinsic range \( b = 1.5 \text{ f} \) corresponding to the process of two-pion exchange. If \( \varphi \) is taken to be the wave-function for \( \Lambda \) Be\(^9\), then \( -\langle V_{\Lambda\Lambda} \rangle \) can be identified with \((B_{\Lambda\Lambda} - 2B_\Lambda) = 4.5 \pm 0.6 \text{ MeV}\), which leads to a first estimate \( 520 \pm 70 \text{ MeV} \text{ f}^3 \) for the volume integral \( \bar{V}_{\Lambda\Lambda} \) of the \(^1\text{S}_0\) \( \Lambda-\Lambda \) potential. However, this estimate is considerably too large, since, owing to the additional binding energy, the wave-function \( \varphi \) appropriate to \( \Lambda \) Be\(^{16} \) will actually fall off much more rapidly with \( r \) than \( \varphi \) for \( \Lambda \) Be\(^9\). To allow for this, we vary the form of \( \varphi \), using the inequality (5) as a variational principle for \( \bar{V}_{\Lambda\Lambda} \). The form

\[
\varphi(r) = N \left[ \exp(-ar^2) + y \exp(-cr^2) \right] \tag{6}
\]

provides a good fit to the \( \Lambda \) Be\(^9\) wave-function for \( a = 0.25 \text{ f}^{-2} \), \( c = 0.07 \text{ f}^{-2} \) and \( y = 0.33 \), the \( \Lambda-\text{Be}^8 \) potential being represented by a shell-model form with strength adjusted to fit the observed \( B_\Lambda \) value. The effect of interest is roughly represented by decreasing \( y \); the minimum occurs for \( y = 0.15 \), leading to the improved estimate,

\[
\bar{V}_{\Lambda\Lambda} = 440 \pm 60 \text{ MeV} \text{ f}^3. \tag{7}
\]

Further improvements to this estimate are still necessary, with improved wave-functions which take into account:

i) the possibility of strong spatial correlations between the two \( \Lambda \) particles;

ii) the distortion of the nuclear core by the presence of two strongly bound \( \Lambda \) particles.

The inclusion of these effects may be expected to lower our estimate for \( \bar{V}_{\Lambda\Lambda} \) further, but certainly not by more than the error quoted in Eq. (7).
As pointed out by Danysz et al., there is possibly an alternative interpretation for this event as \( ^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{Be}^{11} \) with separation energy \( 19.0 \pm 0.6 \) MeV relative to \( \Lambda + \Lambda + \text{Be}^9 \). For \( ^{\Lambda}\text{Be}^{10} \), \( B_\Lambda = 7.9 \pm 0.4 \) MeV, but only the spin-average \( \Lambda - \text{Be}^9 \) interaction is effective in \( ^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{Be}^{11} \), since the \( \Lambda \) spins are in the singlet configuration. Using intermediate coupling wave-functions for \( \text{Be}^9 \), the spin dependent term in \( B_\Lambda \) is 0.32\( \langle \Delta \rangle \), where \( \langle \Delta \rangle \) is an appropriate expectation value of the spin-dependent part of the \( \Lambda - \text{N} \) interaction which has the value \( 1.8 \pm 0.4 \) MeV for neighbouring hypernuclei, as discussed in Section III. Hence the quantity \( (B_{^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{Be}^{10}} - 2B_\Lambda) \) has the value \( [19.0 - 2(7.9 - 0.6)] = 4.4 \pm 1.0 \) MeV, quite comparable with the value used above for \( ^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{Be}^{10} \), so that our estimate (7) of \( \tilde{\nu}_{^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{Be}} \) would not be appreciably modified if the alternative interpretation \( ^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{Be}^{11} \) were adopted.

As for the \( \Lambda - \text{N} \) potential, the long-range part of the \( \Lambda - \Lambda \) potential arises from two pion exchange. For even \( \Lambda\Lambda \) parity, the \( ^1S_0 \) \( \Lambda - \Lambda \) interaction arises dominantly from the two-pion exchange potential in the \( \Lambda\Lambda \) channel, since the potential coupling the \( \Lambda\Lambda \) and \( \Sigma \Sigma \) channels is relatively weak. The reason for this is essentially the same as for the \( \Lambda - \text{N} \) case, namely:

a) for pseudoscalar mesons, the one-pion exchange potential is known to be quite weak;

b) the two-pion contribution to \( V(\Lambda\Lambda - \Sigma\Sigma) \) is necessarily proportional to \( f_{\Sigma\Sigma}^2 \), which appears to be a relatively small coupling parameter.

The structure of the two-pion contribution to \( V(\Lambda\Lambda, \Lambda\Lambda) \) is the same as that for \( V(\Lambda\Lambda, \Lambda\Lambda) \), except for the additional factor \( f_{\Sigma\Lambda}^2/f_{\Sigma\Sigma}^2 \). Hence, if the same hard-core radius is assumed for the \( \Lambda - \Lambda \) and \( \Lambda - \text{N} \) interactions, the comparison of the values \( \tilde{\nu}_{^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{Be}} = 440 \) MeV \( f^3 \) indicates that \( f_{\Sigma\Lambda} \approx f_{\Sigma\Sigma} \) quite closely.
3. Binding energies for the p-shell hypernuclei

On the basis of a shell-model representation for the core nuclei, Lawson and Rotenberg\textsuperscript{11}) and Iwao\textsuperscript{12}) have proposed the following expression:

$$B_{\Lambda} = c + N_p \langle \tilde{V} \rangle + \alpha_N \langle \Delta \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

for the binding energies of hypernuclei with nuclear cores belonging to the lp shell. In this expression $N_p$ denotes the number of p-shell nucleons, and $\langle \tilde{V} \rangle$, $\langle \Delta \rangle$ denote the expectation values of $1/4(3V_1 + V_0)$ and $(V_0 - V_1)$ respectively between the $\Lambda$-particle wave-function and the wave-function of a p-shell nucleon. The coefficient $\alpha_N$ depends on the spin of the hypernuclear state and on the details of the structure of the core nucleus; values of $\alpha_N$ have been calculated by Dalitz and Soper\textsuperscript{13}) using intermediate coupling wave-functions for the core nuclei and including the admixture of excited nuclear states where these are of significance. Generally speaking, the values of $\alpha_N$ are close to those for L-S coupling at the beginning of the p-shell, for $A < 9$, and close to those for j-j coupling for $A > 9$. For j-j coupling, the value of $\alpha_N$ is

$$\alpha_N = -\frac{1}{4} \left[ 1 - \frac{\ell(\ell + 1) - \frac{3}{4}}{J(J + 1)} \right] \left[ J(J + 1) - J_N(J_N + 1) - \frac{3}{4} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

We note here that the result established empirically for $^4_{\Lambda}H^2$, $^4_{\Lambda}H^4$ and $^6_{\Lambda}Li^7$\textsuperscript{14}) that the ground-state hypernuclear spin value $|J_N - 1/2|$ is not expected to be a general rule. For example, $^{13}_{\Lambda}C$ belongs to the $p_{1/2}$ shell, so that $J = 1/2$, $\ell = 1$, $J_N = 1/2$, and the coefficient $\alpha_N$ has the values $+1/2$ for $J = 1$, $-1/2$ for $J = 0$. Hence spin $J = 1$ is expected to hold for the ground state of $^4_{\Lambda}C^{14}$ and $^{14}_{\Lambda}N^{14}$, contrary to the above rule. With $J = 1$, the two-body decays $^{14}_{\Lambda}C^{14} \rightarrow \pi^- + ^4_{\Lambda}H^{14}$ ($J = 1^+$) and $^{14}_{\Lambda}N^{14} \rightarrow \pi^- + ^4_{\Lambda}C^{14}$ ($J = 0^+$) are both allowed through the dominant s-interaction. However, if $J = 0$ held for the ($^{14}_{\Lambda}C$, $^{14}_{\Lambda}N^{14}$) doublet, the two-body decay $^{14}_{\Lambda}N^{14} \rightarrow \pi^- + ^4_{\Lambda}C^{14}$ would be forbidden for the s-interaction, although still allowed through the p-interaction (about 10 times weaker). Since $0^{14}$ has
no known particle-stable excited states, this means that there can be no confusion from \((\pi^- + 0^{1+})\) modes, and the two-body decay of \(\Lambda N^{14}\) would be quite rare; for \(J = 0\), the two-body decay \(\Lambda N^{14} \rightarrow \pi^- + N^{14}\) is allowed through the s-interaction.

The derivation of expression (8) is based essentially on a variational estimate for \(B_\Lambda\), in which the same trial function is used to describe the \(\Lambda\)-nucleus relative motion for all the p-shell hypernuclei. The wave-functions directly calculated do not deviate far from such a mean wave-function, for as the \(B_\Lambda\) value increases and the tail of the wave-function falls off more rapidly, so also does the radius of the \(\Lambda\)-nucleus potential increase, partly compensating this effect. The constant term \(C\) then results from the kinetic energy terms and the interaction of the \(\Lambda\) particle with the s-shell nucleons.

For hypernuclei whose core nuclei are spinless, expression (8) gives a linear relation between \(B_\Lambda\) and \(N_F\). For the systems \(\Lambda He^8(B_\Lambda = 3.1 \pm 0.05\) MeV), \(\Lambda Be^7(B_\Lambda = 4.9 \pm 0.5\) MeV), \(\Lambda Be^9(B_\Lambda = 6.5 \pm 0.15\) MeV) and \(\Lambda C^{13} = 10.6 \pm 0.4\) MeV), this linear relation is well satisfied, with \(C = 3.1 \pm 0.05\) MeV and \(\langle \bar{v} \rangle = 0.90 \pm 0.04\) MeV. This value of \(\langle \bar{v} \rangle\) is in good agreement with the value directly calculated\(^{15}\) from the s-wave \(\Lambda-N\) potentials (without hard core) discussed in Section I.

The spin-dependent term \(\langle \Delta \rangle\) can be estimated in four reliable cases, from \(\Lambda Li^7(B_\Lambda = 5.52 \pm 0.45\) MeV), \(\Lambda Li^8\) and \(\Lambda Be^8(B_\Lambda = 6.50 \pm 0.25\) MeV), \(\Lambda Li^9(B_\Lambda = 8.0 \pm 0.3\) MeV), and \(\Lambda B^1^2(B_\Lambda = 10.5 \pm 0.2\) MeV). The comparison with the expression (8) is given in Table 2. In the \(\Lambda Be^7 - \Lambda Li^7\) comparison, it is clear that \(\Delta B_\Lambda = \langle \Delta \rangle\) cannot exceed 0.9(\pm 0.1) MeV, otherwise \(\Lambda Be^7\) would not be particle-stable. The value expected for \(\langle \Delta \rangle\) on the basis of our knowledge of the \(\Lambda-N\) s-wave potentials is about 0.35 MeV, not incompatible with this value for \(\Lambda = 7\), especially when the mean wave-function assumed in (8) is replaced by the more diffuse wave-function appropriate to the lower \(B_\Lambda\) values for these systems. On the other hand, the large difference \(\Delta B_\Lambda = 1.5\) MeV between \(\Lambda Be^9\) and \(\Lambda Li^9\) requires a correspondingly large value for \(\langle \Delta \rangle\), not really consistent with this estimate for \(\langle \Delta \rangle\). Indeed, the values of \(\langle \Delta \rangle\) given in Table 2 show a
steady increase as $N_p^p$ increases through the p-shell, roughly in proportion with $N_p^p$. The reason for this behaviour of the $B_A$ values is not yet known. Possibly it reflects the inadequacies of the approximations made in the derivation of the expression (8), or perhaps it reflects properties of the $A-N$ forces (for example, the effect of a spin-orbit term) which have not yet been taken into account here.

At this point, accurate and reliable $B_A$ values for further hypernuclear species in this p-shell region would be of great interest, to explore further the dependence of $B_A$ on the spin and structure of the core nucleus. In order for such events to represent a useful addition to the present data, it is essential that they allow a unique and reliable identification of the species, either from analysis of its production process or from its decay process, or both.

II. THE DECAY INTERACTIONS OF THE A PARTICLE

1. The mesic decay processes

It is well known that, owing to the low momentum (100 MeV/c) of the proton resulting from $A$ decay at rest, the rate of $\pi^-$ decay of a $A$ particle in nuclear matter is generally reduced as a result of the Pauli principle, since a large fraction of the final states which can be reached by the final proton are already occupied. This effect is already quite large in $^\Lambda\text{He}^3$, where the $\pi^-$ decay rate is reduced by a factor of about 0.37; in $^\Lambda\text{C}^{13}$, the calculated reduction factor is about 0.14.

It is perhaps less well known that in the lightest hypernuclei, the effect of the Pauli principle can lead to an enhancement of the decay rate in suitable circumstances, namely if the spin configuration and the decay interaction are such that the final proton is necessarily emitted into a final state which satisfies the symmetry requirements of the Pauli principle. For example, in $^\Lambda\text{H}^4 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{He}^4$ decay with $J = 0$ for
\(^{2}\Lambda\text{He}^{4}\), the s-interaction for \(\Lambda\) decay is spin-independent, so that the final proton is necessarily s-wave and in the spin configuration appropriate to \(\text{He}^{4}\), and the decay rate for this transition is enhanced by almost a factor 2 (the space wave-functions do not overlap precisely) as a result of the antisymmetrization appropriate for a final state with two protons.

These same effects hold also for the \(\pi^{0}\) decay modes, of course. Thus, with \(J = 0\) for \(^{2}\Lambda\text{He}^{4}\), the rate for \(\pi^{0}\) decay through the \(s_{0}\) interaction is enhanced, whereas the rate for \(\pi^{0}\) decay through the \(p_{0}\) interaction is strongly suppressed; the rate for \(\pi^{-}\) decay of \(^{2}\Lambda\text{He}^{4}\) is also strongly suppressed, by a factor about 0.35, since there are already two s-wave protons present in the initial state. Hence the \(\pi^{0}/\pi^{-}\) ratio in \(^{2}\Lambda\text{He}^{4}\) decay is strongly sensitive to the \(p_{0}/s_{0}\) ratio in \(\Lambda \to n + \pi^{0}\) decay. For free \(\Lambda\) decay, the \(\pi^{0}/\pi^{-}\) ratio is very close to 0.5; for \(^{2}\Lambda\text{He}^{4}\) decay Block et al.\(^{16}\) have observed the \(\pi^{0}/\pi^{-}\) ratio to be 2.0 \pm 0.3. From this striking result, Block et al. have been able to deduce that the \(\pi^{0}\) mode of \(\Lambda\) decay is dominantly through the \(s_{0}\)-channel, with \(p_{0}^{2}/(p_{0}^{2} + s_{0}^{2}) = 0.23 \pm 0.16\), in agreement with expectation (0.12 \pm 0.03) from the \(\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}\) rule.

2. The non-mesic de-excitation of the \(\Lambda\) particle

For bound \(\Lambda\) particles, the presence of nucleons allows the weak interactions

\[
\begin{align*}
\Lambda + p &\to n + p \quad \text{(10a)} \\
\Lambda + n &\to n + n \quad \text{(10b)}
\end{align*}
\]

to become effective, releasing the full energy difference of about 176 MeV between the \(\Lambda\) particle and nucleon. This weak interaction can scarcely be investigated without appeal to studies of \(\Lambda\)-hypernuclear decay, and rather little is known of its detailed properties at this time.
These processes (10) represent the only strangeness-changing weak interaction which is readily accessible to observation and which involves four strongly-interacting fermions \(^*\)). With our present views on the nature of weak interactions, it is natural to expect the existence of a primary four-fermion interaction (10a). The validity of the \(\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}\) rule for strangeness-changing weak interactions then requires also the existence of a primary interaction of the form (10b), although there is no direct evidence for a neutral weak interaction current (in fact, there is very strong evidence against neutral leptonie currents of strength comparable with the charged currents for leptons). In this view, it is natural to regard the \(\Lambda \rightarrow N + \pi\) decay interactions as secondary in character since they can occur as a consequence of these four-fermion interactions; this connection is illustrated explicitly in Fig. 1, which depicts one sequence of processes by which the interaction (10a) can give rise to \(\Lambda \rightarrow p + \pi^-\) decay. Since this four-fermion interaction involves four strongly-interacting particles, mesonic corrections may be expected to distort the form of the interaction quite strongly from the \((V-A)\) form which the current-current theory would predict. This is illustrated in Fig. 2, which shows a series of processes contributing to the physically-observed interaction (10a). The terms (a) and (b) show the primary interactions (10a) derived from the charged and neutral currents, in turn, the vertices shown being distorted from their primary forms by the usual vertex corrections. The remaining graphs (c) - (f) show corrections which involve the exchange of various mesonic systems between the strangeness-changing and strangeness-conserving currents; the relation between these graphs and the primary interaction may be seen by analysing each \((\Lambda \rightarrow N + \text{meson})\) vertex in the manner of Fig. 1. The terms (c) and (d) are well known, from their discussion by Karplus and Ruderman\(^{24}\) who recognized the importance of their contribution if the \(\Lambda\) spin were large and used its comparison with the experimental data to argue against

\(^*\) The strangeness-conserving weak interaction \(n + p \rightarrow n + p\) is expected to exist if the current-current hypothesis of Feynman and Gell-Mann [Phys.Rev. 102, 193 (1956)] holds valid. This weak interaction is expected to produce parity-violating effects of very small amplitude in nuclear forces and the properties of nuclear states, some of which have been quantitatively estimated by Blin-Stoyle and co-workers.
the possibility of spin $\geq \frac{3}{2}$ for the $\Lambda$ particle. Now that $\mathbf{j}_\Lambda = \frac{1}{2}$
is well established and the $\Lambda \to N + \pi$ interaction is known to be
dominantly s-wave, there is no reason to believe that these Karplus-
Ruderman terms contribute dominantly to the observed process $\Lambda + N \to N + N$; these terms must be taken together with a large number of other mesonic
correction terms, of which several are given explicitly in Fig. 2.

Rather little is known at present concerning the properties
of this weak interaction:

$$\Lambda + N \to N + N.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

The simplest properties of interest are its charge-dependence and its
spin-dependence. For bound $\Lambda$ particles this interaction will dominantly
occur for $\Lambda N$ s-states, in view of the relatively low $\Lambda N$ relative momenta
to be expected in hypernuclei. The final nucleon momentum for $\Lambda N$
de-excitation at rest is about $q = 400$ MeV/c, so we shall simplify the
discussion by using the non-relativistic form for the matrix-elements.
For $\Lambda p$ capture from an s-state configuration the general form of the
matrix-element is

$$M(\Lambda p \to np) = a_p P_o + b_p P_t + \frac{3}{\sqrt{8}} c_p (\sigma_Y \cdot \sigma_N \cdot a - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Y \cdot \sigma_N q^2) / M^2$$
$$+ \frac{3}{\sqrt{8}} d_p (\sigma_Y + \sigma_N) \cdot q / M + e_p (\sigma_Y - \sigma_N) \cdot q P_o / 2M$$
$$+ \sqrt{3} f_p (\sigma_Y - \sigma_N) \cdot q P_t / M, \hspace{1cm} (12)$$

where $P_o = (3 + \sigma_Y \cdot \sigma_N) / 4$ and $P_t = (1 - \sigma_Y \cdot \sigma_N) / 4$ denote the singlet and
triplet spin projection operators, $\sigma_Y$ denotes the $\Lambda$ or n spin and $\sigma_N$ here
denotes the proton spin. In this expression the terms $a_p$ and $e_p$ denote the $^1S_0$
transition amplitudes leading to the $^1S_0$ and $^3P_0$ final states, respectively, and the terms $b_p, c_p, d_p$ and $f_p$ denote the $^3S_1$ transition
amplitudes leading to the $^3S_1$, $^3D_1$, $^3P_1$ and $^1P_1$ final states. For $\Lambda n$
capture the corresponding form is

$$M(\Lambda n \to nn) = a_n P_o + \frac{3}{\sqrt{8}} d_n (\sigma_Y + \sigma_N) \cdot q / M + e_n (\sigma_Y - \sigma_N) \cdot q P_o / 2M \hspace{1cm} (13)$$
where $\alpha_n$ here denotes the spin of the $A$ particle and either of the final neutrons and $\alpha_N$ denotes the spin of the other neutron. Terms of the form $b$, $c$ and $f$ are absent here, as they lead to final states which are forbidden for the $n-n$ system. If the $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ rule holds then we have in addition the following equalities:

$$a_n = \sqrt{2} \; a_p, \quad d_n = \sqrt{2} \; d_p, \quad e_n = \sqrt{2} \; e_p.$$  (14)

We note that the transitions $a$, $b$ and $c$ conserve parity, whereas the transitions $d$, $e$ and $f$ reverse the parity of the state. If time-reversal invariance holds then the phases of each of these amplitudes may be determined from the known $NN$ scattering phases by the use of Watson's theorem. Obviously the determination of all these parameters, and the test of the equalities (14), will require polarization experiments involving the measurement of the longitudinal polarization of the fast $n$ and $p$ emitted from unpolarized hypernuclei (or the angular distribution of the fast nucleons from non-mesic decay of polarized hypernuclei), and of the polarization correlation coefficients for the fast $(np)$ and $(nn)$ pairs emitted in non-mesic decay of hypernuclei. These polarization coefficients could also be measured for initial $AN$ states of definite spin by selecting the appropriate light hypernuclei (cf. below). Such experiments will be difficult to carry out and to interpret and lie far in the future.

In principle, for the calculation of non-mesic decay rates for hypernuclei, matrix-elements of the forms (12) and (13) should be used for each of the nucleons and evaluated between the initial hypernuclear wave-function and the final nuclear states. Here, we shall consider instead a simplified calculation for the non-mesic decay rates which treats the $A$ de-excitation by different nucleons as incoherent. This approximation is not strictly valid, because, owing to the identity of the neutrons and of the protons, the same final state can generally be reached through capture on any one of the nucleons; however, because of the large energy release, it is rather likely that these interference effects will generally be small and will tend to cancel out in the total de-excitation rates, summed over all final states.
Let us denote by $R_{NS}$ the $\Lambda N \to NN$ transition rate, when the $\Lambda N$ system is in an $s$-state of total spin $S$, for unit density of nucleons of type $N$ at the $\Lambda$ position. The non-mesic decay rate for a given hypernucleus is then given by the expression

$$R_{n,\pi^+} = \bar{R}(\Lambda^{A+1}) \rho_A,$$

$$= \bar{R}(\Lambda^{A+1}) A \int_{\Lambda} \rho_N^2(\mathbf{r})d\mathbf{r}, \quad (15)$$

where $\rho_A$ is the mean density of nucleons at the $\Lambda$ position, $\rho_N(\mathbf{r})$ being the nucleon density at position $\mathbf{r}$ and $\psi_{\Lambda}$ the wave-function for the $\Lambda$ nucleus relative motion and $\bar{R}$ is the spin and charge average of the $R_{NS}$ which is appropriate to the hypernucleus considered. In terms of the amplitudes (12) and (13), these quantities $R_{NS}$ are given by

$$R_{p_0} = |c_p|^2 + |a_p|^2(q/\hbar)^2, \quad (16a)$$

$$R_{p_1} = |b_p|^2 + |c_p|^2(q/\hbar)^4 + |d_p|^2(q/\hbar)^2 + |f_p|^2(q/\hbar)^2, \quad (16b)$$

$$R_{n_0} = [|a_n|^2 + |c_n|^2(q/\hbar)^2], \quad (16c)$$

$$R_{n_1} = |d_n|^2(q/\hbar)^2. \quad (16d)$$

In the last expressions $R_{nS}$, we have taken into account the symmetry requirements of the final state and the identity of the two final neutrons. If the $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ rule holds, the equalities (14) lead to the predictions

$$R_{p_0} = \frac{1}{2} R_{n_0}, \quad (17a)$$

$$R_{p_1} \geq \frac{1}{2} R_{n_1}. \quad (17b)$$

The quantity most readily measured is the ratio $Q = (\text{non-mesic}/\pi^-\text{-mesic})$. Here, we shall not include $\pi^0-$ mesonic decay events among the non-mesic decay rate, for the $\pi^0$-mesonic events normally give an exceedingly small star with a visible energy release of at most several...
MeV and would very frequently be overlooked, whereas the non-mesic decay events involve a large energy release. For $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$ hypernuclei in emulsion, estimates of this ratio have been reported as follows: $Q = 2.3 \pm 1.0$ by Fry$^{17}$, $1.5(\pm 0.4) \leq Q \leq 2.8$ by Silverstein$^{18}$ and $Q \geq 1.1 \pm 0.5$ by Schlein$^{19}$, whose non-mesic decay rate includes only two-prong events. For $\Lambda^4\hbox{He}$, Block et al.$^{16}$ have obtained a rather accurate value, $Q = 0.52 \pm 0.10$. About $80\%$ of the $\pi^-$ decays of $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$ in emulsion are due to $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$ decay; adopting the value $Q = 1.5$ for $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$, the correction for admixture of $\Lambda^4\hbox{He}$ non-mesic decay events leads to the estimate $Q = 1.8$ for $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$. On this basis, it is then possible to estimate $Q$ for some of the heavier hypernuclei. This involves an estimate of $R_{n.m.}$ from Eq. (15), using the value $\rho_4 = 0.038$ g$^{-3}$ for $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$ and corresponding calculated values $\rho_A$ for the hypernuclei of interest, together with an estimate of the $\pi^-$ decay rate $R(\pi^-)$ using the completeness relation method$^{20}$. For example, for $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$, the calculated value of $R(\pi^-)$ is 0.25 $\Gamma_A$, where $1/\Gamma_A$ denotes the free $\Lambda$ lifetime, so that our estimate of $Q$ and the above value for $\rho_4$ lead to the estimate

$$\bar{R}(\Lambda^5\hbox{He}) = \frac{1}{6}(3R_{pl} + R_{po} + 5R_n + R_{n.})$$

(18)

$$= (1.8)(0.25) \frac{\Gamma_A}{(0.038)} = 12(\pm 3) \frac{\Gamma_A}{A},$$

where the error quoted represents only the statistical uncertainty on $Q$. With this value for $\bar{R}$, estimates have been made for $Q$ for $\Lambda^7\hbox{Li}$ (neglecting the spin-dependence of $R_{NS}$, $\Lambda^7\hbox{Be}$ and $\Lambda^7\hbox{C}$, as given in Table 3). The rapid rise in $Q$ with increasing $A$ is due primarily to the rapidly increasing suppression of the $\pi^-$ decay process by the Pauli principle. However, the non-mesic decay rate does increase from 0.45 $\Gamma_A$ for $\Lambda^5\hbox{He}$, through 1.5 $\Gamma_A$ for $\Lambda^7\hbox{C}$, to a value of 2.0 $\Gamma_A$ for a very heavy hypernucleus (say $A \approx 100$). Several independent estimates of $R(\pi^-)$ we have made for a hypernucleus of mass number $A \approx 100$, including pion re-absorption effects, lead to values about 0.015 $\Gamma_A$, and therefore to a large value $Q \approx 130$. We conclude that the decay lifetime of a heavy hypernucleus ($A \approx 100$) may be expected to be essentially independent of $A$, with the value $\approx 1.2 \times 10^{-10}$ sec.
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The evidence on the charge dependence of the non-mesic process appears somewhat contradictory at first sight. For $\Lambda^4\text{He}$, Block et al.\textsuperscript{16} have classified non-mesic decay events with a recoil proton of momentum exceeding 250 MeV/c as due to $\Lambda p$ capture, leading to the estimate $(\Lambda p)/(\Lambda n) = 2.2 \pm 0.8$. Since $\Lambda^4\text{He}$ has $J = 0$, this corresponds to the ratio

$$\frac{(3R_{pl} + R_{po})}{R_{no}} = 2.2(\pm 0.8).$$ \hspace{1cm} (19)

On the other hand, for spallation hyperfragments following high-energy $K^-$ interactions in emulsion, for which typically $\Lambda \approx 70$, Beniston\textsuperscript{21} and Lagneau\textsuperscript{22} have compared the observed proton spectrum with those predicted by a Monte Carlo calculation for $(\Lambda p)$ and $(\Lambda n)$ capture processes, and have concluded that, in these heavy hypernuclei, the $(\Lambda n)$ capture process is the dominant non-mesic decay process. The ratio $(\Lambda n)/(\Lambda n + (\Lambda p))$ obtained by Beniston was $\gamma = 0.8 \pm 0.1$, and by Lagneau $\gamma = 0.65 \pm 0.1$, the difference between these values being due, at least in part, to the differing assumptions made about the spatial distribution of the $\Lambda$ particle. To continue, we shall adopt the value $\gamma = 0.7$, so that

$$\frac{3R_{pl} + R_{po}}{3R_{nl} + R_{no}} = \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} - 1\right) \approx 0.4.$$ \hspace{1cm} (20)

From this ratio and the value of Eq. (19), we can conclude the value $3R_{nl} + R_{no} = 69(\pm 20)$ $\Gamma_{\Lambda}$ to be used below. The striking difference between the $(\Lambda p)/(\Lambda n)$ ratios observed for $\Lambda^4\text{He}$ and for heavy hypernuclei can be understood quite simply if the $(\Lambda n)$ de-excitation process has a strong spin-dependence, with

$$R_{no}/R_{nl} \approx 0.3,$$ \hspace{1cm} (21)

the non-mesic $(\Lambda n)$ decay interaction being significantly weaker in the singlet configuration.

The remaining information to be discussed consists of the non-mesic rates for $\Lambda^4\text{He}$ and $\Lambda^4\text{H}$, for which the nucleon density $\rho_3$ is 0.019 fm$^{-3}$.\hspace{1cm} \_66/ND/sgm
For $^\Lambda\text{He}^4$, the calculated suppression\(^{20}\) of $R(\pi^-)$ to 0.26 $\Gamma_\Lambda$, and the above value $Q = 0.52 \pm 0.10$, lead to

$$3R_{pl} + R_{po} + 2R_{n0} = 4.1(\pm 10) \Gamma_\Lambda.$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

From Eqs. (18), (21) and (22) we conclude that $R_{n1} = 21(\pm 7) \Gamma_\Lambda$, $R_{n0} = 6(\pm 2) \Gamma_\Lambda$ and $(3R_{pl} + R_{po}) = 28(\pm 8) \Gamma_\Lambda$. For $^\Lambda\text{He}^4$, the $\pi^-$ decay rate $R(\pi^-)$ has been calculated\(^ {20}\) to be 0.74 $\Gamma_\Lambda$, and the non-mesonic rate is given by

$$0.31(\pm 0.06) \geq (0.019) (R_{po} + 3R_{n1} + R_{n0})/6 \geq 0.22(\pm 0.06),$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

using the above values for $(3R_{n1} + R_{n0})$ and the requirement $0 \leq R_{po} \leq 28(\pm 8) \Gamma_\Lambda$. On this basis, the ratio $Q$ for $^\Lambda\text{He}^4$ is expected to lie between 0.29(\pm 0.08) and 0.42(\pm 0.08). In the experiment of Block et al.\(^{16}\), 120(\pm 11) $^\Lambda\text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^-$ events were seen. From the number of $^\Lambda\text{He}^4$ production events and from charge independence, it was concluded that the total number of $^\Lambda\text{He}^4$ production events was 163 \pm 10. From the $\pi^0/\pi^-$ ratio (2.5 \pm 0.5) observed for $^\Lambda\text{He}^4$ decay, and from the prediction of the $\Delta I = 1/2$ rule that\(^ {20}\)

$$\frac{\pi^0}{\pi^-} (^\Lambda\text{He}^4) \times \frac{\pi^0}{\pi^-} (^\Lambda\text{H}^4) = \frac{1}{4},$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

we may estimate the number of $^\Lambda\text{He}^4 \rightarrow \pi^0$ events as 12 \pm 1. The remainder of the events, amounting to 31 \pm 15, must be attributed to non-mesonic decay processes; this leads to the ratio $Q = 0.26 \pm 0.13$, which is not at all in disagreement with the value predicted above.

This small fraction of $^\Lambda\text{He}^4$ decay events which proceed through the non-mesonic mode may not be easy to identify in the helium bubble chamber experiment, especially because of the confusion possible with slow $\Sigma^-$ hyperons following $K^- - \text{He}^4$ capture which come to rest and interact to give
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a one-prong star. If we assume [for lack of other knowledge *) that the AP capture interaction is spin independent, i.e., \( R_{po} = R_{pl} \), then \( R_{po} \) has the value 7(± 2) \( \Gamma_\Lambda \) and the \( \langle Ap \rangle /\langle An \rangle \) ratio predicted for \( \Lambda^H \) has the value

\[
2R_{po} / (3R_{nl} + R_{no}) = 14(± 2)/69 (± 20) = 0.2(± 0.06),
\]

so that only six non-mesic \( \Lambda^H \) decay events are expected to occur with a fast proton (say ≥ 250 MeV/c) in the experiment of Block et al. 16). However, the majority of the \( \langle An \rangle \) capture events are expected to give a visible prong. Some indication on this can be obtained from the \( \pi^- + He^\ast \) interaction studies of Bortolani et al. 23), which also proceeds through two-nucleon emission with a comparable energy release (≈ 140 MeV). Of 356 \( \pi^- \) interactions at rest in a helium chamber, only 23 gave no visible track; since the primary capture interaction \( \pi^- + p + n \rightarrow n + n + p \) is believed to account for at least \( 3/4 \) of these capture events (the remainder being due to the \( \pi^- + p + p \rightarrow n + p + n \) interaction), we may estimate **) that not more than 9% of the \( \langle An \rangle \) de-excitation events for \( \Lambda^H \) will give no visible track. Although the separation of the \( \Lambda^H \) non-mesic decay events is a difficult task, a value of the \( \langle Ap \rangle /\langle \pi^- - \text{mesic} \rangle \) ratio for \( \Lambda^H \), or even an upper limit on this would be very valuable in providing a limit on \( R_{po} \), and therefore a direct indication of the spin dependence for the \( \langle Ap \rangle \) de-excitation process.

*) With the \( \Delta I = \frac{1}{2} \) rule for the \( \Lambda N \rightarrow NN \) process, the value \( R_{no} = 6(± 2) \) \( \Gamma_\Lambda \) and Eq. (17a) would require \( R_{po} = 3.0(± 1.0) \) \( \Gamma_\Lambda \), an appreciably smaller value than that assumed here. With this value the \( \langle Ap \rangle /\langle An \rangle \) ratio for \( \Lambda^H \) would be 0.06(± 0.04), which would predict only two non-mesic \( \Lambda^H \) with a fast proton in this experiment. We may note here that these spin-dependences for the \( \Lambda n \) and \( \Lambda p \) processes are quite at variance with a simple (V-A) form for the \( \Lambda N \rightarrow NN \) interaction; in the non-relativistic limit, the first term \( (ap) \) of (5.4) would be dominant, and the ratio \( R_{po}/R_{pl} \) would be predicted to be exceedingly large.

**) We should emphasize here that the \( \Lambda n \rightarrow \pi^- + n \) interaction may have quite different spin dependence from the \( \pi^- + pn \rightarrow nn \) interaction, in which case this proportion might well turn out to be larger than this estimate. For example, \( \Lambda^H \) production is found to occur in 22% of \( \pi^- + He^\ast \) capture events; this appears to be a particular feature of the \( \pi^- pn \) and \( \pi^- pp \) capture amplitudes. There is certainly no reason to expect the \( \langle An \rangle \) and \( \langle Ap \rangle \) capture amplitudes to have a similar spin and charge dependence, and it is quite unlikely that the mode \( \Lambda^H + n \) will prove to be as abundant in \( \Lambda^H \) non-mesic decay.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hard core radius ( d )</th>
<th>( d = 0.0 ) ( \text{f} ) (Gaussian shape)</th>
<th>( d = 0.2 ) ( \text{f} ) (square well)</th>
<th>( d = 0.4 ) ( \text{f} ) (square well)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( a_0 ) ( (\text{f}) )</td>
<td>(-2.4^{+1.2}_{-0.6})</td>
<td>(-4.2^{+3.0}_{-1.3})</td>
<td>(-4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_1 ) ( (\text{f}) )</td>
<td>(-0.5 \pm 0.1)</td>
<td>(-0.55 \pm 0.05)</td>
<td>(-0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>obtained from ( \Lambda H^3 ) and ( \Lambda Ho^3 ) (Refs. 3, 5)</td>
<td>obtained from ( \Lambda H^3 ) and ( \Lambda Ho^3 ) (Ref. 6)</td>
<td>obtained from ( \Lambda H^3 ) and ( \Lambda Ho^3 ) (Ref. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of ( J = 1 ) excited state ( \Lambda H^3 ) ( \star )?</td>
<td>( B_{\Lambda} \approx 1.3 \text{ MeV} ) ( (s^* = 1.25) )</td>
<td>Not bound ( (s^* = 0.90) )</td>
<td>Not bound ( (s^* = 0.83) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypernuclei compared</td>
<td>$\Delta B_A$ (MeV)</td>
<td>Estimate from Eq. (8)†</td>
<td>Value of $&lt;\Delta&gt;$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda\text{Be}^7 - \Lambda\text{Li}^7$</td>
<td>$0.6 \pm 0.5 \ (\leq 0.9)$</td>
<td>$0.98 \ &lt;\Delta&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;\Delta&gt; = 0.6 \pm 0.5 \ \text{MeV}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda\text{Be}^8 - \Lambda\text{Be}^9$</td>
<td>$0.0 \pm 0.3$</td>
<td>$0.59 \ &lt;\Delta&gt; - &lt;\bar{V}&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;\Delta&gt; = 1.5 \pm 0.5 \ \text{MeV}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda\text{Be}^9 - \Lambda\text{Li}^9$</td>
<td>$1.50 \pm 0.3$</td>
<td>$0.70 \ &lt;\Delta&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;\Delta&gt; = 2.1 \pm 0.4 \ \text{MeV}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda\text{B}^{12} - \Lambda\text{C}^{13}$</td>
<td>$-0.10 \pm 0.4$</td>
<td>$0.28 \ &lt;\Delta&gt; - &lt;\bar{V}&gt;$</td>
<td>$&lt;\Delta&gt; = 2.7 \pm 1.3 \ \text{MeV}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†) The coefficients $\alpha_N$ used here are those computed from intermediate coupling nuclear wave-functions constructed by J. Soper.
Table 3

\[ Q = \frac{\text{non-mesic}}{\pi^- \text{mesic}} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypernucleus</th>
<th>( \Lambda H^+ )</th>
<th>( \Lambda He^+ )</th>
<th>( \Lambda He^5 )</th>
<th>( \Lambda Li^7 )</th>
<th>( \Lambda Be^9 )</th>
<th>( \Lambda C^{13} )</th>
<th>( \Lambda Ag^{169} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The underlined entries represent the empirical values for Q; the other entries are calculated values based on the entry for \( \Lambda He^5 \).
Fig. 1. The Decay $\Lambda \rightarrow p + \pi^-$ as a consequence of the Four-fermion Weak Interaction. (S.1a)

Fig. 2. Contributions to the Process $\Lambda + p \rightarrow n + p$.
THE NUCLEAR WELL-DEPTH FOR A PARTICLES

B.W. Downs,
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

I. INTRODUCTION

The binding energy of a A particle in its ground state in nuclear matter is a quantity of some interest in the study of the A-nucleon interaction. This binding energy is equal to the well-depth D seen by a A particle whose ground state is a state of zero momentum with respect to the bottom of the well. The well-depth D will, presumably, also be very nearly the central depth seen by a A particle bound in its ground state in a heavy nucleus on account of the expectation that the potential well seen by a A particle in nuclear matter will be only slightly momentum-dependent\(^1,2\). This expectation also suggests that the well-depth D may give a good indication of the central depth of the real part of the optical potential for scattering of low-energy A particles by heavy nuclei.

Several attempts have been made to deduce the well-depth D from the observed binding energies of the light hypernuclei\(^2-5\)\. These have resulted in estimates in the range

\[ D \approx 22 \pm 30 \text{ MeV}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The lower values in Eq. (1) have been obtained from the trend of the binding energies of the observed hypernuclei with \(3 \leq A \leq 12\)\(^2-4\); the higher, from an analysis of the binding energy of \(^\Lambda^ {13}_\)\(^\circ\). The former are suspect because the binding energies of the light hypernuclei are strongly influenced by the density and spin structure of the nucleon cores, both of which fluctuate and differ, in most cases, from their values in nuclear matter, which is taken to be a spin-saturated collection of an equal number of protons and neutrons with a nucleon density equal to the central density observed in the heaviest nuclei\(^6\). The higher estimates, based on \(^\Lambda^ {13}_\)\(^\circ\),
would seem to be more reliable because the nucleon core comes very close to matching the conditions of nuclear matter at its centre\(^6\); even in this case, however, the finite radius of the core and uncertainties concerning its structure leave the estimated values of \(D\) open to some question.

The well-depth \(D\) is determined, in part, by aspects of the \(A\)-nucleon interaction which play a quantitatively different role in determining the binding energies of the light hypernuclei\(^2,3,8\) and it is principally from the analyses of these binding energies that the phenomenological \(A\)-nucleon interaction potential has been deduced\(^2,5,7,8\). It is the purpose of this paper to discuss those aspects of the \(A\)-nucleon interaction which play a role in determining \(D\). In Section II the calculations of \(D\) by Bodmer and Sampanthar\(^2\) in terms of two-body and three-body \(A\)-nucleon potentials without hard cores are briefly reviewed. Calculations of \(D\) in terms of two-body \(A\)-nucleon potentials with hard cores are discussed in Section III. The final Section IV contains a summary of the results of these calculations and an indication of the relation between \(D\) and the properties which the optical potential for scattering of low-energy \(A\)-particles by heavy nuclei might be expected to have.

II. THE WELL-DEPTH \(D\) CORRESPONDING TO \(A\)-NUCLEON POTENTIALS WITHOUT HARD CORES

Bodmer and Sampanthar\(^2\) have used \(A\)-nucleon potentials without hard cores to calculate \(D\) in perturbation theory, nuclear matter being treated as a Fermi gas. The first-order contribution to \(D\) from central two-body direct (non-exchange) \(A\)-nucleon interactions is\(^9\)

\[
D^{(1)}_{\text{direct}} = \rho \Omega, \tag{2}
\]

where \(\rho\) is the density of nuclear matter and \(\Omega\) is the volume integral of the spin-average \(A\)-nucleon potential. The first-order contribution
from two-body exchange potentials of Yukawa form

\[ V(r) = -V_0 \frac{e^{-r/R}}{r} \quad (3) \]

is

\[ D_{\text{exchange}}^{(1)} = \rho \left[ \frac{3}{(k_F R)^2} - \frac{3}{(k_F R)^3} \tan^{-1} k_F R \right], \quad (4) \]

where the Fermi momentum \( k_F \) is related to the density of nuclear matter by

\[ \rho = \frac{2k_F^3}{3\pi^2}. \quad (5) \]

The exchange contribution \((4)\) is smaller than the direct \((2)\) and reduces to it in the limit \((k_F R) \to 0^{10}\). The calculations of Bodmer and Sampanthar indicate that the second-order contributions to both \( D_{\text{direct}} \) and \( D_{\text{exchange}} \) are less than or about 10% of the first-order contributions [and have the same sign as \( D^{(1)} \)] for relevant values of \( k_F \) and \( R \).

Analysis of the binding energy of \( ^{\Lambda}{\text{He}}^6 \) in terms of two-body \( \Lambda \)-nucleon potentials without hard cores, leads directly to a determination of \( \Omega^{3,7} \):

\[ \Omega = \begin{cases} 230 \pm 10 & \text{MeV}^3 \text{ for } b = \begin{cases} 1.5 \text{ } & (R = \hbar/2M_{\Lambda}) \\ 0.85 \text{ } & (R = \hbar/M_{\Lambda}) \end{cases} \end{cases} \]

\( (6a) \equiv (6b) \)

The volume integrals \((6)\) thus deduced are nearly shape-independent for two-body potentials having the same intrinsic range \( b^{11} \). The range parameters used to obtain \((6)\) were chosen as being representative of the two simplest meson-exchange mechanisms which can give rise to a charge-independent \( \Lambda \)-nucleon interaction \(^7\). There is, of course, no assurance that either of these range parameters is the correct one; extensive scattering data, from which the range of the nucleon-nucleon interaction was determined, are not available for the \( \Lambda \)-nucleon system. If the range parameter \((\hbar/2M_{\Lambda})\) is the correct one, and if the \( \Lambda \)-nucleon
interaction arises primarily from the exchange of two pions as such a range would indicate, then that interaction would be primarily a direct interaction. If, on the other hand, \( R = (h/\mu_P) \) and the \( \Lambda \)-nucleon interaction arises primarily from the exchange of a single kaon, that interaction would be primarily an exchange interaction. On this account, Bodmer and Sampantar\(^2\) restricted attention to direct interactions of range \( (h/2M) \) and to exchange interactions of range \( (h/\mu_P) \).

For the values

\[
\rho = 0.172 \text{ nucleons/f}^3 \tag{7a}
\]

and

\[
k_p = 1.366 \text{ f}^{-1}, \tag{7b}
\]

appropriate to the central density in heavy nuclei\(^5\), the calculations of Bodmer and Sampantar lead to the values given in Table 1 for the first-order contributions to \( D \) corresponding to the central values of \( \Omega \) given in (6).

**Table 1**

First-order contributions to \( D \) in MeV. The total value \( D^{(1)} \) and the contributions \( D^{(1) \ast \ell} \) from interactions in \( s \)- and \( p \)-states are given. The missing values of \( D^{(1) \ast \ell} \) correspond to situations not considered by Bodmer and Sampantar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( D^{(1) \ast \ell} )</th>
<th>( D^{(1)} )</th>
<th>( D^{(1) \ast \ell} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( l = 0 )</td>
<td>( l = 1 )</td>
<td>( l = 0 )</td>
<td>( l = 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 f</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85 f</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These values indicate that $D_{\text{exchange}}$ is in reasonably good agreement with the empirical estimates (1) for either range considered, but that agreement with $D_{\text{direct}}$ can be obtained only for a range which would be expected to correspond to an exchange interaction. Bodmer and Sampantar have pointed out that, on the basis of this comparison alone, it would appear that exchange interactions of range $(\hbar/\ell_K)$ may play a significant role in the $\Lambda$-nucleon interaction. It should be noted that the range-dependence of $D_{\text{direct}}$, which follows directly from (6), may play a role in determining $D$ if the actual range turns out to be intermediate between $(\hbar/2M_\pi)$ and $(\hbar/\ell_K)$. The dependence of $D^{(t)}$ on the density of nuclear matter follows from Eq. (2) exactly for direct interactions and approximately for exchange interactions of range as short as $(\hbar/\ell_K)$. The relative importance of the contributions $D^{(t)}$ depends slightly on the density, the p-wave contributions being relatively larger for greater densities (12).

Bodmer and Sampantar\textsuperscript{2} have also analysed the binding-energy data of the light hypernuclei considering the possible presence of three-body $\Lambda$-nucleon interactions, potentials without hard cores being taken for both two-body and three-body interactions. Analyses of the binding energies of $^2\Lambda H$ and $^5\Lambda He$ including attractive three-body $\Lambda$-nucleon potentials lead to a reduction of the two-body contributions to $D$ from those given by Eqs. (2) and (4). Bodmer and Sampantar have calculated the values of $D$ which result from these reduced two-body contributions and the additional contribution which arises from the corresponding three-body potentials. They found that consideration of three-body potentials can bring $D$ into agreement with the empirical estimates for a variety of situations. In particular, agreement can be obtained for direct two-body interactions of range $(\hbar/2M_\pi)$ and a relatively strong three-body interaction; this could be a consistent combination because both interactions presumably arise predominantly from two-pion-exchange mechanisms.
III. THE WELL-DEPTH D CORRESPONDING TO A-NUCLEON POTENTIALS WITH HARD CORES

The potentials without hard cores used by Bodmer and Sampanthan$^{2}$ to estimate D may not provide an adequate representation of the A-nucleon interaction. The presence of a hard core in the nucleon-nucleon interaction$^{13}$ suggests that a hard core may also be characteristic of the A-nucleon interaction. In particular, the assumption of the existence of a universal pion-baryon interaction leads to a pion-exchange contribution to the A-nucleon potential which is a linear combination of nucleon-nucleon potentials$^{14}$; in this case, the hard core in the nucleon-nucleon interaction implies a hard core in the A-nucleon interaction. If the A-nucleon interaction does have a hard core, the perturbation technique of Bodmer and Sampanthan$^{2}$ cannot be used to calculate D; but many-body techniques developed for use with hard-core potentials can be used. Typical of these are the independent-pair approximation of Gomes, Walecka and Weisskopf$^{15}$ and the potential-separation technique of Moszkowski and Scott$^{16}$. The former has been applied by Walecka$^{17}$ to the calculation of D; the later, by Moszkowski et al.$^{18}$ to the calculation of the s-wave contribution to D.

The more transparent of the methods which have been used for the calculation of D in terms of hard-core potentials is that of Walecka$^{17}$. In this method the relative motion of the A particle and a nucleon in nuclear matter is described by a self-consistent Bethe-Goldstone equation in which the particle masses are replaced by appropriate effective masses$^{19}$. The well-depth D is then given by

$$D = -D_C + D_A = \frac{\mu}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^3k}{k^2} \left( \frac{M^2_N}{\mu^*} \right)^3 \int d^3K \int_0^\infty d^3r \bar{\phi}_{CC}(r) \phi_{BB}(r) d^3r,$$

where $V_C$ is the hard-core part of the A-nucleon potential (assumed to be the same for both spin states) and $V_A$ is the spin-average of the attractive parts of the singlet and triplet potentials. These two parts
of the potential give rise to the two contributions $D_C$ and $D_A$ to the depth $D$. A superscript * on a mass indicates an effective mass, and $\mu^* = \frac{m_N^* m_A^*}{(m_N^* + m_A^*)}$. In Eq. (8) $\mathbf{\vec{R}}$ is the relative momentum of a $\Lambda$-nucleon pair, the $\Lambda$ particle being at rest; the maximum momentum which a nucleon can have is the Fermi momentum $k_F$. The integral over $\mathbf{\vec{R}}$ in Eq. (8) represents the effect of the interaction of a $\Lambda$-nucleon pair with relative momentum $\mathbf{\vec{R}}$; the integral over $\mathbf{\vec{R}}$ is essentially a summation over the possible relative momenta. The wave function $\psi_{BG}(\mathbf{\vec{R}})$ is the solution to the Bethe-Goldstone equation for the relative motion with the reduced effective mass $\mu^*$. Although this function vanishes for $r \leq c$, the hard-core radius, the radial part $R^c(r)$ of each partial-wave component of $\psi_{BG}(\mathbf{\vec{R}})$ has a discontinuous derivative at $r = c$, which leads to the partial-wave contributions $D_C^c$ to $D_C$ through (20, 21)

$$V_C(r) R^c(r) \approx \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \left[ \frac{d}{dr} R^c(r) \right]_{r=c+\varepsilon} \delta(r-c).$$

(9)

The core contributions $D_C^c$ essentially take account of the fact that the core forces the radial functions to zero at the core radius, thereby increasing the curvature of the functions in the neighbourhood of the core (over that which they would have in the absence of the interaction), which corresponds to an increase in the kinetic energy of the interacting pair.

Only s-wave solutions of the Bethe-Goldstone equation have so far been obtained (15, 20). For the case of the interaction between the nucleons in nuclear matter, Genes et al. (15) found that the s-wave solution with the potential $(V_C + V_A)$ is nearly the same as that with the hard-core interaction $V_C$ alone. An analytic expression for the latter can be obtained, and this has been used in calculations of interaction energies in nuclear matter (15, 17). The characteristic features of the s-wave solution to the Bethe-Goldstone equation are that:

i) it vanishes at the hard-core radius $c$;

ii) it is very nearly equal to the free-pair (with the reduced mass $\mu^*$ appropriate to nuclear matter) solution for $(r-c) > 4/k_F$.
iii) its amplitude exceeds that of the free-pair solution
for \( (r - c) \leq 4/k_F \) (the last property is a necessary
consequence of the first two).

These properties of the s-wave Bethe-Goldstone function have prompted
the use of several simple approximate functions which incorporate
these features\(^{17, 22}\). The one which will be used for the present
discussion is

\[
R_0(r) \approx B[1 - e^{-2(r-c)/a}] J_0(kr)
\]

(10)

with

\[
B = 1.08
\]

(11a)

and

\[
a = 1/k_F.
\]

(11b)

This function gives a very good representation of \( R^0_{BG}(r) \) for all
values of \( K \) which contribute to Eq. (8) and for all values of \( r \) which
are important with the short-ranged potentials appropriate to the
\( A \)-nucleon interaction\(^{23}\). If it is further assumed that the same cut-
off factor is appropriate to all partial waves\(^{24}\), then the corresponding
approximation to the full Bethe-Goldstone function is

\[
\phi(r) \approx B[1 - e^{-2(r-c)/a}] e^{iK \cdot r}.
\]

(12)

The approximate functions (10) and (12) are appropriate for the evaluation of the contribution
\( D_A \) of the attractive well. With Eqs. (12) and (8), the contribution of
the (central) attractive well is of the form

\[
D_A = \rho \Omega_A B(1 - x).
\]

(13)

where \( \Omega_A \) is the volume integral of the attractive well, and \( x \) contains
the effect of the cut-off term \( \exp[-2(r-c)/a] \). The partial-wave
contributions \( D_A^t \) to \( D_A \) can, of course, be obtained from a partial-wave
expansion of (12). The volume integral $\Omega_A$ can be expressed in the form

$$\Omega_A = \Omega_A^0 f(c/b^0),$$

(14)

where $\Omega_A^0$ is the volume integral the attractive well would have if it were translated to the origin and $b^0$ is the intrinsic range of the translated well. For a given $b^0$ and a given value of the well-depth parameter $^{25}$, the value of $\Omega_A^0$ is essentially shape-independent; the factor $f(c/b^0)$, however, is very far from being shape-independent, being smaller for short-tailed wells such as a square well than it is for longer-tailed wells such as an exponential. In order to investigate the possible effects of this shape-dependence on the value of $D_A$,

A-nucleon potentials with both exponential and square attractive wells are considered here. The cut-off term $x$ in Eq. (13) also has a shape-dependence, which tends to compensate that of $f(c/b^0)$.

If the approximate function (12) is used with Eq. (9) to obtain the core contribution, one obtains from Eq. (8)

$$D_C = \frac{k_F^2 r^2}{2\mu^2} \frac{8 k_F^2 c}{3\pi} 2Bc/a,$$

(15)

the partial-wave contributions $D_C^f$ being obtained in a similar manner. The parameters (11) were chosen to give the best match of Eq. (10) to $R_B^0(r)$ over the range $c \leq r \leq 3/k_F^{23}$. Consequently, Eq. (10) with the parameters (11) has a smaller slope at $r = c$ than the correct function $R_B^0(r)$. Since the values of $D_C^f$ depend entirely on the slope of the radial function at $r = c$ [see Eq. (9)], the value of $2Bc/a$ used in calculations of $D_C$ should be adjusted to reproduce this slope exactly. Since an analytic solution to the Bethe-Goldstone equation can be obtained for $f = 0$ with $V(r) = V_C$, $D_C^0$ can be obtained from this and used to determine the appropriate value of $2Bc/a$ to be used in Eq. (15). For $c = 0.4 f$, and the value of $k_F$ given in Eq. (7b), this procedure leads to $2Bc/a = 1.4$,

in contrast to the value 1.2 which follows from Eq. (11). Since the core contributions $D_C^f$ depend so critically on the form of $R(r)$ in the
neighbourhood of \( r = 0 \), the expression (15) is relatively less reliable than expression (13) for \( D_A \). On this account, approximate expressions for \( D_C \), obtained by consideration of the actual radial solutions of the Bethe-Goldstone equation in the neighbourhood of the hard-core radius\(^2\), were used to obtain the values reported in this section; the values of \( D_C \) were obtained from the exact solution for \( V(r) = V_C \). The expression (15) exhibits the qualitative features of \( D_C \); it has been included primarily for that reason.

The spin-average A-nucleon potentials used for this discussion were assumed to have the following characteristics:

i) a hard core of radius \( c = 0.4 \) \( \rho \) or \( 0.6 \) \( \rho \);

ii) a zero-energy scattering length equal to that of a potential without a hard core having an intrinsic range \( b = 1.5 \) \( \rho \), corresponding to a Yukawa range parameter \( R = (\hbar/2M) \); and the volume integral \( \Omega_A = 230 \text{ MeV} \rho^3 \) given in Eq. (6c)\(^2\).

Several values of the intrinsic range \( b^0 \) of the (translated) attractive well were used with

\[
b - 2c \leq b^0 \leq b. \tag{16}\]

The minimum value of \( b^0 \) given in Eq. (16) is appropriate to a hard-core potential which has a bound state at zero energy\(^2\), and the maximum is the largest possible consistent with an interaction which arises from the two-pion-exchange mechanism\(^7\).

The results of calculations of \( D \) for two hard-core radii and several intrinsic ranges \( b^0 \) for potentials with exponential and square attractive wells are reported below. The values of Eq. (7) were used for the density of nuclear matter and the Fermi momentum. The effective mass \( M^* \) of the A particle was taken to be equal to the real mass \( M_A \)\(^1\); the effective mass of the nucleon \( M_N^* = 0.735 M_N \) was determined in the manner described in Ref. 15 with the (Serber mixture) nucleon-nucleon interaction used there and the value of \( k_F \) given in Eq. (7b)\(^1\). The attractive contributions were evaluated with the approximate function (12);
the core contributions, in the manner described at the end of the paragraph containing Eq. (15).

1. Hard-core radius \( c = 0.4 \, \text{f} \). In this case

\[
\begin{align*}
D_c^0 &= 55 \, \text{MeV} \\
D_c^1 &= 3 \, \text{MeV} \\
D_c^2 &\approx 0 \, \text{MeV}.
\end{align*}
\]

(17a) \hspace{2cm} (17b) \hspace{2cm} (17c)

i) Potentials with exponential attractive wells.

**Table 2**

Values of D and the partial-wave contributions \( D^\ell \) in MeV for potentials with exponential attractive wells and hard-core radius \( c = 0.4 \, \text{f} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( D^0 )</th>
<th>( \ell = 0 )</th>
<th>( \ell = 1 )</th>
<th>( \ell = 2 )</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.7 , \text{f}</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 , \text{f}</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 , \text{f}</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Potentials with square attractive wells.

**Table 3**

Values of D and the partial-wave contributions \( D^\ell \) in MeV for potentials with square attractive wells and hard-core radius \( c = 0.4 \, \text{f} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( D^0 )</th>
<th>( \ell = 0 )</th>
<th>( \ell = 1 )</th>
<th>( \ell = 2 )</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.7 , \text{f}</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 , \text{f}</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
potentials have rather longer tails than one would expect from consideration of the two-pion-exchange mechanism. The exponential well with \( c = 0.4 \) \( f \) and \( b^0 = 1.5 \) \( f \) is the one previously considered by Walecka\(^{17} \) and by Moszkowski et al.\(^{18} \). The value \( D^0 = 18 \) MeV obtained here for this well is remarkably close to the value 16 MeV obtained by Moszkowski et al.\(^{18} \) by a rather different method with a slightly larger value of the Fermi momentum \( (k_F = 1.4 \) \( f^{-1} \) \). For the even larger Fermi momentum \( (k_F = 1.48 \) \) used by Walecka\(^{17} \), the calculations described here led to \( D = 52 \) MeV with \( D^0 = 13 \) MeV, \( D^1 = 31 \) MeV and \( D^2 = 7 \) MeV\(^{28} \). A comparison of these results with the corresponding values in Table 2 gives an indication of the dependence of \( D \) on the value of the Fermi momentum. An estimate of this dependence on \( k_F \) can be made from Eqs. (13) and (15) which show that, in first approximation\(^{23} \), \( D_A \) is proportional to \( k_F^3 \) and that \( D_C \) proportional to \( k_F^4 \) \( (c = 1/k_F) \); and the values of \( D_A \) are about 50% greater than the value of \( D_C \).

The calculations leading to Table 4 were made to investigate the dependence of \( D \) on the value of the hard-core radius \( c \). The dependence of \( D_C \) on the core radius is apparent in Eq. (15)\(^{28} \), but the dependence of \( D_A \) on \( c \) is hidden in the factors \( (1 - x) \) and \( f(c/b^0) \) in Eqs. (13) and (14). Comparison of Tables 2 and 4 indicates that \( D \) decreases with increasing hard-core radius, but not nearly so much as one would expect from Eq. (15) alone.

The effective masses play an obvious role in \( D_C \) [see Eq. (15)] and in all the partial-wave contributions \( D_C^j \). Whereas the effective masses do not play a role in \( D_A \) [see Eq. (13)], they do determine the relative contributions of \( D_C^j \): the smaller the value of the reduced mass \( m_N^0 \) of the nucleon, the smaller is the s-wave contribution \( D_A^0 \).

Finally, it should be remarked that the method used in the calculations reported in this section has not been completely justified; it has, in fact, been the subject of some criticism\(^{16} \).
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IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The results reported in Tables 2-4 indicate that a value of D in the range 30-40 MeV might be expected; and these values are consistent with the values reported in Table 1 for a direct A-nucleon interaction. Values of D much larger than 30 MeV are, however, inconsistent with the empirical estimates given in Eq. (1). It remains to be seen whether the value of D will be found to lie in the range (1) or will fall in the higher range 30-40 MeV.

Attempts by Bodmer and Sampanther\(^2\) to bring theoretical estimates into agreement with Eq. (1) by invoking an exchange and/or a three-body component in the A-nucleon interaction have been discussed in Section II.

On the basis of a calculation mentioned near the end of Section III, Walecka\(^1\) suggested that agreement between Eq. (1) and calculated values of D could be obtained if the strength of the A-nucleon interaction is reduced in odd-parity states. The large p-wave contributions to D reported in Tables 2-4 confirm that this suggestion is a possibility.

The two potentials with \(b^0 = 0.7 f\), for which results are reported in Tables 2 and 3, lead to values of D which are pretty close to the largest empirical estimates given in Eq. (1). These potentials, of course, are the ones which lead to relatively small p-wave contributions to D. They may be as unreasonably narrow as those with \(b^0 = 1.5 f\) are wide. In any case, the relatively small values of D obtained with these potentials indicate that a value of D in reasonably good agreement with Eq. (1) might be obtained with a hard-core potential having a narrow, deep body and a longer, weak tail whose parameters would presumably be dictated by the two-pion exchange mechanism.

That the potential which is seen by a A particle imbedded in nuclear matter is expected to be only slightly momentum-dependent\(^1,2\) was mentioned in Section I. This suggests that the central depth of the real part of the optical potential for scattering of low-energy A particles
of heavy nuclei may be very close to D. If this is true, A-nucleus scattering data (when this becomes available) may provide a method for determining D. Preliminary estimates of some of the properties of the A-nucleus optical potential which might be expected have been made by Ram\textsuperscript{30}. He assumed the optical potential to have a central depth of 30 MeV, consistent with the values of D discussed here. A trapezoidal shape appropriate to the nucleon distributions in heavy nuclei\textsuperscript{6} was assumed for computational convenience; a half-density radius $c = 1.1 \ A^{1/3}\ f$ and a skin-thickness $t = 2.4 \ f$ were used\textsuperscript{6}. Ram found that, for $A \geq 64$, the low-energy s-wave scattering parameters (zero-energy scattering length and effective range) of these trapezoidal optical potentials can be reproduced with considerable accuracy by square wells having a depth of 25 MeV and a radius of $1.26 \ A^{1/3}\ f$. Assuming that the same square wells are appropriate to low-energy scattering in states with higher angular momenta, the values of A for which abnormally large cross-sections (resonances) can be expected are easy to determine. For the square well just mentioned, s-wave resonances will occur for target nuclei with mass numbers $A = 31$ and 144, and p-wave resonances will occur for $A = 73$ and 248. These mass numbers are, of course, only suggestive of those which one might hope to be able to establish.

The calculations reported in Section III were made by the author in collaboration with Dr. W.B. Ware of the University of Colorado and the U.S. Air Force Academy. The partial-wave contributions $D^c_A$ and the core contribution $D^c_C$ were evaluated numerically on the IBM 1620 computer at the University of Colorado with the aid of a grant from the National Science Foundation. The author is indebted to Professor S.C. Miller for his assistance with these computations.
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MESSON THEORY OF HYPERON-NUCLEON FORCES
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I. INTRODUCTION

We will assume that the interaction between a hyperon and a nucleon can be described by a local potential. For low energy \( \Lambda \)-nucleon scattering in the \( ^1S_0 \) state we have to solve the Schrödinger equation

\[
-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_\Lambda} \chi'' + (V_1 - E) \chi = 0.
\]  

(1)

To simplify equations we will consider only \( ^1S_0 \) states; no essential features will be lost, however.

From the existence of the reaction

\[
\Lambda + N \rightarrow \Sigma + N
\]

we know that the \( \Lambda \)-nucleon channel is strongly coupled to the \( \Sigma - N \) channel. A description like Eq. (1), taking into account only the \( \Lambda \)-nucleon channel, has to break down if \( E > 77 \text{ MeV} \). In fact it is reasonable to assume that it breaks down much earlier.

A better way to describe the \( \Lambda \)-nucleon interaction is to take also explicitly account of the \( \Sigma \)-nucleon channel. Therefore, we need to consider potentials

\[
V_\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix}
V_{\Lambda\Lambda} & V_{\Lambda\Sigma} \\
V_{\Sigma\Lambda} & V_{\Sigma\Sigma}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(2)

*) On leave from the University of Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands.
with the coupled Schrödinger equations

\[
- \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{\Lambda}} u_\Lambda'' + V_\Lambda \Lambda u_\Lambda + V_\Lambda \Sigma u_\Sigma = E u_\Lambda \\
- \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{\Sigma}} u_\Sigma'' + V_\Sigma \Lambda u_\Lambda + V_\Sigma \Sigma u_\Sigma = (E - \Delta M c^2) u_\Sigma.
\] (3)

Here \( m_{\Lambda} \) and \( m_{\Sigma} \) are the reduced masses in the different channels, and \( \Delta M = M_{\Sigma} - M_{\Lambda} \) is the difference between the rest masses. In solving Eq. (3) for low-energy \( \Lambda \)-nucleon scattering we have to impose the boundary conditions:

if \( r = 0 \) or \( r = r_c \) then \( \begin{cases} u_\Lambda = 0 \\ u_\Sigma = 0 \end{cases} \)

and

if \( r \to \infty \) then \( \begin{cases} u_\Lambda \to \sin(k_{\Lambda} r + \delta) \\ u_\Sigma \to e^{-k r} \end{cases} \)

where

\[
E = \frac{\hbar^2 k_{\Lambda}^2}{2m_{\Lambda}} = \Delta M c^2 - \frac{\hbar^2 k_{\Sigma}^2}{2m_{\Sigma}}.
\]

It is hoped that with a potential like Eq. (2) one can describe the \( \Lambda \)-nucleon scattering up to about 300 MeV, like the nucleon-nucleon scattering can be done. Our task is to determine \( V \).

We will restrict ourselves to the case of even relative parity, which seems to be firmly established by now\(^1,2\).

**II. MESON THEORETICAL POTENTIALS**

At this moment there are many mesons available, each of which could be responsible for a significant part of the hyperon-nucleon forces. We have, for example, the \( Y = 0 \) mesons like \( \pi, \eta, \rho, \omega \), and \( \Delta \gamma \) particle, and the \( Y = \pm 1 \) mesons like \( K \) and \( K^\circ \). The relevant experimental data
are unfortunately still so scarce that from them almost no indication about the importance of the different mesons can be obtained.

To make any progress in understanding these forces one has to rely therefore heavily upon theoretical arguments and upon the experience obtained in the similar problem of the nucleon-nucleon forces.

The theory in the nucleon-nucleon problem is at this moment in a transition phase; the transition being from considering only the pions as the agent of the force, to including in the calculation of the potentials also the recently discovered mesons as $\rho, \omega, \eta, \text{ABC}$, etc. This transition is surely not completed but one is only at the beginning.

We will base our arguments on the older theories [to be specific we will use the Brueckner-Watson prescription] and we will totally neglect the existence of these new mesons. The main justification for considering only pions lies in the fact that a very satisfactory description can be found employing only the pions.

Because of charge independence the interaction Hamiltonian, between the pions and the baryons, in isospace is

$$H_{\text{int}} = f_{NN} (N^+ N^−) \cdot \Pi + f_{\Lambda\Sigma} (\Lambda^+ \Sigma^− + \Sigma^+ \Lambda) \cdot \Pi - i f_{\Sigma\Sigma} (\Sigma^+ \times \Sigma) \cdot \Pi. \quad (4)$$

For the dependence on the space and spin we will always take the form

$$\frac{f}{\mu} (\psi^\dagger \sigma \cdot \Sigma \psi). \quad (5)$$

The different kind of diagrams that contribute are given in Fig. 1. For completeness we give in Fig. 2 the most important diagrams which are neglected.

Using the prescription of Brueckner and Watson we can then calculate the potentials due to the exchange of one and two pions. The complete potential is then characterized by four constants; the coupling constants $f_{\Lambda\Sigma}$ and $f_{\Sigma\Sigma}$, and the cores $x_0$ and $x_1$ in the singlet and triplet states respectively.

We will try to determine these different constants.
III. LOW-ENERGY Λ-NUCLEON SCATTERING \(^7\))

From the different analysis\(^9\) of the light hyperfragments one can estimate the Λ-nucleon scattering lengths. We take\(^7\)

\[ a_0 = - (3.6 \pm 3.6) \text{ fm} \]

\[ a_1 = - (0.53 \pm 0.12) \text{ fm} \]

Using the meson theoretical potentials in Eq. (2) we can, for a fixed \(x_0\) and \(f_{\Sigma^0}^\Lambda\), determine the value of \(f_{\Lambda^0}^\Sigma\) which will give the correct scattering length \(a_0\). This can be done for every value of \(f_{\Sigma^0}^\Lambda\); still keeping the core radius \(x_0\) fixed. For a fixed core we obtain therefore a line in the \((f_{\Lambda^0}^\Sigma, f_{\Sigma^0}^\Lambda)\) diagram (Fig. 3); every point on this line giving the correct \(a_0\). The same procedure can be repeated for different values of the core and also for the triplet case. We notice then that every combination \((f_{\Lambda^0}^\Sigma, f_{\Sigma^0}^\Lambda)\) can reproduce the scattering lengths \(a_0\) and \(a_1\) provided we choose the right cores \(x_0\) and \(x_1\).

To be able to make any conclusion we have to place restrictions on the possible values of the cores. We will assume that the cores are of the same order of magnitude as the cores in the nucleon-nucleon problem, therefore

\[ 0.30 \leq x_0 \leq 0.40 \mu^{-1} \]

Despite the fact that this drastically limits the possible values for \(f_{\Lambda^0}^\Sigma\) and \(f_{\Sigma^0}^\Lambda\), it still leaves us with quite a large choice (see Fig. 3).

IV. LOW-ENERGY Σ\(^-\)p AND Σ\(^-\)d INTERACTIONS \(^1\)°

When Σ\(^-\) hyperons come to rest in hydrogen they form Σ\(^-\)p atoms, which decay due to the reactions

\[ \Sigma^- + p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 + n^- 3.16 \text{ MeV} \]
\[ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 + n^- 79.30 \text{ MeV} \]
The measured ratio\textsuperscript{11) is } \( r_R(H) = \Sigma^0/\Xi^0 + \Lambda^0 = 0.33 \pm 0.05 \).
Using the cores, \( x_0 \) and \( x_1 \), which give the correct scattering lengths, this ratio \( r_R(H) \) is calculated for different combinations \( (f_{\Lambda \Sigma}, f_{\Sigma \Xi}) \).
This gives a limitation on \( f_{\Sigma \Xi} \). Only those values of \( f_{\Xi \Xi} \) are allowed which lie to the left of the line \( H \) in Fig. 3. This allowable region extends to slightly negative values of \( f_{\Xi \Xi} \).

An analogous reaction is
\[
\Sigma^- + d \rightarrow \Sigma^0 + 2n + 0.94 \text{ MeV} \\
\rightarrow \Lambda + 2n + 77.08 \text{ MeV}.
\]

The measured ratio at rest is\textsuperscript{12) } \( r_R(D) = 0.037 \pm 0.022 \). Also this ratio is calculated\textsuperscript{10,13) }.
This restricts \( f_{\Sigma \Xi} \) to lie to the left of the line \( D \) in Fig. 3.

V. UNITARY SYMMETRY

The unitary symmetry model\textsuperscript{14) } (octet model) of strong interactions predicts the relation
\begin{equation}
\sqrt{3} f_{\Lambda \Sigma} + f_{\Sigma \Xi} = 2f_{NN}
\end{equation}
if we assume that the basic couplings are pseudovector\textsuperscript{7) }. This is described by the straight line in Fig. 3. If the basic couplings are pseudoscalar\textsuperscript{7) } then the relation is:
\[ \sqrt{3} \left( \frac{m_\Lambda + m_\Xi}{2} \right) f_{\Lambda \Sigma} + m_\Xi f_{\Xi \Xi} = 2m_N f_{NN}. \]
However, in the latter case a restriction to only pion couplings is perhaps not justified and kaon exchange potentials should be included in the analysis.
A-A POTENTIAL

We can, of course, consider the low-energy A-A interactions. Due to the recent discovery\(^{15}\) of a double hyperfragment this becomes quite interesting. If we restrict ourselves again to only pion forces, then we have again a set of coupled equations like Eq. (2). We can calculate the Brueckner-Watson potentials and determine the scattering length as a function of the core and the coupling constants. Using the relation\(^9\)

\[
\bar{V} = \frac{\hbar^2}{m_\Lambda} \frac{4\pi a}{1 - 1.23 a/b}
\] (7)

we can translate the scattering lengths into volume integrals \(\bar{V}\) of the potential. The range parameter is \(b = 1.484.3\) f corresponding to a two-pion range.

The volume integral as a function of the coupling constant \(f_{\Sigma\Sigma}\) is given in Fig. 4. The constant \(f_{\Lambda\Sigma}\) is determined by unitary P.V. symmetry [Eq. (6)].

VII. EQUIVALENT POTENTIAL

Finally, we want to consider potentials like \(V_1\) [see Eq. (1)] anyway. How can we deduce a reasonable \(V_1\) from the knowledge of the potential \(V_2\) [Eq. (2)]?

To obtain the correct phase shift we need a solution \(\chi\) of Eq. (1) such that if \(r \to \infty\), then \(\chi \to u_\Lambda\). The choice \(\chi(r) = u_\Lambda(r)\) everywhere would give us the correct scattering length at the energy considered. However, it will not give the same effective range in both cases.

The effective range is given by

\[
r_0 = 2 \int_0^\infty (v^2 - \chi^2) \, dr
\] (8)

for the one-channel Eq. (1), where \(v = \sin(k_\Lambda r + \delta)/\sin \delta\) and by

\[
r_0 = 2 \int_0^\infty (v^2 - u_\Lambda^2 - u_B^2) \, dr
\] (9)

for the two-channel Eq. (3).
To obtain thus the same scattering length and the same effective range in both cases, we have to take

$$\chi = u_A \sqrt{1 - \frac{u_R^2}{u_A^2}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

For $E = 0$ scattering $u_A$ has no zeros (a = negative) and Eq. (10) is a good wave function. This $\chi$ is a solution of Eq. (1), if

$$V_1 = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_A} \left( \frac{x''}{x} \right)$$

$$= \frac{u_A^2}{u_A^2 + u_2^2} V_{\Lambda \Lambda} + \frac{2u_A u_2}{u_A^2 + u_2^2} \left( \frac{m_\Lambda + m_2}{2m_A} \right) V_{\Lambda \Sigma}$$

$$+ \frac{u_3^2}{u_3^2 + m_3} \left[ V_{\Sigma \Sigma} + (M_\Sigma - M_\Lambda) \sigma^2 \right] + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_\Lambda} \left( \frac{u_3^2 u_3'}{u_3^2 + u_3'^2} \right)^2.$$

Therefore, if we solve the system of Eq. (3) for $E = 0$, then we can construct readily the potential $V_1$, which will give the correct $a_0$ and $r_0$. Important is this for the triplet case, because the same procedure is applicable there and we can construct therefore easily a potential with the correct amount of tensor force, etc., to describe the low energy $A$-nucleon scattering.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Any conclusion is dependent on our answer to: "what is a reasonable core?" As long as we do not have a satisfactory way of treating the cores, our conclusions have to be viewed with the proper caution.

The following conclusions can then be made. If we neglect the $K$ mesons, a rather satisfactory way of describing the hyperon-nucleon interaction can be found. The coupling constant $f_{\Lambda \Sigma}$ is of the same order as $f_{NN}$, but $f_{\Sigma \Sigma}$ is much smaller,

$$\left( a = \frac{f_{\Sigma \Sigma}}{2f_{NN}} \leq \frac{1}{5} \right).$$
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Fig. 1. - The one and two-pion exchange diagrams which contribute to the different hyperon-nucleon potentials.

Fig. 2. - The most important one-meson exchange diagrams which are neglected in the calculation of the hyperon-nucleon potentials.
Fig. 3. - The $f_{\Lambda} - f_{\Sigma}$ diagram.

The dashed lines represent the values of $(f_{\Lambda}, f_{\Sigma})$ which give the correct scattering length $a_0$ for a fixed core $x_0$.

The solid lines represent the values of $(f_{\Lambda'}, f_{\Sigma})$ which give the correct scattering length $a_1$ for a fixed core $x_1$.

The line marked H are those points where $r_H(H) = 0.33 + 0.05$.

The points to the left of this line give $r_H(D)$ within the experimental limits. The line marked D are those points where $r_H(D) = 0.037 + 0.022$. The points to the left of this line give $r_H(D)$ within the experimental limits.

The line US gives the combinations $(f_{\Lambda}, f_{\Sigma})$ which are required by unitary symmetry (pseudovector coupling).

Fig. 4. - The volume integral of the $i=I$ potential as a function of $f_{\Sigma}$

The corresponding $f_{\Sigma}$ is chosen to be consistent with unitary P.V. symmetry (6). The results for different core radii are given. $\bar{V} \geq 530$ MeV fm$^3$ corresponds to a bound state.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A reasonable classification of the information obtained in the study of hypernuclei may be made according to its bearing on the following three areas of physical problems:

1) the properties of the nuclear interactions of the hyperons;
2) the weak interactions of the Λ hyperon;
3) the properties of nuclei.

Here we shall survey briefly some of the questions of current or future interest in these areas, as well as some of the experiments which appear feasible in the near future and which will bear directly on these questions.

II. THE NUCLEAR INTERACTIONS OF THE HYPERONS

From the study of binding energies of Λ hypernuclei, we have already learned a great deal about the qualitative properties of the Λ-N interaction in the $^1S_0$ and $^3S_1$ states, and this information has been given an interpretation by de Swart and Iddings in terms of the properties of the pion-hyperon couplings $\Sigma\pi$ and $\Sigma\omega$. However, there are still many questions of detail about the Λ-N forces about which we know little.

*) Work supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.
i) The exchange character of the A-N interaction.
The exchange of a K or K* meson between A and N will give rise
to an exchange term in the A-N potential. There are theoretical
reasons to believe that this will not be a significantly large
term but this needs to be checked directly.

ii) The tensor potential contribution to the A-N interaction.
Meson-theoretical calculations suggest that there is no reason to
expect this to be a large term for the A-N system, in contrast
with the N-N situation.

iii) The nature of the hard core interaction in the A-N interaction.
This information would be enlightening on the origin of the hard
core in baryon-baryon interactions. At present, the most
attractive hypothesis is that this hard core repulsion arises
primarily from a universal and very strong coupling of the baryon
with a neutral vector meson field (possibly the ω meson). This
hypothesis would require the A-N hard core to have radius comparable
with that for the N-N system, apart from small modifications due to
the exchange of other vector mesons such as the ρ, K* and φ, which
appear to be less strongly coupled to baryons and which have different
couplings for different baryon multiplets.

iv) The spin-orbit coupling for the A-N system.
The most natural origin for strong spin-orbit forces in a baryon-
baryon system is the exchange of vector mesons, so that this question
may have quite direct relationship with (iii). In this view it is
natural to expect a strong spin-orbit interaction in the A-N system,
just as is known for the N-N system, and it will be very informative
to learn about its sign and strength.

Probably it will be quite difficult to learn about these questions
from A hypernuclei. In p-shell hypernuclei, the s-wave A particle interacts
with p-shell nucleons and so the magnitudes of the exchange component and
especially of the spin-orbit interaction are relevant to the B( A value and
the pattern of excited levels in these nuclei. More accurate and reliable
$B_\Lambda$ values for a wide range of $\Lambda$ hypernuclei are very desirable to allow a more detailed study of their systematics in this region. Another parameter directly relevant to these questions is the well depth $D_\Lambda$ of nuclear matter for a $\Lambda$ particle; $D_\Lambda$ depends quite strongly on the properties of the $p$-wave $\Lambda-N$ interaction.

Experiments on $\Lambda p$ scattering would naturally give much more direct information about the $\Lambda-N$ interaction, but these are generally rather difficult experiments, in view of the short lifetime of the $\Lambda$ particle. One possibility is the use of $\Lambda$ particles from the reaction $K^- + p \to \Lambda + \pi^0$ for $K^-$ coming to rest in liquid hydrogen; this provides a copious source of $\Lambda$ particles of $32$ MeV kinetic energy (there are also lower energy $\Lambda$ particles from the $\Sigma^0 + \pi^0$, $\Sigma^0 \to \Lambda + \gamma$ sequence) and a search for the rare $\Lambda p$ scattering events near these $K^-$ stops can be carried out rather quickly and efficiently. In this way it should be possible to obtain a good value for $\sigma_{\text{tot}}(\Lambda p)$ for $\Lambda p$ c.m. energies in the $s$-wave region, which should provide an interesting check on the $\Lambda-N$ potentials deduced from hypernuclear $B_\Lambda$ values. These $\Lambda$ particles are necessarily unpolarized; a source of strongly polarized $\Lambda$ particles would allow much more informative experiments. For $\pi^-$ momenta in the range $1,000-1,500$ MeV/c at least, the reaction $\pi^- + p \to \Lambda + K^0$ leads to strongly polarized $\Lambda$ particles with an angular distribution strongly peaked in the backward direction, thus giving quite strong production of relatively slow $\Lambda$ particles with strong polarization. In due course it may be possible to make use of these particles to study some polarization properties of $\Lambda p$ scattering; already a number of $\Lambda p$ scattering events have been observed in this way$^2,3)$ and used to estimate an average value $\overline{\sigma}_{\text{tot}}(\Lambda p) = 25 \pm 10$ mb over the laboratory momentum range $400-640$ MeV/c (c.m. kinetic energy range 60-76 MeV). The simplest polarization property to measure is the mean depolarization of the $\Lambda$ particles due to $\Lambda p$ scattering; this parameter is directly related to the relative strengths of the singlet and the triplet $\Lambda-N$ scattering. Possibly experiments of this kind will prove possible with spark chambers, using a hydrogen target inside the chamber; this would allow the collection of events at a much
more reasonable rate. Another possibility would be the study of secondary $\Lambda$-$N$ collisions for $\Lambda$ particles which are produced on one nucleon in $\pi$-$d$ or $K^-d$ collisions and then collide with the other nucleon of the same nucleus. These events could be selected by requiring the presence of both a $\Lambda$ particle and a fast nucleon in the final state, confining attention to nucleon momenta well above the momentum distribution which is known for "by-stander nucleons" (and which is well fitted by the distribution calculated with the impulse approximation and with a simple deuteron wavefunction) in high-energy processes involving deuterium as target. The simplest such situation to interpret would be the study of $\pi$-$d$ reactions for pion energy well below the threshold for $\Sigma$ production, since this would ensure that the intermediate hyperon was predominantly a $\Lambda$ particle.

Similar studies of $\Sigma^-$-$p$ and $\Sigma^+$-$p$ cross-sections, using hydrogen chambers or spark chamber methods, would also be of great value in providing new parameters to relate to the primary mechanisms giving rise to hyperon-nucleon forces.

The study of hyperfragment production rates in specific hyperon reactions should also prove quite informative on the detailed character of the primary hyperon-nucleon interactions. For example, whereas $\Lambda$-$^4H$ and $\Lambda$-$^6He$ are produced in about 20% of $K^-He^4$ reactions which lead to a primary $\Lambda$ particle (identified by the characteristic momentum of the associated $\pi^-$ meson), not more than one example of $\Lambda$-$^4H$ has been observed in 300 examples of $\Sigma^-+He^4$ capture at rest. This low rate of $\Lambda$-$^4H$ formation (which involves about the same momentum transfer as occurs in the $K^-+He^4 \rightarrow \Lambda+He^4+\pi^-$ reaction) is probably related with the detailed spin character of the interaction $\Sigma^-+p \rightarrow \Lambda+n$.

The recent and remarkable observation of a $\Lambda\Lambda$ hypernucleus by the Warsaw group as part of a large European collaborative effort has opened up a large new field of research. When suitable methods are developed to increase the yield of slow $\Xi^-$ mesons which can be stopped in emulsion, the study of the $\Lambda\Lambda$ hypernuclei formed will quickly lead to a rather accurate value for the $\Lambda-\Lambda$ interaction in the $^1S_0$ state. For this
determination observations on the system $^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{He}^6$ will be of particular interest since this is the system for which the most reliable calculations can be made at present. From the study of the heavier systems, we may expect to learn further about the spin-dependent term in the $\Lambda$-nucleus interaction (about which we have some indications from $\Lambda$-hypermolecular $B_\Lambda$ values) and about the distortion of the core nuclei by the presence of several $\Lambda$ particles. The study of specific capture reactions of particular simplicity will also be important; to illustrate this we may mention the reaction $^3\text{He} + ^{\Lambda}\text{Li}^7 \rightarrow ^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{H}^4 + ^{\Lambda}\text{He}^4$, whose interest [as pointed out by Wilkinson] lies in the fact that the final state consists of two identical spinless particles. It will also be of interest to study the angular correlations between the two successive $\Lambda$ decays of the $^{\Lambda\Lambda}$ hypernuclei, for example in the sequence $^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{He}^6 \rightarrow \pi^- + ^{\Lambda}\text{Li}^7 \rightarrow \pi^- + ^{\Lambda}\text{He}^4$ ($J = 2^+$), which provide a direct check on the spin value for $^{\Lambda}\text{Li}^7$. Probably studies of this kind should not be made in emulsion since the atomic fields probably suffice to destroy the alignment of the $^{\Lambda}\text{Li}^7$ during the relatively long time ($\sim 10^{-10}$ sec) it remains at rest awaiting the second $\Lambda$ decay. The study of the branching ratios for the various decay modes of $^{\Lambda\Lambda}$ hypernuclei would also provide a check on many of our present beliefs about the decay of bound $\Lambda$ particles. To provide an example, we may consider $^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{H}^5$ and its two-body decay mode $^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{H}^5 \rightarrow \pi^- + ^{\Lambda}\text{He}^4$. With $J = 1$ expected for $^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{H}^5$, and $J = 0$ for $^{\Lambda}\text{He}^4$, this decay requires $l = 1$ for the pion and can therefore occur only through the relatively weak $p$ interaction for $\Lambda$ decay: hence the two-body decay modes for $^{\Lambda\Lambda}\text{H}^5$ may be expected to be relatively rare, in contrast with the situation for $^{\Lambda}\text{H}^5$.

Now that an example of the $^{\Lambda\Lambda}$ hypernucleus has been established, it appears reasonable to mention the possibility of forming hypernuclei containing three $\Lambda$ particles. The systematics of the $p_{3/2}$ meson-baryon resonances, the $N_{3/2}^*$ (1238 MeV), the $Y^*_1$ (1385 MeV), strongly suggest the existence of a further state, the $\Omega^-$ baryon with mass about 1680 MeV$^7,8)$. This object has not yet been established, although there was an event reported by Eisenberg in 1954 which may have been an example of $\Omega^-$ decay. The point is that this $\Omega^-$ baryon is predicted to be long-lived, with decay
modes $\pi^+\Sigma$, $K^-\Lambda$ and $\bar{K}+\Sigma$ due to the weak interactions, and to have strangeness $s = -3$. When the $\Omega^-$ particle comes to rest in emulsion and interacts with a nucleus, the following one- and two-nucleon capture processes are possible:

$$\Omega^- + p \rightarrow \Sigma^- + \Lambda \quad (1)$$
$$\Omega^- + p + n \rightarrow \Lambda + \Lambda + \Lambda. \quad (2)$$

In Eq. (1), if the $\Sigma^-$ hyperon undergoes a second interaction in the same nucleus, or in Eq. (2), the effect of the capture process would be to release three $\Lambda$ particles within the nucleus. Even though the net energy release is quite high [$\sim 110$ MeV for reaction (2)], there is a finite probability that all three $\Lambda$ particles may be trapped to form a $\Lambda\Lambda\Lambda$ hypernucleus. In such a system the lowest state available to the third $\Lambda$ particle is a $p$-state, in consequence of the Pauli principle. This condition will forbid the binding of the three $\Lambda$ particles to the lightest nuclei, since the $p$-level of the $\Lambda$-nucleus interaction is bound only for sufficiently large core nuclei. The simplest estimates suggest that $\Lambda\Lambda\Lambda\text{Be}^{11}$ should certainly be stable; this system could be formed in reactions such as

$$\Omega^- + \text{C}^{12} \rightarrow \Lambda\Lambda\Lambda\text{Be}^{11} + n + p. \quad (3)$$

III. THE WEAK INTERACTIONS OF THE $\Lambda$ HYPERON

The study of the $\beta$ decay processes for hypernuclei could usefully complement studies of the properties of $\Lambda-\beta$ decay carried out for free $\Lambda$ particles. Processes of particular interest which may be studied in a helium bubble chamber are

$$\Lambda^H^+ \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu} + \text{He}^4 \quad (4a)$$
$$\Lambda^H^+ \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu} + \text{He}^4. \quad (4b)$$

With $J = 0$ for $\Lambda^H^+$, these processes represent zero-zero transitions which are allowed only through the Fermi part of the $\Lambda_e$ and $\Lambda_\mu$ interactions so that a knowledge of their rate would allow a direct separation between the
Fermi and Gamow-Teller terms in these interactions. This information
may also be obtained from studies of the $\beta$ decay of free polarized
$\Lambda$ particles. The greatest difficulty in the study of processes (4)
will be the problem of low statistics; the branching ratio for these
processes in $\Lambda^4H^2$ is expected to be of the order of $10^{-3}$ so that there
is no advantage in this respect over the study of free $\Lambda$ decay.

The lifetimes of the light hypernuclei form a subject of
great interest, especially in view of the short lifetimes which have
recently been found for $\Lambda^4H^3$ by two different investigations
$^{10,11}$. This result is very much of a surprise, in view of the light binding in
$\Lambda^4H^3$; it is difficult to obtain a lifetime much shorter than $1.8 \times 10^{-10}$ sec
from the theoretical calculations which have given a good account of the
branching ratios observed for $\Lambda^4H^3$ and other light hypernuclei. Until this
short lifetime is understood, there is reason for some scepticism about
our progress in the quantitative understanding of the weak interaction
processes in hypernuclei, so that it is of importance to confirm this result
and to establish more accurate lifetimes for the other light hypernuclei
$\Lambda^4H^4$, $\Lambda^5H^4$ and $\Lambda^5H^5$.

Observations on hypernuclei offer the only means available
for the study of the weak interaction

$$\Lambda + N \rightarrow N + N$$

(5)
giving rise to non-mesic de-excitation of the $\Lambda$ particle. There has
already been a great clarification in our knowledge of the charge and
spin dependence of this interaction, due to the data available on $\Lambda^4He^4$
studies in the helium chamber $^{10}$. Direct studies of the non-mesic rates
for $\Lambda^4H^4$ and $\Lambda^5H^5$ (and also for $\Lambda^4H^3$, although here the rate expected is
quite small, due to the low $\Lambda$ binding) would be very valuable at this point,
both of the total rates and of the $(\Lambda p)/(\Lambda n)$ ratio. Data on the rates
(or branching ratios) for specific modes of decay, such as

$$\Lambda^5He^4 \rightarrow n + He^3$$

(6a)

$$\rightarrow p + H^3$$

(6b)

$$\rightarrow p + n + H^2,$$

(6c)
would also provide valuable information. The decay rates for specific modes would also allow further tests of the $\Delta I = 1/2$ rule for interaction (5); at present the only test available involves the inequality 
\[ \Gamma_{\Lambda n}(\Lambda H^2) \leq 2 \Gamma_{\Lambda n}(\text{He}^4), \]
which appears to be just satisfied. The comparison of the absolute rates for the modes (6a), (6b) and for
\[ \Lambda H^2 \to n + H^3 \tag{7} \]
provide another inequality, $R(n\text{He}^3) + R(pH^3) \geq \frac{1}{2} R(nH^3)$, which can give a further test of the $\Delta I = 1/2$ rule in this process (5).

The spin dependence of the interaction (5) may be investigated to some extent by comparing the $\Lambda H^2$, $\Lambda \text{He}^4$ and $\Lambda \text{He}^3$ rates, especially the rates for the individual two-body modes. However, there will be both parity-conserving and parity-reversing terms in this interaction and these can be separated only by polarization studies. These require observations on the angular distribution of non-mesic decay, relative to the polarization direction for the initial hypernucleus, for example for $\Lambda \text{He}^3$ decay, or on the longitudinal polarization of the high-energy nucleons emitted from each of the light hypernuclei. The study of polarization correlations between the two fast nucleons emerging from non-mesic decay will probably also be necessary before a complete analysis of the spin dependence of the non-mesic interactions can be made.

There is the possibility that multinucleon contributions to the non-mesic $\Lambda$ decay rate may complicate the situation. It appears difficult to separate these processes from the process (5) on a purely empirical basis, since there can always be final state interactions which involve further nucleons. In light hypernuclei, complicated final states, involving the emission of a fast deuteron or a roughly equal sharing of the energy between three final particles, can occur even without invoking secondary interactions, as has been shown for the case of $\pi^- + \text{He}^4$ capture by the calculations of Eckstein\(^{12}\). The identification of multinucleon terms will require the observation of detailed deviations from the results of calculation based on the two-body interaction (5). Probably the proper procedure is to assume that the de-excitation process is dominantly of the type (5), until data turns up which cannot be reconciled with this hypothesis.
The absolute strength of the interaction (5) is of particular interest. One parameter directly relevant to this is the lifetime for a large hypernucleus (say A ~ 100-200). This lifetime could probably be measured by electronic techniques, by studying the occurrence of large energy releases following K\(^-\) capture in heavy nuclei with delay times of the order of 10\(^{-10}\) sec. The present data suggests that this interaction (5) is intrinsically weaker than that of the nuclear β decay interaction by about an order of magnitude; however, it is difficult to make this comparison meaningful until more is known about the form of the interaction (5).

IV. NUCLEAR PHYSICS AND HYPERNUCLEI

1. Nuclei away from the stability valley

Very little is known about the properties of many nuclear species with excess neutrons or protons relative to the normal species, such as H\(^5\), He\(^7\), He\(^8\), C\(^9\), etc. In most cases it is not even known empirically whether these systems have particle stable ground states. These systems are generally quite difficult to form in the kind of nuclear reactions which have been most convenient for experiment in the past, since they usually involve the transfer of at least two neutrons or two protons to (or from) the stable target nucleus. When these systems are formed (at a low rate), it is often difficult to establish their identity conclusively with the usual techniques. For example, the emulsion technique is very convenient for the detailed study of individual rare events; there have been reported in the literature several events following high-energy nuclear disintegrations\(^{13}\), which may represent C\(^9\) B\(^9\) B\(^{9+}\) Be\(^9\) \(\rightarrow\) n + 2α, but even with this striking sequence of phenomena, it has been difficult to establish conclusively even the existence of bound C\(^9\). Similarly, there have recently been reports\(^{14}\) of the observation of the β decay of H\(^5\), following γ + Li\(^7\) reactions at high energy, but here again the arguments are sufficiently indirect as to allow question concerning this interpretation of the observations.
Any of these "exotic nuclei" which are particle stable will certainly form a \( \Lambda \) hypernucleus, and this will even be the case for many nuclear systems for which there is no stable ground state since a bound \( \Lambda \) particle generally adds at least an additional MeV to the stability of the system with respect to removal of the least strongly-bound nucleon\(^{15}\). \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{Be}} \text{\textsuperscript{7}} \) provides a well-known example of this situation, for there is no bound state \( \text{Be}^{6} \); from an accurate knowledge of \( B_{\Lambda} \) for \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{Be}} \text{\textsuperscript{7}} \) it would be possible to deduce (after some necessary corrections) the position of the lowest level of \( \text{Be}^{6} \). In these "exotic hypernuclei", it is the last nucleon which has the least binding; in \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{Be}} \text{\textsuperscript{7}} \) the last proton has binding \( B_{p} = 0.4 \pm 0.5 \) MeV, compared with \( B_{\Lambda} = 3.5 \) MeV (relative to \( \text{He}^{4} + 2p \)). The formation rate for these lightly-bound hypernuclei may be expected to be quite appreciable; \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{Li}} \text{\textsuperscript{8}} \), with \( B_{\Lambda} = 0.2 \) MeV, is a well-known system and the formation rate for \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{Be}} \text{\textsuperscript{7}} \) must also be quite appreciable [since the two identified events represent only the (strongly suppressed) \( \pi^{-} \) mode]. Then, in the \( \Lambda \to p + \pi^{-} \) decay for the bound \( \Lambda \) particle, the relatively large energy release gives rise to fragments whose tracks are frequently long enough to allow identification and accurate measurement; the interpretation of the hypernucleus may be checked by the requirements that the momenta balance and that the \( B_{\Lambda} \) value obtained agrees with the known pattern of \( B_{\Lambda} \) values for neighbouring hypernuclei. For example, the systems \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{He}} \text{\textsuperscript{3}} \), \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{He}} \text{\textsuperscript{6}} \), \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{Li}} \text{\textsuperscript{10}} \), \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{O}} \text{\textsuperscript{16}} \), etc. are all to be expected, and perhaps even neutral systems such as \( _{\Lambda}^{\text{H}} \text{\textsuperscript{6}} \) (following a recent report\(^{16} \)) that \( \pi^{+} \) may have a bound state at \(-4 \) MeV) may be observed in work with propane chambers.

Little is known about the existence and properties of light nuclei with high isospin, \( I \geq \frac{3}{2} \), and it is quite possible that observations on "exotic \( \Lambda \) hypernuclei" may allow some more convenient and conclusive evidence to be obtained concerning such nuclei. We should emphasize that the process of \( K^{-} \) capture with \( \pi^{+} \) emission, or of \( \Sigma^{-} \) capture with proton emission, can readily lead to the charge changes necessary to reach the neutron-rich systems; the proton-rich systems may be less readily accessible, although it is relatively easy to emit several neutrons in these formation reactions, in view of the large kinetic energy released.
2. Excited states of hypernuclei

A hypernuclei will generally possess excited states, some of which may be particle stable. Some of these states may even be metastable, i.e. they may undergo A decay preferentially, rather than γ decay. For example, Danyss and Pniewski have suggested that the first excited state of $^7_{\Lambda}$He (which will have $J = \frac{3}{2}^+$) may be metastable, a possibility which may account for unusual spread in the $B_\Lambda$ value reported for $^7_{\Lambda}$He events; Pniewski has also pointed out that $^{17}_{\Lambda}$C ($\frac{1}{2}^+$) at 6 MeV would also be metastable, at least that the A decay and (e^+e^-) decay modes would be competitive for this system. However, generally, these excited states will decay by γ emission; for example, the second excited state of $^7_{\Lambda}$He (which will have $J = \frac{5}{2}^+$) may be expected to decay by an M1 transition to the $J = \frac{3}{2}^+$ excited state of $^7_{\Lambda}$He.

Questions of interest in connection with these γ transitions are as follows.

i) The energies of the excited states.

It is conceivable that these may be observed from the study of production reactions, in favourable cases where the levels are widely spaced. For example, the first level of $^{13}_{\Lambda}$C may be expected at an excitation energy of about 4 MeV, and its formation might be distinguished from ground state formation in the reaction

$$K^- + {^4N} \rightarrow ^{12}_{\Lambda}C + p + \pi^-.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

On the other hand, it may be feasible to observe the γ rays directly (which would generally be a more satisfactory procedure) with the use of counter techniques. Mesic X-rays have been observed at Berkeley for K^- stopping in various light materials, and the possibility of observing the γ rays emitted from the resulting A hypernuclei has been considered by Ashmore and Falla in a communication to this conference. Observations on the locations of these excited states would give additional evidence on the spin dependence of the A-nucleon interaction; for example, the attachment of a A particle to Li^6 forms two levels, the ground level
with spin \( \frac{1}{2}^+ \) and an excited level with spin \( \frac{3}{2}^+ \), their splitting being due directly to the spin dependent term in the \( \Lambda-N \) potential. Also, such information could frequently give an informative test of current theories of nuclear structure. For example, in \( \Lambda \text{Be}^8^* \) the \( J = 2^+ \) level \( \text{Be}^8^* \) at 3 MeV gives rise to two excited levels with spins \( \frac{3}{2}^+ \) and \( \frac{5}{2}^+ \). If L-S coupling holds, or if the a particle model were valid for \( \text{Be}^8^* \), the splitting between these levels should vanish, whereas their splitting should be quite large for nuclear \( j-j \) coupling; the magnitude of this splitting actually gives a measure of the degree of intermediate coupling appropriate to \( \text{Be}^8^* \).

ii) \((\gamma,\gamma')\) and \((\gamma,\pi)\) angular correlation studies can be made between the hypernuclear \( \gamma \) rays and with the final decay pion. These could provide direct tests of the spin values predicted for these excited states.

iii) The measurement of \( \gamma \) lifetimes for selected transitions. These lifetimes will provide tests of theoretical calculations of the structure of the hypernuclear wavefunctions in selected cases; for all transitions they will depend on the \( \Lambda \) magnetic moment (which will probably have been determined by experiments on the free \( \Lambda \) particle, by the time hypernuclear \( \gamma \) lifetimes can be determined).

3. Branching ratios for mesic decay of hypernuclei

For the transitions

\[
(\Lambda^Z, A^+) \rightarrow \pi^- + (Z+1)A^* \tag{9}
\]

the relative transition rates to various final states will provide tests of the structure of the wavefunctions for the hypernucleus \( \Lambda^Z, A \) and for the nuclear states \((Z+1)A^*\). For example, the rate for the decay mode

\[
\Lambda^7 \rightarrow \pi^- + \text{Be}^8^* \quad (J = 2^+, I = 1)
\]

depends quite strongly on the nuclear coupling scheme \( 2^0 \), being forbidden through the \( s \)-interaction of \( \Lambda \) decay for L-S coupling (since the transition is then \( ^1\text{P}_1 \rightarrow ^3\text{P}_2 \), which requires spin-flip) and being quite strong for \( j-j \) coupling.
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VIII. AFTER-DINNER TALK
PART VIII

AFTER-DINNER TALK GIVEN BY PROFESSOR C.F. POWELL

H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, Royal Fort, Bristol.

Let me say how much we have all enjoyed the Conference which has been organized here under the auspices of CERN; and how deeply, certainly we in Europe, appreciate the existence and the continuing success of CERN. I would like to think, too, that our many friends here from the United States of America, Poland, India and Latin America, appreciate the advantages created by this Institution. It really would be a poor world, for our friends in America for example, if they did not have some people to keep them on their toes; and surely it is a function of CERN to provide them also with valid excuses for frequent agreeable visits to this most delectable Continent of Europe.

Of course, to speak more seriously, the CERN Organization greatly benefits from the fact that it can attract to its Conferences and to the work in the Laboratory, people from all over the world for long and for short periods. Long may it continue.

This Conference was of particular interest to me because it transported me, in a vivid way, back in time through about 15 years. This afternoon our Polish colleagues described their remarkable observation which establishes the existence of nuclei with two Λ particles in them and tells us something about the Λ-Λ interaction. We asked: "How long must it be before we can expect to get a second one?" The answer was: "Well maybe in two years, maybe in six months." The factor is impossible to predict on the statistics of one. I was reminded of a situation 15 years ago, when some of us in Bristol found an event which we called a τ meson. The analysis looked convincing, but we said, "Yes, one is all very well, but we would like two. How long will it take to get another one?" Those
of you who are hoping for a great extension in the library of A-A particles may be heartened to learn that it took us two years before we got our second τ.

This A-A event reminded me also that 20 years ago we were being told that the photographic method was really dead, only it would not lie down. Of course no technique can remain pre-eminent and the field of activity with emulsions has become much more restricted than it was; but it is very remarkable how frequently the method has allowed decisive conclusions to be drawn from a single observation. With this A-A event we have another illustration. I am reminded of a famous remark of Napoleon. Whenever he was presented with a young man for military advancement, he invariably asked the question: "Is he lucky?" This was by no means a casual inquiry. The important quality for which he was seeking was - does this man put himself in a situation where he can be lucky? If you fail to put yourself in a situation where it is possible to have good fortune then you cannot have any success; if you do, you may. So I hope that in that field of experiment we are going to discuss tomorrow, which Professor Dalitz is going to review, and which is so well-adapted to work with emulsions, we shall all be vigorous and energetic in the future.

One final remark that Professor Weisskopf asked me to make about our present situation in physics. We, of course, are the heirs of all the ages. We sometimes think, and in a certain sense it is true, that our experience is unique. However, men in the past have also been through the kind of excitement, the delight in investigation, which we so much enjoy, and this enthusiasm is well illustrated by a remark of Clerk Maxwell's made nearly one hundred years ago. I mentioned it to Weisskopf and he asked me to repeat it to you. If I remember it right it runs: "The mind of man is not like Fourier's heated body, continually settling down to a state of quiet uniformity, the character of which we can already predict. It is rather like a tree, shooting out branches which adapt themselves to the new aspects of the air towards which they climb, or roots which contort themselves among the strange strata of the earth into which they delve. For us who breathe only the spirit of our own age, and who know only the
characteristics of contemporary thought, it is as difficult to anticipate the general tone of the science of the future as it is to predict the particular discoveries it will make. Experimental science is continually revealing to us new features of natural processes and we are thus compelled to search for new forms of thought appropriate for their description." He goes on to refer to the importance of a close study of the relations between mathematical theories and physical reality, so that we may see when it is safe to import mathematical conceptions into one branch of physics from another.

You will see that these remarks from 90 or 100 years ago breathe very much the spirit of our own times and closely anticipate the nature of our own activity. A delight in colours and textures, enquiry into the nature of things, appears very early in human life and it can be encouraged or frustrated in the child or in the man. In our times it is more important than ever before that it should flourish at all levels. Both for the health of natural philosophy in Europe, and indeed throughout the whole world, the progress and support of CERN is of very great importance. I therefore come back to my old friend Weisskopf, and want to propose a toast: "To the Institution of CERN and its Director-General."

* * *
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APPENDIX A

COLLECTION OF HYPER_FRAGMENT_DATA
COLLECTION OF HYPERFRAGMENT DATA

The following partial report of the discussion following Levi Setti's talk on 27 March, 1963, explains the situation.

**Denysz**: Following upon what Dr. Levi Setti said earlier, I would like to propose that it would be of interest for experimentalists to have a library of raw experimental data concerning hyperfragments. In publications, final results only are given, and I think it would be most interesting for those who work in the field and for the others to be able to obtain raw experimental data of analysed hyperfragments from a library where this material will be available to anybody who asks for it. And I think I will propose a place for it: the Chicago Laboratory would be the most suitable if they would like to take up the hard work of organizing such a library.

**Levi Setti**: I think that the suggestion is excellent in matter of principle, and as a matter of fact I would very much like to see this library start building up at CERN. On my side, I have already contributed a tabulation of all the mesic decays that have been analysed in Chicago, and have obtained assurance from Dr. Ammar that he also would be glad to contribute the information available at Northwestern University on mesic decays, so that I think this will be, if agreeable, certainly an excellent solution.

**Powell**: In connection with this suggestion of Denysz about making a library, I wondered would it not be a good plan to make sure that you specify on this occasion, here and now,
Powell (cont.) : precisely what information you want. All the interested parties are here, and if the specification of the information could be laid down here, I think it would be a very timely and useful statement towards such a library.

Levi Setti : The best thing is perhaps simply to give raw data: namely the ranges of the hyperfragment, of the decay products, and their dip angles and projected angles. When there is a possibility of analysing the primary star, one would like to have the same information for all prongs originating from the capture star. Even if it is impossible to analyse such a star, one would like to know at least if a pion was emitted and the number of other prongs.

Powell : It would be worth while to achieve some form of standardization.

Levi Setti : I would say that the standardization is essentially achieved when the density of the emulsion is given in a way or an order, by giving, for example, the range of protons from $\pi^+$ decay in the stack. I would believe that one has already achieved a substantial standardization of the methods of measurement, which in this case are so simple, that perhaps there is no need to go any further, but try to collect the angles and ranges as they come.

Burhop : I wonder if following up Prof. Danysz' suggestion, there shouldn't be appointed a small subcommittee at this meeting, here and now, to prepare the instructions of the type of data which is required for such a hyperfragment bank and also to go to the question of where it could be situated. I feel that it is such a valuable suggestion that this is the time to act on it.
Block

: In the interests of keeping the discussion short, I would like to suggest that Professors Danysz, Burhop, Levi Setti and Lock get together after the meeting and talk this over in private.

The work of this subcommittee resulted in the following letter, which has been sent to all the participants at the Conference.

* * *

:693/AR/cw
Dear Colleague,

At the Hyperfragment Conference held at St. Cergue, Switzerland, in March 1963, it was widely felt that it would be useful to establish a central collection of data on hyperfragments. This could be distributed periodically to all interested groups. The collection of data should include sufficient detail to facilitate world compilation of data on various aspects of hyperfragment production and decay processes. It would be quite impracticable of course to include complete detail but in those cases where more information about particular events is needed it should serve to promote exchanges by correspondence between the interested laboratories.

On behalf of the CERN emulsion group I offered to provide facilities for the collection of this data. You will appreciate that a collection of this kind can only be valuable if the information provided by each laboratory is presented in a standard form. A small subcommittee has therefore drawn up the enclosed form for the tabulation of the data.

You are therefore invited to send me data on hyperfragment events which your group finds and analyses from this date onwards tabulated in conformity with the enclosed form. If you were able to provide data on events already found and 

analysed, this would be very useful but I realise that this may require an undue expenditure of effort.

Yours sincerely,

W.O. Lock

on behalf of
E.H.S. Burhop (London)
M. Denysz (Warsaw)
R. Levi-Setti (Chicago)
### Suggested form for the tabulation of hyperfragment data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Range (μm)(^{(d)})</th>
<th>Dip Angle (degrees) (^{(e)})</th>
<th>Azimuth (degrees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code No. (^{(a)})</td>
<td>HF (^{(b)})</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References (^{(b)})</td>
<td>(\pi^-)</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity (^{(c)})</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((e))</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((f))</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The code number for the event may be followed by the letter P or D to indicate production or decay star. E.g. 3-58-4-P. 40001-D. The particle producing the hyperfragment, its energy and the production reaction, if known, should be given.

(b) Published work in which the event has been first reported but also subsequent work in which the event might have been included.

(c) The standard notation for events at rest in flight should be used. Example: \(F_2^4\), \(R_3^5\), etc.

(d) Indicate when the range is measured from grid coordinates with (grid). Tabulate measured ranges, uncorrected for density effects. The information on the density of the emulsion should be given as measured density, or range of protons from \(\Sigma-p\) decay at rest, or range of muons from \(\pi^-\mu\) decay.

(e) Indicate the observation of a decay electron (β) or recoil disintegration (Hammer) etc.

(f) \(n\) among the decay products indicates that the analysis requires the emission of a neutron.

(g) Sign convention: positive to surface, negative to glass.
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## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institute/Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELGIUM</strong></td>
<td>Lemonne, J.</td>
<td>Université libre, Brussels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renard, P.</td>
<td>Université libre, Brussels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAZIL</strong></td>
<td>de Carvalho, H.G.</td>
<td>Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIRE</strong></td>
<td>Heeran, M. Sr.</td>
<td>University College, Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O'Ceallaigh, C.</td>
<td>Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson, A.</td>
<td>Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRANCE</strong></td>
<td>Baumann, G.</td>
<td>Centre d'Etudes nucléaires, Strasbourg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Braun, H.</td>
<td>Centre d'Etudes nucléaires, Strasbourg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burdet, A. Mrs.</td>
<td>Institut de Physique nucléaire, Lyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuore, F.</td>
<td>Centre d'Etudes nucléaires, Strasbourg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philbert, G.</td>
<td>Institut de Physique nucléaire, Lyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>Diaz, J.</td>
<td>Institut für Experimentalphysik, Hamburg II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmsen, D.</td>
<td>Institut für Experimentalphysik, Hamburg II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muller, D.</td>
<td>Institut für Theoretische Physik, Heidelberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tietge, I.</td>
<td>Max-Planck Institut für Physik und Astrophysik, Munich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIA</strong></td>
<td>Pal, Y.</td>
<td>Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rao, N.K.</td>
<td>Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISRAEL</strong></td>
<td>Perlmutter, A.</td>
<td>The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovoth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITALY</strong></td>
<td>Bizzari, R.</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Della Corte, M.</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Florence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iwao, S.</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Genoa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institute/Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY (cont.)</td>
<td>Quarenzi, G.</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Bologna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratti, S.</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Milan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosati, S.</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Pisa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sassi, E. Miss</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Naples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomasini, G. Miss</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Genoa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vignudelli-Quarenzi, A. Mrs.</td>
<td>Istituto di Fisica, Bologna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUGOSLAVIA</td>
<td>Adamovic, O. Miss</td>
<td>Institute of Physics, Belgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boskovic, B.</td>
<td>Institute of Physics, Belgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td>Kluyver, J.C.</td>
<td>Zeeman Laboratorium, Amsterdam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tannen, A.G.</td>
<td>Zeeman Laboratorium, Amsterdam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>Sorensen, S.O.</td>
<td>Institute of Physics, Blindern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>Darysz, M.</td>
<td>Institute of Physics, Warsaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gajewski, W.</td>
<td>Institute of Physics, Warsaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pniewski, J.</td>
<td>Institute of Physics, Warsaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zakrzewski, J.</td>
<td>Institute of Physics, Warsaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>Allen, J.E.</td>
<td>University College, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashmore, A.</td>
<td>Queen Mary College, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodner, A.</td>
<td>Manchester University, Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis, D.H.</td>
<td>University College, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elton, L.R.B.</td>
<td>Battersea College of Technology, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falle, D.</td>
<td>Queen Mary College, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fletcher, E. Miss</td>
<td>H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, Bristol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fowler, P.H.</td>
<td>H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, Bristol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garbutt, D.A.</td>
<td>University College, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ismail, A.Z.H.</td>
<td>Nuclear Physics Laboratory, Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lokanathan, S.</td>
<td>Nuclear Physics Laboratory, Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institute/Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM (cont.)</td>
<td>Major, J.</td>
<td>Durham University, Durham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March, P.V.</td>
<td>Westfield College, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murphy, J.W.</td>
<td>Manchester University, Manchester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prakash, Y.</td>
<td>Nuclear Physics Laboratory, Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powell, C.F.</td>
<td>H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, Bristol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stannard, F.R.</td>
<td>University College, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>Ammar, R.G.</td>
<td>Northwestern University, Evanston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block, M.M.</td>
<td>Northwestern University, Evanston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Byers, N. Miss</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalitz, R.</td>
<td>The Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies, Chicago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downs, B.W.</td>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyer, J.N.</td>
<td>Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fry, W.F.</td>
<td>Wisconsin University, Wisconsin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harth, E.M.</td>
<td>Syracuse University, Syracuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levi-Setti, R.</td>
<td>The Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies, Chicago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lomon, E.L.</td>
<td>Institute of Technology, Massachusetts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nickols, N.A.</td>
<td>Lockheed-California Company, Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prowse, D.J.</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schneps, J.</td>
<td>Tufts University, Medford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steinberg, P.H.</td>
<td>Maryland University, Maryland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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