u^- +He³ \rightarrow H³+v Capture Rate*

R. J. Oakest

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, California (Received 14 August 1964)

The muon capture rate in He³ for the process μ^- + He³ \rightarrow H³+ ν has been computed using nuclear wave functions suggested by recent analyses of e-He³ and e-H³ scattering experiments.

I. INTRODUCTION

R ECENT analyses of the He³ and H³ electromagnetic form factors, ¹ the inelastic scattering cross section for the process² $e + \text{He}^3 \rightarrow d + p + e'$, and the photodisintegration of³ He³ have yielded considerable information concerning the three-body nuclear wave function. It has been shown that the dominant component of the three-body wave function is the completely spatially symmetric S state and some specific forms of this wave function have been examined. The Irving-Gunn wave function has been found to give the best agreement with the data. The Irving wave function is also reasonably successful. In the following the rate for

the muon capture process μ^- + He³ \rightarrow H³ + ν is calculated as a further test of these three-body wave functions.

II. CAPTURE RATE

The capture rate for the process μ^- + He³ \rightarrow H³ + ν will be calculated using the conserved vector-current theory of weak interactions including both induced pseudoscalar and class II⁴ axial vector currents. We assume the μ^{-} is captured from the ground state of the μ -He³ atom and will consider only the spatially symmetric S state of the nuclear wave function.⁵ Under these assumptions the nonrelativistic reduction of the matrix element leads to

$$\mathfrak{M} = \int d^{3}r_{1} \int d^{3}r_{2} \int d^{3}r_{3} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \exp\{-i[\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}_{k}+\frac{1}{3}\mathbf{P}\cdot(\mathbf{r}_{1}+\mathbf{r}_{2}+\mathbf{r}_{3})]\}\varphi(\mathbf{r}_{k})$$

$$\times u^{*}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3})\{g_{V}F_{1V}(q^{2})(1+p/2M)\chi_{\nu}^{\dagger}(1-\sigma\cdot\hat{p})\chi_{\mu}\Phi_{f}^{\dagger}\tau_{k}^{-}\Phi_{i}$$

$$+[g_{A}F_{A}(q^{2})-(p/2M)g_{V}[F_{1V}(q^{2})+\kappa_{V}F_{2V}(q^{2})]]\chi_{\nu}^{\dagger}(1-\sigma\cdot\hat{p})\sigma\chi_{\mu}\cdot\Phi_{f}^{\dagger}\sigma_{k}\tau_{k}^{-}\Phi_{i}$$

$$-(p/2M)\{g_{A}F_{A}(q^{2})+g_{V}[F_{1V}(q^{2})+\kappa_{V}F_{2V}(q^{2})]-g_{P}F_{P}(q^{2})+g_{\Pi}F_{\Pi}(q^{2})\}\chi_{\nu}^{\dagger}(1-\sigma\cdot\hat{p})\chi_{\mu}\Phi_{f}^{\dagger}\sigma_{k}\cdot\hat{p}\tau_{k}^{-}\Phi_{i}$$

$$+g_{V}F_{1V}(q^{2})/M\chi_{\nu}^{\dagger}(1-\sigma\cdot\hat{p})\sigma\cdot\mathbf{p}_{k}\chi_{\mu}\Phi^{\dagger}\tau_{k}^{-}\Phi_{i}+g_{A}F_{A}(q^{2})/M\chi_{\nu}^{\dagger}(1-\sigma\cdot\hat{p})\chi_{\mu}\Phi_{f}^{\dagger}\sigma_{k}\cdot\mathbf{p}_{k}\tau_{k}^{-}\Phi_{i}\}u(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3}), \quad (1)$$

where **p** and **P** are the momenta of the neutrino and H³, respectively. The momentum and spin operators \mathbf{p}_k and σ_k act on the kth nucleon whose position is \mathbf{r}_k . The neutrino and muon two-component spinors are χ_{ν} and χ_{μ} , the muon atomic wave function is $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$, and the three-body nuclear wave function is $u(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3)\Phi$ with $u(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,\mathbf{r}_3)$ the completely symmetric spatial part and Φ the completely antisymmetric $J=\frac{1}{2}^+$, $I=\frac{1}{2}$ spin-isospin part. The vector, axial vector, induced pseudoscalar, and class II axial vector, coupling constants, and form factors are g_V , g_A , g_P , g_{II} and F_{1V} , F_{2V} , F_A , E_P , and F_{II} , respectively. The form factors are evaluated at the four-momentum transfer to the nucleon $q^2 \approx m_\mu (2p - m_\mu)$. In the conserved vector-current theory F_{1V} and F_{2V} are the isovector electric and magnetic form factors of the nucleon, respectively. Adopting the convention usually followed for the electromagnetic form factors, each form factor has been normalized to $\frac{1}{2}$ at $q^2=0$. τ_k^{-1} is the usual isospin operator that changes the *k*th nucleon from proton to neutron.

After squaring this matrix element, averaging over initial states assuming a statistical distribution, and summing over final states, the capture rate is found to be⁶

$$\Gamma = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{p^2}{(1+p/M_{\rm H^3})} \varphi^2(0) I^2(p) \left\{ g_V^2 F_{1V}^2(q^2) \left(1 + \frac{p}{6M} \right)^2 + 3 \left[g_A F_A(q^2) - \frac{p}{2M} g_V \left[F_{1V}(q^2) + \kappa_V F_{2V}(q^2) \right] \right]^2 + \frac{p}{M} \left[g_A F_A(q^2) - \frac{p}{2M} g_V \left[F_{1V}(q^2) + \kappa_V F_{2V}(q^2) \right] \right] \left\{ \frac{1}{3} g_A F_A(q^2) + g_V \left[F_{1V}(q^2) + \kappa_V F_{2V}(q^2) \right] - g_P F_P(q^2) + g_{\rm H} F_{\rm H}(q^2) \right\} + \left(\frac{p}{2M} \right)^2 \left\{ \frac{1}{3} g_A F_A(q^2) + g_V \left[F_{1V}(q^2) + \kappa_V F_{2V}(q^2) \right] - g_P F_P(q^2) + g_{\rm H} F_{\rm H}(q^2) \right\} \right\}.$$
 (2)

^{*} Supported in part by the U. S. Air Force through Air Force Office of Scientific Research Contract AF 49(638)-1389.
† National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Fellow.
I. S. Levinger, Phys. Rev. 131, 2710 (1963); B. K. Srivastava, *ibid.* 133, B545 (1964); L. I. Schiff, *ibid.* 133, B802 (1964).
² T. A. Griffy and R. J. Oakes, Phys. Rev. 135, B1161 (1964).
³ B. L. Berman, L. J. Koester, and J. H. Smith, Phys. Rev. 133, B117 (1964).
⁴ S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. 112, 1375 (1958).
⁵ Admitures of the other pine performance are thereaft to be averate it in the formation of the other pine performance.

 ⁵ Admixtures of the other nine possible states are thought to be present with only a few percent probability.
 ⁶ A. Fujii and H. Primakoff, Nuovo Cimento 12, 327 (1959); H. Primakoff, Rev. Mod. Phys. 31, 802 (1959). The present result differs from that derived in these references in that a class II axial-vector current is included here and the relativistic terms proportional to the nucleon momentum have been retained. The effect of these relativistic terms is to reduce the capture rate a few percent.

In obtaining Eq. (2) we have approximated the muon atomic wave function by its value at the origin

$$\varphi(0) = [2e^2 m_{\mu} (1 + m_{\mu}/M_{\mathrm{He}^3})^{-1}]^{3/2} / \sqrt{\pi}, \qquad (3)$$

where $e^2 \approx 1/137$ is the fine-structure constant. The muon, nucleon, He³, and H³ masses are denoted by m_{μ} , M, M_{He^3} , and M_{H^3} , respectively. The dependence on the nuclear wave function is contained in the integral I(p) which is defined by

$$I(\mathbf{p}) = \int d^{3}\mathbf{p} \int d^{3}\mathbf{r} \exp[-i\frac{2}{3}\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}] |u(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{p})|^{2}, \qquad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{r}_2 + \mathbf{r}_3)$ and $\boldsymbol{\varrho} = \mathbf{r}_3 - \mathbf{r}_2$. The nuclear wave functions we are concerned with are the Irving and the Irving-Gunn. The Irving wave function is⁷

$$\boldsymbol{u}(\mathbf{r},\boldsymbol{\varrho}) = A \, \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\alpha(2r^2 + \frac{3}{2}\rho^2)^{1/2}\right], \quad (5)$$

where the normalization constant is given by

$$A = \frac{3^{3/4} \alpha^3}{(120)^{1/2} \pi^{3/2}}.$$
 (6)

The Irving-Gunn wave function is⁸

$$u(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\varrho}) = \frac{A \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\alpha(2r^2 + \frac{3}{2}\rho^2)^{1/2}\right]}{(2r^2 + \frac{3}{2}\rho^2)^{1/2}}$$
(7)

and the corresponding normalization constant is

$$A = 3^{1/4} \alpha^2 / \sqrt{2} \pi^{3/2} \,. \tag{8}$$

For these wave functions the integrals I(p) can be carried out using the techniques given in Appendix B of Ref. 2. For the Irving wave function one finds

$$I(p) = (1+Q^2)^{-7/2} \tag{9}$$

and for the Irving-Gunn wave function one finds

$$I(p) = \frac{\frac{4}{3} [1 + 2(1 + Q^2)^{1/2}]}{(1 + Q^2)^{3/2} [1 + (1 + Q^2)^{1/2}]^2}, \qquad (10)$$

where Q^2 is given by

$$Q^2 = 2p^2/9\alpha^2$$
. (11)

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In evaluating the capture rate the vector and axialvector coupling constants quoted by Wu⁹ were used. These are $g_V = 1.15 \times 10^{-11}$ MeV⁻² and $g_A/g_V = -1.19$. The isovector electromagnetic form factors are¹⁰ $F_{1V}(q^2)$ =0.492 and $F_{2V}(q^2)=0.485$. The isovector anomalous magnetic moment is $\kappa_V = \kappa_p - \kappa_n = 3.706$ nucleon magne-

tons. Little is known about the axial-vector form factor but it seems reasonable to put $F_A(q^2) = F_A(0) = 0.5$, for such small momentum transfer ($q^2 \approx 0.27 \text{ F}^{-2}$). Dispersion calculations¹¹ in which the induced pseudoscalar term arises from the one-pion-pole contribution leads to $g_P F_P(q^2) \approx 7 g_A F_A(q^2)$. For the moment we will neglect the class II axial-vector current and put $g_{II} = 0$.

Finally, for the parameter α appearing in the nuclear wave function we take the values arrived at from the analysis of the e-He³ and e-H³ scattering data and the He³ photodisintegration data. Schiff¹ finds $\alpha = 250$ MeV for the Irving wave function, and Berman, Koester, and Smith³ report $\alpha = 152$ MeV for the Irving-Gunn wave function.

The resulting capture rates are $\Gamma = 1.50 \times 10^3 \text{ sec}^{-1}$ for the Irving wave function and $\Gamma = 1.41 \times 10^3$ sec⁻¹ for the Irving-Gunn wave function.

IV. DISCUSSION

Three measurements of the μ^- + He³ \rightarrow H³ + ν capture rate have been reported. The observed values are $(1.41\pm0.14)\times10^3$ sec⁻¹,¹² $(1.52\pm0.05)\times10^3$ sec⁻¹,¹³ and $(1.44\pm0.09)\times10^3$ sec^{-1.14} Comparing these with the values obtained above for the Irving wave function $(1.50 \times 10^3 \text{ sec}^{-1})$ and the Irving-Gunn wave function $(1.41 \times 10^3 \text{ sec}^{-1})$ we conclude that the agreement in the case of the Irving wave function is quite good, while the Irving-Gunn wave function leads to a capture rate which seems a little too small.

These results can also be understood in terms of the mean-square radius of the nucleus. The dependence of the capture rate on the three-body wave function is primarily through the mean-square radius as can be seen by writing I(p) in the approximate form

 $I(p) \approx 1 - \frac{1}{6} p^2 \langle r^2 \rangle,$

where

$$\langle r^2 \rangle \equiv (4/9) \int d^3 \rho \int d^3 r \, r^2 u^2(\varrho, \mathbf{r}) \,.$$
 (13)

For the Irving wave function one finds

$$\langle r^2 \rangle = 14/3\alpha^2, \qquad (14)$$

(12)

while for the Irving-Gunn wave function we have

$$\langle r^2 \rangle = 20/9\alpha^2. \tag{15}$$

Numerically, the radii are 1.70 F for the Irving ($\alpha = 250$ MeV) and 1.93 F for the Irving-Gunn ($\alpha = 152$ MeV). Consequently, the Irving-Gunn wave function with

⁷ J. Irving, Phil. Mag. 42, 338 (1951).
⁸ J. C. Gunn and J. Irving, Phil. Mag. 42, 1353 (1951).
⁹ C. S. Wu, *Theoretical Physics in the 20th Century*, edited by M. Fierz and V. Weiskopf (Interscience Publishers, Inc., New V. 1997). York, 1960). ¹⁰ L. N. Hand, D. G. Miller, and R. Wilson, Rev. Mod. Phys.

^{35, 335 (1963).}

¹¹ M. L. Goldberger and S. B. Treiman, Phys. Rev. 111, 354

¹¹ M. L. Goldberger and S. B. Freiman, Fuys. Rev. 111, 53* (1958). ¹² I. V. Falomkin, A. I. Filippov, M. M. Kulyukin, B. Ponte-corvo, Yu A. Scherbakov, et al., Phys. Letters **3**, 229 (1963). ¹³ L. B. Auerbach, R. J. Esterling, R. E. Hill, D. A. Jenkins, J. T. Lach, and N. H. Lipman, Phys. Rev. Letters **11**, 23 (1963). ¹⁴ R. M. Edelstein, D. Clay, J. W. Keuffel, and R. L. Wagner, Jr., International Conference on Fundamental Aspects of Weak Interactions at Brookhaven National Laboratory (U. S. Department of Commerce Washington D. C. 1963) p. 303. of Commerce, Washington D. C., 1963), p. 303.

 $\alpha = 152$ MeV gives too small a $\mu^- + \text{He}^3 \rightarrow \text{H}^3 + \nu$ capture rate since it corresponds to too large a mean-square radius. (Raising α by about 20 MeV to obtain the correct radius would spoil the agreement with the photodisintegration data.³)

We note that the previous calculations^{6,15} of the μ^- +He³ \rightarrow H³+ ν , which have ranged from 1.40×10³ to 1.66×10³ sec⁻¹, differ primarily in the assumed nuclear wave function. The capture rate essentially depends only on the nuclear wave function through the mean-square radius, and the measurements of the capture rate lead to a radius of 1.6 to 1.7 F which is in agreement

with values found by Hofstadter and collaborators in elastic e-He³ and e-H³ scattering.¹⁶

Finally we observe that the class II axial-vector current enters in the muon-capture matrix element Eq. (1) in the same manner as the induced pseudoscalar term. Consequently, unless the induced pseudoscalar contribution is accurately known, the presence of a small amount of the class II current cannot be detected.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank Professor J. S. Bell and Dr. T. A. Griffy for interesting discussions. We gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of the Physics Division of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies where part of this work was performed.

PHYSICAL REVIEW

VOLUME 136, NUMBER 6B

21 DECEMBER 1964

Theory of Hidden Variables

DAVID KERSHAW Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Received 1 July 1964)

It is shown that the stationary states of the nonrelativistic Schrödinger's equation are just the stationary states of a classical-mechanical system which is subject to random submicroscopic fluctuations of position. The proof covers the case (1) of a single particle moving in a potential, and (2) of two particles interacting through a potential $V(x_1-x_2)$. The results can be easily generalized to the case of *n* interacting particles.

INTRODUCTION

IN his theory of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, Bohm¹ has suggested that the uncertainty expressed by

$$(\Delta p)(\Delta q) \ge h \tag{1}$$

might be due to the presence of some random submicroscopic fluctuations which would introduce uncertainty into the otherwise classical equations of motion.

PART I

Let us then consider a function $\rho(x,t)$ such that

$$\int d^3x \,\rho(x,t) = 1 \,. \tag{2}$$

 $\rho(x,t)$ is to be viewed either as the probability of finding the particle at the point x at time t, or as a function such that $m\rho(x,t)$ is the mass density of a continuous distribution of matter of total mass m. The two points of view will be interchangeable throughout the paper.

The particles are subject to random fluctuations, so in general there exists no velocity (the paths of the particles may be discontinuous). However, let us assume that if the particle was at x at time t, then at time t+dt it will have a probability w(t,x,dt,dx) of being found at the point x+dx. Since w is a probability distribution we have

$$\int w(t,x,dt,dx)d^3(dx) = 1.$$

Then we define the velocity at x at time t by

$$v(x,t) = \lim_{dt\to 0} \left(\frac{1}{dt}\right) \int (dx) w(t,x,dt,dx) d^3(dx) \,.$$

¹⁵ A. Fujii, Phys. Rev. 118, 870 (1960); C. Werntz, Nucl. Phys. 16, 59 (1960); L. Wolfenstein, Proceedings of the 1960 International Conference on High Energy Physics at Rochester (University of Rochester, Rochester, 1960), p. 529; Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. 6, 33 (1961); Proceedings of the 1962 International Conference on High Energy Physics at CERN, edited by J. Prentki (CERN, Geneva, 1962), p. 821; A. F. Yano, Phys. Rev. Letters 12, 110 (1964). See also A. Fujii and Y. Yamaguchi, Progr. Theoret. Phys. (Kyoto) 31, 107 (1964) and W. Drechsler and B. Stech, Z. Physik 178, 1 (1964).

¹⁶ H. Collard, R. Hofstadter, E. B. Hughes, A. Johansson, M. R. Yearian, R. B. Day, and R. T. Wagner, "Proceedings of the 1964 International Conference on High Energy Physics at Dubna" (to be published). The radius is actually ambiguous in that the charge and magnetic radii differ.

¹D. Bohm, in *Quantum Theory*, *Radiation and High Energy Physics*, edited by D. Bates (Academic Press Inc., New York, 1962), Vol. III, p. 345.