arXiv:1505.07139v1 [quant-ph] 26 May 2015

The decay widths, the decay constants, and the branching fractions of a resonant state

Rafael de la Madrid

Department of Physics, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX 77710

E-mail: rafael.delamadrid@lamar.edu

May 11, 2015

Abstract

We introduce the differential and the total decay widths of a resonant (Gamow) state decaying into a continuum of stable states. When the resonance has several decay modes, we introduce the corresponding partial decay widths and branching fractions. In the approximation that the resonance is sharp, the expressions for the differential, partial and total decay widths of a resonant state bear a close resemblance with the Golden Rule. In such approximation, the branching fractions of a resonant state are the same as the standard branching fractions obtained by way of the Golden Rule. We also introduce dimensionless decay constants along with their associated differential decay constants, and we express experimentally measurable quantities such as the branching fractions and the energy distributions of decay events in terms of those dimensionless decay constants.

Keywords: Decay constant; branching fractions; resonant states; Gamow states; resonances; Golden Rule.

PACS: 03.65.-w; 03.65.Bz; 03.65.Ca; 03.65.Db; 03.65.Xp

1 Introduction

The standard Golden Rule allows us to calculate the transition rate (probability of transition per unit time) from an energy eigenstate of a quantum system into a continuum of energy eigenstates. If $|E_{\rm i}\rangle$ is the eigenstate of an unperturbed Hamiltonian H_0, and if such state is coupled to a state $|E_{\rm f}\rangle$ by a perturbation V, the transition probability per unit of time from the initial state $|E_{\rm i}\rangle$ to the final state $|E_{\rm f}\rangle$ is given, to first order in the perturbation, by

$$R_{\rm i\to f} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar}\,|\langle E_{\rm f}|V|E_{\rm i}\rangle|^2\,\delta(E_{\rm i}-E_{\rm f})\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\langle E_{\rm f}|V|E_{\rm i}\rangle$ is the matrix element of the perturbation V between the final and initial states. If the initial state is coupled to a continuum of final states $|E_{\rm f}\rangle$, and if the density of final states (number of states per unit of energy) is $\rho(E_{\rm f})$, the transition probability per unit of time from the state $|E_{\rm i}\rangle$ to the continuum of final states $|E_{\rm f}\rangle$ is given by

$$\overline{R}_{\rm i\to f} = \int {\rm d}E_{\rm f}\,\rho(E_{\rm f})R_{\rm i\to f} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar}\,|\langle E_{\rm f}|V|E_{\rm i}\rangle|^2\,\rho(E_{\rm i})\,, \tag{1.2}$$

where it has been assumed that the matrix element $\langle E_{\rm f}|V|E_{\rm i}\rangle$ is the same for all the states in the continuum. The decay width from the initial state $|E_{\rm i}\rangle$ to the final state $|E_{\rm f}\rangle$ is given by

$$\Gamma_{\rm i\to f} = \hbar R_{\rm i\to f} = 2\pi\,|\langle E_{\rm f}|V|E_{\rm i}\rangle|^2\,\delta(E_{\rm i}-E_{\rm f})\,. \tag{1.3}$$

The decay width from the initial state $|E_{\rm i}\rangle$ to a continuum of final states $|E_{\rm f}\rangle$ is given by

$$\overline{\Gamma}_{\rm i\to f} = \hbar \overline{R}_{\rm i\to f} = 2\pi\,|\langle E_{\rm f}|V|E_{\rm i}\rangle|^2\,\rho(E_{\rm i})\,. \tag{1.4}$$

The standard derivation of Eqs. (1.1)-(1.4) is the result of first-order perturbation theory, and it is valid when the initial and final states are stable. The purpose of the present paper is to introduce the analog of Eqs. (1.1)-(1.4) under the assumption that the initial state is described by a resonant (Gamow) state, and that such state decays into a continuum of stable, scattering states.

In Sec. 2, we introduce the differential and the total decay widths of a resonant state that has only one decay mode. In Sec. 3, we derive an expression for such decay widths in terms of a truncated Breit-Wigner (Lorentzian) lineshape and the matrix element of the interaction. We also show that, when the resonance is sharp and far from the energy threshold, the expressions for the resonant decay widths bear a strong resemblance with Fermi's Golden Rule. In Sec. 4, we apply the results of Sec. 3 to the delta-shell potential. In Sec. 5, we introduce the partial decay widths of a resonant state that has more than one decay mode, we define the branching fractions for each decay mode, and we point out that, at least in principle, such branching fractions afford a way to falsify the formalism of the present paper. In Sec. 6, we introduce dimensionless partial and total decay constants along with their associated differential decay constants, we express the branching fractions in terms of them, and we argue that

the differential decay constant corresponds to a measurement of the energy distributions of decay events (the invariant mass distributions of particle physics). Section 7 contains our conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

Let $H = H_0 + V$ be a Hamiltonian that produces resonances, where H_0 is the free Hamiltonian and V is the interaction potential. The continuum spectra of both H and H_0 will be assumed to be $[0, \infty)$, as it often occurs in non-relativistic quantum mechanics. For simplicity, we will assume that the continuum spectra are non-degenerate, and that the eigenstates of H_0 can be determined by a single quantum number, the energy E. The eigenstates of the free Hamiltonian will be denoted by $|E\rangle$,

$$H_0|E\rangle = E|E\rangle\,. \tag{2.1}$$

We will denote the resonant state by $|z_{\rm R}\rangle$,

$$H|z_{\rm R}\rangle = z_{\rm R}|z_{\rm R}\rangle\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where $z_{\rm R} = E_{\rm R} - {\rm i}\Gamma_{\rm R}/2$ is the complex resonant energy of a decaying state. We will denote by $\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle$ the time evolution of the resonant state, τ being the time parameter that appears in the Schrödinger equation.

When $|E\rangle$ is delta normalized and $|z_{\rm R}\rangle$ is normalized according to Zeldovich's normalization, the "scalar product" $\langle E|\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle$ has dimensions of $\left(\sqrt{\text{energy}}\right)^{-1}$. Thus, $|\langle E|\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2$ has dimensions of $(\text{energy})^{-1}$, and it can be interpreted as a probability density, i.e., a probability per unit of energy. This is why we will identify $|\langle E|\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2$ with the probability density $\frac{{\rm d}P_\tau}{{\rm d}E}$ that the resonance has decayed into a stable particle of energy E at time τ,

$$\frac{{\rm d}P_\tau}{{\rm d}E} \equiv |\langle E|\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{2.3}$$

As is well known, the survival probability of a resonant (Gamow) state abides by the exponential law,

$$p_{\rm s}(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{-\Gamma_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

The initial decay rate $\dot{p}_{\rm s}(0)$ associated with the survival probability satisfies

$$\Gamma_{\rm R} = -\hbar\dot{p}_{\rm s}(0) = -\hbar\left.\frac{{\rm d}p_{\rm s}(\tau)}{{\rm d}\tau}\right|_{\tau=0}\,. \tag{2.5}$$

In analogy to Eq. (2.5), we define the differential decay width of a resonant state as follows:

$$\frac{{\rm d}\overline{\Gamma}(E)}{{\rm d}E} \equiv -\hbar\frac{{\rm d}\dot{P}_{\tau=0}}{{\rm d}E} = -\hbar\frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}\tau}\left(\frac{{\rm d}P_\tau}{{\rm d}E}\right)\Bigg|_{\tau=0}\,, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\frac{\mathrm{d}\dot{P}_\tau}{\mathrm{d}E}$ is the time derivative (rate of change) of $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_\tau}{\mathrm{d}E}$. The total decay width is obtained by integration over the scattering spectrum of the free Hamiltonian,

$$\overline{\Gamma} = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}E \, \frac{\mathrm{d}\overline{\Gamma}(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} \, . \tag{2.7}$$

This formula is valid when the energy E is the only quantum number needed to describe the stable, asymptotic states. If such states are described by additional quantum numbers, we just need to sum/integrate over such quantum numbers.

Three comments are in order here. First, in the standard approach, one uses the Golden Rule to calculate the width $\overline{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{i}\to\mathrm{f}}$ using Eq. (1.4), and then one assumes that $\overline{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{i}\to\mathrm{f}}$ coincides with the width Γ_{R} that arises from the pole of the S-matrix. However, as discussed in Appendix A, the value of the decay width $\overline{\Gamma}$ of Eq. (2.7) is in general different from the value of Γ_{R}. Thus, $\overline{\Gamma}$ should be interpreted as another way to characterize the strength of the interaction between the resonance and the continuum.[1]

Second, because the probability in Eq. (2.3) can be defined also for a square-integrable wave function φ, we can define the differential and the total decay widths for the transition from a state φ into a continuum. We can then expand φ in terms of the resonant (Gamow) states and a background, $|\varphi\rangle = c_{\mathrm{R}}|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle + |\mathrm{bg}\rangle$, where $|\mathrm{bg}\rangle$ is the background, and where it has been assumed that the system has only one resonant state $|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle$. The resulting expression will have a resonant part associated solely with $|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle$, and other terms that involve $|\mathrm{bg}\rangle$. As it usually happens with resonant expansions, the term associated exclusively with $|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle$ carries the contribution from the resonance per se. Such resonant contribution is what Eqs. (2.3), (2.6), and (2.7) contain. The other terms (which, although important, are not the focus of the present paper) contain the non-exponential contributions to the decay constant.

Third, the resonant decay width of Eq. (2.7) depends on the normalization of the Gamow states. When we use Zeldovich's normalization, the decay width has dimensions of energy, but if we used another normalization, the value and possibly the dimensions of $\overline{\Gamma}$ would change.

Before finishing this section, it may be useful to add a few words about the role of resonant expansions in quantum mechanics. In a resonant expansion such as $|\varphi\rangle = c_{\mathrm{R}}|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle + |\mathrm{bg}\rangle$, the resonant state $|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle$ is supposed to carry the resonance's contribution to the state φ (including the exponential decay), and the background is supposed to carry the non-resonant contributions (including deviations from exponential decay). When one calculates, for example, the survival probability using a wave function $\varphi_1 = c_{\mathrm{R},1}|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle + |\mathrm{bg}_1\rangle$, one usually obtains an exponential decay for intermediate times and deviations from exponential decay at short and long times. However, if we used a wave function $\varphi_2 = c_{\mathrm{R},2}|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle + |\mathrm{bg}_2\rangle$ that is only slightly different from φ_1, we would obtain a slightly different survival probability with slightly different deviations from exponential

[1] Interestingly, in particle physics there are sometimes two and even three definitions of the width of unstable particles [1], and only one of them coincides with the width that arises from the pole of the S-matrix [2–12].

decay. The question then arises: What is the wave function of the resonance? Is it φ_1, φ_2, or something else? Or even worse, do φ_1 and φ_2 represent the wave functions of two different resonances? The Gamow-state description of resonances addresses these questions very easily: For each pole of the S-matrix, one can construct a unique Gamow state that is identified with the wave function of the resonance. In our example, there is only one resonance, and φ_1 and φ_2 are two different approximations of one and the same resonant state. Thus, by identifying the resonant (Gamow) state with the wave function of a resonance, one has a clear way to prescribe what is resonance from what is not resonance.

Identifying the Gamow state with the resonance's wave function is very similar to identifying a monochromatic wave with a plane wave. Both a plane wave and a Gamow state are not square-integrable functions, but when you prepare a square integrable wave function very close to a plane wave or a Gamow state, you have, for all purposes and intends, a monochromatic state or a Gamow state.

3 Derivation

Let us assume that our system has been prepared in a resonant state $|z_{\rm R}\rangle$. Such state satisfies the following integral equation [13–16]:

$$|z_{\rm R}\rangle = \frac{1}{z_{\rm R} - H_0 + {\rm i}0} V |z_{\rm R}\rangle \,. \tag{3.1}$$

By multiplying Eq. (3.1) by $\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}z_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar}$, and by taking into account that $\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}z_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle$, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}z_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar} \frac{1}{z_{\rm R} - H_0 + {\rm i}0} V |z_{\rm R}\rangle \,. \tag{3.2}$$

The "scalar product" of Eq. (3.2) with $\langle E|$ can be written as

$$\langle E|\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}z_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar} \langle E| \frac{1}{z_{\rm R} - H_0 + {\rm i}0} V |z_{\rm R}\rangle \,. \tag{3.3}$$

When $\frac{1}{z_{\rm R}-H_0+{\rm i}0}$ acts to the right, as it does in Eq. (3.3), we have that

$$\langle E| \frac{1}{z_{\rm R} - H_0 + {\rm i}0} = \frac{1}{z_{\rm R} - E} \langle E| \,. \tag{3.4}$$

Substitution of Eq. (3.4) into Eq. (3.3) yields

$$\langle E|\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}z_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar} \frac{1}{z_{\rm R} - E} \langle E|V|z_{\rm R}\rangle \,. \tag{3.5}$$

By combining Eqs. (3.5) and (2.3), we obtain

$$\frac{{\rm d}P_\tau(E)}{{\rm d}E} = |\langle E|\mathrm{e}^{-{\rm i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 = \mathrm{e}^{-\Gamma_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar} \frac{1}{(E-E_{\rm R})^2 + (\Gamma_{\rm R}/2)^2} |\langle E|V|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 \,. \tag{3.6}$$

The time derivative of this expression reads

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\dot{P}_\tau(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} = -\mathrm{e}^{-\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}\tau/\hbar}\frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/\hbar}{(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})^2+(\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2)^2}|\langle E|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{3.7}$$

Substitution of Eq. (3.7) into Eq. (2.6) yields the differential decay width of a resonant state,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\overline{\Gamma}(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} = \frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}}{(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})^2+(\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2)^2}|\langle E|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{3.8}$$

Substitution of Eq. (3.8) into Eq. (2.7) yields the total decay width of a resonant state,

$$\overline{\Gamma} = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}E\ \frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}}{(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})^2+(\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2)^2}|\langle E|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{3.9}$$

Thus, the decay width of a resonant state depends on the matrix element squared of the interaction potential and on the Lorentzian lineshape. The energy domain of the Lorentzian, however, does not extend from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$, but it is truncated at the lower energy threshold $E=0$. Equations (3.8) and (3.9) contain no approximations and, as we are going to see below, they bear a strong resemblance with the standard Golden Rule of Eqs. (1.3) and (1.4) in the approximation that the resonance is sharp and far away from the threshold.

In order to relate Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9) with the standard Golden Rule, we are going to use the well-known result that, when its width tends to zero, the Lorentzian becomes the delta function,

$$\delta(x) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{\epsilon/\pi}{x^2+\epsilon^2}\,. \tag{3.10}$$

Let $x=(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})$ and $\epsilon=\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2$. Then, when the resonance is sharp (i.e., when $\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/(2E_{\mathrm{R}})$ is small), and when we can neglect the lower energy threshold (i.e., when the resonance is far from the $E=0$ threshold), we have that Eq. (3.10) yields

$$\delta(E-E_{\mathrm{R}}) = \lim_{\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}\to 0}\frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/(2\pi)}{(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})^2+(\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2)^2}\,. \tag{3.11}$$

By combining Eqs. (3.8), (3.9) and (3.11), we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\overline{\Gamma}(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} \approx 2\pi|\langle E|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2\delta(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})\,, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\overline{\Gamma} \approx 2\pi\,|\langle E_{\mathrm{R}}|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{3.13}$$

Equation (3.12) has the same form as Eq. (1.3). Equation (3.13) has the same form as Eq. (1.4), except that in Eq. (3.13) the "density of states" is 1.

It is surprising that the decay widths of Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9) become very similar to the standard Golden Rule in the approximation that the resonance is sharp, since the

derivation leading to Eqs. (3.12) and (3.12) is completely different from the derivation leading to the standard Golden Rule. Although it is not clear why such is the case, in Appendix B we explore a possible explanation.

In the literature, one can find several expressions for the transition probability of Eq. (3.6) and the decay widths of Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9), see Refs. [17–19]. Such expressions always involve the matrix element squared of the interaction potential and the Lorentzian lineshape. In particular, the decay widths (3.8) and (3.9) coincide with those provided in Ref. [19], although the expressions of Ref. [19] are derived from a time-dependent probability that is different from that in Eq. (3.6).[2]

4 An illustrative example: The delta potential

We are going to use Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9) to calculate the decay width of a particle trapped by a delta potential [28–32] located at $r = a$,

$$V(r) = g\delta(r-a)\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where g accounts for the strength of the potential. Since this potential is spherically symmetric, we can work in the radial, position representation. For simplicity, we will restrict ourselves to s-waves (zero angular momentum), since the higher-order cases are treated analogously. The eigenfunctions $\chi_0(r;E)$ of the free Hamiltonian H_0 satisfy

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}r^2}\chi_0(r;E) = E\chi_0(r;E)\,. \tag{4.2}$$

The delta-normalized solution of Eq. (4.2) is well known (see for example Ref. [33]),

$$\chi_0(r;E) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi}\,\frac{2m/\hbar^2}{k}}\,\sin(kr)\,, \quad 0<r<\infty\,, \tag{4.3}$$

where $k = \sqrt{\frac{2m}{\hbar^2}E}$ is the wave number. The eigenfunctions $\chi(r;E)$ of the Hamiltonian H satisfy

$$\left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}r^2} + g\delta(r-a)\right)\chi(r;E) = E\chi(r;E)\,, \tag{4.4}$$

subject to the boundary conditions

$$\chi(0;E) = 0\,, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\chi(a+;E) = \chi(a-;E)\,, \tag{4.6}$$

$$\chi'(a+;E) - \chi'(a-;E) = \frac{2mg}{\hbar^2}\chi(a;E)\,. \tag{4.7}$$

[2]Further variations on Fermi's Golden Rule can be found in Refs. [20–27].

The solution of Eq. (4.4) subject to Eqs. (4.5)-(4.7) is given by

$$\chi(r;E) = A(E) \begin{cases} \sin(kr) & 0 < r < a\,, \\ \mathcal{J}_1(E)\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}kr} + \mathcal{J}_2(E)\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}kr} & a < r < \infty\,, \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_1(E) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}ka}}{2}\left[\left(1 - \mathrm{i}\frac{2mg}{\hbar^2 k}\right)\sin(ka) - \mathrm{i}\cos(ka)\right], \tag{4.9}$$

$$\mathcal{J}_2(E) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ka}}{2}\left[\left(1 + \mathrm{i}\frac{2mg}{\hbar^2 k}\right)\sin(ka) + \mathrm{i}\cos(ka)\right], \tag{4.10}$$

and where $A(E)$ is an overall normalization constant. The S-matrix reads

$$S(E) = -\frac{\mathcal{J}_1(E)}{\mathcal{J}_2(E)}\,. \tag{4.11}$$

The resonant states are obtained by imposing the purely outgoing boundary condition on the Schrödinger equation. In our case, this is tantamount to imposing that $\mathcal{J}_2(E) = 0$,

$$\left(1 + \mathrm{i}\frac{2mg}{\hbar^2 k}\right)\sin(ka) + \mathrm{i}\cos(ka) = 0\,. \tag{4.12}$$

We will denote the complex solutions of Eq. (4.12) by z_n, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. The corresponding resonant states read as follows:

$$u(r;z_n) = N_n \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\mathcal{J}_1(z_n)}\sin(k_n r) & 0 < r < a\,, \\ \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}k_n r} & a < r < \infty\,, \end{cases} \tag{4.13}$$

where Zeldovich's normalization constant N_n is given by the residue of the S-matrix at the complex resonant wave number k_n, $N_n^2 = \mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{res}\left[S(q)\right]_{q=k_n}$.

The matrix element of the potential is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E|V|z_n\rangle &= \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}r\, \overline{\chi_0(r;E)}\, g\delta(r-a)u(r;z_n) \\ &= g\sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi}\,\frac{2m/\hbar^2}{k}}\,\sin(ka)\,N_n\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}k_n a}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Thus, Eq. (3.8) yields

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\overline{\Gamma}_n(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} = \frac{\Gamma_n}{(E-E_n)^2 + (\Gamma_n/2)^2}\frac{2mg^2}{\pi k\hbar^2}\,\sin^2(ka)\,|N_n|^2\mathrm{e}^{2\beta_n a}\,, \tag{4.15}$$

where β_n is the imaginary part of the complex wave number k_n, i.e., $k_n = \alpha_n - \mathrm{i}\beta_n$. The total decay width is given by

$$\overline{\Gamma}_n = \frac{2mg^2}{\pi\hbar^2}|N_n|^2 \mathrm{e}^{2\beta_n a} C_n \,, \tag{4.16}$$

where

$$C_n = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}E \, \frac{\Gamma_n}{(E-E_n)^2 + (\Gamma_n/2)^2} \frac{1}{k} \, \sin^2(ka) \,. \tag{4.17}$$

Because the delta-shell potential is very simple, one can calculate the decay width analytically. However, for more complicated potentials, it may not be possible to calculate the resonant states exactly, and one may have to resort to approximations.

5 Partial decay widths and branching fractions

When a resonance has different decay modes, one usually defines the branching fractions to account for how likely the resonance will decay into each mode. Experimentally the branching fractions are measured as the number of particles that decay into a given mode divided by the total number of decays.

In order to obtain the theoretical branching fractions, we need to define the partial decay widths. Let us assume for simplicity that the resonance has two decay modes and that each decay mode can be described by a single, discrete, quantum number $j = 1, 2$. Similarly to Eq. (3.6), the probability (per unit of energy) that the resonance decays at time τ into the mode j is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{j,\tau}(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} = |\langle E, j|\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}H\tau/\hbar}|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2 = \mathrm{e}^{-\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}\tau/\hbar} \frac{1}{(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})^2 + (\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2)^2} |\langle E, j|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2 \,, \quad j = 1, 2 \,. \tag{5.1}$$

Similarly to Eq. (3.8), the partial differential decay width of a resonant state is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\overline{\Gamma}_j(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} = \frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}}{(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})^2 + (\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2)^2} |\langle E, j|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2 \,, \qquad j = 1, 2 \,. \tag{5.2}$$

The partial decay width is

$$\overline{\Gamma}_j = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}E \, \frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}}{(E-E_{\mathrm{R}})^2 + (\Gamma_{\mathrm{R}}/2)^2} |\langle E, j|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2 \,, \qquad j = 1, 2 \,. \tag{5.3}$$

The resulting branching fractions are

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{R} \to j) = \frac{\overline{\Gamma}_j}{\overline{\Gamma}_1 + \overline{\Gamma}_2} \,, \qquad j = 1, 2 \,. \tag{5.4}$$

Similarly to Eq. (3.13), when the resonance is sharp, the partial decay widths are approximated by

$$\overline{\Gamma}_j \approx 2\pi \, |\langle E_{\mathrm{R}}, j|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2 \,, \qquad j = 1, 2 \,. \tag{5.5}$$

In such an approximation, the branching fractions read

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathrm{R} \to j) \approx \frac{|\langle E_{\mathrm{R}}, j|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2}{|\langle E_{\mathrm{R}}, 1|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2 + |\langle E_{\mathrm{R}}, 2|V|z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle|^2}\,, \qquad j = 1, 2\,, \tag{5.6}$$

which is the same result we would obtain if we used the decay widths of Eq. (1.4) with $|E_{\mathrm{i}}\rangle \equiv |z_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle$ and $|E_{\mathrm{f}}\rangle \equiv |E_{\mathrm{R}}\rangle$. Thus, in the approximation that the resonance is sharp, the branching fractions obtained from the probability distribution of Eq. (5.1) are the same as those obtained from the Golden Rule. However, when the resonance is not sharp, we would obtain different branching fractions. Because the branching fractions do not depend on the normalization of the resonant state, Eq. (5.4) will in general yield a different result from that of Eq. (5.6), no matter what normalization is used for the resonant state. This, at least in principle, makes the formalism of the present paper falsifiable.

6 The (dimensionless) decay constants

There are two main kinds of decay experiments. In one kind, one measures the number of decay events as a function of time, which corresponds to measuring a time-dependent probability distribution such as the survival probability. In another kind, one measures the number of decay events as a function of the energy, and one obtains an energy distribution of decay events such as the invariant mass distributions of particle physics (see for example Refs. [34–42]). The purpose of this section is to describe the energy distributions of decay events in terms of the resonant states.

Although a scattering experiment is a time-dependent phenomenon, one usually describes it using time-independent quantities such as the cross section and the S-matrix. Such time-independent quantities can be obtained from solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger equation. Similarly, a decay process is a time-dependent phenomenon, but it can be described by time-independent quantities such as the energy distributions of decay events. The experimental energy distributions of decay events are simply the number of decay events per unit of energy as a function of the energy,

$$\left(\frac{\#\text{ decay events}}{\text{energy}}\ \text{vs. energy}\right)\,. \tag{6.1}$$

When we divide the number of decay events by the total number of events N_0, the corresponding experimental distribution corresponds to the theoretical probability distribution of decay,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P(E)}{\mathrm{d}E} = \left(\frac{\text{decay probability}}{\text{energy}}\ \text{vs. energy}\right) \leftrightarrow \left(\frac{1}{N_0}\frac{\#\text{ decay events}}{\text{energy}}\ \text{vs. energy}\right)\,, \tag{6.2}$$

where $\frac{\mathrm{d}P(E)}{\mathrm{d}E}$ is the (theoretical) probability per unit of energy that the resonance has decayed into a stable particle of energy E.

When $|E\rangle$ is delta normalized and $|z_{\rm R}\rangle$ is normalized according to Zeldovich's normalization, the "scalar product" $\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle$ has dimensions of $\left(\sqrt{\text{energy}}\right)^{-1}$. Thus, $|\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2$ has dimensions of $(\text{energy})^{-1}$, and it is natural to identify it with $\frac{{\rm d}P(E)}{{\rm d}E}$,

$$\frac{{\rm d}P(E)}{{\rm d}E} \equiv |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 \,. \tag{6.3}$$

Obviously, the probability of Eq. (6.3) is the time-independent version of the probability of Eq. (2.3). The total probability that the particle has decayed into the continuum is

$$P = \int_0^\infty \frac{{\rm d}P(E)}{{\rm d}E}\, {\rm d}E \,. \tag{6.4}$$

Similarly to the definitions of the decay widths $\frac{{\rm d}\overline{\Gamma}}{{\rm d}E}$ and $\overline{\Gamma}$, we can define the differential and the total decay constants as follows,

$$\tfrac{{\rm d}\Gamma(E)}{{\rm d}E} \equiv \tfrac{{\rm d}P(E)}{{\rm d}E} = |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 \,, \tag{6.5}$$

$$\Gamma \equiv P = \int_0^\infty |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 \, {\rm d}E \,. \tag{6.6}$$

By using Eq. (3.1), and by following similar steps to those in Sec. 3, we can express the decay constants of Eqs. (6.5) and (6.6) as

$$\frac{{\rm d}\Gamma(E)}{{\rm d}E} = \frac{1}{(E-E_{\rm R})^2 + (\Gamma_{\rm R}/2)^2} |\langle E|V|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 \,, \tag{6.7}$$

$$\Gamma = \int_0^\infty {\rm d}E \, \frac{1}{(E-E_{\rm R})^2 + (\Gamma_{\rm R}/2)^2} |\langle E|V|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 \,. \tag{6.8}$$

These expressions are very similar to the expressions for the decay widths of Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9). In fact, it follows from Eqs. (3.8), (3.9), (6.7) and (6.8) that

$$\tfrac{{\rm d}\Gamma(E)}{{\rm d}E} = \tfrac{1}{\Gamma_{\rm R}} \tfrac{{\rm d}\overline{\Gamma}(E)}{{\rm d}E} \,, \tag{6.9}$$

$$\Gamma = \tfrac{\overline{\Gamma}}{\Gamma_{\rm R}} \,. \tag{6.10}$$

As can be seen from Eq. (6.4) or from Eq. (6.10), Γ is a dimensionless constant that can be interpreted as another way to measure the overall strength of the interaction between the resonance and the continuum. By contrast, $\frac{{\rm d}\Gamma(E)}{{\rm d}E}$ has units of $(\text{energy})^{-1}$, and hence can be interpreted as the probability density that the resonance decays into a stable particle of energy E.

Similarly to the decay width $\overline{\Gamma}$, one can define the dimensionless decay constant Γ of a square-integrable wave function φ. When we perform a resonant expansion of φ and substitute such expansion in the expression for Γ, we obtain a contribution that is associated exclusively with the resonant state, and other contributions that involve

the background. The contribution that is associated exclusively with $|z_{\rm R}\rangle$, which is given by Eqs. (6.7) and (6.8), is the contribution of the resonance per se. It should be noted that the (total) decay constant Γ associated with a normalized wave function φ is equal to one, as it should be, since the number of events per unit of energy must add up to the total number of events.

Similarly to $\frac{{\rm d}\overline{\Gamma}_j(E)}{{\rm d}E}$ and $\overline{\Gamma}_j$, we can also define the partial decay constants as follows:

$$\frac{{\rm d}\Gamma_j(E)}{{\rm d}E} = \frac{{\rm d}P_j(E)}{{\rm d}E} = \frac{1}{(E-E_{\rm R})^2+(\Gamma_{\rm R}/2)^2}|\langle E,j|V|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2\,, \qquad j=1,2, \tag{6.11}$$

$$\Gamma_j = P_j = \int_0^\infty {\rm d}E\; \frac{1}{(E-E_{\rm R})^2+(\Gamma_{\rm R}/2)^2}|\langle E,j|V|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2\,, \qquad j=1,2, \tag{6.12}$$

where P_j is the probability that the resonance decays into mode j. It follows from Eqs. (5.2), (5.3), (6.11) and (6.12) that

$$\tfrac{{\rm d}\Gamma_j(E)}{{\rm d}E} = \tfrac{1}{\Gamma_{\rm R}}\tfrac{{\rm d}\overline{\Gamma}_j(E)}{{\rm d}E}\,, \qquad j=1,2, \tag{6.13}$$

$$\Gamma_j = \tfrac{\overline{\Gamma}_j}{\Gamma_{\rm R}}\,, \qquad j=1,2. \tag{6.14}$$

The main advantage of the partial decay constants Γ_j over the partial decay widths $\overline{\Gamma}_j$ is that the decay constants Γ_j make the connection between the experimental and the theoretical branching fractions more apparent. In order to see this, let N_j be the number of decay events into the j mode. Then, the experimental branching fractions are defined as

$$\mathcal{B}({\rm R}\to j) = \frac{N_j}{N_1+N_2}\,, \qquad j=1,2\,. \tag{6.15}$$

If the experiment is done $N_0 = N_1 + N_2$ times (or, equivalently, if there are N_0 copies of the same resonance), the number of decay events into mode j is equal to the number of possible decay events multiplied by the probability that the resonance decays into mode j,

$$N_j = N_0 P_j = N_0\Gamma_j\,, \qquad j=1,2\,, \tag{6.16}$$

where we have used Eq. (6.12) in the second step. Substitution of Eq. (6.16) into Eq. (6.15) yields

$$\mathcal{B}({\rm R}\to j) = \frac{\Gamma_j}{\Gamma_1+\Gamma_2}\,, \qquad j=1,2\,. \tag{6.17}$$

Because of Eq. (6.14), the theoretical branching fractions of Eq. (6.17) are the same as those in Eq. (5.4). However, in Eq. (5.4) the branching fractions are expressed as the quotient of two dimensionful quantities, whereas in Eqs. (6.15) and (6.17) they are expressed as the quotient of dimensionless quantities. Thus, it seems preferable to express the theoretical branching fractions in terms of the (dimensionless) partial decay constants Γ_j rather than in terms of the partial decay widths $\overline{\Gamma}_j$.

7 Conclusions

The resonant (Gamow) states are the natural wave functions of resonances, and they lead to expressions for the differential, partial, and total decay widths of a resonance. In this paper, we have presented a simple derivation of the expressions for such decay widths and have shown that, in the approximation that the resonance is sharp and far from the lower energy threshold, the expressions bear a close resemblance to the standard Golden Rule. When the potential is simple, one can obtain an exact expression for the decay width (as in the example of the delta-shell potential), although for most potentials one is bound to use approximations. We have also constructed the branching fractions for a resonance that has several decay modes. The resulting branching fractions coincide with the branching fractions obtained by way of the Golden Rule only when the resonance is sharp. Thus, when the resonance is not sharp, the branching fractions of the present paper can, at least in principle, be distinguished from the standard ones based on the Golden Rule.

We have also introduced the (dimensionless) partial, and total decay constants of a resonant state. Using these dimensionless decay constants, we can express both the theoretical and experimental branching fractions as the ratio of dimensionless quantities. In addition, the differential decay constant can be identified with the energy distributions of decay events, which are a non-relativistic analog of the invariant mass distributions of particle physics.

Although the results of the present paper are restricted to the non-relativistic case, it is not hard to imagine a relativistic extension. Essentially, in the usual expression for the decay rate [43], instead of a delta function we should have a truncated, relativistic Breit-Wigner lineshape.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank the participants of the Quantum Fest, Mexico City, October 2014, especially Rodolfo Id Betan and Gabriel López-Castro, for stimulating discussions. The author acknowledges financial support from Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación of Spain under project TEC2011-24492.

A Relationship between $\overline{\Gamma}$ and Γ_{R}

When the survival probability is given by $p_{\text{s}}(\tau) = \text{e}^{-\Gamma_{\text{R}}\tau/\hbar}$, the initial decay rate and Γ_{R} are related by

$$\Gamma_{\text{R}} = -\hbar \dot{p}_{\text{s}}(0)\,. \tag{A.1}$$

However, if the survival probability was $p_{\rm s}(\tau) = p_0 {\rm e}^{-\Gamma_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar}$, the initial decay rate and $\Gamma_{\rm R}$ would be related by

$$\Gamma_{\rm R} p_0 = -\hbar \dot{p}_{\rm s}(0)\,. \tag{A.2}$$

Thus, only when the probability is given by the exponential function with no prefactor, does Eq. (A.1) hold. As we are going to see below, because the probability of Eq. (2.3) has a prefactor in front of the exponential, the decay width of Eq. (2.7) is different from the S-matrix width $\Gamma_{\rm R}$.

Equation (2.3) can be written as

$$\frac{{\rm d}P_\tau}{{\rm d}E} = {\rm e}^{-\Gamma_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar} |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{A.3}$$

Thus, the differential decay width (2.6) can be written as

$$\frac{{\rm d}\overline{\Gamma}(E)}{{\rm d}E} = \Gamma_{\rm R} |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{A.4}$$

The total decay width is

$$\overline{\Gamma} = \Gamma_{\rm R} \int_0^\infty {\rm d}E\ |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2\,. \tag{A.5}$$

Thus, $\overline{\Gamma}$ would be equal to $\Gamma_{\rm R}$ if

$$\int_0^\infty {\rm d}E\ |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 = 1\,. \tag{A.6}$$

Since

$$\int_0^\infty {\rm d}E\ |\langle E|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2 = \int_0^\infty {\rm d}r\ |\langle r|z_{\rm R}\rangle|^2\,, \tag{A.7}$$

the decay width $\overline{\Gamma}$ would be equal to the S-matrix width $\Gamma_{\rm R}$ if the absolute value squared of the Gamow state $u(r; z_{\rm R}) = \langle r|z_{\rm R}\rangle$ was normalized to one,

$$\int_0^\infty {\rm d}r\ |u(r; z_{\rm R})|^2 = 1\,. \tag{A.8}$$

However, since Zeldovich's normalization is (formally) given by

$$\int_0^\infty {\rm d}r\ [u(r; z_{\rm R})]^2 = 1\,, \tag{A.9}$$

the decay width $\overline{\Gamma}$ is in general different from the S-matrix width $\Gamma_{\rm R}$.

Finally, we would like to note that, in the standard derivation of the Golden Rule, it is assumed that the transition probability per unit of time (decay rate) is independent of time. However, the decay rate associated with the the survival probability of a resonant state, $\dot{p}_{\rm s}(\tau) = -(\Gamma_{\rm R}/\hbar){\rm e}^{-\Gamma_{\rm R}\tau/\hbar}$, is not independent of time, unless we restrict ourselves to a zero-order approximation. The same holds for any other probability distribution that follows the exponential decay law.

B The analogy with the Golden Rule

In this Appendix, we would like to point out a possible explanation for why the resonant decay widths of Eqs. (3.8) and (3.9) bear such a close resemblance to the standard Golden Rule of Eqs. (1.3) and (1.4) in the approximation that the resonance is sharp.

The Lippmann-Schwinger equation for "in" states can be written as

$$|E^+\rangle = |E\rangle + \frac{1}{E - H_0 + i\epsilon} V |E^+\rangle \,. \tag{B.1}$$

By writing $G_0 = \frac{1}{E-H_0+i\epsilon}$, and by successive substitutions, we obtain the Born expansion of the Lippmann-Schwinger equation,

$$|E^+\rangle = |E\rangle + G_0 V |E\rangle + (G_0 V)^2 |E\rangle + \cdots \,. \tag{B.2}$$

In this expansion, $|E\rangle$ is the term that one would obtain if there was no interaction, i.e., if $V = 0$. Thus, one usually defines the scattered state, $|E_{\rm s}\rangle \equiv |E^+\rangle - |E\rangle$, as the state that contains the actual effect of the interaction. Equation (B.2) can then be written as

$$|E_{\rm s}\rangle = G_0 V |E\rangle + (G_0 V)^2 |E\rangle + \cdots \,. \tag{B.3}$$

The first-order approximation to the scattered state is given by,

$$|E_{\rm s}\rangle \approx G_0 V |E\rangle \,. \tag{B.4}$$

On the other hand, the integral equation satisfied by the resonant states, Eq. (3.1), can be written as

$$|z_{\rm R}\rangle = G_0(z_{\rm R}) V |z_{\rm R}\rangle \,. \tag{B.5}$$

When the resonance is sharp, one can approximate the resonant state by a bound state $|E_{\rm R}\rangle$,

$$|z_{\rm R}\rangle \approx G_0(E_{\rm R}) V |E_{\rm R}\rangle \,. \tag{B.6}$$

The similarity between Eqs. (B.4) and (B.6) may be the reason behind the similarity between the standard Golden Rule of Eqs. (1.3)–(1.4) and the approximate decay widths of Eqs. (3.12)–(3.13).

Although Eqs. (B.4) and (B.6) are analogous, there is a major difference between them. The approximation in Eq. (B.4) relies on the assumption that the potential V is weak, whereas the approximation in Eq. (B.6) relies on the assumption that the potential V is strong enough that the resonance can be considered nearly a bound state.

References

[1] Particle Data Group, S. Eidelman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).

[2] A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2127–2130 (1991); Phys. Lett. B **267**, 240–242 (1991).

[3] S. Willenbrock and G. Valencia, Phys. Lett. B **259**, 373–376 (1991).

[4] R.G. Stuart, Phys. Lett. B **262**, 113–119 (1991).

[5] A. Leike, T. Riemann, and J. Rose, Phys. Lett. B **273**, 513–518 (1991).

[6] T. Bhattacharya and S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 4022–4027 (1993).

[7] M. Passera and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4146–4149 (1996).

[8] A. Bernicha, G. Lopez Castro, and J. Pestieau, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 4454–4461 (1994); Nucl. Phys. A **597**, 623-635 (1996);

[9] A. Bohm and N.L. Harshman, Nucl. Phys. B **581**, 91–115 (2000).

[10] P.A. Grassi, B.A. Kniehl, A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 389–392 (2001).

[11] A. Bohm, Y. Sato, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 085018-1–22 (2005).

[12] F. Giacosa, G. Pagliara, Phys. Rev. C **76**, 065204-1–10 (2007).

[13] D.N. Pattanayak, E. Wolf, Phys. Rev. D **13**, 2287–2290 (1976).

[14] E. Hernández, A. Mondragón, Phys. Rev. C **29**, 722–738 (1984).

[15] J.M. Velazquez-Arcos, C.A. Vargas, J.L. Fernandez-Chapou, A.L. Salas-Brito, J. Math. Phys. **49**, 103508-1–16 (2008).

[16] R. de la Madrid, J. Math. Phys. **53**, 102113 (2012); arXiv:1210.3570.

[17] M.L. Goldberger, K.M. Watson, "Collision Theory," John Wiley & Sons, New York (1964).

[18] E. Merzbacher, "Quantum Mechanics," 3rd Edition, John Wiley & Sons (1998).

[19] A. Bohm, "Quantum Mechanics: Foundations and Applications," 3rd Edition, Springer (1993).

[20] L. Fonda, G.C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41**, 587–631 (1978).

[21] W.E. Lamb, H. Fearn, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2124–2128 (1991).

[22] O. Costin, A. Soffer, Comm. Math. Phys. **224**, 133–152 (2001).

[23] H. Thyrrestrup, A. Hartsuiker, J.-M. Gérard, W.L. Vos, Optics Express **21**, 23130–23144 (2013); arXiv:1301.7612.

[24] K. Ishikawa, Y. Tobita, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. (2013) 073B02; arXiv:1303.4568.

[25] P.W. Bryant, "Exponential Decay and Fermi's Golden Rule from an Uncontrolled Quantum Zeno Effect," arXiv:1309.5347.

[26] V. Debierre, I. Goessens, E. Brainis, T. Durt, "Fermi golden rule beyond the Zeno regime," arXiv:1501.04474.

[27] V. Debierre, T. Durt, A. Nicolet, F. Zolla, "Spontaneous light emission by atomic Hydrogen: Fermi's golden rule without cheating," arXiv:1502.06404.

[28] R.G. Winter, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1503–1507 (1961).

[29] D.A. Dicus, W.W. Repko, R.F. Schwitters, T.M. Tinsley, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032116-1–5 (2002).

[30] G. Garcia-Calderon, Advances in Quantum Chemistry **60**, 407–455 (2010).

[31] U.G. Aglietti, P.M. Santini, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 022111-1–12 (2014); arXiv:1303.4977.

[32] U.G. Aglietti, P.M. Santini, "Geometry of Winter Model," arXiv:1503.02532.

[33] R. de la Madrid, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **42**, 2441–2460 (2003); arXiv:quant-ph/0210167.

[34] The ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1–29 (2012); arXiv:1207.7214

[35] The CMS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30–61 (2012); arXiv:1207.7235.

[36] The LHCb Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 172001-1–9 (2014); arXiv:1407.5873.

[37] The CDF Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 091101-1–8 (2014); arXiv:1409.4906.

[38] The BESIII Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 112006-1–8 (2014); arXiv:1405.1571.

[39] The BELLE Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 112008-1–9 (2014); arXiv:1409.7644.

[40] The D0 Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett **114**, 062001-1–7 (2015); arXiv:1410.1568.

[41] The BABAR Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 012003-1–12 (2015); arXiv:1407.7244.

[42] The ALICE Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **740**, 105–117 (2015); arXiv:1410.2234.

[43] M.E. Peskin, D.V. Schroeder, "An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory," Addison-Wesley (1995).