

# Decuplet Contributions to Hyperon Axial Vector Form Factors

Markus A. Luty

Theoretical Physics Group  
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
1 Cyclotron Road  
Berkeley, California 94720

Martin White

Center for Particle Astrophysics  
301 Le Conte Hall  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

## Abstract

We consider the predictions of chiral perturbation theory for  $SU(3)$  breaking in the axial vector form factor  $g_1$  measured in semileptonic hyperon decays. We confirm that if only octet baryon intermediate states are included, the non-analytic corrections are  $\sim 100\%$ . These corrections are dominated by an  $SU(3)$ -symmetric wavefunction renormalization, which explains the fact that the "corrected" predictions still fit the data well. We argue that the large corrections are nonetheless strong evidence that the chiral expansion is breaking down. Following a recent suggestion of Jenkins and Manohar, we then include contributions from decuplet baryon intermediate states. Unlike these authors, we do not neglect the octet-decuplet mass difference. We find that the effects of  $\sim 0$  significantly change the pattern of corrections: we still find that the decuplet corrections can cancel the large octet contributions in a non-trivial way, but the corrections no longer favor the  $SU(6)$  values of the axial couplings. We also argue that  $D$  and  $F$  axial couplings cannot be reliably extracted from calculations which keep only the non-analytic corrections.

## 1. Introduction

Chiral perturbation theory (PT) provides a rigorous framework for extracting physical predictions from QCD as power series in the "light" quark current masses  $m_u, m_d$ , and  $m_s$ . At lowest order, PT predicts a large number of quantities in terms of a few effective coupling constants. Many of the resulting predictions are very successful.

Clearly, it is important to understand the size of the corrections to the lowest order results, especially for quantities sensitive to  $m_s$ , since experience with the chiral expansion suggests that the fractional corrections to these quantities are of order

$$\frac{m_s}{\Lambda} \sim 0.2; \quad (1)$$

where  $\Lambda \sim 1 \text{ GeV}$  is the PT expansion parameter. Unfortunately, higher orders in the chiral expansion involve many unknown effective couplings. However, there are nonanalytic corrections of order  $m_s \ln m_s$  (and sometimes  $m_s^{1=2}$  for processes involving baryons) which are computable in terms of the lowest-order couplings. For sufficiently small values of  $m_s$ , these are the largest corrections. While the nonanalytic corrections are not expected to be significantly larger than the  $O(m_s)$  contributions in the real world, the nonanalytic corrections can be used to give an estimate of the expected size of corrections. In particular, if the nonanalytic corrections are large, then chiral perturbation theory breaks down unless the  $O(m_s)$  corrections cancel the nonanalytic contributions. Such a cancellation is unnatural, since it can occur only for special values of the quark masses. Thus, the calculation of the non-analytic contributions gives non-trivial information about the chiral expansion, even if they cannot be used to quantitatively predict the size of the corrections.

In ref. [1], baryon chiral perturbation theory was reformulated in terms of an effective lagrangian which includes the octet baryons as heavy fields [2], and it was found that the leading nonanalytic corrections to the baryon axial form factors were  $\sim 100\%$ .<sup>†</sup> This is surprising in light of the fact that the lowest-order predictions work to better than 20%. In this paper, we point out that these corrections are dominated by an SU(3)-singlet wavefunction renormalization, which explains why the fit to the data including the corrections still works well. However, we argue that the presence of these large corrections is nonetheless strong evidence that the chiral expansion defined by this effective lagrangian is breaking down.

---

These effective coupling constants are related to QCD matrix elements which are in principle computable (on the lattice, for example). However, our present knowledge of the relevant matrix elements is rather limited, and we conservatively regard the effective couplings as undetermined parameters.

<sup>†</sup> An earlier calculation [3] which found smaller corrections is incorrect.

In ref. [4], it was found that the large chiral symmetry breaking corrections discussed above are largely cancelled by contributions from decuplet intermediate states. From the point of view of the effective lagrangian, this looks like an unnatural cancellation between two unrelated sectors of the theory. However from the point of view of QCD the decuplet and octet states are certainly related. In fact, in the large- $N_c$  limit of QCD, the baryon spectrum consists of  $N_c$  states with mass differences  $\Delta M_{QCD} \sim N_c$ , and the lowest-lying states have the quantum numbers of the octet and decuplet baryons (for  $N_c$  odd). There are non-trivial relations between the different baryon multiplets in this limit which reproduce the SU(6) spin-flavor symmetry relations between octet and decuplet baryon couplings [5]. While these developments are very interesting, we will take a more phenomenological point of view in this paper, including the decuplet without assuming SU(6) symmetry.

Including the decuplet in the chiral lagrangian is only justified if the decuplet-octet mass splitting is small compared to the PT expansion parameter (numerically,  $\sim 300 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $\sim 1 \text{ GeV}$ .) In this limit, we can treat the decuplet as a nonrelativistic heavy field, substantially simplifying the computation. Our calculation differs from that of ref. [4] mainly in that we do not make the approximation  $m_K \rightarrow 0$ . We find that the effect of nonzero  $m_K$  completely changes the pattern of the non-analytic corrections: the decuplet corrections can still cancel the large octet corrections for some values of the couplings, but the corrections strongly disfavor the SU(6) values of the decuplet axial couplings. We also argue that the axial coupling constants cannot be accurately determined if only the non-analytic corrections are included.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we briefly review the effective lagrangian formalism we will use. In section 3, we present the results of our calculation including only octet intermediate states. In section 4, we present the results of including the decuplet. Section 5 contains our conclusions. Some information on the semileptonic decays used in this paper is given in an appendix.

## 2. Effective Lagrangian

It has been known for some time that the low-energy theorems of spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking can be encoded in an effective lagrangian [6]. The lagrangian gives a systematic framework for investigating deviations from the symmetry limit  $m_u, m_d, m_s \rightarrow 0$ . In this section, we briefly review the effective lagrangian we use to carry out the computation. The notation and conventions we use are the same as those of ref. [7]. The reader familiar with this formalism is urged to skip to section 3.

The effective lagrangian we will use includes the pseudoscalar meson octet



where  $A$  is the axial current formed from pion fields. We have used an abbreviated notation in which SU (3) indices are suppressed:

$$\bar{T}^a T^a = \bar{T}_{jkl} A_m^j T^{mkl}; \quad \bar{T}^a B^a = \bar{T}_{jkl} A_m^j B_n^k \delta_{ln}; \quad (10)$$

### 3. Octet Corrections

In this section, we will discuss the corrections which involve only octet intermediate states. Our calculation differs from that of ref. [1] only in that we keep  $m \neq 0$ . The corrections are expected to be 20% of the K and  $\pi$  corrections, but omitting the contributions systematically increases the predicted SU (3) breaking, so we include them here.

We write

$$g_1^{abc}(0) = \frac{c_{ab}}{16\pi^2 f^2} c_{ab}; \quad (11)$$

where the lowest-order results are

$$\begin{aligned} 1+i2_{pn} &= D + F; \\ 1+i2 &= \frac{2}{3}D; \\ 4+i5_p &= \frac{1}{3}(D + 3F); \\ 4+i5 &= \frac{1}{3}(D - 3F); \\ 4+i5_n &= D - F; \\ 4+i5_0 &= \frac{1}{2}(D + F); \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The leading chiral corrections are

$$\begin{aligned} 1+i2_{pn} &= (D + F)(2D^2 + 4DF + 2F^2 + 1)m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{6}(13D^3 - D^2F + 3D + 3DF^2 + 3F + 33F^3)m_K^2 \ln \frac{m_K^2}{2} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{3}(D + F)(D - 3F)^2 m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2}; \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 1+i2 &= \frac{2}{3}\frac{D}{6}(7D^2 + 3F^2 + 3)m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{3}\frac{D}{6}(3D^2 + 13F^2 + 1)m_K^2 \ln \frac{m_K^2}{2} \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{3}\frac{D}{6}m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2}; \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4+i5}{p} = & \frac{3}{8} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{6} (3D^3 + 27D^2F + D + 25D F^2 + 3F + 9F^3) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{6} (31D^3 + 15D^2F + 9D + 9D F^2 + 27F + 297F^3) m_K^2 \ln \frac{m_K^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{24} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{6} (D + 3F) (19D^2 + 30D F + 27F^2 + 9) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2}; \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4+i5}{8} = & \frac{3}{8} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{6} (3D^3 + 27D^2F + D + 25D F^2 + 3F + 9F^3) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{6} (31D^3 + 15D^2F + 9D + 9D F^2 + 27F + 297F^3) m_K^2 \ln \frac{m_K^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{24} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{6} (D + 3F) (19D^2 + 30D F + 27F^2 + 9) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2}; \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4+i5}{n} = & \frac{1}{24} (35D^3 + 23D^2F + 9D + 33D F^2 + 9F + 123F^3) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{12} (31D^3 + 53D^2F + 9D + 57D F^2 + 9F + 51F^3) m_K^2 \ln \frac{m_K^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{24} (D + F) (11D^2 + 6D F + 27F^2 + 9) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2}; \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{4+i5}{0} = & \frac{1}{24} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{2} (35D^3 + 23D^2F + 9D + 33D F^2 + 9F + 123F^3) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{2} (31D^3 + 53D^2F + 9D + 57D F^2 + 9F + 51F^3) m_K^2 \ln \frac{m_K^2}{2} \\
& + \frac{1}{24} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{2} (D + F) (11D^2 + 6D F + 27F^2 + 9) m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2}; \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $\mu$  is an arbitrary renormalization scale. The  $\mu$  dependence of these results is cancelled by the  $\mu$  dependence of  $O(m_s)$  terms in the effective lagrangian such as

$$\frac{c(\mu)}{2} \text{tr} \bar{B} ( \gamma m_q \gamma + h.c. ) s \quad AB; \tag{19}$$

where  $m_q$  is the quark mass matrix. If we take  $\mu = m_q$ , there are no large logarithms in the higher order coefficients, and near the chiral limit the correction is dominated by the logarithmically enhanced terms computed above. In the real world these logarithms are not very large, but we expect that the logarithmic terms will give some indication of the actual size of the corrections, as discussed in the introduction.

The corrections to individual form factors are all larger than 80%, in agreement with the results of ref. [1]. Closer inspection of the results of this calculation reveals that the largest part of the corrections comes from the SU(3)-invariant part of the wavefunction

renormalization. This contribution can be written

$$g_1^{abc}(0) = \frac{c}{ab} Z; \quad (20)$$

where

$$Z = \frac{1}{8} (5D^2 + 9F^2) - 3m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} + 4m_K^2 \ln \frac{m_K^2}{2} + m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} \quad (21)$$

The logarithmically-enhanced wavefunction renormalization must be positive on general grounds [8], and therefore we know that there must be positive SU(3)-invariant piece. The surprise is that this is by far the most important correction. (If we remove this contribution, the largest correction is 50%, with all other corrections less than 25%.)

This contribution can be formally removed from the chiral expansion by defining the baryon fields

$$B^0 = (1 + Z)^{1/2} B; \quad (22)$$

We can then write the terms in the lagrangian involving two baryon fields as

$$\begin{aligned} L_B &= \text{tr}(\bar{B} i \not{\partial} B) + \sum_j c_j O_j(B) \\ &= (1 + Z) \text{tr}(\bar{B} i \not{\partial} B) + \sum_j c_j^0 O_j(B^0); \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $c_j^0 = (1 + Z)c_j$ . If we now expand in terms of the coefficients  $c_j^0$  treating  $Z$  as order  $m_s \ln m_s$ , the large wavefunction renormalization is absorbed into a redefinition of the chiral couplings.

Since wavefunction renormalization is universal for all amplitudes with two external baryon lines, one might think that the resummation discussed above shows that the large wavefunction correction is "trivial," simply rescaling the couplings of the effective lagrangian and leaving relations among observables intact. However,  $Z$  depends on the quark masses, and chiral symmetry relates this dependence to physical quantities. In particular, the dependence of  $Z$  is compensated by the dependence of the term

$$\frac{c(\cdot)}{f} \text{tr}(\gamma_5 m_q \gamma_5 + h.c.) \text{tr}(\bar{B} i \not{\partial} B); \quad (24)$$

If we chose to make  $Z$  small,  $c(\cdot)$  will be large. This leads to a breakdown of chiral perturbation theory, since this term contributes to e.g. s-wave pion-nucleon scattering. While a full calculation would be required to demonstrate the breakdown of chiral perturbation theory, it is clear that there is no reason to think that the large wavefunction renormalization corrections found in this calculation are trivial.

#### 4. Decuplet Corrections

In this section, we include the decuplet contributions to  $g_1$ . We write

$$g_1^{abc}(0) = c_{ab} + \frac{1}{16} \frac{h}{f^2} c_{ab} + C^2 \frac{i}{c_{ab}}; \quad (25)$$

where  $c_{ab}$  contains the decuplet contributions, which are proportional to the coupling  $C$  defined in eq. (9). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1+i2}{pn} = & \frac{1}{2} (D + F) [4G_1(m) + G_1(m_K)] - \frac{10}{81} H [5G_1(m) + G_1(m_K)] \\ & + \frac{2}{9} [8(D + F)G_2(m) + (3D + F)G_2(m_K)]; \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1+i2}{p} = & \frac{1}{6} D [11G_1(m) + 16G_1(m_K) + 3G_1(m)] \\ & - \frac{5}{27} H [2G_1(m) + G_1(m_K)] \\ & + \frac{2}{9} [(D + 6F)G_2(m) + (8D + 12F)G_2(m_K) + 3DG_2(m)]; \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4+i5}{p} = & \frac{1}{4} D (D + 3F) [7G_1(m) + 3G_1(m_K)] + \frac{5}{9} H [2G_1(m) + G_1(m_K)] \\ & + \frac{1}{3} [(11D + 3F)G_2(m) + 3(D + F)G_2(m_K)]; \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4+i5}{4} = & \frac{1}{4} D (D - 3F) [4G_1(m) + 5G_1(m_K) + G_1(m)] \\ & - \frac{5}{9} H [G_1(m) + G_1(m_K)] \\ & + \frac{1}{3} [(D - 3F)G_2(m) + 3(D - F)G_2(m_K) + 2DG_2(m)]; \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4+i5}{n} = & \frac{1}{12} (D - F) [14G_1(m) + 13G_1(m_K) + 3G_1(m)] \\ & + \frac{5}{81} H [2G_1(m) + G_1(m_K)] \\ & + \frac{1}{9} [2(D + 5F)G_2(m) + (D + 5F)G_2(m_K) - (D - 3F)G_2(m)]; \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4+i5}{0} = & \frac{1}{12} D (D + F) [5G_1(m) + 19G_1(m_K) + 6G_1(m)] \\ & - \frac{5}{81} H [2G_1(m) + 7G_1(m_K) + 3G_1(m)] \\ & + \frac{1}{9} [2(2D + F)G_2(m) + (15D + 13F)G_2(m_K) \\ & + 3(D + F)G_2(m)]; \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$



where

$$G_1(m) = m^2 \left[ 2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} + 4m \right] \frac{1}{m^2} F(\frac{m}{\Lambda}); \quad (32)$$

$$G_2(m) = m^2 \left[ \frac{2}{3} \ln \frac{m^2}{2} + \frac{4m^3}{3} \right] \frac{1}{m^2} F(\frac{m}{\Lambda}) - \frac{4}{3} m^2; \quad (33)$$

Here we have defined

$$F(x) \approx \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1-x^2} \tan^{-1} \frac{1}{1-x^2} & \text{for } x < 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{x^2-1} \ln \frac{x+1}{x-1} & \text{for } x > 1. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

To obtain these results, we have dropped terms analytic in the quark masses which can be absorbed into counterterms in the chiral lagrangian. This amounts to a choice of subtraction procedure. The limiting values of the decuplet corrections can be obtained using

$$G_1(m) = \begin{cases} m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} & \text{for } m \ll \Lambda, \\ m^2 \left[ \frac{2}{3} \ln \frac{4}{2} \right] m^2 & \text{for } m \gg \Lambda, \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

$$G_2(m) = \begin{cases} m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{2} & \text{for } m \ll \Lambda, \\ m^2 \left[ \frac{2}{3} \ln \frac{4}{2} + \frac{5}{3} \right] m^2 & \text{for } m \gg \Lambda. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

From the expressions above it is easy to check that the decuplet contributions decouple in the limit  $m \rightarrow 0$ . In this limit the decuplet corrections are either analytic in the quark masses, and can be absorbed into terms in the effective lagrangian which contain only octet baryon fields, or are  $SU(3)$  symmetric  $O(\ln^2)$  terms which can be absorbed into a redefinition of  $D$  and  $F$ . We can also consider the limit  $m \rightarrow \infty$ ;  $m$  advocated in ref. [4]. We find that  $G_1(m)$  and  $G_2(m)$  are very poorly approximated by setting  $m = 0$ : for example, they have the wrong sign.

The decuplet corrections are large,  $\sim 100\%$ , like the octet corrections. However, unlike the octet corrections, wavefunction renormalization is not the largest part of the decuplet corrections. This means that these corrections cannot be removed by an  $SU(3)$ -conserving field redefinition, as contemplated above.

We now compare our results to semileptonic decay data (see the appendix). The constant  $C$  can be determined from non-leptonic weak decays of decuplet states to be

$C \approx 1.5$  [4], so there is one new undetermined parameter  $H$  compared to the octet case. We assign a 20% theoretical uncertainty due to  $O(m_s)$  corrections to the amplitudes and show the resulting 67%, 90%, and 95% confidence level region in the  $D, F$  plane in Fig. 1. (The region is obtained by projecting the allowed region in  $D, F$ , and  $H$  space onto the  $D, F$  plane.) Because of the large allowed region, a best fit is probably meaningless.

Despite the fact that the allowed region is quite large, one can draw some non-trivial conclusions. The first is that the lowest-order values of  $D$  and  $F$  are allowed. For these values of  $D$  and  $F$ , the corrections are less than 10% if  $H \approx 0.5$ . (A similar cancellation was found in ref. [4], but for a different range of  $H$  values.) This suggests that including decuplet baryon states may improve the convergence of baryon chiral perturbation theory.

We emphasize that the fact that the decuplet contributions can cancel the octet contributions is highly non-trivial: it involves a large cancellation between octet wavefunction renormalization and decuplet "vertex" corrections. (The decuplet contribution to wavefunction renormalization is positive and therefore cannot cancel the octet wavefunction renormalization contribution.) Also, it is striking that the cancellation occurs both for nonzero as well as zero octet-decuplet mass splitting, since the corrections are very different in these two cases.

Finally, we can ask whether the corrections favor the  $SU(6)$  prediction

$$F = \frac{2}{3}D; \quad C = 2D; \quad H = 3D : \quad (37)$$

This relation is excluded by the above analysis at the 95% confidence level. (If we set  $\alpha = 0$ , the corrections favor the  $SU(6)$  values, as found in ref. [4].) It is not clear how meaningful this is, since higher order corrections may be important.

## 5. Conclusions

We have critically examined the chiral perturbation theory predictions for the axial vector form factors, both with and without the inclusion of decuplet intermediate states. We confirmed the result of ref. [1] that the corrections are large if decuplet states are not included. We argued that these large corrections are a symptom that chiral perturbation theory including only octet baryon states is breaking down, despite the fact that the largest correction takes the form of an  $SU(3)$ -singlet wavefunction renormalization. We then examined the contributions of decuplet intermediate states. We found that taking into account the effects of the decuplet-octet mass difference substantially changes the pattern of corrections obtained in ref. [4], which neglects these effects. We found that the decuplet corrections tend to cancel the octet corrections in a non-trivial way (as also

found by ref. [4]), and that the corrections strongly disfavor the SU (6) values of the axial couplings (contrary to the conclusions of ref. [4]). We also argued that D and F cannot be reliably extracted from a calculation which includes only the non-analytic corrections.

While completing the present paper, we received ref. [9], which also makes the point (in a different context) that setting  $\epsilon = 0$  in the decuplet integrals is not a good approximation.

## 6. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank E. Jenkins, M. Luke, A. V. Manohar, M. Savage, and M. Suzuki for discussions. This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC 03-76SF 00098.

## Appendix A. Fit to Semileptonic Decays

In this appendix, we consider the determination of D and F from  $S = 1$  semileptonic decays of hyperons. These decays are governed by the form factors

$$\langle B_a | j_V^c(0) | B_b \rangle = \bar{u}(p_a) [f_1^{abc}(q^2) + \frac{if_2^{abc}(q^2)}{M_a + M_b} \not{q} + \frac{if_3^{abc}(q^2)}{M_a + M_b} \not{q} \not{u}(p_b)]; \quad (38)$$

$$\langle B_a | j_A^c(0) | B_b \rangle = \bar{u}(p_a) [g_1^{abc}(q^2) + \frac{ig_2^{abc}(q^2)}{M_a + M_b} \not{q} + \frac{ig_3^{abc}(q^2)}{M_a + M_b} \not{q} \not{u}(p_b)]; \quad (39)$$

where  $q = p_a - p_b$ . The contributions of the form factors  $f_3$  and  $g_3$  are suppressed by the electron mass, and can be safely neglected. Near the SU (3) limit  $m_u = m_d = m_s$ , the baryons are nearly degenerate, and at the order we are working the decays are determined by the form factors at zero momentum transfer. The contributions of  $f_2$  and  $g_2$  are suppressed by  $O(m_s)$  because of the explicit power of  $q$  multiplying these terms. (In fact, time-reversal invariance can be used to show that  $g_2(0) = 0$  in the SU (3) limit, so that the contributions of  $g_2$  are even smaller.) In the SU (3) limit, the form factors  $f_1(0)$  are given by Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and the  $g_1(0)$ 's are simple linear combinations of D and F (see eq. (13)). The corrections to  $f_1$  are  $O(m_s)$  and can be computed in chiral perturbation theory [7]. The leading corrections to  $g_1$  are  $O(m_s \ln m_s)$  and formally give the largest corrections to the semileptonic decay rates. These are therefore the only corrections to the form factors which we will keep.

To perform our fit, we use both decay rate and asymmetry data taken from the most recent Particle Data Group (PDG) compilation [10]. For the asymmetry data, we directly

use the average values for  $g_A = g_V$  quoted by the PDG. To convert the decay rates into values for  $g_1$ , we keep the full kinematic dependence on the baryon masses, since these effects turn out to be numerically important. The data we use is displayed in table 1.

	lifetime		asymmetry	
$n \rightarrow p$	1.323	0.003	1.257	0.003
$\Lambda \rightarrow p$	0.609	0.029	0.62	0.44
$\Lambda \rightarrow n$	0.972	0.018	0.879	0.021
$\Lambda \rightarrow \Sigma^0$	0.442	0.021	0.340	0.017
$\Lambda \rightarrow \Sigma^+$	0.96	0.19		
$\Lambda \rightarrow \Sigma^0$	0.473	0.026	0.306	0.061

Table 1: Values for  $g_1(0)$  extracted from 1992 PDG

The decay rate and asymmetry determinations of  $g_1$  are inconsistent if we assume only the errors quoted by the PDG. This is either a symptom of systematic errors in the experiments or an indication that higher-order corrections are important. We expect that higher order terms in the chiral expansion will give rise to 20% corrections, and so we added this amount in quadrature to all the quoted errors to take into account the theoretical uncertainty. When we do this, all the errors on all determinations have a sizable overlap.

With this procedure, reasonable fits are obtained. For example, if we fit this data to  $D$  and  $F$  using the lowest-order prediction in eq. (12), we obtain the best fit

$$D = 0.85 \pm 0.06; \quad F = 0.52 \pm 0.04; \quad (40)$$

with  $\chi^2 = 6.1$  for 9 degrees of freedom.

## 7. References

- [1] E. Jenkins and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Lett. 255B, 558 (1991).
- [2] H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. 240B, 447 (1990); T. Mannel, W. Roberts, and Z. Ryzak, Nucl. Phys. B 368, 204 (1992).
- [3] J. Bijnens, H. Sonoda, and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B 261, 185 (1985).
- [4] E. Jenkins and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Lett. 259B, 353 (1991).
- [5] J.-L. Gervais and B. Sakita, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 87 (1984), Phys. Rev. D 30, 1795 (1984); K. Bardakci, Nucl. Phys. B 243, 197 (1984); R. Dashen and A. V. Manohar, UCSD/PTH 93-16,18.
- [6] J. Schwinger, Phys. Lett. 24B, 473 (1967); S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. 117, 2239 (1969); C. G. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. 117, 2247 (1969); S. Weinberg, Physica 96A, 327 (1979).
- [7] J. Anderson and M. A. Luty, LBL preprint LBL-33435, to appear in Phys. Rev. D.
- [8] See e.g. J. C. Collins, Renormalization (Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 192.
- [9] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and Ulf-G. Meißner, BUTP-93/05, CRN-93-06, (hep-ph/9303311), unpublished.
- [10] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D 45, S1 (1992).

## Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Contours of 68% , 90% , and 95% confidence-level regions in the  $D$  -  $F$  plane when decuplet corrections are included, obtained as discussed in the text. The black dot shows the lowest-order values of  $D$  and  $F$  , as discussed in the appendix.

