

Neutrino Interactions in Octet Baryon Matter

Toshitaka Tatsumi¹; Tatsuyuki Takatsuka²; and Ryozo Tamagaki³¹Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan²Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Iwate University

Morioka 020-8550, Japan

³Kamitakano Maeda-cho 26-5, Kyoto 606-0097, Japan

(Received)

Neutrino processes caused by the neutral current are studied in octet baryon matter. Previous confusion about the baryonic matrix elements of the neutral current interaction is excluded, and a correct table for them is improved by consideration of the proton spin problem is presented instead.

In neutron stars, neutrinos have played crucial roles and their weak interactions with nuclear matter have been intensively studied by many authors in relation to supernova explosions, thermal evolution of protoneutron stars and cooling of neutron stars.¹⁾ There work two weak processes in the Standard model²⁾; one is the charged current (CC) process and the other is the neutral current (NC) process. The elementary process where the CC takes part in has been well understood. On the other hand the NC process has not been well established yet due to little empirical information, while the NC process governs the neutrino mean-free path in baryonic matter and the emission from there. The former is closely related to supernova explosions and deleptonization of protoneutron stars.^{1);3)} The latter is related to the cooling problem of young neutron stars such as the bremsstrahlung process⁴⁾ and the emission due to the Cooper pairing of nucleons and quarks.^{5);6);7)}

In these contexts many authors have evaluated and used the matrix elements of the hadron NC between the baryon SU(3) octet by utilizing SU(3) symmetry. Nevertheless we have realized that there is some confusion spread over literatures about their values, especially for hyperons. The problem is related to the GIM mechanism.²⁾ There is another problem to be elucidated. It is well known that the same procedure has successively worked for the CC processes such as hyperon decays. Although there has been no empirical justification a priori for the NC processes, recent experimental data and lattice simulations have suggested a large deviation from these values based on SU(3) symmetry, which is caused by the existence of the flavor singlet current in the baryonic NC. The matrix elements of the flavor singlet current are closely related to the problem of the proton spin as well. To our knowledge there is no consideration to take into account these results for the NC processes in baryon matter.

E-mail: tatsumi@ruby.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp

E-mail: takatsuka@iwate-u.ac.jp

E-mail: tamagaki@yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

In this Letter we reconsider the NC processes in baryon matter to clarify the problematic points mentioned above and present correct values about the matrix elements of the NC between the octet baryons.

In some literatures studying neutron star matter with admixed hyperons, we notice such a mistaken statement that the NC coupling vanishes, e.g., in Refs. 4b) and 6). As shown below, finiteness of this coupling is simply understood with use of the SU(6) quark model for the baryon octet. The effective Lagrangian to describe the NC process is given by way of the Standard model,²⁾

$$L^{(NC)} = \frac{G_F}{2} \bar{l} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) l J^\mu \quad (1)$$

where J^μ is the lepton NC current, $J^\mu = \bar{e} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) e$; and J^μ is the quark NC current,

$$J^\mu = \bar{u} \gamma^\mu (I_+ - \frac{1}{2}) u - \bar{d} \gamma^\mu (I_- - \frac{1}{2}) d - \bar{s} \gamma^\mu (I_- - \frac{1}{2}) s \quad (2)$$

with $I_+ = 1 - 8 \sin^2 \theta_W = 3$ and $I_- = 1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_W = 3$, where θ_W is the Weinberg angle ($\sin^2 \theta_W \approx 0.23$). A point to be noted in what follows is the different sign between the terms of the upper components ($\bar{u}; u; c$) and the lower components ($\bar{d}; d; s$) of the SU(2)_L doublets. If we take the non-relativistic approximation to J^μ , the vector (axial-vector) current operator becomes as $\bar{q} \gamma^0 q$ ($\bar{q} \gamma^0 \gamma_5 q$) with $k = 1; 2; 3$. Then we can evaluate the matrix elements of J^μ between the baryon states described by the SU(6) quark model wave functions, which are given as a sum of the 3-quark product wave functions. Because J^μ is the one-particle operator, only the diagonal (non-exchange) matrix elements with respect to the flavor and spin are non-vanishing.

For the proton spin-up state described by

$$|p \uparrow\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{18}} [2(u \uparrow d \uparrow s \downarrow) - (u \uparrow d \downarrow s \uparrow) + (u \downarrow d \uparrow s \uparrow)]$$

where $u \uparrow d \uparrow s \downarrow$ etc. contain the antisymmetric color state and the symmetric spatial state and s.c. means the sum of symmetric combination, we have

$$\langle p \uparrow | J^0 | p \uparrow \rangle = (2I_+ - I_-) \frac{1}{2} + (5/3) \frac{1}{2} = (1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_W) \frac{1}{2} + (5/3) \frac{1}{2} \quad (3)$$

Similarly for the neutron state, because of $(I_+ - 2I_-) = 1$, we have

$$\langle n \uparrow | J^0 | n \uparrow \rangle = \frac{1}{2} - (5/3) \frac{1}{2} \quad (4)$$

The factor 5/3 should be replaced by $g_A \approx 1.27$.⁸⁾ For the state described by

$$|j \uparrow\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} [2(u \uparrow d \uparrow u \downarrow d \downarrow + d \uparrow u \uparrow d \downarrow u \downarrow) - (u \uparrow d \downarrow u \uparrow d \downarrow) + (u \downarrow d \uparrow u \uparrow d \downarrow)]$$

we have

$$\langle h \uparrow | J^0 | h \uparrow \rangle = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \quad (5)$$

We suppress the c; t; b quark sectors for our purpose.

The non-vanishing coupling is simply understood by the number counting, especially for the $\sin^2 \theta_W$ -independent terms of the vector current by counting the number of each flavor quark with the positive (negative) sign for u (d;s). The matrix elements for the other octet baryons are obtained in the same way.

We define the matrix elements of the baryonic NC as

$$\langle B | j^\mu | B \rangle = \bar{u}_B^0 (C_V^{SU(6)} - C_A^{SU(6)}) u_B; \quad (6)$$

where u_B (\bar{u}_B^0) is the Dirac spinor of the baryon in the initial (nal) state. By equating the matrix elements obtained above with the non-relativistic limit of this equation, we can determine $C_{V,A}^{SU(6)}$ within the SU(6) quark model: $C_V^{SU(6)} = 1$, $4 \sin^2 \theta_W$, $C_A^{SU(6)} = g_A$ for the proton, $C_V^{SU(6)} = -1$, $C_A^{SU(6)} = -g_A$ for the neutron, and $C_V^{SU(6)} = C_A^{SU(6)} = 0$ for the Λ particle. In the same way we obtain the values for the other octet members. $C_V^{SU(6)}$ thus obtained are the same as $C_V^{SU(3)}$ in Table I, while $C_A^{SU(6)}$ become the same as $C_A^{SU(3)}$ by taking $D = 1$ and $F = 2/3$ and replacing $D + F$ by g_A in Table II.

Next we study the properties of the matrix elements of the baryonic NC from a wider viewpoint, namely, on the basis of the SU(3)-symmetry consideration and with reference to the information obtained in the proton spin problem.

The quark NC current given in Eq. (2) is also written in the following form:

$$J = (V^3 - A^3) - 2 \sin^2 \theta_W V^3 + \frac{1}{3} V^8 + J^{GIM} \\ J^{octet} + J^{GIM}; \quad (7)$$

where V^i, A^i are the octet vector and axial-vector currents defined by $V^i = \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q$ and $A^i = \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q$ with the Gell-Mann matrices; $i = 1, \dots, 8$. The current J^{octet} includes only the octet currents and J^{GIM} originates from the GIM mechanism and includes the SU(3) singlet current;

$$J^{GIM} = \frac{1}{3} V^0 - \frac{1}{3} V^0 - A^0 - \frac{1}{3} A^0; \quad (8)$$

where the SU(3) singlet currents are defined by $V^0 = \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q$ and $A^0 = \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q$ with $\gamma^0 = \text{diag}(1, 1, 1)$. Note that J^{GIM} can be explicitly written as $J^{GIM} = \frac{1}{3} (1 - \frac{1}{3}) s$.

The matrix elements of the octet currents between the baryon octet state may be easily evaluated by the Wigner-Eckert theorem and the Clebsch-Gordon coefficients for SU(3) symmetry.²⁾ We introduce the coefficients $C_{V,A}^{octet}$ for the octet baryon state $|B\rangle$ by

$$\lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} \langle B | j^\mu | B \rangle = \bar{u}_B^0 (C_V^{octet} - C_A^{octet}) u_B; \quad (9)$$

as in Eq. (6). The coefficients $C_{V,A}^{octet}$ then can be represented by the constants D and F ^{8);9)}, $D = 0.80$; $F = 0.47$. We list $C_{V,A}^{octet}$ in Table I, II. The authors, e.g.,

in Refs. 4b) and 6) have used these values as the matrix elements of the baryonic weak NC and disregarded the contribution by J^{GIM} . For Δ^0 and Σ^0 with $C_{V,A}^{octet} = 0$, the non-vanishing matrix elements come only from J^{GIM} written by the s-quark operator. To evaluate the matrix elements of J^{GIM} we need a special care, because it includes the SU(3) singlet currents, especially the $U_A(1)$ current; since the singlet vector current V^0 is nothing but three times the baryon $U_V(1)$ current and thereby conserved, the matrix element should be easily evaluated, $\langle B^0 | V^0 | B \rangle = 3u_B^0 - u_B$. A naive thinking that J^{GIM} gives no contribution for nucleons since it is written only in terms of strange quark gives a value of C_A^0 defined by

$$\langle B^0 | A^0 | B \rangle = C_A^0 u_B^0 - 5u_B; \quad (10)$$

e.g. $C_A^0(SU(6)) = 1$ within the non-relativistic SU(6) quark model and $C_A^0(SU(3)) = (D - 3F) / 6$ by way of SU(3) symmetry. Thus we can give the values of $C_{V,A}^{GIM}$ defined like in Eq. (9). The sum of $C_{V,A}^{octet}$ and $C_{V,A}^{GIM}$, $C_{V,A} = C_{V,A}^{octet} + C_{V,A}^{GIM}$ then gives the baryon matrix elements. We present these $C_{V,A}$ in Table I, II within SU(3) symmetry, denoted by $C_{V,A}^{SU(3)}$. Some recent literatures have used these expressions, e.g. Refs. 3) and 7).

Table I. Vector coefficients C_V .

B	C_V^{octet}	$C_V^{SU(3)} = C_V$
n	1	1
p	$1 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W$	$1 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W$
	0	1
	$(2 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W)$	$(3 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W)$
+	$2 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W$	$1 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W$
0	0	1
	$(1 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W)$	$(3 - 4\sin^2 \theta_W)$
0	1	1

Table II. Axial-vector coefficients C_A .

B	C_A^{octet}	$C_A^{SU(3)}$	C_A
n	$(D + F)$	$(D + F)$	$4=3D - 3F$
p	$D + F$	$D + F$	$2=3D + 2F - 3F$
	0	$(D = 3 + F)$	$2=3D - 3F$
	$2F$	$D - 3F$	$2=3D - 2F - 3F$
+	$2F$	$D + F$	$2=3D + 2F - 3F$
0	0	$D - F$	$2=3D - 3F$
	$D - F$	$D - 3F$	$2=3D - 2F - 3F$
0	$(D - F)$	$(D + F)$	$4=3D - 3F$

In 1988 EMC presented information about the baryon matrix element of the singlet current. They measured so-called the quark content of the proton, which triggered the exploding studies about the proton spin problem. Take a proton with momentum p and spin s and consider the following matrix element of the $U_A(1)$

current measured at the scale Q^2 ,⁹⁾

$$(Q^2)s = \sum_{u,d,s} q_i \otimes q_i(Q^2) p;s : \quad (11)$$

Writing $(Q^2) = u + d + s$, q is called the quark content inside the proton. Then the coefficient C_A^0 can be identified with $(Q^2 = 0)$ at low momentum transfer. EMC measured the spin-dependent proton structure function by using the polarized muon beam and proton at $Q_{EMC}^2 = 10.7 \text{ GeV}^2$,¹⁰⁾ and extracted a remarkably small value. Subsequently SMC also reported a small value at $Q_{SMC}^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$,¹¹⁾ and confirmed the EMC conclusion. Although there are still left some ambiguities about the value, they suggest $C_A^0 = 0.032$.¹²⁾ This value is quite discrepant with the SU(3) value. Subsequent lattice simulations have also shown $C_A^0 = 0.08 - 0.37$, which is consistent with the observations.¹³⁾

The $U_A(1)$ current is not conserved even when quarks are massless, and has an anomalous divergence coming from the triangle diagram,

$$\partial_\mu A^\mu = \frac{3}{2} \text{Tr} G \tilde{G}; \quad (12)$$

where G is the gluon tensor (the Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly). Hence

(Q^2) should consist of not only the quark but also the gluon contributions, the latter of which can be also interpreted as the sea-quark contribution. Thus we can write (Q^2) as^{14);9)}

$$(Q^2)_{\text{quark}} = \frac{3}{2} s(Q^2) g(Q^2); \quad (13)$$

where $g(Q^2)$ is an integrated gluon distribution inside the proton. Then $(Q^2)_{\text{quark}}$ can be identified with the $C_A^0(\text{SU}(3))$ for the proton. Extending this idea to other members by way of SU(3) symmetry, we can evaluate C_A

for the baryon octet by taking into account the sea-quark contribution. In Table I, II we list the final expressions of $C_{V,A}$ corrected by these considerations, i.e., $C_A = C_A^{\text{SU}(3)} - (C_A^0(\text{SU}(3))) = 3 = C_A^{\text{SU}(3)} - D = 3 + F = 3$.

To demonstrate the effect of α on some neutrino processes in neutron stars, we consider the bremsstrahlung emissivity / C_A^2 , the emissivity due to the 3P_2 -Cooper pairing / $C_V^2 + 2C_A^2$ and the () scattering opacity / $C_V^2 + 3C_A^2$ in nuclear matter. In Fig. 1 we plot their ratios R^i to the SU(3) values as functions of α . We




Fig. 1. Ratios of the reaction rates as functions of α . Upper three curves show the ratios for the proton processes, which are almost overlapped with each other due to the fact, $C_V = 0$. Lower three curves show the ratios for the neutron processes.

can easily see that R^i are given as increasing functions for neutrons, while decreasing functions for protons; it also implies that the sea-quark contribution suppresses the neutron processes at most by 30%, while enhances the proton processes at most by 40%.

We have assumed SU(3) symmetry for baryons and the sea-quark contribution as well, but it is not obvious, especially for the sea-quark contribution. When one uses the SU(3) value for C_A^0 and the experimental data of $\langle Q^2 \rangle$, one may extract the sea quark contribution to be, e.g., $\text{sea}U' = \text{sea}d' = \text{sea}s' = 0.16$ from the EMC data.¹⁰⁾ Thus the sea-quark contribution is almost SU(3) symmetric. Recent lattice simulations have studied the SU(3) symmetry breaking effect, and also supported our idea that the sea-quark contribution is approximately SU(3) symmetric.¹³⁾

Although we can estimate the value of C_A^0 by using the data of deep inelastic scattering, a direct measurement of $C_A^0 = \langle Q^2 \rangle = 0$ may be carried out by the elastic scattering off nucleons or nuclei.¹⁵⁾

Acknowledgements

We thank T. Muto, S. Tsuruta and H. Matsufuru for useful discussions. The present work is supported by the Japanese Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fund of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (11640272, 13640282, 13640252).

-
- [1] For reviews, M. P. Prakash, J. M. Lattimer, R. F. Sawyer and R. R. Volkas, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 51 (2001), 295.
A. Burrows and T. A. Thompson, *astro-ph/0211404*.
S. Tsuruta, *Phys. Rep.* 292 (1998) 1.
 - [2] T. D. Lee, *Particle Physics and Introduction to Field Theory* (Harwood Academic Pub., 1988).
 - [3] S. Reddy, M. P. Prakash and J. M. Lattimer, *Phys. Rev. D* 58 (1998), 013009.
 - [4] a) B. L. Friman and O. V. Maxwell, *Ap. J.* 232 (1979), 541.
b) O. V. Maxwell, *Ap. J.* 316 (1987), 691.
 - [5] E. Flowers, M. Ruderman and P. Sutherland, *Ap. J.* 205 (1976), 541.
D. N. Voskresensky and A. V. Senatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* 45 (1987), 411.
 - [6] D. G. Yakovlev, A. D. Kaminker and K. P. Levenish, *Astro. Astrophys.* 343 (1999), 650.
D. G. Yakovlev, A. D. Kaminker, O. Y. Gnedenko and P. Heansel, *Phys. Rep.* 354 (2001), 1.
 - [7] P. Jaikumar and M. P. Prakash, *Phys. Lett. B* 516 (2001), 345.
 - [8] K. Hagiwara et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 66 (2002), 010001.
 - [9] R. L. Jaffe and A. Manohar, *Nucl. Phys. B* 337 (1990), 509.
 - [10] EMC, J. Ashman et al., *Nucl. Phys. B* 328 (1989), 1; *Phys. Lett. B* 206 (1988), 364.
 - [11] SM C, B. Adeva et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 302 (1993), 533; *ibid.* B 320 (1994), 400.
SM C, D. Adamson et al., *Phys. Lett.* 329 (1994), 399; *ibid.* B 357 (1995), 248.
 - [12] U. Stiegler, *Phys. Rep.* 227 (1996), 1.
Papers in Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) B 105 (2002).
 - [13] M. Fukugita, Y. Kuramashi, M. Okawa and A. Ukawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75 (1995), 2092.
S. J. Dong, J. F. Lagae and K. F. Liu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75 (1995), 2096.
SESAM Collaboration, *Nucl. Phys. B* 83 – 84 (Proc. Suppl.) (2000), 259.
QCD SF Collaboration, M. Gockeler et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 545 (2002), 112.
 - [14] G. Altarelli and G. G. Ross, *Phys. Lett. B* 212 (1988), 391.
R. D. Carlitz, J. C. Collins and A. H. Mueller, *Phys. Lett. B* 214 (1988), 229.
 - [15] R. Tayloe, *Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) B* 105 (2002), 62.