arXiv:nucl-th/0503037v2 4 Oct 2005

A sym m etry param eter for nonm esonic hypernuclear decay

Cesar Barbero

Departamento de F sica, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, C.C. 67, 1900 La Plata, Argentina.

A lfredo P.Galezo Instituto de F sica Teorica, Universidade Estadual Paulista,

Rua Pamphona 145, 01405-900 Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil.

Francisco K m potic Instituto de F sica, Universidade de Sao Paulo, C.P. 66318, 05315-970 Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil, Instituto de F sica La Plata, CONICET, 1900 La Plata, Argentina, and Facultad de Ciencias Astronomicas y Geof sicas, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, 1900 La Plata, Argentina. (D ated: A pril 16, 2024)

We give general expressions for the vector asymmetry in the angular distribution of protons in the nonmesonic weak decay of polarized hypernuclei. From these we derive an explicit expression for the calculation of the asymmetry parameter, a , which is applicable to the speci c cases of 5 H e and 12 C described within the extrem e shellm odel. In contrast to the approximate formula widely used in the literature, it includes the elects of three-body kinematics in the nal states of the decay and correctly treats the contribution of transitions originating from single-proton states beyond the s-shell. This expression is then used for the corresponding numerical computation of a within several one-meson-exchange models. Besides the strictly local approximation usually adopted for the transition potential, we also consider the addition of the rst-order nonlocality terms. We not values for a ranging from 0.62 to 0.24, in qualitative agreement with other theoretical estimates but in contradiction with some recent experimental determinations.

PACS num bers: 21.80.+ a, 13.75 Ev, 21.60.-n K eyw ords: hypernuclear decay; asym m etry param eter; one-m eson-exchange m odel

I. IN TRODUCTION

W hile the hyperon, in free space, decays 99.7% of the time through the mesonic mode, ! N, inside nuclei this is Pauli-blocked, and, already for A > 5, the weak decay is gradually dom inated by the nonmesonic channel, N ! N N, where the large momentum transfers involved (400 M eV/c) put the two em itted nucleons above the Ferm i surface. This decay mode is interesting since it o ers a unique opportunity to probe the strangeness-changing weak interaction between hadrons. For a recent review of hypernuclear decay, see Ref. [1].

For a long time, the experimental data for this process was restricted to the full nonmesonic decay rate, $_{nm}$, and, in some cases, also the partial ones, $_{n} = (n!nn)$ and $_{p} = (p!np)$. More recently, the rst results, obtained at KEK [2, 3, 4], for another in portant observable of nonmesonic decay, namely, the intrinsic asymmetry parameter, a , are becoming available. This is experimentally more demanding, as it requires measuring the asymmetry in the angular distribution of protons emitted in the decay of polarized hypernuclei. On the theoretical side, however, a carries in portant new information, since it is determined by the interference terms between the parity-conserving (PC) and the parity-violating (PV) proton-induced transitions to nal states with dimentisopins. In opposition to that, the decay rates depend only on the square moduli of the separate components of the transition potential, being dominated by the PC ones. One expects, therefore, that the asymmetry parameter, besides being more sensitive to the PV amplitudes, will have more discriminating power to constrain the proposed mechanisms for nonmesonic hypernuclear decay.

M ost of the theoretical work on this decay m ode constructs the transition potential by m eans of one m eson-exchange (O M E) m odels, the m ost complete ones including up to the whole ground pseudoscalar and vector m eson octets (, , K, , !, K) [5, 6, 7]. Recently we have extended such m odels to take into account the kinem atical corrections due to the di erence between the lam bda and nucleon m asses and the rst-order nonlocality term s [8]. There are also OM E m odels that consider additional e ects, such as correlated-two-pion exchange [9] and direct-quark interaction [10]. In all these cases, to which we will refer below as strict OM E m odels, the weak coupling constants for the pion are empirically determ ined from the free m esonic decay, and those of the rem aining m esons by m eans of unitary-sym m etry

argum ents [5, 6].

All such models reproduce quite easily the total nonmesonic decay rate, $_{nm} = _{n} + _{p}$, but seem to strongly underestim ate the experimental values for the n=p branching ratio, $_{n} = _{p}$ [1]. However, there are recent indications, based on the intranuclear cascade model, that this might be due to contam ination of the data by secondary nucleons unleashed by nall state interactions (FSI) while the primary ones are traversing the residual nucleus [11]. A nother serious discrepancy between theory and experiment in nonmesonic decay concerns the asymmetry parameter. The measurements favor a negative value for 12 C and a positive value for 5 He. However, all existing calculations based on strict OME models [5, 6, 8, 9, 10] nd values for a between 0:73 and 0:19 [1, 12]. A lso, when results for 12 C are available in the same model, they are very similar to those for 5 He, as expected, since the intrinsic asymmetry parameter, a , has been de ned [13] in such a way as to subdue its dependence on the particular hypernucleus considered. A recent attempt [12] to explain this discrepancy along similar lines to those used for the n=p problem has failed. A smight be expected, the FSI do have an e ect in attenuating the asymmetry, but show no tendency to reverse its sign. The only theoretical calculations that attain som e agreement with the experimental data for a are a rst application of elective eld theory to nonmesonic decay [14] and a very recent extension of the direct-quark interaction m odel to include sigm a-m eson exchange [15]. How ever, in both cases, one or m ore coupling constants are speci cally adjusted to reproduce the experimental value of a for 5 He.

Most calculations of the asymmetry parameter make use of an approximate formula (Eq. (43), below) which, however, is valid only for s-shell hypernuclei. Since an essential aspect in the asymmetry puzzle presented above concerns the comparison of its values for ⁵ He and ¹² C, it would be of great interest to have a simple expression that is applicable to both cases. This is the main objective of the present paper, in which a general form alism for the asymmetry parameter in nonmesonic decay is derived and subsequently particularized to these two hypernuclei. We start by presenting, in Section II, the main steps in the derivation of the general expression, Eq. (6), of the vector hypernuclear asymmetry in terms of decay strengths. This is equivalent to Eq. (27) of Ref. [13]. However, we deviate considerably from that reference from this point onwards. The main di erence is that we do not make use of spectroscopic factors, but rather rely on spectroscopic am plitudes, which can then be com puted in the nuclear structure m odel of choice. This has, in our view, two great advantages. Firstly, the spectroscopic am plitudes can be determ ined without any am biguity as to their phases. This is particularly im portant for the asymmetry parameter, where, di erently from the case of the decay rates, one is dealing with an interference phenom enon. Secondly, since, due to the large value of the momentum transferred in the fundam ental process, nonm esonic decay is not signi cantly a ected by details of nuclear structure, one can choose to work in the extrem e shellm odel. Doing this, much of the sum m ation over the nalstates of the residual nucleus can be explicitly perform ed, leading to very simple expressions for the asymmetry. (See, for instance, Eq. (42).) The scheme for computing the decay strengths by means of an integration over the available phase space is presented in Section III, and the sum mations needed for the asymmetry param eter are perform ed in Section IV. Finally, the num erical results obtained by applying this form alism to the calculation of a for, both 5 He, and 12 C, in several strict OME models, are presented and discussed in Section V, where we also sum marize our main conclusions. Details of the derivation of the nal expression for a are given in Appendices A {C, and some identities that have been used for this purpose are listed in Appendix D.

II. VECTOR HYPERNUCLEAR ASYMMETRY

Single- hypernuclei produced in a ($^+$;K $^+$) reaction, under favorable kinem atical conditions, are known to end up with considerable vector polarization along the direction norm all to the reaction plane, $n = (p + p_{K^+})=p_{F^+}$ p_{K^+} ; of which they retain a signi cant am ount, P_V , even after they have cascaded down to their ground states by electrom agnetic and strong processes [2, 3, 16]. Therefore, the initial mixed state from which the hypernucleus will decay weakly can be described by the density matrix [17, Eq.(9.29)]

$$(J_{I}) = \frac{1}{2J_{I} + 1} \quad 1 + \frac{3}{J_{I} + 1} P_{V} J_{I} \quad \hat{n} \quad ;$$
(1)

where J_{I} is the hypernuclear spin.

The angular distribution of protons em itted in the proton-induced nonmesonic decay, p! np, of the pure initial hypernuclear state j_IM_I is given by Ferm i's golden rule as

$$\frac{d (J_{I}M_{I}! p_{2}t_{p})}{d_{p_{2}}} = \frac{Z Z X}{d_{p_{1}} dF} \int_{s_{1}s_{2}M_{F}} p_{1}s_{1}t_{n} p_{2}s_{2}t_{p-F} J_{F}M_{F} y jJ_{I}M_{I}ij^{2}:$$
(2)

Here, p_1s_1 and p_2s_2 are the momenta and spin projections of the emitted neutron and proton, respectively, and we

have introduced the compact notation (h = c = 1)

^Z
dF ::: = 2
$$X = \frac{2}{p_{F}^{2} dp_{2}} \frac{p_{2}^{2} dp_{2}}{(2)^{3}} \frac{p_{1}^{2} dp_{1}}{(2)^{3}} = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{1} + p_{2} f}{2M_{F}} = F_{F} I_{F}$$
 (3)

M being the nucleon mass; M_F, that of of the residual nucleus, which is left in state $j_F J_F M_F$ i where $_F$ speci es the remaining quantum numbers besides those related to the nuclear spin; and $_{_F J_F}$, the liberated energy. (To avoid confusion, we will be using Rom an font (M , m) for masses and italic font (M , m) for azim uthal quantum numbers.) A lso indicated in Eq. (2) are the isospin projections t_n 1=2 and t_p + 1=2 of the neutron and proton, respectively. The transition am plitude includes both the direct and the exchange contributions, i.e.,

$$hp_1s_1t_n p_2s_2t_p F J_F M_F jV jJ_I M_I i$$

$$= (p_1s_1t_n p_2s_2t_p F J_F M_F jV jJ_I M_I i (p_2s_2t_p p_1s_1t_n F J_F M_F jV jJ_I M_I i;$$

$$(4)$$

where the round brasstand for simple (nonantisymm etrized) product states for the emitted nucleons and the transition potential, V, is extracted from the Feynman amplitude for the direct process [8].

It is then possible to show [13, 18], by taking the appropriate average of Eq. (2), that the angular distribution of protons from the decay of the polarized m ixed state described by Eq. (1) has the form

$$\frac{d [(J_{I})! \dot{p}_{2}t_{p}]}{d_{p_{2}}} = \frac{p}{4} (1 + P_{V}A_{V}\dot{p}_{2} \hat{n});$$
(5)

where $_{\rm p}$ is the full proton-induced decay rate, and the vector hypernuclear asymmetry, A $_{\rm V}$, is given by

$$A_{V} = \frac{3}{J_{I} + 1} \frac{P_{I} M_{I} (J_{I}M_{I})}{P_{M_{I}} (J_{I}M_{I})}$$
(6)

The new quantities introduced above are the decay strengths,

$$(J_{I}M_{I}) = d_{p_{1}} dF \qquad j_{p_{1}s_{1}t_{n}} p_{2}s_{2}t_{p} F J_{F}M_{F} j_{J}j_{I}M_{I}i_{p:h:f:J}^{2};$$
(7)

where the subscript ph:f: indicates that one is dealing here with the transition am plitude in the proton helicity frame, in which the direction for angular momentum quantization is that of the proton momentum. Equivalently, one can choose, for the calculation of the decay strengths, a coordinate system having the z-axis pointing along the proton momentum, and proceed as usually. This is depicted in Fig. 1.

It is clear that, with the help of Eq. (5), one can extract the value of the product $P_V A_V$ from the counting rates parallel and opposite to the polarization direction, by taking the ratio of their di erence to their sum . A ssum ing that P_V can also be independently m easured, or calculated, this experim entally determ ines the vector hypernuclear asymmetry, A_V .

III. DECAY STRENGTHS

To compute the decay strengths, it is convenient to rewrite the transition amplitudes in Eq. (7) in the total spin $(S;M_S)$ and isospin $(T;M_T)$ basis. We start from the relation

$$\dot{p}_{1}s_{1}t_{n}p_{2}s_{2}t_{p}) \quad \dot{p}_{2}s_{2}t_{p}p_{1}s_{1}t_{n})$$

$$= (1=2s_{1} 1=2s_{2}\beta M_{s}) (1=2t_{n} 1=2t_{p}\beta M_{T})$$

$$s_{M_{s}TM_{T}}$$

$$\dot{p}PSM_{s}TM_{T}) \quad ()^{S+T} j pPSM_{s}TM_{T}) ;$$

$$(8)$$

where we have also changed the representation to relative and totalm om enta, given respectively by

$$p = \frac{1}{2}(p_2 \quad p_1);$$

$$P = p_1 + p_2:$$
(9)





Since we are taking t_n

1=2 and t_p + 1=2, we can write

$$(1=2t_n \ 1=2t_p \ \mathbf{j} T M_T) = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} (T_1 \ T_0)_{M_T 0};$$
(10)

and perform ing the transform ation (8) in Eq. (4), we get

where we have de ned

$$pPSM_{S}T_{F}J_{F}M_{F}jVjJ_{I}M_{I}i = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} (pPSM_{S}T_{F}J_{F}M_{F}jVjJ_{I}M_{I}i ()^{S+T} (pPSM_{S}T_{F}J_{F}M_{F}jVjJ_{I}M_{I}i; (12))$$

dropping, for simplicity, the $M_T = 0$ labels, as shall be done henceforth. Finally, introducing Eq. (11) into Eq. (7), and making use of the orthogonality of the C lebsch-G ordan ∞ e cients in spin space, we are left with

For the integration in Eq. (13), there are 6 m on entum variables involved, namely, the components of p_1 and p_2 . These, how ever, are not all independent. The choice of z-axis in Fig. 1 eliminates two angular variables. Also, the

5

energy conservation condition in Eq. (3) gives one relation to be satisfied. This leaves 6 = 3 independent variables. A convenient choice is

independent variables:
$$p_2; p_1; p_1$$
: (14)

Sim ple trigonom etry, applied in Fig. 1, leads to the relations

$$4p^{2} = p_{1}^{2} + p_{2}^{2} \quad 2p_{1}p_{2} \cos p_{1};$$

$$P^{2} = p_{1}^{2} + p_{2}^{2} + 2p_{1}p_{2} \cos p_{1};$$

$$\cos p = \frac{p_{2} \quad p_{1} \cos p_{1}}{2p};$$

$$\cos p = \frac{p_{2} + p_{1} \cos p_{1}}{P};$$
(15)

which, together with the energy conservation condition, determ ine all m om entum variables in terms of the set in Eq. (14). Notice that the azim uthal angles of the severalm om enta are related as follows

$$p = p_1 + ; \quad p = p_1 :$$
 (16)

For the transition am plitude, we expand the nalstate in terms of the relative and center-of-m as partial waves of the em itted nucleons [7, (2.5)], getting,

where the values of M_J are xed by the relations $M_I = M_J + M_F = + M_S + M_F$. Due to the rotational invariance of V, the last matrix element in Eq. (17) is independent of M_I , and this label has, therefore, been om itted. For the same reason, the subscript phf: has also been dropped. Notice that, from Eq. (12) and the well known behavior of the spherical harm onics under parity, one has

$$hp\mathbb{P}L \text{ SJT }_{F}J_{F};J_{I}J_{J}J_{I}i = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} 1 \quad ()^{HS+T} \quad (p\mathbb{P}L \text{ SJT }_{F}J_{F};J_{I}J_{J}J_{I}i:$$
(18)

Upon integration on the angle p_1 , Eq. (13) gives, then,

$$(J_{I}M_{I}) = \frac{1}{2} (4)^{5} d\cos_{p_{1}} dF X X (J_{I}M_{I}) = \frac{1}{2} (4)^{5} d\cos_{p_{1}} dF (J_{I}M_{I})^{T} i^{1} V_{I}(p;) Y_{L}(p; 0)] (SM_{S}JM_{J}) (JM_{J}J_{F}M_{F}J_{I}M_{I}) hp PL SJT_{F}J_{F}; J_{I}J J J_{I}J_{I} :$$
(19)

It can be shown quite generally that

$$\begin{array}{l} \left[Y_{1}(p; p) \quad Y_{L}(p; p) \right] \quad \left[Y_{10}(p; p) \quad Y_{L^{0}}(p; p) \right]_{0} \\ = & \left(4 \right)^{-1} \left(\right)^{1^{0} + L^{0}} \underbrace{10}_{L} \widehat{L}_{0}^{0} \widehat{0} \\ & \wedge (101^{0} 0; k)) (L 0L^{0} 0; k 0) \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \\ & \left(\begin{array}{c} k^{K} \\ k^{K} \\ k^{K} \\ k^{K} \end{array} \right)^{9} \\ < & 1 \quad 1^{0} \quad k = \\ & L \quad L^{0} \quad K \\ & & i \quad k^{K} \left(p; p \right) \right) Y_{K} \left(p; p \right) \right]_{0}; \end{array}$$

$$(20)$$

where $\hat{1} = \frac{p}{2l+1}$ and similarly for other angular momentum labels. Therefore, upon opening the square and performing the sum mations on M_S and M_F, Eq. (19) becomes

$$(J_{I}M_{I}) = \frac{1}{2} (4)^{4} d\cos_{p_{1}} dF_{STT^{0}}^{X} ()^{T+T^{0}}$$

IV. ASYMMETRY PARAMETER

In order to carry out the sum m ations on M $_{\rm I}$ needed in Eq. (6), we $\,$ rst rew rite it in the form

$$A_{V} = 3 \int \frac{J_{I}}{J_{I} + 1} \frac{J_{I}}{J_{I} + 1} \frac{J_{I}}{J_{I}} ; \qquad (22)$$

where we have introduced the decay m om ents

$${}_{0}(J_{I}) = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} X \\ (J_{I}M_{I}); \\ M_{I} \end{array}} (23)$$

$${}_{1}(J_{I}) = \frac{1}{J_{I}(J_{I}+1)} \sum_{M_{I}}^{X} M_{I}(J_{I}M_{I}) :$$
(24)

Then we take advantage of the particular values

and use the orthogonality relation

$$(J_{I}M_{I} \ 0 \ J_{I}M_{I}) (J_{I}M_{I} \ 0 \ J_{I}M_{I}) = \ _{0} \ J_{I}^{2} \ ^{2}$$

$$(26)$$

to get, for = 0 and 1,

$$(J_{I}) = \frac{1}{2} (4)^{4} \hat{J}_{I}^{3} \wedge {}^{1} d\cos_{p_{1}} dF X_{STT^{0}} \\ X X_{i} {}^{1^{0} L^{0} 1 L} ()^{+S+J+J^{0}+J_{I}+J_{F}} \widehat{\Pi} \widehat{\Pi} \widehat{L} \widehat{\Lambda} ^{0} \widehat{\Lambda} \widehat{J} \widehat{J} ^{0} \\ X_{I} {}^{1^{0} L^{0} 0 J^{0}} \\ (101^{0} 0 J^{0}) (L0L^{0} 0 J^{0}) (Y_{k} (p;)) Y_{K} (p; 0)]_{0} \\ {}^{KK}_{I} {}^{J_{I}}_{J} {}^{J_{I}}_{J} {}^{J_{0}}_{S} {}^{0} {}^{0} : {}^{L} L_{0}^{0} K;$$

$$hp \mathbb{P} L SJT_{F} J_{F}; J_{I} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{Y}_{I} hp \mathbb{P} L^{0} SJ^{0}T^{0}{}_{F} J_{F}; J_{I} \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{Y}_{I} \mathcal{I} :$$

$$(27)$$

From [7, (2.13)] (see also [19]):

$$p \mathbb{P} \mathbb{L} S J \mathbb{T}_{F} J_{F}; J_{I} \mathcal{J} \mathcal{J}_{I} i$$

$$= ()^{J_{F}+J} J_{I} \mathcal{J}_{I}^{1} M_{I} \mathcal{J}_{I} a_{j}^{Y} a_{j}^{Y} \mathcal{J}_{F} J_{F} i \mathbb{M} (p \mathbb{P} \mathbb{L} S J \mathbb{T}; j \mathbf{j});$$

$$(28)$$

$$i$$

where j n l j and j_p n_p l_p j_p are the single-particle states for the lambda and proton, respectively, and

M (plPL SJT; j, j) =
$$\frac{1}{\frac{P}{2}}$$
 1 ()^{1+S+T} (plPL SJT j) j, J): (29)

W e are working in the weak-coupling m odel (W CM), where the hyperon is assumed to stay in the $j = 1s_{1=2}$ singleparticle state, and the initial hypernuclear state $jJ_I i$ is built by the simple coupling of this orbital to the core, taken as the ^{A-1}Z ground state $jJ_C i$, i.e., $jJ_I i$ j(j J_C) $J_I i$. Under these circum stances, the two-particle spectroscopic amplitudes in Eq. (28) are cast as [7, 20]

$$hJ_{I} j a_{j}^{Y} a_{j}^{Y} j F_{J} F^{J} = ()^{J+J_{I}+J_{F}} \hat{J} \hat{J}_{I} J_{j} J_{F} h C_{j} j a_{j}^{Y} j F_{J} F^{J} i$$
(30)

To continue, we will adopt the extrem e shell model (ESM) and restrict our attention to cases where the singleproton states are completely lled in jJ_c i. This is so, within the ESM, for the cores of, both ⁵ He ($J_I = 1=2; J_c = 0$), and ¹² C ($J_I = 1; J_c = 3=2$). In such cases, the nalnuclear states take the form $j_F J_F i = j(j_P^{-1} J_C) J_F i$, and we can associate the extra label $_F$ with the occupied single-proton states, j_P . Consequently, on one hand, only one term contributes to the sum in Eq. (28), and, on the other, the corresponding single-proton spectroscopic amplitude in Eq. (30) is given by

$$h_{J_{C}} j_{a_{i}}^{Y} j_{J_{F}} J_{F} i = ()^{J_{F} + J_{C} + j_{p}} \hat{J_{F}} :$$
 (31)

Notice also that, within this description, the liberated energies are independent of J_F , i.e., $_{FJ_F}$! $_{\frac{1}{2}}$. This suggests rewriting Eq. (3) as

7

^Z
dF :::=
$$\frac{1}{(2)^5} X^{Z} dF_{j} X^{J_{F}}$$
 :::; (32)

where

$${}^{Z} dF_{\frac{1}{P}} :::= {}^{Z} p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{\dot{p}_{1} + p_{2} \dot{f}}{2M_{F}} _{\frac{1}{P}} ::::: (33)$$

Putting all this together and perform ing the sum mation on $J_{\rm F}$, we $% J_{\rm F}$ nally get

7

$$(J_{I}) = \frac{4}{\pi} \int_{I}^{3} \wedge 1^{X} \int_{I}^{2} \int_{I}^{2} \int_{I}^{2} \int_{I}^{X} \int_{I}^{2} \int_{I}^{$$

From Eqs. (22) and (34), it can be seen that all the dependence on $J_{\rm I}$ is contained in the factor

$$r = \frac{1=2 \quad J_{I} \quad J_{C}}{J_{I} + 1} = \frac{1=2 \quad J_{I} \quad J_{C}}{1=2 \quad J_{I} \quad J_{C}} = \frac{1 \quad \text{for} \quad J_{I} = J_{C} + 1=2;}{J_{I} \quad J_{I} = J_{C} \quad J_{I} = J_{C} \quad 1=2:}$$
(35)

Thus, within the fram ework of the WCM, one frequently introduces the intrinsic asymmetry parameter, a , [1, 13] de ned as

$$a = \begin{array}{ccc} A_{V} & \text{for} & J_{I} = J_{C} + 1 = 2; \\ \frac{J_{I} + 1}{J_{T}} A_{V} & \text{for} & J_{I} = J_{C} & 1 = 2; \end{array}$$
(36)

which does not depend on the hypernuclear spin, as we have just shown within the ESM and for core states having no open proton subshells. For such cases, we get

$$a = \frac{!_1}{!_0};$$
 (37)

with, for = 0 and 1,

It can be shown [18] that $!_0 = p$. Therefore, the new information carried by a comes from the numerator in Eq. (37), i.e., from $!_1$.

The orbital angular m om enta in Eq. (38) obey the restrictions:

$$()^{L+L^{0}} {}^{K} = +1;$$

$$()^{L+L^{0}} {}^{K} = +1;$$

$$()^{k+K} = +1:$$
(39)

The rst two follow from well known properties of C lebsch-G ordan coe cients with vanishing azim uthal quantum num bers. The last one can be obtained by rst deriving the general relation

$$[Y_{k}(p; p) Y_{K}(p; p)] = ()^{k+K} + [Y_{k}(p; p) Y_{K}(p; p)] :$$
(40)

Then, recalling that any spherical harm onic with azim uthal angle equal to, either 0, or , is real, one gets,

$$[Y_{k}(p;) Y_{K}(p; 0)]_{0} = ()^{k+K} [Y_{k}(p;) Y_{K}(p; 0)]_{0};$$
(41)

from which the third one of Eqs. (39) follows in mediately. The presence of the phase factor i $1^{\circ} L^{\circ} 1 L$ in Eq. (38) may seem disquieting at rst sight. However, by taking the complex conjugate of that equation, interchanging the dum my variables L JT \$ $1^{\circ}L^{\circ} 0 J^{\circ}T^{\circ}$, and making use of Eqs. (39) and of the symm etry properties of angularmom entum coupling and recoupling coe cients, one easily gets the relation ! = !, showing that these quantities are real, as they should be by de nition.

To compute the two-body matrix elements de ned in Eq. (29), we resort to a M oshinsky transformation [21] of the initial state, and phenom enologically add initial and nal short-range correlations. (For more detail on this and related points, see Refs. [7] and [8].) For ⁵ He, the sole contribution to Eq. (38) comes from the $1s_{1=2}$ proton state, and one can put $L = L^0 = K = 0$. On the other hand, for ${}^{12}C$, also the $1p_{3=2}$ state contributes, in which case L and L^0 can each take the values 0 and 1. Consequently one could, in principle, have K = 0;1 and 2 in Eq. (38). But we prove in Appendix A that the contribution with K = 1 vanishes identically, both for = 0, and for = 1. Sim ilarly, we prove in Appendix B that the contribution with K = 1 vanishes for = 0. We do not have an analytical proof that the contribution with K = 0 survives in Eq. (38), and it reduces to the following expression, that can be used for the two hypernuclei:

with L = 0 for the $1s_{1=2}$ state, and L = 0 and 1 for the $1p_{3=2}$ state.

It is interesting to observe that the presence of the C lebsch-G ordan coe cient in Eq. (42), for = 1, ensures that 1 and 1^{0} have opposite parities. Since the initial state in the two matrix elements has a denite parity, this implies that all contributions to $!_{1}$ come from interference terms between the parity-conserving and the parity-violating parts of the transition potential. Furtherm ore, the antisymmetrization factor in Eq. (29) shows that the two nal states have T $\in T^{0}$. These are general properties of the asymmetry parameter, as mentioned in the introduction.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

TABLE I: Results for the asym metry parameter, a	, based on the nonm esonic decay of	⁵ He. See text for detailed explanation.
--	-------------------------------------	---

M odel/C alculations	! ₀ (1s ₁₌₂)	! ₁ (1s ₁₌₂)	a
Strictly local	0 : 5176	0:2254	0:4354 (0:4351)
Plus corrections	0 : 6492	0:2913	0:4487 (0:4456)
(;;K)			
Strictly local	0:3322	0:1878	0:5652 (0:5852)
Plus corrections	0:3920	0:2412	0:6153 (0:6384)
+			
Strictly local	0:5011	0:1227	0:2449 (0:2665)
Plus corrections	0 : 5937	0:1776	0:2991 (0:3155)
(;;K)+(;!;K)			
Strictly local	0:5352	0:2739	0:5117 (0:5131)
P lus corrections	0:5526	0:2974	0:5382 (0:5388)
Experim ent	κεκ- P s ε278 β		0:24 0:22
$a = A_V (^5 H e)$	KEK-PSE462 [4]	(prelim inary)	0:11 0:08 0:04

Shown in Tables I and II are the results obtained in the calculation of the asymmetry parameter, a , based on the expressions of the previous section applied to ⁵ He and ¹² C, respectively. The values of !₀ and !₁ are in units of the free decay constant, ⁽⁰⁾ = 2.50 10 ⁶ eV, and, in the case of ¹² C, we give in separate columns the contributions of the $1s_{1=2}$ and $1p_{3=2}$ proton states. A loo included are them easured values for a obtained from some recent experiments on the nonmesonic decay of these two hypernuclei. The value for a in ¹² C extracted from experiment KEK PSE 508 and given in Table II was taken from the preprint version of Ref. [4], since only a weighted average for ¹² C and ¹¹ B is explicitly reported in the published version, its value being 0.20 0.26 0.04.

We consider several OME models, and for each one we give the results of two dimensions. First, are those corresponding to the strictly local approximation for the transition potential, usually adopted in the literature. Secondly, are the ones obtained when we add the corrections due to the kinematical elects related to the lambdanucleon mass dimension and the rst-order nonlocality terms that we have discussed in Ref. [8]. The rst thing to notice is that these corrections act systematically in the direction of increasing the absolute values of all the tabulated quantities. The elect is typically in the range of $20\{30\%$ for ! but only $5\{10\%$ for a , tending to be larger in the

+ model and smaller in the complete model. To put it shortly, if one wants precise values for the asymmetry parameter, the correction terms should be included in the transition potential, but, in view of the present level of indeterm inacy in the measurements, they can be dispensed with for the moment.

In the case of 5 He, we have also included, between parentheses, in Table I, the values for a obtained with the approximate form ula usually adopted in the literature [1], namely,

$$A_{v} ({}^{5}He) = \frac{2 < {}^{p}\overline{3}ae \ b(c \ {}^{p}\overline{2}d) + {}^{p}\overline{3}f(\overline{2}c + d)}{j_{a}f + j_{b}f + 3(j_{b}f + j_{d}f + j_{d}f + j_{d}f + j_{d}f)};$$
(43)

M odel/C alculations	! ₀ (1s ₁₌₂)	! ₀ (1p ₃₌₂)	! ₁ (1s ₁₌₂)	! 1 (1p ₃₌₂)	a
Strictly local	0:4111	0:4724	0:1830	0:1990	0 : 4324
P lus corrections	0:5206	0:5954	0:2400	0:2596	0 : 4477
(;;K)					
Strictly local	02788	0:3161	0:1580	0:1707	0:5526
P lus corrections	0:3336	0:3817	02057	0:2217	0 : 5975
+					
Strictly local	0:4138	0:4607	0:0984	0:1096	0:2379
P lus corrections	0:4922	0:5514	0:1461	0:1596	02930
(;;K)+(;!;K)					
Strictly local	0:4391	0:4803	0:2300	0:2378	0 : 5088
P lus corrections	0:4619	0:5083	0:2546	0:2599	0 : 5303
Experiment	KEK-PS E160	[2]			0:9 0:3ª
$a = 2A_V (^{12}C)$	кек- Р ѕе508	[4] (prelim inary)			0:44 0:32 ^b

TABLE II: Results for the asym m etry parameter, a , based on the nonmesonic decay of 12 C. See text for detailed explanation.

 $^{\rm a}$ T his result corresponds to an improved weighted average among several p-shell hypernuclei [1, p.95]. $^{\rm b}$ See text.

where

$$a = \operatorname{hnp}_{i}^{1} S_{0} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{p}_{i}^{1} S_{0} \mathbf{i}; \qquad b = \operatorname{innp}_{i}^{3} P_{0} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{p}_{i}^{1} S_{0} \mathbf{i}; \qquad c = \operatorname{hnp}_{i}^{3} S_{1} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{p}_{i}^{3} S_{1} \mathbf{i}; d = \operatorname{hnp}_{i}^{3} D_{1} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{p}_{i}^{3} S_{1} \mathbf{i}; \qquad e = \operatorname{innp}_{i}^{1} P_{1} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{p}_{i}^{3} S_{1} \mathbf{i}; \qquad f = \operatorname{innp}_{i}^{3} P_{1} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{p}_{i}^{3} S_{1} \mathbf{i}: \qquad (44)$$

The extra factors in the transition am plitudes in Eqs. (44) are due to di erences in phase conventions, as explained in Ref. [3]. It is important to emphasize that Eq. (43) is only an approximation, that can be adapted from the corresponding expression for the two-body reaction pn ! p in free space [22]. As such, it ignores the fact that the nal state of nonmesonic decay is a three-body one and the ensuing kinematical complications should be properly dealt with, which requires a direct integration over the available phase space as done in the expressions used here. More importantly, Eq. (43) does not include the full contribution of the transitions coming from proton states beyond the s-shell, being therefore of only limited validity, and should not be used for p-shell hypernuclei such as 12 C, or, even worse, for heavier ones. This being said, comparison of the corresponding values for a in Table I shows that the form ula works well within its range of validity. This conclusion is in agreement with our preliminary result reported elsewhere [23], which was restricted to one-pion-exchange only.

C om ing now to 12 C, it is evident in Table II that the p-shell contributions to $!_0$ and $!_1$ are by no m eans negligible, being in fact of the same order as those of the s-shell. However, they are also in approximately the same ratio, so that the e ect on a , given by Eq. (37), is much smaller. This corroborates the theoretical expectation that the intrinsic asymmetry parameter, a , should have only a moderate dependence on the particular hypernucleus considered. P resently we are investigating to which degree this remains true form one general cases, such as that of 11 B [24]. Notice that in the previous section we have explicitly proven that a is independent of the hypernuclear spin. However this does not, by itself, exclude the possibility that it might depend on other aspects of hypernuclear structure.

In closing, let us remark that we have derived simple formulas for the evaluation of the asymmetry parameter, which exactly include the e ects of three-body kinematics in the nal states of nonmesonic hypernuclear decay and correctly treat the contribution of transitions originating from proton states beyond the s-shell. As to our numerical results, let us rst of all observe that the calculated values of a in the four OME models considered here vary from

0:62 to 0:24. This broad spectrum of values indicates that the asymmetry parameter can indeed be a powerful tool to discriminate between dimensional methanisms for nonmesonic decay, requiring for this purpose, how ever, a

m ore precise experim ental determ ination of this observable than those presently available. Secondly, the fact that, for each of these OME m odels, the results for 5 H e and 12 C are very similar is compatible with the general expectation that a should depend little on the hypernucleus. Finally, the negative value system atically obtained for a for the two hypernuclei indicates, once again, that it will be hard to get a positive or zero value for it in the rst case, at least within strict OME m odels. The puzzle posed by the experim ental results for a in s- and p-shell hypernuclei rem ains unexplained.

APPENDIX A:
$$K = 2 CONTRIBUTIONS TO !_0 AND !_1$$

As mentioned in Section IV, to compute the transition matrix elements M appearing in Eq. (38), we perform a M oshinsky transformation of the initial p state [8, Eq.(A.1)],

where $n \ln L$ in $l n_p l_p$ are the Moshinsky brackets with their phases adapted so as to conform with our convention for the relative coordinate as discussed in Appendix A of Ref. [8]. We have put bars over l, and S to distinguish them from the analogous angular momenta in the partial waves of the nalNN state. This is not necessary for L and J, since all transitions are diagonal in these two quantum numbers. Introducing Eq. (A1) into Eq. (29), one gets

$$M (plPL SJT; j; j) = C (nlNL S; j; jJ) M (plPL SJT; nlN S); (A2)$$

where

M (plPL SJT;nlN S) =
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 1 ()^{l+S+T} (plPL SJTjV nlNL SJ : (A3)

The transition potential can be decomposed as

$$V = \bigvee_{i}^{X} v_{i}(\mathbf{r}) I_{i} i; \qquad (A 4)$$

~

where the isospin factor I_i is equal to 1 or 1_2 , for isoscalar or isovector interactions, respectively, and the i_i are rotationally invariant operators having de nite spin and spatial ranks, i.e., operators of the form

$$i = [A_i^{i}(1; 2) B_i^{i}(r; r)]_{00}$$
: (A5)

Due to the algebraic properties of the Paulim atrices, the rank $_{i}$ can be at most equal to 2. For the OME models we consider, including eventual kinem atical and nonlocality corrections, the several possibilities are:

Q

PC terms

$$i = 0 \quad \text{for central and } r \quad r \quad \text{forces}$$

$$(\text{spin-independent or spin-spin});$$

$$i = 1 \quad \text{for linear spin-orbit forces};$$

$$i = 2 \quad \text{for tensor forces};$$

$$n$$
PV terms

$$i = 1 \quad \text{for all kinds}:$$
(A 6)

As can be seen in Eqs. (A.3) to (A.15) of Ref. [8], the di erent term s have matrix elements of the general form

$$(pPL SJT jv_i I_i i nlN L SJ = G_i(lL SJT ; l S) (PL N L) (pl jv_i (r) d_i (r) jn l);$$
(A7)

where $(P \perp N \perp)$ are the overlaps of the cm. radial wave functions and the $\hat{d_i}(r)$ are, either unity, or one of the e ective di erential operators de ned in Eq. (A 16) of that reference. The important point is that the G_i are purely geom etrical factors, involving, at most, 3 j and 6 j symbols. Scrutinizing these equations more closely, one notices that the dependence on , and J can be isolated as follows

$$G_{i}(IL SJT; 1S) = ()^{J^{*}} \stackrel{i}{=} \frac{i}{1L 1} \frac{g_{i}(ILST; 1S):}{SJS}$$
(A8)

This result is completely general and depends only on the application of the W igner-E ckart theorem to operators of the form given in Eq. (A5). (See, for instance, Chapter 7 of Ref. [25], or Section 1A-5 of Ref. [26].)

Taking these ideas into account in Eq. (38), it is clear that the sum m ation over $, J, ^{0}$ and J^{0} can be performed rst, leading to a remaining sum m and that is proportional to

A ctually, the is always in the $1s_{1=2}$ state, and one can make use of Eq. (6.4.14) of Ref. [25] to replace the above expression by

where we have dropped an irrelevant factor.

For a proton in the s shell, the M oshinsky transform ation requires that $L = L^0 = 0$, and the 9j sym bol in Eq. (A 10) selects K = 0 as the only possibility. For a proton in the p shell, there are two alternatives for the relative and cm.angularmomenta, namely,

p shell alternative 1:
$$l = 1$$
 and $L = 0$;
alternative 2: $l = 0$ and $L = 1$; (A11)

and similarly for the primed quantities. In principle, therefore, there are three possibilities for K, namely, K = 0;1 and 2.

It is clear from this discussion that a contribution with K = 2 in Eq. (38) can only come from the alternative 2 in Eq. (A11). Therefore, setting $L = L^0 = 1$ and $l = l^0 = 0$ in Eq. (A10), and making use of Eq. (6.3.2) of Ref. [25], we get

$$X (j_{b} = 1p_{j_{b}}; L = L^{0} = 1)$$

1

$$= \frac{()^{1+1^{0}}}{310} \xrightarrow{1}_{i^{1}-i^{0}1^{0}} X X ()^{0+J+J^{0}-2}\sqrt{2}J^{2}J^{2}J^{0^{2}}$$

$$()^{J}_{i^{1}-i^{0}1^{0}} X X ()^{0+J+J^{0}-2}\sqrt{2}J^{2}J^{2}J^{0^{2}}$$

$$()^{J}_{i^{1}-i^{0}1^{0}} X X X ()^{0+J^{1}-1^{0}} X X X ()^{0+J^{1}-1^{0}} X X ()^{0+J^{1}-1^{0}} X ()^{0+J^{1}-1^{0}}$$

To proceed, it will be unavoidable to perform som e manipulations with 12j sym bols, and the needed identities are collected in Appendix D for convenience. W ith the help of well known symmetry properties of 6j and 9j symbols [25], one can make use of Eqs. (D 2), (D 3) and (D 4), in succession, to perform, rst the summation over , and then that over $^{\circ}$, in Eq. (A 12), getting

$$X (\dot{p} = 1p_{j_{p}}; L = L^{0} = 1) ($$

$$= \frac{()^{K+1^{0}+S^{0}}}{3\hat{1}^{0}} \stackrel{K S S^{0}}{\stackrel{1}{_{1}}^{_{0}1^{0}}} S \stackrel{1^{0}}{_{1}} 1 \stackrel{9}{_{9}}$$

$$X X \stackrel{8}{_{2}} \stackrel{8}{_{2}} \stackrel{9}{_{2}} \\ ()^{J^{0}} \stackrel{J^{2}}{_{2}} \stackrel{J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{2}{_{2}} \stackrel{J J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{3}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{J J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{3}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{J J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{J J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{J J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{J J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{J J^{0}}{_{2}} \stackrel{1}{_{2}} \stackrel{$$

Repeating the same procedure, we can now perform, rst the sum mation over J, and then that over J⁰, to get

$$X (j_{p} = 1p_{j_{p}}; L = L^{0} = 1)$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

$$= \frac{()^{K + k + 1^{0} + S^{0}}}{310^{0}} () + k S S^{0}$$

The 9j, as well as the last 6j, in Eq. (A 14) restricts K to 0 and 1, and we conclude that the contribution with K = 2 in Eq. (38) vanishes identically, both for = 0, and for = 1. Notice that this result holds, not only for $\frac{1}{p} = 1p_{3=2}$, which is of direct interest for ¹² C, but also for $\frac{1}{p} = 1p_{1=2}$, which may be relevant for other p-shell hypernuclei.

APPENDIX B:K = $1 CONTRIBUTION TO !_0$

Recalling Eq. (33), it is clear that the K = 1 contribution to $!_0$ in Eq. (38), from the single-proton state $\frac{1}{2}$, has the form

14

where f(p; P) represents the rest of the integrand in Eq. (38), the important point being that it depends on the momenta only through p and P.

From the explicit expressions of the spherical harm onics, we nd

$$[Y_1(p;) Y_1(p; 0)]_{00} = \frac{p_{\overline{3}}}{4} \cos(p+p);$$
 (B2)

and, making use of the last two equations in (15), this becomes

$$[Y_1(p;) Y_1(p; 0)]_{00} = \frac{p_3}{4} \frac{p_2^2 p_1^2}{2pP} :$$
 (B3)

Introducing this result in Eq. (B1), we are left with

$$\begin{array}{l} P_{0}\left(\frac{1}{p}; K = 1\right) \\ = \frac{p_{3}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{\dot{p}_{1} + p_{2} f}{2M_{F}} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{\dot{p}_{1} + p_{2} f}{2M_{F}} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{\dot{p}_{1} + p_{2} f}{2M_{F}} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{\dot{p}_{1} + p_{2} f}{2M_{F}} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{\dot{p}_{1} + p_{2} f}{2M_{F}} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{\dot{p}_{1} + p_{2} f}{2M_{F}} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad d\cos_{p_{1}} \quad p_{2}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{2} \quad p_{1}^{2} dp_{1} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2M} + \frac{p_{2}^{2}}{2M} \\ = \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{4} \quad do_{p_{1}} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2} \quad \frac{p_{1}^{2}}{2$$

Let us now perform the interchange of dummy variables $p_1 \ p_2$ in Eq. (B4), keeping \cos_{p_1} xed. Then, noticing that, according to the rst two equations in (15), p and P are invariant under this transform ation, we arrive at the result

$$!_{0}(j_{0}; K = 1) = !_{0}(j_{0}; K = 1);$$
 (B5)

from which it follows that the contribution with K = 1 in Eq. (38) vanishes for = 0.

APPENDIX C:K =
$$1 CONTRIBUTION TO !_1$$

TABLE III: Results for the K = 1 contribution to $!_1$ in the nonmesonic decay of 12 C. See text for detailed explanation.

M odel/C alculations	$!_1 (1p_{3=2}; K = 1)$	ja =a j(%)
Strictly local	0:0007	0:18
P lus corrections	0:0010	0:20
(;;K)		
Strictly local	0:0005	0:15
Plus corrections	0:0007	0:16
+		
Strictly local	0:0007	0:34
P lus corrections	0 : 0008	0:26
(;;K)+(;!;K)		
Strictly local	0:0003	0 : 06
P lus corrections	0:0006	0:12

We have not been able to nd an analytical proof that the K = 1 contribution in Eq. (38) vanishes also for = 1. However, for the cases we are dealing with, this contribution can only arise from the $j_p = 1p_{3=2}$ proton state in ¹² C, and we have num erically computed its values in the several OME models we are considering. They are given, in units of $^{(0)}$, in Table III. The nonzero values may be due to truncation and roundo errors. For instance, we have computed, with the same routine, the analogous contribution with = 0 in the case of the complete OME model plus kinem atical and nonlocality terms. Even though it has been proved in Appendix B that this is exactly zero, the numerical result came out as 0.0004, which is comparable to the value obtained for $!_1(1p_{3=2}; K = 1)$ in the same model.

C om parison of Tables II and III im m ediately shows that the K = 1 contribution to $!_1$ is, in any case, very sm all. Furtherm ore, in the last column of Table III, we give the relative e ect that its inclusion would have on a , and it always stays below 0.4%. We conclude that, even if this contribution is not exactly zero, it can be safely neglected.

APPENDIX D:SOME PROPERTIES OF 12j SYM BOLS

The 12j sym bols arise in the recoupling of ve angular momenta [27, 28]. They are not unique, but here we shall need only those of the rst kind,

$$\begin{cases} 8 & & & 9 \\ \gtrless j_{1} & j_{2} & j_{3} & j_{4} \stackrel{\geq}{=} X \\ \downarrow & l_{2} & l_{3} & l_{4} \stackrel{=}{=} ()^{R_{4} \times \hat{X}^{2}} \\ \gtrless & k_{1} & k_{2} & k_{3} & k_{4} & & \\ (&) & (&) & (&) & (&) \\ j_{1} & k_{1} \times & j_{2} & k_{2} \times & j_{3} & k_{3} \times & j_{4} & k_{4} \times \\ & & k_{2} & j_{2} & l_{4} & k_{3} & j_{3} & l_{2} & k_{4} & j_{4} & l_{3} & j_{1} & k_{1} & l_{4} \end{cases}$$

$$(D1)$$

as de ned in Eq. (19.1) of Ref. [28], whose notation for the 12j symbols we follow. In Eq. (D1), R_4 stands for the sum of all the angular momentum labels in the 12j symbol.

These symbols obey the recursion relation [28, Eq.(A.6.13)]

$$\begin{cases} 8 & & & 9 \\ 2 & j_{1} & j_{2} & j_{3} & j_{4} \\ & & & \\$$

and have several sym m etry properties, am ong which [28, Eq.(17.4)]

There are also reduction form ulas, such as [28, Eq.(A.6.39)]

^[1] W.M.Alberico and G.Garbarino, Phys.Rep. 369, 1 (2002).

^[2] S.A jim ura et al., Phys. Lett. B 282, 293 (1992).

^[3] S.A jm ura et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 4052 (2000).

- [4] T.Manuta et al, Nucl. Phys. A 754, 168c (2005). See also nucl-ex/0402017.
- [5] J.F.Dubach, G.B.Feldman, B.R. Holstein and L. de la Torre, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 249, 146 (1996).
- [6] A.Parreno, A.Ram os and C.Bennhold, Phys. Rev. C 56, 339 (1997); A.Parreno and A.Ram os, Phys. Rev. C 65, 015204 (2002).
- [7] C.Barbero, D.Horvat, F.Km potic, T.T.S.Kuo, Z.Narancic and D.Tadic, Phys. Rev. C 66, 055209 (2002).
- [8] C. Barbero, C. De Conti, A. P. Galeao and F. Km potic, Nucl. Phys. A 726, 267 (2003).
- [9] K. Itonaga, T. Ueda and T. Motoba, Phys. Rev. C 65, 034617 (2002); K. Itonaga, T. Motoba and T. Ueda, Electrophoto Production of Strangeness on Nucleons and Nuclei (Sendai03), K. Maeda, H. Tamura, S.N. Nakamura and O. Hashimoto eds., World Scientic (2004) pp. 397 [402.
- [10] K. Sasaki, T. Inoue and M. Oka, Nucl. Phys. A 707, 477 (2002); ibid A 669, 331 (2000); Erratum, ibid A 678, 455 (2000).
- [11] G.Garbarino, A.Parreno and A.Ramos, Phys.Rev.C 69, 054603 (2004) and references therein.
- [12] W. M. Alberrico, G. Garbarino, A. Parrero and A. Ramos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 082501 (2005).
- [13] A.Ramos, E.van Meijgaard, C.Bennhold and BK.Jennings, Nucl. Phys. A 544, 703 (1992).
- [14] A. Parrero, C. Bennhold and B. R. Holstein, Phys. Rev. C 70, 051601 (R) (2004).
- [15] K.Sasaki, M.Izakiand M.Oka, Phys.Rev.C 71, 035502 (2005).
- [16] H.E jiri, T.Fukuda, T.Shibata, H.Bando and K.-I.Kubo, Phys. Rev. C 36, 1435 (1987).
- [17] N.Austern, Direct Nuclear Reaction Theories, W iley-Interscience, N.Y., 1970.
- [18] A.P.Galeao, in preparation.
- [19] A.P.Galeao, in IX Hadron Physics and VII Relativistic A spects of Nuclear Physics: A Joint M eeting on QCD and QGP, R io de Janeiro, 28 M arch { 3 A pril 2004, edited by M.E.Bracco, M.Chiapparini, E.Ferreira, and T.Kodama (A IP C onference Proceedings 739, 2004), pp. 560 { 562. See also extended version mentioned therein.
- [20] F.K m potic and D. Tadic, B raz. J. Phys. 33, 187 (2003).
- [21] M . M oshinsky, Nucl. Phys. 13, 104 (1959).
- [22] H.Nabetani, T.Ogaito, T.Sato and T.Kishim oto, Phys. Rev. C 60, 017001 (1999).
- [23] C. Barbero, A. P. Galeao and F. K nn potic, Braz. J. Phys. 34, 822 (2004).
- [24] C.Barbero, A.P.Galeao and F.K m potic, work in progress.
- [25] A.R.Edmonds, Angular Momentum in Quantum Mechanics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1974.
- [26] A.Bohr and B.R.M ottelson, Nuclear Structure, Vol. I, W.A.Benjam in, Inc., New York, 1969.
- [27] M. Rotenberg, R. Bivins, N. Metropolis and J. K. Wooten, Jr., The 3-j and 6-j Symbols, The Technology Press, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1959.
- [28] A.P.Yutsis, I.B.Levinson and V.V.Vanagas, M athem atical Apparatus of the Theory of Angular M om entum, published for the N ational Science Foundation, W ashington, D.C., by the Israel Program for Scientic Translations, Jerusalem, 1962. Translated from Russian by A.Sen and R.N.Sen.