

Determination of G_A/G_V from the set of three angular-correlation coefficients observed in the decay of the free neutron

Yu. A. Mostovoi

I. V. Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy, Moscow

(Submitted 21 December 1982)

Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **37**, No. 3, 162–163 (5 February 1983)

An equation relating $\lambda = G_A/G_V$ to the three angular-correlation coefficients yields the value $\lambda = -1.226 \pm 0.042$. The indicated error is determined entirely by the error in the measurements of the antineutrino-spin correlation. This quantity may thus be regarded as the result of a new measurement of λ , the first based on this correlation.

PACS numbers: 13.30.Ce, 14.20.Dh, 11.30.Er

Measurements of the angular correlations in the β decay of the free neutron can yield the ratio $\lambda = G_A/G_V$ of the axial vector and vector constants of the weak interaction, under the assumption that the constants are real in the $V-A$ version of the theory. The most effective approach in such a determination is to make use of the electron-spin correlation,

$$A = -2 \frac{\lambda^2 + \lambda}{1 + 3\lambda^2}. \quad (1)$$

In this case the errors $\Delta\lambda$ and λA are related by $\Delta\lambda \cong 2.6\Delta A$. If we take A to be the average of the two most accurate values,^{1,2}

$$\bar{A} = -0.1136 \pm 0.0039, \quad (2)$$

we find

$$\lambda = -1.260 \pm 0.010. \quad (3)$$

It is less effective to use the electron-antineutrino angular correlation coefficient,

$$a = \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{1 + 3\lambda^2}; \quad (4)$$

for it we have $\Delta\lambda \cong 3.3\Delta a$.

The most accurate measurement³ yields

$$a = -0.1017 \pm 0.0051, \quad (5)$$

from which we find

$$\lambda = -1.259 \pm 0.017. \quad (6)$$

The most effective approach is to use the antineutrino-spin correlation,

$$B = 2 \frac{\lambda^2 - \lambda}{1 + 3\lambda^2}. \quad (7)$$

For it we have $\Delta\lambda \cong 11\Delta B$.

Substitution of the values

$$B = 1.00 \pm 0.030, \quad (8)$$

averaged over the two most accurate measurements,^{4,5} into (7) yields

$$\lambda = -1.00 \pm 0.33. \quad (9)$$

The weak dependence of this coefficient on λ is the reason why measurements of B are ordinarily not used to find λ .

There is the interesting possibility of using all three coefficients jointly to determine λ . From (1), (4), and (7) we find

$$\lambda = \frac{a-1}{B+A}. \quad (10)$$

Analysis of (10) shows that in this case the accuracy of the λ determination and the errors in the measurements of A , a , and B are related in a more favorable way than for the quadratic relations discussed above [(1), (2), and (3)]:

$$\Delta\lambda = \frac{1}{B+A} \sqrt{(\Delta a)^2 + (\lambda \Delta A)^2 + (\lambda \Delta B)^2} \cong \sqrt{(1.06 \Delta a)^2 + (1.33 \Delta A)^2 + (1.33 \Delta B)^2}. \quad (11)$$

If all three of the coefficients were measured with the same accuracy $\Delta = \Delta a = \Delta A = \Delta B$, the error in λ would be $\Delta\lambda \cong 2.3\Delta$. Substitution of the present values of A , a , and B (given above) into (10) and (11) yields

$$\lambda = -1.226 \pm 0.042 \quad (12)$$

The existing error in the measurements of B is the reason why the accuracy is poorer than in (3) and (6). It follows from (11) that the error $\Delta\lambda$ is due entirely to the error ΔB at the present accuracy of measurements of the angular-correlation coefficients. The value in (12) may thus be regarded as the result of a new measurement of the ratio G_A/G_V , the first in practice to be based on the value of the antineutrino-spin correlation coefficient. It thus becomes worthwhile to improve the accuracy of measurements of the antineutrino-spin correlation coefficient, if only to the level of ± 0.01 ; this improvement would make it possible to determine the ratio G_A/G_V within $\Delta\lambda = \pm 0.016$ —an error comparable to that corresponding to the electron—antineutrino correlation.

¹C. Christensen, V. E. Krohu, and G. R. Ringo, *Phys. Lett.* **55B**, 175 (1975).

²B. G. Erokolimskii, A. I. Frank, Yu. A. Mostovoi *et al.* *Yad. Fiz.* **30**, 692 [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **30**, 356 (1979)].

³Chr. Stratowa, R. Dobrosemsky, and P. Weinzierl, *Phys. Rev.* **D 18**, 3970 (1978).

⁴C. Christensen, V. E. Krohu, and G. R. Ringo, *Phys. Rev.* **C 1**, 1693 (1970).

⁵B. G. Erokolimskii, L. N. Bondarenko, Yu. A. Mostovoi, *et al.* *Yad. Fiz.* **12**, 323 (1970) [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **12**, 178 (1971)].