## Mesonic Decay of a Tritium Hyperfragment

A. O. VAISENBERG AND V. A. SMIRNITSKII (Submitted to JETP editor December 14, 1956)
J. Exptl. Theoret. Phys. (U.S.S.R.) 32, 736-737 (April, 1957)

An analysis is made of the mesonic decay of a hyperfragment according to the scheme  ${}^{3}_{A_{0}}H^{*} \rightarrow p + p + n + \pi^{-} + Q$ , where Q = 35.9 + 0.7 Mev.

I N THE SYSTEMATIC scanning of a stack of 30 Ilford G5 pellicles provided by Professor Powell, which had been exposed in Italy at 25 km for 8 hours during the autumn of 1955, we observed the mesonic decay of a tritium hyperfragment with the  $\pi^-$ -meson coming to rest in the emulsion. Since there are few known decays of this type which permit a relatively exact measurement of the  $\Lambda^0$  particle binding energy<sup>1-4</sup> we wish to add this case to the available data.

A slow singly-charged particle hf is ejected from the primary  $10 + 0_n$  star (see the projection drawing), is stopped in the same pellicle, and produces a secondary three-prong star. The range of hf is  $360 \mu$ , its mass is greater than a proton mass as estimated either from the gap count and range or from the scattering and range (the second difference  $\overline{D}$ , as measured on the basis of  $\overline{D} = 0.5 \mu$ , is  $0.23 \pm 0.10 \mu$ ). A single charge is found for hf from the gap count, range, and grain density.

The two short-range particles of the secondary

star (tracks 1 and 2) have identical ranges  $12 \pm 0.6 \mu$ . The charge which results from comparison of the grain densities of tracks 1 and 2 with the grain densities of  $\alpha$  particle tracks from Be<sup>8</sup> and ThC' decay gives z = 1. Track 3 belongs to a  $\pi^-$ -meson with 15,700  $\mu$  range. This  $\pi^-$ -meson passed through 8 pellicles and produced a one-prong  $\sigma$  star at the end of its range. The details of the measurements are given in the tables.

The combined momentum of particles 1, 2 and 3 is  $91.2 \pm 1.2 \text{ Mev}/c$ . If it is assumed that an equal and opposite momentum was borne off by a neutron we obtain the following decay scheme:

<sup>3</sup>H\* 
$$\rightarrow$$
 p + p + n +  $\pi^-$  + Q,

where  $Q = 35.9 \pm 0.7$  Mev. Hence we obtain for the  $\Lambda^{\circ}$  binding energy in tritium

$$B_{\Lambda 0} = -1.2 \pm 1.2$$
 Mev.

The most accurate values of  $B_{\Lambda^0}$  for similar <sup>3</sup>H\*  $\rightarrow p + p + n + \pi^-$  decays are 1.4 ±0.6<sup>1</sup>; 0.4 ±0.7<sup>2</sup>; 5.4 ±1<sup>3</sup> and  $-3.0 \pm 0.8^4$  Mev.



Primary star	Associa- ted phe- nomena	Range, µ	Dip angle in unde- veloped emulsion	Proof of stopping		Mass meas- urement	Energy per nucle on in Mev
10 + 0 <sub>n</sub>	Unob- served	360 <u>+</u> 5	10°40′	1) Scattering 2) Grain den- sity	1	$ > M_p  (\alpha, R)  > M_p  (g, R) $	≈4.2 (if H <sup>3</sup> )

TABLE I. Hyperfragment track

TABLE II. Secondary star

Track	Range, µ	Total experi- mental error	Strag- gling in %	Dip ⊐angle θ	Error $\Delta \theta$	Polar angle φ	$\frac{\mathbf{Error}}{\Delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}}$	Type of parti- cle	Measured mass	Energy in Mev
1 2 3	12 12 15700	$\begin{array}{c} \pm \ 0.6 \\ \pm \ 0.6 \\ \pm \ 500 \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} \sim 2.5 \\ \sim 2.5 \\ \sim 2.4 \end{array} $	-15°20' +27° +17°40'	$\pm 30' \pm 40' \pm 6'$	214°30′ 55° 18°40′	$ \begin{array}{c} \pm 1^{\circ} \\ \pm 1^{\circ} \\ \pm 10' \end{array} $	ρ ρ π-		0.9 0.9 29,8±0.6

The decay scheme  ${}^{4}\text{H}^{*} \rightarrow p + d + n + \pi^{-}$  cannot be entirely excluded. In this case the large negative values  $-4.7 \pm 1.2$  and  $-4.4 \pm 1.2$  Mev are obtained for  $B_{\Lambda^{0}}$  depending upon whether track 1 or 2 is the deuteron. The decay  ${}^{4}\text{H}^{*} \rightarrow p + p + n + n + \pi^{-}$  into 5 particles also cannot be excluded but possesses small probability.

In our reduction of the data we used values of constants taken from Shapiro's survey article<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Haskin, Bouwen, Glasser and Schein, Phys. Rev. 102, 244 (1956).

<sup>2</sup> Fry, Schneps and Swami, Phys. Rev. 101, 1526 (1956)
<sup>3</sup> H. Yagoda, Phys. Rev. 98, 153 (1955).

<sup>4</sup> Anderson, Lawler and Negin, Nuovo Cimento 7, 605 (1955).

<sup>5</sup> A. M. Shapiro, Revs. Modern Phys. 28, 2 (1956). Translated by I. Emin

171