

## Beta-neutrino angular-correlation coefficient in $^{21}\text{Na}$

I. S. Towner and J. C. Hardy

Recently [1], an ‘exact’ calculation of the beta-neutrino angular-correlation coefficient for  $^{21}\text{Na}$  was published. The coefficient is defined as

$$a_{ev}(W) = a_{ev}^0 + \Delta a_{ev}(W) \quad (1)$$

with  $a_{ev}^0 = (a_1^2 - \frac{1}{3} c_1^2)/(a_1^2 + c_1^2)$  being the major contribution, where  $a_l = g_V M_F$  and  $c_l = g_A M_{GT}$  with  $M_F$  and  $M_{GT}$  being the Fermi and Gamow-Teller matrix elements and  $g_V$  and  $g_A$  their respective coupling constants. Here  $W$  is the electron total energy expressed in electron rest-mass units. We computed the correction  $\Delta a_{ev}$  using the exact formalism of Behrens and Böhning (BB) [2] and found  $\Delta a_{ev}$ , when averaged over the electron energy spectrum, gave a correction of order 1%. Alternatively computing the correction with the formalism of Holstein [3] we found the correction to be much smaller, of order 0.05%. To try and resolve this discrepancy we have been working with the BB formalism, identifying the leading order terms and comparing them with those of Holstein.

The beta-decay differential decay rate is written as

$$d^5\Gamma = \frac{G^2}{(2\pi)^5} F(Z, W) (W_0 - W)^2 p W dW d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu \left( f_1(W) + f_2(W) \frac{p}{W} \hat{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}} + \dots \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$  are unit vectors in the directions of the electron and neutrino respectively. Here  $W_0$  is the maximum value of  $W$ ,  $p$  the electron momentum  $p^2 = W^2 - 1$  in electron rest-mass units and  $F(Z, W)$  the Fermi function. The beta-neutrino angular-correlation coefficient is defined as

$$a_{ev} = \frac{f_2(W)}{f_1(W)} \quad (3)$$

Holstein [3] gives expressions for the spectral functions with electromagnetic corrections to order  $(\alpha Z)$ . It is convenient to write out separately the Fermi and Gamow-Teller pieces,  $f_1(W) = f_1^F(W) + f_1^{GT}(W)$  and  $f_2(W) = f_2^{GT}(W) + f_2^{GT}(W)$ , and show their electron energy dependence explicitly by writing them as

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha^F(W) &= a_1^2 k_\alpha^F \left( 1 + A_\alpha^F W + \frac{B_\alpha^F}{W} + C_\alpha^F W^2 \right) \\ f_\alpha^{GT}(W) &= c_1^2 k_\alpha^{GT} \left( 1 + A_\alpha^{GT} W + \frac{B_\alpha^{GT}}{W} + C_\alpha^{GT} W^2 \right), \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

For a mixed Fermi plus Gamow-Teller transition, these expressions are combined by defining

$$f_\alpha(W) = (a_1^2 + c_1^2)k_\alpha \left( 1 + A_\alpha W + \frac{B_\alpha}{W} + C_\alpha W^2 \right), \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \quad (5)$$

where, for example,  $A_\alpha = (a_1^2 A_\alpha^F + c_1^2 A_\alpha^{GT}) / (a_1^2 + c_1^2)$  and likewise for  $k_\alpha$ ,  $B_\alpha$  and  $C_\alpha$ .

In comparing our results from BB with the expressions of Holstein, we note two main differences:

- There is no electromagnetic ( $\alpha Z$ ) correction to Holstein's weak-magnetism form factor;
- Behrens-Bühring argue that  $(W_0R)$  and  $(\alpha Z)$  are comparable small quantities and expressions evaluated to second order should contain terms in  $(W_0R)^2$ ,  $(W_0R)(\alpha Z)$  and  $(\alpha Z)^2$ . Holstein does not provide any corrections in order  $(\alpha Z)^2$ .

These differences do not represent errors, but reflect different approximations made in the derivations. There is little numerical consequence from the second item in this list. It is the electromagnetic correction to the weak-magnetism form factor that explains the differing beta-neutrino angular correlation values in  $^{21}\text{Na}$ .

To illustrate this, we perform a shell-model calculation with the USD effective interaction [4] of the nuclear matrix elements involved in  $^{21}\text{Na}$  beta decay. Note that the Gamow-Teller form factor,  $c_1$ , can alternatively be determined from the experimental  $ft$  value using  $ft = \frac{6140}{B(GT)}$  and  $|c_1| = \sqrt{B(GT)}$ . Thus we have adjusted the  $g_A$  value so that when combined with the shell-model matrix element  $M_{GT}$  the experimental  $c_1$  value is obtained. With these shell-model values we compute the beta-neutrino correlation coefficient,  $a_{ev}$ , (averaged over the electron energy spectrum) with the formulae from Eq. (4) and 'exactly' using a computer code [5] based on the Behrens-Büring formalism. In the exact computation, the spectral functions  $f_1(W)$  and  $f_2(W)$  are obtained in numerical form. We therefore use a least-squares fitting program to fit these tabular values to the expressions given in Eq. (4). In the fitting only two parameters could be usefully determined; so for  $f_1(W)$  we fixed  $B_1$  and  $C_1$  to the values given by the formulae and determined  $k_1$  and  $A_1$ . Likewise for  $f_2(W)$ , we fixed  $B_2$  and  $C_2$  and determined  $k_2$  and  $A_2$ . The results are given in Table I. One sees the Behrens-Büring formulae agree well with the 'exact'

**Table I.** Values of the coefficients in the spectral functions  $f_1(W)$  and  $f_2(W)$ , Eq.(5), for the beta decay of  $^{21}\text{Na}$  obtained from the formulae of Holstein and Behrens-Büring and the 'exact' computation.

	$k_1$	$k_1 A_1(\%)$	$k_1 B_1(\%)$	$k_1 C_1(\%)$		
Holstein	1.00417	-0.027	0.115	-0.003		
BB formula	1.01133	-0.027	0.115	-0.003		
BB'exact'	1.01066	-0.020				
	$k_2$	$k_2 A_2(\%)$	$k_2 B_2(\%)$	$k_2 C_2(\%)$	$a_{ev}$	$\Delta a_{ev}$
Holstein	0.55489	0.188	0.000	0.002	0.55867	-0.00028
BB formula	0.55296	0.187	0.020	0.002	0.55286	-0.00592
BB'exact'	0.55243	0.195			0.55330	-0.00548

computed values, while the Holstein formulae appear deficient in the energy-independent coefficients  $k_1$  and  $k_2$ . This we trace to the absence of the electromagnetic weak-magnetism term in the Holstein formulae.

- [1] V.E. Jacob, J.C. Hardy, C.A. Gagliardi, J. Goodwin, N.Nica, H.I. Park, G. Tabacaru, L. Trache, R.E. Tribble, Y. Zhai, and I.S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **74**, 015501 (2006).
- [2] H. Behrens and W. Bühring, *Electron Radial Wave Functions and Nuclear Beta-decay* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1982); H. Behrens, H. Genz, M. Conze, H. Feldmeir, W. Stock, and A. Richter, *Ann. Phys.* **115**, 276 (1978).
- [3] B.R. Holstein, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **46**, 789 (1974).
- [4] B.H. Wildenthal, in *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics*, ed. D.H. Wilkinson (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1984) Vol. **11**, p. 5.
- [5] J.C. Hardy and I.S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **71**, 055501 (2005).