PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

VOLUME 40 | 15 MAY 1978 | NUMBER 20

Determination of the Weak Neutral-Current Couplings

L. F. Abbott and R. Michael Barnett
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305
(Received 28 March 1978)

A model-independent analysis of new data provides, for the first time, a unique determination of the weak neutral-current couplings of u and d quarks. Data for exclusive pion production are a crucial new input in this analysis.

Weak neutral-current interactions were first observed in neutrino deep-inelastic scattering[1,2] ($\nu N \to \nu X$, where X may be anything) only five years ago. Since then, they have been observed in elastic neutrino-proton scattering[3,4] ($\nu p \to \nu p$), in neutrino-induced inclusive pion production[5] ($\nu N \to \nu \pi X$), in neutrino-induced exclusive pion production[6,7] ($\nu N \to \nu \pi N$), and in nonhadronic processes.

In this Letter, the most recent data for all four types of hadronic neutrino experiments are combined to give strict, new limits (independent of models) on the neutral-current couplings of u and d quarks. We consider only vector and axial-vector currents having the usual properties under charge conjugation, and we neglect the small effects due to s, c, and other heavy quarks. Since these are difficult experiments with significant backgrounds, we feel it is important to use, at a minimum, 90% confidence limits on all experimental results rather than just 1 standard deviation.

There have been many analyses[8-11] of neutral-current data. Among the new features of this work are the following: (1) The exclusive pion data are analyzed in detail and are found to be a crucial input; (2) the elastic cross sections are "inverted" to give allowed coupling values (using very recent data[4]); and (3) our analysis uses high-energy deep-inelastic data[2] for which the parton-model assumptions should hold and for which the experimental efficiencies are high.

In the notation used here, u_L, d_L, u_R, and d_R are the coefficients in the effective neutral-current coupling:

$$\mathcal{L} = (G/\sqrt{2})\bar{\nu}\gamma_\mu(1+\gamma_5)\nu[u_L\bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1+\gamma_5)u + u_R\bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)u + d_L\bar{d}\gamma_\mu(1+\gamma_5)d + d_R\bar{d}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)d].$$

For example, in the Weinberg-Salam (WS) theory[12] with the Glashow-Iliopoulos-Maiani mechanism,[13] one has $u_L = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3}\sin^2\theta_W$, etc. In Fig. 1, we will plot our results in the u_L-d_L and u_R-d_R coupling-constant planes. Since the overall sign of the neutral current is always ambiguous, we will choose our sign convention by requiring u_L to be positive; this will restrict our consideration to the upper half of the u_L-d_L plane.

The data for deep-inelastic scattering determine the values of $u_L^2 + d_L^2$ and of $u_R^2 + d_R^2$, i.e., the radii of circles in the u_L-d_L and u_R-d_R planes. With 90%-confidence-level upper and lower limits, these circles become the annuli which are shown in Fig. 1. We use the data of Ref. 2 which give neutral-current to charged-current ratios of $R_\nu^{\mathrm{DI}} = 0.295 \pm 0.01$ and $R_{\bar{\nu}}^{\mathrm{DI}} = 0.34 \pm 0.03$. An assumption concerning the antiquark to quark ratio in the nucleon is required to calculate these radii; however, the results are quite insensitive for ratios in the range (0–20)%.



FIG. 1. The left (a) and right (b) coupling planes. Annular regions are allowed by deep-inelastic data. The region shaded with lines is allowed by deep-inelastic, elastic, and exclusive-pion data. The regions shaded with dots are allowed by deep-inelastic and inclusive-pion data.

Since the radii in the left and right planes are reasonably well determined, one can now use the other data to obtain information about allowed values of the angles θ_L and θ_R where

$$\theta_L \equiv \arctan(u_L/d_L), \quad \theta_R \equiv \arctan(u_R/d_R).$$

In Fig. 2 we will plot the allowed angular regions, choosing left and right radii of 0.52 and 0.22, respectively (but all allowed radii give similar results).

The elastic neutrino-proton scattering data[3] provide significant limitations on the allowed angular regions. Using the data of Ref. 3 (with $R_\nu^E = 0.15 \pm 0.03$ and $R_{\bar\nu}^E = 0.21 \pm 0.07$), only the region inside the dotted curve in Fig. 2 is allowed at the 90% confidence level.[14] Note that the value of θ_R is not well determined (especially for $\theta_L \approx 135°$). The q^2 dependence of the data does not impose any significant additional limits.

Further restrictions on the allowed angular regions are imposed by the exclusive pion production data.[6] A method for analyzing neutrino-induced exclusive pion production was pioneered by Adler.[8] We use the detailed pion-prodiction model of Adler (described in the first two papers in Ref. 8) which includes nonresonant production, incorporates excitation of the $\Delta(1232)$ resonance, and satisfies current-algebra constraints. This model is valid only for small values of W, the invariant mass of the pion-nucleon system. We require $W < 1.4$ GeV. The data are not available with this cut; however, we note three important points: (1) For each process, most of the data are below $W = 1.4$ GeV; (2) use of ratios reduces the effect of this cut; and (3) most importantly, examination of a selected sample of events plotted in Ref. 6 indicates that application of the cut would strengthen, not weaken, our conclusions. There



FIG. 2. Allowed angles for the radii given in the text. The dotted curve indicates the area allowed by elastic data. The region shaded with lines is allowed by elastic and exclusive-pion data. The ellipitical regions are allowed by inclusive-pion data. The area shaded with dots is the only region allowed by all data.

is some uncertainty in the theoretical analysis from several sources.[15] As a result, we feel it is best to require consistency with the exclusive-pion-production data only within a factor of 2 (which is, in fact, far greater than the 90% confidence level). Nonetheless, these data remain a crucial feature of our analysis.

To restrict the allowed angular region (Fig. 2) with exclusive-pion-production data,[6] we consider six neutral-current to charged-current cross-section ratios (the neutral-current channels are $\nu \to p\pi^0, n\pi^0, p\pi^-, n\pi^+$ and $\bar\nu \to N\pi^0, p\pi^-$). The observed neutral-current cross sections tend to be rather large because of excitation of the $\Delta(1232)$ resonance. This indicates that isovector currents are favored over isoscalar currents, especially in the left plane. The region allowed by both the elastic and the exclusive-pion data is shown in Figs. 1 and 2 by shading with lines. The allowed values of θ_R are greatly reduced by consideration of exclusive-pion-production data. It can be seen in Fig. 2 that the allowed region is now fairly small; this is not as evident in Fig. 1, since left-right correlations are not exhibited there.

Another input is provided by analysis of the inclusive-pion-production data.[5] This analysis (discussed by Sehgal[10]) involves significant parton-model assumptions. Unfortunately the data[5] presently available are taken at very low energies where such assumptions might be questionable. However, by making these data the final imput in our analysis, its role is clear. The regions allowed at the 90% confidence level by these data alone are shown in Figs. 1 and 2. While two regions (and a very small part of a third), shown in Fig. 2, are allowed by the conjunction of elastic and inclusive-pion data, the exclusive-pion data reduce the number to just one.

The region of neutral-current coupling-constant space allowed by these four types of neutrino experiments is the small region in Figs. 1 and 2 which has shading with both lines and dots. Now for the first time, the neutral-current couplings are uniquely determined and are

$$u_L = 0.33 \pm 0.07, \quad u_R = -0.18 \pm 0.06,$$

$$d_L = -0.40 \pm 0.07, \quad d_R = 0.0 \pm 0.11,$$

where the errors are 90% confidence limits and an overall sign convention has been assumed. It is interesting to note that knowledge of these quark couplings allows one to directly test the electron's couplings with searches for parity nonconservation in electron-nucleon interactions.

Our results are compared with the predictions of various gauge models of the weak and electromagnetic interactions in Fig. 3. The WS model with $\sin^2\theta_W$ between 0.22 and 0.30 is entirely consistent with the data. Furthermore, the m_Z to m_W ratio obtained with the minimal Higgs-boson structure[12] is the only ratio which leads to consistency with the data. This confirmation by the data may not be proof of the validity of the model, but it certainly is a remarkable result. The predictions of three other SU(2)⊗U(1) guage models[16] are also shown in Fig. 3. These models have the same values of u_L and d_L as the WS model, and choosing $\sin^2\theta_W = 0.3$, we plot the corresponding values in the right plane. The model labeled A has a $(u\ b)_R$ coupling, B has a $(t\ d)_R$ coupling, and C (vector) has both. Even if the m_Z to m_W ratio is changed, none of these models [and probably no other conventional SU(2)⊗U(1) model besides WS] is consistent with the data. Also shown are two SU(3)⊗U(1) models[17,18] which are ruled out by these data; models D and E have the u quark in a right-handed singlet[17] and triplet[18], respectively. The parameters of some SU(2)⊗SU(2)⊗U(1) models can be chosen to give results very similar to those of the WS model.



FIG. 3. Various gauge models compared with the allowed coupling-constant region. The line marks the WS model for values of $\sin^2\theta_W$ from 0.0 to 0.7; A, B, and C indicate SU(2)⊗U(1) models (Ref. 16); and D and E indicate SU(3)⊗U(1) models (Refs. 17 and 18) described in the text. For E, u_L and d_L lie within the shaded region.

In conclusion, the values of the weak neutral-current couplings of u and d quarks are now uniquely determined, setting strict limits on the construction of gauge models.

The authors wish to thank S. Adler for several valuable discussions concerning the analysis of exclusive-pion data. We also wish to acknowledge very helpful discussions with J. Bjorken, F. Gilman, P. Lepage, C. Matteuzzi, Y. J. Ng, J. Strait, and L. Sulak. This research was support in part by the U. S. Department of Energy.

[1]F. J. Hasert *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 46B, 121 (1973); A. Benvenuti *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 800 (1974); and more recently: J. Blietschau *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B118, 218 (1977); A. Benvenuti *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 1039 (1976); B. C. Barish *et al.*, California Institute of Technology Report No. CALT-68-601, 1977 (unpublished).

[2]M. Holder *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 72B, 254 (1977).

[3]J. Strait, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1978 (unpublished); W. Kozanecki, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1978 (unpublished); D. Cline *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 252, 648 (1976).

[4]W. Lee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 186 (1976); M. Pohl *et al.*, CERN Report No. CERN/EP/PHYS 77-53, 1977 (unpublished).

[5]H. Kluttig *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 71B, 446 (1977).

[6]W. Krenz *et al.*, CERN Report No. CERN/EP/PHYS 77-50, 1977 (unpublished); O. Erriques *et al.*, unpublished.

[7]S. J. Barish *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 33, 448 (1974); W. Lee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 202 (1977).

[8]S. L. Adler, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 50, 189 (1968), and Phys. Rev. D 12, 2644 (1975); S. L. Adler *et al.*, Phys.

Rev. D 12, 3501 (1975).
[9]S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D 5, 1412 (1972); R. M. Barnett, Phys. Rev. D 14, 2990 (1976); C. H. Albright *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 14, 1780 (1976); V. Barger and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B124, 426 (1977); D. P. Sidhu, Phys. Rev. D 14, 2235 (1976); F. Martin, Nucl. Phys. B104, 111 (1976).
[10]L. M. Sehgal, Phys. Lett. 71B, 99 (1977); P. Q. Hung, Phys. Lett. 69B, 216 (1977); P. Scharbach, Nucl. Phys. B82, 155 (1974).
[11]P. Q. Hung and J. J. Sakurai, Phys. Lett. 72B, 208 (1977); J. Bernabéu and C. Jarlskog, Phys. Lett. 69B, 71 (1977).
[12]S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 1264 (1967); A. Salem, in *Elementary Particle Physics: Relativistic Groups and Analyticity*, edited by N. Svartholm (Almquist and Wiksell, Stockholm, 1968), p. 367.
[13]S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani, Phys. Rev. D 2, 1285 (1970).
[14]We used form-factor masses $m_V^2 = 0.71$ GeV^2 and $m_A^2 = 0.79$ GeV^2. Changing m_A^2 to 1 GeV^2 has very little effect on the boundaries shown in the figures.
[15]For example, because of uncertainty in the $O(q)$ corrections, they were omitted following the suggestion of S. Adler (private communication).
[16]R. M. Barnett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 41 (1975), and Phys. Rev. D 11, 3246 (1975), and 13, 671 (1976); P. Fayet, Nucl. Phys. B78, 14 (1974); F. Gürsey and P. Sikivie, Phys. Rev. Lett. 36, 775 (1976); P. Ramond, Nucl. Phys. B110, 214 (1976); A. De Rújula *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 12, 3589 (1975); F. A. Wilczek *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 12, 2768 (1975); H. Fritzsch *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 59B, 256 (1975); S. Pakvasa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 702 (1975).
[17]G. Segrè and J. Weyers, Phys. Lett. 65B, 243 (1976); B. W. Lee and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 1237 (1977); B. W. Lee and R. E. Shrock, Phys. Rev. D (to be published).
[18]R. M. Barnett and L. N. Chang, Phys. Lett. 72B, 233 (1977); R. M. Barnett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D (to be published); P. Langacker and G. Segrè, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 259 (1977).

Observation of Primary $E2$ Transitions in the Reaction ^{207}Pb(n, γ)

S. Raman, M. Mizumoto,[a] G. G. Slaughter, and R. L. Macklin
Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830
(Received 13 February 1978)

Thirty-six high-energy, primary $E2$ transitions to the ^{208}Pb ground state have been identified and their radiation widths measured in a study of the reaction ^{207}Pb(n,γ). The measured $E2$ widths in the excitation energy region between 7.37 and 8.17 MeV are compared with those expected from the rising tails of giant quadrupole resonances located at 8.9 and 10.9 MeV.

In the (n,γ) reaction, the observed γ-ray transitions originating from the capturing state (primary transitions) are predominantly electric dipole ($E1$) or magnetic dipole ($M1$); primary electric quadrupole ($E2$) transitions are extremely rare. A survey of the literature yielded only seven such $E2$ transitions, all serendipitous, in an equal number of nuclides. The absolute radiation widths are known only in three cases[1]—^{57}Fe (14 meV width for the 7511-keV transition), ^{93}Mo (9 meV, 8067 keV), and ^{239}U(70 μeV, 4610 keV). The sparsity of observed primary $E2$ transitions from the (n,γ) reaction is *a posteriori* understandable for two reasons. Firstly, the transition rates fall off rapidly with increasing multipole order.[2] Secondly, if the giant resonances influence the (n,γ) reaction,[3] the primary $E2$ transitions are weak for low-energy incident neutrons because the capturing state, which depends on the neutron separation energy (S_n), is too far down on the tail of the giant quadrupole resonance (GQR). The S_n values lie at 7 ± 3 MeV for most nuclei (generally higher values for lower masses; $S_n = 7.368$ MeV for ^{208}Pb), whereas the isoscalar GQR energies decrease monotinically as $\approx 63A^{-1/3}$ MeV (10.6 MeV for $A = 208$). The best chance for observing $E2$ transitions from many neutron resonances occurs in a nucleus which is heavy and has a large S_n value. The doubly magic nucleus, ^{208}Pb, is such a case and here we have observed over 36 primary $E2$ transitions to the ground state and have measured their radiation widths. In the 0–800-keV neutron energy region studied in the present experiment, the observed $E2$ widths can be interpreted as arising from the tail of the GQR.

The ^{207}Pb(n,γ) measurements were carried out at the Oak Ridge Electron Linear Accelerator (ORELA) utilizing a 92.4% enriched 249-g ^{207}Pb metal target. These measurements, which also unraveled the fine structure of the $M1$ giant reso-

