On hyperon masses, axial charges, and form factors

Nolan Miller G. Bradley M. Lazarow H. Monge-Camacho A. Nicholson P. Vranas A. Walker-Loud others

July 28, 2021





THE UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA at CHAPEL HILL

Why hyperons?

Hyperon: a baryon containing at least one strange quark but no heavier quarks

Why study hyperons?

- ► Decays $\implies V_{us} \implies \text{top-row}$ unitarity: $|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{ub}|^2 \stackrel{?}{=} 1$
- Axial charge, mass spectra important for neutron star equation of state
- Test heavy baryon χ PT

Why the lattice?

- Hypernuclear structure harder to study experimentally
- ► Hyperons decay rapidly in the lab (τ < 1 ns)</p>



Experimental determination of $|V_{us}|$?

Experimental results are less precise without lattice QCD input

- Leptonic/semi-leptonic K decays: requires LQCD estimate of F_K/F_{π} or $f^+(0)$
- Hyperon decays: requires estimate of axial charge, vector charge, and other form factors; new results from LHCb could make this competitive
- ► τ hadronic decays (eg, $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \nu_{\tau}$): LQCD not required, but there are theory problems



Tension between K_{12} & K_{13}

 $K_{l2} (f_{K\pm}/f_{\pi\pm})$: $\sum |V_{uq}|^2 = 0.99883(37)$ $q \in \{d,s,b\}$ \implies 3.2 σ deviation K_{I3} (f₊(0)): $\sum |V_{uq}|^2 = 0.99794(37)$ $q \in \{d, s, b\}$ \implies 5.6 σ deviation



Project goals & lattice details

Project Goals:

- 1. Determine the hyperon mass spectrum
- 2. Determine axial/vector charges
- 3. Test convergence of SU(2) HBXPT for hyperons
- 4. Calculate hyperon-to-nucleon form factors

Action	Valence: Domain-wall	
	Sea: staggered	
m_{π}	130 - 400 MeV	
а	0.06 - 0.15 fm	
Scale setting?	Done!	

Previous work



Ξ correlator fits





Fit strategy: mass formulae

Consider the S = 2 hyperons in the isospin limit

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{M}_{\Xi}^{(\chi)} &= \mathcal{M}_{\Xi}^{(0)} & \mathcal{M}_{\Xi^*}^{(\chi)} = \mathcal{M}_{\Xi^*}^{(0)} \\ &+ \sigma_{\Xi} \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^2 & + \overline{\sigma_{\Xi}} \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^2 \\ &- \frac{3\pi}{2} g_{\pi \Xi \Xi}^2 \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^3 & - \frac{5\pi}{6} g_{\pi \Xi^* \Xi^*}^2 \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^3 \\ &- g_{\pi \Xi^* \Xi}^2 \Lambda_{\chi} \mathcal{F}(\epsilon_{\pi}, \epsilon_{\Xi \Xi^*}, \mu) & - \frac{1}{2} g_{\pi \Xi^* \Xi^*}^2 \Lambda_{\chi} \mathcal{F}(\epsilon_{\pi}, -\epsilon_{\Xi \Xi^*}, \mu) \\ &+ \frac{3}{2} g_{\pi \Xi^* \Xi}^2 (\sigma_{\Xi} - \overline{\sigma_{\Xi}}) \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^2 \mathcal{J}(\epsilon_{\pi}, \epsilon_{\Xi \Xi^*}, \mu) \\ &+ \alpha_{\Xi^*}^{(4)} \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^4 \log \epsilon_{\pi}^2 + \beta_{\Xi}^{(4)} \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^4 & + \alpha_{\Xi^*}^{(4)} \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^4 \log \epsilon_{\pi}^2 + \beta_{\Xi^*}^{(4)} \Lambda_{\chi} \epsilon_{\pi}^4 \end{split}$$

Some observations:

► Many shared LECs between expressions ⇒ fit simultaneously

Mass fits depend on axial charges

Hyperon mass spectrum: Ξ preliminary results



+1: Taylor
$$\mathcal{O}(m_{\pi}^2)$$

+1: $\chi \text{PT } \mathcal{O}(m_{\pi}^3)$
+3: Taylor $\mathcal{O}(m_{\pi}^4) \oplus \chi \text{PT } \{0, \mathcal{O}(m_{\pi}^3), \mathcal{O}(m_{\pi}^4)\}$
5: chiral choices

- ×5: chiral choices ×2: $\{\mathcal{O}(a^2), \mathcal{O}(a^4)\}$
- $\times 2$: incl./excl. strange mistuning
- ×2: Naïve priors or empirical priors

40 : total choices

 $M_{\Xi} = 1339(17)^{\rm s}(02)^{\chi}(05)^{\rm a}(00)^{\rm phys}(01)^{\rm M}(??)^{\rm V}$

Summary & future work

In conclusion:

- Chiral mass and charge expressions share many LECs and would benefit from a simultaneous fit
- Hyperon decays provide an alternate method for extracting |V_{us}|
- Competitive if O(1%) determination of the form factors

To do:

- Add finite volume effects to mass fits
- (Simultaneously) fit axial charges
- Calculate hyperon-to-nucleon form factors



Transition matrix element for $B_1 \rightarrow B_2 + I^- + \overline{\nu}_I$ Extra slides

$$T_{\rm fi} = \frac{G_{\rm F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{us} \left[\overbrace{\langle B_2 | \overline{u} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma^5 s | B_1 \rangle}^{\rm axial-vector} - \overbrace{\langle B_2 | \overline{u} \gamma_{\mu} s | B_1 \rangle}^{\rm vector} \right] \overline{l} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma^5) \nu_l$$

with hadronic matrix elements

$$\langle B_2 | \overline{u} \gamma_\mu \gamma^5 s | B_1 \rangle = g_A(q^2) \gamma_\mu \gamma^5 + \underbrace{\frac{f_T(q^2)}{2M} i\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu \gamma^5}_{2M} + \frac{f_P(q^2)}{2M} q_\mu \gamma^5 q_\mu \gamma^5}_{2M}$$

G-parity

CVC

$$\langle B_2 | \overline{u} \gamma_\mu s | B_1 \rangle = g_V(q^2) \gamma_\mu + \frac{f_{\mathsf{M}}(q^2)}{2M} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu + \underbrace{\frac{f_{\mathsf{S}}(q^2)}{2M} q_\mu}_{2M}$$

Empirical Bayes Method Extra slides

Let $M = \{\Pi, f\}$ denote a model. Per Bayes's theorem:

$$p(\Pi|D, f) = \frac{p(D|\Pi, f)p(\Pi|f)}{p(D|f)}$$

Assuming a uniform distribution for $p(\Pi | f)$:

peak of $p(D|\Pi, f) \implies$ peak of $p(\Pi|D, f)$

where $p(D|\Pi, f)$ is the (readily available) likelihood

 Caveat: the uniformity assumption breaks down if we vary too many parameters separately or make our priors too narrow

	П	$p(D \Pi, f)$	$p(\Pi f)$
1	0 ± 0.1	0.27	0.33
	0 ± 1	0.54	0.33
	0 ± 10	0.19	0.33