

is quite small<sup>8</sup>, although it may be of theoretical interest in the analysis of the performance of electronic instruments.

- 1 L. R. Smith, Phys. Rev. **69**, 195 (1946).
- 2 D. Gabor, Phil. Mag. **41**, 1161 (1950).
- 3 I. R. Senitzky, Phys. Rev. **91**, 1309 (1953).
- 4 I. R. Senitzky, Phys. Rev. **95**, 904 (1954).
- 5 I. R. Senitzky, Phys. Rev. **98**, 875 (1955).
- 6 P. S. Farago and G. Marx, Acta Phys. Hung., **4**, 23 (1954); Phys. Rev. **99**, 1063 (1955).
- 7 J. Weber, Phys. Rev. **94**, 215 (1954); **96**, 556 (1954).
- 8 V. L. Ginzburg and V. M. Fain, Radiotekhnika i Elektronika **2**, (1957).
- 9 H. B. Callen and T. A. Welton, Phys. Rev. **83**, 35 (1951).
- 10 V. L. Ginzburg, Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk **46**, 348 (1952); Fortsch. d. Physik **1**, 51 (1953).
- 11 V. L. Ginzburg, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **23**, 773 (1939); **24**, 130 (1939).
- 12 A. I. Akhiezer and V. B. Berestetskii, *Quantum Electrodynamics*, Sec. 32, GTTI, 1953.

Translated by E. Rabkin

33

## On the Problem of $K^0$ Decays

I. IU. KOBZAREV

(Submitted to JETP editor October 25, 1956)  
 J. Exptl. Theoret. Phys. (U.S.S.R.) **32**, 180-181  
 (January, 1957)

IF we assume that in  $K$ -meson decays parity is conserved, then from the whole of the experimental data it apparently follows that there exist two mesons  $\tau$  and  $\theta$  with spin and parity  $0^-$  and  $0^+$  respectively. Then it must be supposed that there exists a certain "degeneracy in parity" for the "strange particles"<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand one can assume that there exists only one  $K$  meson and that parity is not conserved in the decay interactions<sup>2</sup>. In the present note we point out one possibility for an experimental test of the hypothesis of nonconservation of parity.

We suppose that parity is conserved and consider the decay of a  $\tau^0$  meson. The possible decay schemes for it will be

$$\tau^0 \begin{cases} \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^- + \pi^0 \\ \rightarrow 3\pi^0 \end{cases}, \quad \tau^0 \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mu^\pm \\ e^\pm \end{cases} + \nu + \pi^\mp.$$

Like the  $\theta^0$  meson, the  $\tau^0$  meson must represent a mixture of charge-even and charge-odd components

$$\tau^0 = (\tau_s^0 + i\tau_a^0) / \sqrt{2}.$$

$\tau_s^0$  will decay according to all four possible schemes, with the decay  $\tau_s^0 \rightarrow 3\pi$  being the isotopic analogue of the  $\tau^+$  decay.

For  $\tau_a^0$  the decay  $\tau_a^0 \rightarrow 3\pi^0$  is forbidden, and the decay  $\tau_a^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^- + \pi^0$  must go into states with orbital angular momentum different from zero and will be suppressed, so that the main decay for it will be

$$\tau_a^0 \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mu^\pm \\ e^\pm \end{cases} + \nu + \pi^\mp.$$

For both components the lifetime will be of the order of  $10^{-7}$  sec.<sup>3</sup>

The situation is fundamentally changed if we assume that there exists one  $K$  meson but that decays occur with nonconservation of parity. In this case the main decay for the  $K^0$  component will be  $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^-$ ; this decay is a fast one, so that the lifetime of  $K_s^0$  will be  $t \sim 10^{-10}$  sec. The charge-odd component, for which two-meson decay is impossible<sup>4</sup>, will decay mainly according to the schemes

$$K^0 \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mu^\pm \\ e^\pm \end{cases} + \nu + \pi^\mp \quad \text{or} \quad K^0 \rightarrow 2\pi + \gamma$$

with lifetime  $t \sim 10^{-8}$ - $10^{-7}$  sec.

Let us consider the decay curve of  $\tau^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^- + \pi^0$ . In the case of conservation of parity, we must observe two slightly separated exponentials with nearly equal lifetimes  $t \sim 10^{-7}$  sec. But in the case of nonconservation of parity we must observe together with an exponential of lifetime  $t \sim 10^{-8}$ - $10^{-7}$  sec a short-lived component with lifetime of the order of  $10^{-10}$  sec.

I express my thanks to I. Ia. Pomeranchuk for a discussion.

1 T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **102**, 290 (1956).

2 R. P. Feynman, Proc. Sixth Rochester Conference.

3 G. A. Snow, Phys. Rev. **103**, 1111 (1956).

4 M. Gell-Mann and A. Pais, Phys. Rev. **97**, 1387 (1955).

Translated by W. H. Furry

43