



Magnetic Moments of Quarks, Leptons and Hadrons: A Serious Difficulty for Composite Models

HARRY J. LIPKIN^{*}

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510

and

Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439

and

Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel

ABSTRACT

The coupling of three elementary spin $1/2$ particles to make a composite state of spin $1/2$ arises in (a) recently proposed models for quarks and leptons made of three more fundamental building blocks, (b) models of baryons made of three quarks. Reproducing the observed magnetic moments of physical particles provides stringent constraints on these models. Obtaining the observed Dirac moments of the electron and muon is particularly difficult because the mass scale of the moment must be precisely the mass of the composite system rather than some function of basic building block masses, and because the total spin and magnetic moment are not obtained by simple addition of constituent properties but involve Clebsches. The Clebsch problem also arises in obtaining u and d quark moments proportional to their charges. Difficulties in the quark description of recent values of baryon magnetic moments are also discussed.

^{*} Supported in part by the Israel Commission for Basic Research and the US-Israel Bi-national Science Foundation.

I. MAGNETIC MOMENTS OF QUARKS AND LEPTONS FROM COMPOSITE MODELS

The possibility that leptons might not be elementary but could have a composite structure has been considered for a long time^{1,2} and recently revived³ together with a possible compositeness for quarks. But the observed magnetic moments of leptons and the implied magnetic moments of quarks from experimental hadron moments provide strong constraints on any such composite model. In particular the precise agreement of $g - 2$ for leptons with QED predictions is evidence for a remarkable precision in the value $g = 2$ to which the higher order corrections are added. This value of 2 comes from the Dirac equation, but does not arise naturally in any composite model.¹ There are two separate aspects of the problem, the mass scale problem and the Clebsch problem.

1. The Mass Scale Problem. Magnetic moments have a mass scale, the magneton. In the Dirac equation this is simply the mass term which also appears in the kinetic energy and in the behavior of the particle under Lorentz transformations. But in a composite system there is no simple mass scale. Each constituent has its own four-momentum and mass scale and its own coupling to the electromagnetic field. To make the magnetic moment exactly that of a Dirac particle with a mass equal to the mass of the bound state would require a peculiar accident in which these couplings combine into a minimal coupling depending only on the total four-momentum of the system and completely independent of the masses or reduced masses of the constituents.

2. The Clebsch problem. A composite model of a spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particle with constituents having spin must necessarily have some spins parallel and some spins antiparallel to the spin of the bound state. The magnetic moment of the bound state is a complicated linear function of the magnetic moments of the constituents,

with coefficients determined by the angular momentum Clebsches coupling the constituent spins to give a total spin of $\frac{1}{2}$. The electric charge of the bound state is simply the algebraic sum of the constituent charges. Thus the ratio of the magnetic moment of a composite system to its charge Q is given by

$$\frac{\mu}{Q} = \frac{\sum_i C_i \mu_i}{\sum_i q_i} \quad (1)$$

where μ_i and q_i are the magnetic moment and electric charge of constituent i , and C_i is a function of Clebsch-Gordan coefficients in the coupling of the spins of the constituents to the total spin. Since the denominator of (1) is a simple sum, while the numerator is a linear combination involving coefficients generally unequal and often with opposite signs, the resultant ratio is generally very different from the ratio μ_i/q_i for any constituent.

Consider, for example the deuterium atom in the state of total angular momentum $J = \frac{1}{2}$. The mass of the atom is determined primarily by the mass of the deuteron, which plays essentially no role in determining the scale of the magnetic moment. The scale of the magnetic moment is determined almost completely by the magnetic moment of the electron. However, because the deuteron has spin one and the electron has spin $\frac{1}{2}$, the electron spin is antiparallel to the spin of the atom, and the sign of the magnetic moment of the atom is opposite to that of an electron. The magnetic moment of the atom μ_A is neither the Dirac moment nor the electron magnetic moment μ_e but rather μ_e multiplied by Clebsch factors arising from the coupling of the electron and deuteron spins

$$\mu_A = (2/3)\mu_d - (1/3)\mu_e \quad (2)$$

where μ_d is the magnetic moment of the deuteron.

The Clebsch factors (2/3) and -(1/3) appear because the deuteron and electron spins are not really "antiparallel." An atom with spin up has the naive "antiparallel" coupling with the deuteron spin up and the electron spin down in only 2/3 of the wave function; the other 1/3 has the deuteron spin "sideways" and the electron up. The factors 2/3 and 1/3 are the squares of the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients arising in the coupling of two spins of 1 and 1/2 to a total spin of 1/2. The result (2) is general and applies to the magnetic moment of any system with spin 1 and spin 1/2 constituents coupled to a total spin of 1/2.

This example shows the following general features: 1) The mass of the bound state bears no relation to the scale of the magnetic moment. 2) The constituents have equal and opposite charge, but not equal magnetic moments; therefore the charges cancel but the magnetic moments do not. 3) The constituents have antiparallel spins; therefore their magnetic moments add completely differently from their charges. Even if the magnetic moments of the electron and deuteron were equal, they would not cancel in the total magnetic moment like the charges. These three features can be expected in any composite model for quarks and leptons and should be checked very carefully in testing the model.

We now consider in detail the coupling of three spin 1/2 constituents to make spin 1/2 quarks or leptons and write down the appropriate Clebsch factors for the magnetic moment. The three constituents are denoted by a, b and c. There are two independent states with three angular momenta of 1/2 coupled to a total angular momentum of 1/2. We choose the basis in which particles a and b are coupled either to spin zero or to spin one. For these two states the magnetic moments are given by

$$\mu_0 \equiv \mu[(ab)_{S=0}; c]_{S=\frac{1}{2}} = \mu_c \quad (3a)$$

$$\mu_1 \equiv \mu[(ab)_{S=1}; c]_{S=\frac{1}{2}} = (2/3)(\mu_a + \mu_b) - (1/3)\mu_c \quad (3b)$$

For the state (3a), the particles a and b coupled to spin zero make no contribution to the magnetic moment or total spin of the system and all comes from c. In the state (3b), particles a and b have their spins parallel to the total spin, and particle c is antiparallel. This is exactly the same coupling scheme as the deuterium atom (2) and the same factors of (2/3) and -(1/3) appear.

For three different constituents, Eqs. (3) can be used for any choice of a, b and c, and thus gives the magnetic moments for six different states which are pairs of orthogonal states in three different bases. Magnetic moments for states in which no pair is coupled to a definite total angular momentum are slightly more complicated because of off-diagonal matrix elements between the two basic states (3a) and (3b). However, if particles a and b are identical, these off-diagonal matrix elements vanish and the magnetic moment of any linear combination of the two states (3) is simply the weighted average of the two values (3).

If the individual constituents a, b and c all have Dirac moments, the results (3) are in general very different from the Dirac moment. However, in two special cases the Clebsch problem simplifies and a Dirac moment can be obtained if the mass scale problem is solved.

If the magnetic moments and charges of all three constituents are equal

$$q_a = q_b = q_c \quad (4a)$$

$$\mu_a = \mu_b = \mu_c \quad , \quad (4b)$$

the total magnetic moment is given for both coupling schemes (3) by

$$\mu = \mu_a = \mu_b = \mu_c = (1/3)(\mu_a + \mu_b + \mu_c) \quad (5a)$$

while the total electric charge is

$$Q = 3q_a = 3q_b = 3q_c = q_a + q_b + q_c \quad . \quad (5b)$$

Thus

$$(\mu/Q) = (1/3)(\mu_a/q_a) \quad . \quad (5c)$$

If the constituents have Dirac moments corresponding to a mass m , the composite system then has a Dirac moment corresponding to mass $3m$.

A similar result is obtained for the case of a wave function which is a 50-50 mixture of the two spin couplings (3a) and (3b). The magnetic moment is then given by the mean of the two,

$$\mu = (1/2)(\mu_0 + \mu_1) = (1/3)(\mu_a + \mu_b + \mu_c) \quad . \quad (6a)$$

If the ratio of the charges to the magnetic moments of all constituents is the same,

$$(\mu_a/q_a) = (\mu_b/q_b) = (\mu_c/q_c) \quad , \quad (6b)$$

then Eq. (5c) holds for the ratio of the total charge to the total magnetic moment also for this case.

For these cases where Eq. (5c) holds, the magnetic moment of the bound state will be the Dirac moment, as if the state were an elementary particle, if the "effective mass" m of the constituent is exactly one third of the total mass, as is often assumed for quarks in nucleons. However, one must still explain why the magnetic moment of the constituent is given by the Dirac moment with a scale of one third of the bound state mass.

The case of equally charged constituents (4) has been considered for the leptons,³ and avoids the Clebsch problem. However, it is unsuitable for quarks unless new objects with charges of $-(1/9)$ and $+(2/9)$ of the electron charge are introduced. The case of the 50-50 mixture (6) might be used for quarks, but some reason must then be found for the peculiar spin couplings. If constituents a and b are identical and satisfy some kind of statistics, the wave function should be either symmetric or antisymmetric under the permutation of the particles, depending upon the symmetry of the other degrees of freedom including hidden degrees of freedom like color. Since the wave functions (3a) and (3b) are odd and even respectively under spin permutations of particles a and b , and one would expect ground state configurations to be symmetric under spatial permutations, the mixing of (3a) and (3b) appears to be forbidden for particles obeying normal statistics. However, since examples of constituents apparently obeying peculiar statistics have occurred before, we should not discard this possibility too quickly.

II. BARYON MAGNETIC MOMENTS

The same Clebscherei applies to magnetic moments of baryons made of three constituent quarks. Eq. (3a) applies to the Λ , if constituent c is a strange quark; Eq. (3b) applies to the remaining seven octet baryons, with (a, b, c) being:

(u, u, d) and (d, d, u) for the proton and neutron,

(u, u, s), (u, d, s) and (d, d, s) for the Σ^+ , Σ^0 and Σ^-

and

(s, s, u) and (s, s, d) for the Ξ^0 and Ξ^- .

Substituting these into Eq. (3b) gives the well-known results^{4,5}

$$\mu_p = (4/3)\mu_u - (1/3)\mu_d = -(8/3)\mu_d - (1/3)\mu_d = -3\mu_d \quad (7a)$$

$$\mu_n = (4/3)\mu_d - (1/3)\mu_u = (4/3)\mu_d + (2/3)\mu_d = 2\mu_d = -(2/3)\mu_p \quad (7b)$$

$$\mu_\Lambda = \mu_s \quad (7c)$$

$$\mu_{\Sigma^+} = (4/3)\mu_u - (1/3)\mu_s = \mu_p + (1/3)(\mu_d - \mu_s) = \mu_p - (1/9)(\mu_p + 3\mu_\Lambda) \quad (7d)$$

$$\mu_{\Sigma^0} = (2/3)(\mu_u + \mu_d) - (1/3)\mu_s = -(2/3)\mu_d - (1/3)\mu_s = (2/9)\mu_p - (1/3)\mu_\Lambda \quad (7e)$$

$$\mu_{\Sigma^-} = (4/3)\mu_d - (1/3)\mu_s = -(4/9)\mu_p - (1/3)\mu_\Lambda \quad (7f)$$

$$\mu_{\Xi^0} = (4/3)\mu_s - (1/3)\mu_u = (4/3)\mu_s + (2/3)\mu_d = (4/3)\mu_\Lambda - (2/9)\mu_p \quad (7g)$$

$$\mu_{\Xi^-} = (4/3)\mu_s - (1/3)\mu_d = (4/3)\mu_\Lambda + (1/9)\mu_p \quad (7h)$$

The mass scale problem has no obvious solution since free quark masses are not known and may not be relevant. We assume the same mass scale for the u and d quarks and that quark magnetic moments are proportional to their charges. Thus $\mu_u = -2\mu_d$, and we obtain the well-known successful result (7b) for the ratio of the neutron and proton moments.

The magnetic moments of all the Σ and Ξ baryons are given in terms of the proton and Λ magnetic moments. However, the magnetic moment of the Λ cannot be related to that of the nucleon without some assumption about mass scale. The general result obtained from Eqs. (7) is

$$\mu_\Lambda = -(1/3)\mu_p(\mu_s/\mu_d) = -(1/3)\mu_p(m_d/m_s) \quad , \quad (8)$$

where m_d and m_s are effective constituent quark masses which set the mass scales for the corresponding magnetic moments, and which are not known a priori.

Three independent determinations^{6,7} of the mass scale factor (m_d/m_s) have been shown to give surprising agreement with experiment when substituted into the relation (8)

$$m_d/m_s = (M_{\Sigma^*} - M_{\Sigma}) / (M_{\Lambda} - M_p) \quad (9a)$$

$$m_s - m_d = M_{\Lambda} - M_p = \frac{3}{4}(M_{K^*} - M_{\rho}) + \frac{1}{4}(M_K - M_{\pi}) \quad (9b)$$

Equation (9a) follows from the assumption that the spin splittings on the right-hand side are hyperfine splittings inversely proportional to quark masses because they come from the "color magnetic" force from one gluon exchange. Equation (9b) follows from the assumption that the only flavor dependence in hadron masses comes from the quark mass difference (9b) and the hyperfine splittings (9a). That these hadron mass differences should give such precise values for the mass scale which determines the hadron magnetic moments is very surprising. It may only be coincidental, in view of the many higher order effects neglected, but it may also be a clue to some underlying physics which is not yet understood. Possible theoretical implications have been discussed.⁷

Recent measurements of the Ξ^0 and Σ^+ magnetic moments do not fit this simple picture.^{8,9}

$$\mu_{\Xi^0} = -1.20 \pm 0.06 \text{ n.m.}$$

$$\mu_{\Sigma^+} = 2.30 \pm 0.14 \text{ n.m.}$$

Both moments are smaller in magnitude by about 15% from the predicted values, thus leading to the following qualitative conclusions.

1. The discrepancy between predictions and experiment cannot be fixed by adjusting the magnetic moment of the strange quark, because the moments of the Λ , Σ^+ and Ξ^0 depend upon it in very different ways. The value of μ_{Λ} is exactly equal to μ_s . The value of μ_{Σ^+} depends mainly on μ_u and is very insensitive to μ_s . The value of μ_{Ξ^0} depends roughly equally on μ_d and μ_s . Thus, even if one of the three experimental values for strange magnetic moments is incorrect; the other two cannot be fit by adjusting μ_s .

2. That both μ_{Σ^+} and μ_{Ξ^0} are reduced in magnitude by about the same amount is suggestive. Both these hyperons have only u and s quarks. The u and s

charges have opposite sign, and their spins are antiparallel, so that their magnetic moments add with spins coupled to give the maximum possible magnetic moment. Any admixture of a different configuration with a different spin coupling would reduce the magnetic moment and might explain the experimental result. But such mixing could easily spoil the good results for the nucleon and Λ .

3. The predictions (7) all assume the same mass scale factor for all baryons. If the mass scale factor depends upon the baryon mass, then heavier hyperons will have larger mass scales and smaller magnetic moments. This would reduce the Σ^+ and Ξ^0 moments relative to the nucleon and Λ .

The obvious modifications of the model giving Eq. (7) are thus seen to push the Σ^+ and Ξ^0 moments in the right direction. But with only two pieces of data to fit, and models which go in the right direction anyway, it is too easy to get a fit which is not really significant. One way to try to stay honest is to examine modified models already proposed for other reasons before these new data were available. One finds two candidates, one with configuration mixing¹⁰ and one with a new mass scale.⁵

Configuration mixing of a d-wave into the baryon octet,¹⁰ analogous to the d-wave in the deuteron can affect only the Σ and Ξ , without affecting the nucleon and the Λ . The reason is that unlike the deuteron which has spin one and can have an $L = 2$ admixture without recoupling spins, the baryons with spin $1/2$ can only admix $L = 2$ and keep $J = 1/2$ by recoupling the quark spins to $S = 3/2$. But if there is some dynamical reason favoring mixing only of states with maximum space symmetry as seems reasonable for short range attractive forces, then quark statistics with $S = 3/2$ requires an $SU(3)$ decuplet. Octet-decuplet mixing is forbidden by $SU(3)$, but is expected to occur like the usual octet-singlet mixing as a result of the $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking due to the $m_s - m_u$ mass difference.

However, such octet-decuplet mixing can affect only the Σ and the Ξ , which have states of the same isospin in both octet and decuplet. The nucleon and Λ have no counterparts in the decuplet with the same isospin, and therefore cannot be mixed without violating isospin conservation.

Although this mechanism gives a qualitative effect in the right direction for the right states, it is difficult to see how effects as large as 15% can be obtained. Precise quantitative values can be obtained only by specific model calculations. One such calculation does indeed give effects which are much too small.¹¹

The other alternative is to give the magnetic moment of a quark of a given flavor a mass scale which depends upon the mass of the hadron.⁵ The nucleon magnetic moments give the magnetic moments of u and d quarks in the nucleon. The Λ magnetic moment gives the moment of the strange quark in the Λ . If the mass scale of the magneton in each case is proportional to the mass of the hadron, Eqs. (7d-h) are modified by replacing μ_p on the right-hand side by $\mu_p M_p/M_Y$ and μ_Λ by $\mu_\Lambda M_\Lambda/M_Y$, where M_Y is the mass of the appropriate hyperon, Σ in Eqs. (7d-f) and Ξ in Eqs. (7g-h). With this modification, the predicted value for μ_{Σ^+} is reduced from 2.68 to 2.15, and for μ_{Ξ^0} from -1.43 to -1.13. These new predictions agree to about one standard deviation with the new experimental results. Several similar analyses with mass factors have recently been given.^{12,13,14}

Measurements of other hyperon magnetic moments would give a better insight into the possible mechanism for violation of the simple predictions. In particular, one can examine the following linear combinations of magnetic moments which depend only on either the strange or nonstrange quark contributions

$$\mu_{\Sigma^+} - \mu_{\Sigma^-} = -3\mu_d = (4/3)\mu_p (g_\Sigma^d/g_N^d) \quad (10a)$$

$$\mu_{\Sigma^+} + 2\mu_{\Sigma^-} = -\mu_s = -\mu_\Lambda (g_\Sigma^s/g_\Lambda^s) \quad (10b)$$

$$\mu_{\Xi^0} - \mu_{\Xi^-} = \mu_d = -(1/3)\mu_p (g_{\Xi}^d/g_N^d) \quad (10c)$$

$$\mu_{\Xi^0} + 2\mu_{\Xi^-} = 4\mu_s = 4\mu_{\Lambda} (g_{\Xi}^s/g_{\Lambda}^s) \quad (10d)$$

$$\mu_{\Omega^-} = 3\mu_s = 3\mu_{\Lambda} (g_{\Omega}^s/g_{\Lambda}^s) \quad (10e)$$

where $g_{H'}^f/g_H^f$ is the ratio of the magnetic moment of a quark of flavor f in hadron H' to the magnetic moment of the same quark in hadron H . There are a sufficient number of predictions to allow systematics in any disagreements to appear. For example, if the mass scale effect is responsible for the decreased moments of the Σ^+ and Ξ^0 , there are a sufficient number of cross checks in the predictions (10) which should be reduced by the same mass factors to definitely prove or disprove this model.

REFERENCES

- ¹ T. Massam and A. Zichichi, *Nuovo Cimento* 43A (1966) 227.
- ² H.J. Lipkin, The Spectrum of Hadrons, Proc. Florence Inaugural Conf. of the European Physical Society, Special Number of *Revista del Nuovo Cimento* I, (1969) 134. See also *Physics Reports* 8C (1973) 172.
- ³ O.W. Greenberg and C.A. Nelson, *Phys. Rev.* D10 (1974) 2567 and references cited therein; H. Harari, "A Schematic Model of Quarks and Leptons," SLAC-PUB-2310, to be published in *Physics Letters*; Michael A. Schupe, "A Composite Model of Leptons and Quarks," University of Illinois (Urbana) preprint UI-HEPG-1979-7.
- ⁴ H.R. Rubinstein, F. Scheck and R.H. Socolow, *Phys. Rev.* 154 (1967) 1608.
- ⁵ H.J. Lipkin, "Why Are Hyperons Interesting and Different from Nonstrange Baryons?", *Particles and Fields 1975*. Edited by H.J. Lubatti and P.M. Mockett, University of Washington (Seattle), p. 352.
- ⁶ A. De Rujula, H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow, *Phys. Rev.* D12 (1975) 147.
- ⁷ H.J. Lipkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 41 (1978) 1629, *Physics Letters* 74B (1978) 399.
- ⁸ R. Bunce, et al., to be published in *Physics Letters*.
- ⁹ R. Settles et al., to be published in *Physical Review*.
- ¹⁰ H.J. Lipkin, *Physics Letters* 35B (1971) 534.
- ¹¹ N. Isgur, private communication.
- ¹² Y. Tomazawa, *Phys. Rev.* D19 (1979) 1626.
- ¹³ R.B. Teese and R. Settles, *Physics Letters* 87B (1979) 111.
- ¹⁴ N. Isgur and G. Karl, Toronto preprint.