

On the Mass and Width of the Z -boson and Other Relativistic Quasistable Particles

Arno R. Bohm¹ and N. L. Harshman²

The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

Abstract

The ambiguity in the definition for the mass and width of relativistic resonances is discussed, in particular for the case of the Z -boson. This ambiguity can be removed by requiring that a resonance's width Γ (defined by a Breit-Wigner lineshape) and lifetime τ (defined by the exponential law) always and exactly fulfill the relation $\Gamma = \hbar/\tau$. To justify this one needs relativistic Gamow vectors which in turn define the resonance's mass M_R as the real part of the square root $\text{Re}\sqrt{s_R}$ of the S -matrix pole position s_R . For the Z -boson this means that $M_R \approx M_Z - 26\text{MeV}$ and $\Gamma_R \approx \Gamma_Z - 1.2\text{MeV}$ where M_Z and Γ_Z are the values reported in the particle data tables.

PACS: 11.80.-m; 11.30.Cp; 14.70.Hp; 13.38.Dg

Keywords: Z -boson lineshape; Relativistic Breit-Wigner; Relativistic resonances; Relativistic Gamow vector, Poincaré semigroup, Time asymmetry

¹E-mail: bohm@physics.utexas.edu

²E-mail: harshman@physics.utexas.edu

1 Introduction

Relativistic resonances and quasi-stable particles are listed along with stable, elementary particles [1] and are not considered qualitatively different from the latter. Both are characterized by species labels or internal quantum numbers, spin-parity j^P and the center of mass energy squared s . The only difference between the characterizations is that stable particles have a real value for $s = m^2 \geq 0$ and quasi-stable particles and resonances have a complex value for s , which is often also parameterized by the two real values “mass” m and “width” Γ . These can be combined as $s = (m - i\frac{\Gamma}{2})^2$ among other ways³.

The ratio of the resonance characterization parameter (Γ/m) runs over a wide range: from $(\Gamma/m) \sim 10^{-2}$ - 10^{-1} for hadron resonances and $(\Gamma/m) \sim 3 \times 10^{-2}$ for the Z -boson to much smaller values for other electroweakly decaying particles, e.g. $(\Gamma/m)_{\pi^0} \sim 10^{-7}$, $(\Gamma/m)_{\pi^\pm} \sim 10^{-15}$ and $(\Gamma/m)_{K^0} \sim 10^{-14}$. The experimental definition or method of determination of Γ and m is quite different for different magnitudes of (Γ/m) .

1. For $\Gamma/m > 10^{-7}$, Γ and m are determined as the lineshape parameters of relativistic Breit-Wigner (BW) amplitudes from the cross sections and asymmetries (e.g. for the Z -boson in $e\bar{e} \rightarrow Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ [2]). In what follows we discuss two different relativistic BW's.
2. For $\Gamma/m \sim 10^{-14}$ and less, the lineshape cannot be resolved and instead of Γ one measures the lifetime τ . The definition of τ is based on the exponential law for the partial decay rates $\dot{P}_\eta(t)$ and/or the decay probability $P(t) = \sum_\eta P_\eta(t)$. One measures τ by a fit to the exponential law [3].

Observationally, Γ and τ are different quantities; Γ comes from the BW energy distribution and τ from the exponential counting rate. Statements

³We use the notation m, Γ if we do not specify which mass and width parameter is meant. M_R, Γ_R is used for the complex pole position $s_R = (M_R - i\frac{\Gamma_R}{2})^2$ of the S -matrix or the pole position of the Z propagator. Conventionally one parameterizes the pole position using the quantities M_ρ, Γ_ρ given by

$$s_R \equiv M_\rho^2 - iM_\rho\Gamma_\rho = M_R^2(1 - \frac{1}{4}(\frac{\Gamma_R}{M_R})^2) - iM_R\Gamma_R \quad (1)$$

and calls $M_\rho = M_R\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{4}(\frac{\Gamma_R}{M_R})^2}$ the resonance mass and $\Gamma_\rho = \Gamma_R(1 - \frac{1}{4}(\frac{\Gamma_R}{M_R})^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ its width. To denote m and Γ in the on-mass-shell definition we use M_Z and Γ_Z . The notation in the literature varies (some call $M_Z \rightarrow M_R$ or vice versa).

that the exponential law is not exact and the use of alternate forms for the relativistic BW have further confused the connection between the width and the lifetime. Connected with the definition of resonance width is the definition of resonance mass. Experimentalists have in the past identified it with the peak of the invariant mass distribution which was sufficient since the data were not accurate enough. S -matrix theoreticians prefer to define it as $\text{Re}\sqrt{s_R} = M_R$ instead of the peak $\sqrt{\text{Re}s_R} = M_\rho$ or the on-shell definition M_Z (see footnote 1). Only since the LEP data for the Z -boson has accuracy reached a level where these differences have become of practical importance. Nevertheless, the exact definition of m and Γ and the relation of Γ to τ have always been of fundamental importance. Conventionally, the identification $\hbar/\Gamma \approx \tau$ is justified by some heuristic and approximate arguments [4, 5] based on the Weisskopf-Wigner (WW) methods [6]. So far, no generally accepted theory precisely related \hbar/Γ and τ because there did “not exist ... a rigorous theory to which these various methods [WW, etc.] can be considered as approximations” [7].

A rigorous description of non-relativistic resonances and decaying states by Gamow kets $\psi^G = |E - i\Gamma/2\rangle$ has been provided during the last two decades by the Rigged Hilbert Space (RHS) formulation of quantum mechanics [8–10]. For these Gamow kets one can derive both an exact Breit-Wigner with width Γ for the lineshape and an exact, exponential time evolution $\psi^G(t) = e^{-iEt}e^{-\frac{\Gamma}{2}t}\psi^G(0)$. From the latter follows the exact Golden Rule for the partial decay rate of the resonance R into the channel η , $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_\eta(t) = \Gamma_\eta e^{-\Gamma t}$. Thus with the properties of the Gamow vectors, the precise relation $\tau = \hbar/\Gamma$ between the differently defined quantities τ and \hbar/Γ was established for non-relativistic resonances.

Guided and motivated by recent discussions concerning the ambiguities in the definition of mass and width of relativistic quasi-stable particles, in particular for the Z -boson [1, 2, 11–17], we explore the use of relativistic Gamow kets to provide unambiguous definitions of mass and width. The theoretical foundations of the relativistic Gamow vectors are based on the time asymmetric Poincaré transformations of relativistic spacetime and have recently been presented elsewhere [18].

2 Lineshape Parameters and Relativistic Breit-Wigners

The determination of the Z -boson mass and width from the lineshape has been performed with two different definitions of mass and width and two different relativistic Breit-Wigner amplitudes. As a result, two different values for m and Γ have been obtained from the same experimental data [1, 2, 11].

The first approach, followed by practically all experimental analyses of the LEP and SLC data [1], is based on the on-shell definition of mass and width, which we shall denote M_Z and Γ_Z . The Z -boson mass and width are defined in perturbation theory by the (transverse) self-energy $\Pi(s)$ of the Z -boson propagator. The part of the Z -boson propagator proportional to $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ is given by

$$D(s) = \frac{1}{s - M_0^2 - \Pi(s)}. \quad (2)$$

The on-shell scheme defines the (real) mass M_Z and the width Γ_Z by the renormalization conditions:

$$M_Z^2 = M_0^2 + \text{Re}\Pi(M_Z^2), \quad M_Z\Gamma_Z = \frac{-\text{Im}\Pi(M_Z^2)}{1 - \text{Re}\Pi'(M_Z^2)}, \quad (3a)$$

where the prime indicates differentiation with respect to s . Using these conditions and expanding $\text{Re}\Pi(s)$ about $s = M_Z^2$, $D(s)$ is written

$$\begin{aligned} D(s) &= \frac{1}{(s - M_Z^2)[1 - \text{Re}\Pi'(M_Z^2)] - i\text{Im}\Pi(s)} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \text{Re}\Pi'(M_Z^2)} \times \frac{1}{s - M_Z^2 + i\sqrt{s}\Gamma_Z(s)} \end{aligned} \quad (3b)$$

where the “ s -dependent width” $\Gamma_Z(s)$ has been defined by

$$\sqrt{s}\Gamma_Z(s) \equiv \frac{-\text{Im}\Pi(s)}{1 - \text{Re}\Pi'(M_Z^2)} \quad (4)$$

This leads, to the “relativistic Breit-Wigner with energy dependent width” [e.g. p. 189 of [1]] for the lineshape of the Z -boson

$$a_j^Z(s) = \frac{-\sqrt{s}\sqrt{\Gamma_e(s)\Gamma_f(s)}}{s - M_Z^2 + i\sqrt{s}\Gamma_Z(s)} \quad (5)$$

where the partial widths have the same s dependence: $\Gamma_{e,f}(s) = (\text{const.}) \times \Gamma_Z(s)$. Neglecting the fermion mass, one calculates for the Z -boson near the resonance peak

$$\frac{\text{Im}\Pi(s)}{1 - \text{Re}\Pi'(M_Z^2)} = -\frac{s}{M_Z} \Gamma_Z. \quad (6)$$

Inserting this in (5) (neglecting the irrelevant s -dependence in the numerator), one obtains the standard expression for the j th partial wave amplitude used in the line shape analysis of all experiments

$$a_j^Z(s) \approx \frac{-M_Z B_{ef} \Gamma_Z}{s - M_Z^2 + i \frac{s}{M_Z} \Gamma_Z} = \frac{R_Z}{s - M_Z^2 + i \frac{s}{M_Z} \Gamma_Z} \quad (7)$$

The on-mass shell renormalization is arbitrary [13–17, 19] and may have some problems with gauge invariance. More serious may be the problem that the conventional expressions of $\text{Im}\Pi$ and therewith of Γ treat the unstable state as an asymptotically free state, i.e. as eigenvectors of the free Hamiltonian $H_0 = H_f + H_{\bar{f}}$ and not the full Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + V$, where V is the decay interaction, cf. (7.49) and (7.63) of [19]. Therefore another scheme based on the complex valued position of the propagator pole $s_R = M_0^2 + \Pi(s_R)$ may be better because scattering resonances are different from their asymptotically free in- and out-states.

Writing the pole position as $s_R = M_\rho^2 - iM_\rho\Gamma_\rho$, one obtains in place of (7) the expression (8) below which agrees phenomenologically with the S -matrix definition. The merit of the notation in terms of M_R and Γ_R will become clear at the end of the paper.

In analytic S -matrix theory a resonance with spin j is defined by a (pair of) first order pole(s) at the position(s) $s_R = (M_R - i\Gamma_R/2)^2$ (and $s_R^* = (M_R + i\Gamma_R/2)^2$) on the second sheet of the analytically continued j -th partial S -matrix element [20]. Analytic S -matrix theory defines the complex quantity s_R in a model independent way.

Using the S -matrix definition of the Z -resonance (or the pole definition of the propagator), the Z -boson pole term of the j th partial amplitude is given by

$$a_j^R(s) = \frac{R_Z}{s - M_\rho^2 + iM_\rho\Gamma_\rho} = \frac{R_Z}{s - (M_R - i\frac{\Gamma_R}{2})^2} = \frac{R_Z}{s - s_R} \quad (8)$$

where Γ_R and M_R are basic S -matrix parameters and independent of the energy s . The same parameterization is obtained from the complex pole definition of the Z -propagator. We call (8) also a “relativistic Breit-Wigner” or the S -matrix pole Breit-Wigner⁴.

One can compare the two definitions of the mass M_Z and M_R by adjusting the maximum $s_{max}^{(1)}$ of (7) and the maximum $s_{max}^{(2)}$ of (8) to the peak position of the experimental cross section data, s_{peak} . The maximum of $|a_j^Z(s)|^2$ is $s_{max}^{(1)} = M_Z^2(1 + (\Gamma_Z/M_Z)^2)^{-1}$ and the maximum of $|a_j^R(s)|^2$ is $s_{max}^{(2)} = M_R^2(1 - 1/4(\Gamma_R/M_R)^2) \equiv M_\rho^2$ and from $s_{peak} = s_{max}^{(1)} = s_{max}^{(2)}$ one obtains the following differences in the values of M_R , M_ρ and M_Z [14–17]:

$$M_R^2 = M_Z^2 - \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{\Gamma_Z}{M_Z}\right)^2 M_Z^2 + O\left(\left(\frac{\Gamma_Z}{M_Z}\right)^4\right) \quad (9)$$

or

$$M_R = M_Z - 26\text{MeV} \quad M_\rho = M_Z - 34\text{MeV}. \quad (10)$$

Both parameterizations (7) and (8) were fitted to the experimental cross sections and asymmetries [2, 11]. These fits confirmed the differences (10) and also yielded $\Gamma_\rho - \Gamma_Z \approx (1 - 2)\text{MeV}$.

The experimental fits incorporate more than just (8) or (7), e.g. corrections, background and interference needed to be incorporated into the analysis. The pole term (8) which enters into the j -th partial amplitude $a_j(s)$ only describes the part of the scattering which goes through the Z resonance

$$e\bar{e} \rightarrow Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}. \quad (11)$$

Even if there is only one intermediate particle with $j^P = 1^-$ there is *always* a slowly varying background amplitude $B(s)$ so that $a_j(s) = a_j^R(s) + B(s)$. If there are also other intermediate particles with $j^P = 1^-$, for example only one other with (complex) mass squared $s = s_{R_2}$, then the partial amplitude contains a sum of two BW’s and a background term

$$a_j(s) = \frac{R_Z}{s - s_R} + \frac{R_2}{s - s_{R_2}} + B(s). \quad (12)$$

⁴The “relativistic S -matrix pole Breit-Wigner” (8) in the non-relativistic limit becomes the standard non-relativistic Breit Wigner $(E - E_R + i\Gamma/2)^{-1}$.

This form (12) does not follow from the expansion of $a_j(s)$ into a Laurent series based on analyticity assumptions about $a_j(s)$. Instead it follows from a stronger hypothesis of the RHS formulation of quantum mechanics⁵.

The fit to the LEP data [2,11] used for the amplitude an expression which contained, in addition to the Z -boson Breit-Wigner (8) or (7), a photon term (“ γ -Breit-Wigner”) and a slowly varying background amplitude $B(s)$ which is assumed to be constant in the Z -boson energy region [21]:

$$a_j(s) = \frac{R_Z}{s - s_R} + \frac{R_\gamma}{s} + B(s), \text{ with } s_R = (M_R - i\Gamma_R/2)^2. \quad (13)$$

The external line QED corrections are included by a convolution integral with the basic scattering cross sections given by $|a_j(s)|^2$ of (13). The γ -Breit-Wigner is the analogue of the one photon exchange graph of the internal line QED corrections. Its inclusion in (13) treats the scattering as a double multichannel resonance process [22],

$$e\bar{e} \rightarrow \frac{Z}{\gamma} \rightarrow f\bar{f}. \quad (14)$$

In the S -matrix approach the amplitude (13) may be considered as a limiting case of the double resonance amplitude (12) for $s_{R_2} \rightarrow 0$, though there is really no S -matrix theory justification for (13) except the analogy to (12). However, the Z - γ interference term from (13) is important for the fits of various asymmetries [2].

The earlier fits to the LEP data use the amplitude with the s -dependent denominator (7) from the on-mass shell definition:

$$a_j(s) = \frac{R_Z}{s - M_Z^2 + is\frac{\Gamma_Z}{M_Z}} + \frac{R_\gamma}{s} + B(s). \quad (15)$$

After the arbitrariness of this form became known, the same kinds of fits were made using the S -matrix definition (13). The fits of the LEP data to (13) and (15) were equally good and they reproduced the expected difference (10) between the differently defined masses and widths, (M_Z, Γ_Z) from (15) and (M_R, Γ_R) from (13). Thus the experimental lineshape data of the Z -boson do not favor either of these two definitions of Z -boson mass and width.

⁵ In addition to the conventional analyticity assumption (12) requires also the hypothesis that the prepared in-states ϕ^+ and the observed out-states (decay products) ψ^- of the S -matrix element $(\psi^-, \phi^+) = (\psi^{out}, S\phi^{in})$ are vectors of two different dense subspaces of the Hilbert Space \mathcal{H} . See Appendix.

Recently the conventional approach, using a Breit-Wigner with energy dependent width (7), and the S-matrix approach, using the pole definition (8), were compared for hadron resonances. For baryon resonances like the Δ_{33} , recent editions of reference [1] list both the pole position $s_h = (1210 - i\frac{100}{2})^2 \text{MeV}$ in addition to the conventional parameters $M_h = 1232 \text{MeV}$ and $\Gamma(M_h^2) = 120 \text{MeV}$. The interpretation given to these different values by [23] is that the pole position s_h belongs to the Δ -resonance whereas the conventional parameters $(M_h, \Gamma(M_h^2))$ belong to the Δ and the background together. This interpretation is in agreement with our RHS theory of resonance scattering as expressed by the results (12) and (13).

When both the S -matrix definition (8) and the on-mass shell definition (7) were applied to the ρ -meson data [24], the conclusion was that the S -matrix definition of M_ρ and Γ_ρ is phenomenologically preferred. The reason given was that these fitted parameters remained largely independent of the parameterization of the background term $B(s)$ and the $\rho - \omega$ interference. A similar fit to the S -matrix Breit-Wigner (8) was performed for the experimental data on πp scattering in the Δ resonance region [25]. As with the ρ , the fits to (8) were better than the fits to (7) and they were independent of the background parameterization. Also, the fitted values of M_Δ and Γ_Δ from (8) turn out to be significantly smaller than the conventional values from (7). Therefore, for the hadron resonances the pole definition (8) may be phenomenologically preferred. Again, as stated above, the same conclusion does not follow from the Z -boson data [2, 11] where these two approaches lead just to different values of the Z -boson parameters.

3 Lifetime Parameter and Exponential Decay Rate

Neither the treatment of the resonant propagator based on the complex pole position $s_R = M_0^2 + \Pi(s_R)$ nor the phenomenologically equivalent S -matrix theory definition of a quasi-stable particle by the pole at s_R define the mass and width separately. A wide assortment of two real numbers can be extracted from s_R and identified with the mass and width [26], e.g. one could write

$$s_R = (M_R - i\frac{\Gamma_R}{2})^2 = M_\rho^2 - iM_\rho\Gamma_\rho \quad (16)$$

and call either M_R, Γ_R or M_ρ, Γ_ρ the resonance mass and width. There is no principle in analytic S -matrix theory that tells us how to separate the complex number s_R into the real mass and width. Lineshape by itself, however accurately determined and however precisely the background and corrections are known, does not determine mass and width separately. However, there is a separate physical meaning for the width (and the resonance mass). For this we turn to the second definition of Γ given by the inverse lifetime $\Gamma = \hbar/\tau$, as mentioned in section 1.

The measurement of the lifetime uses the exponential law for the partial decay rates $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_\eta(t)$ of the quasi-stable particle R into any decay products with the channel quantum numbers η . It is done by a fit of the experimental counting rate $\dot{N}_\eta(t)/N = \dot{\mathcal{P}}_\eta(t)/\Gamma$ to the exponential $\exp(-t/\tau)$, where t is the time in the center of mass frame of the decay products η . This cannot be done for the Z -boson because \hbar/Γ_Z would be too short to measure, although it has been done for many other decaying elementary particles like $\mu^\pm, \pi^\pm, K^{\pm,0}$.

All relativistic quasistable particles should have a width Γ defined by the Breit-Wigner and a lifetime τ defined by the exponential decay law. Although both Γ and τ may not be measured for the same particle due to experimental limitations, we want to require that a complete theoretical description of a resonance should provide an unambiguous, *exact* connection between them: the relation $\Gamma = \hbar/\tau$ should be fulfilled exactly and universally.

To establish the width Γ of (8) as the inverse lifetime we have to first establish

$$\dot{\mathcal{P}}_\eta(t) = \Gamma^{(\eta)} e^{-\Gamma_R t} \tag{17}$$

as a precise result obtained from the second sheet S -matrix pole definition of a resonance. Then, the relationship $\Gamma = \hbar/\tau$ will hold precisely and not just as a result of the WW approximate methods [4, 6]. So we need an intermediary that connects the Breit-Wigner (8) to the exponential law (17). This will be the “state vector” of the resonance state, the relativistic Gamow vector.

Conventionally state vectors representing decaying states and resonances are obtained using heuristic finite dimensional models with an n -dimensional complex “effective Hamiltonian matrix” H^{eff} . For example, in the two dimensional neutral Kaon system [27], the elementary particle state is defined as the eigenvector of the complex Hamiltonian matrix with a complex eigen-

value

$$H^{eff} f^{K_{S,L}} = (m_{S,L} - i\frac{\Gamma_{S,L}}{2}) f^{K_{S,L}}. \quad (18)$$

From this one concludes

$$f^{K_{S,L}}(t) \equiv e^{-iH^{eff}t} f^{K_{S,L}} = e^{-im_{L,S}t} e^{-\frac{\Gamma_{S,L}t}{2}} f^{K_{S,L}} \quad (19)$$

and the general state vector is taken as the superposition

$$\phi = c_S f^{K_S} + c_L f^{K_L} \quad (20a)$$

with the time evolution

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(t) &= e^{-H^{eff}t} \phi = c_S f^{K_S}(t) + c_L f^{K_L}(t) \\ &= c_S e^{-im_S t} e^{-\Gamma_S t/2} f^{K_S} + c_L e^{-im_L t} e^{-\Gamma_L t/2} f^{L_S}. \end{aligned} \quad (20b)$$

The exponential law (17) is then justified in the following way: one inserts (19) for all values of t into Dirac's Golden Rule and obtains a rate $R(t)$ for all values of t ⁶. This $R(t)$ one then equates with the time derivative of the decay probability $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_\eta(t)$. This deduction of the exponential law has the following deficiencies:

1. Dirac's Golden Rule is only an approximation for the initial decay rate (i.e. for $t \rightarrow 0$) and has only been obtained for the Dirac Lippmann-Schwinger eigenkets of real energy $|E^- \rangle$ and not for vectors like f^{K_S} with complex energies $(E - i\Gamma/2)$. To justify (17) one should start from the fundamental quantum mechanical formula for the probability of decay from R to η

$$\mathcal{P}_\eta(t) = \text{Tr}(\Lambda_\eta |\psi^G(t)\rangle \langle \psi^G(t)|), \quad (21)$$

where ψ^G describes the decaying state R and Λ_η is the projection operator on the space of decay products η . Then the probability rate (17) should result as the time derivative of $\mathcal{P}_\eta(t)$ [9].

⁶Additionally, one inserts (20b) into Dirac's Golden Rule and obtains the decay rate for the neutral Kaon state considered as a superposition of two exponentially decaying states, but this matter is not the subject of the present paper.

2. Γ_S is defined by (18) as the imaginary part of a complex energy and from (19) one sees this is thus just another name for \hbar/τ . It is unrelated to the width of a lineshape (8) because (18) and its underlying assumptions do not imply a precise relation between Γ_S and any width Γ (either Γ_R , Γ_ρ , Γ_Z or others) of any relativistic Breit-Wigner. To justify $\tau = \hbar/\Gamma$ one must relate Γ_S of (18) to the Γ_R (or Γ_ρ , etc.) of the pole definition of the lineshape (8) or any other definition for the lineshape, e.g. (7).
3. The energy operator H (or in the rest system, $H \equiv P_0 = M = (P_\mu P^\mu)^{1/2}$ for the relativistic case like the K -meson) is a self-adjoint operator in an infinite dimensional space, usually the representation space of the Poincare group of transformations of spacetime. To justify the two dimensional “complex” eigenvector expansion of a general state vector ϕ (20a), one first has to show that the eigenvectors with complex eigenvalue (18) have a meaning for self-adjoint H , that they can be elements of a basis system for the infinite dimensional space and that the truncation to the two-dimensional subspace gives (20a) as an approximation.

All these things can be justified, with some qualifications, within the RHS formulation of time asymmetric quantum theory by augmenting the conventional assumptions of scattering theory with the new hypothesis described in the Appendix.

From this new hypothesis one derives both the form of the j th partial amplitude (12) for two resonance poles of the partial S -matrix and a complex basis vector decomposition for the prepared in-state ϕ^+ , i.e. $e\bar{e}$ in case of (11), given by (cf. eq. (6.24) of [9] for the non-relativistic case):

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^+ &= \sum_{R_i} |j, s_{R_i}; b_i^-\rangle c_{R_i} + \phi^{bg} \\
&= |j = 1^-, s_R; b_R^-\rangle c_R + |j = 1^-, s_{R_2}; b_{R_2}^-\rangle c_{R_2} + \phi^{bg}, \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

which is reminiscent of (20a). Here b denotes a set of degeneracy labels⁷

The terms in the basis vector decomposition (22) correspond to the terms in the multi-resonance partial amplitude (12). To each vector in the sum over

⁷For b one could choose the momentum \mathbf{p}_m and j_3 but we suggest the spatial components of the 4-velocity $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_m = \mathbf{p}_m/s$. However this is not important for our discussions here; for a detailed discussion see [18].

the resonances R_i in (22) corresponds a BW in the j th partial amplitude (12). The vector ϕ^{bg} is the component of the (arbitrary) in-state vector ϕ^+ in the infinite dimensional subspace representing the non-resonant continuum and it corresponds to the $B(s)$ term in (12). In the next section we will show how to obtain the decomposition of the in-state into a sum over resonances and a non-resonant part by the analytic continuation of the partial S -matrix. The vector $|j, s_{R_i}; b^-\rangle$ in the sum over R_i in (22) comes from the pole at s_{R_i} in the second sheet of the S -matrix and the vector ϕ^{bg} is represented by a background integral (see (29) below). It is because we can obtain both the BW amplitude (8) and the resonance vector $|j, s_R; b^-\rangle$ from the S -matrix pole that we can exactly and precisely establish the relation $\tau = \hbar/\Gamma_R$.

Before continuing with the details of the derivation in the following section, a few comments are in order about the vectors $|j, s_R; b^-\rangle$, which (except for a normalization factor) are the relativistic Gamow vectors ψ^G .

For stable relativistic elementary particles the vector space description is given by the irreducible unitary representation spaces of the Poincare group \mathcal{P} [28], from which we can then define the fields. This is not restricted to the asymptotic, interaction free states [29]. The ‘out’ and ‘in’ “states” of [29], which we denote by $|j, s; b^-\rangle$ and $|j, s; b^+\rangle$ and which fulfill the Lippmann-Schwinger equation, are basis vectors of an irreducible unitary representation (j, s) of \mathcal{P} . They are eigenkets of the (self-adjoint) invariant mass squared operator $P_\mu P^\mu \equiv M^2$ with real eigenvalue s :

$$P_\mu P^\mu |j, s; b^-\rangle = s |j, s; b^-\rangle \quad (23)$$

$$P_0 |j, s; b = b_{rest}^-\rangle = \sqrt{s} |j, s; b = b_{rest}^-\rangle. \quad (24)$$

We want to consider the Z -boson (or any quasistable relativistic particle) as a fundamental particle in the Wigner sense and therefore give its description in terms of a representation space of Poincaré group transformations. The Gamow vectors $|j, s_R; b^-\rangle$ of (22) should therefore also be basis vectors of an irreducible representation (j, s_R) of Poincaré transformations. The Gamow kets $|j, s_R; b^-\rangle$ are thus just generalizations of the well-established ‘out-states’ $|j, s; b^-\rangle$ and are obtained from them by analytic continuation in s from its “physical value” $\{s | (m_e + m_e)^2 \leq s < \infty\}$ to the S -matrix pole position s_R in the second sheet (or if there are several poles, a Gamow ket $|j, s_{R_i}; b^-\rangle$ is obtained for each pole s_{R_i}). In place of (23) and (24) for the Dirac Lippmann-Schwinger kets $|j, s; b^\pm\rangle$, the Gamow kets should be generalized eigenvectors of the self-adjoint mass-squared operator $P_\mu P^\mu \equiv M^2$ with

complex eigenvalue $s_R = (M_R + i\Gamma_R/2)^2$:

$$P_\mu P^\mu |j, s_R; b^-\rangle = s_R |j, s_R; b^-\rangle \quad (25)$$

$$P_0 |j, s_R; b = b_{rest}^-\rangle = (M_R - i\frac{\Gamma_R}{2}) |j, s_R; b = b_{rest}^-\rangle. \quad (26)$$

These eigenvalue equations are exact and mathematically rigorous if the $|j, s_R; b^-\rangle$ are defined as continuous functionals over the space of observables Φ_+ (cf. Appendix (35)). More details will be given in the following section, but for further details see [18].

The eigenvalue equation (26) agrees with the complex Hamiltonian eigenvalue equation (18) and the decomposition (20a) is the truncation of (22) to the resonance subspace if the background ϕ^{bg} (or equivalently $B(s)$ in (12)) is neglected. Thus the Lee-Oehme-Yang theory [27] of the neutral kaon system summarized by (18-20) and other finite dimensional effective theories with complex Hamiltonians [30] will be established as approximations of the RHS theory after (22, 25, 26) have been justified in the next section.

4 Relating the BW Lineshape to the Exponential Decay Law: Relativistic Gamow Vectors

The mathematical object that makes the connection between the Γ that appears in the lineshape (8) and the Γ that appears in the exponential decay law (17) is the relativistic Gamow vector ψ^G . The vector ψ^G fulfills (25) and (26) precisely and is obtained from the pole term of the S -matrix. The Gamow vector ψ^G will on the one hand lead to the lineshape (8) and on the other hand to a precise form of the exponential law (19). Since both come from the same vector characterized by Γ_R , the lineshape- Γ and the inverse lifetime- Γ are the same and given by Γ_R . Because the Gamow vector distinguishes Γ_R as the characterizing parameter, it implies a preferred separation of the complex value s_R into two real parameters (M_R, Γ_R) : $s_R = (M_R - i\Gamma_R/2)^2$.

We start with the S -matrix element

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi^{out}, S\phi^{in}) &= (\psi^-, \phi^+) \\ &= \sum_j \int_{(m_e+m_{\bar{e}})^2}^{\infty} ds \sum_b \langle \psi^- | j, s; b^- \rangle S_j(s) \langle +j, s; b | \phi^+ \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $\phi^+ \in \Phi_-$ represents the prepared in-state (e.g. e^+e^-) and $\psi^- \in \Phi_+$ represents the detected out-state (e.g. decay products $f\bar{f}$). Then to obtain the Gamow vectors one proceeds in exactly the same way as in the non-relativistic case [8]. One deforms the contour of integration from the upper rim of the cut along the positive real axis $(m_e + m_{\bar{e}})^2 \leq s < \infty$ through the cut into the second (or higher) sheet past the pole at s_R (or past the poles at s_R, s_{R_2}, \dots if there is more than one resonance pole). For the contour around each resonance pole s_R , the integral in (27) splits off a pole term which gives the Gamow vector $|j, s = s_R; b^-\rangle$ as an analytic continuation of the Dirac-Lippmann-Schwinger kets $|j, s; b^-\rangle$. The Gamow kets are defined (using the Cauchy formula) by the contour integral around the resonance pole s_R

$$\langle \psi^- | j, s_R; b^- \rangle \equiv -\frac{i}{2\pi} \oint ds \langle \psi^- | j, s; b^- \rangle \frac{1}{s - s_R} \quad (28a)$$

$$= \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty_{II}}^{+\infty} ds \langle \psi^- | j, s; b^- \rangle \frac{1}{s - s_R}. \quad (28b)$$

The integral in (27) thus becomes a sum of pole terms (one for each s_{R_i}) plus a background integral

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} ds \langle \psi^- | j, s; b^- \rangle S_j(s) \langle +j, s; b | \phi^+ \rangle \equiv \langle \psi^- | \phi^{bg} \rangle \quad (29)$$

over a contour \mathcal{C} , which we are largely free to choose far away from the resonance poles (e.g. along the negative real axis on the second sheet). In this way one arrives at the representation (12) for the j -th partial amplitude (or similarly for the j -th partial S-matrix $\langle b' | S_j(s) | b \rangle = S_j(s)$). By omitting the arbitrary $\psi^- \in \Phi_+$ in (27) one arrives at the complex basis vector decomposition (22) for the in-state vector ϕ^+ where ϕ^{bg} is given by (29) with the arbitrary $\psi^- \in \Phi_+$ omitted. Summarizing, we have obtained by contour deformation the BW amplitude (12) and the basis vector decomposition (22) from the S-matrix element and established the correspondence between the terms of these equations. From (28b) we see that the variable s in (8), (12), etc. extends from $-\infty_{II}$ to $+\infty$; however for “unphysical” values of $s \leq (m_e + m_{\bar{e}})^2 = 4m_e^2$ these values are in the second sheet.

In order to perform the contour deformation that separates (27) into a sum over resonant terms like (28) plus the background term (29) and in order to derive the Breit-Wigner energy distribution of (28b) from the pole in (28a) some mathematical properties must be fulfilled in addition to

the conventional assumptions. This is the new hypothesis of the Appendix and here means specifically that the energy wave functions $\langle^-j, s; b|\psi^- \rangle$ and $\langle^+j, s; b|\phi^+ \rangle$ must be well-behaved Hardy class functions⁸ of the upper and lower half-plane, respectively, in the second sheet of the energy surface of the S-matrix, e.g. $\langle^-s|\psi^- \rangle \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{H}_+^2$.

The relativistic Gamow vectors $|j, s_R, b^- \rangle$ defined by (28) satisfy the eigenvalue equations

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi^- | (M^2)^\times | j, s_R; b^- \rangle &= \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds s \langle \psi^- | j, s; b^- \rangle \frac{1}{s - s_R} \\ &= s_R \langle \psi^- | j, s; b^- \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

for every $\psi^- \in \Phi_+ \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \Phi_+^\times$. To prove (30) one needs to use the properties of Hardy class spaces discussed in footnote 8. Similarly, one can show that the Gamow vectors in the rest frame $|j, s_R; b^- \rangle \rightarrow |j, s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle$ are generalized eigenvectors of the energy operator $H = P_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi^- | H^\times | j, s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle &= \frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds \sqrt{s} \langle \psi^- | j, s; b_{rest}^- \rangle \frac{1}{s - s_R} \\ &= (M_R - i\frac{\Gamma_R}{2}) \langle \psi^- | j, s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\sqrt{s_R} = (M_R - i\frac{\Gamma_R}{2})$. The eigenvalue equations (30) and (31) are precise formulations of (25) and (26). The operators H^\times and $(M^2)^\times$ denote the conjugate operators in Φ_+^\times of the operators H and $M^2 \equiv P_\mu P^\mu$ in the space Φ_+ and are defined by $\langle H\psi^- | F^- \rangle \equiv \langle \psi^- | H^\times | F^- \rangle$ and $\langle M^2\psi^- | F^- \rangle \equiv \langle \psi^- | M^{2^\times} | F^- \rangle$ for all $\psi^- \in \Phi_+$ and $F^- \in \Phi_+^\times$ (see [8] for more on their definition and use).

⁸The proof of the second equality in (28) and of relations (30) and (31) is a consequence of the following Titchmarsh theorem for Hardy class functions $G_-(s) \in \mathcal{H}_-^2$:

For $G_-(s) \in \mathcal{H}_-$ (Hardy class in the lower plane) and $\text{Im } z > 0$ one has

$$G_-(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{G_-(s)}{s - z} ds$$

The functions $\langle^+s|\phi^+ \rangle, \langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_-$ are *well-behaved* Hardy-class functions in the lower half plane and $\langle \phi^+ | s^+ \rangle, \langle^-s|\psi^- \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_+$ are well-behaved Hardy-class functions in the upper half plane. This means that $\sqrt{s} \langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle, s \langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle, \dots, s^{\frac{n}{2}} \langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle, \dots$ (for $n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$) are also well-behaved elements of \mathcal{H}_- . Choosing $G_-(s) = s^{\frac{n}{2}} \langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle$ one obtains (28), (30), (31) and more.

The Gamow kets $|j, s_R; b^-\rangle$ are also generalized eigenvectors with generalized eigenvalues $b = b_1, b_2, \dots$ in the sense of Dirac kets. Continuous linear combinations of the Gamow kets with an arbitrary weight function $\phi_{j_3}(b) \in \mathcal{S}$ (Schwartz space)

$$\psi_{j s_R}^G = \sum_{j_3} \int d\mu(b) |j, s_R; b^-\rangle \phi_{j_3}(b), \quad (32)$$

also represent relativistic Gamow states with complex mass $\sqrt{s_R} = (M_R - i\Gamma_R/2)$ and a Breit-Wigner energy distribution $\langle -j, s; b | \psi_{j s_R} \rangle \propto (s - s_R)^{-1}$.

For the time evolution we consider here only the Gamow states at rest, where t is the proper time. We calculate for all $\psi^- \in \Phi_+$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e^{iHt} \psi^- | s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle &= \langle \psi^- | e^{-iH^\times t} | s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle \\ &= \frac{i}{2\pi} \int ds \frac{\langle \psi^- | e^{-iH^\times t} | s; b_{rest}^- \rangle}{s - s_R} \\ &= \frac{i}{2\pi} \int ds \frac{e^{-i\sqrt{s}t} \langle \psi^- | s; b_{rest}^- \rangle}{s - s_R} \\ &= e^{-i\sqrt{s_R}t} \langle \psi^- | s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The last equality holds iff $\langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_-$ and $e^{-i\sqrt{s}t} \langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_-$ because only then can one also use the Titchmarsh formula of footnote 8 for $G_-(s) = e^{-i\sqrt{s}t} \langle \psi^- | s^- \rangle$ ($\pi < \arg \sqrt{s} \leq 2\pi$) and obtain $G_-(s_R)$. This is fulfilled only for $t \geq 0$ and not for $t < 0$. Thus, due to the new hypothesis of the Appendix, we have exponential time evolution, but only for $t \geq 0$. The dual operator $(e^{iHt})^\times \equiv e^{-iH^\times t}$ of e^{iHt} is not defined for $t < 0$ because e^{iHt} is not a continuous operator in Φ_+ . Omitting the arbitrary $\psi^- \in \Phi_+$ in (33), we obtain the time evolution of the relativistic Gamow states at rest:

$$e^{-iH^\times t} |j, s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle = e^{-iM_R t} e^{-\Gamma_R t/2} |j, s_R; b_{rest}^- \rangle, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (34)$$

This is a functional equation over the space $\Phi_+ = \{\psi^-\}$, describing the detected decay products. This means it only makes mathematical sense when used to calculate the probabilities $|\langle \psi^- | e^{-iH^\times t} | j, s_R \rangle|^2$ of the decay products ψ^- ; the ‘‘scalar products’’ of (34) with ϕ^+ or $\psi_{j s_R}^G$ are not defined. This is as far as we can establish the heuristic equation (19) by the mathematically rigorous result (34). That it holds for $t \geq 0$ only does not constitute a limitation for the physics. Just to the contrary, $t \geq 0$ describes the physical

situation correctly because the decay products η , described by ψ^- , can only be detected *after* the decaying state R , described by the Gamow vector $|j, s_R^-\rangle$, has been created at $t = 0$ [10].

The time evolution (34) holds for every Gamow vector in the basis vector expansion (22). Therewith the time evolution of the heuristic state vector (20b) as a superposition of two exponentials can also be justified for $t \geq 0$ if ϕ^{bg} in (22) can be neglected. While the time evolution of the resonance terms in (22) depends only upon the parameters (M_{R_i}, Γ_{R_i}) and is exponential, the time evolution of the non-resonant background ϕ^{bg} is non-exponential and depends upon the particular choice of the prepared in-state ϕ^+ as seen from (29). The time evolution of $|\langle\psi^-|\phi^+(t)\rangle|^2$ can be very close to exponential if ϕ^+ is prepared such that $\phi^{bg} \approx 0$ [31] (and there is only one resonance in (22)).

5 Summary and Conclusion

The relativistic Gamow vector has the exact exponential time evolution (34) and the exact S-matrix pole Breit-Wigner energy distribution (8). Since these are the signatures of a quasistable particle and a relativistic resonance, we want to assign the relativistic Gamow vectors as the “state vectors” of quasistable relativistic particles. On the basis of (34) we want M_R and Γ_R to define “mass” and “width” of a quasistable relativistic particle, and from (34) it follows that the lifetime is exactly $\tau = \hbar/\Gamma_R$ and not \hbar/Γ_Z or \hbar/Γ_ρ .

Since the resonance always occurs with at least some background, described by $B(s)$ of the amplitude (12) and by the much lesser known (because it is standardly ignored, e.g. in (20)) ϕ^{bg} of the prepared state ϕ^+ , one may doubt the utility of the definition of a Gamow state vector. However, stable elementary particles also never occur in total isolation and the accuracy with which the exponential law has been observed in some cases [3] shows that the isolation of a microphysical Gamow state ψ^G from the background ϕ^{bg} can be very good. The popularity of the effective theories with finite dimensional complex Hamiltonian matrices not only in particle physics [27] but also in other areas [30] testifies to the usefulness of separating exponentially evolving state vectors. The relativistic Gamow vector is not more nor less of an idealization of reality than Wigner’s unitary representations for stable particles. A vector description (or in general a density operator description) is needed because the fundamental probabilities (17) and (21) of quantum mechanics

are calculated in terms of operators or vectors. To define a quantum physical entity entirely by the S -matrix pole alone would be incomplete.

If the description of resonances by relativistic Gamow vectors is valid, then the lineshape (8) with mass (and by (34)) resonance energy in the rest frame) given by $M_R = 91.1626 \pm .0031\text{GeV}$ and the width (by (34) the inverse lifetime) given by $\Gamma_R = 2.4934 \pm .0024\text{GeV}$ is its first prediction. This differs from the conventional mass definition by the lineshape (7) of the on-mass shell renormalization scheme $M_Z = 91.1871 \pm .0021\text{GeV}$ and it also differs from the definition by the peak position of the relativistic BW (8), $M_\rho = 91.1541 \pm .0031\text{GeV}$ [32].

This prediction was obtained, like the relativistic Gamow vector, from the definition of the resonance as a pole of the S -matrix at s_R , which by itself is insufficient to fix $M_R = \text{Re}\sqrt{s_R}$ and $\Gamma_R = -2\text{Im}\sqrt{s_R}$. Fixing the mass and width could only be done using the new hypothesis of time asymmetric quantum physics, (35) and (36) of the Appendix.

The other results of this theory like the exponential law with the precise $\tau = \frac{\hbar}{\Gamma_R}$, the basis vector expansion (22) or its truncation to the complex “effective” theories like (18-20b), the representation (12) of interfering Breit-Wigners associated to (22) all have been introduced before as separate assumptions and it may be welcome that here they all follow from the same new hypothesis about the boundary conditions.

The only result which may be difficult to accept is the semigroup property of the time evolution (34). In the relativistic theory this means that Gamow vectors can only undergo Poincaré transformations into the forward light cone [18]. These Poincaré transformations form only a semigroup $\mathcal{P}_+ = \{(a, \Lambda)\}$, where Λ is a proper orthochronous Lorentz transformation and $a = (a_0, \mathbf{a})$ is a four vector which fulfills $\hat{p} \cdot a = \sqrt{1 + \hat{\mathbf{p}}^2}a_0 - \hat{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \mathbf{a} \geq 0$ for any $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \in \mathbb{R}^{39}$.

This semigroup property was a surprising and unintended result when it was first derived for the non-relativistic theory. It expresses a time asymmetry on the microphysical level which is connected with neither the violation of time reversal invariance of the Hamiltonian nor entropy increase (at least not in an obvious way, although for a contrary opinion see [33]). In the meanwhile, the irreversible character of quantum mechanical decay has been mentioned in a few textbooks [34] and more general considerations support

⁹One checks by direct calculations that $(a_1, \Lambda_1) \circ (a_2, \Lambda_2) = (a_1 + \Lambda_1 a_2, \Lambda_1 \Lambda_2) \in \mathcal{P}_+$ for $(a_i, \Lambda_i) \in \mathcal{P}_+$ but that not every $(a, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{P}_+$ has an inverse in \mathcal{P}_+ , i.e. \mathcal{P}_+ is a semigroup.

the existence of a fundamental time asymmetry in the quantum theory of cosmology [33] and of microsystems [35]. The semigroup time evolution of the Gamow states is just an example of this general time asymmetry.

Acknowledgments

Augusto Garcia first drew our attention to the problem of mass definition for resonances as discussed in [16] and [25]. We are grateful to the following persons for their contributions: A. Mondragon for valuable discussions on the subject, T. Riemann for correspondence and discussions which provided further phenomenological background on the Z -boson, and D. Dicus and G. Lopez Castro for discussions and advice on the perturbation theory definitions of Z -boson mass and width and the problems with gauge invariance and for reading and improving on the manuscript. We gratefully acknowledge the valuable support of the Welch Foundation.

Appendix: Time Asymmetric Quantum Theory of Scattering

In this section we state the new hypothesis by which time asymmetric quantum theory (TAQT) differs from the assumptions of standard scattering theory. The dynamical (differential) equations, the algebras of observables and the physical interpretation (probability) remain the same as in time symmetric quantum theory in the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . The only difference is that TAQT uses time asymmetric boundary conditions, and even these are already implicit in the heuristic Lippmann-Schwinger (integral) equations used for the calculation of the transition matrix (T -matrix). Of the two alternate ways of calculating the T -matrix [36], we admit as physically valid only the one which agrees with our intuitive notion of causality. In order to give this a mathematical formulation, we need two Rigged Hilbert Spaces (RHS) with the same Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

The relativistic Gamow vector is a precisely defined mathematical object in the RHS formulation of quantum theory. This new quantum theory is not a drastic departure from the usual Hilbert space (HS) formulation but an extension so that the theory includes Dirac kets $|E\rangle$ and the solutions of the Lippmann-Schwinger equation $|E^-\rangle$ and $|E^+\rangle$ which fulfill outgoing and

incoming boundary conditions, respectively. The RHS and the HS theory have the same (time symmetric) dynamical equations but different boundary conditions. The standard HS boundary conditions are time symmetric: the space of in-states $\{\phi^+\}$ and the space of out-states $\{\psi^-\}$ of scattering theory are identified with the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \{\phi^+\} = \{\psi^-\}$ or at least with the same subspace thereof $\{\phi^+\} = \{\psi^-\} \subset \mathcal{H}$.

The RHS theory *distinguishes* meticulously between prepared *states* (in-states) $\{\phi^+\}$ and *observables* (out-states) $\{\psi^-\}$ for which it uses two RHS's of Hardy class

$$\phi^+ \in \Phi_- \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \Phi_-^\times \quad (35a)$$

$$\psi^- \in \Phi_+ \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \Phi_+^\times. \quad (35b)$$

The space Φ_- (Φ_+) is of Hardy class type in the lower (upper) half plane; this means mathematically that the energy wave functions $\langle^+ E|\phi^+\rangle$ ($\langle^- E|\psi^-\rangle$) are well-behaved Hardy class functions in the lower (upper) half plane, $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{H}_-^2|_{\mathbb{R}_+}$ ($\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{H}_+^2|_{\mathbb{R}_+}$):

$$\phi^+ \in \Phi_- \Leftrightarrow \langle^+ E|\phi^+\rangle \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{H}_-^2|_{\mathbb{R}_+} \quad (36a)$$

$$\psi^- \in \Phi_+ \Leftrightarrow \langle^- E|\psi^-\rangle \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{H}_+^2|_{\mathbb{R}_+}. \quad (36b)$$

The notation $|_{\mathbb{R}_+}$ means the restriction to the positive real line, i.e. the physical values of energy, and \mathcal{S} denotes the Schwartz space. The vectors ϕ^+ represent states that are prepared by the accelerator and the vectors ψ^- represent observables or out-states that are defined by the detector. The dual spaces in the RHS's contain, in addition to the Dirac-Lippmann-Schwinger kets $|E^\pm\rangle \in \Phi_\mp^\times$, also Gamow kets $|E_R \pm i\frac{\Gamma^\pm}{2}\rangle \in \Phi_\mp^\times$.

This mathematical assumption of distinct RHS's of Hardy class for states and observables is the new hypothesis from which the results that differ from the conventional theory follow. At least in the non-relativistic theory [9, 10] one can connect this mathematical assumption to the causality condition that a state must be prepared at a time t_0 before an observable can be measured at time $t > t_0$, and from this condition the Gamow vectors can be naturally derived from the S -matrix.

References

- [1] C. Caso et al, The European Physical Journal **C3** (1998) 1.

- [2] T. Riemann, in *Irreversibility and Causality*, A. Bohm, H. D. Doebner, P. Kielanowski [Eds.] (Springer, Berlin, 1998) p. 157, and references thereof.
- [3] For the neutral Kaon system: K. Kleinknecht, in *CP Violation*, C. Jarlskog [Ed.], World Scientific (1989) p. 41 and references therein; E731, K. L. Gibbons, et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 6625. Or concerning the exponential law in general: V. L. Fitch et al., *Phys. Rev. B* **140** (1965) 1088; N. N. Nikolaev, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **11** (1968) 522 and references therein; E. B. Norman, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **60** (1988) 2246.
- [4] M. L. Goldberger, K. M. Watson, *Collision Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1964), chap. 8.
- [5] G. Höhler, *Z. f. Physik* **152** (1958) 546 gives references and an excellent review of earlier work on the subject.
- [6] V. Weisskopf and E. P. Wigner, *Z. f. Physik* **63** (1930) 54; **65**, (1930) 18.
- [7] M. Levy, *Nuovo Cimento* **13** (1959) 115.
- [8] A. Bohm, S. Maxson, M. Loewe, M. Gadella, *Physica A* **236**, (1997) 485 and references therein.
- [9] A. Bohm, N. L. Harshman, in *Irreversibility and Causality*, A. Bohm, H. D. Doebner, P. Kielanowski [Eds.] (Springer, Berlin, 1998) p. 181 and references therein.
- [10] A. Bohm, *Phys. Rev A* **60** (1999) 861.
- [11] The L3 Collab., O. Adriani et al., *Phys. Lett. B* **315** (1993) 494; *Phys. Rep.* **236** (1993) 1; S. Kirsch and S. Riemann, *A Combined Fit to the L3 Data Using the S-Matrix Approach (First Results)*, L3 note #1233 (Sep. 1992), unpublished; Martin W. Grünwald, *Phys. Rep.* **322** (1999) 125.
- [12] F. A. Berends in *Z⁰-Physics*, p. 307, Maurice Levi, et al. [Eds.] Plenum Press N. Y. (1991).
- [13] F. A. Berends, G. Burgers, W. Hollik and W. van Neerven, *Phys. Letters B* **203** (1988) 177.

- [14] S. D. Bardin, A. Leike, T. Riemann, M. Sachwitz, Phys. Letters B **206** (1988) 539.
- [15] A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 2127; Phys. Lett. B **267** (1991) 240.
- [16] R. G. Stuart, Phys. Lett. B **262** (1991) 113.
- [17] S. Willenbrock, G. Valencia, Phys. Lett. B **259** (1991) 373.
- [18] A. Bohm, H. Kaldass, S. Wickramasekara, P. Kielanowski, "Semigroup Representations of the Poincaré Group and Relativistic Gamow Vectors," LANL Archives, hep-th/9911059, to appear in Phys. Lett. (2000).
- [19] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory (Perseus, Reading Mass., 1995), p. 236.
- [20] R. J. Eden, P. V. Landshoff, P. J. Olive and J. C. Polkinghorne, The Analytic S-Matrix (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [21] A. Leike, T. Riemann and J. Rose, Phys. Lett. B **273** (1991) 513.
- [22] A. Bohm, Quantum Mechanics-Foundations and Applications, 3rd edition (Springer, New York, 1994) sect. XX.2, eq. (2.9).
- [23] G. Höhler, in [1], p. 624; R. E. Cutkosky and G. Höhler, Reviews of Particle Physics (1994) p. VIII.12; Phys. Rev. D **45** No. 11, p. VIII.10, Review of Particle Properties (1992).
- [24] A. Bernicha, G. López Castro, J. Pestieau, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 4454.
- [25] A. Bernicha, G. López Castro, J. Pestieau, Nucl. Phys. A **597** (1996) 623.
- [26] R. G. Stuart, Phys. Rev. D **56**(1997) 1515.
- [27] T. D. Lee, R. Oehme and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **106** (1957) 340.
- [28] E. P. Wigner, Ann. Math. (2) **40** (1939) 149.
- [29] S. Weinberg, The Quantum Theory of Fields (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995) vol. 1, chap. 3.

- [30] L. S. Ferreira, in *Lect. Notes in Phys.*, vol. 325, E. Brändas [Ed.], (Springer, Berlin 1989) p. 201; C. Mahaux, in *ibid* p. 139; O. I. Totstkhin, V. N. Ostrovsky and H. Nakamura, *Phys. Rev.* **58** (1998) 2077; V. I. Kukulín, V. N. Krasnopolsky and J. Horáček, *Theory of Resonances* (Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1989).
- [31] It is not universally accepted that the Z -boson or any resonance should have a purely exponential time evolution, e.g. A. Martin in Z^0 -Physics, Maurice Levy, et al. [Eds.] (Plenum Press, London, 1991) p. 483, and references therein. But this belief is probably only based on the widely known result that exponential time evolution is prohibited by the mathematics (topology) of the Hilbert space. The Gamow state vectors $\psi_{j s_R}^G \in \Phi_+^\times$ are not elements of \mathcal{H} , but the (apparatus-prepared) in-states ϕ^+ are.
- [32] The value of M_Z quoted here is the ‘Average Value’ in Table 2 of Morris L. Swartz, LANL Archives, hep-th/9912026. The values of M_ρ (usually called \bar{M}_Z) and Γ_ρ (usually called $\bar{\Gamma}_Z$) are the ‘ S -Matrix fit Average Value’ from Table 12 of LEP Collaborations, LEP Electroweak Working Group and the SLD Heavy Flavour and Electroweak Groups, CERN-preprint 99-15, however the values quoted there are $\bar{M}_Z + 34.1\text{MeV}$ and $\bar{\Gamma}_Z + 0.9\text{MeV}$. We calculate M_R and Γ_R from the values of M_ρ and Γ_ρ using the algebraic relation (1) of footnote 1 since (M_R, Γ_R) and (M_ρ, Γ_ρ) are just alternate parameterizations of the same BW amplitude with s -independent and width.
- [33] M. Gell-Mann and J. B. Hartle, in *Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry*, J. J. Halliwell, et al. [Eds.] (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1994); M. Gell-Mann and J. B. Hartle, University of California at Santa Barbara, Report No. UCSBTH-95-28 (1995), LANL Archives, gr-qc/9509054.
- [34] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, et al., *Quantum Mechanics, Vol. II* (Wiley, New York, 1977) p. 1345, 1353-54; T. D. Lee, *Particle Physics and Introduction to Field Theory* (Harwood Academic, New York 1981) chap. 13.
- [35] R. Haag, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **132**, (1990) 245; Lectures at the Max-Born-Symposium on “Quantum Future” (Przieska, 1997).

- [36] R. G. Newton, *Scattering Theory of Waves and Particles*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982) sect. 7.2.2.