EFT analysis of neutrino, nuclear & collider physics

UNIGE seminar

Nov 29th, 2023

Martín González-Alonso

IFIC, Univ. of Valencia / CSIC



EFT analysis of neutrino, nuclear & collider physics

UNIGE seminar

Nov 29th, 2023

Martín González-Alonso

IFIC, Univ. of Valencia / CSIC



Outline

Introduction

- Standard Model EFT (SMEFT)
- Neutrino physics in the SMEFT
- COHERENT vs Electroweak Precision Observables
- Neutrino oscillations in the SMEFT (\rightarrow DayaBay)

Introduction: SM



QUARKS LEPTONS BOSONS HIGGS BOSON











M. González-Alonso

Introduction: SM



Introduction: $SM \rightarrow BSM$



M. González-Alonso

Introduction: $SM \rightarrow BSM \rightarrow EFT$



<u>Near observer</u>, L~R, needs to know the position of every charge to describe electric field in her proximity

<u>Far observer</u>, $r \gg R$, can instead use multipole expansion: $V(\vec{r}) = \frac{Q}{r} + \frac{\vec{d} \cdot \vec{r}}{r^3} + \frac{Q_{ij}r_ir_j}{r^5} + \dots$ $\sim 1/r = \frac{R/r^2}{r^3} + \frac{Q_{ij}r_ir_j}{r^5} + \dots$

Higher order terms in the multipole expansion are suppressed by powers of the small parameter (R/r). One can truncate the expansion at some order depending on the value of (R/r) and experimental precision

Far observer is able to describe electric field in his vicinity using just a few parameters: the total electric charge Q, the dipole moment \vec{d} , eventually the quadrupole moment Q_{ii} , etc....

On the other hand, far observer can only guess the "fundamental" distributions of the charges, as many distinct distributions lead to the same first few moments

[Slide borrowed from A. Falkowski's CP2023 lectures]



~ 100 GeV \mathcal{L}_{SM} (EW theory)

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{g_L^2}{2} \bar{u}(k_2) \gamma_{\rho} P_L u(p_1) \frac{1}{q^2 - m_W^2} \bar{u}(k_4) \gamma_{\rho} P_L v(k_3)$$
$$q = p_1 - k_2$$













 $l^{i} = \begin{pmatrix} v_{L}^{i} \\ e_{L}^{i} \end{pmatrix}$ $\varphi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v + h(x) \end{pmatrix}$ $D_{\mu} = I\partial_{\mu} - ig_{s} \frac{\lambda^{A}}{2} G_{\mu}^{A} - ig \frac{\sigma^{a}}{2} W_{\mu}^{a} - ig' Y B_{\mu}$

- Model independence
- Efficiency:

Observable = f(NP couplings) not trivial!

Analysis (bkg, PDFs, FF, simulations, ...) done once and for all!



Provides general parametrizations for observables

- Many bins \rightarrow a few parameters
- Useful especially if one avoids additional assumptions
- Assess the interplay between processes in a general setup

- Measurements that are disconnected in the SM can be connected in the presence of NP. Example:
 - Neutrino oscillation \rightarrow PMNS factors and neutrino masses;



• Nuclear beta decay \rightarrow V_{ud}, g_A, ...



• CC Drell-Yan (p $p \rightarrow e \nu$) \rightarrow weak angle



- Measurements that are disconnected in the SM can be connected in the presence of NP. Example:
 - Neutrino oscillation \rightarrow PMNS factors and neutrino masses;



• Nuclear beta decay \rightarrow V_{ud}, g_A, ...





• CC Drell-Yan (p p \rightarrow e v) \rightarrow weak angle





Connecting measurements

- Calculate the observable you are interested in e.g. $O = O_{SM} + 3C_1 - C_6$
- What are the known limits on the Wilson coefficients? e.g. from LEP... $C_1 = 0.00(1)$, $C_6 = 0.01(3)$, + correlation $\rightarrow 3C_1 - C_6 = -0.01(4)$



- Implications:
 - ~4% sensitivity (th+exp) to be competitive (or to check a LEP anomaly);
 - If your sensitivity is better than that, you are exploring new SMEFT territory and your measurement should be added to the big fit.
 - A deviation larger than that indicates some wrong assumptions in your EFT!
- Often we have a dataset (instead of a single data point O) and one can probe several combinations of coefficients (*e.g.* C_1 , C_6). The same logic applies.

Summary



• Heavily used in precision measurements in flavor, LHC, low-energy, ...



Summary

 \mathbf{L} source

• Heavily used in precision measurements in flavor, LHC, low-energy, ...



M. González-Alonso

EFT for neutrino data

Summary

source

• Heavily used in precision measurements in flavor, LHC, low-energy, ...



M. González-Alonso

EFT for neutrino data

Outline



- Standard Model EFT (SMEFT)
- Neutrino physics in the SMEFT
- COHERENT vs Electroweak Precision Observables
- Neutrino oscillations in the SMEFT (\rightarrow DayaBay)



[Same in detection]

[Same in detection]



		Normal Ordering (best fit)		Inverted Ordering $(\Delta \chi^2 = 7.1)$	
		bfp $\pm 1\sigma$	3σ range	bfp $\pm 1\sigma$	3σ range
with SK atmospheric data	$\sin^2 heta_{12}$	$0.304\substack{+0.012\\-0.012}$	$0.269 \rightarrow 0.343$	$0.304\substack{+0.013\\-0.012}$	$0.269 \rightarrow 0.343$
	$ heta_{12}/^\circ$	$33.44_{-0.74}^{+0.77}$	$31.27 \rightarrow 35.86$	$33.45_{-0.75}^{+0.78}$	$31.27 \rightarrow 35.87$
	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	$0.573\substack{+0.016\\-0.020}$	$0.415 \rightarrow 0.616$	$0.575\substack{+0.016\\-0.019}$	$0.419 \rightarrow 0.617$
	$ heta_{23}/^{\circ}$	$49.2^{+0.9}_{-1.2}$	$40.1 \rightarrow 51.7$	$49.3_{-1.1}^{+0.9}$	$40.3 \rightarrow 51.8$
	$\sin^2 heta_{13}$	$0.02219\substack{+0.00062\\-0.00063}$	$002032 \to 0.02410$	$0.02238\substack{+0.00063\\-0.00062}$	$0.02052 \rightarrow 0.02428$
	$\theta_{13}/^{\circ}$	$8.57^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	$8.20 \rightarrow 8.93$	$8.60^{+0.12}_{-0.12}$	$8.24 \rightarrow 8.96$
	$\delta_{ m CP}/^{\circ}$	197^{+27}_{-24}	$120 \rightarrow 369$	282^{+26}_{-30}	$193 \rightarrow 352$
	$\frac{\Delta m^2_{21}}{10^{-5}~{\rm eV}^2}$	$7.42_{-0.20}^{+0.21}$	$6.82 \rightarrow 8.04$	$7.42^{+0.21}_{-0.20}$	$6.82 \rightarrow 8.04$
	$\frac{\Delta m_{3\ell}^2}{10^{-3}~{\rm eV}^2}$	$+2.517^{+0.026}_{-0.028}$	$+2.435 \rightarrow +2.598$	$-2.498\substack{+0.028\\-0.028}$	$-2.581 \rightarrow -2.414$

[I.Esteban et al., 2007.14792 JHEP]







• QM approach not useful ("source/detector NSI") \rightarrow QFT approach needed

 $|\nu_{\alpha}^{s}\rangle = \frac{(1+\epsilon^{s})_{\alpha\gamma}}{N_{\alpha}^{s}}|\nu_{\gamma}\rangle \qquad \varepsilon^{s} = f(?)$



• QM approach not useful ("source/detector NSI") \rightarrow QFT approach needed

 $|\nu_{\alpha}^{s}\rangle = \frac{(1+\epsilon^{s})_{\alpha\gamma}}{N_{\alpha}^{s}}|\nu_{\gamma}\rangle \qquad \varepsilon^{s} = f(?)$

Giunti et al. [hep-ph/9305276] Akhmedov Kopp [arXiv:1001.4815]



$$R_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}}{dtdE_{\nu}} = \dots = \frac{\kappa}{E_{\nu}} \sum_{k,l} e^{-i\frac{L\Delta m_{kl}^2}{2E_{\nu}}} \int d\Pi_{P'} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha k}^P \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha l}^P \int d\Pi_D \mathcal{M}_{\beta k}^D \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{\beta l}^D$$



$$R_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}}{dtdE_{\nu}} = \dots = \sum_{k,l}^{\kappa} \sum_{k,l} e^{-i\frac{L\Delta m_{kl}^{2}}{2E_{\nu}}} \int d\Pi_{P'} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha k}^{P} \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha l}^{P} \int d\Pi_{D} \mathcal{M}_{\beta k}^{D} \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{\beta l}^{D}$$
Geometric
factor
 $\kappa = N_{S}N_{T}/(32\pi L^{2}m_{S}m_{T})$









• The rest is "straightforward": specify the Lagrangian and calculate the production & detection amplitudes.



Oscillations in QFT \rightarrow EFT

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{2V_{ud}}{v^2} \{ [\mathbf{1} + \epsilon_L]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma^{\mu}P_L d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}\gamma_{\mu}P_L \nu_{\beta}) \\ + [\epsilon_R]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma^{\mu}P_R d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}\gamma_{\mu}P_L \nu_{\beta}) \\ + \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_S]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}P_L \nu_{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_P]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma_5 d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}P_L \nu_{\beta}) \\ + \frac{1}{4} [\epsilon_T]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\sigma^{\mu\nu}P_L d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}\sigma_{\mu\nu}P_L \nu_{\beta}) + \text{h.c.} \}$$



NP models: W', charged scalar, LQ, ...

Oscillations in QFT \rightarrow EFT

Oscillations in QFT \rightarrow EFT

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{L} \supset &- \frac{2V_{ud}}{v^2} \{ [\mathbf{1} + \epsilon_L]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma^{\mu} P_L d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha} \gamma_{\mu} P_L \nu_{\beta}) \\ &+ [\epsilon_R]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma^{\mu} P_R d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha} \gamma_{\mu} P_L \nu_{\beta}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_S]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha} P_L \nu_{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_P]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma_5 d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha} P_L \nu_{\beta}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} [\epsilon_T]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\sigma^{\mu\nu} P_L d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}\sigma_{\mu\nu} P_L \nu_{\beta}) + \text{h.c.} \} \end{split}$$

$$NP \text{ models: W', charged scalar, LQ, ...} \\ R_{\alpha\beta} &= \Phi_{\alpha}^{\text{SM}} \sigma_{\beta}^{\text{SM}} \sum_{k,l} e^{-i\frac{L\Delta m_{kl}^2}{2E_{\nu}}} [U_{\alpha k}^* U_{\alpha l} + p_{XL} (\epsilon_X U)_{\alpha k}^* U_{\alpha l} + p_{XL}^* U_{\alpha k}^* (\epsilon_X U)_{\alpha l} + p_{XY} (\epsilon_X U)_{\alpha k}^* (\epsilon_Y U)_{\alpha l}] \\ &\times [U_{\beta k} U_{\beta l}^* + d_{XL} (\epsilon_X U)_{\beta k} U_{\beta l}^* + d_{XL}^* U_{\beta k}^* (\epsilon_X U)_{\beta l}^* + d_{XY} (\epsilon_X U)_{\beta k} (\epsilon_Y U)_{\beta l}] \end{split}$$
• Choose your favourite experiment: 0 = 0 (θ_i , Δm^2 , ϵ_j) $\rightarrow \epsilon_j$

• Compare and combine with other searches.







• Choose your favourite experiment: 0 = 0 (θ_i , Δm^2 , ϵ_j) $\rightarrow \epsilon_j$



EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT

- COHERENT observed for the first time CEvNS (Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering): $vN \rightarrow vN$
- It occurs for E_v small enough so that the neutrino does not resolve the nucleus → CEvNS cross section enhanced by N². Theoretically known since the 70's
 [Freedman''74; Kopeliovich & Frankfurt''74]
- Extremely challenging experimentally (very small nuclear recoil)









[Image credit: Duke U.]



EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT



EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT



$$\sum_{j} R_{\alpha j}^{S} \equiv \frac{dN_{\alpha j}^{S}}{dt dE_{\nu} dT} = \frac{\kappa}{E_{\nu}} \sum_{k,l,j} e^{j \frac{L \Delta m_{kl}^{2}}{2E_{\nu}}} \int d\Pi_{P'} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha k}^{P} \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha l}^{P} \int d\Pi_{D} \mathcal{M}_{jk}^{D} \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{jl}^{D}$$

• CC production: pion and muon decays.

EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT



M. González-Alonso

EFT for neutrino data

EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT

• Simple case: linear NP + flavor universality



• COHERENT data (LAr + CsI, recoil & time distribution: <u>664 data</u>) give:

 $0.67\epsilon_u + 0.74\epsilon_d = -0.002 \pm 0.010,$



EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT

• Simple case: linear NP + flavor universality



• COHERENT data (LAr + CsI, recoil & time distribution: <u>664 data</u>) give:



EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT

• Simple case: linear NP + flavor universality



• COHERENT data (LAr + CsI, recoil & time distribution: <u>664 data</u>) give:



These operators are constrained by many EWPO: LEP1, LEP2, APV, …
 Is COHERENT probing a new region in the SMEFT parameter space? → Global fit needed!

• Global fit to Electroweak precision observables in the flavor-universal SMEFT

[Update of Falkowski, MGA & Mimouni, JHEP'17]



COHERENT in the SMEFT

• Global fit to Electroweak precision observables in the flavor-universal SMEFT

[Update of Falkowski, MGA & Mimouni, JHEP'17]



COHERENT in the SMEFT

• Global fit to Electroweak precision observables in the flavor-universal SMEFT

[Update of Falkowski, MGA & Mimouni, JHEP'17]



18 free parameters

[Breso-Pla, Falkowski, MGA, Monsálvez-Pozo, 2301.07036 JHEP]

COHERENT in the SMEFT

• Global fit to Electroweak precision observables in the flavor aniversal SMEFT

[Update of Falkowski, MGA & Mimouni, JHEP'17]



e d

V_T

u

- $L \neq 0 \rightarrow \text{oscillations!} \rightarrow 0 = 0 \ (\theta_i, \Delta m^2)$
- Adding NP: 0 = 0 ($\theta_i, \Delta m^2, \varepsilon_j$) [simultaneous fit!]

- $L \neq 0 \rightarrow \text{oscillations!} \rightarrow 0 = 0 \ (\theta_i, \Delta m^2)$
- Adding NP: 0 = 0 ($\theta_i, \Delta m^2, \varepsilon_j$) [simultaneous fit!]
- Example: short-baseline reactor neutrino experiments

$$P_{\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e}(L, E_\nu) = 1 - \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E_\nu}\right) \sin^2\left(2\theta_{13}\right)$$





- $L \neq 0 \rightarrow \text{oscillations!} \rightarrow 0 = 0 \ (\theta_i, \Delta m^2)$
- Adding NP: **0** = **0** (θ_i , Δm^2 , ε_j) [simultaneous fit!]
- Example: short-baseline reactor neutrino experiments

$$P_{\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e}(L, E_\nu) = 1 - \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E_\nu}\right) \sin^2\left(2\theta_{13}\right)$$

• Precision: $\theta_{13} = 0.0856(29)$ [DayaBay'18, ~4M neutrino events!]





Vτ

u



- $L \neq 0 \rightarrow \text{oscillations!} \rightarrow 0 = 0 \ (\theta_i, \Delta m^2)$
- Adding NP: **0** = **0** (θ_i , Δm^2 , ε_j) [simultaneous fit!]
- Example: short-baseline reactor neutrino experiments

$$P_{\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e}(L, E_\nu) = 1 - \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E_\nu}\right) \sin^2\left(2\theta_{13}\right)$$

- Precision: $\theta_{13} = 0.0856(29)$ [DayaBay'18, ~4M neutrino events!]
- UV-meaning of the good agreement with SM setup?





- $L \neq 0 \rightarrow \text{oscillations!} \rightarrow 0 = 0 \ (\theta_i, \Delta m^2)$
- Adding NP: **0** = **0** (θ_i , Δm^2 , ε_j) [simultaneous fit!]
- Example: short-baseline reactor neutrino experiments

$$P_{\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e}(L, E_\nu) = 1 - \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E_\nu}\right) \sin^2\left(2\tilde{\theta}_{13}\right)$$



- Precision: $\theta_{13} = 0.0856(29)$ [DayaBay'18, ~4M neutrino events!]
- UV-meaning of the good agreement with SM setup?
 - Non-standard V-A ($e_{L}\gamma_{\mu}v_{\tau}$ $u_{L}\gamma^{\mu}d_{L}$) gets hidden: $\theta_{13} \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}_{13}$





- $L \neq 0 \rightarrow \text{oscillations!} \rightarrow 0 = 0 \ (\theta_i, \Delta m^2)$
- Adding NP: **0** = **0** (θ_i , Δm^2 , ε_j) [simultaneous fit!]
- Example: short-baseline reactor neutrino experiments

$$P_{\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e}(L, E_{\nu}) = 1 - \sin^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E_{\nu}}\right) \sin^2 \left(2\tilde{\theta}_{13} - \alpha_D \frac{m_e}{E_{\nu} - \Delta} - \alpha_P \frac{m_e}{f_T(E_{\nu})}\right) + \sin \left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E_{\nu}}\right) \sin(2\theta_{13}) \left(\beta_D \frac{m_e}{E_{\nu} - \Delta} - \beta_P \frac{m_e}{f_T(E_{\nu})}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_X^2)$$



- Precision: $\theta_{13} = 0.0856(29)$ [DayaBay'18, ~4M neutrino events!]
- UV-meaning of the good agreement with SM setup?
 - Non-standard V-A ($e_L \gamma_{\mu} v_{\tau} u_L \gamma^{\mu} d_L$) gets hidden: $\theta_{13} \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}_{13}$
 - Scalar/tensor interactions can be probed





[A. Falkowski, MGA, & Z. Tabrizi, 1901.04553, JHEP]

- $L \neq 0 \rightarrow \text{oscillations!} \rightarrow 0 = 0 \ (\theta_i, \Delta m^2)$
- Adding NP: **0** = **0** (θ_i , Δm^2 , ε_j) [simultaneous fit!]
- Example: short-baseline reactor neutrino experiments

$$P_{\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e}(L, E_{\nu}) = 1 - \sin^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E_{\nu}}\right) \sin^2 \left(2\tilde{\theta}_{13} - \alpha_D \frac{m_e}{E_{\nu} - \Delta} - \alpha_P \frac{m_e}{f_T(E_{\nu})}\right) + \sin \left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E_{\nu}}\right) \sin(2\theta_{13}) \left(\beta_D \frac{m_e}{E_{\nu} - \Delta} - \beta_P \frac{m_e}{f_T(E_{\nu})}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_X^2)$$



- Precision: $\theta_{13} = 0.0856(29)$ [DayaBay'18, ~4M neutrino events!]
- UV-meaning of the good agreement with SM setup?
 - Non-standard V-A ($e_{L}\gamma_{\mu}v_{\tau}$ $u_{L}\gamma^{\mu}d_{L}$) gets hidden: $\theta_{13} \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}_{13}$
 - Scalar/tensor interactions can be probed → % level bounds



(TeV scale) [Similar bounds from nuclear beta decays]

Summary

- (SM)EFT: an efficient framework to search for **generic** (heavy) New Physics.
- The path to analyze any given neutrino experiment in the presence of them is now clear: 0 = 0 (θ_i, Δm², ε_j)
- This allows us to:

۲

- Understand the UV implication of that experiment;
- Have a general description (parametrization) of it;
- Compare/combine with any other experiment (SMEFT!);





-1.0

-1.5

-1.0

-0.5

 $\delta g_{l,z}$

0.0



Clu



Thanks!

Backups

EFT in QFT



Known theory at high-E



EFT at low-E



EFT that includes high-E effects



Known theory at low-E (or at least symmetries & fields)

Given a set of low-E fields & symmetries, one builds an EFT Lagrangian putting all possible interactions and following a power counting

M. González-Alonso

$SMEFT \rightarrow Beta-decay LEFT$

$$\frac{l\,\vec{\epsilon}(\mu)}{l\log\mu} = \left(\frac{\alpha(\mu)}{2\pi}\gamma_{\rm ew} + \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{2\pi}\gamma_s\right)\,\vec{\epsilon}(\mu),$$



EFT at the EW scale: SMEFT



- In the SM most measurements are not competitive \rightarrow no new information.
- Not true anymore if NP are present, since they are sensitive to different NP effects.
- EFT allows us the study this in a model-independent way.

Beta decay & neutrino physics



Example: LEP2 WW vs Higgs

EFT (symmetry) connects these processes.
 See e.g.



Example: LEP2 WW vs Higgs



Summary

• Many other examples...



$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{2V_{ud}}{v^{2}} \{ [1 + \epsilon_{L})_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma^{\mu}P_{L}d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}\gamma_{\mu}P_{L}\nu_{\beta}) + [\epsilon_{R}]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma^{\mu}P_{R}d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}\gamma_{\mu}P_{L}\nu_{\beta}) + [\frac{1}{2} (\epsilon_{S})_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}P_{L}\nu_{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_{P}]_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\gamma_{5}d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}P_{L}\nu_{\beta}) + h.c. \}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} (\epsilon_{T})_{\alpha\beta} (\bar{u}\sigma^{\mu\nu}P_{L}d) (\bar{\ell}_{\alpha}\sigma_{\mu\nu}P_{L}\nu_{\beta}) + h.c. \}$$

$$M(S \rightarrow X_{\alpha}\nu_{k}) = U_{ak}^{*}A_{L}^{P} + \sum_{X} [\epsilon_{X}U]_{ak}^{*}A_{X}^{P} + \sum_{X} [\epsilon_{X}U]_{ak}A_{X}^{P} + \sum_{X}$$

[A. Falkowski, MGA, & Z. Tabrizi, JHEP'20]



[A. Falkowski, MGA, & Z. Tabrizi, JHEP'20]

$$\mathcal{M}(S \to X_{\alpha}\nu_{k}) = U_{\alpha k}^{*}A_{L}^{P} + \sum_{X} [\epsilon_{X}U]_{\alpha k}^{*}A_{X}^{P}$$

$$\mathcal{M}(\nu_{k}T \to Y_{\beta}) = U_{\beta k}A_{L}^{D} + \sum_{X} [\epsilon_{X}U]_{\beta k}A_{X}^{D}$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{k} \to T$$







EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT

• SM prediction \rightarrow one weak charge (per target nucleus)

$$\frac{dN^{\text{prompt}}}{dT} = N_T \int dE_{\nu} \frac{d\Phi_{\nu\mu}}{dE_{\nu}} \frac{d\sigma}{dT} ,$$

$$\frac{dN^{\text{delayed}}}{dT} = N_T \int dE_{\nu} \left(\frac{d\Phi_{\nu_e}}{dE_{\nu}} \frac{d\sigma}{dT} + \frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}\mu}}{dE_{\nu}} \frac{d\sigma}{dT} \right) ,$$

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dT} = (m_{\mathcal{N}} + T) \frac{(\mathcal{F}(T))^2}{2v^4 \pi} \left(1 - \frac{(m_{\mathcal{N}} + 2E_{\nu}) T}{2E_{\nu}^2} \right) Q^2 + \sum_{Q_{SM}^2}^2 \sim N^2$$
Weak charge:
EFT analysis of NP at COHERENT

- SM prediction \rightarrow one weak charge (per target nucleus)
- EFT prediction → three weak charges (per target nucleus) [including, for the 1st time, generic NP in production & detection]

$$\begin{split} \frac{dN^{\text{prompt}}}{dT} &= N_T \int dE_{\nu} \frac{d\Phi_{\nu_{\mu}}}{dE_{\nu}} \frac{d\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu_{\mu}}}{dT} ,\\ \frac{dN^{\text{delayed}}}{dT} &= N_T \int dE_{\nu} \left(\frac{d\Phi_{\nu_{e}}}{dE_{\nu}} \frac{d\tilde{\sigma}_{\nu_{e}}}{dT} + \frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}_{\mu}}}{dE_{\nu}} \frac{d\tilde{\sigma}_{\bar{\nu}_{\mu}}}{dT} \right) ,\\ \hline \underbrace{\frac{d\tilde{\sigma}_{f}}{dT} &= (m_{\mathcal{N}} + T) \frac{(\mathcal{F}(T))^2}{2v^4 \pi} \left(1 - \frac{(m_{\mathcal{N}} + 2E_{\nu}) T}{2E_{\nu}^2} \right) \tilde{Q}_{f}^2} \\ \tilde{Q}_{f}^2 &\equiv Q_{SM}^2 + g_f(\epsilon_{NC}, \epsilon_{CC}) \end{split}$$

• These CC interactions *also* affect the pion/muon BR measurements, which are used to calculate the neutrino flux! → Crucial to take it into account.

Short-baseline reactor exp.



$$P_{\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e}(L, E_\nu) = 1 - \sin^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E_\nu}\right) \sin^2 \left(2\hat{\theta}_{13} - \alpha_D \frac{m_e}{E_\nu - \Delta} - \alpha_P \frac{m_e}{f_T(E_\nu)}\right) \\ + \sin \left(\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E_\nu}\right) \sin(2\hat{\theta}_{13}) \left(\gamma_R + \beta_D \frac{m_e}{E_\nu - \Delta} - \beta_P \frac{m_e}{f_T(E_\nu)}\right)$$

