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Take home messages

- the axial mass parameter, or axial charge radius, is a fundamental property of the nucleon, and a phenomenologically important quantity

- we can employ model-independent constraints when extracting this quantity

- there is no “axial mass anomaly” without unjustified model dependent assumptions on nucleon level form factors
Outline of the talk

• analyticity and scattering amplitudes
• analyticity and the charge form factor of the nucleon
• model independent determination of $m_A$ in charged-current quasielastic scattering
Motivations

• Proton (charge) radius problem: \(\sim 5\sigma\) discrepancy between electron scattering/electron hydrogen and muonic hydrogen determinations
  - most mundane resolution may be \(\sim 5\sigma\) shift in Rydberg (less mundane resolutions proposed)

• CKM phenomenology: Tensions in semileptonic \(|V_{ub}|\) from \(b\to u\nu\), \(R(B\to D^{(*)}\nu V / B\to D^{(*)}e\nu)\)
  - need extrapolate between different kinematic regions connecting experiment and lattice QCD.
  - need model independent implementation/validation of lattice results

• Axial radius of proton: determines strength of signal process (CCQE) in e.g. \(\nu_e\) appearance oscillation searches
  - CCQE important in itself
  - moreover, CCQE studies constrain nuclear parameters that feed into other background estimations
sterile neutrinos or SM background?

\[ \nu \rightarrow e \text{ signal} \]
\[ \nu \rightarrow \nu \gamma \text{ background} \]
\[ \mu \rightarrow \mu \]

\[ [\text{MiniBooNE (2009)}] \]
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sterile neutrinos or SM background?

\[ \nu \rightarrow e \text{ signal} \]
\[ \nu \rightarrow \nu \gamma \text{ background} \]
\[ \mu \rightarrow \mu \]  

Model for single photon processes

[Harvey, Hill, Hill 2007, RJH 2009]

Excess appearing also in antineutrinos

Need quantitative understanding of nucleon level amplitudes for input to nuclear modeling
Charged current quasielastic scattering (CCQE)

In a simpler, but no less important process, find a disturbing anomaly:

\[
\langle p(p')|J_W^{+\mu}|n(p)\rangle \propto \bar{u}^{(p)}(p') \left\{ \gamma^\mu F_1(q^2) + \frac{i}{2m_N} \sigma^{\mu\nu} q_\nu F_2(q^2) + \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 F_A(q^2) + \frac{1}{m_N} q^\mu \gamma_5 F_F(q^2) \right\} u^{(n)}(p)
\]

- Discrepancies (~3 sigma) in CCQE measurements [basic signal process / flux determination at accelerator neutrino experiments ]
At the nucleon level, single-photon process is described by many Lorentz invariant amplitudes, each a function of many kinematic variables

\[ \mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu}[\nu(p) + N(k) \to \gamma(q) + N(k')] = \sum_{i=1}^{12} M_i(s, t, u, p^2) \Gamma_{i}^{\mu\nu} \]

On top of this are nuclear effects..

To gain some traction, revert to simple process: nucleon level CCQE

\[ \langle p(p')|J_{W}^{+\mu}|n(p)\rangle \propto \bar{u}(p)(p')\left\{ \gamma^{\mu} F_1(q^2) + \frac{i}{2m_N} \sigma^{\mu\nu} q_{\nu} F_2(q^2) + \gamma^{\mu} \gamma_5 F_A(q^2) + \frac{1}{m_N} q^{\mu} \gamma_5 F_P(q^2) \right\} u^{(n)}(p) \]

Vector form factors well constrained (at \( \nu \) level of precision) by electron scattering; pseudoscalar form factor subdominant (lepton mass suppressed), leaving axial-vector form factor

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Single amplitude depending on single kinematic invariant} \]

Should be able to make some headway here..
**Idea:**

Apply constraints of analyticity to nucleon form factor, separate

1) nucleon form factor model
2) nuclear modeling (e.g. $^{12}$C target)

Eliminate model errors from (1). Can be used for unambiguous tests of (2).

Apply first to better measured vector form factors
**Similar formalism can be applied to vector form factors**

In fact, this relates to a very puzzling anomaly from atomic spectroscopy

**proton radius puzzle**

- inferred from muonic H [Pohl et al, Nature 2010]
- inferred from electronic H [CODATA 2008]
- extraction from e p, e n scattering, pi pi NN data
- previous extractions from e p scattering (as tabulated in PDG)

Let’s first apply analyticity constraints to the vector form factors. Extension to axial-vector form factor will be straightforward
Convenient to work in terms of Sachs basis:

\[
\langle k' | J_{\text{e.m.}}^\mu | k \rangle = \bar{u}(k') \left[ \gamma^\mu F_1(q^2) + \frac{i}{2M} F_2(q^2) \sigma^{\mu\nu} q_\nu \right] u(k)
\]

\[
G_E = F_1 + \frac{q^2}{4M^2} F_2
\]

\[
G_M = F_1 + F_2
\]

\[
M^2 \frac{d}{dq^2} G_E \bigg|_{q^2=0} = \frac{1}{6} r_E^p = ?
\]

**blue points**: fits of e p scattering data using different data sets, different functional forms of \( G_E(q^2) \)
Analyticity and form factor constraints

What functional form to use in extrapolating to $Q^2=0$?

$$G_E = 1 + a_1 q^2 + a_2 q^4 + \ldots$$  [Simon et al 1980]

radius of convergence $< 4 m_{\pi}^2$

$$G_E = \frac{1}{1 + a_1 \frac{q^2}{1 + a_2 \frac{q^2}{1 + \ldots}}}$$  [Sick 2003]

no control on parameters

**fundamental problem**: need larger $Q^2$ to increase statistics but then introduce sensitivity to more parameters (need even more statistics, ...)

**analyticity:**

- extended to complex values of $t=q^2$, form factor is analytic outside cut in $t$ plane

\[
z(t, t_{\text{cut}}, t_0) = \frac{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t} - \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}}{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t} + \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}}\]

- “resums” simple Taylor expansion, ensuring convergence through entire physical range

$4m_\pi^2$ (isovector channel) point mapping to $z=0$ (scheme choice)
- basic idea: small expansion parameter, $z$, with order unity expansion coefficients

$$G(q^2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z (q^2)^n$$

- in fact, a little better, e.g.

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n^2 < \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad a_n \text{ smaller for large } n$$

The $z$ expansion has become a standard tool for meson transitions (e.g. $|V_{ub}|$ determinations in $B \to \pi \ell \nu$)

Bring the $z$ expansion into the domain of baryon form factors
For the cognoscenti, the real power of the expansion is based on observation of $O(1)$ coefficients, not unitarity bounds. Example for $K \to \pi$ vector form factor, can measure bound

$$A = \sqrt{\sum_k \frac{a_k^2}{a_0^2}}$$

unitarity bound on A (require exclusive rate < inclusive rate)

actual size of A (measured $\tau \to K\pi\pi\pi$)

scheme choice to evaluate OPE for inclusive rate

⇒ Unitarity bound either uncertain (low $Q$) or overestimates bound (high $Q$)

For nucleon form factors, unitarity even less relevant, as dominant dispersive contribution to form factors is from states below NN threshold
- study of vector dominance models, $\pi \pi \pi$ approximation to isovector form factors: expect $O(1)$ is really order 1 (e.g. not 10)

\begin{align*}
G_E^P & \quad Q^2 (GeV^2) \\
0 & \quad 0.1 \quad 0.2 \quad 0.3 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.5 \\
0.2 \quad 0.4 \quad 0.6 \quad 0.8 \quad 1
\end{align*}

- more concretely, fits to data yield

\[
a_0 \equiv 1, \quad a_1 = -1.01(6), \quad a_2 = -1.4^{+1.1}_{-0.7}, \quad a_3 = 2^{+2}_{-6}
\]

- to assign error, constrain coefficients $<5$ (conservative) or $<10$ (very conservative)
**results for proton charge radius:**

\[ r_E^p = 0.870 \pm 0.023 \pm 0.012 \text{ fm} \]

[Graph showing variation of fitted proton charge radius as a function of \( Q^2 \text{ (GeV}^2) \) with data from Arrington et al PRC 2007]

- larger \( Q^2 \) range: sensitive to more coefficients in expansion, but doesn’t improve slope at \( Q^2=0 \)

- can reduce error by decomposing isospin amplitudes, adding neutron scattering data, \( \pi\pi \rightarrow N\bar{N} \) data
Investigate “scheme” dependence, finding little:

TABLE III. The rms charge radius extracted using electron-proton and electron-neutron scattering data, and different schemes presented in the text. The neutron form-factor slope is constrained using (31). A cut $Q_{\text{max}}^2 = 0.5$ GeV$^2$ is enforced. In the lower part of the table, the bounds on $\sum_k a_k^2$ from Table II are multiplied by 4. $\phi_{\text{VMD}}$ and $\phi_{\text{OPE}}$ are defined in Eqs. (22) and (23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$k_{\text{max}} = 2$</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\phi = 1, t_0 = 0,</td>
<td>a_k</td>
<td>\leq 10$</td>
<td>$888^{+5}_{-5}$</td>
<td>$865^{+11}_{-11}$</td>
<td>$888^{+17}_{-21}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 33.67$</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi = 1, t_0 = 0,</td>
<td>a_k</td>
<td>\leq 5$</td>
<td>$888^{+5}_{-5}$</td>
<td>$865^{+11}_{-11}$</td>
<td>$881^{+10}_{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 33.67$</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>21.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi = \phi_{\text{VMD}}, t_0 = 0,</td>
<td>a_k</td>
<td>\leq 10$</td>
<td>$865^{+6}_{-6}$</td>
<td>$874^{+12}_{-13}$</td>
<td>$884^{+23}_{-24}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 23.26$</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>21.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi = 1, t_0 = 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$888^{+5}_{-5}$</td>
<td>$865^{+11}_{-11}$</td>
<td>$880^{+13}_{-16}$</td>
<td>$882^{+14}_{-16}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 33.67$</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td>21.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi = \phi_{\text{OPE}}, t_0 = 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$904^{+5}_{-5}$</td>
<td>$861^{+10}_{-11}$</td>
<td>$888^{+14}_{-21}$</td>
<td>$883^{+20}_{-20}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 61.34$</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>20.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi = \phi_{\text{OPE}}, t_0 = 0^{\text{opt}}(0.5 \text{ GeV}^2)$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$912^{+5}_{-5}$</td>
<td>$869^{+9}_{-9}$</td>
<td>$887^{+18}_{-19}$</td>
<td>$881^{+20}_{-19}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 93.69$</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>20.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recap:

- Motivated by anomalies in neutrino cross sections, we look for model-independent constraints on nucleon-level amplitudes.
- We employed analyticity to describe the vector form factors.

Return to our mission of constraining the axial-vector form factor: in particular, what is $m_A$?

First, let’s define $m_A$ (motivated by, but not dependent on, dipole ansatz)

$$F_A(q^2) = F_A(0) \left[1 + \frac{2}{m_A^2} q^2 + \ldots \right] \quad \Rightarrow \quad m_A \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2F_A(0)}{F'_A(0)}}$$

Slope and normalization essentially the only parameters probed (form factor almost linear in $z$ variable).
Same techniques as for vector form factors

\[
F_A(q^2) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z(q^2)^k
\]

\[
z(t, t_{\text{cut}}, t_0) = \frac{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t} - \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}}{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t} + \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}}
\]

\[9m_{\pi}^2\text{ point mapping to } z=0\text{ (scheme choice)}\]

define “norms”

\[
\|F_A\|_p = \left(\sum_k |a_k|^p\right)^{1/p}
\]

\[
\|F_A\|_2 = \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{t_{\text{cut}}}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t - t_0} \sqrt{\frac{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}{t - t_{\text{cut}}}} |F_A(t)|^2\right)^{1/2}
\]

\[
\|F_A\|_\infty = \sup_k |a_k| = \lim_{p \to \infty} \|F_A\|_p
\]

\[
a_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} d\theta \Re F_A[t(\theta) + i0] = F_A(t_0),
\]

\[
a_{k \geq 1} = -\frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} d\theta \Im F_A[t(\theta) + i0] \sin(k\theta) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{t_{\text{cut}}}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t - t_0} \sqrt{\frac{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}{t - t_{\text{cut}}}} \Im F_A(t) \sin[k\theta(t)]
\]

\[
t = t_0 + \frac{2(t_{\text{cut}} - t_0)}{1 - \cos \theta} \equiv t(\theta)
\]

how big is “order unity” ?
e.g. “axial-vector dominance” ansatz

\[ \text{Im} F_A(t + i0) = \frac{\mathcal{N} m_{a_1}^3 \Gamma_{a_1}}{(t - m_{a_1}^2)^2 + \Gamma_{a_1}^2 m_{a_1}^2} \theta(t - t_{\text{cut}}) \]

can then compute explicitly:

| $\|F_A\|_2/|F_A(t_0)|$ | $t_0 = 0$ | $t_0 = t_0^{\text{opt}}(1.0 \text{ GeV}^2)$ |
|-------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| $|F_A|/|F_A(t_0)|$     | 1.5-1.7 | 1.9-2.3           |
| $|F_A|/|F_A(t_0)|$     | 1.0-1.4 | 1.4-1.8           |

⇒ Indicates that “order unity” really means order unity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>V_{ud}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_p$</td>
<td>2.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_n$</td>
<td>-1.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_\mu$</td>
<td>0.1057 GeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_F$</td>
<td>$1.166 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV$^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_N$</td>
<td>0.9389 GeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_A(0)$</td>
<td>-1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_b$</td>
<td>0.025 GeV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_F$</td>
<td>0.220 GeV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$E_{ij} = (\delta \sigma_i)^2 \delta_{ij} + (\delta N)^2 \sigma_i \sigma_j$

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{ij} (\sigma_{i \text{ expt.}} - \sigma_{i \text{ theory}}) E_{ij}^{-1} (\sigma_{j \text{ expt.}} - \sigma_{j \text{ theory}})$$

**Fit to double differential CCQE data from MiniBooNE**

**Assume Relativistic Fermi Gas nuclear model**

[MiniBooNE, PRD81, 092005 (2010)]

[Smith and Moniz (1972)]
Results for axial mass:

\[ m_A = 0.85^{+0.22}_{-0.07} \pm 0.09 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{(neutrino scattering)} \]

\[ m_A^{\text{dipole}} = 1.29 \pm 0.05 \text{ GeV} \]
Revisit pion electroproduction

Experimental anomalies are between
a) high and low energy neutrino data
b) neutrino data and electroproduction data

\[ m_A = 0.92^{+0.12}_{-0.13} \pm 0.08 \text{ GeV} \]  \text{(electroproduction)}

\[ \Rightarrow \text{World average strongly affected by dipole assumption.} \]

Errors previously underestimated
Where does that leave us?

• No model-independent basis for an axial-mass anomaly, either between low- and high-energy neutrino data, or between neutrino and electroproduction data

• Nuclear cross sections are the convolution of a) nucleon-level process and b) nuclear effects.

  Given a) can make progress on b)

Constraints on nuclear model

Example: consider the binding energy parameter in RFG nuclear model

\[ \sigma_{\text{nuclear}} \approx 2V \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} n_i(p) \]

\[ \left\{ \frac{G_F^2}{16|k \cdot p|} \int \frac{d^3k'}{(2\pi)^3 2E_{k'}} \int \frac{d^3p'}{(2\pi)^3 2E_{p'}} (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p - p' + q) L_{\mu\nu} H_{\mu\nu} \right\} [1 - n_f(p')] \]

\[ p^0 \rightarrow \epsilon_p \equiv E_p - \epsilon_b \]

\[ \epsilon_b = 28 \pm 3 \text{ MeV} \]
Summary

- enforced analyticity constraints on invariant amplitudes for nucleon level processes

- extracted fundamental nucleon parameters independent of model assumptions \((m_A, r_E, \ldots)\)

- can disentangle nucleon level process from nuclear effects in a model-independent way

Should make use of model-independent information when it’s available: it’s a free lunch!