

Nuclear matrix elements and the BSM energy scales in the EFT description of 0νββ **decay**

Mihai Horoi

Department of Physics, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859, USA

Ø**Support from NSF grant PHY-1404442, DOE grants DE-SC0008529, and DE-SC0015376 is acknowledged**

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

Classical Double Beta Decay Problem

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

$$
U = \begin{bmatrix}\nU_{e1} & U_{e2} & U_{e3} \\
U_{H1} & U_{H2} & U_{H3}\n\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\nU_{e1} & U_{e2} & U_{e3} \\
U_{H1} & U_{H2} & U_{H3}\n\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\nc_{12}c_{13} & \nS_{13}c_{13} & \nS_{12}c_{13} & \nS_{13}c_{13} & 0\n\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}\ne^{i\alpha_{1}/2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & e^{i\alpha_{2}/2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n
\n**1** Tritium decay:
\n
$$
U = \begin{bmatrix}\nU_{e1} & U_{e2} & U_{e3} \\
U_{r1} & U_{r2} & U_{r3}\n\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\nc_{12}c_{13} & \nS_{12}c_{13} & 0\n\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}\ne^{i\alpha_{1}/2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & e^{i\alpha_{2}/2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1\n\end{bmatrix}
$$
\n
\n**1** Tritium decay:
\n
$$
{}^{3}H \rightarrow {}^{3}He + e^{-} + \nabla_{e}
$$
\n
$$
{}^{3}H \rightarrow {}^{3}He + e^{-} + \nabla_{e}
$$
\n
$$
{}^{3}H \rightarrow {}^{3}He + e^{-} + \nabla_{e}
$$
\n
$$
{}^{3}H \rightarrow {}^{3}He + e^{-} + \nabla_{e}
$$
\n
$$
{}^{3}H \rightarrow {}^{3}He + e^{-} + \nabla_{e}
$$
\n

Fork on the Road: Are Neutrinos Majorana or Dirac Fermions?

Best (Only?) Bet: Neutrinoless Double-Beta Decay.

$$
m_M = m_D m_N^{-1} m_D \quad (m_D \sim Y < \phi >)
$$

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

M. Horoi CMU

August 8, 2016 \sim 2 *Dirac mass fromthe Yukawa* interaction with Higgs: $\bar{\psi}_i Y_{\bar{j}} \psi_j < \phi$

Shell Model Nuclear Matrix Elements

$$
M_{S}^{o_{v}} = \sum_{\substack{J, p < p' \\ n < n' \\ p < n}} (\Gamma) \left\langle 0_{f}^{+} \left\| \left(a_{p}^{+} a_{p'}^{+} \right)^{J} \left(\tilde{a}_{n}, \tilde{a}_{n} \right)^{J} \right\|^{0} \right\langle \tilde{a}_{n}, \tilde{a}_{n} \right\rangle^{J}} \right\| \left\langle 0_{f}^{+} \left\langle p \left(p' \right) \right\rangle \left\langle p \left(p' \right) \right\rangle \left\langle p \left(q^{2} dq \right| \left[\hat{S} \frac{h(q) j_{k}(qr) G_{FS}^{2} f_{SRC}^{2}}{q(q + \langle E \rangle)} \tau_{1} \tau_{2} \right] \right| n n'; J \right\rangle_{as} - closure
$$
\nShort range correlations (SRC):

\n
$$
f_{SRC} = 1 - c e^{ar^{2}} \left(1 - b r^{2} \right)
$$

$$
M^{0\nu} = M_{GT}^{0\nu} - (g_V / g_A)^2 M_F^{0\nu} + M_T^{0\nu}
$$

$$
\hat{S} = \begin{cases} \sigma_1 \tau_1 \sigma_2 \tau_2 & \text{Gamma (F)} \\ \tau_1 \tau_2 & \text{Fermi (F)} \\ [3(\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \hat{n})(\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \hat{n}) - (\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2)] \tau_1 \tau_2 & \text{Tensor (T)} \end{cases}
$$

TABLE II. Parameters for the short-range correlation (SRC) parametrization of Eq. (11).

QRPA-En M. T. Mustonen and J. Engel, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 064302 (2013).

QRPA-Jy J. Suhonen, O. Civitarese, Phys. NPA **847** 207–232 (2010).

QRPA-Tu A. Faessler, M. Gonzalez, S. Kovalenko, and F. Simkovic, arXiv:**1408.6077**

ISM-Men J. Menéndez, A. Poves, E. Caurier, F. Nowacki, NPA **818** 139–151 (2009).

SM M. Horoi et. al. PRC **88**, 064312 (2013), PRC **89**, 045502 (2014), PRC **89**, 054304 (2014), PRC **90**, 051301(R) (2014), PRC **91**, 024309 (2015), PRL **110**, 222502 (2013), PRL **113**, 262501(2014).

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

Other models: Left-Right symmetric model and SUSY R-parity violation

21, 2017 21, 2017

INT TC & 17-2a, June M. Horoi CMU M. Horoi CMU ^(e) **M. Horoi, A. Neacsu, PRD 93, 113014 (2016)**

DBD signals from different mechanisms p in the corresponding to the **CENTRAL MICHIGAN DBD** signals from different mechanis physics parameters holding \mathbb{R}^n , with the corresponding to \mathbb{R}^n , with the corresponding \mathbb{R}^n **CENTRAL MICHIGAN u** different file

l et al.: Probing New Physics Models of Neutrinoless Double Beta De

arXiv:1005.1241

$$
\[T_{1/2}^{0\nu}\]^{-1} = \left|M_{GT}^{(0\nu)}\right|^2 \{C_{\nu^2} + C_{\nu\lambda}\cos\phi_1 + C_{\nu\eta}\cos\phi_2 + C_{\lambda^2} + C_{\eta^2} + C_{\lambda\eta}\cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2)\},\]
$$

$$
\frac{d^2 W_{0^+\to 0^+}^{0\nu}}{d\epsilon_1 d\cos\theta_{12}} = \frac{a_{0\nu\omega_{0\nu}(\epsilon_1)}}{2(m_e R)^2} \left[A(\epsilon_1) + B(\epsilon_1)\cos\theta_{12} \right] \qquad \frac{2d W_{0^+\to 0^+}^{0\nu}}{d(\Delta t)} = \frac{2a_{0\nu}}{(m_e R)^2} \frac{\omega_{0\nu}(\Delta t)}{m_e c^2} A(\Delta t)
$$

$$
t = \varepsilon_{e1} - \varepsilon_{e2}
$$

INT TC $\&$ 17-2a, June **M.** Horoi CMU 21, 2017 $21, 2017$ **the nuclear radius (***R* R + 17.26 km), M $1111 \& \& 17-2a, \text{ June}$
 21.2017 sions for the constant *a*0⌫ and the function !0⌫ are given

 $\&$ 17-2a, June M. Horoi CMU

$\langle \lambda \rangle$ dominates

 $\langle \eta \rangle$ dominates

$$
r(v/N) \equiv T_{1/2}^{v/N}(1) / T_{1/2}^{v/N}(2) = \frac{G_{01}^{0\nu}(2) / [M^{0\nu/N}(2)]^2}{G_{01}^{0\nu}(1) / [M^{0\nu/N}(1)]^2}
$$

 $r(x) = r(N)/r(y)$ $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{N}^{\mathcal{N}})$ $R(N / v) = r(N) / r(v)$

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017 $21, 2017$

M. Horoi CMU

The pre-last line in Table VI pr

IBA-2 J. Barea, J. Kotila, and F. Iachello, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 014315 (2013).

QRPA-Tu A. Faessler, M. Gonzalez, S. Kovalenko, and F. Simkovic, arXiv:**1408.6077.**

QRPA-Jy J. Hivarynen and J. Suhonen, PRC 91, 024613 (2015), **ISM-StMa** J. Menendez, private communication.

ISM-CMU M. Horoi et. al. PRC **88**, 064312 (2013), PRC **90**, PRC **89**, 054304 (2014), PRC **91**, 024309 (2015), PRL **110**, 222502 (2013).

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

Towards an effective 0*v*DBD operator

Similarity Renormalization Group (SRG) evolution

$$
H_{\lambda}=U_{\lambda}H_{\lambda=\infty}U_{\lambda}^{\dagger}
$$

$$
\frac{d H_{\lambda}}{d\lambda}=-\frac{4}{\lambda^5}[[G,H_{\lambda}],H_{\lambda}]
$$

$$
O_{\lambda} = U_{\lambda} O_{\lambda = \infty} U_{\lambda}^{+}
$$

N3LO 500

arXiv:1302.5473

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

制 **CENTRAL MIGHIGAN** TOWards an effective 0*vDBD* operator: heavy neutrino-exchange NME

$$
O_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} O_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\boldsymbol{\infty}} U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^*
$$

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

M. Horoi CMU

 76 Ge

CENTRAL MIGHIGAN Towards an effective 0*v*DBD operator: heavy neutrino-exchange NME

$$
O_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} O_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}=\boldsymbol{\infty}} U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^+
$$

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

CENTRAL MIGHIGAN TOWards an effective 0*v*DBD operator: light neutrino-exchange NME

INT TC & 17-2a, June 21, 2017

Other models: Left-Right symmetric model and SUSY R-parity violation

21, 2017 21, 2017

INT TC & 17-2a, June M. Horoi CMU M. Horoi CMU ^(e) **M. Horoi, A. Neacsu, PRD 93, 113014 (2016)**

INT TC & 17-2a, June **M. Ho** 21, 2017 $21, 2017$ *^V ^A,* ✏ *^S±^P ,* ✏*T R V* +*A P*²⁰¹⁷ *S*+*P* $\frac{1}{2017}$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ n_{17} p_{11}

T L, ✏*T R*

 $[1]$ ₂ M₂ $\frac{1}{2}$

\blacksquare In terms of the effective of the effective of the effective or Ω UNIVERSITY CONSEQUENCES: - SCAIES TOP \overline{a} at the loop level; in such cases, the additional behavior \overline{a} Consequences: - scales for new physics \mathbb{R}^n ew pnysics

couplings are normalized with respect to the Fermi coupling GF and the proton mass mass mass mass mass mass much mass \sim baryogen $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S} \mathbf{S}$. This will make it unlikely that such contributions of the such contr - baryogenesis via leptogenesis

PHYSICAL REVIEW D 92, 036005 (2015)

following argumentation with respect to baryogenesis $\mathcal{L}_D =$ Λ_D $\mathcal{L}_D = \frac{g}{\Lambda_D^{D-4}}$ \mathcal{O}_D

 $g \approx 1$ v = 174 GeV (Higgs expectation value) P_{max} and P_{max} improved by function P_{max} vaccum expectation value, *^G^F* = 1*.*¹⁶⁶ ⇥ ¹⁰⁵ GeV²

limit *^T*1*/*² *>* ¹*.*¹ ⇥ ¹⁰²⁶ years.

$$
\frac{\mathcal{O}_D}{\mathcal{O}_5} \quad \frac{\bar{\epsilon}_D}{2.8 \times 10^{-7}} \quad \Lambda_D}{2.0 \times 10^{-7} \quad 2.12 \times 10^{14}}
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{O}_7 \quad 2.0 \times 10^{-7} \quad 3.75 \times 10^4
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{O}_9 \quad 1.5 \times 10^{-7} \quad 2.48 \times 10^3
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{O}_{11} \quad 1.5 \times 10^{-7} \quad 1.16 \times 10^3
$$

INT TC & 17-2a, June M. Horoi CMU 21, 2017 $t = 0$ \overline{D} for the smaller form induced diagrams. As \overline{D} $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \end$ $\frac{21}{201}$

$Consequences: -scal$ \sim 5 16 meeting meeting meeting meeting me, whereas the other mass me, whereas the other mass me, whereas the other measureme, whereas the other measureme, whereas the other measureme, whereas the other measureme, wh $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ Consequences: - scales for new physics $\frac{1}{2}$ CENTRAL MIGHIGAN Consequences: - scales for new physics <u>CONSQUENCES. SCAICS FOR HEW PHYSICS.</u> C ENTRAL MICHIGAN C_{α} and α and α and α and α Consequences. Sea *^L^D* ⁼ *^g*

couplings are not the Fermi contributions of the Fermi contr $\frac{\partial a}{\partial x}$ che be observed in the programs. - baryogenesis via leptogenesis stringent upper-limits than "1. With the exception of ¹ 1*.*08 0*.*75 2*.*81 1*.*98 1*.*63 $\frac{1}{2}$ *[|]*"1*[|]* ¹*.*⁴ *·* ¹⁰⁵ ³*.*² *·* ¹⁰⁷ ²*.*⁴ *·* ¹⁰⁶ ⁷*.*¹ *·* ¹⁰⁷ ¹*.*⁵ *·* ¹⁰⁷ *•* baryogenesis via leptogenesis $\overline{1}$ of \overline{C}

PHYSICAL REVIEW D 92, 036005 (2015) $\frac{1}{2}$ example the $\frac{1}{2}$ limit is $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ F1 is signal keview D 92, 0500 PHYSICAL REVIEW D 92, 036005 (2015)

¹=² > *,* (14e) *.* (14f) ¹ = 1*.*38 are taken ↵ are presented in

$$
\mathcal{L}_{D}=\frac{g}{\left(\Lambda_{D}\right)^{D-4}}\mathcal{O}_{D}
$$

$$
m_e \bar{\epsilon}_5 = \frac{g^2 (yv)^2}{\Lambda_5}, \qquad \frac{G_F \bar{\epsilon}_7}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{g^3 (yv)}{2(\Lambda_7)^3},
$$

$$
\frac{G_F^2 \bar{\epsilon}_9}{2m_p} = \frac{g^4}{(\Lambda_9)^5}, \qquad \frac{G_F^2 \bar{\epsilon}_{11}}{2m_p} = \frac{g^6 (yv)^2}{(\Lambda_{11})^7}
$$

TABLE VIII. The BSM effective scale $\left(\text{in GeV}\right)$ for different dimension-D operators at the present ¹³⁶Xe half-life limit (Λ_D^0) and for $T_{1/2} \approx 1.1 \times 10^{28}$ years (Λ_D) . *BLE VIII.* The BSM effective scale (in GeV) for differ-

\mathcal{O}_D	$\bar{\epsilon}_D$	$\Lambda_D^0(y=1)$ $(\Lambda_D^0(y=y_e)$ $\Lambda_D(y=y_e))$	
	\mathcal{O}_5 $2.8 \cdot 10^{-7}$ $2.12 \cdot 10^{14}$	1904	19044
	\mathcal{O}_7 $2.0 \cdot 10^{-7}$ $3.75 \cdot 10^4$	541	1165
	\mathcal{O}_9 $1.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$ $2.47 \cdot 10^3$	2470	3915
	\mathcal{O}_{11} $1.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$ $1.16 \cdot 10^{3}$	31	43

$$
\eta_N \propto \frac{1}{m_{W_R}^4 m_N} \qquad \qquad g \approx 1 \quad v = 17
$$

 $\eta_N \propto \frac{1}{m^4 m}$ $g \approx 1$ $v = 174 \text{ GeV}$ $v_s = 3 \times 10^{-6}$ electron mass Yukawa y_e \rightarrow \rightarrow \sim 10 electron mass fund was *^g* ≈*1 ^v* =*174 GeV* $\eta_{N} \propto \frac{1}{m_{W}^{4} m_{N}}$ $g \approx 1$ $v = 174 \text{ GeV}$ $y_{e} = 3 \times 10^{-6}$ electron mass Yukawa $\omega = \omega^2 \times 10^{-6}$ electron mass Yukawa y_e $\int \sqrt{v}$ electron mass *Lundwa ^S±^P [|]*, *[|]*✏*T R*

INT TC & 17-2a, June $21, 2017$ \overline{D} for the smaller form induced diagrams. As \overline{D} $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \end$ $\frac{21}{201}$ **INT TC & 17-2a**, June **M. Hore** h

M. Horoi CMU *|*" *LRz*(*RLz*) ³ *|*, *|*"4*|*, *|*"5*|*

Summary

- The physics of the neutrinos is very exciting and offers a lot of research opportunities.
- Double beta decay (DBD), if observed, will represent a big step forward in our understanding of the neutrinos, and of physics beyond the Standard Model. A Nobel prize may be awarded for its discovery.
- The physics learned from DBD is complementary to that learned from Large Hadron Collider (future colliders).
- Better nuclear matrix elements and effective DBD operators are needed, especially for the short range mechanisms. And we are working hard for that!

Collaborators:

- Alex Brown, NSCL@MSU
- **Roman Senkov, CUNY/CMU**
- **Andrei Neacsu, CMU**
- Jonathan Engel, UNC
- Jason Holt, TRIUMF
- Petr Navratil, TRIUMF
- Sofia Quaglioni, LLNL
- Micah Schuster, ORNL
- **Changfeng Jiao, CMU**

MS Theses:

- Fahim Ahmed, CMU
- Shiplu Sarker, CMU/ISU

27