Axial Vector form factors for neutrino-nucleus scattering

Rajan Gupta Theoretical Division Los Alamos National Laboratory, USA



LA-UR: 16-29009, 17-23678, 18-25335, 19-25275

CNNP2020, South Africa: 28 July 2020

GOAL: High precision results for axial, electric and magnetic form factors versus Q^2 needed for determining x-section of (ν , e, μ) scattering off nuclei

METHOD: Use large scale simulations of lattice QCD to calculate the matrix elements of the axial and vector currents within the nucleon state.

Collaborators:Tanmoy Bhattacharya,
Sungwoo Park,Vincenzo Cirigliano,
Boram Yoon (LANL);
Yong-Chull Jang (BNL) Huey-Wen Lin (MSU)

	Charges:	Gupta et al,	PRD.98	(2018) 034503
References	AFF:	Gupta et al,	PRD 96	(2017) 114503
	AFF:	Jang et al,	PRL 124	(2020) 072002
	VFF:	Jang et al,	PRD 100	(2020) 014507

The v-n differential cross-section:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma}{dQ^2} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_l + n \to l^- + p \\ \bar{\nu}_l + p \to l^+ + n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{M^2 G_F^2 \cos^2 \theta_c}{8\pi E_\nu^2} \left\{ A(Q^2) \pm B(Q^2) \frac{(s-u)}{M^2} + C(Q^2) \frac{(s-u)^2}{M^4} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{split} A(Q^2) &= \frac{(m^2 + Q^2)}{M^2} \left[(1 + \tau) F_A^2 - (1 - \tau) F_1^2 + \tau (1 - \tau) F_2^2 + 4\tau F_1 F_2 \right. \\ &- \frac{m^2}{4M^2} \left((F_1 + F_2)^2 + (F_A + 2F_P)^2 - 4 \left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{4M^2} \right) F_P^2 \right) \right], \\ B(Q^2) &= \frac{Q^2}{M^2} F_A(F_1 + F_2), \\ C(Q^2) &= \frac{1}{4} (F_A^2 + F_1^2 + \tau F_2^2). \end{split}$$

 $\langle NA_{\mu}N \rangle \rightarrow$ linear combination of F_A , \tilde{F}_P $\langle NPN \rangle \rightarrow G_P$ $\langle NV_{\mu}N \rangle \rightarrow G_E$, G_M $F_A = \text{axial form factor}$ $G_E = F_1 - \tau F_2 \text{ Electric}$ $G_M = F_1 + F_2 \text{ Magnetic}$ $\tau = Q^2/4M^2$ $M = M_p = 939 \text{ MeV}$

Cohesive strategy for (e, μ , v)-Z scattering •5 Form Factors, g_A , μ , g_p^*

- $G_E(Q^2)$ Electric
- $G_M(Q^2)$ Magnetic
- $G_A(Q^2)$ Axial
- $\tilde{G}_P(Q^2)$ Induced pseudoscalar
- $G_P(Q^2)$ Pseudoscalar
- The lattice methodology is the same
- Precise experimental data exist for $G_E(Q^2)$ and $G_M(Q^2)$
- Axial ward identity relates $G_A(Q^2)$, $\tilde{G}_P(Q^2)$, $G_P(Q^2)$
- $G_E(Q^2 = 0) = 1$
- Conserved vector charge
- $G_M(Q^2 = 0) = \mu = 4.7058$ Magnetic moment
- $G_A(Q^2 = 0) = g_A = 1.277(2)$ Axial charge
- $\tilde{G}_P(Q^2 = 0.88m_\mu^2) = g_p^* = 8.06(55)$ Induced pseudoscalar charge

Axial-vector form factors A_{μ} A_{μ} $\gamma_{\mu}\gamma_{5}G_{A}(Q^{2})$

 $\propto 1/Q^4$

Calculate the 3 form factors on the lattice

- Axial: G_A
- Induced pseudoscalar: \tilde{G}_P

 $\gamma_{\mu}\gamma_{5} g_{A}$

• Pseudoscalar: G_P

$$\langle N(p_f) | A^{\mu}(q) | N(p_i) \rangle = \overline{u}(p_f) \left[\gamma^{\mu} G_A(q^2) + q_{\mu} \frac{\tilde{G}_P(q^2)}{2M} \right] \gamma_5 u(p_i)$$

$$\langle N(p_f) | P(q) | N(p_i) \rangle = \overline{u}(p_f) G_P(q^2) \gamma_5 u(p_i)$$

$$G_A, \quad \tilde{G}_P, \quad G_P \text{ must satisfy the PCAC relation: } \partial_{\mu} A_{\mu} = 2m_5^P$$

PCAC ($\partial_{\mu}A_{\mu} = 2\hat{m}P$) requires $2\hat{m}G_P(Q^2) = 2M_N G_A(Q^2) - \frac{Q^2}{2M_N}\tilde{G}_P(Q^2)$ Pion pole-dominance (PPD) hypothesis $\widetilde{G_{P}}(Q^{2}) = G_{A}(Q^{2}) \left[\frac{4M_{N}^{2}}{Q^{2} + M_{\pi}^{2}} - \frac{\sqrt{2}q_{\mu}F_{\pi}}{\sqrt{2}q_{\mu}F_{\pi}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}q_{\mu}F_{\pi}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{$

If pion pole-dominance holds ⇒ there is only one independent form factor

Goldberger-Trieman relation at $Q^2 = 0$

$$F_{\pi} g_{\pi NN} = M_N g_A$$

Extracting the ground state matrix elements from 3-point functions

 $\langle N(p_f) | A_{\mu}(q) | N(p_i) \rangle$ $\langle N(p_f) | P(q) | N(p_i) \rangle$ $\langle N(p_f) | V_{\mu}(q) | N(p_i) \rangle$

QM tells us $\langle A_{\mu} \rangle = \int d^3x \, \overline{\psi}(x) A_{\mu} \, \psi(x)$

Lattice QCD gives us $\psi(x)$ as an "integral over paths"

Calculating matrix elements using Lattice QCD



Ensemble average over background gauge configurations $\langle \Omega | \hat{N}(t,p') \hat{O}(\tau,p'-p) \hat{N}(0,p) | \Omega \rangle =$ $\sum_{i,j} \langle \Omega | \hat{N}(p') | N_j \rangle e^{-\int dt H} \langle N_j | \hat{O}(\tau,p'-p) | N_i \rangle e^{-\int dt H} \langle N_i | \hat{N}(p) | \Omega \rangle =$ $\sum_{i,j} \langle \Omega | \hat{N}(p') | N_j \rangle e^{-E_j(t-\tau)} \langle N_j | \hat{O}(\tau,p'-p) | N_i \rangle e^{-E_i \tau} \langle N_i | \hat{N}(p) | \Omega \rangle$

Spectrum from the 2-point function Γ^2



- A_0, A_1, \ldots corresponding amplitudes
- The signal degrades exponentially $e^{-(M_N-1.5M_\pi)t}$
- To resolve a <u>small</u> mass gap $(M_1 M_0)$ needs large t

Excited states & violation of PCAC

Challenge: To get the matrix elements in the ground state of the nucleon, the contributions of all excited states have to be removed.



Issue: How to determine the spectrum of all states that contribute significantly to a given 3-point function?

Challenges

- Cannot go to large τ because the signal/noise degrades as $e^{-(M_N-1.5M_\pi)\tau}$
 - 2-pt: $\tau \sim 2 \text{fm}$; 3-pt: $\tau \sim 1.5 \text{fm}$



- \widehat{N} couples to the nucleon, all its excitations and multihadron states with the same quantum numbers
- As $\vec{q} \rightarrow 0$, the tower of physical $N\pi$, $N\pi\pi$ states becomes arbitrarily dense above ~1210 MeV
- The excited states that gives significant contribution to a give ME are not known *a priori*

2017 Showed Violation of PCAC

PCAC:
$$R_1 + R_2 = \frac{\hat{m} G_P}{M_N G_A} + \frac{Q^2 \tilde{G}_P}{4M_N^2} = 1$$

PCAC violated if one uses the spectrum from 2-point function



2019: Resolution of PCAC and PPD

Jang et al, PRL 124 (2020) 072002

On including low mass $N_{p=0}\pi_p$ and $N_p\pi_{-p}$ excited states neglected in previous works, showed PCAC and PPD are satisfied



Spectrum from the 2-point function

Comparing two 4-state fits



Large region of parameter values give similar χ^2/dof

 $G_A \sim 1-4\%$

 Resulting Change in:
 $\tilde{G}_P \sim 15-25\%$
 $G_P \sim 20-30\%$



Issues:

- The pattern of excited states cannot be determined from $\langle NA_4N \rangle$ at $(Q^2 = 0)$. Thus analysis of g_A is not yet fully resolved
- In principle there is a tower of $N_p \pi_{-p}$ states. We have only included the dominant one (consistent with chiral perturbation theory)
- Statistical precision falls at large Q^2

Future:

- Determine a robust way to extract $G_A(Q^2 = 0) \equiv g_A$
- Further improve control over excited-states
- Increase the range of values of lattice spacing and pion masses to reduce the associated systematics
- Incorporate/Develop methods to extend the range of Q^2

Electric & Magnetic form factors

Matrix Elements of $V_{\mu} \rightarrow$ Dirac (F₁) and Pauli (F₂) form factors

$$\left\langle N(p_f) \Big| V^{\mu}(q) \Big| N(p_i) \right\rangle = \overline{u}(p_f) \left[\gamma^{\mu} F_1(q^2) + \sigma^{\mu\nu} q_{\nu} \frac{F_2(q^2)}{2M} \right] u(p_i)$$

Define Sachs Electric (G_E) and Magnetic (G_M) form factors $G_E(q^2) = F_1(q^2) - \frac{q^2}{4M^2}F_2(q^2), \qquad G_M(q^2) = F_1(q^2) + F_2(q^2)$

Current Status: Electric & Magnetic



- The extraction of electric and magnetic form factors is insensitive to the details of the excited states
- The form factors do not show significant dependence on the lattice spacing or the quark mass
- Good agreement with the Kelly curve. Confirms lattice methodology
- Improve precision and get data over larger range of parameter values

Future

- Continue to develop a robust analysis strategy for removing excited states in all nucleon matrix elements
 - Charges, Form factors
 - nEDM
- Flavor diagonal operators for ("neutral current" interactions, dark matter, proton spin, momentum fraction, ...)
- Generate and analyze ensembles to improve chiral and continuum extrapolation for
 - Clover-on-clover formulation
 - Increase statistics on Clover-on-HISQ calculations
- Perform a comprehensive analysis of scattering data using lattice results for $G_E(Q^2)$, $G_M(Q^2)$, $G_A(Q^2)$, $\tilde{G}_P(Q^2)$