

# Electric dipole moments: a theory overview

EMANUELE MEREGHETTI<sup>1</sup>

*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

Electric dipole moments are extremely sensitive probes of physics beyond the Standard Model. A vibrant experimental program is in place, with the goal of improving existing bounds on the electron and neutron electric dipole moments by one or two orders of magnitude, while testing new ideas for the measurement of electric dipole moments of light ions, such as the proton and the deuteron, at a comparable level. The success of this program, and its implications for physics beyond the Standard Model, relies on the precise calculation of the electric dipole moments in terms of the couplings of CP-violating operators induced by beyond-the-Standard-Model physics. In light of the nonperturbative nature of both QCD at low energy and of the nuclear interactions, these calculations have proven difficult, and are affected by large theoretical uncertainties. In this talk I will review the progress that has been achieved on different aspects of the calculation of hadronic and nuclear EDMs, the challenges that remain to be faced, and the implications for our understanding of physics beyond the Standard Model.

PRESENTED AT

Conference on the Intersections of Particle and Nuclear  
Physics  
Palm Springs, USA, May 29– June 3, 2018

---

<sup>1</sup>Work supported by the DOE Office of Science and by the LDRD program at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

# 1 Introduction

The observation of a permanent electric dipole moment (EDM) would be a signal of the violation of the symmetries of parity ( $P$ ) and time reversal ( $T$ ), and, consequently, of charge conjugation and parity ( $CP$ ). EDMs are mostly sensitive to  $CP$  violation (CPV) in the quark and lepton flavor diagonal sectors, and thus are largely unaffected by CPV in the Standard Model (SM), represented by the phase of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix. The phase of the CKM matrix contributes to the neutron and electron EDMs at the level of  $10^{-19}$  and  $10^{-25}$   $e$  fm [1, 2], orders of magnitude away from the current experimental bounds,  $d_n < 3.0 \cdot 10^{-13}$   $e$  fm [3, 4] and  $d_e < 8.7 \cdot 10^{-16}$   $e$  fm [5]. EDM searches are then in the ideal situation of having negligible SM background, so that an observation in the next generation of experiments would be a clear indication of physics beyond the Standard Model (BSM).

EDM searches are performed on a variety of systems, from the muon [6] and the neutron [3, 4], to diamagnetic atoms as  $^{199}\text{Hg}$ ,  $^{129}\text{Xe}$  and  $^{225}\text{Ra}$  [7, 8, 9], to paramagnetic atoms and molecules such as  $\text{ThO}$  and  $\text{HfF}$  [5, 10], which are mostly sensitive to the electron EDM. The current limits on the EDMs of these systems are reported in Table 1. Future experiments will improve these bounds by one or two orders of magnitude [11]. While the observation of an EDM in any of these systems will reveal the existence of new sources of CPV, with profound implications for the understanding of the matter-antimatter asymmetry of the universe, the “inverse problem”, i.e. using EDM experiments to identify the microscopic CPV mechanism(s) and discriminate between various BSM scenarios, is complicated by the fact that hadronic, nuclear and atomic EDMs are sensitive to a variety of physical scales, from those typical of atomic and nuclear physics to the TeV or multi-TeV scale.

The multiscale nature of the problem suggests to attack it with the tools of Effective Field Theories (EFTs). Assuming that BSM physics arises at scales much larger than the electroweak, new CPV effects are captured by  $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ -invariant operators of higher canonical dimension, starting at dimension six. The extension of the SM with these effective operators is dubbed SM Effective Field Theory (SM-EFT), and the complete set of dimension-six operators is given in Refs. [12, 13]. The operators in the SM-EFT can be used for collider phenomenology, but to study EDM experiments it is convenient to match the SM-EFT to an  $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{\text{em}}$ -invariant EFT [14, 15]. This matching step can be performed in perturbation theory and allows to model-independently preserve a link between EDMs and other low-energy precision experiments, such as CPV violation in the kaon or  $B$  meson systems. Going down in energy, one has to match the theory at the quark-gluon level onto a theory of hadrons, such as chiral perturbation theory ( $\chi$ PT) or chiral EFT ( $\chi$ EFT). This step is inherently nonperturbative, and, as we will discuss, is at the moment affected by large theoretical uncertainties, often  $\sim 100\%$ . Finally, one can use  $\chi$ EFT

limit	$d_e$	$d_\mu$	$d_n$	$d_{\text{Hg}}$	$d_{\text{Xe}}$	$d_{\text{Ra}}$
	$8.7 \cdot 10^{-16}$	$1.9 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$3.0 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$6.2 \cdot 10^{-17}$	$5.5 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$1.2 \cdot 10^{-10}$

Table 1: Current limits on the electron [5], neutron [3, 4], mercury [7], xenon [8] and radium [9] EDMs in units of  $e$  fm (90% confidence level).

to compute EDM of light nuclei, and use the  $T$ -violating nucleon-nucleon potential and currents derived in  $\chi$ EFT as input for many-body calculations.

From this schematic description, one can appreciate that achieving a seamless connection between nuclear and atomic EDMs and the high-energy mechanism that generates them requires a careful control of the theoretical uncertainties, in particular those arising from nonperturbative QCD and nuclear physics. The importance of such control can be appreciated by considering two examples, discussed in Refs. [16, 17]. The top sector of the SM-EFT contains a gluonic and a weak dipole operator,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{top}} = -\frac{g_s}{2} C_g m_t \bar{t}_L \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} t_R \left(1 + \frac{h}{v}\right) - g m_t C_{Wt} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{b}_L \sigma_{\mu\nu} t_R W_{\mu\nu}^- + \dots \right] \left(1 + \frac{h}{v}\right), \quad (1)$$

where  $g$  and  $g_s$  are the  $SU(2)_L$  and  $SU(3)_c$  gauge couplings, and the coefficients  $C_g$  and  $C_{Wt}$  are in general complex,  $C_\alpha = c_\alpha + i\tilde{c}_\alpha$ . The real parts  $c_g$  and  $c_{Wt}$  are constrained by processes involving the Higgs boson and/or top quarks, such as  $gg \rightarrow h$ ,  $t\bar{t}$  and single- $t$  production, and top decays. Indirect constraints from the  $S$  parameter, and  $b \rightarrow s\gamma$  also play an important role, especially for  $C_{Wt}$  [16, 17]. From Fig. 1 one can see that the limits on  $c_g$  and  $c_{Wt}$  are at the level of  $\sim 5\%$ - $10\%$ , pointing to scales slightly above the TeV. Interestingly, the top chromo-magnetic moment  $c_g$  is more constrained by Higgs production via gluon fusion than by  $t\bar{t}$  production. The limits on the imaginary part of the coefficients,  $\tilde{c}_{Wt}$  and  $\tilde{c}_g$ , are shown on the  $y$ -axes in Fig. 1, and are obtained by using two strategies. In the ‘‘central’’ strategy, the theoretical uncertainties on the nucleon and nuclear EDMs are neglected. The limits obtained with this strategy show the full potential of EDM experiments. In the ‘‘Rfit’’ strategy, on the other hand, we vary all theoretical uncertainties affecting the nucleon and nuclear EDMs within the allowed ranges, assuming a flat distribution, and minimize the total  $\chi^2$ . This method corresponds to the Range-fit (R-fit) procedure defined in Ref. [18]. Fig. 1 shows that the limits on  $\tilde{c}_{Wt}$  and  $\tilde{c}_g$  are completely dominated by EDM experiments, and that  $\tilde{c}_{Wt}$  and  $\tilde{c}_g$  are much more strongly constrained than their real counterpart, pointing to new physics scales larger than 10 TeV. In the case of  $\tilde{c}_{Wt}$  the bound is dominated by two-loop contributions to the electron EDM [16, 17], and it is largely unaffected by theoretical uncertainties. On the other hand, the bound on  $\tilde{c}_g$  is dominated by the neutron EDM, and in this case the effect of taking into account theoretical uncertainties is dramatic. Indeed, while the EDM bounds obtained in the central strategy are one order of magnitude stronger than collider, with the current

uncertainties on hadronic matrix elements the Rfit strategy allows for cancellations between different contributions to  $d_n$ , causing the constraints to become weaker by a factor of ten.




Figure 1: 90% confidence level bounds on the dipole operators  $C_{Wt}$  and  $C_g$ . The bounds are obtained considering collider and low energy probes, as discussed in Refs. [16, 17].

This example illustrates how improving the knowledge of hadronic matrix elements of CPV operators is crucial to make the most of the rich EDM experimental program. In the rest of my talk I will discuss how EFTs can help achieve this important goal.

## 2 From quarks to nucleons

We consider QCD with three flavors of light quarks. The CPV sector of the Lagrangian contains a single dimension-four operator, the QCD  $\bar{\theta}$  term [19, 20, 21]. In  $\chi$ EFT, it is convenient to rotate the  $\bar{\theta}$  term into a complex mass term, obtaining, after vacuum alignment [22],

$$\mathcal{L}_4 = m_* \bar{\theta} \bar{q} i \gamma_5 q \quad (2)$$

where

$$m_* = \frac{m_u m_d m_s}{m_s(m_u + m_d) + m_u m_d} = \frac{\bar{m}(1 - \epsilon^2)}{2 + \frac{\bar{m}}{m_s}(1 - \epsilon^2)} \quad (3)$$

and the combinations of light quarks masses  $\bar{m}$  and  $\epsilon$  are  $2\bar{m} = m_u + m_d$ ,  $\epsilon = (m_d - m_u)/(m_d + m_u)$ .

The low-energy CPV operators relevant for EDMs have been cataloged in several works, e.g. Refs. [1, 24]. Ref. [23] considered all the low-energy operators that are induced by SM-EFT operators at tree level, retaining the two lightest quarks. Generalizing to three light flavors, we find that there are 19  $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{\text{em}}$ -invariant purely hadronic operators that can be induced at tree level by SM-EFT operators

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{6,\text{hadr}} = & \frac{g_s C_{\tilde{G}}}{6v^2} f^{abc} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} G_{\alpha\beta}^a G_{\mu\rho}^b G_{\nu}^{c\rho} \\
& - \sum_q \frac{m_q}{2v^2} (\tilde{c}_\gamma^{(q)} \bar{q} i \sigma^{\mu\nu} \gamma_5 q e F_{\mu\nu} + \tilde{c}_g^{(q)} \bar{q} i \sigma^{\mu\nu} g_s G_{\mu\nu} \gamma_5 q) \\
& - \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ \Sigma_1^{(ud)} (\bar{d}_L u_R \bar{u}_L d_R - \bar{u}_L u_R \bar{d}_L d_R) + \Sigma_1^{(us)} (\bar{s}_L u_R \bar{u}_L s_R - \bar{s}_L s_R \bar{u}_L u_R) \right. \\
& + \Sigma_2^{(ud)} (\bar{d}_L^\alpha u_R^\beta \bar{u}_L^\beta d_R^\alpha - \bar{u}_L^\alpha u_R^\beta \bar{d}_L^\beta d_R^\alpha) + \Sigma_2^{(us)} (\bar{s}_L^\alpha u_R^\beta \bar{u}_L^\beta s_R^\alpha - \bar{s}_L^\alpha s_R^\beta \bar{u}_L^\beta u_R^\alpha) \\
& \left. + \Sigma_3^{(us)} (\bar{s}_L u_R \bar{u}_L s_R + \bar{s}_L s_R \bar{u}_L u_R) + \Sigma_4^{(us)} (\bar{s}_L^\alpha u_R^\beta \bar{u}_L^\beta s_R^\alpha + \bar{s}_L^\alpha s_R^\beta \bar{u}_L^\beta u_R^\alpha) \right\} \\
& - \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ \Xi_1^{(ud)} \bar{d}_L \gamma^\mu u_L \bar{u}_R \gamma_\mu d_R + \Xi_1^{(us)} \bar{s}_L \gamma^\mu u_L \bar{u}_R \gamma_\mu s_R + \Xi_1^{(ds)} \bar{s}_L \gamma^\mu d_L \bar{d}_R \gamma_\mu s_R \right. \\
& \left. \Xi_2^{(ud)} \bar{d}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu u_L^\beta \bar{u}_R^\beta \gamma_\mu d_R^\alpha + \Xi_2^{(us)} \bar{s}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu u_L^\beta \bar{u}_R^\beta \gamma_\mu s_R^\alpha + \Xi_2^{(ds)} \bar{s}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu d_L^\beta \bar{d}_R^\beta \gamma_\mu s_R^\alpha \right\}. \quad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

The coefficients  $\tilde{C}_G$ ,  $\tilde{c}_{\gamma,g}^{(q)}$ ,  $\Sigma_{1,2,3,4}^{(qq')}$  and  $\Xi_{1,2}^{(qq')}$  are dimensionless, and scale as  $(v/\Lambda)^2$ , where  $v = 246$  GeV is the Higgs vacuum expectation value, and  $\Lambda$  is the scale of new physics. The quark EDM (qEDM) and chromo-EDM (qCEDM) operators,  $\tilde{c}_{\gamma,g}^{(q)}$ , and the Weinberg three-gluon operators  $C_{\tilde{G}}$  have received the most attention in the literature [1, 25]. The four-quark operators  $\Xi$  arise, for example, in left-right symmetric models, while  $\Sigma$  are generated in leptoquarks models, see for example Ref. [26, 27, 28].

In addition to the hadronic operators, there are three leptonic EDM operators and four semileptonic operators

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{6,\text{lept}} = & - \sum_l \frac{m_l}{2v^2} \tilde{c}_\gamma^{(l)} \bar{l} i \sigma^{\mu\nu} \gamma_5 l e F_{\mu\nu} + C_{LesQ} \bar{e} l e_R \bar{s}_R s_L + C_{LedQ} \bar{e} l e_R \bar{d}_R d_L \\
& + C_{LeQu}^{(1)} \bar{e} l e_R \bar{u}_L u_R + C_{LeQu}^{(3)} \bar{e} l \sigma^{\mu\nu} e_R \bar{u}_L \sigma_{\mu\nu} u_R. \quad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

The Lagrangians in Eq. (4) and (5) need to be matched onto  $\chi$ PT. For quark bilinear operators, such as those in Eq. (5) or  $\tilde{c}_\gamma^{(q)}$ , such matching is equivalent to

computing the nucleon scalar, pseudoscalar and tensor charges. Thanks to progress in Lattice QCD (LQCD), these are now known with better than 10% accuracy [29, 30, 31].

The situation is more complicated in the case of the remaining hadronic operators in Eq. (4). The chiral Lagrangian which is relevant for the calculation of the nucleon and nuclear EDMs at leading order is [23]

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi = -2\bar{N}(\bar{d}_0 + \bar{d}_1\tau_3)S^\mu v^\nu N F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\bar{g}_0}{2F_\pi}\bar{N}\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}N - \frac{\bar{g}_1}{2F_\pi}\pi_3\bar{N}N, \quad (6)$$

where  $N$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  denote nucleon and pion fields, and  $F_\pi = 92.2$  MeV is the pion decay constant. The first two operators in Eq. (6) subsume short-range contributions to the nucleon EDM.  $\bar{g}_{0,1}$  denote CPV pion-nucleon couplings, which give long-range contributions to the nucleon EDM [32] and to the CPV nucleon-nucleon potential [33, 23].

In terms of these couplings, the nucleon and proton EDMs are [36, 35, 37]

$$\begin{aligned} d_n &= (\bar{d}_0 - \bar{d}_1)(\mu) + \frac{eg_A\bar{g}_1}{(4\pi F_\pi)^2} \left( \frac{\bar{g}_0}{\bar{g}_1} \left( \log \frac{m_\pi^2}{\mu^2} - \frac{\pi m_\pi}{2m_N} \right) + \frac{1}{4}(\kappa_1 - \kappa_0) \frac{m_\pi^2}{m_N^2} \log \frac{m_\pi^2}{\mu^2} \right), \\ d_p &= (\bar{d}_0 + \bar{d}_1)(\mu) - \frac{eg_A\bar{g}_1}{(4\pi F_\pi)^2} \left( \frac{\bar{g}_0}{\bar{g}_1} \left( \log \frac{m_\pi^2}{\mu^2} - \frac{2\pi m_\pi}{m_N} \right) - \frac{\pi m_\pi}{2m_N} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{5}{2} + \kappa_1 + \kappa_0 \right) \frac{m_\pi^2}{4m_N^2} \log \frac{m_\pi^2}{\mu^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\kappa_{0,1}$  are the isoscalar and isovector anomalous magnetic moments,  $\kappa_1 = 3.7$  and  $\kappa_0 = -0.12$ . The second term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (7) is induced by pion loops. The pion loop contribution is dominated by  $\bar{g}_0$ , and scales as  $\bar{g}_0\epsilon_\chi^2$ , where  $\epsilon_\chi$  is the  $\chi$ PT expansion parameter,  $\epsilon_\chi = Q/\Lambda_\chi$ , with  $Q \sim m_\pi$  and  $\Lambda_\chi \sim 1$  GeV.

The calculation of EDMs of light nuclei has received substantial attention in recent years, reaching a very satisfactory level of accuracy [38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47]. The expression for light nuclear EDMs is

$$d_A = a_n d_n + a_p d_p + a_0 \frac{\bar{g}_0}{2F_\pi} + a_1 \frac{\bar{g}_1}{2F_\pi}. \quad (8)$$

with  $a_{n,p} \sim 1$ , and  $a_{0,1} \sim 1/F_\pi$ , barring additional suppression factors, e.g. from isospin invariance in nuclei with  $N = Z$  [38, 42]. Using, for example, the results of Refs. [43, 44], one finds

$$d_d = 0.94(d_n + d_p) - 0.18 \frac{\bar{g}_1}{2F_\pi} e \text{ fm} \quad (9)$$

$$d_{3\text{He}} = 0.90d_n - 0.03d_p - \left( 0.11 \frac{\bar{g}_0}{2F_\pi} + 0.14 \frac{\bar{g}_1}{2F_\pi} \right) e \text{ fm}. \quad (10)$$

		$\bar{d}_0 F_\pi$	$\bar{d}_1 F_\pi$	$\bar{g}_0/F_\pi$	$\bar{g}_1/F_\pi$
$\bar{\theta}$	$\times \epsilon_\chi$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	1	$\epsilon \epsilon_\chi^2$
$\tilde{c}_g^{(u,d)}$	$\times \epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	1	1
$\tilde{c}_\gamma^{(u,d)}$	$\times \epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	–	–
$C_{\tilde{G}, \Sigma_{1,2}}^{(ud)}$	$\times \epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi$	1	1	1	$\epsilon$
$\Xi_{1,2}^{(ud)}$	$\times \epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	$\epsilon$	1
$\Xi_{1,2}^{(us,ds)}$	$\times \epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	1	1
$\Sigma_{3,4}^{(us)}$	$\times \epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	$\epsilon_\chi^2$	1	1

Table 2: NDA estimates for the couplings  $\bar{d}_{0,1}$  and  $\bar{g}_{0,1}$  induced by the hadronic operators in Eq. (4).  $\epsilon_\chi$  denotes the  $\chi$ EFT expansion parameter  $\epsilon_\chi = Q/\Lambda_\chi$ , with  $Q \sim m_\pi$ .  $\epsilon_v = \Lambda_\chi/v$  is the suppression factor of dimension-six operators, while  $\epsilon$  indicates that the contribution to the LEC requires isospin breaking from the quark masses.

Other calculations finds similar results, for compilations of recent results see the reviews [48, 49].

From Eqs. (7), (8), (9), we see that light nuclear EDMs receive an enhanced contribution from CPV pion-nucleon couplings, and are sensitive to different combinations of couplings with respect to the nucleon EDM. For these reasons, the proposed searches of the proton and deuteron EDMs in storage ring experiments [50] are very exciting.

To connect EDM experiments with the microscopic mechanism of CPV, one needs to determine the dependence of the low-energy constants (LECs)  $\bar{d}_{0,1}$  and  $\bar{g}_{0,1}$  on the couplings of the quark level theory. Naive dimensional analysis (NDA) [51] allows to estimate the relative importance of the LECs, determined by their scalings with  $\epsilon_\chi$ , which are given in Table 2 [23, 34]. The NDA expectations of Table 2, which follow from the transformation properties of the dimension-six operators under chiral symmetry and isospin, allow to identify interesting hierarchy patterns between the four LECs, which are typical or certain classes of operators, and, if observed, would offer important clues to disentangle various BSM scenarios.

For example, operators that break chiral symmetry but not isospin, such as the QCD  $\bar{\theta}$  term, generate a large  $\bar{g}_0$ , but a suppressed  $\bar{g}_1$ , while operators that break chiral symmetry and isospin, such as  $\Xi_{1,2}^{(ud)}$  or the qCEDM, generate  $\bar{g}_1$  and  $\bar{g}_0$  of similar sizes. In the first case, one would expect to find that the deuteron EDM is well approximated by  $d_n + d_p$ , while in the second  $d_d$  should be roughly a factor of 10 larger than  $d_n + d_p$ . To draw quantitative conclusions, however, we need to replace the NDA estimates in Table 2 with solid, first principle calculations.

### 3 Determination of the LECs

The status of the determination of the LECs in Table 2 is, unfortunately, far from settled. The simplest operators in Eq. (4) are the qEDMs,  $\tilde{c}_\gamma^{(q)}$ , since in this case the nucleon EDM is determined by the nucleon tensor charge, the matrix element of a quark bilinear. The nucleon EDM induced by  $\tilde{c}_\gamma^{(u,d)}$  is known at the 5% level [29, 30, 31]. The error on the contribution of  $\tilde{c}_\gamma^{(s)}$  is larger, but both Ref. [29] and [31] observe a non-zero signal.

There has been considerable effort in the LQCD community to pin down the nucleon EDM induced by the QCD  $\bar{\theta}$  term [52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59]. Unfortunately, as discussed in Ref. [59], at the moment all calculations give results compatible with zero. The best estimate of the nucleon EDM induced by  $\bar{\theta}$  is still the one based on the assumption that the chiral logarithm dominates Eq. (7), as originally suggested in Ref. [32], coupled with the improved determination of  $\bar{g}_0(\bar{\theta})$  discussed in Ref. [60]. The study of the nucleon EDM induced by  $\tilde{c}_g^{(q)}$  and  $\tilde{C}_G$  is also a very active research area [59, 61, 62, 63]. Since the LQCD results are not yet conclusive, the best estimates remain those derived with QCD sum rules [1, 64, 65].

The determination of CPV pion-nucleon couplings is facilitated by chiral symmetry. For CPV sources that break chiral symmetry, it is indeed possible to prove that pion-nucleon couplings are related to modifications of the baryon spectrum, as pointed out for  $\bar{\theta}$  in Ref. [32]. In the case of the QCD  $\bar{\theta}$  term, one can prove that, up to small N<sup>2</sup>LO corrections,

$$\frac{\bar{g}_0}{2F_\pi}(\bar{\theta}) = \frac{(m_n - m_p)_{\text{str}}}{2F_\pi} \frac{1 - \epsilon^2}{2\epsilon} \bar{\theta}, \quad (11)$$

where  $(m_n - m_p)_{\text{str}}$  is the contribution to the nucleon mass difference induced by  $m_d - m_u$ . The relation is valid both in  $SU(2)$  and  $SU(3)$   $\chi$ PT [60]. Because of the contamination from electromagnetic isospin breaking,  $(m_n - m_p)_{\text{str}}$  cannot be extracted from data, but it can be lifted from existing LQCD calculations [66, 67, 68], to yield a precise value for  $\bar{g}_0$

$$\frac{\bar{g}_0}{2F_\pi}(\bar{\theta}) = (15.5 \pm 2.0 \pm 1.6) \cdot 10^{-3} \bar{\theta}, \quad (12)$$

where the first error is the LQCD error on  $(m_n - m_p)_{\text{str}}$ , while the second is a conservative estimate of the error due to missing N<sup>2</sup>LO terms in  $\chi$ PT.

Similarly, the CPV couplings induced by  $\tilde{c}_g^{(q)}$ ,  $\Xi_{1,2}^{(ij)}$  and  $\Sigma_{3,4}^{(us)}$  can be extracted from modifications to the baryon spectrum induced by the CP-conserving chiral partners of CPV operators [69, 34, 70, 71]. For example, in the case of the qCEDM, introducing the chromo-magnetic operators

$$\mathcal{L} = - \sum_q \frac{m_q}{2v^2} c_g^{(q)} \bar{q} i \sigma^{\mu\nu} g_s G_{\mu\nu} q \quad (13)$$



and defining the couplings  $v^2 \tilde{d}_{0,3} = m_u \tilde{c}_g^{(u)} \pm m_d \tilde{c}_g^{(d)}$ , and  $v^2 c_{0,3} = m_u c_g^{(u)} \pm m_d c_g^{(d)}$ , one finds [69]

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{g}_0 &= \tilde{d}_0 \left( \frac{d}{dc_3} + r \frac{d}{d(\bar{m}\varepsilon)} \right) (m_n - m_p) + \delta m_{N,\text{QCD}} \frac{1 - \varepsilon^2}{2\varepsilon} (\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}_{\text{ind}}) , \\ \bar{g}_1 &= -\tilde{d}_3 \left( \frac{d}{dc_0} - r \frac{d}{d\bar{m}} \right) (m_n + m_p) ,\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

where  $r$  is the ratio of vacuum matrix elements

$$r = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle 0 | \bar{q} g_s \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q | 0 \rangle}{\langle 0 | \bar{q} q | 0 \rangle} = \frac{dm_\pi^2}{dc_0} \frac{d\bar{m}}{dm_\pi^2}\tag{15}$$

and  $\bar{\theta}_{\text{ind}}$  is a combination of coefficients

$$\bar{\theta}_{\text{ind}} = \frac{r}{v^2} (\tilde{c}_g^{(u)} + \tilde{c}_g^{(d)} + \tilde{c}_g^{(s)}) .\tag{16}$$

If the Peccei-Quinn mechanism is active [72],  $\bar{\theta}_{\text{ind}}$  is the minimum of the axion potential in the presence of the qCEDM, so that  $\bar{\theta}$  relaxes to  $\bar{\theta}_{\text{ind}}$ . Eqs. (14) and (15) show that the CPV pion-nucleon couplings induced by the qCEDM are determined by the pion and nucleon generalized sigma terms. Relations such as Eq. (14) are useful because these generalized sigma terms are more easily accessible in LQCD [69], thus providing a concrete avenue for a reliable and systematically improvable determination of  $\bar{g}_{0,1}$ .

A common feature of relations as Eq. (14) is that the pion-nucleon couplings receive a “direct” contribution, proportional to the nucleon matrix element of the dimension-six operators, and a “tadpole” contribution, which involves the vacuum matrix element of SM-EFT operators, and the standard nucleon sigma term and mass splitting. While calculations are in progress that will give the full CPV pion-nucleon couplings, we can already estimate the tadpole contributions. Indeed,  $r$  in Eq. (15) has been estimated in Ref. [74], yielding  $r = 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$ . The analogous vacuum matrix elements for the operators  $\Xi_{1,2}^{(qq')}$  and  $\Sigma_{3,4}^{(us)}$  are related by  $SU(3)$  chiral symmetry to matrix elements required to estimate BSM contributions to  $K$ - $\bar{K}$  oscillations, the electroweak penguin contributions to  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  and pion-range non-standard contributions to neutrinoless double beta decay [34, 70, 73]. These matrix elements have been computed in LQCD with good accuracy [75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80], allowing for reliable estimates of the tadpole contributions to  $\bar{g}_{0,1}$ . Using for example

the results of Refs. [78, 80] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{\bar{g}_0}{2F_\pi} \right|_{\text{tad}} &= -\epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi \left\{ 0.08 (0.7\tilde{c}_g^{(d)} + 0.3\tilde{c}_g^{(u)}) + 0.25 (\Xi_1^{(us)} + \Xi_1^{(ds)}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 1.0 (\Xi_2^{(us)} + \Xi_2^{(ds)}) - 0.06\Sigma_3^{(us)} + 0.02\Sigma_4^{(us)} \right\} \\
\left. \frac{\bar{g}_1}{2F_\pi} \right|_{\text{tad}} &= -\epsilon_v^2 \epsilon_\chi \left\{ + 0.75 (0.7\tilde{c}_g^{(d)} - 0.3\tilde{c}_g^{(u)}) + 3.82 (\Xi_1^{(us)} - \Xi_1^{(ds)} + 2\Xi_1^{(ud)}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 17.6 (\Xi_2^{(us)} - \Xi_2^{(ds)} + 2\Xi_2^{(ud)}) - 3.49\Sigma_3^{(us)} + 1.08\Sigma_4^{(us)} \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the coefficients are evaluated at 3 GeV, and we used the values  $\bar{m} = (m_u + m_d)/2 = 3.37 \pm 0.08$  MeV,  $\epsilon = 0.37 \pm 0.03$  [81],  $\bar{m}(dm_N/d\bar{m}) = 59.1 \pm 3.5$  MeV [82] and  $(d(m_n - m_p)/d\bar{m}\epsilon) \simeq (m_n - m_p)_{\text{str}}/(\bar{m}\epsilon) = (2.49 \pm 0.17 \text{ MeV})/(\bar{m}\epsilon)$  [66, 67].

From these expressions we see that  $\bar{g}_1$  is usually larger than  $\bar{g}_0$ , due to the fact that the nucleon sigma term is much larger than the nucleon mass splitting. The tadpole components of  $\bar{g}_1$  are in good agreement with the NDA expectations of Table 2, with the exception of  $\Xi_2^{(q\bar{q}' )}$ , where the coupling is enhanced by the large vacuum matrix element of the color-mixed operators [78, 76, 80]. The large values of  $\bar{g}_1$  in several non- $\bar{\theta}$  scenarios, if confirmed by the full calculations, will enhance the deuteron,  $^{199}\text{Hg}$  and  $^{225}\text{Ra}$  EDMs.

## 4 Conclusions

$CP$  violation in the Standard Model is insufficient to explain the matter-antimatter asymmetry in the universe. The new CPV sources required in many baryogenesis scenarios might manifest themselves in EDM experiments. A rich experimental program is underway, with the goal of improving the limits on the EDM of leptons, hadrons, diamagnetic and paramagnetic atoms, and molecules by one or two orders of magnitude. To take advantage of the experimental program, the theory of EDMs needs to make comparable progress. In this talk I have discussed an EFT approach to EDMs. EFTs allow to parametrize EDMs in terms of the coefficients of few quark-level operators, to identify the most important CPV low-energy interactions between pions and nucleons, to derive  $T$ -violating potentials and currents, and to compute EDMs of the nucleon and of light nuclei. The most important missing piece for a seamless connection of EDM experiments to high-energy physics is the nonperturbative matching between the EFT at the quark-gluon level and  $\chi\text{PT}$ . I have reviewed progress in this area, and discussed the challenges that remain to be faced.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EM acknowledges support by the DOE Office of Science and by the LDRD program at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

## References

- [1] M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, *Annals Phys.* **318**, 119 (2005) [doi:10.1016/j.aop.2005.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2005.04.002) [[hep-ph/0504231](#)].
- [2] C. Y. Seng, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**, no. 2, 025502 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.91.025502](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.91.025502) [[arXiv:1411.1476](#) [[hep-ph](#)]].
- [3] C. A. Baker *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 131801 (2006) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.131801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.131801) [[hep-ex/0602020](#)].
- [4] J. M. Pendlebury *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no. 9, 092003 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.092003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.092003) [[arXiv:1509.04411](#) [[hep-ex](#)]].
- [5] J. Baron *et al.* [ACME Collaboration], *Science* **343**, 269 (2014) [doi:10.1126/science.1248213](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1248213) [[arXiv:1310.7534](#) [[physics.atom-ph](#)]].
- [6] G. W. Bennett *et al.* [Muon (g-2) Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 052008 (2009) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.052008](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.80.052008) [[arXiv:0811.1207](#) [[hep-ex](#)]].
- [7] B. Graner, Y. Chen, E. G. Lindahl and B. R. Heckel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, no. 16, 161601 (2016) Erratum: [*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, no. 11, 119901 (2017)] [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.161601](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.161601) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.119901](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.119901) [[arXiv:1601.04339](#) [[physics.atom-ph](#)]].
- [8] M. A. Rosenberry, T. E. Chupp, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, no. 1, 22 (2001) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.22](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.22)
- [9] M. Bishof *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **94**, no. 2, 025501 (2016) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.94.025501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.94.025501) [[arXiv:1606.04931](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [10] W. B. Cairncross *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, no. 15, 153001 (2017) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.153001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.153001) [[arXiv:1704.07928](#) [[physics.atom-ph](#)]].
- [11] T. Chupp, P. Fierlinger, M. Ramsey-Musolf and J. Singh, [[arXiv:1710.02504](#) [[physics.atom-ph](#)]].
- [12] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, *Nucl. Phys. B* **268**, 621 (1986). [doi:10.1016/0550-3213\(86\)90262-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(86)90262-2)

- [13] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak and J. Rosiek, JHEP **1010**, 085 (2010) [doi:10.1007/JHEP10\(2010\)085](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP10(2010)085) [[arXiv:1008.4884](https://arxiv.org/abs/1008.4884) [hep-ph]].
- [14] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar and P. Stoffer, JHEP **1803**, 016 (2018) [doi:10.1007/JHEP03\(2018\)016](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP03(2018)016) [[arXiv:1709.04486](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.04486) [hep-ph]].
- [15] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar and P. Stoffer, JHEP **1801**, 084 (2018) [doi:10.1007/JHEP01\(2018\)084](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2018)084) [[arXiv:1711.05270](https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.05270) [hep-ph]].
- [16] V. Cirigliano, W. Dekens, J. de Vries and E. Mereghetti, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 3, 034031 (2016) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.034031](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.034031) [[arXiv:1605.04311](https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.04311) [hep-ph]].
- [17] V. Cirigliano, W. Dekens, J. de Vries and E. Mereghetti, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 1, 016002 (2016) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.016002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.016002) [[arXiv:1603.03049](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.03049) [hep-ph]].
- [18] J. Charles *et al.* [CKMfitter Group], Eur. Phys. J. C **41**, no. 1, 1 (2005) [doi:10.1140/epjc/s2005-02169-1](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s2005-02169-1) [hep-ph/0406184].
- [19] C. G. Callan, Jr., R. F. Dashen and D. J. Gross, Phys. Lett. B **63**, 334 (1976) [Phys. Lett. **63B**, 334 (1976)]. [doi:10.1016/0370-2693\(76\)90277-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(76)90277-X)
- [20] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 8 (1976). [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.37.8](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.37.8)
- [21] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 3432 (1976) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **18**, 2199 (1978)]. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.18.2199.3](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.18.2199.3), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.14.3432](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.14.3432)
- [22] V. Baluni, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 2227 (1979). [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.19.2227](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.19.2227)
- [23] J. de Vries, E. Mereghetti, R. G. E. Timmermans and U. van Kolck, Annals Phys. **338**, 50 (2013) [doi:10.1016/j.aop.2013.05.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aop.2013.05.022) [[arXiv:1212.0990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.0990) [hep-ph]].
- [24] I. B. Khriplovich and S. K. Lamoreaux, Berlin, Germany: Springer (1997) 230 p
- [25] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2333 (1989). [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.2333](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.2333)
- [26] J. Ng and S. Tulin, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 033001 (2012) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.033001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.85.033001) [[arXiv:1111.0649](https://arxiv.org/abs/1111.0649) [hep-ph]].
- [27] W. Dekens, J. de Vries, J. Bsaisou, W. Bernreuther, C. Hanhart, U. G. Meißner, A. Nogga and A. Wirzba, JHEP **1407**, 069 (2014) [doi:10.1007/JHEP07\(2014\)069](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2014)069) [[arXiv:1404.6082](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.6082) [hep-ph]].
- [28] W. Dekens, J. de Vries, M. Jung and K. K. Vos, [[arXiv:1809.09114](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.09114) [hep-ph]].
- [29] C. Alexandrou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 11, 114514 (2017) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 9, 099906 (2017)] [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.114514](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.95.114514), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.099906](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.099906) [[arXiv:1703.08788](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.08788) [hep-lat]].

- [30] R. Gupta, B. Yoon, T. Bhattacharya, V. Cirigliano, Y. C. Jang and H. W. Lin, [[arXiv:1808.07597 \[hep-lat\]](#)].
- [31] R. Gupta, Y. C. Jang, B. Yoon, H. W. Lin, V. Cirigliano and T. Bhattacharya, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 034503 (2018) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.034503](#) [[arXiv:1806.09006 \[hep-lat\]](#)].
- [32] R. J. Crewther, P. Di Vecchia, G. Veneziano and E. Witten, *Phys. Lett.* **88B**, 123 (1979) Erratum: [*Phys. Lett.* **91B**, 487 (1980)]. [doi:10.1016/0370-2693\(80\)91025-4](#), [doi:10.1016/0370-2693\(79\)90128-X](#)
- [33] C. M. Maekawa, E. Mereghetti, J. de Vries and U. van Kolck, *Nucl. Phys. A* **872**, 117 (2011) [doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2011.09.020](#) [[arXiv:1106.6119 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [34] V. Cirigliano, W. Dekens, J. de Vries and E. Mereghetti, *Phys. Lett. B* **767**, 1 (2017) [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.037](#) [[arXiv:1612.03914 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [35] C. Y. Seng, J. de Vries, E. Mereghetti, H. H. Patel and M. Ramsey-Musolf, *Phys. Lett. B* **736**, 147 (2014) [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.07.014](#) [[arXiv:1401.5366 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [36] E. Mereghetti, J. de Vries, W. H. Hockings, C. M. Maekawa and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Lett. B* **696**, 97 (2011) [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.12.018](#) [[arXiv:1010.4078 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [37] K. Ottnad, B. Kubis, U.-G. Meissner and F.-K. Guo, *Phys. Lett. B* **687**, 42 (2010) [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.03.005](#) [[arXiv:0911.3981 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [38] C.-P. Liu and R. G. E. Timmermans, *Phys. Rev. C* **70**, 055501 (2004) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.70.055501](#) [[nucl-th/0408060](#)].
- [39] I. Stetcu, C.-P. Liu, J. L. Friar, A. C. Hayes and P. Navratil, *Phys. Lett. B* **665**, 168 (2008) [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.06.019](#) [[arXiv:0804.3815 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [40] J. de Vries, E. Mereghetti, R. G. E. Timmermans and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 091804 (2011) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.091804](#) [[arXiv:1102.4068 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [41] J. Bsaisou, C. Hanhart, S. Liebig, U.-G. Meissner, A. Nogga and A. Wirzba, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **49**, 31 (2013) [doi:10.1140/epja/i2013-13031-x](#) [[arXiv:1209.6306 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [42] J. de Vries, R. Higa, C.-P. Liu, E. Mereghetti, I. Stetcu, R. G. E. Timmermans and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev. C* **84**, 065501 (2011) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.84.065501](#) [[arXiv:1109.3604 \[hep-ph\]](#)].

- [43] J. Bsaisou, J. de Vries, C. Hanhart, S. Liebig, U. G. Meissner, D. Minossi, A. Nogga and A. Wirzba, JHEP **1503**, 104 (2015) Erratum: [JHEP **1505**, 083 (2015)] doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2015)104, doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2015)083 [arXiv:1411.5804 [hep-ph]].
- [44] J. Bsaisou, U. G. Meiner, A. Nogga and A. Wirzba, Annals Phys. **359**, 317 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.aop.2015.04.031 [arXiv:1412.5471 [hep-ph]].
- [45] N. Yamanaka and E. Hiyama, Phys. Rev. C **91**, no. 5, 054005 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.91.054005 [arXiv:1503.04446 [nucl-th]].
- [46] N. Yamanaka and E. Hiyama, JHEP **1602**, 067 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2016)067 [arXiv:1512.03013 [hep-ph]].
- [47] N. Yamanaka, T. Yamada, E. Hiyama and Y. Funaki, Phys. Rev. C **95**, no. 6, 065503 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.95.065503 [arXiv:1603.03136 [nucl-th]].
- [48] N. Yamanaka, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **26**, no. 4, 1730002 (2017) doi:10.1142/S0218301317300028 [arXiv:1609.04759 [nucl-th]].
- [49] E. Mereghetti and U. van Kolck, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **65**, 215 (2015) doi:10.1146/annurev-nucl-102014-022344 [arXiv:1505.06272 [hep-ph]].
- [50] F. J. M. Farley *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 052001 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.052001 [hep-ex/0307006].
- [51] A. Manohar and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B **234**, 189 (1984). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(84)90231-1
- [52] E. Shintani *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 014504 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.72.014504 [hep-lat/0505022].
- [53] E. Shintani *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 034507 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.034507 [hep-lat/0611032].
- [54] E. Shintani, S. Aoki and Y. Kuramashi, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 014503 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.014503 [arXiv:0803.0797 [hep-lat]].
- [55] E. Shintani, T. Blum, T. Izubuchi and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 9, 094503 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.094503 [arXiv:1512.00566 [hep-lat]].
- [56] A. Shindler, T. Luu and J. de Vries, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 9, 094518 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.094518 [arXiv:1507.02343 [hep-lat]].
- [57] J. Dragos, T. Luu, A. Shindler and J. de Vries, EPJ Web Conf. **175**, 06018 (2018) doi:10.1051/epjconf/201817506018 [arXiv:1711.04730 [hep-lat]].

- [58] F.-K. Guo *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 6, 062001 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.062001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.062001) [[arXiv:1502.02295](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.02295) [hep-lat]].
- [59] M. Abramczyk, S. Aoki, T. Blum, T. Izubuchi, H. Ohki and S. Syritsyn, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 1, 014501 (2017) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.014501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.014501) [[arXiv:1701.07792](https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.07792) [hep-lat]].
- [60] J. de Vries, E. Mereghetti and A. Walker-Loud, Phys. Rev. C **92**, no. 4, 045201 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.92.045201](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.92.045201) [[arXiv:1506.06247](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.06247) [nucl-th]].
- [61] T. Izubuchi, M. Abramczyk, T. Blum, H. Ohki and S. Syritsyn, PoS LATTICE **2016**, 398 (2017) [doi:10.22323/1.256.0398](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.256.0398) [[arXiv:1702.00052](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00052) [hep-lat]].
- [62] A. Shindler, J. de Vries and T. Luu, PoS LATTICE **2014**, 251 (2014) [doi:10.22323/1.214.0251](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.214.0251) [[arXiv:1409.2735](https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.2735) [hep-lat]].
- [63] T. Bhattacharya, V. Cirigliano, R. Gupta and B. Yoon, PoS LATTICE **2016**, 225 (2016) [doi:10.22323/1.256.0225](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.256.0225) [[arXiv:1612.08438](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.08438) [hep-lat]].
- [64] M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 073015 (2001) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.073015](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.63.073015) [[hep-ph/0010037](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0010037)].
- [65] D. A. Demir, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 015007 (2003) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.67.015007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.67.015007) [[hep-ph/0208257](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0208257)].
- [66] S. Borsanyi *et al.* [Budapest-Marseille-Wuppertal Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, no. 25, 252001 (2013) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.252001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.252001) [[arXiv:1306.2287](https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.2287) [hep-lat]].
- [67] S. Borsanyi *et al.*, Science **347**, 1452 (2015) [doi:10.1126/science.1257050](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1257050) [[arXiv:1406.4088](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.4088) [hep-lat]].
- [68] D. A. Brantley, B. Joo, E. V. Mastropas, E. Mereghetti, H. Monge-Camacho, B. C. Tiburzi and A. Walker-Loud, [[arXiv:1612.07733](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.07733) [hep-lat]].
- [69] J. de Vries, E. Mereghetti, C. Y. Seng and A. Walker-Loud, Phys. Lett. B **766**, 254 (2017) [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.017) [[arXiv:1612.01567](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.01567) [hep-lat]].
- [70] S. Alioli, V. Cirigliano, W. Dekens, J. de Vries and E. Mereghetti, JHEP **1705**, 086 (2017) [doi:10.1007/JHEP05\(2017\)086](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP05(2017)086) [[arXiv:1703.04751](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.04751) [hep-ph]].
- [71] C. Y. Seng and M. Ramsey-Musolf, Phys. Rev. C **96**, no. 6, 065204 (2017) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.96.065204](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.96.065204) [[arXiv:1611.08063](https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.08063) [hep-ph]].
- [72] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977). [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.38.1440](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.38.1440)

- [73] V. Cirigliano, W. Dekens, M. Graesser and E. Mereghetti, Phys. Lett. B **769**, 460 (2017) [doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.04.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.04.020) [[arXiv:1701.01443](https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.01443) [hep-ph]].
- [74] V. M. Belyaev and B. L. Ioffe, Sov. Phys. JETP **57**, 716 (1983) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **84**, 1236 (1983)].
- [75] B. J. Choi *et al.* [SWME Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 1, 014511 (2016) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.014511](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.014511) [[arXiv:1509.00592](https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.00592) [hep-lat]].
- [76] N. Garron *et al.* [RBC/UKQCD Collaboration], JHEP **1611**, 001 (2016) [doi:10.1007/JHEP11\(2016\)001](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2016)001) [[arXiv:1609.03334](https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.03334) [hep-lat]].
- [77] N. Carrasco *et al.* [ETM Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 3, 034516 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.034516](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.92.034516) [[arXiv:1505.06639](https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.06639) [hep-lat]].
- [78] Z. Bai *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 21, 212001 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.212001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.212001) [[arXiv:1505.07863](https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.07863) [hep-lat]].
- [79] T. Blum *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 7, 074502 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.074502](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.91.074502) [[arXiv:1502.00263](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.00263) [hep-lat]].
- [80] A. Nicholson *et al.*, [[arXiv:1805.02634](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.02634) [nucl-th]].
- [81] S. Aoki *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 2, 112 (2017) [doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4509-7](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4509-7) [[arXiv:1607.00299](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.00299) [hep-lat]].
- [82] M. Hoferichter, J. Ruiz de Elvira, B. Kubis and U. G. Meißner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 092301 (2015) [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.092301](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.092301) [[arXiv:1506.04142](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.04142) [hep-ph]].