

Dark-matter induced neutron-antineutron oscillations

THEO BRUGEAT¹, CHRISTOPHER SMITH²

*Laboratoire de Physique Subatomique et de Cosmologie,
Université Grenoble-Alpes, CNRS/IN2P3, Grenoble INP, 38000 Grenoble, France.*

Abstract

If dark matter carries a baryon number of two, neutron-antineutron oscillations could require its presence to manifest themselves. If it is in addition very light, in the micro-eV range or up to a few orders of magnitude below, these oscillations could even exhibit a Rabi resonance. Though the magnetic tuning required to convert a macroscopic number of neutrons into antineutrons is not realistic, sizeable enhancements remain possible. Building on this observation, axionic realizations for this scenario are systematically analyzed. For true QCD axion models, we find that the Goldstone boson nature of the axion imposes the presence of axionless $n - \bar{n}$ mixing effects, either in vacuum or in decays, which are sufficiently constrained experimentally to leave no room for axion-induced oscillations. Thus, a generic scalar or axion-like dark matter background would have to exist to induce resonant $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations. Yet, if Nature has taken that path to relate dark matter and baryon number violation, the experimental signature would be striking and certainly worth pursuing.

¹ brugeat@lpsc.in2p3.fr

² chsmith@lpsc.in2p3.fr

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Baryonic axion models	4
3	Neutron mass eigenstates and standard basis	6
3.1	Two-component representation and Takagi’s factorization	7
3.2	Step-wise diagonalization in the general case	8
3.3	Approximate expressions and special cases	9
4	Electroweak neutron interactions in the standard basis	11
4.1	Magnetic and electric dipole moments	12
4.2	Weak interaction and beta decay	13
5	Axion derivative interactions and anomalies	14
5.1	Equations of motion and classical divergences	16
5.2	Anomalies and local terms	19
6	Axion-induced $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations	22
7	Conclusion	25
A	Appendices	27
A.1	Conventions	27
A.2	Explicit form of the mixing matrix	27
A.3	Triangle diagrams	28

1 Introduction

Among cosmological enigmas, the nature of dark matter and the origin of the baryonic asymmetry of the Universe stand out in the particle physics community. Answering them should be possible without departing too much from our current understanding of the microscopic world. After all, baryon number \mathcal{B} is only accidentally conserved in the Standard Model Lagrangian, and does not survive to quantization. At the same time, the extraordinary stability of the proton seems at odd with only an approximate conservation of baryon number. One way out here is that proton decay requires both baryon and lepton number \mathcal{L} to be broken by one unit. By contrast, the smallness of neutrino masses rather points towards a violation of \mathcal{L} by two units. It is then quite natural to imagine those are accompanied by $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ interactions, given that $\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{L}$ is anomaly free and could even be gauged in a grand unified context. This will be our first starting point. The second one is the observation that the dark matter and baryon relic densities could be magnitudes apart, but happen to be of the same order. Though we will not in any way attempt to construct a model explaining this possibly coincidental fact, we will use it as a motivation to entangle the two cosmological puzzles. In practice, our strategy to do that is to ask dark matter to have a baryon number of two, and then study the possible signatures of such a scenario.

At low-energy, neutron-antineutron oscillations are the hallmark of $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ interactions [1]. Let us recall their main features (see e.g. Refs. [2, 3] for reviews). Typically, some UV physics at the

scale $\Lambda_{\Delta B=2}$ induces six-quark effective interactions, whose hadronization collapses to Majorana mass terms for the neutron

$$\mathcal{L}_{free} = \bar{n}(i \not{\partial} - m)n - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(\bar{n}^C n + \bar{n}n^C). \quad (1)$$

Given their dimension-nine origin, we expect the mixing term to be tiny, $\varepsilon/m \sim (\Lambda_{QCD}/\Lambda_{\Delta B=2})^5 \sim 10^{-18}$ ($1 \text{ TeV}/\Lambda_{\Delta B=2}$)⁵ using $\Lambda_{QCD} \approx 300 \text{ MeV}$ [4]. In the non-relativistic limit, a two-state Schrodinger-like representation can be constructed, and a standard quantum mechanical calculation expresses the $n - \bar{n}$ oscillation probability as

$$P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t) = e^{-\Gamma t} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(\Delta E/2)^2 + \varepsilon^2} \sin^2 \left(\sqrt{(\Delta E/2)^2 + \varepsilon^2} t \right), \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta E = E_n - E_{n^C}$, and Γ is the neutron decay width. The CPT theorem predicts $m_n = m_{n^C}$, but even a minuscule magnetic field generates $\Delta E \gg \varepsilon$ because of the neutron magnetic moment $\mu(n) = -\mu(n^C) = -6.03 \times 10^{-2} \mu\text{eV/T}$ [5]. Experiments target the so-called quasi-free condition, with $\Delta E t \lesssim 1$. Efficient magnetic shielding is then required to allow t to reach about a second, in which case $P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}} \approx \varepsilon^2 t^2 \approx (t/\tau_{osc})^2$. The best limit is quite old [6,7], standing at $\tau_{osc} > 0.86 \times 10^8 \text{ s}$ using a flight-time of about 0.1 s , and translates as $\varepsilon < 0.8 \times 10^{-23} \text{ eV}$.

The starting point of the present analysis is to observe that if the mixing term oscillates,

$$\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon_0 \sin(\omega t), \quad (3)$$

then the oscillation probability becomes

$$P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t) = e^{-\Gamma t} \frac{\varepsilon_0^2}{((\omega - \Delta E)/2)^2 + \varepsilon_0^2} \sin^2 \left(\sqrt{((\omega - \Delta E)/2)^2 + \varepsilon_0^2} t \right). \quad (4)$$

The system exhibits a Rabi resonance [8] for a fixed magnetic field, when the energy difference matches the mixing term frequency. Compared to the much weaker enhancements achievable with oscillating magnetic fields [9,10], it could even in principle reach a maximal value of $1/2$, turning half the neutrons into antineutrons!

Such an extreme signal is not realistic though. To see this, let us imagine that $\omega = 1 \mu\text{eV}$, and that no external magnetic field is turned on (except the tiny ambient one). Then, $\omega \gg \Delta E$, and the quasifree condition would require way too short flight time. Instead, $P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t)$ oscillates in the GHz range. For the typical 0.1 s used to derive the limit for constant ε , it would average to $P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t \approx 0.1 \text{ s}) \approx \varepsilon_0^2/\omega^2$, which translates into the constraint $\varepsilon_0 \lesssim 10^{-15} \text{ eV}$, eight orders of magnitude weaker than for a constant $\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon_0$. If one could turn on an external magnetic field to get precisely at the Rabi resonance, then $P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t) \approx e^{-\Gamma t} \sin^2(\varepsilon_0 t)$. With ε_0 as large as 10^{-15} eV , the oscillation characteristic time is about a second, and a huge number of antineutrons would appear.

The issue though is how close to the resonance one could get. In principle, we need $\varepsilon_0 \gg \omega - \Delta E$, with ω several orders of magnitude greater than ε_0 . In practice, adjusting ΔE requires adjusting the magnetic field, and there is a limit to how precise this can be done. One way forward would be to repeat the analysis with a slowly varying or oscillating external magnetic field, but this would bring us too far afield. Keeping with the simple picture, the important point is that if we could (optimistically) adjust to a 10^{-6} precision the magnetic field, the oscillation probability would be enhanced by 10^{12} since $P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t \approx 0.1 \text{ s}) \approx \varepsilon_0^2/(\omega - \Delta E)^2$. So, even if we do not expect abundant

antineutrons to emerge from a neutron beam, there is ample room for improving the current best limit on the oscillatory scenario.

The next question is how could the mixing term depend on time. This is where we connect with our original motivation to entangle $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ interactions with dark matter. Indeed, if dark matter is made of scalar fields carrying $\mathcal{B} = -2$, then at the effective level, we can construct the coupling

$$\lambda\phi\bar{n}^C n . \quad (5)$$

Provided ϕ is stable and very light, the dark matter could be made of a coherent, classical mode $\phi(t) = \phi_0 \sin(m_\phi t)$. Neutron-antineutron oscillations would then resonate according to Eq. (4) with $\omega = m_\phi$ the scalar mass and $\varepsilon_0 = \phi_0\lambda$. Setting quite conservatively $\lambda \approx (\Lambda_{QCD}/\Lambda_{\Delta\mathcal{B}=2})^6$, and from $\phi_0 = \sqrt{2\rho_{DM}}/m_\phi$ with $\rho_{DM} = 0.4 \text{ GeV}/\text{cm}^3$ [11], the parameter ε_0 scales like

$$\varepsilon_0 = 10^{-18} \text{ eV} \left(\frac{1 \text{ TeV}}{\Lambda_{\Delta\mathcal{B}=2}} \right)^6 \left(\frac{1 \text{ } \mu\text{eV}}{m_\phi} \right) , \quad (6)$$

which should be within reach experimentally. Notice that the probability $P_{n\rightarrow\bar{n}}$ scales like m_ϕ^{-3} , so the accessible $\Lambda_{\Delta\mathcal{B}=2}$ scales increase with decreasing m_ϕ . This remains true until $\omega - \Delta E$ falls below about 10^{-15} eV , since then, with $\omega - \Delta E > \varepsilon_0$, one would recover a quasifree situation, with $P_{n\rightarrow\bar{n}} \approx \varepsilon_0^2 t^2$. Importantly though, this situation is achieved not thanks to a magnetic shielding to reduce ΔE , but rather by matching the magnetic field to the mass of the dark matter particle.

The possibility of having dark matter charged under \mathcal{B} is not new (see e.g. Ref. [12] and references there). With $\mathcal{B} = 2$, typical signature would come from $nn \rightarrow \text{invisibles}$, for which constraints have been obtained and will be improved in the future [13–16]. Typically though, the corresponding scale $\Lambda_{\Delta\mathcal{B}=2}$ must simply be above the TeV, compatible with Eq. (6). Let us stress that the dark-matter couplings we consider here are tiny, and become observable only by exploiting a possible resonant effect. The situation appears similar concerning possible limits from neutron stars [17–20]. Those are known to poorly probe $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations [21], but to strongly constrain a possible dark decay mode for the neutron [22–25]. This is a different signature, motivated by the dark matter interpretation of the persistent neutron lifetime anomaly [26], on which the present scenario does not add anything given the size of the coupling in Eq. (6) and the dark matter mass range considered. Though further investigations may prove neutron stars to be competitive also for $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ transitions, for the time being, the $n - \bar{n}$ signature discussed here appears more promising.

Now, in a spirit of minimality, it is tempting to identify this scalar field with the QCD axion. In that case, one would simultaneously solve the strong CP puzzle (see e.g. Ref. [27] for a short review), identify the nature of dark matter, and bring in some \mathcal{B} violation, opening new paths to explain the baryon asymmetry of the Universe. Coincidentally, given that $\mu(n) = -6.03 \times 10^{-2} \text{ } \mu\text{eV}/\text{T}$, the preferred axion mass range and the energy splitting achievable with realistic magnetic fields happen to overlap, so it is in principle possible to get to the Rabi resonance. The main goal for the present paper is thus to investigate whether the axion could induce resonant $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations.

Answering this question is more complicated than it seems. At first sight, being a pseudoscalar, the only possible couplings of the axion should be either

$$a\bar{n}^C\gamma^5 n \quad , \quad \partial_\mu a\bar{n}^C\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n . \quad (7)$$

Together with $\phi\bar{n}^C n$, these two close the set of possible $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ fermion bilinears since $\bar{n}^C\gamma^\mu n = \bar{n}^C\sigma^{\mu\nu} n = 0$. But a moment of thought shows that this cannot be the full story:

- The axion is a Goldstone boson. It must be possible to use the equivalence theorem to relate the two couplings in Eq. (7). Further, it must be possible to understand the derivative one, which is shift-symmetric, in terms of the PQ symmetry currents. But, realistic axion $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ couplings require first to merge the PQ symmetry with baryon number, in which case we would rather expect the axion to couple to the baryon number current, $\partial_\mu a \bar{n} \gamma^\mu n$. A first question is thus how is this coupling related to those in Eq. (7).
- Again because it is a Goldstone boson, the axion must actually couple through $(1 + ia/v + \dots)$ combinations, with v the PQ breaking scale. The axion couplings of Eq. (7) should thus be accompanied by $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ mass terms (breakings the conservation of the baryon number current), from which they are relatively suppressed by the large v scale. A way to evade this pattern must be found otherwise axion-induced neutron oscillations would always be surpassed by those in vacuum.
- Technically, the couplings in Eq. (7) upset the usual non-relativistic reduction to a Schrodinger-like equation for $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations. In the Dirac representation, γ^5 couples small and large spinor components, in contrast to ε in Eq. (1) which does not. This is immediately problematic for a $\bar{n}^C \gamma^5 n$ coupling, and raises questions about the use of the equation of motion to simplify the $\partial_\mu a \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n$ coupling.

Our analysis is organized as follows. In the next Section, we will start by presenting generic baryonic axion models, elucidating the role of the baryon number current. In Sec. 3, we tackle the diagonalization of fully general neutron mass terms, essentially following Refs. [28–30]. This is rather technical, but instrumental to quantify the impact of this diagonalization first on the electromagnetic and weak interactions of the neutron in Sec. 4, and then on the derivative interaction terms for the axion in Sec. 5. There, the anomalous nature of the diagonalization will also be explored, explaining how the parametrization equivalence between both couplings of Eq. (7) works in practice. With all this at hand, we will go back in Sec. 6 to the initial question of whether it is possible to induce $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations using the dark matter axion flux. We will find that though it is possible to turn off oscillations in vacuum, additional suppressions compared to Eq. (6) nevertheless occur. Observing axionic $n - \bar{n}$ oscillation at that level would be in conflict with resolving the strong CP puzzle, thus could only occur for axion-like particles. This is summarized in our Conclusions, along with perspectives and possible paths for further improvements.

2 Baryonic axion models

Axion models are constructed by first adding a complex scalar field ϕ , along with the $U(1)$ symmetry $\phi \rightarrow \exp(i\alpha)\phi$ called the Peccei-Quinn symmetry (PQ) [31, 32]. The next ingredients are first some $U(1)$ invariant couplings to colored fermions, ensuring the $U(1)$ symmetry becomes anomalous, and second, a spontaneous symmetry breaking inducing potential $V(\phi^\dagger\phi)$. With this, the axion is the associated Goldstone boson [33, 34], and it ends up coupled to $G_{\mu\nu}\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$, ensuring a resolution to the strong CP puzzle.

Since baryon number is a symmetry of the SM, it is often possible to add couplings of ϕ to some \mathcal{B} -charged combination of fields [35]. At the UV, to maintain renormalizability, this requires additional colored particles, e.g. diquarks, but we will not be concerned by the specifics (explicit examples of UV models are presented in Ref. [36]). The important point is that this unifies the $U(1)$ symmetry carried by ϕ with baryon number. Both sum up to a single resulting $U(1)$ that

gets spontaneously broken. In our case, we assume the specific \mathcal{B} -charged combination of fields to which ϕ couples forces it to carry $\mathcal{B} = -2$.

An effective representation for this construction at the low scale corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{eff} = & \partial_\mu \phi^\dagger \partial^\mu \phi + V(\phi^\dagger \phi) + \bar{n}(i \not{\partial} - m_D)n \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_L \phi \bar{n}_L^C n_L - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_L^* \phi^\dagger \bar{n}_L n_L^C - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_R \phi^\dagger m_R \bar{n}_R n_R^C - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_R^* \phi \bar{n}_R^C n_R . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Its only global $U(1)$ is baryon number, and ϕ breaks it spontaneously. Of course, $\varepsilon_{L,R}$ are not to be expected of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ since they encode all the heavy degrees of freedom required to effectively couple ϕ to six-quark states. Rather, if these new states have masses of $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda)$, then $\varepsilon_{L,R}$ should naively scale as $\Lambda_{\Delta\mathcal{B}=2}^{-6}$.

The spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) is assume to occur at some very high energy, so the true effective Lagrangian is obtained by expressing $\phi = (\sigma + v) \exp(ia/v)$ and integrating σ out. Setting $m_L = \varepsilon_L v$ and $m_R = \varepsilon_R v$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{eff} = & \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \bar{n}(i \not{\partial} - m_D)n \\ & - \frac{1}{2} m_L e^{ia/v} \bar{n}_L^C n_L - \frac{1}{2} m_L^* e^{-ia/v} \bar{n}_L n_L^C - \frac{1}{2} m_R e^{-ia/v} m_R \bar{n}_R n_R^C - \frac{1}{2} m_R^* e^{ia/v} \bar{n}_R^C n_R , \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

or in Dirac form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{eff} = & \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \bar{n}(i \not{\partial} - m_D)n \\ & - \frac{1}{2} m_S e^{ia/v} \bar{n}^C n - \frac{1}{2} m_S^* e^{-ia/v} \bar{n} n^C - \frac{1}{2} m_P e^{-ia/v} \bar{n} i \gamma^5 n^C - \frac{1}{2} m_P^* e^{ia/v} \bar{n}^C i \gamma^5 n , \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with

$$m_S = \frac{m_R^* + m_L}{2}, \quad m_P = i \frac{m_R - m_L^*}{2} . \quad (11)$$

Note well that the axion is still assumed to solve the strong CP puzzle. Alongside the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ sector, both DFSZ [37, 38] or KSVZ [39, 40] realizations can be added separately [36]. For example, adopting the latter approach, we could add to the above model a heavy colored fermion chirally coupled to ϕ . This would ensure the necessary $a G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$ coupling arises at the low scale.

At this stage, it is conventional to perform a fermionic reparametrization. Let us first recall how this proceeds in standard axion models. Those starts from Lagrangians of the type:

$$\mathcal{L}_{UV}^{chiral} = \partial_\mu \phi^\dagger \partial^\mu \phi + V(\phi^\dagger \phi) + \bar{\psi}(i \not{\partial})\psi + (y \phi \bar{\psi}_L \psi_R + h.c.) . \quad (12)$$

The PQ symmetry requires ψ_L and ψ_R to have different charges, so its defining characteristic is to be chiral, but it does not involve baryon or lepton number. After SSB and at low energy, plugging in $\phi \rightarrow v \exp(ia/v)$, the effective Lagrangian in the so-called exponential parametrization is, with $m_D = vy$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff}^{chiral} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \bar{\psi}(i \not{\partial})\psi + m_D \bar{\psi} \exp(i \gamma^5 a/v) \psi . \quad (13)$$

The fermion fields still transform under the PQ symmetry. The derivative representation of the axion Lagrangian is reached via the fermionic reparametrization $\psi \rightarrow \exp(i \gamma^5 a/2v) \psi$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff}^{chiral} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \bar{\psi}(i \not{\partial} - m_D)\psi + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2v} \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 \psi + \mathcal{L}_{Jac} . \quad (14)$$

Though not manifest in the Feynman rules, such a change of variable is allowed, as all observables have been proven to be identical [41, 42]. The terms in \mathcal{L}_{Jac} break the Goldstone boson shift symmetry

$$\mathcal{L}_{Jac} = \frac{a}{16\pi^2} \left(g_Y B_{\mu\nu} \tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} + g_L W_{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}^{\mu\nu} + g_G G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} \right), \quad (15)$$

where $g_{F,W,G}$ depend on the SM and PQ charges of the fermion field ψ . They arise since the PQ symmetry is, by construction, anomalous, and so is the reparametrization. The presence of these anomalous terms is important [43–45]: they ensure the whole theory stays anomaly-free. Indeed, in shifting from pseudoscalar to axial interactions, the axion to gauge-boson triangle graphs become anomalous. This piece is not physical, and precisely compensated by the local terms in \mathcal{L}_{Jac} .

Returning to the baryonic axion model of Eq. (10), we can remove entirely the axion from the Majorana mass terms via the purely baryonic reparametrization $n \rightarrow \exp(-ia/2v)n$, $n^C = \exp(ia/2v)n^C$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{eff} = & \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \bar{n}(i \not{\partial} - m_D)n + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2v} \bar{n} \gamma^\mu n \\ & - \frac{1}{2} m_L \bar{n}_L^C n_L - \frac{1}{2} m_L^* \bar{n}_L n_L^C - \frac{1}{2} m_R \bar{n}_R n_R^C - \frac{1}{2} m_R^* \bar{n}_R^C n_R + \mathcal{L}_{Jac}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

with

$$\mathcal{L}_{Jac} = -\frac{a}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} g^2 W_{\mu\nu}^i \tilde{W}^{i,\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g'^2 B_{\mu\nu} \tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} \right). \quad (17)$$

As in the chiral case, a derivative coupling appears to the associated symmetry current, which is now the usual baryon number current. The anomalous terms in \mathcal{L}_{Jac} have to be added since the baryon number $U(1)$ is anomalous. If $a \rightarrow W^+ W^-$ is calculated, the triangle graph from the derivative coupling $\partial_\mu a \bar{n} \gamma^\mu n$ has an anomaly that precisely cancel with the local interaction from \mathcal{L}_{Jac} , ensuring the whole process is anomaly-free and matches the result one would get using instead the Lagrangian in the exponential parametrization, Eq. (10).

3 Neutron mass eigenstates and standard basis

In the derivative representation, the axion leaves behind fully generic neutron mass terms. Indeed, a generic $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ free Lagrangian would take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{free} = & \bar{n}_R i \not{\partial} n_R + \bar{n}_L i \not{\partial} n_L - m_D \bar{n}_R n_L - m_D^* \bar{n}_L n_R \\ & - \frac{1}{2} m_L \bar{n}_L^C n_L - \frac{1}{2} m_L^* \bar{n}_L n_L^C - \frac{1}{2} m_R \bar{n}_R n_R^C - \frac{1}{2} m_R^* \bar{n}_R^C n_R. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In Dirac form, this corresponds to including scalar and pseudoscalar Dirac and Majorana mass terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{free} = & \bar{n}(i \not{\partial})n - \text{Re } m_D \bar{n}n - \text{Im } m_D \bar{n} i \gamma^5 n \\ & - \frac{1}{2} m_S \bar{n}^C n - \frac{1}{2} m_S^* \bar{n} n^C - \frac{1}{2} m_P \bar{n} i \gamma^5 n^C - \frac{1}{2} m_P^* \bar{n}^C i \gamma^5 n. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Notice that naively, the CP-conserving limit of Eq. (18) would prescribe $m_{D,L,R}$ to be real since $(\bar{n}_{R,L} n_{R,L}^C)^\dagger = \bar{n}_{R,L}^C n_{R,L}$, in which case m_S and m_D are real, but m_P is purely imaginary. The goal of the present section is to diagonalize these mass terms, or more precisely, to show that no matter the initial parameters, a change of basis always permits to reach

$$\mathcal{L}_{free} = \bar{n}(i \not{\partial})n - m \bar{n}n - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon (\bar{n}^C n + \bar{n} n^C), \quad (20)$$

for some real parameter m and ε . This is not a new result (see e.g. Ref. [28]), but we will need to set up this diagonalization procedure in details to study its impact on other sectors, and in particular on axion couplings.

3.1 Two-component representation and Takagi's factorization

To proceed, it is useful to switch to a two-component notation:

$$n = \begin{pmatrix} n_L = \xi_\alpha \\ n_R = \eta^{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{n} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{n}_R = \eta^{\dagger\alpha} & \bar{n}_L = \xi_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21a)$$

$$n^C = \begin{pmatrix} n_R^C = \eta_{\dot{\beta}}^\dagger \\ n_L^C = \xi^{\dagger\beta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{n}^C = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{n}_L^C = \xi^\beta & \bar{n}_R^C = \eta_{\dot{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21b)$$

Some details about our conventions are given in Appendix A.1 (also see e.g. Ref. [46] for a review). In terms of the η and ξ Weyl spinors, the Lagrangian written in matrix form is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \frac{1}{2} \left[\begin{pmatrix} \xi_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger & \eta_{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \cdot i(\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \partial_\mu \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \xi^\alpha & \eta^{\dagger\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \cdot i(\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \partial_\mu \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \\ \eta^{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \left[\begin{pmatrix} \xi^\alpha & \eta^{\dagger\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger & \eta_{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} m_L^* & m_D^* \\ m_D^* & m_R^* \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \\ \eta^{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \right]. \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

To reach this form, the kinetic terms are first split using $\bar{n}(i\not{\partial})n = \bar{n}^C(i\not{\partial})n^C$.

The four-component spinor made of ξ and η^\dagger is neither a Dirac state nor a Majorana state. However, being of the same chirality, those two Weyl spinors can mix into mass eigenstates. Specifically, the kinetic terms are invariant under ‘flavor’ $U(2)$ rotations in the space spanned by ξ_α and $\eta_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \xi'_\alpha \\ \eta_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\prime\dagger} \end{pmatrix} = U^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_{\dot{\alpha}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \\ \eta^{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\prime\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \\ \eta^{\prime\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} = U^T \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \\ \eta^{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

This can be used to bring the mass matrix to a diagonal form. If we explicitly write all the mass terms as modulus times phase,

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} m_L e^{i\phi_L} & m_D e^{i\phi_D} \\ m_D e^{i\phi_D} & m_R e^{i\phi_R} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow U^T \begin{pmatrix} m_L e^{i\phi_L} & m_D e^{i\phi_D} \\ m_D e^{i\phi_D} & m_R e^{i\phi_R} \end{pmatrix} U = \begin{pmatrix} m_- & 0 \\ 0 & m_+ \end{pmatrix} \equiv \Sigma, \quad (24)$$

where $m_{L,R,D} > 0$ and $m_\pm > 0$. From a parameter point of view, U has four parameters: one angle and three phases. Those permit to get rid of the three phases of M , along with a real parameter, leaving m_\pm as the two remaining real parameters [28].

This procedure is not a true diagonalization but rather a Takagi's factorization, which expresses a symmetric complex matrix M as $\Sigma = U^T M U$ with Σ diagonal and positive-definite and U unitary. This is a consequence of the singular-value decomposition $\Sigma = W^T M V$ with W and V unitary and Σ real diagonal and positive semidefinite. With in addition M symmetric, V and W at most differ by a diagonal matrix of phases, $V = W P^\dagger$, and defining either $U = V P^{-1/2}$ or $U = W P^{*-1/2}$ gives $\Sigma = U^T M U$, as announced.

The diagonal entries in Σ are the absolute values of the eigenvalues, equal to the positive square root of the (real) eigenvalues of $M^\dagger M$. When $\phi_{L,R,D} = 0$ and with $m_D \gg m_{L,R}$, these are

$$m_\pm = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{4m_D^2 + (m_L - m_R)^2} \pm (m_R + m_L) \right), \quad (25)$$

while the U matrix is then a simple $O(2)$ rotation of angle α with $\tan 2\alpha = -|m_L - m_R|/m_D$. For M complex, the eigenvalues can easily be worked out, but the expression of U is way more complicated because of the matrix of phases P discussed above. Our goal here is to construct explicitly a matrix U such that $\Sigma = U^T M U$ with Σ diagonal and positive-definite. A generic U matrix can be arranged into $U = U(\alpha, \sigma) \cdot P(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ with

$$U(\alpha, \sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & e^{-i\sigma} \sin \alpha \\ -e^{i\sigma} \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix}, \quad P(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi_1} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

We will also distinguish baryonic rephasing $P_B(\phi) = P(\phi/2, -\phi/2)$ and chiral rephasing $P_C(\phi) = P(\phi/2, \phi/2) = \exp(i\phi/2) \times \mathbf{1}$. Notice that $U(\alpha, \sigma) = P_B(-\sigma) \cdot U(\alpha, 0) \cdot P_B(\sigma)$, $\det U(\alpha, \sigma) = \det P_B(\phi) = 1$ but $\det P_C(\phi) = e^{i\phi}$. In practice, we will construct U in steps as a product of unitary matrices assuming the above decomposition, following essentially the procedure outlined in Ref. [29].

3.2 Step-wise diagonalization in the general case

As a first step, it is convenient to get rid of some phases using P_B and P_C transformations. First, since

$$\arg \det M = k\pi + \arctan \left(\frac{m_D^2 \sin 2\phi_D - m_L m_R \sin(\phi_R + \phi_L)}{m_D^2 \cos 2\phi_D - m_L m_R \cos(\phi_R + \phi_L)} \right) \equiv -2\zeta, \quad (27)$$

for some integer k , we perform a chiral rotation to put the mass matrix into the form

$$M \xrightarrow{P_C(\zeta)} \begin{pmatrix} m_L e^{i(\phi_L - \phi_D)} & m_D \\ m_D & m_R e^{i(\phi_R - \phi_D)} \end{pmatrix} e^{i\zeta + \phi_D}, \quad (28)$$

which it has a real positive determinant (when $m_D > m_{R,L}$). Since $\det \Sigma$ is also real positive, U must now be an $SU(2)$ matrix (up to its sign which is ambiguous), i.e., a combination of $U(\alpha, \sigma)$ and $P_B(\phi)$ only. We can also remove a further phase $\phi_\Delta = (\phi_R - \phi_L)/2$, leaving only the common phase $\phi_\Sigma = (\phi_R + \phi_L - 2\phi_D)/2$ as

$$M \xrightarrow{P_B(\phi_\Delta)} \begin{pmatrix} m_L e^{i\phi_\Sigma} & m_D \\ m_D & m_R e^{i\phi_\Sigma} \end{pmatrix} e^{i\zeta + \phi_D}. \quad (29)$$

In view of the mass terms, a good strategy is to perform yet another P_B rephasing to force $m_R^* - m_L$ or $m_R^* + m_L$ to be phase-free. Choosing the former, the target form is

$$M \xrightarrow{P_B(\beta)} \begin{pmatrix} m_L e^{i(\phi_\Sigma + \beta)} & m_D \\ m_D & m_R e^{i(\phi_\Sigma - \beta)} \end{pmatrix} e^{i\zeta + \phi_D} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_s e^{i\delta} - \varepsilon_p & m_D \\ m_D & \varepsilon_s e^{-i\delta} + \varepsilon_p \end{pmatrix} e^{i\zeta + \phi_D}, \quad (30)$$

with

$$\varepsilon_p = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{m_L^2 - 2m_L m_R \cos(2\phi_\Sigma) + m_R^2} = |m_P|, \quad \varepsilon_s = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{m_L^2 + 2m_L m_R \cos(2\phi_\Sigma) + m_R^2} = |m_S|. \quad (31)$$

To ensure that ε_p is positive, β must be taken in specific quadrants depending on that of ϕ_Σ , thereby fixing that of δ . If by definition $\arctan(x) \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, the compact representation

$$\beta = \frac{\pi}{2} s_{\phi_\Sigma} + \arctan \left(\frac{1}{\tan \phi_\Sigma} \frac{m_L - m_R}{m_L + m_R} \right), \quad \delta = \frac{\pi}{2} s_{2\phi_\Sigma} + \arctan \left(\frac{m_R^2 - m_L^2}{2m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma} \right), \quad (32)$$

ensures the correct signs with $s_\phi = \text{sign}(\sin \phi)$, whatever ϕ_Σ and the sign of $m_L - m_R$.

The interest of the form of Eq. (30) is that an $O(2)$ rotation $U(\alpha, 0)$ now permits to move ε_p to the Dirac mass terms, with $\tan 2\alpha = -\varepsilon_p/m_D$, with $\alpha \in [-\pi/4, 0]$ when ε_p is smaller than m_D . This rotation is the core of the diagonalization procedure; this is where states get mixed with their complex conjugate. In some sense, at the level of the neutron Dirac spinor, it can be viewed as a kind of Bogoliubov transformation [29]. It brings the mass matrix in the form

$$M \xrightarrow{U(\alpha, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_s \sqrt{1 - r_\alpha^2} e^{i\eta} & \sqrt{m_D^2 + \varepsilon_p^2 + i\varepsilon_s r_\alpha} \\ \sqrt{m_D^2 + \varepsilon_p^2 + i\varepsilon_s r_\alpha} & \varepsilon_s \sqrt{1 - r_\alpha^2} e^{-i\eta} \end{pmatrix} e^{i\zeta + \phi_D}, \quad \eta = \frac{\pi}{2} s_{2\phi_\Sigma} - \arctan\left(\frac{1}{\tan \delta \cos 2\alpha}\right), \quad (33)$$

with $r_\alpha = \sin \delta \sin 2\alpha$.

From here, only trivial transformations remain. The phase η can be removed with $P_{\mathcal{B}}(-\eta)$, leaving both identical diagonal and off-diagonal entries, and a 45° rotation suffices to reach

$$M \xrightarrow{P_{\mathcal{B}}(-\eta) \cdot U(\pi/4, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_s \sqrt{1 - r_\alpha^2} - \sqrt{m_D^2 + \varepsilon_p^2} - i\varepsilon_s r_\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon_s \sqrt{1 - r_\alpha^2} + \sqrt{m_D^2 + \varepsilon_p^2} + i\varepsilon_s r_\alpha \end{pmatrix} e^{i\zeta + \phi_D}. \quad (34)$$

Since ζ ensures that the mass matrix has unit determinant, the phases of both entries are equal and opposite, and can be eliminated with $P_{\mathcal{B}}(\gamma)$:

$$M \xrightarrow{P_{\mathcal{B}}(\gamma)} \begin{pmatrix} -m_- & 0 \\ 0 & m_+ \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma = -\frac{1}{2} \arctan\left(\frac{2r_\alpha \sqrt{1 - r_\alpha^2} \varepsilon_s^2}{m_D^2 + \varepsilon_p^2 - (1 - 2r_\alpha^2) \varepsilon_s^2}\right), \quad (35)$$

where

$$m_\pm = \sqrt{m_D^2 + \varepsilon_p^2 + \varepsilon_s^2 \pm 2\varepsilon_s \sqrt{m_D^2 + \varepsilon_p^2} \cos \delta}. \quad (36)$$

A final rephasing with $P(\pi/2, 0)$ makes the first entry positive. Alternatively, the *standard basis* relevant for neutron oscillation is reached by undoing the previous 45° rotation

$$M \xrightarrow{U(-\pi/4, 0)} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon & m \\ m & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix}, \quad m = \frac{m_+ + m_-}{2}, \quad \varepsilon = \frac{m_+ - m_-}{2} > 0. \quad (37)$$

3.3 Approximate expressions and special cases

Altogether, the transformation matrix can be expressed in various forms, for example as

$$U = P_{\mathcal{B}}(\beta + \phi_\Delta) \cdot U(\alpha, 0) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(-\eta) \cdot U(\pi/4, 0) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(\gamma) \cdot U(-\pi/4, 0) \cdot P_{\mathcal{C}}(\zeta) \quad (38a)$$

$$= P_{\mathcal{B}}(\phi_\Delta) \cdot U(\alpha, -\beta) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(\beta - \eta) \cdot U(\gamma/2, \pi/2) \cdot P_{\mathcal{C}}(\zeta). \quad (38b)$$

Notice that as constructed here, U depends on many parameters, yet only four should be sufficient since $U \in U(2)$. However, because of the complex dependencies on the initial mass matrix parameters, and of the non-linear composition rule for unitary matrices, there does not seem to be a simple way to express this redundancy analytically. To proceed, let us instead take the route of the mass expansion.

Numerically, given that $m_D \gg m_{L,R}$, some approximate expressions for U can be constructed. All but β and δ admit $1/m_D$ expansions:

$$\alpha = -\frac{\varepsilon_p}{2m_D} + \frac{\varepsilon_p^3}{6m_D^3} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-5}), \quad (39a)$$

$$\eta = \delta + \frac{m_R^2 - m_L^2}{8\varepsilon_s^2} \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2m_D^2} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-4}), \quad (39b)$$

$$\gamma = -\frac{2\varepsilon_s}{m_D} \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2m_D^2} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-5}), \quad (39c)$$

$$\zeta = -\phi_D + \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2m_D^2} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-4}). \quad (39d)$$

For completeness, the standard parameters in the mass matrix, Eq. (37), have the expansion

$$m = m_D + \frac{\varepsilon_p^2}{2m_D} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3}), \quad \varepsilon = \varepsilon_s - \frac{m_L^2 m_R^2 \sin^2(2\phi_\Sigma)}{8\varepsilon_s m_D^2} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3}). \quad (40)$$

Three observations can be made on the basis of these expansions.

First, γ starts at $\mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3})$. For all practical purpose, it can be set to zero. This simplifies the U matrix to

$$U = P_B(\phi_\Delta) \cdot U(\alpha, -\beta) \cdot P_B(\beta - \eta) \cdot P_C(\zeta) + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3}). \quad (41)$$

Notice how setting γ to zero removes both $\pi/4$ rotations in U . This is a first instance where one can see the special properties of the basis of Eq. (37), that will be apparent again when discussing current transformations.

Second, in view of the occurrence of $\sin 2\phi_\Sigma$ in all these expansions, both $\phi_\Sigma = 0 + k\pi$ and $\phi_\Sigma = \pi/2 + k\pi$ appear as interesting limiting cases. Setting $\phi_\Sigma = 0$ or $\pi/2$ makes $m_{L,R}$ purely real or imaginary, respectively (but for a global phase). Correspondingly, m_S is real and m_P imaginary for $\phi_\Sigma = 0$, and the opposite holds at $\phi_\Sigma = \pi/2$. These two situations correspond to interchanging ε_s and ε_p since (all angles given up to $k\pi$)

$\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow 0$	$\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow \pi/2$
$\beta \rightarrow 0$	$\beta \rightarrow \pi/2$
$\delta, \eta, \gamma \rightarrow 0, \zeta \rightarrow -\phi_D$	
$\varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon_s$	
$\varepsilon_s \rightarrow (m_L + m_R)/2$	$\varepsilon_s \rightarrow m_L - m_R /2$
$\varepsilon_p \rightarrow m_L - m_R /2$	$\varepsilon_p \rightarrow (m_L + m_R)/2$

Third, the two scenarios above are actually quite different. Technically, this is apparent if we now also send $m_L - m_R$ to zero. Care is needed to do that because not all the angles stay well-defined. This is reminiscent of the usual breakdown of the polar representation when the modulus of a complex number goes to zero. In practice, it shows up as poles in $1/\varepsilon_p$ for $\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow 0$, or $1/\varepsilon_s$ for $\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow \pi/2$, in

$$\sin \delta = \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2\varepsilon_p \varepsilon_s}, \quad \cos \delta = \frac{m_R^2 - m_L^2}{4\varepsilon_p \varepsilon_s}, \quad (42a)$$

$$\sin \beta = \frac{m_L + m_R}{2\varepsilon_p} \sin \phi_\Sigma, \quad \cos \beta = \frac{m_R - m_L}{2\varepsilon_p} \cos \phi_\Sigma. \quad (42b)$$

The combined limit $\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow 0$ together with $m_L - m_R \rightarrow 0$ can be made stable by writing the U matrix as

$$U = P_{\mathcal{B}}(\phi_\Delta) \cdot U(\alpha, -\beta) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(\beta - \delta) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(\delta - \eta) \cdot P_{\mathcal{C}}(\zeta) + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3}) . \quad (43)$$

Indeed, the combination $\eta - \delta$ is obviously regular, see Eq. (39), the combination $\beta - \delta$ satisfies

$$\sin(\beta - \delta) = \frac{m_R - m_L}{2\varepsilon_s} \sin \phi_\Sigma , \quad \cos(\beta - \delta) = \frac{m_R + m_L}{2\varepsilon_s} \cos \phi_\Sigma , \quad (44)$$

while the $1/\varepsilon_p$ pole cancels out in the product $e^{\pm i\beta} \sin \alpha$ occurring in the off-diagonal entries of $U(\alpha, -\beta)$. All in all, $P_{\mathcal{B}}(\beta - \delta)$, $P_{\mathcal{B}}(\delta - \eta)$, and $U(\alpha, -\beta)$ all become trivial when ϕ_Σ and $m_L - m_R$ go to zero (up to irrelevant global signs). This is expected since at that point, the mass matrix is immediately in the standard form of Eq. (37), so no rephasings nor Bogoliubov rotations are needed. In App. A.2, we show the explicit form of U , using the decomposition of Eq. (43).

The situation is not the same for $\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow \pi/2$ because ε_s defines the angle δ (and thus η) via the expression $\varepsilon_s e^{i\delta}$, see Eq. (30). Adjusting the relative speed at which $\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow \pi/2$ and $m_L \rightarrow m_R$, δ (or η) can take any value one wishes. One may think this is an artifact of the parametrization and that it should be possible to somehow interchange ε_p and ε_s , but this is not so. These two parameters do not play symmetrical roles, as is most evident the expansion of the mixing term ε , Eq. (40). This shows that actually, $\phi_\Sigma = \pi/2$ and $m_L = m_R$ is very special [29]: it is the only point in parameter space where $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, that is, where an effective baryon number is restored (besides the trivial $m_L = m_R = 0$). This is the point where the mass matrix takes the form, with $\bar{m} \equiv m_L = m_R$:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} i\bar{m} & m_D \\ m_D & i\bar{m} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (45)$$

which is diagonalized by $U = U(\alpha, \pi/2)$ with $\tan 2\alpha = \bar{m}/m_D$. The parameter $\varepsilon = 0$ because the two eigenvalues are identical, as trivially follows from $M^\dagger M = (m_D^2 + \bar{m}^2)\mathbf{1}$. Physically, this means that the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{free} = \bar{n}(i\partial)n - m_D \bar{n}n + \frac{1}{2} \bar{m}(\bar{n}i\gamma^5 n^C + \bar{n}^C i\gamma^5 n) , \quad (46)$$

actually do not induce any $\Delta\mathcal{B}$ effects, being equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L}_{free} = \bar{n}(i\partial)n - \sqrt{m_D^2 + \bar{m}^2} \bar{n}n . \quad (47)$$

We will see in the following that though $\Delta\mathcal{B} \rightarrow 0$ in the free Lagrangian, some imprints of $U(\alpha, \pi/2)$ can remain in several other sectors which develop $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ components.

4 Electroweak neutron interactions in the standard basis

In the SM, the neutron has two main electroweak interactions: the magnetic moment and weak β decay. The associated observables are crucial to define the CP-conserving spinor basis, and to differentiate neutrons from antineutrons. At the same time, these interactions are not preserved under the diagonalization of the mass term, so it is important to understand how the two play together.

4.1 Magnetic and electric dipole moments

Let us first consider the electromagnetic couplings

$$\mathcal{L}_{em} = -\frac{\mu}{4}\bar{n}_R\sigma^{\mu\nu}n_L F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\mu^*}{4}\bar{n}_L\sigma^{\mu\nu}n_R F_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{\text{Re}\mu}{2}\bar{n}\sigma^{\mu\nu}n F_{\mu\nu} + i\frac{\text{Im}\mu}{2}\bar{n}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\gamma^5 n F_{\mu\nu}, \quad (48)$$

where we identify the neutron anomalous magnetic moment a_n (MDM) and electric dipole moment d_n (EDM) as

$$\text{Re}\mu = \frac{ea_n}{2m_D}, \quad d_n = \text{Im}\mu. \quad (49)$$

The quark model gives $a_n = -2$, in fairly good agreement with the measured $a_n \approx -1.913$ [5]. On the other hand, d_n is experimentally tiny, $d_n < 1.8 \times 10^{-26}$ ecm [47].

Written in terms of Weyl spinors, \mathcal{L}_{em} takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{em} = \frac{F_{\mu\nu}}{2} \left[\begin{aligned} & \left(\begin{array}{cc} \xi^\alpha & \eta^{\dagger\alpha} \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \mu (\sigma^{\mu\nu})_\alpha{}^\beta \left(\begin{array}{c} \xi_\beta \\ \eta_\beta^\dagger \end{array} \right) \\ & - \left(\begin{array}{cc} \xi_\alpha^\dagger & \eta_{\dot{\alpha}} \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \mu^* (\bar{\sigma}^{\mu\nu})^{\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\dot{\beta}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \xi^{\dagger\dot{\beta}} \\ \eta^{\dot{\beta}} \end{array} \right) \end{aligned} \right]. \quad (50)$$

The antisymmetry in flavor space means that the magnetic moment transforms in a very simple way under $U(2)$:

$$\mu \rightarrow \mu' = \mu \det(U) = \mu e^{i\zeta}, \quad (51)$$

with ζ given in Eq. (27) and its expansion in Eq. (39). Thus, only the chiral part of the $U(2)$ transformation contributes, while neither the baryonic rephasing nor the Bogoliubov rotation affect the electromagnetic couplings. If only the Dirac mass term has a phase, then $\zeta = -\phi_D$ and we recover the well-known fact that eliminating a pseudoscalar mass term via a chiral rotation redefines the splitting between MDM and EDM (see e.g. the discussion in Ref. [48] and references there). In view of this, conventionally, the phase of μ is chosen such that no EDM arises in the basis in which the Dirac mass term is real. Thus, we set

$$\mu = |\mu| e^{i\phi_D}.$$

As a result, under the action of U , the shift is $\mu \rightarrow \mu' = |\mu| \exp(i(\zeta + \phi_D))$. The change in a_n is then driven by that of $m_D \rightarrow m$ with m in Eq. (37), with the result

$$a'_n = \frac{2m}{e} |\mu| \cos(\zeta + \phi_D) = a_n \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon_p^2}{2m_D^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3}), \quad (52a)$$

$$d'_n = |\mu| \sin(\zeta + \phi_D) = |\mu| \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2m_D^2} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3}) \approx \frac{ea_n}{2m_D} \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2m_D^2}. \quad (52b)$$

If we assume $m_L \approx m_R$ and $\phi_\Sigma \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, then the current bound on d_n implies $m_{L,R}/m_D \lesssim 10^{-6}$, far less constraining than the bound derived from neutron-antineutron oscillations, $\varepsilon \sim m_{L,R} < 0.80 \times 10^{-23}$ eV.

4.2 Weak interaction and beta decay

At the level of the proton and neutron, the weak interaction vertex is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{weak} &= \frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}}V_{ud}\{\bar{p}\gamma^\mu(g_V + g_A\gamma_5)n\}W_\mu^+ + h.c. \\ &= \frac{g}{4\sqrt{2}}V_{ud}\{\bar{p}\gamma^\mu(g_V + g_A\gamma_5)n - \bar{n}^C\gamma^\mu(g_V - g_A\gamma_5)p^C\}W_\mu^+ + h.c. ,\end{aligned}\quad (53)$$

where g is the weak gauge coupling, V_{ud} is the CKM matrix element, g_V and g_A are the vector and axial vector form-factors for which we neglect the momentum dependence. Because of the conserved vector current hypothesis (or QED current conservation), g_V stays very close to one even at the hadronic level, but g_A receives large corrections. Experimentally, $\lambda = g_A/g_V = -1.2756(13)$ [5]. This assumes $g_{A,V}$ are real, as is the case in the SM. If they are not, their relative phase can be extracted from a specific T-odd triple correlation in the decay of polarized neutrons. Current experimental searches sum up to $\arg g_A/g_V = 180.017(26)^\circ$, compatible with π [5].

The U transformation acts differently on n_R and n_L , and thus affects λ and its phase. Given Eq. (21) and Eq. (23), we have

$$n = \begin{pmatrix} n_L = \xi_\alpha \\ n_R = \eta^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow n' = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}^*\xi_\alpha + U_{21}^*\eta^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \\ U_{12}\xi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} + U_{22}\eta^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}^*n_L + U_{21}^*n_R^C \\ U_{12}n_L^C + U_{22}n_R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (54a)$$

$$n^C = \begin{pmatrix} n_R^C = \eta_\beta^\dagger \\ n_L^C = \xi^{\dagger\dot{\beta}} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow n'^C = \begin{pmatrix} U_{12}^*\xi_\beta + U_{22}^*\eta_\beta^\dagger \\ U_{11}\xi^{\dagger\dot{\beta}} + U_{21}\eta^{\dagger\dot{\beta}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{12}^*n_L + U_{22}^*n_R^C \\ U_{11}n_L^C + U_{21}n_R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (54b)$$

which can be written as

$$n \rightarrow n' = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}^* & 0 \\ 0 & U_{22} \end{pmatrix} n + \begin{pmatrix} U_{21}^* & 0 \\ 0 & U_{12} \end{pmatrix} n^C = \begin{pmatrix} \det U^* & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} (U_{22}n + U_{12}\gamma^5 n^C), \quad (55a)$$

$$n^C \rightarrow n'^C = \begin{pmatrix} U_{22}^* & 0 \\ 0 & U_{11} \end{pmatrix} n^C + \begin{pmatrix} U_{12}^* & 0 \\ 0 & U_{21} \end{pmatrix} n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \det U \end{pmatrix} (U_{22}^*n^C - U_{12}^*\gamma^5 n), \quad (55b)$$

since for a 2×2 unitary matrix, $U_{11} = U_{22}^* \det U$ and $U_{12} = -U_{21}^* \det U$. The weak vertices in the standard basis are then obtained by substituting these expressions in Eq. (53). Thus, only $\det U$ can affect the phase of λ since a pure baryonic rephasing, $P_{\mathcal{B}}(\phi)$, only enters in U_{22} and can always be compensated by a corresponding baryonic rephasing of the proton (both have $\mathcal{B} = 1$). By contrast, the chiral rephasing tuned by $\det U$ cannot be compensated if the proton already has its usual real Dirac mass term. The n^C component of n is tuned by U_{12} , which is always suppressed by $m_{L,R}/m_D$. The presence of γ_5 is important though. It comes from the Bogoliubov-like rotation $U = U(\alpha, 0)$, for which

$$n \rightarrow n' = n \cos \alpha + \gamma^5 n^C \sin \alpha, \quad n^C \rightarrow n'^C = n^C \cos \alpha - \gamma^5 n \sin \alpha. \quad (56)$$

This shows that g_V and g_A get mixed under $U(\alpha, 0)$. This will be particularly relevant when discussing anomalies in Sec. 5.2.

Let us be more explicit and calculate the variation of λ . We can write

$$\bar{p}\gamma^\mu(g_V + g_A\gamma_5)n \rightarrow |U_{22}| \bar{p}\gamma^\mu(\det U^*(g_V - g_A)P_L + (g_V + g_A)P_R)n + \dots, \quad (57)$$

which amounts to

$$\begin{pmatrix} g_V \\ g_A \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}|U_{22}^*| \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \det U^* & 1 - \det U^* \\ 1 - \det U^* & 1 + \det U^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g_V \\ g_A \end{pmatrix}. \quad (58)$$

Thus, the ratio $\lambda = g_A/g_V$ for neutron mass eigenstates (or equivalently for neutron fields in the standard basis) is different than for weak interaction eigenstates. It is given by

$$\arg \lambda = \arg \frac{g_A}{g_V} \rightarrow \arctan \left(\frac{\lambda^2 - 1}{2\lambda} \operatorname{Im} \det U^* \right). \quad (59)$$

Phenomenologically, this effect is totally irrelevant given the expected size of $m_{L,R}/m_D$. The interesting point here is rather conceptual: CP-violation is again tuned entirely by the chiral phase extracted via $\det U$. Majorana phases do not contribute¹, as could have been expected since this observable is again $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 0$.

In practice, even if $\operatorname{Im} \det U$ was much larger, it would be difficult to observe this effect. Neutrons would have to be produced somehow, say via strong interaction processes. If we model those by some pion exchanges, starting from $\{\bar{p}\gamma^5 n\}\pi$ vertices, the same substitution as in Eq. (55) must be done. Moving to the standard neutron basis also creates $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ strong interaction effects. So, a pure neutron beam would be difficult to isolate.

In this respect, let us stress that even in a scenario in which $\varepsilon = 0$, some $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ effects can remain because the strong and weak vertices depend on the whole U matrix. In other words, if one is looking for antineutrons in a neutral beam obtained from some nuclear reactions, there will be some antineutron pollution in the beam due to the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ strong interactions, and some of the neutrons will decay to antiprotons due to the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ weak vertices. Of course, this is not truly an oscillation, and it does not depend on time or energy, but it must in principle be taken into account.

Let us illustrate this in the $\varepsilon = 0$ scenario, assuming phases cancel out leaving just $U = U(\alpha, 0)$ with $\tan 2\alpha = -\bar{m}/m_D$, $\bar{m} = m_L = m_R$. In some sense, the wrong \mathcal{B} state pollution at production and decay is maximal in this case. At production, the neutral beam is made of the n' states of Eq. (56). This state is a mass eigenstate that propagates and then decays, with its true neutron and antineutron components producing $n \rightarrow \cos \alpha |pe^- \nu\rangle + \sin \alpha |\bar{p}e^+ \nu\rangle$ and $n^C = |\bar{p}e^+ \nu\rangle \cos \alpha - \sin \alpha |pe^- \nu\rangle$. Thus, we have a probability $\sin^2(2\alpha)$ of detecting a positron even without any $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations. Notice that this effect disappears in the opposite limit in which ε is maximal but $\varepsilon_p = 0$, and thus $\alpha = 0$. This arises for $m_L = m_R$ with $\phi_\Sigma = 0$, that is, when the neutrons are from the start in the standard basis and U is trivial, so neither the strong nor the weak vertex have $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ components.

5 Axion derivative interactions and anomalies

Whether through reparametrization or directly from some UV models, there may be a series of derivative couplings to neutron pairs. In full generality, four such currents can be constructed:

$$\mathcal{L}_{der} = \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2v} \left(\eta_V \bar{n} \gamma^\mu n + \eta_A \bar{n} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n + \lambda_A \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n + \lambda_A^* \bar{n} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n^C \right), \quad (60)$$

¹It would be interesting at this stage to calculate CP-violation in $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations, following Ref. [49]. We leave that for future studies.

which can be split into

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{der} = & \frac{\partial_\mu a}{4v} \eta_V (\bar{n}_L \gamma^\mu n_L - \bar{n}_L^C \gamma^\mu n_L^C + \bar{n}_R \gamma^\mu n_R - \bar{n}_R^C \gamma^\mu n_R^C) \\
& + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{4v} \eta_A (\bar{n}_R \gamma^\mu n_R - \bar{n}_R^C \gamma^\mu n_R^C - \bar{n}_L \gamma^\mu n_L + \bar{n}_L^C \gamma^\mu n_L^C) \\
& + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2v} (\lambda_A (\bar{n}_L^C \gamma^\mu n_R - \bar{n}_R^C \gamma^\mu n_L) + \lambda_A^* (\bar{n}_R \gamma^\mu n_L^C - \bar{n}_L \gamma^\mu n_R^C)) .
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

There is no $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ vector current because of Eq. (111), which translates as $\bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu n = -\bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu n$ and $\bar{n} \gamma^\mu n^C = -\bar{n} \gamma^\mu n^C$. Switching to a two-component notation, identifying chiral states with the corresponding Weyl spinor, Eq. (21), these couplings can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{der} = \frac{\partial_\mu a}{4v} \eta^m J_m^\mu, \quad J_m^\mu = \begin{pmatrix} \xi^\alpha & \eta^{\dagger\alpha} \\ & \eta^{\dot{\beta}} \end{pmatrix} \cdot (\sigma^m) \cdot (\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}, \tag{62}$$

where $\eta_0 = \eta_A$ tunes the axial current, $\eta_1 = 2 \text{Re } \lambda_A$ and $\eta_2 = -2 \text{Im } \lambda_A$ tune the CP-conserving and CP-violating parts of the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial current, and $\eta_3 = -\eta_V$ tunes the baryon number vector current. Summation over the Latin index $m = 0, 1, 2, 3$ is Euclidian, so $\eta_m = \eta^m$.

The basis of currents is complete in the sense that the full hermitian basis made of Pauli matrices is present. Given the spinor involved and Eq. (23), the action of U is not the same as on the mass matrix, but rather

$$\eta_m \sigma^m \rightarrow \eta'_m \sigma^m = U^T \eta_m \sigma^m U^*, \tag{63}$$

so that $\eta^m J_m^\mu = \eta'^m J_m^\mu$, with J_m^μ expressed as in Eq. (62) but in terms of ξ', η' . Unitarity of U implies that $\eta'_0 = \eta_0$ and $\vec{\eta}'^2 = \vec{\eta}^2$, $\vec{\eta}' = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3)$. Thus, the vector and $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial currents get mixed, but the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 0$ axial current is totally unaffected by the diagonalization of the mass matrix. This makes sense since that current is intrinsically $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 0$, while the vector current is actually the baryon number current. Said differently, the chiral rotation required to make the Dirac mass term real relies on the axial symmetry, which is preserved by these currents (up to anomalies, see later).

Here, it is important to define U with respect to the standard basis in Eq. (37), and not the basis in which the mass matrix is diagonal. Indeed, it is only in the former basis that the transformation of the currents make sense from the point of view of the CP symmetry. The reason is essentially that $U \rightarrow 1$ when α and all the phases go to zero only in the basis of Eq. (37). By contrast, denoting U_{diag} that diagonalizing the mass matrix, we have $U_{diag} \rightarrow U(\pi/4, 0)$ in that same limit. For neutrons, it makes sense to keep the states as close as possible to Dirac states. Indeed, if one thinks in terms of the non-relativistic expansion, it is the real Dirac mass term that defines the basis from which one can identify e.g. the CP-violating EDM term.

The action of U on the four-component coefficients η_m , Eq. (63), reduces to that of an orthogonal rotation on its vector components,

$$\vec{\eta} \rightarrow \vec{\eta}' = \mathcal{R}(U) \cdot \vec{\eta}, \tag{64}$$

with

$$\mathcal{R}(U) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_\gamma & -s_\gamma \\ 0 & s_\gamma & c_\gamma \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_\eta & -s_\eta & 0 \\ s_\eta & c_\eta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{2\alpha} & 0 & s_{2\alpha} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{2\alpha} & 0 & c_{2\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{\beta+\phi_\Delta} & s_{\beta+\phi_\Delta} & 0 \\ -s_{\beta+\phi_\Delta} & c_{\beta+\phi_\Delta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{65}$$

where $c_\delta, s_\delta \equiv \cos \delta, \sin \delta$. It is quite remarkable that the full-fledged unitary transformation collapses to this orthogonal form, in terms of the same angles as defined in the diagonalization procedure. Further, these angles here have simple interpretations, with $\beta + \phi_\Delta$ and η inducing CP-violating mixings between the two $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial current, α mixing the CP-conserving vector and $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial currents, and γ mixing the CP-conserving vector and CP-violating $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial current. Actually, this last rotation is equivalent to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_\gamma & -s_\gamma \\ 0 & s_\gamma & c_\gamma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{\pi/2} & 0 & -s_{\pi/2} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s_{\pi/2} & 0 & c_{\pi/2} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_\gamma & s_\gamma & 0 \\ -s_\gamma & c_\gamma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{\pi/2} & 0 & s_{\pi/2} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{\pi/2} & 0 & c_{\pi/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (66)$$

which corresponds to the $\pi/4$ and $-\pi/4$ rotations in U , see Eq. (38). In this form, the baryonic rephasing $P_B(\phi)$ always act on the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ subspace, while $U(\phi, 0)$ rotations always mix the CP-conserving currents only. Notice that in the CP-conserving limit, all that remain is the angle α that mixes η_1 and η_3 , but leaves the CP-violating η_2 untouched. Any mixing into η_2 requires CP-violation, and this violation is parametrically independent of the chiral phase relevant for the EDM term or beta decay, since $\arg \det U$ cancels out here, see Eq. (63).

The explicit expression of $\mathcal{R}(U)$ in terms of the original parameters of the mass matrix is:

$$\mathcal{R}(U) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{m_L \cos \phi_L + m_R \cos \phi_R}{2\varepsilon_s} & \frac{m_R \sin \phi_R - m_L \sin \phi_L}{2\varepsilon_s} & \frac{m_L^2 - m_R^2}{4m_D \varepsilon_s} \\ \frac{m_L \sin \phi_L - m_R \sin \phi_R}{2\varepsilon_s} & \frac{m_L \cos \phi_L + m_R \cos \phi_R}{2\varepsilon_s} & -\frac{m_R m_L \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2m_D \varepsilon_s} \\ \frac{m_R \cos \phi_R - m_L \cos \phi_L}{2m_D} & \frac{m_R \sin \phi_R + m_L \sin \phi_L}{2m_D} & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2}), \quad (67)$$

for $\phi_D = 0$ (for $\phi_D \neq 0$, simply replace $\phi_{L,R} \rightarrow \phi_{L,R} - \phi_D$). One can check that $\mathcal{R}(U)^T \cdot \mathcal{R}(U) = \mathcal{R}(U) \cdot \mathcal{R}(U)^T = 1$, up to terms of $\mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2})$. This form shows that the mismatch in the m_L and m_R phases is the source of an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ reorganization between CP-conserving and CP-violating component of the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial currents. This is the equivalent in the $\Delta\mathcal{B}$ sector of how the MDM and EDM get reorganized when the Dirac mass term is made real. As such, it is worth noting that they are much larger than the CP-violating $\det U$ term, which is $\mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2})$, see Eq. (39). By contrast, any mixing between the vector current and the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial current requires a Bogoliubov rotation, and is thus necessarily of $\mathcal{O}(m_D^{-1})$.

5.1 Equations of motion and classical divergences

The most general derivative interactions of a scalar field with Weyl fermion in Eq. (62) can be written in a symmetric way as

$$\mathcal{L}_{der} = \frac{\partial_\mu a}{4v} \eta_m \left[\left(\xi^\alpha \quad \eta^{\dagger\alpha} \right) \cdot \sigma^m \cdot (\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta} \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dagger\beta} \\ \eta^\beta \end{pmatrix} - \left(\xi_\beta^\dagger \quad \eta_\beta \right) \cdot \sigma^{mT} \cdot (\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\beta\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_\alpha^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \right], \quad (68)$$

using $\eta_{\dot{\alpha}} (\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \xi_\alpha = -\xi^\alpha (\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \eta^{\dot{\alpha}}$ and similar. Remember that η_m gives the specific couplings of the a field to the axial, vector, CP-violating and CP-conserving $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial currents. In the presence of several scalar fields, summation is understood. Integrating by part, the derivative is made to act on the fermion fields. At that stage, assuming them on-shell, the Weyl equation of motion simplifies the coupling to combinations of scalar and pseudoscalar couplings.

Specifically, using identities like $\xi_\alpha^\dagger (\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \partial_\mu \xi_\alpha = \xi^\alpha (\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \partial_\mu \xi^{\dot{\alpha}}$ up to a total derivative, the four free equations of motion (EoM) are

$$i(\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \partial_\mu \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dot{\alpha}} \\ \eta^{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_\alpha^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad i(\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \partial_\mu \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_\alpha^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m_L^* & m_D^* \\ m_D^* & m_R^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dot{\alpha}} \\ \eta^{\dot{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (69)$$

the derivative interactions collapses to pseudoscalar and scalar interactions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{der} = & i \frac{a}{4v} \eta_m \begin{pmatrix} \xi^\alpha & \eta^{\dagger\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left\{ \sigma^m \cdot \begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} \cdot \sigma^{mT} \right\} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\alpha \\ \eta_\alpha^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \\ & - i \frac{a}{4v} \eta_m \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\beta^\dagger & \eta_\beta \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} m_L^* & m_D^* \\ m_D^* & m_R^* \end{pmatrix} \cdot \sigma^m + \sigma^{mT} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} m_L^* & m_D^* \\ m_D^* & m_R^* \end{pmatrix} \right\} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \xi^{\dagger\beta} \\ \eta^{\dot{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Notice that this form is compatible with the diagonalization procedure, in the sense that using Eqs. (23) and (63),

$$\mathcal{L}_{der} = i \frac{a}{4v} \eta'_m \begin{pmatrix} \xi'^\alpha & \eta'^{\dagger\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \left\{ \sigma^m \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon & m \\ m & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon & m \\ m & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \cdot \sigma^{mT} \right\} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \xi'_\alpha \\ \eta'^{\dagger\alpha} \end{pmatrix} + h.c., \quad (71)$$

where $\eta'_0 = \eta_0$, $\vec{\eta}' = \mathcal{R}(U) \cdot \vec{\eta}$ and the primed spinors are those in the standard basis (37).

5.1.1 Axial current

For the axial current, setting $\eta_m \sigma^m = \eta_0 \sigma^0$ the induced couplings are obtained from \mathcal{L}_{free} , Eq. (18), by shifting

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \left(1 + i \frac{a}{2v}\right) \eta_0 \begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix}. \quad (72)$$

With $\eta_0 = 1$, this is consistent with the chiral couplings

$$\mathcal{L}_{chiral} = \bar{n}(i \not{\partial})n - m_D e^{ia/v} \bar{n}_R n_L - \frac{1}{2} m_L e^{ia/v} \bar{n}_L^C n_L - \frac{1}{2} m_R e^{ia/v} \bar{n}_R n_R^C + h.c., \quad (73)$$

expanded to linear order in the scalar field a . This is expected on the basis of the usual Ward identity $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 2imP$ with $A^\mu = \bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n$ and $P = \bar{n}\gamma^5 n$, generalized to account for the presence of Majorana mass terms as (for m_D real):

$$\partial_\mu (\bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n) \stackrel{\text{classical}}{=} 2im_D \bar{n}\gamma^5 n + m_S^* \bar{n} i\gamma^5 n^C + m_S \bar{n}^C i\gamma^5 n - m_P^* \bar{n}^C n - m_P \bar{n} n^C, \quad (74)$$

with $m_{S,P}$ defined in Eq. (11). This last equation can also be checked directly using the EoM for the four Dirac fields n , n^C , \bar{n} , and \bar{n}^C . Notice also that the scalar field decouples if it becomes constant, $a(x) \rightarrow a_0$. This is manifest in the derivative representation, and can be reproduced in the \mathcal{L}_p representation via the constant chiral rotation $n_L \rightarrow n_L e^{ia_0/2v}$, $n_R \rightarrow n_R e^{-ia_0/2v}$.

5.1.2 Vector current

Similarly, for the vector current $\eta_m \sigma^m = \eta_3 \sigma^3$, the induced couplings are obtained from \mathcal{L}_{free} , Eq. (18), by shifting

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} + \left(1 + i \frac{a}{2v}\right) \eta_3 \begin{pmatrix} m_L & 0 \\ 0 & m_R \end{pmatrix}. \quad (75)$$

To leading order in a with $\eta_3 = 1$, this corresponds to the baryonic couplings

$$\mathcal{L}_{baryonic} = \bar{n}(i \not{\partial})n - m_D \bar{n}_R n_L - \frac{1}{2} m_L e^{ia/v} \bar{n}_L^C n_L - \frac{1}{2} m_R e^{-ia/v} \bar{n}_R n_R^C + h.c. . \quad (76)$$

Again, the decoupling in the limit $a(x) \rightarrow a_0$ is consistent since a_0 can be removed by the baryonic rephasing $n_{L,R} \rightarrow n_{L,R} e^{ia_0/2v}$. Also, the use of the EoM corresponds to the classical Ward identity $\partial_\mu V^\mu = 0$ with $V^\mu = \bar{n} \gamma^\mu n$ generalized to

$$\partial_\mu (\bar{n} \gamma^\mu n) \stackrel{\text{classical}}{=} i m_S \bar{n}^C n - m_S^* i \bar{n} n^C + m_P \bar{n} \gamma^5 n^C - m_P^* \bar{n}^C \gamma^5 n . \quad (77)$$

5.1.3 $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ currents

The situation is significantly different for the two $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ currents. Setting $\eta_\nu \sigma^\nu = \eta_1 \sigma^1 + \eta_2 \sigma^2$, their divergences are

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} m_L & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix} + i \frac{a}{4v} (\eta_1 + i\eta_2) \begin{pmatrix} 2m_D & m_L \\ m_L & 2m_D \end{pmatrix} + i \frac{a}{4v} (\eta_1 - i\eta_2) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_R \\ m_R & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (78)$$

The scalar field couplings are no longer aligned with the mass terms. With Dirac and Majorana mass terms getting mixed up, this cannot correspond to the linearized version of a simple exponential representation. This is expected since from the point of view of the possible $U(1)$ symmetries, either one rotates n_L and n_R by the same phase, or by opposite phases. This then fixes the rotations of all the other fields via the definition $n_{L,R}^C = C \bar{n}_{L,R}^T$. These two rephasings correspond to the chiral and baryonic rephasing, leaving no more room for an extra $U(1)$. The same is visible in the Weyl representation, where ξ and η can either be rotated by the same phase or opposite phases.

By contrast, the transformations associated to η_1 and η_2 directly affects the very definitions of C since they correspond to mixing states with their complex conjugate. Infinitesimally, they act e.g. as $n_{L,R}^C = C \bar{n}_{L,R}^T + \chi_{L,R} n_{R,L} + \mathcal{O}(\chi_{L,R}^2)$, $\bar{n}_{L,R}^C = -n_{L,R}^T C^\dagger - \xi_{R,L} \bar{n}_{R,L} + \mathcal{O}(\xi_{R,L}^2)$, with $\chi_{L,R}, \xi_{R,L} \sim a/v$ up to phases. This corresponds to the classical equations (for m_D real)

$$\partial_\mu (\bar{n} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n^C + \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n) \stackrel{\text{classical}}{=} 2i m_D (\bar{n}^C \gamma^5 n + \bar{n} \gamma^5 n^C) + 4i \text{Re} m_S \bar{n} \gamma^5 n - 4 \text{Re} m_P \bar{n} n , \quad (79a)$$

$$i \partial_\mu (\bar{n} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n^C - \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n) \stackrel{\text{classical}}{=} 2m_D (\bar{n}^C \gamma^5 n - \bar{n} \gamma^5 n^C) - 4i \text{Im} m_S \bar{n} \gamma^5 n - 4 \text{Im} m_P \bar{n} n . \quad (79b)$$

The decoupling in the $a(x) \rightarrow a_0$ limit is no longer manifest in this case, but must nevertheless hold. Consider the situation in which $m_{L,R} = 0$, so baryon number is only broken by the derivative couplings and must disappear in the decoupling limit. For simplicity, consider also that only the J_1 current is present. After integrating by part and using the EoM, it generates pseudoscalar $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ couplings. In the $a(x) \rightarrow a_0$ limit, those become Majorana mass terms, whose form precisely match that in Eq. (46). This means these Majorana terms are spurious, and baryon number is indeed conserved in the decoupling limit, as it should. Turning on J_2 does not change this picture since a rotation permits to recover $\eta_1 \sigma^1 + \eta_2 \sigma^2 \rightarrow \eta'_1 \sigma^1$. Note that this brings also a phase in the Dirac mass term which has to be included in the EoM to get the decoupling. Somewhat similarly, the decoupling also works in the presence of electroweak couplings. Technically, this is ensured by the cancellation of two different contributions. First, one should include the weak vertices in the EoM, and this generates additional weak couplings in Eqs. (79). In the $a(x) \rightarrow a_0$ limit, these become $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ weak vertices. Second, the other terms in Eqs. (79) become mass terms in the $a(x) \rightarrow a_0$ limit that require a non-trivial U transformation, generating again some $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ weak vertices that precisely cancel with those arising from the EoM.




Figure 1: Top: Anomalous triangle graphs contributing to the divergence of the axial current (a) and of the baryonic current (b). Bottom: In a scenario with only a Bogoliubov rotation $U(\alpha, 0)$, the axial $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ current becomes anomalous because of the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ components of the weak vertices (c), while the vector current anomaly gets reduced (d).

5.2 Anomalies and local terms

As soon as fermion fields undergo $U(1)$ rotations, the question of anomalies must be posed. In the present context, the U transformation contains both the chiral and baryonic $U(1)$ s, which are anomalous. To proceed, let us first discuss these anomalies, and their dependence on the fermion basis, and then calculate how the Lagrangian changes when the mass term is brought into the standard form.

5.2.1 Triangle graphs

The classical divergences presented in the previous section do not survive quantization, but must be corrected for anomalous terms. Our goal here is to calculate those from triangle graphs involving one current insertion, and a pair of charged weak gauge bosons.

In the absence of mass terms, the axial current gets an electroweak anomaly from the AVV and AAA triangles (see Fig. 1 and Appendix A.3), with the usual result

$$J_0^\mu = \bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n, \quad \partial_\mu J_0^\mu = g^2|V_{ud}|^2 \frac{g_V^2 + g_A^2}{16\pi^2} W^{+, \mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^-. \quad (80)$$

The baryonic current is vectorial, but gets an anomalous divergence since the weak gauge boson have both axial and vector couplings, see Fig. 1. The triangle is again the AVV one, but with gauge invariance now enforced on the A vertex and one of the V vertices, giving

$$J_3^\mu = -\bar{n}\gamma^\mu n, \quad \partial_\mu J_3^\mu = -g^2|V_{ud}|^2 \frac{g_A g_V}{8\pi^2} W^{+, \mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^-. \quad (81)$$

For both the axial and baryonic currents, the contributions from the proton current should be added, but this is inessential here. For their part, the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ currents have no anomaly since the weak vertices are $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 0$, so

$$J_1^\mu = (\bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n^C + \bar{n}^C\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n), \quad \partial_\mu J_1^\mu = 0, \quad (82a)$$

$$J_2^\mu = i(\bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n^C - \bar{n}^C\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n), \quad \partial_\mu J_2^\mu = 0. \quad (82b)$$

Once turning on generic mass terms, these anomalies do not change, but do not necessarily stay in the same current. Indeed, what is peculiar in this case is that the anomaly moves around because the currents depend on the basis for the neutron fields. Specifically, for neutron states in the standard basis, all three currents are in general anomalous

$$\partial_\mu J_i'^\mu = \mathcal{R}(U)_{ij} \partial_\mu J_j^\mu = \mathcal{R}(U)_{i3} \partial_\mu J_3^\mu, \quad (83)$$

with $\partial_\mu J_3^\mu$ given in Eq. (81). Of course, this is an artifact of the basis, but it must nevertheless be accounted for. Indeed, though phenomenologically, it is always possible to reach the standard basis via some U transformation, the anomalous divergences do depend on the path taken from the initial Lagrangian down to that basis. In this way, some dependences on the original basis are still present.

Physically, this dependence boils down to that of the weak vertices. They also keep a trace of the U transformation, see Eq. (55). The two crucial points here is that they can develop a $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ component, and that the Bogoliubov rotation involves a γ_5 , see Eq. (56). Let us take an example. We consider just a single $U = U(\alpha, 0)$. In the new basis, both J_1^μ and J_3^μ are anomalous. Looking at Fig. 1 it is clear that

$$\partial_\mu J_1'^\mu = 2 \cos \alpha \sin \alpha \partial_\mu J_3^\mu, \quad (84)$$

$$\partial_\mu J_3'^\mu = (\cos^2 \alpha - \sin^2 \alpha) \partial_\mu J_3^\mu. \quad (85)$$

At the same time, $\mathcal{R}(U(\alpha, 0))$ is a rotation matrix of angle 2α , see Eq. (65), so Eq. (83) gives the same result, $\partial_\mu J_1'^\mu = \sin 2\alpha \partial_\mu J_3^\mu$ and $\partial_\mu J_3'^\mu = \cos 2\alpha \partial_\mu J_3^\mu$. Yet, it is quite satisfying to see that these trigonometric functions of 2α , coming from the representation of the $SU(2)$ matrix $U(\alpha, 0)$ as an $SO(3)$ rotation matrix, precisely match the various possibilities to construct the triangle graphs, with $\cos \alpha$ or $\sin \alpha$ at the weak vertices, see Fig. 1.

5.2.2 Anomalous transformations

In full generality, the SM Lagrangian should include the CP-violating couplings

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta = \frac{g}{4\pi^2} \theta_L W^{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{g'}{4\pi^2} \theta_Y B^{\mu\nu} \tilde{B}_{\mu\nu}. \quad (86)$$

Usually, the $W^{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}$ term is cancelled by performing a $\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{L}$ rotation, which is a symmetry of the SM, leaving the innocuous abelian $B^{\mu\nu} \tilde{B}_{\mu\nu}$ term. This cannot be done here since \mathcal{B} is explicitly broken, and so is presumably \mathcal{L} to induce neutrino masses. Actually, if both these breaking are induced spontaneously, as in Ref. [36], then one could imagine $W^{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}$ is initially absent at the high scale, but gets entirely generated by the diagonalization of neutron and neutrino masses. Indeed, anomalous rephasing permits to move back-and-forth the CP-violating phases in the mass terms and in the anomalous couplings. This is the exact weak-interaction analog of how the strong θ parameter tuning the gluonic $G^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$ term is entangled with the phases of the quark masses.

Our goal here is to calculate the induced $W^{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}$ coupling arising from the diagonalization of the neutron mass matrix, i.e., by the matrix U of Eq. (38), which we can write as

$$U = e^{i(\beta+\phi_\Delta)\sigma_3/2} \cdot e^{i\alpha\sigma_2} \cdot e^{-i\eta\sigma_3/2} \cdot e^{i(\pi/4)\sigma_2} \cdot e^{i\gamma\sigma_3/2} \cdot e^{-i(\pi/4)\sigma_2} \cdot e^{i\zeta\sigma_0/2}. \quad (87)$$

The chiral phase commutes with all the others and can easily be treated: it induces the change in

the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{L} &= \zeta\partial_{\mu}J_0^{\mu} = g^2|V_{ud}|^2\frac{g_V^2+g_A^2}{16\pi^2}\zeta W^{+,\mu\nu}\tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^{-} \\ &= g^2|V_{ud}|^2\frac{g_V^2+g_A^2}{16\pi^2}W^{+,\mu\nu}\tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^{-}\frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_{\Sigma}}{2m_D^2} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3}).\end{aligned}\quad (88)$$

As said before, we consider that ζ is induced only by Majorana phases. The contributions coming from the phase of the Dirac mass terms for both the neutron (denoted ϕ_D in Eq. (39)) and proton would simply add up to ζ , but are assumed to be absent here, as is consistent with the splitting between their EDM and MDM.

We would like to proceed similarly for the other factors of U , but the presence of Bogoliubov rotations complicates matters. Indeed, performing a $P_{\mathcal{B}}(\phi)$ rephasing after such a rotation does not induce a phase difference of ϕ between n and n^C since these rotated neutron states are mixtures of both n and n^C , see Eq. (56). After a Bogoliubov rotation, $P_{\mathcal{B}}(\phi)$ is no longer purely baryonic but contains also a non-anomalous trivial global rephasing component.

To view this explicitly, consider the transformation $U(\alpha, \sigma) = P_{\mathcal{B}}(-\sigma) \cdot U(\alpha, 0) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma)$. If $U(\alpha, 0)$ had no impact, the baryonic rephasing $P_{\mathcal{B}}(-\sigma)$ would be compensated by $P_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma)$, and no shift would occur for the $W^{+,\mu\nu}\tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^{-}$ coupling. This cannot hold because if $\alpha = \pi/2$, we can write

$$U(\pi/2, \sigma) = P_{\mathcal{B}}(-\sigma) \cdot U(\pi/2, 0) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) = U(\pi/2, 0) \cdot P_{\mathcal{B}}(2\sigma) = P_{\mathcal{B}}(-2\sigma) \cdot U(\pi/2, 0). \quad (89)$$

The last expression shows that the true shift in θ_L must actually be -2σ . Indeed, $P_{\mathcal{B}}(-2\sigma)$ occurs in the original weak interaction basis, and is followed by a non-anomalous real rotation $U(\pi/2, 0)$. That it is not anomalous is ensured by the expression

$$U(\alpha, \sigma) = \cos \alpha \sigma_0 - i\sigma_1(\sin \alpha \sin \sigma) + i\sigma_2 \sin \alpha \cos \sigma. \quad (90)$$

Thus, $U(\pi/2, 0) = \exp(i\pi\sigma_2/2)$ is associated to the current J_2^{μ} , which has no anomaly since we are still in the weak basis after the $P_{\mathcal{B}}(-2\sigma)$ rotation (provided the proton is also rephased accordingly).

Returning to $U(\alpha, \sigma)$, it has an anomaly because it does not exponentiate to $\exp(i\sigma_1 a_1) \cdot \exp(i\sigma_2 a_2)$ for some a_1 and a_2 . Instead, contributions proportional to $[\sigma_1, \sigma_2] = 2i\sigma_3$ appear, and σ_3 corresponds to the vector current which does have an anomaly in the weak basis, see Eq. (83). Explicitly, with the decomposition $U(\alpha, \sigma) = \exp(-i\sigma\sigma_3/2) \cdot \exp(i\alpha\sigma_2) \cdot \exp(i\sigma\sigma_3/2)$, the first factor generates $-\sigma\partial_{\mu}J_3^{\mu}$ with $\partial_{\mu}J_3^{\mu}$ in the weak basis, $U(\alpha, 0)$ generates $\alpha\partial_{\mu}J_2^{\mu}$ which is not anomalous, and the last factor generates $+\sigma\partial_{\mu}J_3^{\mu}$ in the rotated basis, such that $\partial_{\mu}J_3^{\mu} = \mathcal{R}(U(\alpha, 0))_{3i}\partial_{\mu}J_i^{\mu}$ with $\mathcal{R}(U(\alpha, 0))$ the next-to-last rotation matrix in Eq. (65). Since only $\partial_{\mu}J_3^{\mu} \neq 0$, we only need $\mathcal{R}(U(\alpha, 0))_{33} = \cos(2\alpha)$ to find

$$\delta_{U(\alpha, \sigma)}\mathcal{L} = g^2|V_{ud}|^2\frac{g_{AGV}}{8\pi^2}(-\sigma + \sigma \cos(2\alpha)) = g^2|V_{ud}|^2\frac{g_{AGV}}{8\pi^2}(-2\sigma \sin^2 \alpha). \quad (91)$$

Thus, $\delta_{U(\alpha, \sigma)}\mathcal{L}$ vanishes for $\alpha = 0$, and is proportional to -2σ for $\alpha = \pi/2$, as it should.

A similar strategy applies for a generic change of basis. Specifically, we can write

$$U = \prod_{k=1}^n e^{i\theta_k \sigma_{i_k}} : \delta\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k \partial_{\mu} J_{i_k}^{(k-1)\mu}, \quad J_i^{(k)\mu} = \mathcal{R}_{ij} \left(\prod_{l=1}^k e^{i\theta_l \sigma_{i_l}} \right) \cdot J_j^{\mu}, \quad (92)$$

where $\mathcal{R}(U)$ is constructed as in Eq. (65). With the anomalous term coming entirely from $\partial_{\mu}J_3^{\mu}$, we find

$$\delta\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}} = \frac{g_{AGV}}{8\pi^2} W^{+,\mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^{-} \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k \mathcal{R}_{i_k 3} \left(\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} e^{i\theta_l \sigma_{i_l}} \right). \quad (93)$$

An important caveat though is the use of Noether's theorem, which assumes the field variation is small enough to discard higher-order corrections. The $\pi/4$ rotations in Eq. (65) are particularly problematic, so we write instead

$$U = e^{i(\beta+\phi_\Delta)\sigma_3/2} \cdot e^{i\alpha\sigma_2} \cdot e^{-i\eta\sigma_3/2} \cdot e^{-i\gamma\sigma_1/2} \cdot e^{i\zeta\sigma_0/2} . \quad (94)$$

This form and Eq. (65) do not give the same result, which can be understood intuitively by the curvature of the sphere on which these rotations live. That curvature cannot be caught by the linear approximation in Eq. (92). In this respect, the above form is certainly more appropriate since γ is small, of $\mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3})$, see Eq. (39). The result is then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{L}_B &= \frac{g_{AGV}}{8\pi^2} W^{+, \mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^- (\beta + \phi_\Delta - \eta \cos 2\alpha - \gamma \sin 2\alpha \cos \eta) \\ &= \frac{g_{AGV}}{8\pi^2} W^{+, \mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^- (\beta + \phi_\Delta - \eta) + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2}) . \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

We can compare this to the result one would get going back to the full expression for U . If we extract the total baryonic phase as the phase difference between n and n^C induced by the full transformation, but neglect the small admixture of the complex conjugated states, we get from Eq. (55)

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \arg U_{22}^* &= 2 \arctan \frac{\cos \alpha \cos \gamma/2 \sin(\beta + \phi_\Delta - \eta)/2 - \sin \alpha \sin \gamma/2 \cos(\beta + \phi_\Delta + \eta)/2}{\sin \alpha \sin \gamma/2 \sin(\beta + \phi_\Delta + \eta)/2 + \cos \alpha \cos \gamma/2 \cos(\beta + \phi_\Delta - \eta)/2} \\ &= \beta + \phi_\Delta - \eta - \gamma \tan \alpha \cos \eta + \mathcal{O}(\gamma^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

This result matches the previous one at the linear order only. Yet, the fact that the dependence on γ disappears when $\alpha = 0$ is well-reproduced in both representations (and would not be present had we used Eq. (65)). This is appropriate since without the Bogoliubov rotation by α , the γ rephasing has no anomaly. It essentially takes place in the weak basis, and rephases identically both n and n^C . Since α is $\mathcal{O}(m_D^{-1})$, and γ is $\mathcal{O}(m_D^{-3})$, this phase is in any case totally negligible. So, using Eq. (44), our final result is

$$\delta\mathcal{L}_B = \frac{g_{AGV}}{8\pi^2} W^{+, \mu\nu} \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}^- \left(\phi_\Delta + \arctan \left(\frac{m_R - m_L}{m_R + m_L} \tan \phi_\Sigma \right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2}) . \quad (97)$$

This is much larger than the impact of a chiral phase in the Majorana mass terms, see Eq. (88). Notice that if the $\arg U_{22}^*$ baryonic rephasing is also applied to protons, thereby maintaining the reality of the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 0$ part of the weak vertices, $\delta\mathcal{L}_B$ gets multiplied by two.

6 Axion-induced $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations

All the ingredients are now in place to return to the baryonic axion model. Bringing the mass term into the standard basis, the axion Lagrangian of Eq. (16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{eff} &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu a \partial^\mu a + \bar{n} (i \not{\partial} - m) n - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\bar{n}^C n + \bar{n} n^C) - \frac{\mu}{2} \bar{n} \sigma^{\mu\nu} n F_{\mu\nu} \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2v} J_i^\mu \mathcal{R}(U)_{i3} + \mathcal{L}_{Jac} + \mathcal{L}_{weak} + \delta_C \mathcal{L} + \delta_B \mathcal{L} . \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

The terms in the first line form the standard $n - \bar{n}$ oscillation Lagrangian. We assume to be in the basis in which m_D is real and μ is the usual magnetic dipole moment, and neglect the small induced

electric dipole moment, see Eq. (52). Then, as stated in Ref. [28], none of these terms depend on the precise form of the initial mass term, since no reference to the diagonalization matrix remain.

On the contrary, all the terms in the second line except \mathcal{L}_{Jac} depend on the specific form of the initial mass terms. The matrix $\mathcal{R}(U)$, given in Eq. (67), is the induced mixing starting from the baryonic vector current. Explicitly, the three currents are

$$J_1^\mu = (\bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n^C + \bar{n}^C\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n), \quad J_2^\mu = i(\bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n^C - \bar{n}^C\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n), \quad J_3^\mu = -\bar{n}\gamma^\mu n, \quad (99)$$

where n and n^C are understood to be the redefined neutron fields, and their coefficients are

$$\mathcal{R}(U)_{i3} = \left(\frac{m_L^2 - m_R^2}{4m_D\varepsilon_s}, -\frac{m_R m_L \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{2m_D\varepsilon_s}, 1 \right) + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2}). \quad (100)$$

Notice that in the CP conserving limit, $\phi_{L,R} = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}(U)_{23} = 0$. In that limit, we further have $\mathcal{R}(U)_{13} = 0$ if $m_L = m_R$ since U becomes trivial.

The weak interaction \mathcal{L}_{weak} are also to be given in the standard basis, so they include $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ pieces, see Eq. (55). The anomalous terms are first the Jacobian terms \mathcal{L}_{Jac} given in Eq. (17), which involve the axion, and then the shifted θ terms $\delta_C\mathcal{L}$ and $\delta_B\mathcal{L}$ given in Eqs. (88) and (97), respectively. Note that all three currents are anomalous. As explained previously, if the $a \rightarrow WW$ process is calculated, the anomalies in the triangle graphs involving these three currents then cancel out precisely with the terms in \mathcal{L}_{Jac} .

If only the terms in the first line above are considered, the usual Schrodinger-like formalism for $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations is derived. Specifically, the EoM for n and n^C are

$$\begin{cases} \left(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - m - \frac{\mu}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} \right) n = \varepsilon n^C, \\ \left(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - m + \frac{\mu}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} \right) n^C = \varepsilon n. \end{cases} \quad (101)$$

We are free to move to the Dirac representation, where γ^0 is diagonal (see Eq. (114)) and allows the construction of the non-relativistic limit by pulling out the time variation of the fields. Setting $i\partial_\mu = (i\partial_t, -\mathbf{p})$, this takes the form

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^0 \left(\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{p} + m + \frac{\mu}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} \right) & \varepsilon\gamma^0 \\ \varepsilon\gamma^0 & \gamma^0 \left(\boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{p} + m - \frac{\mu}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} \right) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix}. \quad (102)$$

A generic non-relativistic expansion corresponds to a unitary transformation $n \rightarrow e^{iS}n$ and $n^C \rightarrow e^{iS'}n^C$, such that the coupled equation become

$$i\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{iS}\mathcal{H}e^{-iS} - \dot{S} & e^{iS}he^{-iS'} \\ e^{iS'}he^{-iS} & e^{iS'}\mathcal{H}^C e^{-iS'} - \dot{S}' \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix}. \quad (103)$$

To leading order, given the form of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^C , the transformations are identical, $iS = iS' = \boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{p}/(2m)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} i\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H} + [iS, \mathcal{H}] + \dots - \dot{S} & h + [iS, h] + \dots \\ h + [iS, h] + \dots & \mathcal{H}^C + [iS, \mathcal{H}^C] + \dots - \dot{S} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^0(m - \boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{B}) & \varepsilon\gamma^0 \\ \varepsilon\gamma^0 & \gamma^0(m + \boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{B}) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{p}^2/m), \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

since ε is constant in space. A crucial property of the above system is the diagonal nature of the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ coupling $\varepsilon\gamma^0$. If the magnetic field is aligned with the spin quantization axis, this allows us to split the set of eight equations into four equivalent sets of two equations. Each of these sets describe the evolution of a two-state system, from which one recovers $P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t)$ as given in Eq. (2).

To the above picture we now add the axion derivative interactions. The vector current does not lead to any effect because its whole impact can be encoded as $(E, p) \rightarrow (E - \dot{a}/m, p - \nabla a/m)$. This reflects the fact that such a current corresponds to the pure gauge part of the electromagnetic minimal coupling for a charged fermion. Even if the neutron is neutral, such a would-be gauge part cancels out, and none of these terms can lead to oscillations. More problematic are the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ currents because of the presence of the γ^5 . Specifically, consider the J_1^μ current, which adds to the equation of motion the terms:

$$\begin{cases} \left(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m - \frac{\mu}{2} \sigma^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \right) n = \varepsilon n^C + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{4v} \lambda \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n^C, \\ \left(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m + \frac{\mu}{2} \sigma^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \right) n^C = \varepsilon n + \frac{\partial_\mu a}{4v} \lambda \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n, \end{cases} \quad (105)$$

where $\lambda = \mathcal{R}(U)_{13}$ of Eq. (100). The off-diagonal entries in the Schrodinger equation (104) are then

$$\varepsilon\gamma^0 \rightarrow \varepsilon\gamma^0 + \frac{i\lambda}{4v} (\partial_t a \gamma^5 + \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \nabla a). \quad (106)$$

This time, diagonalizing the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 0$ sector does not diagonalize the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ sector. As a result, the set of eight equations no longer splits into equivalent subsets of two equations. The $\partial_t a$ term mixes small and large components: it couples e.g. the large spinor component of n to the small spinor component of n^C . How to proceed in such a case probably requires dealing with the whole set of equations, and the usual simple formalism for $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations is not sufficient. This goes beyond our purpose, so instead, we simply notice that had we used the elimination method, that small component would appear suppressed by $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}/m$, and thus working at leading order, it can be discarded.

The axion wind term, proportional to ∇a , is immediately diagonal, but not proportional to γ_0 . It affects differently neutrons and antineutrons, contrary to ε , and depends on the neutron polarization state through $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Let us thus consider the neutrons, and in addition, turn off the parameter ε . This can be achieved by setting $\phi_\Sigma = \pi/2$ and $m_L = m_R = \bar{m}$. This forces $\varepsilon = 0$ exactly, while J_1^μ is tuned by $\lambda = \mathcal{R}(U)_{13} = \bar{m}/m_D$. This scenario is not necessarily violating CP since ϕ_Δ is still free. If we set it also to $\pi/2$, $\phi_L = 0$ but $\phi_R = \pi$, so m_R (or m_L) simply ends up with a "wrong sign". There is no J_2^μ component for $\phi_\Sigma = \pi/2$, $\mathcal{R}(U)_{23} = 0$, as expected since the original baryonic current is CP conserving. With all this, the oscillation equation reduces to

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^0 (m - \mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{B}) & \frac{i\lambda}{4v} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \nabla a \\ \frac{i\lambda}{4v} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \nabla a & \gamma^0 (m + \mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{B}) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n^C \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{p}/m). \quad (107)$$

This scenario collapses to the resonant case discussed in the Introduction, Yet, instead of having $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(t)$, what matters is the time dependence of the gradient of the axion field, coupled to the neutron spin, so polarized neutrons would be needed.

Numerically, the presence of the gradient is a high price to pay. To compare with Eq. (6), let us write the classical dark matter axion field is $a(x, t) \approx a_0 \sin(m_a(\mathbf{v}_a \cdot \mathbf{x} + t))$ with $v_a \sim 10^{-3}$ the local axion dark matter speed relative to the sun, and $a_0 = \sqrt{2\rho_{DM}/m_a}$ with $\rho_{DM} = 0.4 \text{ GeV}/\text{cm}^3$ [11].

Neglecting the orientation of the Earth [50] and neutron spins, we can identify

$$\varepsilon_0 \sin(\omega t) \approx \frac{\lambda}{4v} m_a v_a a_0 \sin(m_a t) . \quad (108)$$

The specific axion model enters in the parameter $\lambda = \mathcal{R}(U)_{13} = \bar{m}/m_n$. In the simplest case of Eq. (8), Majorana masses are given in terms of the PQ breaking scale as $\bar{m} = m_L = m_R \equiv \bar{\varepsilon}v$. Then, the size of the off-diagonal entries become independent of the axion parameters:

$$\varepsilon_0 \approx \frac{v_a \sqrt{2\rho_{DM}}}{m_n} \bar{\varepsilon} \approx (10^{-15} \times \bar{\varepsilon}) \text{ eV} . \quad (109)$$

This cannot lead to observational effects because even in a scenario in which there is no oscillation in vacuum, $\lambda = \bar{\varepsilon}v/m_n \ll 1$, so $\bar{\varepsilon}$ must be tiny for $v \approx 10^{12}$ GeV. Indeed, as discussed in Sec. 4.2, $n - \bar{n}$ mixing in production and decay is maximal when oscillations in vacuum are turned off, with a probability scaling like λ^2 . Naively, the ILL search [6, 7] sets $\lambda < 10^{-9}$ so $\bar{\varepsilon} < 10^{-21}$. Returning to $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations, this would give $\varepsilon_0 < 10^{-36}$, way too small to be observable. Given that ε_0 is rather insensitive to axion parameters, this conclusion appears robust.

True QCD axion cannot impact $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations, but the situation would evidently be totally different for axion-like particles (ALP). If a pseudoscalar directly couples to the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ axial currents, all other $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ mixing effects would be absent, whether in the weak vertices or in oscillations, and λ/v would be a free parameter not related to Majorana masses. For the QCD axion, this setting is problematic because though the axion shift symmetry is correctly built in, there is no way to construct an equivalent exponential parametrization (see Sec. 5.1.3). The PQ symmetry would have to be broken in a quite convoluted way, and it may even be impossible to do so without at some level inducing axion-independent $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ couplings. This is why we consider that turning on only the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ derivative coupling is in conflict with solving the strong CP puzzle. Yet, from a model-independent perspective, this scenario is perfectly viable and worth the effort from an experimental point of view.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, motivated by the possibility to induce resonant $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations if dark matter carries $\mathcal{B} = 2$, we have performed a detailed analysis of axion models in which the PQ symmetry is aligned with baryon number. The Goldstone boson nature of the axion severely constrains these theoretical constructions, to the point that it appears phenomenologically impossible to generate sizeable effects in $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations. The reasons for this are however not trivial, and in the course of this analysis, several delicate points were clarified:

- Though oscillations in vacuum are always parametrically the same no matter the initial neutron Dirac and Majorana mass terms, imprints of the path taken to bring these mass terms to the standard form are left in many sectors. In particular, neutron production and decay, the baryon number current, and triangle anomalies all depend on the rotation needed to reach the standard $n - \bar{n}$ basis. This is often overlooked in the literature.
- In the present context, these imprints play a central role, and are embodied in our final Lagrangian, Eq. (98). Indeed, true axion models necessarily entangle the $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ mass terms with the axion couplings. Axion induced oscillations are then always superseded either by $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations in vacuum, or $n - \bar{n}$ mixing in weak decays. Both are experimentally very constrained, and together, they cover the whole parameter space.

- Actually, we can draw a much stronger conclusion. The fact that axion-induced oscillations are small could have been expected from the shift-symmetry, bringing in a factor $m_a v_a/v$ with v_a the axion velocity, m_a its mass, and v the PQ breaking scale. But this is not the full story. Even in the relativistic limit, at higher energies or in astrophysical environments, the $\partial_\mu a \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n$ coupling is tiny. It is not only suppressed by v , as would be expected for dimensional reason, but in addition by a coupling constant known experimentally to be tiny, $\mathcal{R}(U)_{13}$ and $\mathcal{R}(U)_{23} < 10^{-9}$ in Eq. (98), because true axion models require $\partial_\mu a \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n$ to always be accompanied by axionless $n - \bar{n}$ mixing effects.
- Another way to view this obstruction is as due to the very specific relationship between the two couplings $a \bar{n}^C \gamma^5 n$ and $\partial_\mu a \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n$ of Eq. (7). We investigated in details how the reparametrization theorem works for $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ couplings, and found it to be far less trivial than for the usual chiral axion models. Said differently, resonant $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations can be induced via either $a \bar{n}^C \gamma^5 n$ or $\partial_\mu a \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n$, except if they share the reparametrization relationship expected for the QCD axion. In this respect, the possibility thus remains open for an axion-like particle, for which there would be no associated axionless $n - \bar{n}$ mass mixing effects. In that context, one would presumably concentrate on the shift-symmetric $\partial_\mu a \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n$ coupling, but both would be possible from a model-independent perspective.

In our opinion, this settles the question for axion-induced $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations in most models. Maybe some intricate ways to break the PQ symmetry could evade this conclusion, but they remain to be devised. Beyond that, some questions remain open, both on the technical aspects or concerning other related signatures, that would deserve dedicated studies. Let us mention in particular:

- The formalism developed here would apply equally well to neutrinos. In addition, it is quite natural to merge the Majoron and axion mechanism [35, 51], thereby creating axion couplings to right-handed neutrinos. In that context, reparametrization of the neutrino would couple the axion to the lepton number current, and the diagonalization of the neutrino mass would mix that current with $\Delta\mathcal{L} = 2$ axial currents. The main difference between the two sectors is of course the expected scaling between Majorana and Dirac mass terms, which are somehow opposite. These scenarios would be worth further investigations.
- The usual non-relativistic reduction for the $n - \bar{n}$ system breaks down for pseudoscalar couplings like $a \bar{n}^C \gamma^5 n$ and $\partial_\mu a \bar{n}^C \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 n$. The problem boils down to axial mixing terms between n and n^C , that prevents the immediate elimination of their small spinor components, or the trivial decoupling of their negative-energy components when using the Foldy-Wouthuysen formalism. Though we think we correctly identified the leading non-relativistic effect, further work would be needed to develop a systematic procedure for this system.
- Fundamentally, baryon number is a flavored $U(1)$ symmetry, and as such, there is no reason to expect it to be universal in flavor space. Rather, as advocated in Ref. [52–54], it would even make more sense to expect a coupling to flavor singlet combinations of quarks, like e.g. $dst \times dst$ instead of $ddu \times ddu$. The latter would then not be forbidden, but very suppressed by SM flavor mixings. This means that λ would indeed be tiny, so there would be no induced $n - \bar{n}$ oscillations, but it would open the door to signatures involving heavy quarks, that could be looked for at colliders or in heavy baryon transitions [55].

To conclude, let us stress that scalar or pseudoscalar-induced $\Delta\mathcal{B} = 2$ resonant effects in $n - \bar{n}$ represents an unexplored possible signature of dark matter. Though unifying such scenarios with axions appear impossible at present, this does not mean Nature has not chosen that path. Experimental searches for such a striking signature would really be worth the effort.

Acknowledgements:

First and foremost, we would like to thank Sacha Davidson for her help and many advises in the early stage of this work. This research is supported by the IN2P3 Master project ‘‘Axions from Particle Physics to Cosmology’’, and from the French National Research Agency (ANR) in the framework of the ‘‘GrAHal’’ project (ANR-22-CE31-0025).

A Appendices

A.1 Conventions

Charge conjugate states are defined as

$$\psi^C = C\bar{\psi}^T, \quad \bar{\psi}^C = -\psi^T C^\dagger, \quad (110)$$

with C satisfying $C^\dagger = C^{-1}$, $C^T = -C$. While under hermitian conjugation, bilinear currents transform as $(\bar{\psi}_2 \Gamma_A \psi_1)^\dagger = \bar{\psi}_1 \Gamma_A \psi_2$, their behavior under charge conjugation involves specific signs:

$$(\bar{\psi}_2^C \Gamma_A \psi_1^C) = \eta_A (\bar{\psi}_1 \Gamma_A \psi_2), \quad \eta_A = +1 \text{ for } \Gamma_A = 1, i\gamma_5, \gamma^\mu \gamma_5, \quad \eta_A = -1 \text{ for } \Gamma_A = \gamma^\mu, \sigma^{\mu\nu}, \quad (111)$$

since $C^{-1} \Gamma_A C = \eta_A \Gamma_A^T$. Chiral projections get inverted under charge conjugation, so with $P_{L,R} = (1 \mp \gamma_5)/2$,

$$n_{L,R} = P_{L,R} n, \quad \bar{n}_{R,L} = \bar{n} P_{L,R} \implies n_{R,L}^C = P_{L,R} n^C, \quad \bar{n}_{L,R}^C = \bar{n}^C P_{L,R}. \quad (112)$$

In the present work, we adopt the Weyl representation

$$\gamma^\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta} \\ (\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\dot{\alpha}\beta} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} (\sigma^{\mu\nu})_\alpha^\beta & 0 \\ 0 & (\bar{\sigma}^{\mu\nu})^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^5 = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (113)$$

with $(\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta} \equiv (1, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $(\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\dot{\alpha}\beta} \equiv (1, -\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. This permits to identify the chiral components of a Dirac spinor with two-components Weyl spinors, see Eq. (21). By contrast, the Dirac representation used to construct the non-relativistic limit asks for γ^0 to be diagonal, in which case

$$\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \\ -\boldsymbol{\sigma} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma^5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (114)$$

A.2 Explicit form of the mixing matrix

Explicitly, up to terms of $\mathcal{O}((m_{L,R}/m_D)^3)$, a relatively compact expression for U is obtained as, for the chiral transformation:

$$P_C(\zeta) = (-\phi_D + m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma / (2m_D^2)) \mathbf{1}, \quad (115)$$

and for the Bogoliubov and baryonic transformations:

$$U(\alpha, -\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_p^2}{8m_D^2} & \frac{(m_L - m_R)c_{\phi_\Sigma} - i(m_L + m_R)s_{\phi_\Sigma}}{4m_D} \\ \frac{(m_R - m_L)c_{\phi_\Sigma} - i(m_L + m_R)s_{\phi_\Sigma}}{4m_D} & 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_p^2}{8m_D^2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (116)$$

$$P_B(\delta - \eta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + i\frac{m_R^2 - m_L^2}{8\varepsilon_s^2} \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{4m_D^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - i\frac{m_R^2 - m_L^2}{8\varepsilon_s^2} \frac{m_L m_R \sin 2\phi_\Sigma}{4m_D^2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (117)$$

$$P_B(\beta - \delta) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}_s - i(m_L - m_R) \sin \phi_\Sigma}{2\sqrt{\bar{\varepsilon}_s \varepsilon_s}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}_s + i(m_L - m_R) \sin \phi_\Sigma}{2\sqrt{\bar{\varepsilon}_s \varepsilon_s}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (118)$$

with $c_{\phi_\Sigma}, s_{\phi_\Sigma} = \cos \phi_\Sigma, \sin \phi_\Sigma$ and $\bar{\varepsilon}_s = (m_L + m_R) \cos \phi_\Sigma + 2\varepsilon_s$. These expressions are adequate to derive the series expansion when $m_L \rightarrow m_R$, $\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow 0$ or $m_R \rightarrow 0$, which can be written down straightforwardly. For ϕ_Σ small and $\phi_D = 0$, we find

$$U = P_B(\phi_\Delta) \cdot \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - i\frac{\phi_\Sigma}{2} \frac{m_L - m_R}{m_L + m_R} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{m_L - m_R}{4m_D} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - i\frac{\phi_\Sigma}{8} \frac{m_L^2 + 6m_L m_R + m_R^2}{(m_L + m_R)m_D} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2}, \phi_\Sigma^2) \right]. \quad (119)$$

The expansion for $m_L \rightarrow m_R$ is very similar, as well as that for $\phi_\Sigma \rightarrow \pi$. If one of the Majorana mass term is absent, say $m_R \rightarrow 0$, the U matrix simplifies to

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\phi_L/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_L/2} \end{pmatrix} + \frac{m_L}{4m_D} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\phi_L/2} \\ -e^{i\phi_L/2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(m_D^{-2}, m_R). \quad (120)$$

and analogously for $m_L \rightarrow 0$.

A.3 Triangle diagrams

Most expressions in the literature deal with the triangle graph with one axial current A , and two symmetrized vector current V . The usual discussion then revolves around the issue of maintaining the vector symmetry, which fixes the inherent ambiguity of the regularized triangle loop and leaves the whole anomaly into the axial current A . This is insufficient for us since one of the V is to be the anomalous baryon current, while the other V should be the non-anomalous weak interaction. Similarly, the AAA triangle is usually described in its fully symmetrized form, while here two of the axial currents have to be conserved.

General expressions for the AVV and AAA triangle graphs with axial and vector currents were derived in Ref. [43], following the procedure detailed in Ref. [56]. Those forms are independent of which of the currents is assumed to be anomalous. For ease of reference, those expressions are

reproduced here. For the AVV triangles, the general Ward identities are

$$i(q_1 + q_2)_\alpha \mathcal{T}_{AV_1V_2}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 2im \mathcal{T}_{PV_1V_2}^{\beta\gamma} + \frac{\text{Tr}(T_A\{T_{V_1}, T_{V_2}\})}{8\pi^2} (a - b) \varepsilon^{\beta\gamma\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (121a)$$

$$-i(q_1)_\beta \mathcal{T}_{AV_1V_2}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \frac{\text{Tr}(T_A\{T_{V_1}, T_{V_2}\})}{8\pi^2} (1 + b) \varepsilon^{\gamma\alpha\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (121b)$$

$$-i(q_2)_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{AV_1V_2}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \frac{\text{Tr}(T_A\{T_{V_1}, T_{V_2}\})}{8\pi^2} (1 - a) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (121c)$$

and similarly, for the AAA triangles:

$$i(q_1 + q_2)_\alpha \mathcal{T}_{A_1A_2A_3}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 2im \mathcal{T}_{PA_1A_2}^{\beta\gamma} + \frac{\text{Tr}(T_{A_1}\{T_{A_2}, T_{A_3}\})}{8\pi^2} (a - b) \varepsilon^{\beta\gamma\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (122a)$$

$$-i(q_1)_\beta \mathcal{T}_{A_1A_2A_3}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 2im \mathcal{T}_{PA_2A_3}^{\alpha\gamma} + \frac{\text{Tr}(T_{A_1}\{T_{A_2}, T_{A_3}\})}{8\pi^2} (1 + b) \varepsilon^{\gamma\alpha\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (122b)$$

$$-i(q_2)_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{A_1A_2A_3}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 2im \mathcal{T}_{PA_1A_3}^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\text{Tr}(T_{A_1}\{T_{A_2}, T_{A_3}\})}{8\pi^2} (1 - a) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (122c)$$

The parameters a and b are chosen to remove the anomalous piece from the conserved currents. In these expressions, the mass-dependent pseudoscalar triangle amplitudes are

$$\mathcal{T}_{P_{VV}}^{\alpha\beta} = -i \frac{\text{Tr}(T_A\{T_{V_1}, T_{V_2}\})}{4\pi^2} m C_0(m^2) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (123a)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{P_{AA}}^{\alpha\beta} = -i \frac{\text{Tr}(T_{A_1}\{T_{A_2}, T_{A_3}\})}{4\pi^2} m (C_0(m^2) + 2C_1(m^2)) \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (123b)$$

where $C_i(m^2) = C_i(q_1^2, q_2^2, (q_1 + q_2)^2, m^2, m^2, m^2)$. The operator versions of these amplitude-level identities is obtained using $\langle \gamma(q_1, \alpha_1) \gamma(q_2, \alpha_2) | F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} | 0 \rangle = 4ie^{\alpha_1\alpha_2\rho\sigma} q_{1,\rho} q_{2,\sigma}$.

Adapted to our case, and with only a Dirac mass term, we find for the axial current the two contributions:

$$i(q_1 + q_2)_\alpha \mathcal{T}_{AVV}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 2im_D \mathcal{T}_{P_{VV}}^{\beta\gamma} + g^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \frac{g_V^2}{16\pi^2} \varepsilon^{\beta\gamma\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (124)$$

$$i(q_1 + q_2)_\alpha \mathcal{T}_{A_1A_2A_3}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 2im_D \mathcal{T}_{P_{A_1A_2}}^{\beta\gamma} + g^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \frac{g_A^2}{16\pi^2} \varepsilon^{\beta\gamma\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}, \quad (125)$$

and for the baryonic current the contribution (a factor two comes from the two permutation of the axial and vector gauge vertex)

$$-i(q_1)_\beta \mathcal{T}_{AV_1V_2}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = g^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \frac{g_A g_V}{8\pi^2} \varepsilon^{\gamma\alpha\mu\nu} q_{1\mu} q_{2\nu}. \quad (126)$$

From this, the Ward identities in Eqs. (80) and (81) are immediately derived.

References

- [1] R. N. Mohapatra and R. E. Marshak, Phys. Lett. B **94** (1980), 183 [erratum: Phys. Lett. B **96** (1980), 444-444] doi: [10.1016/0370-2693\(80\)90853-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(80)90853-9)
- [2] R. N. Mohapatra, J. Phys. G **36** (2009), 104006 doi: [10.1088/0954-3899/36/10/104006](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/36/10/104006) [arXiv:0902.0834 [hep-ph]].

- [3] D. G. Phillips, II, W. M. Snow, K. Babu, S. Banerjee, D. V. Baxter, Z. Berezhiani, M. Bergevin, S. Bhattacharya, G. Brooijmans and L. Castellanos, *et al.* Phys. Rept. **612** (2016), 1-45 doi: [10.1016/j.physrep.2015.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2015.11.001) [arXiv:1410.1100 [hep-ex]].
- [4] E. Rinaldi, S. Syritsyn, M. L. Wagman, M. I. Buchoff, C. Schroeder and J. Wasem, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122** (2019) no.16, 162001 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.162001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.162001) [arXiv:1809.00246 [hep-lat]].
- [5] S. Navas *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Phys. Rev. D **110** (2024) no.3, 030001 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.110.030001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.110.030001)
- [6] M. Baldo-Ceolin, P. Benetti, T. Bitter, F. Bobisut, E. Calligarich, R. Dolfini, D. Dubbers, F. Eisert, P. El-Muzeini and M. Genoni, *et al.* Phys. Lett. B **236** (1990), 95-101 doi: [10.1016/0370-2693\(90\)90601-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(90)90601-2)
- [7] M. Baldo-Ceolin, P. Benetti, T. Bitter, F. Bobisut, E. Calligarich, R. Dolfini, D. Dubbers, P. El-Muzeini, M. Genoni and D. Gibin, *et al.* Z. Phys. C **63** (1994), 409-416 doi: [10.1007/BF01580321](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01580321)
- [8] I. I. Rabi, Phys. Rev. **51** (1937) no.8, 652 doi: [10.1103/PhysRev.51.652](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.51.652)
- [9] G. D. Pusch, Nuovo Cim. A **74** (1983), 149 doi: [10.1007/BF02902503](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02902503)
- [10] P. S. Krstic, R. K. Janev, I. V. Komarov and N. Zovko, Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988), 2590-2596 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.37.2590](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.37.2590)
- [11] R. Catena and P. Ullio, JCAP **08** (2010), 004 doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2010/08/004](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2010/08/004) [arXiv:0907.0018 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [12] J. Heeck, Phys. Lett. B **813** (2021), 136043 doi: [10.1016/j.physletb.2020.136043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2020.136043) [arXiv:2009.01256 [hep-ph]].
- [13] T. Araki *et al.* [KamLAND], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006), 101802 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.101802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.101802) [arXiv:hep-ex/0512059 [hep-ex]].
- [14] A. Allega *et al.* [SNO+], Phys. Rev. D **105** (2022) no.11, 112012 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.105.112012](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.112012) [arXiv:2205.06400 [hep-ex]].
- [15] A. Abusleme *et al.* [JUNO], [arXiv:2405.17792 [hep-ex]].
- [16] P. S. B. Dev, L. W. Koerner, S. Saad, S. Antusch, M. Askins, K. S. Babu, J. L. Barrow, J. Chakraborty, A. de Gouvêa and Z. Djurcic, *et al.* J. Phys. G **51** (2024) no.3, 033001 doi: [10.1088/1361-6471/ad1658](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6471/ad1658) [arXiv:2203.08771 [hep-ex]].
- [17] T. F. Motta, P. A. M. Guichon and A. W. Thomas, J. Phys. G **45** (2018) no.5, 05LT01 doi: [10.1088/1361-6471/aab689](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6471/aab689) [arXiv:1802.08427 [nucl-th]].
- [18] J. M. Berryman, S. Gardner and M. Zakeri, Symmetry **14** (2022) no.3, 518 doi: [10.3390/sym14030518](https://doi.org/10.3390/sym14030518) [arXiv:2201.02637 [hep-ph]].
- [19] J. Ellis, G. Hütsi, K. Kannike, L. Marzola, M. Raidal and V. Vaskonen, Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.12, 123007 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.123007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.123007) [arXiv:1804.01418 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [20] D. McKeen, M. Pospelov and N. Raj, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.11, 115002 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.103.115002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.115002) [[arXiv:2012.09865](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.09865) [hep-ph]].
- [21] I. Goldman, R. N. Mohapatra, S. Nussinov and R. Shrock, [[arXiv:2408.14555](https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.14555) [hep-ph]].
- [22] D. McKeen, A. E. Nelson, S. Reddy and D. Zhou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121** (2018) no.6, 061802 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.061802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.061802) [[arXiv:1802.08244](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08244) [hep-ph]].
- [23] G. Baym, D. H. Beck, P. Geltenbort and J. Shelton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121** (2018) no.6, 061801 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.061801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.061801) [[arXiv:1802.08282](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08282) [hep-ph]].
- [24] J. M. Cline and J. M. Cornell, JHEP **07** (2018), 081 doi: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2018\)081](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2018)081) [[arXiv:1803.04961](https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.04961) [hep-ph]].
- [25] M. Bastero-Gil, T. Huertas-Roldan and D. Santos, Phys. Rev. D **110** (2024) no.8, 083003 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.110.083003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.110.083003) [[arXiv:2403.08666](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08666) [astro-ph.CO]].
- [26] B. Fornal and B. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120** (2018) no.19, 191801 [erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **124** (2020) no.21, 219901] doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.191801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.191801) [[arXiv:1801.01124](https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01124) [hep-ph]].
- [27] C. Smith, [[arXiv:2411.09529](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.09529) [hep-ph]].
- [28] Z. Berezhiani and A. Vainshtein, [[arXiv:1506.05096](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.05096) [hep-ph]].
- [29] K. Fujikawa and A. Tureanu, Phys. Rev. D **94** (2016) no.11, 115009 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.115009](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.115009) [[arXiv:1609.03203](https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.03203) [hep-ph]].
- [30] Z. Berezhiani and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **788** (2019), 58-64 doi: [10.1016/j.physletb.2018.11.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2018.11.014) [[arXiv:1809.00997](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.00997) [hep-ph]].
- [31] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977), 1440-1443 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.38.1440](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.38.1440).
- [32] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. D **16** (1977), 1791-1797 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1791](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1791).
- [33] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40** (1978), 223-226 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.40.223](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.40.223).
- [34] F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40** (1978), 279-282 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.40.279](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.40.279).
- [35] J. Quevillon and C. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **102** (2020) no.7, 075031 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.102.075031](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.075031) [[arXiv:2006.06778](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.06778) [hep-ph]].
- [36] F. Arias-Aragón and C. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **106** (2022) no.5, 055034 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.106.055034](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.106.055034) [[arXiv:2206.09810](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.09810) [hep-ph]].
- [37] M. Dine, W. Fischler and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. B **104** (1981), 199-202 doi: [10.1016/0370-2693\(81\)90590-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(81)90590-6).
- [38] A. R. Zhitnitsky, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31** (1980), 260.
- [39] J. E. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** (1979), 103 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.43.103](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.43.103).

- [40] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **166** (1980), 493-506 doi: [10.1016/0550-3213\(80\)90209-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(80)90209-6).
- [41] J. S. R. Chisholm, Nucl. Phys. **26** (1961) no.3, 469-479 doi: [10.1016/0029-5582\(61\)90106-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0029-5582(61)90106-7)
- [42] S. Kamefuchi, L. O’Raifeartaigh and A. Salam, Nucl. Phys. **28** (1961), 529-549 doi: [10.1016/0029-5582\(61\)90056-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0029-5582(61)90056-6)
- [43] J. Quevillon and C. Smith, Eur. Phys. J. C **79** (2019) no.10, 822 doi: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7304-4](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7304-4) [arXiv:1903.12559 [hep-ph]].
- [44] Q. Bonnefoy, L. Di Luzio, C. Grojean, A. Paul and A. N. Rossia, JHEP **07** (2021), 189 doi: [10.1007/JHEP07\(2021\)189](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2021)189) [arXiv:2011.10025 [hep-ph]].
- [45] J. Quevillon, C. Smith and P. N. H. Vuong, JHEP **08** (2022), 137 doi: [10.1007/JHEP08\(2022\)137](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP08(2022)137) [arXiv:2112.00553 [hep-ph]].
- [46] H. K. Dreiner, H. E. Haber and S. P. Martin, Phys. Rept. **494** (2010), 1-196 doi: [10.1016/j.physrep.2010.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2010.05.002) [arXiv:0812.1594 [hep-ph]].
- [47] C. Abel, S. Afach, N. J. Ayres, C. A. Baker, G. Ban, G. Bison, K. Bodek, V. Bondar, M. Burghoff and E. Chanel, *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **124** (2020) no.8, 081803 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.081803](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.081803) [arXiv:2001.11966 [hep-ex]].
- [48] C. Smith, Eur. Phys. J. C **84** (2024), 12 doi: [10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-12354-5](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-12354-5) [arXiv:2302.01142 [hep-ph]].
- [49] D. McKeen and A. E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D **94** (2016) no.7, 076002 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.94.076002](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.94.076002) [arXiv:1512.05359 [hep-ph]].
- [50] S. Knirck, A. J. Millar, C. A. J. O’Hare, J. Redondo and F. D. Steffen, JCAP **11** (2018), 051 doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2018/11/051](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2018/11/051) [arXiv:1806.05927 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [51] J. D. Clarke and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.3, 035001 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.93.035001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.035001) [arXiv:1509.07243 [hep-ph]].
- [52] E. Nikolidakis and C. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008), 015021 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.77.015021](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.77.015021) [arXiv:0710.3129 [hep-ph]].
- [53] C. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012), 036005 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.85.036005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.85.036005) [arXiv:1105.1723 [hep-ph]].
- [54] G. Durieux, J. M. Gerard, F. Maltoni and C. Smith, Phys. Lett. B **721** (2013), 82-85 doi: [10.1016/j.physletb.2013.02.052](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2013.02.052) [arXiv:1210.6598 [hep-ph]].
- [55] G. Alonso-Álvarez, G. Elor, M. Escudero, B. Fornal, B. Grinstein and J. Martin Camalich, Phys. Rev. D **105** (2022) no.11, 115005 doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.105.115005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.115005) [arXiv:2111.12712 [hep-ph]].
- [56] S. Weinberg, *The quantum theory of fields. Vol. 2: Modern applications*, Cambridge, 1996. doi: [10.1017/CBO9781139644174](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139644174)