

Probing Standard Model and Beyond with Reactor $CE\nu NS$ Data of CONUS+ experiment

Ayan Chattaraj ^{1,*} Anirban Majumdar ^{1,†} and Rahul Srivastava ^{1,‡}

¹*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research - Bhopal,
Bhopal Bypass Road, Bhauri, Bhopal 462066, India*

We explore the potential of reactor neutrino-induced Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering ($CE\nu NS$) data from the CONUS+ experiment to investigate both Standard Model (SM) and Beyond Standard Model (BSM) scenarios. Alongside $CE\nu NS$, elastic neutrino-electron scattering ($E\nu ES$) events are also included in our analysis, enabling more stringent constraints on new physics. Within the SM, we examine the weak mixing angle as a precision test of the electroweak sector. For BSM scenarios, we constrain the parameter space of light mediators arising from neutrino generalized interactions (NGI), while also setting limits on the electromagnetic properties of neutrinos, including their charge radius, millicharge, and magnetic moment.

I. INTRODUCTION

Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering ($CE\nu NS$) is a neutral current process within the Standard Model (SM) mediated by the exchange of a Z boson. In this process, a neutrino elastically scatters off an entire nucleus leading to a nuclear ground state to ground state transition. Furthermore, the coherence condition is satisfied when the momentum transfer is smaller than the inverse of the nuclear radius. Although $CE\nu NS$ was first predicted by Freedman in 1974 [1], its experimental detection was challenging due to the small nuclear recoil energies involved. The first observation of $CE\nu NS$ was achieved more than four decades later in 2017 by the COHERENT collaboration at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, USA, using a CsI detector [2]. Subsequent detections using liquid argon (LAr) [3] and germanium (Ge) [4] detectors in 2020 and 2024, respectively, confirmed this initial observation.

In 2022, the Dresden-II collaboration reported $CE\nu NS$ detection using reactor-based antineutrinos, marking a significant milestone for reactor-based experiments [5]. More recently, the CONUS+ collaboration has independently measured the $CE\nu NS$ events using reactor antineutrinos [6]. Reactor-based antineutrino sources are particularly well-suited for studying $CE\nu NS$ due to their low-energy neutrino spectrum, which ensures a near unity nuclear form factor and highly coherent interactions.

The CONUS+ experiment utilized a high antineutrino flux of $1.5 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ provided by the boiling water reactor at the Leibstadt Nuclear Power Plant (KKL) in Switzerland. The reactor operates at a thermal power of 3.7 GW, and the detector, comprising three high-purity germanium (HPGe) detectors with energy thresholds of 160, 170, and 180 eV_{ee}, was positioned at 20.7 meters from the reactor core. With a total exposure of 347 kg-days, the collaboration detected 395 ± 106 $CE\nu NS$ events, achieving a 3.7σ confidence level of $CE\nu NS$ detection.

In this paper we explore the potential of $CE\nu NS$ data from the CONUS+ experiment to probe both SM and Beyond Standard Model (BSM) physics. Elastic neutrino-electron scattering ($E\nu ES$),

* ayan23@iiserb.ac.in

† anirban19@iiserb.ac.in

‡ rahul@iiserb.ac.in

a concurrent process to CE ν NS, also contributes to the observed signals. Within the SM, the E ν ES contribution to the total event rate is negligible at low recoil energies and is therefore often disregarded in CE ν NS analyses. However, in certain BSM scenarios, the E ν ES contribution can become significantly enhanced. This makes its inclusion essential, as it allows for the derivation of stronger constraints on BSM parameters. Consequently, in this work, we incorporate E ν ES signals alongside CE ν NS signals in all cases to ensure a comprehensive analysis. Within the SM framework, we compute the weak mixing angle as a precision test of the electroweak theory. Concerning BSM interactions, we investigate possible signatures of new mediators arising from the neutrino generalized interactions (NGI). Additionally, we place constraints on the electromagnetic properties of neutrinos, including their charge radius, millicharge, and magnetic moment.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we describe the theoretical framework and present the CE ν NS and E ν ES cross sections under SM and different BSM scenarios. Sec. III details the methodology used for event simulation and statistical analysis, including the experimental specifications of the CONUS+ experiment. In Sec. IV, we present and discuss our results, highlighting the sensitivity of the CONUS+ experiment to SM and BSM phenomena. Finally, in Sec. V, we summarize our findings and discuss their implications.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. CE ν NS and E ν ES within the Standard Model Framework

In the SM, the differential cross section for CE ν NS arises from a t -channel neutral current interaction. At low neutrino energies ($E_\nu \ll M_Z$), the differential cross section is expressed as [1, 7]:

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_{\text{SM}}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{G_F^2 m_N}{\pi} \mathcal{F}_W^2(q^2) (Q_V^{\text{SM}})^2 \left(1 - \frac{m_N T_N}{2E_\nu^2} \right), \quad (1)$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, m_N is the nuclear mass, T_N is the nuclear recoil energy, and $\mathcal{F}_W(q^2)$ represents the nuclear form factor at momentum transfer $\mathbf{q} = \sqrt{2m_N T_N}$. In our present work we have considered the nuclear effect using a Helm type effective form factor [8]. The SM weak vector charge, Q_V^{SM} , is given by:

$$Q_V^{\text{SM}} = Z \left(\frac{1}{2} - 2 \sin^2 \theta_W \right) - \frac{N}{2}, \quad (2)$$

where Z and N are the proton and neutron numbers in the nucleus, respectively, and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ is the weak mixing angle.

At the Z -pole, the weak mixing angle is precisely measured as $\sin^2 \theta_W(M_Z) = 0.23121 \pm 0.00004$. However, at lower energy scales relevant to CE ν NS (i.e., $q^2 \rightarrow 0$), its value is less constrained experimentally. Theoretically, its value at low energy is determined using the Renormalization Group Equations (RGE). Within the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, it is predicted as $\sin^2 \theta_W(q=0) = 0.23857 \pm 0.00005$ [9, 10]. The $\sin^2 \theta_W$ dependence makes CE ν NS a promising probe for testing the weak mixing angle at low momentum transfer. Variations in $\sin^2 \theta_W$ around its predicted value cause fluctuations in both the CE ν NS cross section and the predicted event rate, offering a means to measure this parameter at low energy scales. While analyses of data from experiments like COHERENT (CsI and LAr) have provided constraints on $\sin^2 \theta_W$ at specific energy scales [11], reactor neutrino experiments such as CONUS+ can offer complementary measurements. As reactor experiments operate in a different energy regime, it presents a unique opportunity to probe the weak mixing

angle at a different energy scale, thereby enhancing our understanding of electroweak interactions in the low-energy domain.

On the other hand within the SM, the tree-level differential cross section for $E\nu$ ES with respect to the electron recoil energy, T_e , is expressed as [12]:

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma_{\nu\ell}}{dT_e} \right]_{\text{SM}}^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}} = \frac{G_F^2 m_e}{2\pi} \left[(g_V \pm g_A)^2 + (g_V \mp g_A)^2 \left(1 - \frac{T_e}{E_\nu} \right)^2 - (g_V^2 - g_A^2) \frac{m_e T_e}{E_\nu^2} \right], \quad (3)$$

where m_e is the electron mass, and the $+$ ($-$) sign corresponds to neutrino (antineutrino) scattering, respectively. The parameters g_V and g_A represent the vector and axial-vector couplings, respectively, and are defined as:

$$g_V = -\frac{1}{2} + 2\sin^2\theta_W + \delta_{\ell e}, \quad g_A = -\frac{1}{2} + \delta_{\ell e}. \quad (4)$$

Here, $\delta_{\ell e}$ is the Kronecker delta, which accounts for the presence of charged-current interactions in the cross section. This term applies only to $\nu_e e^-$ and $\bar{\nu}_e e^-$ scattering processes, where $\delta_{\ell e} = 1$. For all other neutrino flavors, $\delta_{\ell e} = 0$, as there are no charged-current contributions.

B. Neutrino Electromagnetic properties

The observation of neutrino oscillations [13, 14], which imply nonzero neutrino masses [15, 16], provides a strong motivation to explore the nontrivial electromagnetic (EM) properties of neutrinos [17–20]. The most general EM vertex for neutrinos can be described using the EM form factors $F_q(q^2)$, $F_\mu(q^2)$, $F_e(q^2)$, and $F_a(q^2)$ [21] (for a comprehensive review, see Ref. [22–24]). At zero momentum transfer, these form factors correspond to the neutrino millicharge, magnetic dipole moment, electric dipole moment, and anapole moment, respectively. For neutrino scattering processes, it is convenient to define an effective magnetic moment $\mu_{\nu\ell}^{\text{eff}}$, expressed in terms of the fundamental neutrino magnetic (μ) and electric (ϵ) dipole moments. In the context of short-baseline experiments, such as CONUS+, $\mu_{\nu\ell}^{\text{eff}}$ can be written as [25, 26]:

$$\mu_{\nu\ell}^{\text{eff}} = \sum_k \left| \sum_i U_{\ell k}^* \lambda_{jk} \right|^2, \quad (5)$$

where $\lambda_{jk} = \mu_{jk} - i\epsilon_{jk}$ are the fundamental transition magnetic moments (TMM), and U represents the neutrino mixing matrix.

Within the SM, the only nonzero EM properties of neutrinos are the neutrino charge radius (CR), $\langle r_{\nu\ell\ell'}^2 \rangle$, and the neutrino magnetic moment, $\mu_{\nu\ell}^{\text{eff}}$ [20, 27–34]. However, these quantities are extremely small as they arise from radiative corrections. In contrast, certain new physics scenarios can give rise to nonzero neutrino millicharges ($q_{\nu\ell\ell'}$) and significantly enhance the neutrino magnetic moment and CR [35]. Thus, the detection of any nontrivial EM properties in neutrinos would indicate the presence of physics beyond the SM. Experimental measurements of these parameters are therefore crucial for testing the SM and probing new physics.

The helicity-flipping neutrino magnetic moment contribution to the $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ cross sections adds incoherently to the SM contribution and is given by [21]:

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma_{\nu\ell}}{dT_N} \right]_{\text{mag}}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{\pi\alpha_{\text{EM}}^2}{m_e^2} \left[\frac{1}{T_N} - \frac{1}{E_\nu} \right] Z^2 \mathcal{F}_W^2(q^2) \left(\frac{\mu_{\nu\ell}^{\text{eff}}}{\mu_B} \right)^2, \quad (6a)$$

¹ The existence of a neutrino magnetic moment requires a minimal extension of the SM to include right-handed neutrinos. Because the magnetic moment arises from a helicity-flipping interaction, described by the vertex $(\bar{\nu}_R \sigma_{\mu\nu} \nu_L) F^{\mu\nu}$, where $\sigma_{\mu\nu} = i/2[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$, and $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the electromagnetic field tensor.

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma_{\nu\ell}}{dT_e} \right]_{\text{mag}}^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}} = \frac{\pi\alpha_{\text{EM}}^2}{m_e^2} \left[\frac{1}{T_e} - \frac{1}{E_\nu} \right] \left(\frac{\mu_{\nu\ell}^{\text{eff}}}{\mu_B} \right)^2, \quad (6b)$$

where μ_B is the Bohr magneton, and α_{EM} is the fine structure constant.

The helicity-preserving EM contributions due to millicharge ($q_{\nu\ell\ell'}$) and neutrino CR ($\langle r_{\nu\ell\ell'}^2 \rangle$) can be expressed using the following differential cross sections [23, 24]:

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma_{\nu\ell}}{dT_N} \right]_{\text{SM+EM}}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{G_F^2 m_N}{\pi} \left(1 - \frac{m_N T_N}{2E_\nu^2} \right) \mathcal{F}_W^2(q^2) \left\{ \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\sin^2\theta_W - Q_{\ell\ell} \right) Z - \frac{N}{2} \right]^2 + Z^2 \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} |Q_{\ell\ell'}|^2 \right\}, \quad (7a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{d\sigma_{\nu\ell}}{dT_e} \right]_{\text{SM+EM}}^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}} &= \frac{G_F^2 m_e}{2\pi} \left\{ \left[(g_V \pm g_A + Q_{\ell\ell})^2 + \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} |Q_{\ell\ell'}|^2 \right] + \left[(g_V \mp g_A + Q_{\ell\ell})^2 + \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} |Q_{\ell\ell'}|^2 \right] \left(1 - \frac{T_e}{E_\nu} \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left[(g_V + Q_{\ell\ell})^2 - g_A^2 + \sum_{\ell' \neq \ell} |Q_{\ell\ell'}|^2 \right] \frac{m_e T_e}{E_\nu^2} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7b)$$

where $Q_{\ell\ell'} = \sqrt{2}\pi\alpha_{\text{EM}}/G_F \left(\langle r_{\nu\ell\ell'}^2 \rangle / 3 - 2/q^2 \cdot (q_{\nu\ell\ell'}/e) \right)$, with e being the electron charge². Here, $\langle r_{\nu\ell\ell}^2 \rangle$ and $q_{\nu\ell\ell}$ represent the diagonal components of the neutrino CR and millicharge, while $\langle r_{\nu\ell\ell'}^2 \rangle$ and $q_{\nu\ell\ell'}$ are the off-diagonal components, also referred to as neutrino transition CR and millicharge in the flavor basis.

C. Neutrino Generalized Interactions

In this section, we explore extensions of the SM by introducing light mediators. We take a model independent approach and consider all possible Lorentz-invariant bilinear interactions between neutrinos and quarks/electrons, commonly referred to as neutrino generalized interactions (NGIs). Within this framework, the most general Lagrangian can be written as [36–38]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NGI}} \supset -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\substack{X=S,P,V,A,T \\ f=u,d,e}} \varepsilon_{\nu f}^X [\bar{\nu}\Gamma^X\nu] [f\bar{\Gamma}_X f], \quad (8)$$

where $\Gamma_X \equiv \{\mathbb{1}, i\gamma^5, \gamma_\rho, \gamma_\rho\gamma^5, \sigma_{\rho\delta}\}$ with $\sigma_{\rho\delta} = \frac{i}{2}[\gamma_\rho, \gamma_\delta]$ corresponding to the scalar (S), pseudoscalar (P), vector (V), axial-vector (A), and tensor (T) interactions, respectively.

As the CONUS+ experiment utilizes a Ge detector, it is important to note that most of the Ge isotopes consist of even-even nuclei. For these spin 0 isotopes, the spin-dependent pseudoscalar, axial-vector, and tensor interactions vanish entirely [39]. Only ^{73}Ge , which has an odd neutron number and non-zero spin, can have non-vanishing contributions from the pseudoscalar, axial-vector, and tensor components [39]. However, the abundance of ^{73}Ge in natural Ge is very small ($\sim 7.75\%$). As a result, these spin-dependent interactions contribute negligibly to the overall signal. This implies that CONUS+ data will not be able to put any meaningful limits on P, A, T interactions. Henceforth, we focus exclusively on spin-independent scalar and vector interactions.

We start with considering the vector interaction. For that we consider $U(1)_{B-L}$ model as a benchmark, which incorporates a new mediator field, Z' . The relevant part of the Lagrangian

² Notice that the magnitude of the three momentum transfer for CE ν NS process is given as, $q = \sqrt{2m_N T_N}$, while for the E ν ES it is expressed as, $q = \sqrt{2m_e T_e}$.

describing the interaction of Z' with fermions in the context of $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ processes is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{B-L} \supset g_{B-L} \left(Q_{B-L}^q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q + Q_{B-L}^e \bar{e} \gamma^\mu e + Q_{B-L}^\nu \bar{\nu}_L \gamma^\mu \nu_L \right) Z'_\mu + \frac{1}{2} M_{Z'}^2 Z'_\mu Z'^\mu. \quad (9)$$

Here, the charges of the fermions under the $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry are determined by anomaly cancellation conditions, resulting in $Q_{B-L}^q = 1/3$, and $Q_{B-L}^e = Q_{B-L}^\nu = -1$. Within this framework, the $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ differential cross section is modified as a rescaling of the SM cross section [40, 41]:

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_{\text{SM}+Z'}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \left(1 + \frac{Q_{Z'} g_{B-L}^2}{\sqrt{2} G_F Q_V^{\text{SM}} (M_{Z'}^2 + 2m_N T_N)} \right)^2 \left[\frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_{\text{SM}}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}}, \quad (10)$$

where the Z' -mediated effective nuclear charge is expressed as:

$$Q_{Z'} = Q_{B-L}^\nu \left[Z \left(2Q_{B-L}^u + Q_{B-L}^d \right) + N \left(Q_{B-L}^u + 2Q_{B-L}^d \right) \right] = -A \quad (11)$$

Here, $A = Z + N$ is the mass number of the nucleus. For $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$, the differential cross section can be derived from the SM expression by modifying the vector coupling as [42]:

$$g_V \rightarrow g'_{Z'} = g_V + \frac{g_{B-L}^2 Q_{B-L}^\nu Q_{B-L}^e}{\sqrt{2} G_F (M_{Z'}^2 + 2m_e T_e)} = g_V + \frac{g_{B-L}^2}{\sqrt{2} G_F (M_{Z'}^2 + 2m_e T_e)}. \quad (12)$$

Next, we examine scenarios involving a possible light scalar mediator. We extend the SM by introducing a CP -even real scalar boson ϕ with mass M_ϕ . The relevant part of the Lagrangian for $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ processes is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi \supset \left(g_\phi^q \bar{q} q + g_\phi^e \bar{e} e + g_\phi^\nu \bar{\nu}_R \nu_L \right) \phi - \frac{1}{2} M_\phi^2 \phi^2. \quad (13)$$

The scalar interaction creates an additive contribution to the SM cross section for both $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$. For $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$, the corresponding differential cross section is given as [43],

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_\phi^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{m_N^2 T_N Q_\phi^2}{4\pi E_\nu^2 (M_\phi^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \mathcal{F}_W^2(\mathbf{q}^2), \quad (14)$$

where the effective nuclear coupling for scalar interactions is:

$$Q_\phi = g_\phi^\nu \left(Z \sum_{q=u,d} g_\phi^q \frac{m_p}{m_q} f_{T_q}^p + N \sum_{q=u,d} g_\phi^q \frac{m_n}{m_q} f_{T_q}^n \right). \quad (15)$$

Here, m_p and m_n are the proton and neutron masses, m_q represents the quark masses, and the hadronic structure parameters for scalar interactions are $f_{T_u}^p = 0.026$, $f_{T_d}^p = 0.038$, $f_{T_u}^n = 0.018$, $f_{T_d}^n = 0.056$ [44].

The differential cross section for the scalar-mediated $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ process can be written as [45]:

$$\left[\frac{d\sigma_{\nu e}}{dT_e} \right]_\phi^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}} = \frac{m_e^2 T_e (g_\phi^\nu g_\phi^e)^2}{4\pi E_\nu^2 (M_\phi^2 + 2m_e T_e)^2}. \quad (16)$$

III. DATA ANALYSIS

In this section we provide an overview of the CONUS+ experiment [6], outlining its key specifications and describing the methods used to simulate the expected CE ν NS and E ν ES signals. Additionally, the statistical framework employed in this study is discussed in detail.

The expected number of theoretical CE ν NS events in the i th energy bin is calculated as follows:

$$[R_i]_{\xi}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = t_{\text{run}} N_{\text{target}} \int_{T_e^i}^{T_e^{i+1}} dT_e \left(\frac{1}{Q_f} - \frac{T_e}{Q_f^2} \frac{dQ_f}{dT_e} \right) \int_{E_{\nu}^{\text{min}}}^{E_{\nu}^{\text{max}}} dE_{\nu} \frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}_e}}{dE_{\nu}} \left[\frac{d\sigma_{\bar{\nu}_e}}{dT_{\mathcal{N}}} \right]_{\xi}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}}, \quad (17)$$

where $\xi = \{\text{SM}, \text{BSM}\}$ specifies the interaction type under consideration. In this expression, t_{run} is the total data acquisition time, while N_{target} represents the number of target nuclei in the detector, given by $N_{\text{target}} = m_{\text{det}} N_A / m_{\text{Ge}}$. Here, m_{det} is the detector mass, N_A is Avogadro number, and m_{Ge} is the molar mass of the germanium isotopes. We consider all stable isotopes of Ge, including $\{^{70}\text{Ge}, ^{72}\text{Ge}, ^{73}\text{Ge}, ^{74}\text{Ge}, ^{76}\text{Ge}\}$ with their respective natural abundances $\{20.57, 27.45, 7.75, 36.50, 7.73\}\%$ [46]. The minimum neutrino energy required for producing a nuclear recoil of energy $T_{\mathcal{N}}$ is determined by the kinematics of the interaction, $E_{\nu}^{\text{min}} \approx \sqrt{m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}} / 2}$, while E_{ν}^{max} is the maximum neutrino energy of the reactor antineutrino spectrum. The electron-equivalent ionization energy, T_e , is related to the nuclear recoil energy, $T_{\mathcal{N}}$, via the quenching factor Q_f , which quantifies the fraction of nuclear recoil energy that produces ionization. This relationship is expressed as $T_e = Q_f(T_{\mathcal{N}}) \cdot T_{\mathcal{N}}$. For the CONUS+ experiment, the quenching factor is modeled using Lindhard theory [47] with a parameter $k = 0.162$, as reported by the collaboration [6, 48].

The flux distribution of reactor antineutrinos, $\bar{\nu}_e$, is expressed as:

$$\frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}_e}}{dE_{\nu}} = \frac{P}{4\pi d^2 \epsilon} \sum_k f_k \frac{dN_{\bar{\nu}_e}^k}{dE_{\nu}}, \quad (18)$$

where P denotes the thermal power of the reactor, d is the distance from the reactor core to the detector, and ϵ represents the average energy released per fission. The term $dN_{\bar{\nu}_e}^k/dE_{\nu}$ corresponds to the energy spectrum of antineutrinos emitted by different production mechanisms, indexed by k . Reactor antineutrinos primarily originate from two key sources: (a) the beta decays of fission fragments from the isotopes ^{235}U , ^{238}U , ^{239}Pu , and ^{241}Pu . For these contributions, the antineutrino spectra are modeled using the Huber-Müller parametrization [49, 50] above 2 MeV and from Ref. [21] for lower energies. As reported by the CONUS+ collaboration in Ref. [6], during reactor operation, the average fission fractions (f_k) of these fissile isotopes are considered to be 53%, 8%, 32%, and 7%, respectively; (b) neutron capture on ^{238}U , leading to the production of ^{239}U ($^{238}\text{U}(n, \gamma)^{239}\text{U}$). The spectrum of this process is adopted from Ref. [51]. The total antineutrino flux is obtained by summing over all relevant contributions: $k = \{^{235}\text{U}, ^{238}\text{U}, ^{239}\text{Pu}, ^{241}\text{Pu}, ^{238}\text{U}(n, \gamma)^{239}\text{U}\}$, weighted by their respective fission fractions. For the CONUS+ experiment, the experimental baseline is $d = 20.7$ m, the reactor thermal power is $P = 3.6$ GW, and the average energy release in each fission is $\epsilon = 205.24$ MeV. Using these the total flux normalization at the detector is estimated to be $\mathcal{N} = 1.5 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ [6].

On the other hand, the predicted number of theoretical E ν ES events in the i th electron-recoil energy bin is determined as:

$$[R_i]_{\xi}^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}} = t_{\text{run}} N_{\text{target}} \int_{T_e^i}^{T_e^{i+1}} dT_e Z_{\text{eff}}(T_e) \int_{E_{\nu}^{\text{min}}}^{E_{\nu}^{\text{max}}} dE_{\nu} \frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}_e}}{dE_{\nu}} \left[\frac{d\sigma_{\bar{\nu}_e}}{dT_e} \right]_{\xi}^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}}. \quad (19)$$

For E ν ES the kinematics of the process gives $E_{\nu}^{\text{min}} = [T_e + \sqrt{T_e^2 + 2m_e T_e}] / 2$. The effective number of electrons, $Z_{\text{eff}}(T_e)$, available for ionization at a given recoil energy T_e , incorporates

the effects of atomic binding. This quantity is approximated via a series of step functions, as discussed in Ref. [52], and is expressed as $Z_{\text{eff}}(T_e) = \sum_{j=1}^{32} \Theta(T_e - \mathcal{B}_j)$, where $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function, and \mathcal{B}_j represents the binding energy of the j th electron in a germanium atom. The binding energy values are taken from the data presented in Ref. [53]. This approximation accounts for the energy thresholds of each atomic electron, ensuring an accurate representation of the ionization process within the detector.




FIG. 1: Simulated signals (colored histograms) and background-subtracted reactor-on data (black points with error bars) as a function of T_e at the CONUS+ experiment, with a full experimental run time of 119 days. The simulated signals incorporate contributions from both $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ events and are computed by combining the counts from three detectors (C2, C3, and C5) with different recoil thresholds.

Figure 1 illustrates the simulated events and the background-subtracted reactor-on data observed at the CONUS+ experiment over a full experimental run time of 119 days, plotted as a function of T_e . The simulated signals, shown as colored histograms, represent the predicted events spectra for the SM as well as various new physics scenarios. In all cases, the simulated spectra include contributions from $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$. Notably, the predicted events are computed by combining the counts from three detectors (C2, C3, and C5) with different recoil thresholds: 180 eV_{ee} for C2, 160 eV_{ee} for C3, and 170 eV_{ee} for C5.

The statistical analysis employed in this study is based on the Gaussian χ^2 function, which is given by [54]:

$$\chi^2(\vec{S}; \alpha) = \sum_i \left[\frac{(1 + \alpha) (R_i^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} + R_i^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}}) (\vec{S}) - R_i^{\text{exp}}}{\sigma_i^{\text{exp}}} \right]^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha}{\sigma_\alpha} \right)^2, \quad (20)$$

where $R_i^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}}$ and $R_i^{\text{E}\nu\text{ES}}$ represent the theoretical predictions for the $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ events in the i th bin, respectively. \vec{S} contains the set of free parameters that we aim to determine. Additionally, R_i^{exp} and σ_i^{exp} denote the experimentally observed number of events and their associated statistical uncertainties in the i th bin, as provided in the data release [6]. The cumulative systematic uncertainty in the model, accounting for uncertainties due to reactor antineutrino flux spectrum estimation and quenching effects, is incorporated via the nuisance parameter α , with its associated uncertainty, $\sigma_\alpha = 20\%$. For the analysis of a given parameter from the set \vec{S} , we perform marginalization over the nuisance parameter α in the χ^2 function.

IV. RESULTS

In this section, we present the sensitivities derived from the CONUS+ experiment for various physics scenarios discussed in Sec. II. We begin by examining the constraints on the weak mixing angle. Figure 2 shows the $\Delta\chi^2$ profile for $\sin^2\theta_W$. From this, we extract the 1σ determination of




FIG. 2: $\Delta\chi^2$ profile of weak mixing angle obtained from CONUS+ data.

the weak mixing angle as:

$$\sin^2\theta_W = 0.252^{+0.056}_{-0.064}.$$

In Fig. 3, we compare our results, derived from the analysis of CONUS+ data, with other determinations from experiments spanning a wide energy range [11, 55–57]. It is important to note that




FIG. 3: Comparison of the weak mixing angle results from CONUS+ with other experimental constraints at different renormalization scales.

while the CONUS+ constraint is comparable to that from the Dresden-II experiment [55] using

the FeF quenching factor, it is less stringent than the limits obtained from COHERENT CsI+LAr data [11]. However, the CONUS+ result demonstrates a significantly higher precision compared to the limits derived from recent measurements of solar ^8B neutrino-induced $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ signals by PandaX-4T and XENONnT [56]. Finally, our determination of $\sin^2\theta_W$ is also consistent with that obtained in the recent Ref. [58] which appeared on arXiv while this manuscript was under preparation.




FIG. 4: $\Delta\chi^2$ profile of effective neutrino magnetic moment obtained from CONUS+ data exploiting both $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ signals.

$\mu_{\nu_e}^{\text{eff}} (10^{-11} \mu_B)$
$\leq \mathbf{9.16}$ (CONUS+)
≤ 7.5 (CONUS) [59]
≤ 420 (COHERENT CsI+LAr) [60]
≤ 20.8 (DRESDEN-II) [60]
≤ 3.9 (Borexino) [61, 62]
≤ 7.4 (TEXONO) [51]
≤ 2.9 (GEMMA) [63]
≤ 1.4 (LZ) [64]
≤ 0.9 (XENONnT) [64]

TABLE I: Comparison of 90% C.L. upper limits on the effective neutrino magnetic moment from various experiments.

We now turn our attention to the constraints on the neutrino magnetic moment obtained from the CONUS+ experiment, utilizing both $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ signals. Since reactor neutrinos primarily constitute the $\bar{\nu}_e$ flux, the only relevant parameter in this analysis is $\mu_{\nu_e}^{\text{eff}}$. The $\Delta\chi^2$ profile for $\mu_{\nu_e}^{\text{eff}}$ is shown in Fig. 4. By combining the $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ and $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ signals, we obtain the upper limit at 90% C.L. as $\mu_{\nu_e}^{\text{eff}} \leq 9.16 \times 10^{-11} \mu_B$. Using only the $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ signal, we find the upper limit to be $\mu_{\nu_e}^{\text{eff}} \leq 5.06 \times 10^{-10} \mu_B$. Clearly, incorporating $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ along with $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ signals results in a more stringent limit. Notably, the limit obtained from the $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ -only analysis in this study is consistent with the results reported in the recent Ref. [58]. In Tab. I, we compare the 90% C.L. upper limits on $\mu_{\nu_e}^{\text{eff}}$ from CONUS+ with those from other experiments. As can be seen, while the

CONUS+ limit is more precise than those from COHERENT and Dresden-II experiments, it is still less stringent than the limits obtained from E ν ES-based analyses of solar neutrino data, such as those from XENONnT, LZ, and Borexino.




FIG. 5: Marginalized $\Delta\chi^2$ profiles for $q_{\nu ee}$ (left) and $q_{\nu e\mu}$, $q_{\nu e\tau}$ (right) obtained from CONUS+ data exploiting both CE ν NS and E ν ES signals. Notably, the limits on $q_{\nu e\mu}$ and $q_{\nu e\tau}$ are same (see text for details).

$q_{\nu ee}$ (10^{-12} e)	$ q_{\nu e\mu} $ (10^{-12} e)	$ q_{\nu e\tau} $ (10^{-12} e)
$[-1.50, 1.59]$ (CONUS+)	≤ 1.55 (CONUS+)	≤ 1.55 (CONUS+)
≤ 3.3 (CONUS) [59]		
$[-500, 500]$ (COHERENT CsI+LAr) [60]	≤ 180 (COHERENT CsI+LAr) [60]	≤ 500 (COHERENT CsI+LAr) [60]
$[-8.6, 8.7]$ (DRESDEN-II) [60]	≤ 8.6 (DRESDEN-II) [60]	≤ 8.6 (DRESDEN-II) [60]
$[-0.3, 0.6]$ (LZ) [64]		
$[-0.1, 0.6]$ (XENONnT) [64]		

TABLE II: Comparison of 90% C.L. limits on the neutrino millicharge from various experiments.

We now discuss the constraints on the neutrino millicharge obtained from the CONUS+ experiment. The relevant parameters in this analysis are $q_{\nu ee}$, $q_{\nu e\mu}$, and $q_{\nu e\tau}$. During the fitting process, we allow the remaining two parameters to vary freely in order to compute the theoretical events. For each parameter of interest, we then marginalize the χ^2 function over the other two parameters. Further, one should note that as reactor neutrinos consist solely of $\bar{\nu}_e$ flux, and the cross section in Eq. (7) is symmetric with respect to $q_{\nu e\mu}$ and $q_{\nu e\tau}$, the obtained limits on these two parameters from CONUS+ data are same. Figure 5 displays the marginalized $\Delta\chi^2$ profiles for $q_{\nu ee}$, $q_{\nu e\mu}$, and $q_{\nu e\tau}$ obtained by analyzing both CE ν NS and E ν ES signals. At 90% C.L., the limits are:

$$\{q_{\nu ee}, |q_{\nu e\mu}|, |q_{\nu e\tau}|\} = \{[-1.50, 1.59], (\leq 1.55), (\leq 1.55)\} \times 10^{-12} e.$$

For comparison, using only the CE ν NS signal, the 90% C.L. limits are:

$$\{q_{\nu ee}, |q_{\nu e\mu}|, |q_{\nu e\tau}|\} = \{[-0.31, 3.79], (\leq 2.11), (\leq 2.11)\} \times 10^{-8} e.$$

Clearly, the inclusion of the $E\nu$ ES signal alongside the $CE\nu$ NS signal significantly improves the constraints on the neutrino millicharge. Table II summarizes the 90% C.L. limits from CONUS+ and compares them with results from other experiments. As shown, the CONUS+ constraints are more stringent than those from COHERENT and Dresden-II experiments. However, they remain less stringent than limits derived from $E\nu$ ES-based analyses of solar neutrino data, such as those from XENONnT and LZ.




FIG. 6: Marginalized $\Delta\chi^2$ profiles for $\langle r_{\nu ee}^2 \rangle$ (left) and $\langle r_{\nu e\mu}^2 \rangle, \langle r_{\nu e\tau}^2 \rangle$ (right) obtained from CONUS+ data, exploiting both $CE\nu$ NS and $E\nu$ ES signals. Notably, the limits on $\langle r_{\nu e\mu}^2 \rangle$ and $\langle r_{\nu e\tau}^2 \rangle$ are same (see text for details).

$\langle r_{\nu ee}^2 \rangle$ (10^{-32} cm 2)	$\langle r_{\nu e\mu}^2 \rangle$ (10^{-32} cm 2)	$\langle r_{\nu e\tau}^2 \rangle$ (10^{-32} cm 2)
$[-60.18, 8.76]$ (CONUS+)	≤ 34.48 (CONUS+)	≤ 34.48 (CONUS+)
$[-57, 4]$ (DRESDEN-II) [60]	≤ 30 (DRESDEN-II) [60]	≤ 30 (DRESDEN-II) [60]
$[-69, 14]$ (COHERENT CsI+LAr) [60, 65]	≤ 30 (COHERENT CsI+LAr) [60]	≤ 42 (COHERENT CsI+LAr) [60]
$[-4.2, 6.6]$ (TEXONO) [66]		
$[-5.94, 8.28]$ (LSND) [67]		
$[-121, 37.5]$ (LZ) [64]		
$[-93.4, 9.5]$ (XENONnT) [64]		

TABLE III: Comparison of 90% C.L. limits on the neutrino CR parameters from CONUS+ and other experiments.

Turning to neutrino charge radius (CR), the relevant neutrino CR parameters in this analysis are $\langle r_{\nu ee}^2 \rangle$, $\langle r_{\nu e\mu}^2 \rangle$, and $\langle r_{\nu e\tau}^2 \rangle$. Similar to the neutrino millicharge case, marginalized $\Delta\chi^2$ profiles for these parameters are shown in Fig. 6. Furthermore, the obtained limits on the transition CR parameters $\langle r_{\nu e\mu}^2 \rangle$ and $\langle r_{\nu e\tau}^2 \rangle$ are identical in the CONUS+ analysis. At 90% C.L., the limits obtained from CONUS+ are:

$$\{\langle r_{\nu ee}^2 \rangle, |\langle r_{\nu e\mu}^2 \rangle|, |\langle r_{\nu e\tau}^2 \rangle|\} = \{[-60.18, 8.76], (\leq 34.48), (\leq 34.48)\} \times 10^{-32} \text{ cm}^2.$$

It is worth noting that the contribution of $E\nu$ ES to the neutrino CR cross section is negligible. Therefore, including $E\nu$ ES data alongside $CE\nu$ NS signal does not effectively improve the constraints, yielding results consistent with a $CE\nu$ NS-only analysis. Tab. III compares the 90% C.L. limits obtained from CONUS+ with those from other experiments. Notably, the CONUS+ limits on neutrino CR parameters are competitive with those obtained from DRESDEN-II and COHERENT experiments, they remain less stringent compared to constraints from TEXONO and LSND.




FIG. 7: Exclusion limits at 90% C.L. in the (M_X, g_X) parameter space for light scalar and vector $B - L$ mediators derived from CONUS+ data, exploiting both $CE\nu$ NS and $E\nu$ ES signals. Existing experimental and astrophysical constraints are also shown for comparison, providing a comprehensive perspective on the probed parameter space (see text for details).

We now present the constraints on light scalar and vector $B - L$ mediators derived from the CONUS+ experiment. Figure 7 illustrates the 90% C.L. exclusion contours in the (M_X, g_X) parameter space. The inclusion of $E\nu$ ES data alongside $CE\nu$ NS significantly improves the constraints for vector $B - L$ mediators in the light mediator regime, particularly for $M_X \lesssim 10$ MeV. However, for scalar mediators, the addition of $E\nu$ ES signal does not produce a visible impact on the exclusion limits.

A comparison of these results with constraints from other experimental and astrophysical studies highlights their complementarity. In Fig. 7, we include exclusion limits derived from the combined analysis of combined CsI and LAr $CE\nu$ NS data of COHERENT collaboration [11, 41, 68]. Notably, the CsI analysis incorporates both $CE\nu$ NS and $E\nu$ ES contributions, whereas the LAr results rely solely on $CE\nu$ NS events. Additionally, limits from recent measurements of solar ^8B neutrino-induced $CE\nu$ NS signals by PandaX-4T and XENONnT [56, 69] are shown. The parameter space probed by CONUS+ is further compared with constraints from $E\nu$ ES-based constraints, including BOREXINO [70], CHARM-II [71], and TEXONO [41, 72], as well as combined analyses of data from PandaX-4T, XENONnT, and LZ [41, 64, 73]. We also present limits from dark photon searches carried out at various fixed-target experiments, including beam-dump facilities such as CHARM [74, 75], NA64 [76–78], NOMAD [79], E141 [80, 81], E137 [82, 83], E774 [84], KEK [85], Orsay [83], U70/ ν -CAL I [86, 87], and APEX [88]. High-energy collider experiments, such as BaBar [89, 90] and LHCb [91], have also set constraints on dark photon models. These dark photon search limits have been recasted into the relevant parameter space using the darkcast software, as detailed in Refs. [92, 93]. Astrophysical and cosmological observations impose further limits. Constraints from the cooling of Supernova 1987A [94–96] and cosmological bounds on the relativistic degrees of freedom (N_{eff}) [97–99], as well as Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) limits [100, 101], are also included.

The complementarity of the CONUS+ constraints on scalar and vector $B - L$ mediators is particularly evident in Fig. 7. Notably, for scalar mediators, the CONUS+ bounds provide the most stringent constraint for $M_\phi > 6$ MeV. Focusing exclusively on constraints derived from CE ν NS data, the CONUS+ results surpass all existing CE ν NS-based limits for both scalar and vector $B - L$ interactions.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The CONUS+ experiment has recently reported the reactor neutrino induced CE ν NS data. We have analyzed the SM and BSM physics implications of this data set. Within the framework of the SM, we looked at the estimation of weak mixing angle and found that the constraint derived from CONUS+ data exhibit a significantly improved precision compared to the limits from recent measurements of solar ^8B neutrino-induced CE ν NS signals by PandaX-4T and XENONnT. The CONUS+ limit is also comparable to those from the Dresden-II experiment using the FeF quenching factor. However, it is less stringent than the limits obtained from COHERENT CsI+LAr data. For BSM physics we looked at several aspects such as neutrino EM properties as well as NGI with light mediators. The CONUS+ limits on neutrino electromagnetic (EM) properties, including the charge radius, millicharge, and magnetic moment, are comparable to those extracted from the COHERENT and Dresden-II data, and in some cases, provide improved constraints. Notably, the inclusion of E ν ES signals alongside the CE ν NS data significantly enhances the constraints on the neutrino magnetic moment and millicharge. However, the obtained CONUS+ limits remain less stringent compared to constraints derived from E ν ES-based experiments, such as TEXONO, Borexino, LZ, and XENONnT. Regarding NGI with light mediators, we analyzed scalar and vector $B - L$ interaction scenarios. The CONUS+ results provide complementary constraints in these scenarios. Specifically, for scalar mediators, the CONUS+ bounds are the most stringent for $M_\phi > 6$ MeV. Focusing exclusively on CE ν NS-based constraints, the CONUS+ results surpass all existing limits for both scalar and vector $B - L$ mediator scenarios, highlighting the significance of this data set in probing new physics beyond the SM.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are indebted to Dimitris Papoulias for his insightful comments which have been invaluable in completion of this work. The authors also acknowledge C. Buck for valuable correspondence and assistance regarding the data release from the CONUS+ collaboration. AM expresses sincere thanks for the financial support provided through the Prime Minister Research Fellowship (PMRF), funded by the Government of India (PMRF ID: 0401970).

-
- [1] D. Z. Freedman, “Coherent Neutrino Nucleus Scattering as a Probe of the Weak Neutral Current,” *Phys. Rev. D* **9** (1974) 1389–1392.
 - [2] **COHERENT** Collaboration, D. Akimov *et al.*, “Observation of Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering,” *Science* **357** no. 6356, (2017) 1123–1126, [arXiv:1708.01294 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
 - [3] **COHERENT** Collaboration, D. Akimov *et al.*, “First Measurement of Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering on Argon,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** no. 1, (2021) 012002, [arXiv:2003.10630 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
 - [4] **COHERENT** Collaboration, S. Adamski *et al.*, “First detection of coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering on germanium,” [arXiv:2406.13806 \[hep-ex\]](#).

- [5] J. Colaresi, J. I. Collar, T. W. Hossbach, C. M. Lewis, and K. M. Yocum, “Measurement of Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering from Reactor Antineutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129** no. 21, (2022) 211802, [arXiv:2202.09672 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [6] **CONUS+** Collaboration, N. Ackermann *et al.*, “First observation of reactor antineutrinos by coherent scattering,” [arXiv:2501.05206 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [7] A. Drukier and L. Stodolsky, “Principles and Applications of a Neutral Current Detector for Neutrino Physics and Astronomy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **30** (1984) 2295.
- [8] R. H. Helm, “Inelastic and elastic scattering of 187-mev electrons from selected even-even nuclei,” *Phys. Rev.* **104** (Dec, 1956) 1466–1475.
- [9] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, R. L. Workman *et al.*, “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [10] J. Erler and M. Schott, “Electroweak Precision Tests of the Standard Model after the Discovery of the Higgs Boson,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **106** (2019) 68–119, [arXiv:1902.05142 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [11] V. De Romeri, O. G. Miranda, D. K. Papoulias, G. Sanchez Garcia, M. Tórtola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Physics implications of a combined analysis of COHERENT CsI and LAr data,” *JHEP* **04** (2023) 035, [arXiv:2211.11905 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [12] B. Kayser, E. Fischbach, S. P. Rosen, and H. Spivack, “Charged and Neutral Current Interference in $\nu_e e$ Scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **20** (1979) 87.
- [13] A. B. McDonald, “Nobel Lecture: The Sudbury Neutrino Observatory: Observation of flavor change for solar neutrinos,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88** no. 3, (2016) 030502.
- [14] T. Kajita, “Nobel Lecture: Discovery of atmospheric neutrino oscillations,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **88** no. 3, (2016) 030501.
- [15] B. Pontecorvo, “Mesonium and anti-mesonium,” *Sov. Phys. JETP* **6** (1957) 429.
- [16] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa, and S. Sakata, “Remarks on the unified model of elementary particles,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **28** (1962) 870–880.
- [17] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, “Majorana Neutrinos and Magnetic Fields,” *Phys. Rev. D* **24** (1981) 1883–1889. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 25, 283 (1982)].
- [18] J. F. Nieves, “Electromagnetic Properties of Majorana Neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **26** (1982) 3152.
- [19] B. Kayser, “Majorana Neutrinos and their Electromagnetic Properties,” *Phys. Rev. D* **26** (1982) 1662.
- [20] R. E. Shrock, “Electromagnetic Properties and Decays of Dirac and Majorana Neutrinos in a General Class of Gauge Theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **206** (1982) 359–379.
- [21] P. Vogel and J. Engel, “Neutrino Electromagnetic Form-Factors,” *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 3378.
- [22] M. Nowakowski, E. A. Paschos, and J. M. Rodriguez, “All electromagnetic form-factors,” *Eur. J. Phys.* **26** (2005) 545–560, [arXiv:physics/0402058](#).
- [23] C. Giunti and A. Studenikin, “Neutrino electromagnetic interactions: a window to new physics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87** (2015) 531, [arXiv:1403.6344 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] C. Giunti, K. Kouzakov, Y.-F. Li, and A. Studenikin, “Neutrino Electromagnetic Properties,” [arXiv:2411.03122 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] W. Grimus and P. Stockinger, “Effects of neutrino oscillations and neutrino magnetic moments on elastic neutrino - electron scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 1762–1768, [arXiv:hep-ph/9708279](#).
- [26] D. Aristizabal Sierra, O. G. Miranda, D. K. Papoulias, and G. S. Garcia, “Neutrino magnetic and electric dipole moments: From measurements to parameter space,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105** no. 3, (2022) 035027, [arXiv:2112.12817 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] S. T. Petcov, “The Processes $\mu \rightarrow e + \gamma$, $\mu \rightarrow e + \bar{e}$, $\nu' \rightarrow \nu + \gamma$ in the Weinberg-Salam Model with Neutrino Mixing,” *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **25** (1977) 340. [Erratum: *Sov.J.Nucl.Phys.* 25, 698 (1977), Erratum: *Yad.Fiz.* 25, 1336 (1977)].
- [28] W. J. Marciano and A. I. Sanda, “Exotic Decays of the Muon and Heavy Leptons in Gauge Theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **67** (1977) 303–305.
- [29] K. Fujikawa and R. Shrock, “The Magnetic Moment of a Massive Neutrino and Neutrino Spin Rotation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45** (1980) 963.
- [30] P. B. Pal and L. Wolfenstein, “Radiative Decays of Massive Neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **25** (1982) 766.
- [31] J. Bernabeu, L. G. Cabral-Rosetti, J. Papavassiliou, and J. Vidal, “On the charge radius of the neutrino,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 113012, [arXiv:hep-ph/0008114](#).
- [32] J. Bernabeu, J. Papavassiliou, and J. Vidal, “On the observability of the neutrino charge radius,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 101802, [arXiv:hep-ph/0206015](#). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 89, 229902

- (2002)].
- [33] J. Bernabeu, J. Papavassiliou, and J. Vidal, “The Neutrino charge radius is a physical observable,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **680** (2004) 450–478, [arXiv:hep-ph/0210055](#).
 - [34] M. Dvornikov and A. Studenikin, “Electric charge and magnetic moment of massive neutrino,” *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 073001, [arXiv:hep-ph/0305206](#).
 - [35] K. S. Babu and R. N. Mohapatra, “Model for Large Transition Magnetic Moment of the ν_e ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63** (1989) 228.
 - [36] M. Lindner, W. Rodejohann, and X.-J. Xu, “Coherent Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering and new Neutrino Interactions,” *JHEP* **03** (2017) 097, [arXiv:1612.04150 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [37] D. Aristizabal Sierra, V. De Romeri, and N. Rojas, “COHERENT analysis of neutrino generalized interactions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 075018, [arXiv:1806.07424 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [38] L. J. Flores, N. Nath, and E. Peinado, “CE ν NS as a probe of flavored generalized neutrino interactions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105** no. 5, (2022) 055010, [arXiv:2112.05103 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [39] A. Chattaraj, A. Majumdar, D. K. Papoulias, and R. Srivastava, “Probing conventional and new physics at the ESS with coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering,” [arXiv:2501.12443 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [40] E. Bertuzzo, G. Grilli di Cortona, and L. M. D. Ramos, “Probing light vector mediators with coherent scattering at future facilities,” *JHEP* **06** (2022) 075, [arXiv:2112.04020 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [41] A. Majumdar, D. K. Papoulias, H. Prajapati, and R. Srivastava, “Constraining low scale Dark Hypercharge symmetry at spallation, reactor and Dark Matter direct detection experiments,” [arXiv:2411.04197 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [42] M. Lindner, F. S. Queiroz, W. Rodejohann, and X.-J. Xu, “Neutrino-electron scattering: general constraints on Z' and dark photon models,” *JHEP* **05** (2018) 098, [arXiv:1803.00060 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [43] Y. Farzan, M. Lindner, W. Rodejohann, and X.-J. Xu, “Probing neutrino coupling to a light scalar with coherent neutrino scattering,” *JHEP* **05** (2018) 066, [arXiv:1802.05171 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [44] E. Del Nobile, “The Theory of Direct Dark Matter Detection: A Guide to Computations,” [arXiv:2104.12785 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [45] J. M. Link and X.-J. Xu, “Searching for BSM neutrino interactions in dark matter detectors,” *JHEP* **08** (2019) 004, [arXiv:1903.09891 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [46] M. Berglund and M. E. Wieser, “Isotopic compositions of the elements 2009 (iupac technical report),” *Pure and Applied Chemistry* **83** no. 2, (2011) 397–410.
 - [47] J. Lindhard, M. Scharff, and H. Schiott, “Range concepts and heavy ion searches,” *Mat. Fys. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk.* **33** (1963) .
 - [48] A. Bonhomme *et al.*, “Direct measurement of the ionization quenching factor of nuclear recoils in germanium in the keV energy range,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** no. 9, (2022) 815, [arXiv:2202.03754 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
 - [49] P. Huber, “On the determination of anti-neutrino spectra from nuclear reactors,” *Phys. Rev. C* **84** (2011) 024617, [arXiv:1106.0687 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.C* 85, 029901 (2012)].
 - [50] T. A. Mueller *et al.*, “Improved Predictions of Reactor Antineutrino Spectra,” *Phys. Rev. C* **83** (2011) 054615, [arXiv:1101.2663 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [51] **TEXONO** Collaboration, H. T. Wong *et al.*, “A Search of Neutrino Magnetic Moments with a High-Purity Germanium Detector at the Kuo-Sheng Nuclear Power Station,” *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 012001, [arXiv:hep-ex/0605006](#).
 - [52] J.-W. Chen, H.-C. Chi, C. P. Liu, and C.-P. Wu, “Low-energy electronic recoil in xenon detectors by solar neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **774** (2017) 656–661, [arXiv:1610.04177 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [53] A. C. Thompson, D. Vaughan, M. A. Cox, *et al.*, *X-Ray Data Booklet*, 2009. <https://xdb.lbl.gov/>.
 - [54] F. M. L. Almeida, Jr., M. Barbi, and M. A. B. do Vale, “A Proposal for a different chi square function for Poisson distributions,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **449** (2000) 383–395, [arXiv:hep-ex/9911042](#).
 - [55] A. Majumdar, D. K. Papoulias, R. Srivastava, and J. W. F. Valle, “Physics implications of recent Dresden-II reactor data,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 9, (2022) 093010, [arXiv:2208.13262 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [56] V. De Romeri, D. K. Papoulias, and C. A. Ternes, “Bounds on new neutrino interactions from the first CE ν NS data at direct detection experiments,” [arXiv:2411.11749 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [57] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, S. Navas *et al.*, “Review of particle physics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 3, (2024) 030001.
 - [58] M. Alpízar-Venegas, L. J. Flores, E. Peinado, and E. Vázquez-Jáuregui, “Exploring the Standard Model and Beyond from the Evidence of CE ν NS with Reactor Antineutrinos in CONUS+,”

- arXiv:2501.10355 [hep-ph].
- [59] **CONUS** Collaboration, H. Bonet *et al.*, “First upper limits on neutrino electromagnetic properties from the CONUS experiment,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** no. 9, (2022) 813, arXiv:2201.12257 [hep-ex].
- [60] M. Atzori Corona, M. Cadeddu, N. Cargioli, F. Dordei, C. Giunti, Y. F. Li, C. A. Ternes, and Y. Y. Zhang, “Impact of the Dresden-II and COHERENT neutrino scattering data on neutrino electromagnetic properties and electroweak physics,” *JHEP* **09** (2022) 164, arXiv:2205.09484 [hep-ph].
- [61] **Borexino** Collaboration, M. Agostini *et al.*, “Limiting neutrino magnetic moments with Borexino Phase-II solar neutrino data,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no. 9, (2017) 091103, arXiv:1707.09355 [hep-ex].
- [62] P. Coloma, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, J. a. P. Pinheiro, and S. Urrea, “Constraining new physics with Borexino Phase-II spectral data,” *JHEP* **07** (2022) 138, arXiv:2204.03011 [hep-ph]. [Erratum: *JHEP* 11, 138 (2022)].
- [63] A. G. Beda, V. B. Brudanin, V. G. Egorov, D. V. Medvedev, V. S. Pogosov, M. V. Shirchenko, and A. S. Starostin, “The results of search for the neutrino magnetic moment in GEMMA experiment,” *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2012** (2012) 350150.
- [64] S. K. A., A. Majumdar, D. K. Papoulias, H. Prajapati, and R. Srivastava, “Implications of first LZ and XENONnT results: A comparative study of neutrino properties and light mediators,” *Phys. Lett. B* **839** (2023) 137742, arXiv:2208.06415 [hep-ph].
- [65] A. N. Khan, “Neutrino millicharge and other electromagnetic interactions with COHERENT-2021 data,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **986** (2023) 116064, arXiv:2201.10578 [hep-ph].
- [66] **TEXONO** Collaboration, M. Deniz *et al.*, “Measurement of $\text{Nu}(e)\text{-bar}$ -Electron Scattering Cross-Section with a CsI(Tl) Scintillating Crystal Array at the Kuo-Sheng Nuclear Power Reactor,” *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 072001, arXiv:0911.1597 [hep-ex].
- [67] **LSND** Collaboration, L. B. Auerbach *et al.*, “Measurement of electron - neutrino - electron elastic scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 112001, arXiv:hep-ex/0101039.
- [68] M. Atzori Corona, M. Cadeddu, N. Cargioli, F. Dordei, C. Giunti, Y. F. Li, E. Picciau, C. A. Ternes, and Y. Y. Zhang, “Probing light mediators and $(g - 2)_\mu$ through detection of coherent elastic neutrino nucleus scattering at COHERENT,” *JHEP* **05** (2022) 109, arXiv:2202.11002 [hep-ph].
- [69] P. Blanco-Mas, P. Coloma, G. Herrera, P. Huber, J. Kopp, I. M. Shoemaker, and Z. Tabrizi, “Clarity through the Neutrino Fog: Constraining New Forces in Dark Matter Detectors,” arXiv:2411.14206 [hep-ph].
- [70] P. Coloma, I. Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, L. Larizgoitia, F. Monrabal, and S. Palomares-Ruiz, “Bounds on new physics with data of the Dresden-II reactor experiment and COHERENT,” *JHEP* **05** (2022) 037, arXiv:2202.10829 [hep-ph].
- [71] **CHARM-II** Collaboration, P. Vilain *et al.*, “Constraints on additional Z bosons derived from neutrino - electron scattering measurements,” *Phys. Lett. B* **332** (1994) 465–470.
- [72] S. Bilmis, I. Turan, T. M. Aliev, M. Deniz, L. Singh, and H. T. Wong, “Constraints on Dark Photon from Neutrino-Electron Scattering Experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** no. 3, (2015) 033009, arXiv:1502.07763 [hep-ph].
- [73] V. De Romeri, D. K. Papoulias, and C. A. Ternes, “Light vector mediators at direct detection experiments,” *JHEP* **05** (2024) 165, arXiv:2402.05506 [hep-ph].
- [74] **CHARM** Collaboration, F. Bergsma *et al.*, “Search for Axion Like Particle Production in 400-GeV Proton - Copper Interactions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **157** (1985) 458–462.
- [75] S. N. Gninenko, “Constraints on sub-GeV hidden sector gauge bosons from a search for heavy neutrino decays,” *Phys. Lett. B* **713** (2012) 244–248, arXiv:1204.3583 [hep-ph].
- [76] **NA64** Collaboration, D. Banerjee *et al.*, “Search for invisible decays of sub-GeV dark photons in missing-energy events at the CERN SPS,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** no. 1, (2017) 011802, arXiv:1610.02988 [hep-ex].
- [77] **NA64** Collaboration, D. Banerjee *et al.*, “Improved limits on a hypothetical $X(16.7)$ boson and a dark photon decaying into e^+e^- pairs,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 7, (2020) 071101, arXiv:1912.11389 [hep-ex].
- [78] **NA64** Collaboration, Y. M. Andreev *et al.*, “Search for Light Dark Matter with NA64 at CERN,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** no. 16, (2023) 161801, arXiv:2307.02404 [hep-ex].
- [79] **NOMAD** Collaboration, P. Astier *et al.*, “Search for heavy neutrinos mixing with tau neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **506** (2001) 27–38, arXiv:hep-ex/0101041.

- [80] E. M. Riordan *et al.*, “A Search for Short Lived Axions in an Electron Beam Dump Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59** (1987) 755.
- [81] J. D. Bjorken, R. Essig, P. Schuster, and N. Toro, “New Fixed-Target Experiments to Search for Dark Gauge Forces,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 075018, [arXiv:0906.0580 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [82] J. D. Bjorken, S. Ecklund, W. R. Nelson, A. Abashian, C. Church, B. Lu, L. W. Mo, T. A. Nunamaker, and P. Rassmann, “Search for Neutral Metastable Penetrating Particles Produced in the SLAC Beam Dump,” *Phys. Rev. D* **38** (1988) 3375.
- [83] S. Andreas, C. Niebuhr, and A. Ringwald, “New Limits on Hidden Photons from Past Electron Beam Dumps,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 095019, [arXiv:1209.6083 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [84] A. Bross, M. Crisler, S. H. Pordes, J. Volk, S. Errede, and J. Wrbanek, “A Search for Shortlived Particles Produced in an Electron Beam Dump,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** (1991) 2942–2945.
- [85] A. Konaka *et al.*, “Search for Neutral Particles in Electron Beam Dump Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** (1986) 659.
- [86] J. Blumlein and J. Brunner, “New Exclusion Limits for Dark Gauge Forces from Beam-Dump Data,” *Phys. Lett. B* **701** (2011) 155–159, [arXiv:1104.2747 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [87] J. Blümlein and J. Brunner, “New Exclusion Limits on Dark Gauge Forces from Proton Bremsstrahlung in Beam-Dump Data,” *Phys. Lett. B* **731** (2014) 320–326, [arXiv:1311.3870 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [88] **APEX** Collaboration, S. Abrahamyan *et al.*, “Search for a New Gauge Boson in Electron-Nucleus Fixed-Target Scattering by the APEX Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 191804, [arXiv:1108.2750 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [89] **BaBar** Collaboration, J. P. Lees *et al.*, “Search for a Dark Photon in e^+e^- Collisions at BaBar,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** no. 20, (2014) 201801, [arXiv:1406.2980 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [90] **BaBar** Collaboration, J. P. Lees *et al.*, “Search for Invisible Decays of a Dark Photon Produced in e^+e^- Collisions at BaBar,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** no. 13, (2017) 131804, [arXiv:1702.03327 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [91] **LHCb** Collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, “Search for $A' \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ Decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124** no. 4, (2020) 041801, [arXiv:1910.06926 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [92] P. Ilten, Y. Soreq, M. Williams, and W. Xue, “Serendipity in dark photon searches,” *JHEP* **06** (2018) 004, [arXiv:1801.04847 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [93] C. Baruch, P. Ilten, Y. Soreq, and M. Williams, “Axial vectors in DarkCast,” *JHEP* **11** (2022) 124, [arXiv:2206.08563 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [94] L. Heurtier and Y. Zhang, “Supernova Constraints on Massive (Pseudo)Scalar Coupling to Neutrinos,” *JCAP* **02** (2017) 042, [arXiv:1609.05882 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [95] J. H. Chang, R. Essig, and S. D. McDermott, “Revisiting Supernova 1987A Constraints on Dark Photons,” *JHEP* **01** (2017) 107, [arXiv:1611.03864 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [96] D. Croon, G. Elor, R. K. Leane, and S. D. McDermott, “Supernova Muons: New Constraints on Z' Bosons, Axions and ALPs,” *JHEP* **01** (2021) 107, [arXiv:2006.13942 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [97] H. Esseili and G. D. Kribs, “Cosmological implications of gauged $U(1)_{B-L}$ on ΔN_{eff} in the CMB and BBN,” *JCAP* **05** (2024) 110, [arXiv:2308.07955 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [98] S.-P. Li and X.-J. Xu, “ N_{eff} constraints on light mediators coupled to neutrinos: the dilution-resistant effect,” *JHEP* **10** (2023) 012, [arXiv:2307.13967 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [99] D. K. Ghosh, P. Ghosh, S. Jeusun, and R. Srivastava, “ N_{eff} at CMB challenges $U(1)_X$ light gauge boson scenarios,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 7, (2024) 075032, [arXiv:2404.10077 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [100] N. Blinov, K. J. Kelly, G. Z. Krnjaic, and S. D. McDermott, “Constraining the Self-Interacting Neutrino Interpretation of the Hubble Tension,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** no. 19, (2019) 191102, [arXiv:1905.02727 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [101] A. M. Suliga and I. Tamborra, “Astrophysical constraints on nonstandard coherent neutrino-nucleus scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 8, (2021) 083002, [arXiv:2010.14545 \[hep-ph\]](#).