





# Probing conventional and new physics at the ESS with coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering

Ayan Chattaraj <sup>1,\*</sup> Anirban Majumdar <sup>1,†</sup>  
 Dimitrios K. Papoulias <sup>2,‡</sup> and Rahul Srivastava <sup>1,§</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup>*AHEP Group, Institut de Física Corpuscular – CSIC/Universitat de València  
 C/Catedrático José Beltrán, 2 E-46980 Paterna, Spain*

We explore the potential of the European Spallation Source (ESS) in probing physics within and beyond the Standard Model (SM), based on future measurements of coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering (CE $\nu$ NS). We consider two SM physics cases, namely the weak mixing angle and the nuclear radius. Regarding physics beyond the SM, we focus on neutrino generalized interactions (NGIs) and on various aspects of sterile neutrino and sterile neutral lepton phenomenology. For this, we explore the violation of lepton unitarity, active-sterile oscillations as well as interesting upscattering channels such as the sterile dipole portal and the production of sterile neutral leptons via NGIs. The projected ESS sensitivities are estimated by performing a statistical analysis considering the various CE $\nu$ NS detectors and expected backgrounds. We find that the enhanced statistics achievable in view of the highly intense ESS neutrino beam, will offer a drastic improvement in the current constraints obtained from existing CE $\nu$ NS measurements. Finally, we discuss how the ESS has the potential to provide the leading CE $\nu$ NS-based constraints, complementing also further experimental probes and astrophysical observations.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering (CE $\nu$ NS) was theoretically proposed over five decades ago by Freedman [1] and later revisited by Drukier and Stodolsky [2]. In this process, a neutrino interacts coherently with the entire nucleus via the exchange of a virtual Standard Model (SM)  $Z$  boson, leading to nuclear ground-state-to-ground-state transitions. The contributions from all nucleons add up coherently, resulting in an enhanced cross section that scales approximately with the square of the neutron number of the target nucleus. For this to occur, the momentum transfer  $q$  must remain comparable to or smaller than the inverse of the nuclear radius. Notably, CE $\nu$ NS constitutes the dominant neutrino scattering process, significantly surpassing other relevant neutrino processes such as the elastic neutrino-electron scattering (E $\nu$ ES). Despite its large cross section, the experimental observation of CE $\nu$ NS remained elusive for decades due to the extremely small recoil energies imparted to the nucleus in the interaction.

The first experimental observation of CE $\nu$ NS was achieved by the COHERENT Collaboration at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which utilized neutrinos from pion-decay-at-rest ( $\pi$ -DAR) produced at the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) facility. This milestone was accomplished using a CsI detector [3, 4], it was later confirmed with a liquid argon detector [5], and more recently with a germanium detector [6]. By exploiting reactor antineutrinos, a suggestive evidence for CE $\nu$ NS was reported by the Dresden-II Collaboration, also using a germanium target [7]. Very recently, the upgraded version of the CONUS experiment [8, 9], referred to as the CONUS+ experiment,

\* [ayan23@iiserb.ac.in](mailto:ayan23@iiserb.ac.in)

† [anirban19@iiserb.ac.in](mailto:anirban19@iiserb.ac.in)

‡ [dipapou@ific.uv.es](mailto:dipapou@ific.uv.es)

§ [rahul@iiserb.ac.in](mailto:rahul@iiserb.ac.in)

has observed reactor antineutrino-induced  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  signals with a statistical significance of  $3.7\sigma$  using a germanium detector [10]. Moreover, the XENONnT [11] and PandaX-4T [12] Collaborations, using liquid xenon detectors, reported their first  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  measurements induced by solar  $^8\text{B}$  neutrinos. Beyond these, several experimental efforts aim to exploit diverse neutrino sources and detection technologies to further advance  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  studies. The Coherent Captain Mills experiment at Los Alamos National Laboratory plans to utilize a liquid argon target for  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  detection [13]. Reactor-based experiments such as CONNIE [14],  $\nu\text{Gen}$  [15], NUCLEUS [16], RICOCHET [17], MINER [18],  $\nu\text{IOLETA}$  [19], TEXONO [20, 21], NUKE [22], CHILLAX [23], RED-100 [24–26], Scintillating Bubble Chamber [27] etc. are also under development for  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  measurements with high precision (for a review see [28]).

The current data have already marked a significant milestone in the field of low-energy neutrino physics, prompting several studies to explore both SM and beyond the SM physics. For instance,  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  measurements allow for precision tests on fundamental parameters of SM electroweak theory such as the weak mixing angle at low energies [29–39]. They also constitute powerful probes of nuclear structure parameters like the neutron root mean square (rms) radius [31, 34, 40–43], which remains poorly constrained for most nuclei. Concerning physics beyond the SM,  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  data has been analyzed to set stringent constraints on nonstandard neutrino interactions (NSIs) [32, 34, 44–52], neutrino generalized interactions (NGIs) [34, 35, 53–56], light mediators [34, 39, 57–64], heavy scalar and vector mediators [34, 65, 66], sterile neutrino oscillation [34, 53, 67, 68], upscattering production of sterile neutral leptons [34, 69–71], deviations from lepton unitarity [68], and neutrino electromagnetic properties [31, 34, 72, 73].

The European Spallation Source (ESS), currently under development in Lund, Sweden, will utilize the world’s most powerful superconducting proton linear accelerator in combination with an advanced hydrogen moderator to produce the most intense neutron beams in the world, paving the way for a diverse experimental program [74]. The facility will operate with a 2 GeV proton beam and an unprecedented beam power of 5 MW, resulting to a proton-on-target (POT) number of  $2.8 \times 10^{23}$  over 208 days, (equivalent to a calendar year) of operation. In addition to its primary focus on neutron science, the ESS will generate an intense, pulsed neutrino flux offering unique opportunities for  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  measurements with high statistics. Compared to existing  $\pi$ -DAR facilities, the ESS is expected to achieve an order-of-magnitude enhancement in neutrino flux compared to the SNS. This significant increase, combined with the proposed cutting-edge detector technologies, positions the ESS to enable precision studies of  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  with unparalleled statistical accuracy. Six advanced detector technologies have been proposed [75], including detectors based on CsI, Xe, Ge, Si, Ar, and  $\text{C}_3\text{F}_8$ . The resulting experimental reach is anticipated to provide deep insights into both SM parameters and physics beyond the SM, offering enhanced sensitivity far beyond current experimental capabilities. Surprisingly, only a limited number of phenomenological studies have investigated the potential of ESS in probing SM and BSM physics parameters. These, mainly include projections for a precise determination of the weak mixing angle [75] and constraints on neutrino electromagnetic properties [75, 76]. Moreover, the ESS sensitivity on NSIs using  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  has been analyzed in Ref. [77], highlighting its capability to probe a large portion of a previously unexplored region of the parameter space.

Motivated by the latter we are intended to explore the discovery potential of ESS by performing a thorough study investigating several physics scenarios, for the first time. We begin by evaluating the projected sensitivities focusing first on low-energy SM precision measurements at the ESS, e.g., the determination of the weak mixing angle and the nuclear neutron rms radius. Then, concerning new physics we focus our attention in scenarios beyond conventional vector-type NSIs, in an effort to extend previous works. To this purpose, we instead consider the broader framework of NGIs, and explore both the light and heavy mediator regimes taking into account several Lorentz-invariant structures. Furthermore, we study potential signatures due to the violation of lepton unitarity and

the existence of sterile neutrinos and sterile neutral leptons. For the latter, we examine two different possibilities: i) short-baseline active-sterile oscillations, and ii) sterile neutral lepton production in the context of the sterile dipole portal which is possible via the upscattering of active neutrinos on nuclei. Going one step further, we explore sterile neutral leptons by systematically analyzing various Lorentz-invariant interactions including scalar, pseudoscalar, vector, axial vector, and tensor ones. For all the aforementioned scenarios, our results are presented for the individual detectors as well as in terms of a combined analysis.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we outline the theoretical framework, providing a brief description of the CE $\nu$ NS cross sections for the different scenarios within and beyond the SM. Section III describes the adopted methodology for event simulation and statistical analysis used in the present work in order to estimate the projected sensitivities. This section also includes a detailed overview of the specifications regarding the different CE $\nu$ NS detector technologies proposed at the ESS. In Sec. IV, we present and discuss the results of our sensitivity projections. Finally, we conclude with a summary of our findings in Sec. V.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this section, we present the CE $\nu$ NS cross sections corresponding to the various physics scenarios within and beyond the SM.

### A. The standard CE $\nu$ NS cross section

At tree level, within the SM CE $\nu$ NS is a flavor-blind neutral current process, mediated by the  $Z$  boson [78]. For incoming neutrino energies much below the  $Z$  boson mass ( $E_\nu \ll M_Z$ ), the quark-level four-Fermi interaction Lagrangian governing this process can be written as [44]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}}^{\nu q} \subset -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\substack{q=u,d \\ \alpha=e,\mu,\tau}} [\bar{\nu}_\alpha \gamma^\rho (1 - \gamma^5) \nu_\alpha] \left[ \bar{q} \gamma_\rho (g_q^{V(\text{SM})} - g_q^{A(\text{SM})} \gamma^5) q \right], \quad (1)$$

where  $G_F = 1.1663787 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$  denotes the Fermi constant [79],  $q = \{u, d\}$  represents the up and down quarks, and  $g_q^{V(\text{SM})}$  and  $g_q^{A(\text{SM})}$  represent the SM vector and axial vector couplings of the quarks to the  $Z$  boson. The values of these couplings are given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_u^{V(\text{SM})} &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{4}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W, & g_d^{V(\text{SM})} &= -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W, \\ g_u^{A(\text{SM})} &= \frac{1}{2}, & g_d^{A(\text{SM})} &= -\frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

These couplings depend on the weak mixing angle, which constitutes a fundamental parameter of the Salam-Weinberg electroweak theory [80, 81] and has been precisely measured at the  $Z$  pole to be  $\sin^2 \theta_W(M_Z) = 0.23121 \pm 0.00004$ . At low energies, however, such as those relevant to CE $\nu$ NS (i.e. for  $q \rightarrow 0$ ), the weak mixing angle remains poorly constrained by experiments. Indeed, despite numerous experimental efforts [79], existing low-energy measurements suffer by substantial uncertainties. Theoretically, its value is extrapolated via renormalization group equations (RGE) in the context of  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme, as  $\sin^2 \theta_W(q=0) = 0.23857 \pm 0.00005$  [79, 82]. Therefore, a precise low-energy determination of the weak mixing angle will constitute a critical test of the SM. CE $\nu$ NS, being a low-energy process, provides a valuable avenue for probing the weak mixing angle at low momentum transfer.

For a neutrino with energy  $E_\nu$  scattering off a nucleus of mass  $m_{\mathcal{N}}$ , the differential cross section with respect to the nuclear recoil energy,  $T_{\mathcal{N}}$ , is expressed as [1, 83]

$$\left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_{\mathcal{N}}} \right]_{\text{SM}}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{G_F^2 m_{\mathcal{N}}}{\pi} \left[ \mathcal{F}_W^2(\mathbf{q}^2) (Q_W^V)^2 \left( 1 - \frac{m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}}}{2E_\nu^2} - \frac{T_{\mathcal{N}}}{E_\nu} \right) + \mathcal{F}_A(\mathbf{q}^2) \left( 1 + \frac{m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}}}{2E_\nu^2} - \frac{T_{\mathcal{N}}}{E_\nu} \right) \right]. \quad (3)$$

The SM vector charge,  $Q_W^V$ , is defined as,

$$Q_W^V = \mathbb{Z} (2g_u^{V(\text{SM})} + g_d^{V(\text{SM})}) + \mathbb{N} (g_u^{V(\text{SM})} + 2g_d^{V(\text{SM})}), \quad (4)$$

with  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  being the proton and neutron numbers of the nucleus, respectively. Given that the nucleus is a composite object, a nuclear form factor,  $\mathcal{F}_W(\mathbf{q}^2)$ , accounting for the spatial distribution of the nucleons within the nucleus, is also incorporated. In this analysis, we adopt the Helm parametrization [84]

$$\mathcal{F}_W(\mathbf{q}^2) = 3 \frac{j_1(\mathbf{q}R_0)}{\mathbf{q}R_0} e^{-\frac{\mathbf{q}^2 s^2}{2}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $j_1$  is the spherical Bessel function of the first order,  $s = 0.9$  fm [85] represents the surface thickness, and  $R_0^2 = \frac{5}{3}(R^2 - 3s^2)$ , with  $R$  denoting the rms nuclear radius which is parametrized as  $R = 1.23\text{A}^{1/3}$  fm.

The SM axial vector contribution to the CE $\nu$ NS cross section is subdominant in comparison to the vector component, being highly suppressed by the nuclear spin [44]. However, in our analysis, we have incorporated this component, with the corresponding axial vector form factor taken to be<sup>1</sup> [83, 86]

$$\mathcal{F}_A(\mathbf{q}^2) = \frac{2\pi}{2J+1} \cdot g_A^2 \cdot S_{11}^{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{q}^2), \quad (6)$$

where  $J$  denotes the total angular momentum of the nucleus in its ground state (see Table I), while the axial vector coupling of the nucleon is parameterized as  $g_A = \Delta_u^p - \Delta_d^p$ . Here,  $\Delta_q^p$  parametrizes the contribution of the quark spin content of the nucleon. Assuming isospin symmetry, the relevant values are taken from lattice QCD studies [87] and read  $\Delta_u^p = \Delta_d^n = 0.777$  and  $\Delta_d^p = \Delta_u^n = -0.438$ . The transverse spin structure functions,  $S_{ij}^{\mathcal{T}}$ , are evaluated following the methodology outlined in Ref. [83], with only  $S_{11}^{\mathcal{T}}$  being relevant for the SM case. This is because of the assumed isospin symmetry together with the fact that  $g_u^{A(\text{SM})} = -g_d^{A(\text{SM})}$  for which only the isovector part of the full spin-structure function survives. Moreover, tiny contributions from the longitudinal multipoles are of the order  $\mathcal{O}(T_{\mathcal{N}}/m_{\mathcal{N}})$  and hence safely ignored. It is important to note that, due to the spin-dependent nature of the axial vector component, this contribution is non-zero only for nuclei with non-zero total angular momentum. Therefore, among the various proposed ESS detectors considered here, only the CsI and C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> ones receive non-zero axial vector contributions.

For completeness, Table I lists the physical properties of the target nuclei employed in these detectors, including their proton and neutron numbers, atomic masses, spin values, and proton rms radii.

<sup>1</sup> We neglect subdominant contributions from strangeness and two-body currents.

Target nucleus	Z	N	$m_{\mathcal{N}}$ (a.m.u) [88]	$J^\pi$ [88]	$R_p$ (fm) [89, 90]
$^{133}\text{Cs}$	55	78	132.91	$7/2^+$	4.824
$^{127}\text{I}$	53	74	126.90	$5/2^+$	4.766
$^{132}\text{Xe}$	54	78	131.29	$0^+$	4.786
$^{72}\text{Ge}$	32	40	71.92	$0^+$	4.050
$^{28}\text{Si}$	14	14	27.98	$0^+$	3.150
$^{40}\text{Ar}$	18	22	39.95	$0^+$	3.393
$^{12}\text{C}$	6	6	12.0	$0^+$	2.471
$^{19}\text{F}$	9	10	19.00	$1/2^+$	2.900

TABLE I: Key properties of the proposed ESS nuclear targets (see also Table II): the number of protons (Z), neutrons (N), atomic mass ( $m_{\mathcal{N}}$ ), nuclear ground-state ( $J^\pi$ ), and proton rms radius ( $R_p$ ).

### B. Neutrino Generalized Interactions

NSIs provide straightforward and theoretically motivated SM extensions. They can be naturally accommodated by extending the SM with an additional  $U(1)$  gauge group, which introduces a new vector mediator. If such mediators exist, they could contribute significantly to  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  processes, resulting in observable distortions of the detectable rates, being particularly relevant at low-energy nuclear recoils. Several studies examined NSI contributions to  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  in both the light [62, 91] and heavy [35, 77, 92] mediator regimes. To our knowledge, up to now there exists only one study which explored the impact of NSI at the ESS, focusing mainly on the heavy mediator regime [77].

In addition to the conventional NSI, which usually encompasses vector ( $V$ ) or axial vector ( $A$ ) interactions arising from gauge extensions, a more generalized framework can be constructed to account for all Lorentz-invariant interactions that may indicate new physics. This scenario is known as NGI [54, 55], which accounts also for scalar ( $S$ ), pseudoscalar ( $P$ ) and tensor ( $T$ ) interactions. A few comments are in order: scalar and pseudoscalar interactions can emerge from Yukawa-type interaction terms if an additional scalar/pseudoscalar mediator is introduced alongside the existing SM particle content, while vector and axial vector interactions are commonly generated within gauge extensions of the SM. In contrast, tensor interactions represent an effective type of interaction, typically necessitating multiple mediators or composite particles within a UV complete theory to be fully realized. As such, tensor interactions often arise in low energy phenomenological processes, while a full UV complete model may require a more intricate theoretical foundation involving composite structures or the interplay of multiple mediator particles.

Following a model-independent approach, in this work, we add the most general effective NGI operators to the SM Lagrangian below the electroweak scale, as [55]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NGI}}^{\nu q} \supset -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\substack{X=S,P,V,A,T \\ q=u,d}} \varepsilon_{\nu q}^X [\bar{\nu}\Gamma^X\nu] [\bar{q}\Gamma_X q]. \quad (7)$$

This Lagrangian incorporates all possible Lorentz-invariant, neutral-current interactions between neutrinos and first-generation quarks. Here,  $\Gamma_X \equiv \{\mathbb{1}, i\gamma^5, \gamma_\rho, \gamma_\rho\gamma^5, \sigma_{\rho\delta}\}$  (with  $\sigma_{\rho\delta} = \frac{i}{2}[\gamma_\rho, \gamma_\delta]$ ) correspond to  $X \equiv \{S, P, V, A, T\}$ . The relative strengths of the new physics interactions are encoded in the real, dimensionless coefficients  $\varepsilon_{\nu q}^X$ . For the case of light mediators, where their mass is comparable to or smaller than the typical momentum transfer in the experiment ( $\sim \mathcal{O}(10)$  MeV for  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ ), the interaction strength is parameterized as  $\varepsilon_{\nu q}^X \sim [\sqrt{2}/G_F] [g_X^2/(q^2 + M_X^2)]$ . Here,  $M_X$  represents the mediator mass of the type  $X \equiv \{S, P, V, A, T\}$ , and  $g_X$  denotes the

corresponding coupling strength defined as  $g_X = \sqrt{g_\nu^X g_q^X}$ , where universal quark couplings  $g_u^X = g_d^X = g_q^X$  have been assumed, while  $g_\nu^X$  stands for the corresponding neutrino coupling. Notably, for mediators with masses much higher than the momentum transfer of the experiment, one can integrate out the mediator mass from the denominator of the interaction strength.

Moving from quark- to nuclear-level operators the resulting Lagrangian takes the form [55]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NGI}}^{\nu\mathcal{N}} \supset - \sum_{X=S,P,V,A,T} \frac{C_X}{\mathbf{q}^2 + M_X^2} [\bar{\nu}\Gamma^X\nu] [\mathcal{N}\Gamma_X\mathcal{N}], \quad (8)$$

where  $C_X$  represents the effective  $\nu\text{-}\mathcal{N}$  coupling. Among the different interactions, scalar and vector interactions are spin-independent, whereas pseudoscalar, axial vector, and tensor interactions depend on nuclear spin. The contributions of different interactions to the CE $\nu$ NS differential cross section are expressed as [39]

$$\left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_S^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{m_N^2 T_N C_S^2}{4\pi E_\nu^2 (M_S^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \mathcal{F}_W^2(\mathbf{q}^2), \quad (9a)$$

$$\left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_V^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \left( 1 + \frac{C_V}{\sqrt{2} G_F Q_W^V (M_V^2 + 2m_N T_N)} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_{\text{SM}}^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}}, \quad (9b)$$

$$\left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_A^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{4m_N}{2J+1} \frac{C_A^2}{(M_A^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \left[ 1 + \frac{m_N T_N}{2E_\nu^2} - \frac{T_N}{E_\nu} \right] S_{00}^T(\mathbf{q}^2), \quad (9c)$$

$$\left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_T^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}} = \frac{m_N}{2J+1} \frac{C_T^2}{(M_T^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \left\{ \left[ 2 - \frac{m_N T_N}{E_\nu^2} - \frac{2T_N}{E_\nu} \right] S_{00}^T(\mathbf{q}^2) + \left[ 1 - \frac{T_N}{E_\nu} \right] S_{00}^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{q}^2) \right\}, \quad (9d)$$

where  $\mathcal{O}(T_N/m_N)$  and higher order  $\mathcal{O}(T_N^2)$  terms have been neglected. The pseudoscalar interaction is neglected since its contribution at low-momentum transfer ( $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0$ ) is found to be negligible [39, 93]. It is important to note that the differential cross sections for  $X = S, A, T$  interactions are provided for pure new physics contributions. In contrast, due to the interference term, the differential cross section for the vector interaction is expressed as the sum of the SM and BSM contributions. Even though the SM CE $\nu$ NS cross section given in Eq. (3) includes an axial vector component, there is no interference between the SM and axial vector NGI contributions considered here. The absence of interference arises since the relevant spin-structure function for the SM CE $\nu$ NS case is  $S_{11}^T$ , while for the NGI case the relevant spin structure function is  $S_{00}^T$ . This is due to the fact that for the NGI scenarios, universal quark couplings  $g_u^A = g_d^A$  are assumed. The effective couplings for the different interactions are given as [83, 93–96]

$$C_S = g_\nu^S \left( \mathbb{Z} \sum_{q=u,d} g_q^S \frac{m_p}{m_q} f_{T_q}^p + \mathbb{N} \sum_{q=u,d} g_q^S \frac{m_n}{m_q} f_{T_q}^n \right), \quad (10a)$$

$$C_V = \kappa g_\nu^V [\mathbb{Z}(2g_u^V + g_d^V) + \mathbb{N}(g_u^V + 2g_d^V)] = 3\kappa \mathbb{A} g_\nu^V g_q^V, \quad (10b)$$

$$C_A = g_\nu^A g_q^A (\Delta_u^p + \Delta_d^p), \quad (10c)$$

$$C_T = g_\nu^T g_q^T (\delta_u^p + \delta_d^p), \quad (10d)$$

where  $m_p$  and  $m_n$  are the proton and neutron masses,  $m_q$  are the quark masses, and finally the hadronic structure parameters for the scalar interaction are [97]

$$f_{T_u}^p = 0.026, \quad f_{T_d}^p = 0.038, \quad f_{T_u}^n = 0.018, \quad f_{T_d}^n = 0.056.$$



For the vector-mediated interaction, we consider the anomaly-free  $U(1)_{B-L}$  gauge extension of the SM as the benchmark model. In this case, anomaly cancellation conditions dictate the charges assigned to leptons ( $Q'_\ell = -1$ ) and quarks ( $Q'_q = 1/3$ ) under the additional  $U(1)'$  gauge symmetry. This results in an effective vector charge as defined in Eq. (10b), with  $\kappa = Q'_\ell \cdot Q'_q = -1/3$ . For axial vector and tensor-mediated cross sections the longitudinal and transverse spin structure functions,  $S_{ij}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $S_{ij}^{\mathcal{T}}$ , are evaluated following the methodology specified in Ref. [83] (for more details see the Appendix B of Ref. [71]). Finally, for the tensor interaction, the hadronic structure functions read [97]

$$\delta_u^p = \delta_d^n = 0.784, \quad \delta_d^p = \delta_u^n = -0.204.$$

Again and similarly to the axial vector case, for tensor NGI the relevant spin-structure functions are  $S_{00}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $S_{00}^{\mathcal{T}}$ .

As explained previously, among the different detectors analyzed in this study, only the CsI and  $C_3F_8$  detectors, which contain spin-dependent isotopes, acquire non-vanishing sensitivity to axial vector and tensor-mediated  $CE\nu NS$  processes.

### C. Phenomenology of sterile neutrinos and sterile neutral leptons

Within the context of the SM, neutrinos are left-handed and massless without any isosinglet “right-handed” counterparts. One of the simplest mechanisms to provide mass to neutrinos is the so-called “seesaw” mechanism, which introduces an arbitrary number of new right-handed sterile neutral leptons for each left-handed neutrino [98–103]. These right-handed neutral leptons, typically taken as singlets under the SM gauge group, are commonly referred to as sterile neutrinos or sterile neutral lepton in the literature<sup>2</sup>. Depending on their masses, the experimental signatures of these sterile neutral leptons can be best probed in different ways. Therefore, in order to differentiate their role and implications in neutrino phenomenology, in this work we make the following distinction.

- **Sterile Neutrinos ( $\nu_s$ ):** We call them sterile neutrinos if they are sufficiently light. In that case, they may participate in neutrino oscillations in the short baseline experiments, leading to active-sterile oscillations [68, 104, 105].
- **Sterile Neutral Leptons ( $N_R$ ):** When they are sufficiently heavier than active neutrinos, we simply call them sterile neutral leptons (SNL). Indeed, if their masses are significantly larger than the electroweak scale, they would contribute to weak interaction processes only through their mixing with the SM neutrinos, leading to a phenomenon known as lepton unitarity violation [106–108].

SNLs can be also produced via active-sterile neutrino Transition Magnetic Moments (TMM) [109]. Going one step further, one can also build up the framework for the production of a massive sterile neutral lepton through the upscattering of active neutrinos on nuclei, involving various Lorentz-invariant interactions (scalar, pseudoscalar, vector, axial vector, and tensor) [70, 71, 110–112].

In this subsection, we will briefly discuss all the aforementioned scenarios, with a particular emphasis on their implications in the context of  $CE\nu NS$ .

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that, as far as Lorentz and SM gauge symmetries are concerned, there is no difference between right handed neutrinos, sterile neutrinos and sterile neutral leptons. Hence these terms are often used interchangeably.

### 1. Violation of lepton unitarity

We consider a scenario that extends the SM by incorporating  $n$  heavy neutral leptons ( $N_{R,i}$ ;  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) in addition to the three standard light neutrinos. These new heavy neutral leptons are assumed to be SM gauge singlets and much heavier than the electroweak scale. In such scenarios, the generalized unitary lepton mixing matrix can be expressed as [106, 113]

$$U \equiv \begin{pmatrix} N_{3 \times 3} & S_{3 \times n} \\ V_{n \times 3} & T_{n \times n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where  $N_{3 \times 3}$  describes the mixing among light neutrino states,  $S$  and  $V$  represent the mixing between light and heavy states, and  $T$  denotes the mixing among the heavy states. The  $N_{3 \times 3}$  submatrix can be written as [107]

$$N_{3 \times 3} = N_{3 \times 3}^{\text{NP}} U_{3 \times 3}^{\text{PMNS}}, \quad (12)$$

where  $U_{3 \times 3}^{\text{PMNS}}$  is the standard  $3 \times 3$  Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) unitary mixing matrix [114, 115], while  $N_{3 \times 3}^{\text{NP}}$  accounts for new physics effects associated with unitarity violation. The latter matrix is parameterized in a lower-triangular form [107]

$$N_{3 \times 3}^{\text{NP}} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha_{12} & \alpha_{22} & 0 \\ \alpha_{13} & \alpha_{23} & \alpha_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where the diagonal elements  $\alpha_{ii}$  are real, and the off-diagonal elements  $\alpha_{ij}$  are generally small and complex. These elements satisfy the ‘‘triangle inequalities’’ [116, 117]

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_{21}| &\leq \sqrt{(1 - \alpha_{11}^2)(1 - \alpha_{22}^2)}, \\ |\alpha_{31}| &\leq \sqrt{(1 - \alpha_{11}^2)(1 - \alpha_{33}^2)}, \\ |\alpha_{32}| &\leq \sqrt{(1 - \alpha_{22}^2)(1 - \alpha_{33}^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In Eq. (11), the submatrix  $S \sim \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is the seesaw expansion parameter [118]. The unitarity condition of  $U$  then implies  $NN^\dagger + SS^\dagger = I$ , leading to  $NN^\dagger \sim 1 - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ . Consequently, within the seesaw paradigm, we find  $\alpha_{ii}^2 \sim 1 - \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$  and  $|\alpha_{ij}|^2 \sim \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^4)$  [108]. For the most general charged-current interactions, the relevant rectangular sub-block is  $K \equiv \begin{pmatrix} N_{3 \times 3} & S_{3 \times n} \end{pmatrix}$ , while for neutral-current interactions,  $P = K^\dagger K$  is required [106]. If the energy of a given process is much lower than the masses of the heavy sterile states, these will not be produced in the short baseline experiments, like e.g. the ESS. For example, the heavy states will not take part in oscillation experiments. Then, effectively, only the first  $3 \times 3$  blocks of  $K$  ( $N$ ) and  $P$  ( $N^\dagger N$ ) will play a crucial role in the charged- and neutral-current weak interactions, respectively.

The SM CE $\nu$ NS cross section, discussed in Eq. (3), is proportional to the Fermi constant  $G_F$ , which is usually extracted from the  $\mu^-$  decay width. However, in the presence of non-unitarity (NU), the  $W$ -boson vertices are modified, and as a result the measured quantity would be the effective muon decay coupling  $G_\mu$ . These are related by [68]

$$\frac{G_F^2}{G_\mu^2} = \frac{1}{(NN^\dagger)_{ee}(NN^\dagger)_{\mu\mu}}. \quad (15)$$



Given that at the ESS the neutrinos are generated through charged-current interaction, and subsequently scatter with the nucleus via the neutral-current interaction channel, the zero-distance probability factor is given as [108]

$$\mathcal{P} = (NN^\dagger NN^\dagger NN^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\nu_\alpha$  is the incident neutrino flavor. The ratio of the expected events in the SM ( $R_{\text{SM}}$ ) and NU cases ( $R_{\text{NU}}$ ) is then expressed as  $R_{\text{NU}}/R_{\text{SM}} = \mathcal{P} \cdot [G_F^2/G_\mu^2]$ . Following Ref. [108], we expand  $R_{\text{NU}}$  in powers of  $\varepsilon$ , retaining terms up to  $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\nu_\mu\mathcal{N}}^{\text{NU}} &= (2\alpha_{22}^2 - \alpha_{11}^2)R_{\nu_\mu\mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}}, \\ R_{\nu_e\mathcal{N}}^{\text{NU}} &= (2\alpha_{11}^2 - \alpha_{22}^2)R_{\nu_e\mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}}, \\ R_{\bar{\nu}_\mu\mathcal{N}}^{\text{NU}} &= (2\alpha_{22}^2 - \alpha_{11}^2)R_{\bar{\nu}_\mu\mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Thus, for our analysis, the relevant NU parameters affecting the neutrino signal are  $\alpha_{11}$  and  $\alpha_{22}$ . Unlike neutrino oscillation experiments, the neutrino signal in this case is independent of CP-violating phases and standard oscillation phenomena.

## 2. Sterile neutrino oscillations

Although most theoretical neutrino mass mechanisms suggest the existence of heavy sterile neutral leptons, it is possible that singlet neutrinos also exist in nature, being light enough to participate in oscillations [119]. These are commonly referred to as light sterile neutrinos ( $\nu_s$ ). In our study, we consider the simplest 3+1 scenario in which the standard lepton mixing matrix is extended to incorporate the three standard generations of active neutrinos plus one light sterile neutrino. In experiments such as ESS, where neutrinos are detected via CE $\nu$ NS, the oscillation effects differ from those observed in conventional oscillation experiments. The very short baseline of such facilities suppresses the oscillations between active neutrino flavors, while matter effects can also be neglected due to the minimal path length. Moreover, while neutrinos are primarily produced via conventional charged-current processes, the CE $\nu$ NS detection relies on neutral-current interactions, unlike the case of dedicated oscillation experiments. Therefore, CE $\nu$ NS signals in ESS-like experiments can provide complementary constraints on light sterile neutrinos, particularly given their potential for a high-intensity pulsed neutrino source and high-statistics data.

In this context, the survival probabilities of electron neutrinos ( $\mathcal{P}_{ee}$ ) and muon (anti)neutrinos ( $\mathcal{P}_{\mu\mu}$ ) are expressed as [68]

$$\mathcal{P}_{ee}(E_\nu) \approx 1 - \sin^2(2\theta_{14}) \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m_{41}^2 L}{4E_\nu}\right), \quad (18a)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mu\mu}(E_\nu) \approx 1 - \sin^2(2\theta_{24}) \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m_{42}^2 L}{4E_\nu}\right), \quad (18b)$$

where  $\theta_{14}$  and  $\theta_{24}$  are the active-sterile mixing angles, and  $\Delta m_{41}^2 \approx \Delta m_{42}^2 = \Delta m^2$  represent the active-sterile mass splittings, while  $L$  is the baseline of the experiment. Here, we assume  $\Delta m^2$  to be much larger than the solar ( $\Delta m_{21}^2$ ) and atmospheric ( $|\Delta m_{31}^2|$ ) mass splittings. The sterile neutrino oscillation effects modify the unoscillated flux distributions reaching the detector according to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Phi_{\nu_e}}{dE_\nu} &= \mathcal{P}_{ee}(E_\nu) \frac{d\Phi_{\nu_e}^0}{dE_\nu}, \\ \frac{d\Phi_{\nu_\mu}}{dE_\nu} + \frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}_\mu}}{dE_\nu} &= \mathcal{P}_{\mu\mu}(E_\nu) \left( \frac{d\Phi_{\nu_\mu}^0}{dE_\nu} + \frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}_\mu}^0}{dE_\nu} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where  $d\Phi_{\nu_\alpha}^0/dE_\nu$  represents the unoscillated flux distributions produced at the source, and  $d\Phi_{\nu_\alpha}/dE_\nu$  corresponds to the flux arriving at the detector.

### 3. Sterile dipole portal

As discussed previously, one possibility of producing SNLs is through electromagnetic upscattering of an active neutrino on nuclei, provided that there is a large TMM between the active and sterile states. When muon or electron (anti)neutrinos interact electromagnetically with a target nucleus of charge  $\mathbb{Z}e$ , it is possible to generate SNL via the upscattering process  $\nu_{e/\mu} \mathcal{N} \rightarrow N_R \mathcal{N}$ . Neglecting the tiny contribution from the nuclear magnetic dipole moment, the differential cross section for this process is given as [69, 109, 112]

$$\left[ \frac{d\sigma_{\nu_\alpha \mathcal{N}}}{dT_{\mathcal{N}}} \right]_{\text{DP}}^{\nu_{\mathcal{N}} - N_R \mathcal{N}} = \frac{\pi \alpha_{\text{EM}}^2}{m_e^2} \mathbb{Z}^2 \mathcal{F}_W^2(\mathbf{q}^2) \left| \frac{\mu_{\nu_\alpha}}{\mu_B} \right|^2 \times \left[ \frac{1}{T_{\mathcal{N}}} - \frac{1}{E_\nu} - \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{2E_\nu T_{\mathcal{N}} m_{\mathcal{N}}} \left( 1 - \frac{T_{\mathcal{N}}}{2E_\nu} + \frac{m_{\mathcal{N}}}{2E_\nu} \right) + \frac{m_{N_R}^4 (T_{\mathcal{N}} - m_{\mathcal{N}})}{8E_\nu^2 T_{\mathcal{N}}^2 m_{\mathcal{N}}^2} \right], \quad (20)$$

where  $\alpha_{\text{EM}}$  is the fine-structure constant,  $m_{N_R}$  is the mass of SNL, and  $\mu_{\nu_\alpha}$  is the effective neutrino magnetic moment<sup>3</sup>, expressed in units of the Bohr magneton,  $\mu_B$ . The kinematics of this process imposes an upper bound on the produced SNL mass  $m_{N_R}$ , as

$$m_{N_R}^2 \lesssim 2m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{2}{m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}}} E_\nu} - 1 \right), \quad (21)$$

while for this scenario the minimum neutrino energy is obtained by inverting the last expression, and reads

$$E_\nu^{\text{min}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}}}{2}} \left( 1 + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{2m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}}} \right). \quad (22)$$

### 4. Upscattering Production of Sterile Neutral Leptons via NGIs

In analogy to the dipole portal scenario discussed previously, SNLs can also be produced via the upscattering of active neutrinos on nuclei mediated by generalized Lorentz-invariant interactions. For this scenario, we adopt a nuclear-level Lagrangian similar to the one considered for the NGI framework in Eq. (8), but with the outgoing active neutrino replaced by a massive SNL ( $N_R$ ). The modified Lagrangian is expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SNL}}^{\nu_{\mathcal{N}} - N_R \mathcal{N}} \supset - \sum_{\substack{X=S,P,V,A,T \\ \alpha=e,\mu,\tau}} \frac{C_X}{\mathbf{q}^2 + M_X^2} [\bar{N}_R \Gamma^X \nu_{L,\alpha}] [\mathcal{N} T_X \mathcal{N}], \quad (23)$$

where  $\nu_{L,\alpha}$  is the left-handed neutrino field.

<sup>3</sup> The effective neutrino magnetic moment for the active-sterile transition is written in terms of fundamental TMMs, CP phases and neutrino mixing parameters [69]. In this work, for simplicity we will focus on effective magnetic moments only.

The corresponding CE $\nu$ NS cross sections by dropping  $\mathcal{O}(T_N/m_N)$  and higher order  $\mathcal{O}(T_N^2)$  terms<sup>4</sup>, read [70, 71]

$$\left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_S^{\nu\mathcal{N}-N_R\mathcal{N}} = \frac{m_N C_S^2}{4\pi(M_S^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \mathcal{F}_W^2(\mathbf{q}^2) \left( \frac{m_N T_N}{E_\nu^2} + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{2E_\nu^2} \right), \quad (24a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_V^{\nu\mathcal{N}-N_R\mathcal{N}} &= \frac{m_N C_V^2}{2\pi(M_V^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \mathcal{F}_W^2(\mathbf{q}^2) \\ &\times \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{m_N T_N}{2E_\nu^2} - \frac{T_N}{E_\nu} \right) - \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{4E_\nu^2} \left( 1 + \frac{2E_\nu}{m_N} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (24b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_A^{\nu\mathcal{N}-N_R\mathcal{N}} &= \frac{2m_N}{2J+1} \frac{C_A^2}{(M_A^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \\ &\times \left\{ \left[ \left( 2 + \frac{m_N T_N}{E_\nu^2} - \frac{2T_N}{E_\nu} \right) - \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{2E_\nu^2} \left( 1 + \frac{3E_\nu}{m_N} + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{m_N T_N} \right) \right] S_{00}^T(\mathbf{q}^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{E_\nu^2} \left( 2 + \frac{3E_\nu}{m_N} + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{m_N T_N} \right) S_{00}^L(\mathbf{q}^2) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (24c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_N} \right]_T^{\nu\mathcal{N}-N_R\mathcal{N}} &= \frac{m_N}{2J+1} \frac{C_T^2}{(M_T^2 + 2m_N T_N)^2} \\ &\times \left\{ \left[ \left( 2 - \frac{m_N T_N}{E_\nu^2} - \frac{2T_N}{E_\nu} \right) + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{2E_\nu^2} \left( 1 + \frac{3E_\nu}{m_N} + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{m_N T_N} \right) \right] S_{00}^T(\mathbf{q}^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{T_N}{E_\nu} \right) - \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{2E_\nu^2} \left( 1 + \frac{3E_\nu}{2m_N} + \frac{m_{N_R}^2}{2m_N T_N} \right) \right] S_{00}^L(\mathbf{q}^2) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (24d)$$

where  $m_{N_R}$  is the SNL mass. For the axial vector and tensor interactions, non-zero contributions are expected only for Ar and C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detectors, as previously discussed. Unlike the SM and NGI cases, in this scenario the axial vector cross section receives non-negligible contributions from the longitudinal multipoles as well, as previously noted in Ref. [71]. Finally, the kinematics of this process remains essentially identical to that discussed for the sterile neutrino dipole portal scenario in Eqs. (21) and (22). One may notice that in the limit  $m_{N_R} \rightarrow 0$  the NGI cross sections given in Eq. (9) are recovered.

### III. EVENTS SIMULATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In this section, we detail the methodology for accurately simulating the CE $\nu$ NS signal expected at the proposed ESS detectors. We furthermore describe the statistical analysis procedures employed in this work for obtaining the attainable ESS sensitivities for the various SM and BSM parameters of interest.

Following Ref. [75], we evaluate the expected CE $\nu$ NS events in each nuclear recoil energy bin,

<sup>4</sup> For the full expressions see Ref. [71].

Detector	$m_{\text{det}}$ (kg)	$T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{th}}$ (keV $_{nr}$ )	$T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{max}}$ (keV $_{nr}$ )	$\sigma_0$ (keV $_{nr}$ )	Steady-state background
CsI	22.5	1	46.1	0.3	10 counts/keV $_{nr}$ /kg/day
Xe	20	0.9	45.6	0.36	10 counts/keV $_{nr}$ /kg/day
Ge	7	0.6	78.9	0.09	3 counts/keV $_{nr}$ /kg/day
Si	1	0.16	212.9	0.096	0.04375 counts/keV $_{nr}$ /kg/day
Ar	10	0.1	150	0.04	0.1 counts/kg/day
C <sub>3</sub> F <sub>8</sub>	10	2	329.6	0.8	0.1 counts/kg/day

TABLE II: Summary of the key parameters for different detectors proposed for CE $\nu$ NS measurements at the ESS. The table includes the target nucleus, detector mass, nuclear recoil energy threshold, maximum nuclear recoil energy, resolution power at  $T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{th}}$ , and steady-state background counts. For CsI, Xe, Ge, and Si detectors, flat background rates are provided (counts/keV $_{nr}$ /kg/day), whereas for Ar and C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detectors, total background counts/(kg-day) are provided. It should be noted that the background rates listed do not include the reduction factor of  $4 \times 10^{-2}$  due to ESS duty cycle. The information presented here is adapted from Ref. [75].

$i$ , for different interaction channels  $x \equiv \{\text{SM}, \text{BSM}\}$  through the expression

$$[R_{\nu\alpha\mathcal{N}}^\kappa]^i = t_{\text{run}} N_T \mathcal{A} \int_{T_{\mathcal{N}}^i}^{T_{\mathcal{N}}^{i+1}} dT_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{reco}} \int_0^{T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{max}}} dT_{\mathcal{N}} G(T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{reco}}, T_{\mathcal{N}}) \int_{E_\nu^{\text{min}}(T_{\mathcal{N}})}^{E_\nu^{\text{max}}} dE_\nu \frac{d\Phi_{\nu\alpha}(E_\nu)}{dE_\nu} \left[ \frac{d\sigma}{dT_{\mathcal{N}}} \right]_x^{\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}}, \quad (25)$$

where  $t_{\text{run}}$  is the experimental run time, and  $\mathcal{A}$  represents the detector efficiency which is taken to be flat 80% above the nuclear recoil threshold following Ref. [75]. Moreover,  $N_T = m_{\text{det}} N_A / M$  is the number of target nuclei in the detector, where  $m_{\text{det}}$  is the detector mass,  $N_A$  is Avogadro's number, and  $M$  is the molar mass of the target. The variables  $T_{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{reco}}$  represent the true and measured nuclear recoil energies, respectively. The minimum neutrino energy<sup>5</sup> required to induce a recoil energy  $T_{\mathcal{N}}$  is given by  $E_\nu^{\text{min}} \approx \sqrt{m_{\mathcal{N}} T_{\mathcal{N}} / 2}$ , and the maximum recoil energy is  $T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{max}} \approx 2(E_\nu^{\text{max}})^2 / m_{\mathcal{N}}$ , while the maximum neutrino energy from the ESS flux is  $E_\nu^{\text{max}} = m_\mu / 2 \approx 52.8$  MeV. The neutrino fluxes consist of a prompt  $\nu_\mu$  beam from  $\pi^+$  decay at rest, and a delayed  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  and  $\nu_e$  beams from  $\mu^+$  decay at rest. The differential neutrino energy spectra are given by the Michel spectra [120, 121]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Phi_{\nu_\mu}(E_\nu)}{dE_\nu} &= \eta \delta \left( E_\nu - \frac{m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2}{2m_\pi} \right) && \text{(prompt)}, \\ \frac{d\Phi_{\bar{\nu}_\mu}(E_\nu)}{dE_\nu} &= \eta \frac{64E_\nu^2}{m_\mu^3} \left( \frac{3}{4} - \frac{E_\nu}{m_\mu} \right) && \text{(delayed)}, \\ \frac{d\Phi_{\nu_e}(E_\nu)}{dE_\nu} &= \eta \frac{192E_\nu^2}{m_\mu^3} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{E_\nu}{m_\mu} \right) && \text{(delayed)}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the flux normalization  $\eta = r N_{\text{POT}} / 4\pi L^2$ , with  $L = 20$  m being the ESS baseline,  $r = 0.3$  the neutrino yield per flavor per Proton On Target (POT), and  $N_{\text{POT}} = 2.8 \times 10^{23}$  the number of POT accumulated over one calendar year (208 effective days).

For realistic simulations, the event spectra are smeared using a Gaussian resolution function

$$G(T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{reco}}, T_{\mathcal{N}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma(T_{\mathcal{N}})} \exp \left( - \left[ \frac{T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{reco}} - T_{\mathcal{N}}}{\sqrt{2} \sigma(T_{\mathcal{N}})} \right]^2 \right). \quad (27)$$

<sup>5</sup> For the case of upscattering processes, the kinematically allowed minimum neutrino energy is given in Eq. (22).




FIG. 1: Expected signal and SSB event spectra as a function of the reconstructed nuclear recoil energy for CsI, Xe, Ge, and Si detectors. The results are obtained assuming 3 effective years of data taking time. The signal events are estimated for SM and various possible new physics contributions to the CE $\nu$ NS. The cyan curve represents the square root of the expected SSB for visual clarity.

The energy-dependent resolution power is parameterized as  $\sigma(T_{\mathcal{N}}) = \sigma_0 \sqrt{T_{\mathcal{N}}/T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{th}}}$ , where  $\sigma_0$  denotes the resolution power at the recoil energy threshold,  $T_{\mathcal{N}}^{\text{th}}$ . The values of  $\sigma_0$  for the various proposed detectors are provided in Ref. [75] and are also listed in Table II. As outlined in Ref. [75], the reconstructed nuclear recoil energy range is divided into bins for CsI, Xe, Ge, and Si detectors, with the bin width taken to be twice the energy resolution at the bin center. However, for Ar and C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detectors, no recoil energy binning is considered. In these cases, the total number of events is calculated by simply integrating the event rate between the threshold and the maximum nuclear recoil energies.

The relevant specifications of the various proposed CE $\nu$ NS detectors at the ESS in Ref. [75] are summarized in Table II, which includes information on detector-specific parameters such as mass, nuclear recoil thresholds, energy resolution, and background rates. These steady-state back-

grounds (SSB), primarily arising from cosmic ray interactions, are anticipated to be the dominant background for CE $\nu$ NS searches at ESS, as discussed in Ref. [75]. Other potential background sources, such as Beam-Related spallation Neutrons (BRN) and Neutrino-Induced Neutrons (NIN), are considered to be negligible due to their relatively small contributions.

In Fig. 1, we present the simulated event spectra for the CsI, Xe, Ge, and Si detectors, assuming 3 years of data taking time. The spectra show the number of signal events as a function of the reconstructed nuclear recoil energy, incorporating the SM prediction for CE $\nu$ NS as well as contributions from various new physics scenarios at future ESS. Notice that the SM case is found to be in excellent agreement with Ref. [77]. Additionally, the SSB is displayed for each detector with a cyan curve, by noting that for the sake of better visualization its square root shown.

For the spectral analysis, we employ the following Poissonian  $\chi^2$  test statistic

$$\chi^2(\mathcal{S}) = 2 \sum_i \left[ R_{\text{th}}^i(\mathcal{S}; \alpha, \beta) - R_{\text{exp}}^i + R_{\text{exp}}^i \ln \left( \frac{R_{\text{exp}}^i}{R_{\text{th}}^i(\mathcal{S}; \alpha, \beta)} \right) \right] + \left( \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_\alpha} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\beta}{\sigma_\beta} \right)^2, \quad (28)$$

where  $R_{\text{exp}}^i$  represents the expected number of events in the  $i$ th energy bin, derived as the sum of the SM contributions from signal and SSB, i.e.,  $R_{\text{exp}}^i = \sum_\alpha [R_{\nu_\alpha \mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}}]^i + [R_{\text{SSB}}]^i$ . The term  $R_{\text{th}}^i$  denotes the theoretically predicted events in the  $i$ th bin, incorporating both signal and background contributions as determined by the model under consideration. The latter quantity incorporates the nuisance parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , which account for signal and background systematic uncertainties, respectively, as

$$R_{\text{th}}^i(\mathcal{S}; \alpha, \beta) = (1 + \alpha) \sum_\alpha [R_{\nu_\alpha \mathcal{N}}^x]^i + (1 + \beta) [R_{\text{SSB}}]^i. \quad (29)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{S}$  denotes the set of free parameters associated with the interaction channel  $x$  being tested. As suggested in Ref. [75], a systematic uncertainty of  $\sigma_\alpha = 10\%$  is adopted for the signal prediction, which accounts for cumulative uncertainties from neutrino flux estimation, nuclear form factors, and energy efficiency. Finally, the systematic uncertainty on background normalization is fixed to  $\sigma_\beta = 1\%$  for all detectors considered in this analysis.

#### IV. RESULTS

We now present the results on the projected ESS sensitivities considering 3 years of experimental run time for the various physics scenarios discussed in Sec. II. For visual clarity, whenever possible the latter are illustrated in the form of combined sensitivities, extracted from a simultaneous analysis of all the proposed ESS detectors. While it is not clear whether all the aforementioned detectors will be deployed at the ESS, in this work we intend to explore the full potential of future ESS measurements given the provided information [75]. For completeness, the projected sensitivities obtained for the individual detectors are shown in Appendix A. Let us also stress that, as can be seen from the Appendix, for most of the cases the constraints coming out from the individual detector analyses are quite similar, hence the combined analysis presented below is not driven by a particular nuclear target.

We begin by exploring the projected constraints on the SM weak mixing angle. With its high-intensity neutrino flux and potential for large statistical samples, ESS is a favorable facility to constrain the weak mixing angle in the low-energy regime. The  $\Delta\chi^2$  profile of  $\sin^2\theta_W$  from the combined analysis of all ESS detectors considered in this study is shown in Fig. 2, while the corresponding  $1\sigma$  determination is found to be<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> The value of the RGE extrapolated weak mixing angle which coincides with our best fit point, has been rounded to match the number of significant figures.






FIG. 2: Projected sensitivity on the weak mixing angle from the combined analysis of the proposed ESS detectors.




FIG. 3:  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  evolution within the SM, depicted by the magenta solid line, under the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  renormalization scheme as a function of the renormalization scale ( $\mu$ ). The blue error bar denotes the  $1\sigma$  determinations of  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  from the combined analysis of all detectors considered in this study. Other measurements from various experiments across different renormalization scales are also included for comparison.

$$\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.239^{+0.011}_{-0.010}.$$

The individual  $1\sigma$  projections on  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  coming out from the analysis of the different detectors are provided in Table IV in Appendix A. As expected, the extracted best fit value matches exactly with the RGE-extrapolated value of  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  in the low-energy regime. This is expected by recalling that in our performed statistical analysis when treating the weak mixing angle as a free parameter, we compare the corresponding predicted events with the expected SM events. Since





FIG. 4: Projected sensitivity on the neutron rms radii of different detectors at the ESS.

the latter is evaluated by fixing the weak mixing angle to the value predicted by the low-energy RGE extrapolation, we consistently obtain this to be the best fit point. In Fig. 3, we compare our results with determinations from other probes [34, 35, 122] across a wide range of energies. While the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty of  $\sin^2\theta_W$  in the low-energy regime will not be able to compete with other precision experiments such as atomic parity violation (APV), the complementarity with other CE $\nu$ NS measurements is particularly noteworthy. Indeed, due to the high statistics anticipated from the ESS facility, its sensitivity on  $\sin^2\theta_W$  is expected to surpass that of current CE $\nu$ NS-based measurements. For instance, our present results imply that the uncertainty will be reduced by  $\sim 60\%$  with respect to the COHERENT limit [34] and  $\sim 80\%$  compared to Dresden-II [35, 72]. Further improvements can be achieved by combining the future ESS sensitivities presented here with APV data, as recently done in Refs. [33, 36] for the case of COHERENT.

The nuclear rms radius is another crucial SM parameter of the CE $\nu$ NS cross section which enters through the nuclear form factor (see Eqs. (1) and (5) for reference). From the theoretical perspective, the estimation of this parameter is heavily dependent on the nuclear structure model [83, 123–125]. While the nuclear proton rms radius ( $R_p$ ) has been measured experimentally with high precision [126], the corresponding nuclear neutron rms radius ( $R_n$ ) is yet poorly constrained. CE $\nu$ NS being a purely neutral-current process offers a valuable probe for a precise determination of  $R_n$  [43, 127–129]. In this study, different rms radii are considered for protons and neutrons, i.e., we take  $\mathcal{F}_p(q^2) \neq \mathcal{F}_n(q^2)$ . Specifically, for each detector nucleus, the proton rms radius is fixed as listed in Table I, while the neutron one is treated as a free parameter.

Since a combined analysis has no meaning for  $R_n$ , in Fig. 4 we show the projected sensitivities for the different proposed target nuclei at the future ESS experiment. The corresponding  $1\sigma$  ranges are summarized in Table III. Comparing with bounds placed from the analysis of available CE $\nu$ NS data, we conclude that a significant improvement is expected to be reached by the ESS. In particular, for CsI (Ar) we find an improvement of  $\sim 40\%$  compared to an existing analysis

Detector	CsI	Xe	Ge	Si	Ar	C <sub>3</sub> F <sub>8</sub>
$R_n$ (fm)	[5.948, 6.425]	[5.975, 6.458]	[4.527, 5.602]	[2.612, 4.609]	[3.252, 4.911]	[1.994, 4.057]

TABLE III:  $1\sigma$  range of neutron rms radius  $R_n$  for different detectors.FIG. 5: Projected sensitivity in the  $(R_n, \sin^2 \theta_W)$  plane for the various proposed ESS detectors. The shaded teal region represents the allowed  $1\sigma$  region.

of COHERENT-CsI [34]. Notice that the analysis of COHERENT-LAr data [32, 34] yielded an upper limit only, thus the future ESS measurement will provide valuable new information. For the case of germanium, the first COHERENT data [6] have low statistics, while existing data from the Dresden-II and CONUS+ reactor experiments —for which the momentum transfer is rather low— are less sensitive to nuclear physics effects. Finally, for Xe target nuclei utilized by the direct dark matter detection experiments, while the momentum transfer is not as low as in the reactor experiments, the statistics is still poor to provide a strong constraint.

Finally, we perform a simultaneous fit allowing both  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  and  $R_n$  to vary. Figure 5 displays the projected  $1\sigma$  sensitivity in the  $(R_n, \sin^2 \theta_W)$  plane for different detectors. The different panels provide a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between the weak mixing angle and the neutron nuclear rms radius, highlighting the capability of ESS to simultaneously constrain these parameters. From the various plots one can see that the use of heavier target nuclei leads to an enhanced sensitivity on the nuclear neutron rms radius. This is expected since for the latter cases the effect of the nuclear form factor becomes more pronounced at lower recoil energies, leading to spectral features. Before closing this discussion, let us also mention that the band-shaped regions found for Ar and C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detectors are due to the fact that a single-bin analysis is done for these cases. For the case of CsI, the ESS results will improve previous limits placed by the analysis of




FIG. 6: Projected sensitivities at 90% C.L. for the various  $X = \{S, V, A, T\}$  interactions derived from a combined analysis of all proposed detectors at the ESS.

COHERENT-only data [33, 36]. However, we must note that in a recent work [37] a global fit of all available electroweak data was performed, combining  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  with APV (on Cs and Pb) and PREX-II data. This led to a dramatic improvement in the simultaneous determination of both  $\sin^2\theta_W$  and  $R_n$ . A similar analysis, including future  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  data from the ESS will offer further improvement.

We now explore the prospect of constraining several BSM physics scenarios at the ESS via the  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  channel. We begin our discussion by focusing on NGIs. In Fig. 6, we present the 90% C.L. projected sensitivities in the  $(M_X, g_X)$  parameter plane, obtained from a combined analysis of all proposed detectors. Our purpose here is to highlight the relative strength of the constraints for the different interaction channels. As can be seen, the scalar and vector interactions are expected to yield the most stringent limits, while the nuclear spin-suppressed axial vector interaction will be the least constrained. The projections concerning the various NGIs  $X = \{S, V, A, T\}$  derived for each ESS detector individually, are demonstrated in Appendix A.

It is interesting to examine the complementarity of the projected ESS limits obtained in the present work, with existing constraints in the literature from various experimental and astrophysical sources. Figure 7 overlays the ESS sensitivities (blue contours) with constraints derived from available  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  data, in particular, from a combined analysis of COHERENT CsI and LAr data<sup>7</sup> [34, 62, 130] as well as from a combined analysis of the recently measured solar  $^8\text{B}$  neutrino-induced  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  signals of PandaX-4T and XENONnT [39, 64]. We also include constraints from  $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$ -based analyses of data available from BOREXINO [131], CHARM-II [132], TEXONO [62, 133], and from a combined analysis of PandaX-4T, XENONnT, and LZ data [62, 91, 134]. Limits from the invisible decay of novel bosons at NA64 [135, 136] are also included. We furthermore depict limits from dark photon searches at fixed target electron beam-dump experiments (such as CHARM [137, 138], NA64 [139–141], NOMAD [142], E141 [143, 144], E137 [145, 146], E774 [147], KEK [148], Orsay [146], U70/ $\nu$ -CAL I [149, 150], APEX [151], etc.) and high-energy collider experiments (e.g., BaBar [152, 153] and LHCb [154]). These dark photon search limits

<sup>7</sup> The constraints incorporate both  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  and  $\text{E}\nu\text{ES}$  events for COHERENT-CsI data, whereas only  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  events are considered for COHERENT-LAr data analysis. For further details see Ref. [34].




FIG. 7: Projected sensitivities at 90% C.L. in the  $(M_X, g_X)$  parameter space for scalar, vector  $B - L$ , axial vector, and tensor NGIs, derived from the combined analysis of all the proposed ESS detectors (blue contours). Existing constraints from other experimental and astrophysical probes are included for comparison (see main text for more details).

have been recast into the relevant parameters using the `darkcast` software package, as detailed in Refs. [155, 156]. Additionally, constraints from astrophysical observations, such as Supernova 1987A (SN1987A) [157–159], and cosmological parameters like  $N_{\text{eff}}$  [160–162], which also incorporate Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) limits [163, 164], are superimposed.

From the present analysis we conclude that future CE $\nu$ NS measurements at the ESS will substantially advance the sensitivity to NGIs, complementing and extending existing bounds from diverse experimental and observational datasets. Specifically, for the case of scalar and vector  $B - L$  interactions, the ESS will dominate the constraints for  $M_S > 40$  MeV and  $25 < M_V < 200$  MeV, respectively. Notably these regions are not in conflict with bounds from cosmology. On the other hand, for the spin-dependent axial vector and tensor interactions, the ESS will not be able to compete with existing constraints obtained from E $\nu$ ES analyses. However, this comparison is valid only under the assumption of universal couplings between the novel mediators with the quarks and leptons. Focusing on constraints solely from CE $\nu$ NS, the ESS has the prospect to surpass all the CE $\nu$ NS-based constraints for all the interactions<sup>8</sup>.

At this point we consider the potential to probe unitarity violation effects in the neutrino mixing

<sup>8</sup> Let us remind that the COHERENT constraints reported in Refs. [34, 39] includes also E $\nu$ ES data, which drive the depicted constraints to lower couplings for low mediator masses.




FIG. 8: Projected sensitivity on the NU parameter  $\alpha_{22}$  from the combined analysis of all the proposed ESS detectors considered in this study. For comparison, the corresponding 90% C.L. constraint derived from neutrino oscillation global fits is also shown.

matrix at ESS. As discussed in Sec. II C 1, for the case of ESS the relevant NU parameters are  $\alpha_{11}$  and  $\alpha_{22}$ . However, since the different components of SM events spectra,  $R_{\nu_{\mu}\mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}}$ ,  $R_{\bar{\nu}_{\mu}\mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}}$ , and  $R_{\nu_e\mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}}$ , are approximately equal, using Eq. (17) the ratio of the total number of events can be expressed as  $\sum_{\alpha} R_{\nu_{\alpha}\mathcal{N}}^{\text{NU}} / \sum_{\alpha} R_{\nu_{\alpha}\mathcal{N}}^{\text{SM}} \approx 3\alpha_{22}^2$ . As a result, the total number of events is predominantly sensitive to  $\alpha_{22}$ , rendering ESS incapable of severely constraining  $\alpha_{11}$ . In Fig. 8, we present the  $\Delta\chi^2$  profile of  $1 - \alpha_{22}^2$  from the combined analysis of all detectors considered in this study. As for the previously studied cases, the individual detector sensitivities are shown in Appendix A. From the combined analysis, the projected 90% C.L. sensitivity on  $1 - \alpha_{22}^2$  is determined to be

$$1 - \alpha_{22}^2 < 0.14.$$

For comparison, Fig. 8 also includes the constraints on  $\alpha_{22}$  derived from a global fit of neutrino oscillation data [165]. It becomes evident that given the considered experimental setup, the sensitivities projected for the ESS are not expected to be competitive with those of large-scale oscillation experiments.

Now we turn our attention on exploring the potential of probing sterile neutrino oscillations via neutral current  $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$  measurements at the ESS. The left panel of Fig. 9 shows the 90% C.L. projected sensitivity in the  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{14}, \Delta m^2)$  plane, corresponding to oscillations of electron neutrinos into light sterile states. The right panel displays the corresponding constraints in the  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{24}, \Delta m^2)$  plane for oscillations involving muon neutrinos. Since the ESS will exploit  $\pi$ -DAR neutrinos, the sensitivity to  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{14}, \Delta m^2)$  is notably weaker compared to the  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{24}, \Delta m^2)$  case. It becomes evident that the ESS is not expected to provide stringent constraints in comparison to short baseline neutrino experiments, see e.g., Ref. [166].

Next we discuss the future ESS sensitivity on active-sterile neutrino transitions in the presence of nonzero TMMs. Figure 10 presents the projected 90% C.L. exclusion regions for  $\mu\nu_e$  (left panel) and  $\mu\nu_{\mu}$  (right panel) as a function of the sterile neutral lepton mass  $m_{N_R}$ . These projections are derived from the combined analysis of all detectors considered in this work. Due to the specific nuclear recoil ranges of the various ESS detectors and the energy range of  $\pi$ -DAR neutrinos produced at the ESS, the generated SNL mass ( $m_{N_R}$ ) is kinematically limited to approximately 50 MeV, as implied by Eq. (21). For a comparison with our present ESS sensitivities we include existing constraints






FIG. 9: Projected 90% C.L. sensitivity regions for sterile neutrino oscillations in the  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{14}, \Delta m^2)$  (left, magenta contour) and  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{24}, \Delta m^2)$  (right, blue contour) parameter spaces, obtained from the combined analysis of all the proposed ESS detectors considered in this work. The analysis assumes  $\Delta m_{41}^2 \approx \Delta m_{42}^2 = \Delta m^2$ .




FIG. 10: Projected 90% C.L. sensitivity on the sterile dipole portal scenario. The left and right panels show the contours in the  $(m_{N_R}, \mu_{\nu_e})$  and  $(m_{N_R}, \mu_{\nu_\mu})$  planes, respectively. The results are obtained from the combined analysis of all detectors proposed for the ESS CE $\nu$ NS experiment. For comparison, constraints from other experimental and astrophysical probes have been superimposed (see main text for further details).

from CE $\nu$ NS analyses of COHERENT [34, 69], Dresden-II [61]<sup>9</sup>, and from the combined analysis of PandaX-4T and XENONnT data [73]. Also included are limits coming from E $\nu$ ES analyses using Borexino [167, 168] and CHARM-II [169] data, as well as from the recent combined analysis of XENONnT, PandaX-4T and LUX-ZEPLIN data performed in Ref. [73]. Additional bounds from LSND [170], LEP [170], NOMAD [171, 172], MiniBooNE [173], T2K [174, 175], and from  $N_R \rightarrow \nu\gamma$  decay [168, 176] using solar (Borexino and Super-Kamiokande) and atmospheric (Super-Kamiokande) [177] data, are also shown<sup>10</sup>. We finally superimpose bounds from astrophysical

<sup>9</sup> This analysis is based on the iron-filter (Fef) quenching factor model.

<sup>10</sup> We account for a factor 2 difference in the Lagrangian defined in Refs. [168, 170]. For the case of MinibooNE,




FIG. 11: Projected sensitivity to scalar-mediated SNL production at the future ESS experiment, derived from the combined analysis of all detectors. The left (right) panels display the 90% C.L. exclusion contours for ESS with orange lines, projecting on the mediator (SNL) mass, considering three benchmark scenarios  $m_{N_R} = \{0.1, 1, 10\} \times M_S$ . For comparison, the ESS projections are shown together with constraints from current XENONnT and COHERENT data, as well as with sensitivity projections from DUNE Near Detector measurements.

and cosmological data such as SN1987A [170, 178], BBN [167, 170], and CMB constraints on  $\Delta N_{\text{eff}}$  [167].

For SNL masses below 10 MeV, the ESS analysis performed in this work results in exclusion limits as low as  $\mu_{\nu_e} \sim 8 \times 10^{-10} \mu_B$  and  $\mu_{\nu_\mu} \sim 6 \times 10^{-10} \mu_B$ . These projections demonstrate a significant improvement over existing limits. For instance, the ESS is expected to improve the COHERENT bound by a factor 5 for both electron and muon neutrinos. It will furthermore improve the combined PandaX-4T and XENONnT CE $\nu$ NS result by factor 2 (3) for the case of electron (muon) neutrinos. While the projected exclusion for  $\mu_{\nu_e}$  is slightly weaker than the limits inferred from Dresden-II reactor data [61], the ESS experiment offers a broader reach in SNL masses. In particular, the ESS facility using the CE $\nu$ NS channel has the prospect to investigate a completely unexplored part of the parameter space as it will dominate the constraints in the mass range  $10 \lesssim m_{N_R} \lesssim 40$  MeV ( $10 \lesssim m_{N_R} \lesssim 40$  MeV) for electron (muon) neutrinos. Before closing this discussion we must warn that the limits depicted in the figure are not always directly comparable. This is due to the fact that the effective magnetic moments corresponding to the various experiments depend on different combinations of TMMs, CP phases and oscillation parameters (for a discussion see Ref. [69]). Since both COHERENT and ESS exploit  $\pi$ -DAR neutrinos, a direct comparison is possible for these two experiments only, where the more intense ESS neutrino beam will offer a significant improvement.

We now present the projected sensitivities for upscattering production of SNL in the presence of NGIs at the future ESS experiment. Figures 11, 12, 13, and 14 illustrate the 90% C.L. projected exclusion limits for scalar, vector, axial vector, and tensor-mediated channels respectively, denoted by  $X = \{S, V, A, T\}$ . As previously, the obtained results come out from the combined analysis of all ESS detectors, while the results corresponding to the individual detectors are given in Appendix A. The figures demonstrate three representative benchmark scenarios with  $m_{N_R} = \{0.1, 1, 10\} \times M_X$ .

the depicted constraints are relevant for muon neutrinos only, for which the preferred regions are shown from the analysis of energy ( $E_\nu^{\text{QE}}$ ) and angular ( $\cos\theta$ ) data.




FIG. 12: Same as Fig. 11, but for vector-mediated SNL production.




FIG. 13: Same as Fig. 11, but for axial vector-mediated SNL production.

In each case, the left panels illustrate the limits in the coupling-mediator mass plane,  $g_X$  vs  $M_X$ , while the right panels show the contours in the coupling-SNL mass plane,  $g_X$  vs  $m_{N_R}$ . At small mediator ( $M_X$ ) or SNL masses ( $m_{N_R}$ ), the sensitivity contours plateau, reflecting the saturation of constraints, and become essentially identical to the NGI cases shown in Fig. 7. Conversely, for larger  $M_X$  or  $m_{N_R}$ , the behavior diverges. In the left panels the exclusion limits diminish at different mediator masses  $M_X$  based on the different  $m_{N_R}/M_X$  ratios, while in the right panels the sensitivity loss occurs at a fixed SNL mass, as dictated by the kinematic constraint of Eq. (21).

To assess the complementarity of the ESS projections, the figures also overlay existing constraints from XENONnT and COHERENT CsI, along with projected limits from the DUNE Near Detector, as reported in Ref. [71]. It becomes evident that different experiments dominate in different regions of the parameter space. For instance, XENONnT using the  $E\nu$ ES channel provides the most stringent constraints for very low  $M_X$  or  $m_{N_R}$ , while for  $m_{N_R} \geq 0.5$  MeV, the ESS projections are expected to surpass XENONnT sensitivities. Notably, the ESS sensitivity is expected




FIG. 14: Same as Fig. 11, but for tensor-mediated SNL production.

to exceed current limits from COHERENT CsI-2021 across most of the parameter space, except at low  $m_{N_R}$  for some cases<sup>11</sup>. For scalar and vector interactions, ESS constraints outperform those anticipated from DUNE Near Detector measurements until they reach the kinematical constraint of about 50 MeV. Instead for the spin-dependent axial vector and tensor interactions, the DUNE Near Detector offers enhanced sensitivity since the corresponding  $CE\nu NS$  cross sections are suppressed by the nuclear spin, which is not the case for the  $E\nu ES$ -based DUNE constraints. Additionally, the high neutrino beam accessible at DUNE enables a broader reach of SNL masses compared to the ESS across all channels. As a result, the ESS experiment and the DUNE Near Detector provide complementary results, with the two experiments dominating in different mass regimes. For completeness, whenever available we superimpose cosmological constraints (see the discussion of Fig. 7).

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The highly intense ESS neutrino beam will produce a wealth of new  $CE\nu NS$  data, opening a new avenue for probing interesting physics phenomena within and beyond the SM. The unprecedented statistics characterizing the new era of  $CE\nu NS$  measurements at the ESS, will offer improved sensitivities by up to one order of magnitude—or more depending on the physics scenario in question—in comparison to existing ones from  $CE\nu NS$  measurements exploiting  $\pi$ -DAR (COHERENT), reactor (Dresden-II) and solar (PandaX-4T and XENONnT) data. In this work, a comprehensive exploration of the ESS potential is carried out focusing on the various detectors, highlighting the promising potential of the ESS to explore both fundamental and exotic neutrino physics. For the various physics scenarios, by performing a combined analysis of all the proposed ESS detectors, the projected sensitivities are quantified. The attainable sensitivities resulted by analyzing each detector individually are given in Appendix A, where their relative performance is also discussed.

The explored physics scenarios focus on important SM parameters such as the weak mixing angle and the nuclear size through the neutron rms radius. For the former, we find that the ESS

<sup>11</sup> Notice that the authors in Ref. [71] incorporated both  $E\nu ES$  and  $CE\nu NS$  signals in their analysis of COHERENT CsI-2021 data; this dual-channel strategy enhances the sensitivity for very low  $m_{N_R}$ , i.e., in a region where  $E\nu ES$  events dominate over the  $CE\nu NS$  ones.

will improve the precision reached by COHERENT (Dresden-II) by  $\sim 60\%$  ( $\sim 80\%$ ), with Ar and  $C_3F_8$  expected to set the most stringent limits. Concerning the nuclear neutron rms radius, the multitarget strategy of the ESS CE $\nu$ NS experiment will constrain the Si and  $C_3F_8$  rms radii for the first time. In the case of Ar and CsI where constraints already exist from e.g. COHERENT, an improvement of  $\sim 40\%$  is anticipated for the case of CsI, while for the case of Ar only an upper limit exists. Moreover, while there exist CE $\nu$ NS measurements on Xe and Ge targets from the Dresden-II and the dark matter direct detection experiments (PandaX-4T and XENONnT), it should be stressed that the corresponding sensitivities are weak. This is because reactor experiments are not ideal to probe nuclear physics effects as they are sensitive to the (almost fully) coherent regime, while the statistics collected by the dark matter direct detection experiments is yet poor. Turning to new physics scenarios, we explored NGIs and presented the corresponding constraints for the Lorentz-invariant scalar, vector, axial vector and tensor interactions. We found that in general the ESS will drastically improve previous CE $\nu$ NS-based constraints in all cases, with the different proposed detector performing equally well (for a detailed discussion see the Appendix). Moreover, for the scalar and vector interactions, the projected constraints will not only complement collider and astrophysical limits but are expected to dominate in certain regions of the parameter space e.g. for  $M_S > 40$  MeV and  $25 < M_V < 200$  MeV, respectively. On the other hand, as expected the spin-dependent axial vector and tensor ESS sensitivities will not be able to compete with existing bounds resulting from E $\nu$ ES analyses. Our present analysis implies that future CE $\nu$ NS measurements at the ESS will not be able to provide competitive sensitivities for the case of active-sterile neutrino oscillations and the violation of lepton unitarity. However, by focusing on upscattering channels we have verified that the ESS will serve as a valuable probe of sterile neutral lepton phenomenology. To this aim, we explored two interesting scenarios for producing massive sterile particle states, e.g., the so-called sterile dipole portal in the presence of neutrino magnetic moments and via NGIs. For the former case, the ESS will surpass previous CE $\nu$ NS sensitivities and will furthermore probe a previously unexplored region in the parameter space i.e., for  $10 \lesssim m_{N_R} \lesssim 40$  MeV and  $10 \lesssim m_{N_R} \lesssim 40$  MeV for electron and muon neutrinos, respectively. Finally, we investigated the possible production of final state sterile neutral leptons within the NGI framework and discussed the complementarity with existing  $\pi$ -DAR-induced CE $\nu$ NS at COHERENT, solar neutrino-induced E $\nu$ ES searches at dark matter direct detection experiments, as well as with prospects from the future DUNE Near detector.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to Gonzalo Sanchez Garcia for fruitful discussions. 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). The work of DKP is supported by the Spanish grants PID2023-147306NB-I00 and CEX2023-001292-S (MCIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033), as well as CIPROM/2021/054 (Generalitat Valenciana) and CNS2023-144124 (MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and ‘‘Next Generation EU’’/PRTR).

## Appendix A: Projected limits from individual detectors

Sec. IV presents the combined ESS limits on various physics scenarios derived by combining the results from all the proposed detectors considered in this study. For completeness, in this Appendix we present the projected limits obtained from the analysis of the individual detectors.

The  $\Delta\chi^2$  profiles of  $\sin^2\theta_W$  for the different detectors are shown in Fig. 15, while the projected  $1\sigma$  determinations are listed in Table IV. These results indicate that, within the specified experimental




FIG. 15: Projected sensitivity on the weak mixing angle obtained exploiting different ESS detectors.

Detector	$\sin^2 \theta_W$	Detector	$\sin^2 \theta_W$
CsI	$0.239^{+0.019}_{-0.016}$	Si	$0.239^{+0.017}_{-0.016}$
Xe	$0.239^{+0.019}_{-0.017}$	Ar	$0.239^{+0.016}_{-0.014}$
Ge	$0.239^{+0.018}_{-0.015}$	C <sub>3</sub> F <sub>8</sub>	$0.239^{+0.015}_{-0.013}$
		<b>ESS Combined</b>	<b><math>0.239^{+0.011}_{-0.010}</math></b>

TABLE IV: Best fit values and  $1\sigma$  uncertainties of  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  obtained for the various ESS detectors.

setup, the most precise limits on  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  can be expected from the C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detector, while the least precise limits are expected from the Xe detector. Our results are in good agreement with those extracted in Ref. [75]. We should further note, that while the most stringent constraints are expected for the heavier target nuclei, since in these cases the statistics is higher, the different backgrounds corresponding to each detector together with the nuclear physics suppression and the different thresholds are forcing the limits to be stronger for the C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detector.

Figure 16 depicts the 90% C.L. projected NGI sensitivities at the ESS in the  $(M_X, g_X)$  parameter space for scalar, vector  $B - L$ , axial vector, and tensor interactions. Let us remind that only the CsI and C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detectors exhibit sensitivity to nuclear spin-dependent axial vector and tensor interactions, while the rest detectors being spin-zero nuclei are not sensitive to these interactions (see also Table I). Among these, the C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> detector is projected to impose more stringent constraints on spin-dependent interactions compared to the CsI detector. This is because the relative axial vector contribution compared to the dominant SM vector component is more significant for light nuclei, since the latter are composed by fewer nucleons and hence their vector part is less enhanced.






FIG. 16: Projected sensitivities at 90% C.L. in the  $(M_X, g_X)$  parameter space for scalar, vector  $B - L$ , axial vector and tensor interactions, derived for the individual ESS detectors.

For the case of spin-independent scalar and vector  $B - L$  interactions, all the detectors provide similar constraints, except the Ar and  $C_3F_8$  cases which perform slightly worse. Further, in the case of scalar interactions, it is worth noting that, unlike the CsI, Xe, Ge and Si detectors, the little kink in the contour around  $M_S \approx 10$  MeV is absent for the Ar and  $C_3F_8$  cases. This feature and the performance difference arise due to the adoption of a single-bin analysis strategy for these detectors.

Turning to the NU scenario, we present the  $\Delta\chi^2$  profile of  $1 - \alpha_{22}^2$  for the different ESS detectors in Fig. 17. The projected 90% C.L. upper limits on  $1 - \alpha_{22}^2$  for each detector are listed in Table V. Under the specified experimental setup, the CsI and Xe detectors are projected to provide the most stringent constraints on  $\alpha_{22}$ , while the Si detector is expected to yield the least stringent limit. As explained in the main text, the NU sensitivity at the ESS using the  $CE\nu NS$  channel will not be able to compete with oscillation experiments.

Focusing now on the active-sterile neutrino oscillation scenario, the upper and lower panels of Fig. 18 illustrate the 90% C.L. sensitivities in the  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{14}, \Delta m^2)$  and  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{24}, \Delta m^2)$  parameter space, respectively. As can be seen from the plot, similar sensitivities are found from the analyses of the individual ESS detectors. We conclude that, the ESS sensitivity on this scenario is rather weak and quite far from that of dedicated short baseline neutrino experiments [166].

We now focus on the active-sterile dipole portal scenario, i.e., we explore the possibility of generating a massive final state sterile neutral leptons via upscattering in the presence of nonzero TMMs. For the different ESS detectors, the upper two rows of Fig. 19 present the projected exclusion limits at 90% C.L. in the  $(m_{N_R}, \mu_{\nu_e})$  plane, while the lower two rows show the corresponding result in the  $(m_{N_R}, \mu_{\nu_\mu})$  planes. As can be seen, the Si and Ge detectors are anticipated to provide the most stringent constraints, whereas the Ar and  $C_3F_8$  detectors —for which a single-bin analysis




FIG. 17:  $\Delta\chi^2$  profile of  $1 - \alpha_{22}^2$  for the different ESS detectors. The green dashed line represent the corresponding 90% C.L. upper limit derived from neutrino oscillation global fits.

Detector	$1 - \alpha_{22}^2$	Detector	$1 - \alpha_{22}^2$
CsI	$< 0.14$	Si	$< 0.22$
Xe	$< 0.14$	Ar	$< 0.18$
Ge	$< 0.16$	C <sub>3</sub> F <sub>8</sub>	$< 0.18$
<b>ESS Combined</b>	<b><math>&lt; 0.14</math></b>	<b>Oscillation limit</b>	<b><math>&lt; 0.01</math> [165]</b>

TABLE V: Projected 90% C.L. upper limits on  $1 - \alpha_{22}^2$  for different ESS detectors considered in this study. For comparative purposes, the 90% C.L. upper limit on  $1 - \alpha_{22}^2$  derived from global fits of neutrino oscillation data is also included.

is performed— are expected to yield the least stringent constraints.

Finally, we present the 90% C.L. projected limits regarding the production of sterile neutral leptons via neutrino upscattering in the presence of NGIs. Again, the results are obtained from the individual analysis of the various proposed ESS detectors. The upper two rows of Fig. 20 and Fig. 21, illustrate the limits for the scalar and vector-mediated interaction by projecting on the mediator mass. The lower two rows of Fig. 20 and Fig. 21, depict the corresponding projections on  $m_{N_R}$ . The spin-dependent axial vector and tensor interactions are shown in Fig. 22 and Fig. 23, respectively. The left (right) panels show the projections on the mediator (SNL) mass. In each case the limits are demonstrated for three benchmark scenarios:  $m_{N_R} = \{0.1, 1, 10\} \times M_X$ . Concerning the spin-independent scalar and vector interactions, the CsI, Xe, Ge and Si detectors perform equally well, while the Ar and C<sub>3</sub>F<sub>8</sub> ones provide less stringent constraints. As explained previously,




FIG. 18: Sensitivity projections at the 90% C.L. in the  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{14}, \Delta m^2)$  and  $(\sin^2 2\theta_{24}, \Delta m^2)$  planes, for the different ESS detectors. The magenta (blue) contours represent the exclusion regions for active-sterile oscillations involving electron (muon) neutrinos in the upper (lower) panel.

this is because a single-bin analysis is performed for these detectors. Regarding the spin-dependent axial vector and tensor interactions, only CsI and  $C_3F_8$  detectors are relevant since the nuclear ground state of Cs, I and F isotopes is different from  $0^+$ . Among these detectors, the lighter  $C_3F_8$  nuclear target performs significantly better (see the discussion on the NGI in the main text).




FIG. 19: Projected 90% C.L. exclusion regions in the sterile dipole portal for the individual ESS detectors. The results are shown for electron (muon) neutrinos in the 1st and 2nd (3rd and 4th) rows.




FIG. 20: Projected 90% C.L. limits for the case of the scalar-mediated scenario for SNL production via upscattering, assuming three benchmark scenarios:  $m_{N_R} = \{0.1, 1, 10\} \times M_S$ . The results are projected in the  $(M_S, g_S)$  plane (1st and 2nd rows) and in the  $(m_{N_R}, g_S)$  plane (3rd and 4th rows), for the individual detectors at ESS.




FIG. 21: Same as Fig. 20, but for vector-mediated upscattering.




FIG. 22: Projected 90% C.L. limits on the axial vector-mediated scenario for SNL production via upscattering, for the three considered benchmark scenarios:  $m_{N_R} = \{0.1, 1, 10\} \times M_A$ . The left panel shows the projections in  $(M_A, g_A)$  plane, while the right panel shows the projections in the  $(m_{N_R}, g_A)$  plane.






FIG. 23: Same as Fig. 22, but for tensor-mediated upscattering.

- 
- [1] D. Z. Freedman, “Coherent Neutrino Nucleus Scattering as a Probe of the Weak Neutral Current,” *Phys. Rev. D* **9** (1974) 1389–1392.
- [2] A. Drukier and L. Stodolsky, “Principles and Applications of a Neutral Current Detector for Neutrino Physics and Astronomy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **30** (1984) 2295.
- [3] **COHERENT** Collaboration, D. Akimov *et al.*, “Observation of Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering,” *Science* **357** no. 6356, (2017) 1123–1126, [arXiv:1708.01294 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [4] **COHERENT** Collaboration, D. Akimov *et al.*, “Measurement of the Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering Cross Section on CsI by COHERENT,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129** no. 8, (2022) 081801, [arXiv:2110.07730 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [5] **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 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [6] S. Adamski *et al.*, “First detection of coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering on germanium,” [arXiv:2406.13806 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [7] 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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [8] **CONUS** Collaboration, H. Bonet *et al.*, “Novel constraints on neutrino physics beyond the standard model from the CONUS experiment,” *JHEP* **05** (2022) 085, [arXiv:2110.02174 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [9] **CONUS** Collaboration, N. Ackermann *et al.*, “Final CONUS Results on Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering at the Brokdorf Reactor,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133** no. 25, (2024) 251802, [arXiv:2401.07684 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [10] **CONUS+** Collaboration, N. Ackermann *et al.*, “First observation of reactor antineutrinos by coherent scattering,” [arXiv:2501.05206 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [11] **XENON** Collaboration, E. Aprile *et al.*, “First Indication of Solar B8 Neutrinos via Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering with XENONnT,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133** no. 19, (2024) 191002, [arXiv:2408.02877 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [12] **PandaX** Collaboration, Z. Bo *et al.*, “First Indication of Solar B8 Neutrinos through Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering in PandaX-4T,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133** no. 19, (2024) 191001, [arXiv:2407.10892 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [13] **CCM** Collaboration, A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.*, “First dark matter search results from Coherent CAPTAIN-Mills,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 1, (2022) 012001, [arXiv:2105.14020 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [14] **CONNIE** Collaboration, A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.*, “Results of the Engineering Run of the Coherent Neutrino Nucleus Interaction Experiment (CONNIE),” *JINST* **11** no. 07, (2016) P07024, [arXiv:1604.01343 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [15]  $\nu$ GeN Collaboration, I. Alekseev *et al.*, “First results of the  $\nu$ GeN experiment on coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 5, (2022) L051101, [arXiv:2205.04305 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [16] **NUCLEUS** Collaboration, G. Angloher *et al.*, “Exploring CE $\nu$ NS with NUCLEUS at the Chooz nuclear power plant,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** no. 12, (2019) 1018, [arXiv:1905.10258 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [17] J. Billard *et al.*, “Coherent Neutrino Scattering with Low Temperature Bolometers at Chooz Reactor Complex,” *J. Phys. G* **44** no. 10, (2017) 105101, [arXiv:1612.09035 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [18] **MINER** Collaboration, G. Agnolet *et al.*, “Background Studies for the MINER Coherent Neutrino Scattering Reactor Experiment,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **853** (2017) 53–60, [arXiv:1609.02066 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [19] G. Fernandez-Moroni, P. A. N. Machado, I. Martinez-Soler, Y. F. Perez-Gonzalez, D. Rodrigues, and S. Rosauero-Alcaraz, “The physics potential of a reactor neutrino experiment with Skipper CCDs: Measuring the weak mixing angle,” *JHEP* **03** (2021) 186, [arXiv:2009.10741 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] H. T. Wong, H.-B. Li, J. Li, Q. Yue, and Z.-Y. Zhou, “Research program towards observation of neutrino-nucleus coherent scattering,” *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **39** (2006) 266–268, [arXiv:hep-ex/0511001](#).
- [21] **TEXONO** Collaboration, S. Karmakar *et al.*, “New Limits on Coherent Neutrino Nucleus Elastic

- Scattering Cross Section at the Kuo-Sheng Reactor Neutrino Laboratory,” [arXiv:2411.18812](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [22] K. Ni, J. Qi, E. Shockley, and Y. Wei, “Sensitivity of a Liquid Xenon Detector to Neutrino–Nucleus Coherent Scattering and Neutrino Magnetic Moment from Reactor Neutrinos,” *Universe* **7** no. 3, (2021) 54.
- [23] E. P. Bernard *et al.*, “Thermodynamic stability of xenon-doped liquid argon detectors,” *Phys. Rev. C* **108** no. 4, (2023) 045503, [arXiv:2209.05435](#) [[physics.ins-det](#)].
- [24] D. Y. Akimov *et al.*, “Status of the RED-100 experiment,” *JINST* **12** no. 06, (2017) C06018.
- [25] D. Y. Akimov *et al.*, “The RED-100 experiment,” *JINST* **17** no. 11, (2022) T11011, [arXiv:2209.15516](#) [[physics.ins-det](#)].
- [26] D. Y. Akimov *et al.*, “First constraints on the coherent elastic scattering of reactor antineutrinos off xenon nuclei,” [arXiv:2411.18641](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [27] **SBC, CE $\nu$ NS Theory Group at IF-UNAM** Collaboration, L. J. Flores *et al.*, “Physics reach of a low threshold scintillating argon bubble chamber in coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering reactor experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 9, (2021) L091301, [arXiv:2101.08785](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [28] M. Abdullah *et al.*, “Coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering: Terrestrial and astrophysical applications,” [arXiv:2203.07361](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [29] D. K. Papoulias, “COHERENT constraints after the COHERENT-2020 quenching factor measurement,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 11, (2020) 113004, [arXiv:1907.11644](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [30] A. N. Khan and W. Rodejohann, “New physics from COHERENT data with an improved quenching factor,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 11, (2019) 113003, [arXiv:1907.12444](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [31] M. Cadeddu, F. Dordei, C. Giunti, Y. F. Li, and Y. Y. Zhang, “Neutrino, electroweak, and nuclear physics from COHERENT elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering with refined quenching factor,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 3, (2020) 033004, [arXiv:1908.06045](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [32] O. G. Miranda, D. K. Papoulias, G. Sanchez Garcia, O. Sanders, M. Tórtola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Implications of the first detection of coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering (CE $\nu$ NS) with Liquid Argon,” *JHEP* **05** (2020) 130, [arXiv:2003.12050](#) [[hep-ph](#)]. [Erratum: *JHEP* **01**, 067 (2021)].
- [33] M. Cadeddu, N. Cargioli, F. Dordei, C. Giunti, Y. F. Li, E. Picciau, C. A. Ternes, and Y. Y. Zhang, “New insights into nuclear physics and weak mixing angle using electroweak probes,” *Phys. Rev. C* **104** no. 6, (2021) 065502, [arXiv:2102.06153](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [34] 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](#)].
- [35] 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](#)].
- [36] M. Atzori Corona, M. Cadeddu, N. Cargioli, F. Dordei, C. Giunti, and G. Masia, “Nuclear neutron radius and weak mixing angle measurements from latest COHERENT CsI and atomic parity violation Cs data,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** no. 7, (2023) 683, [arXiv:2303.09360](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [37] M. Atzori Corona, M. Cadeddu, N. Cargioli, F. Dordei, and C. Giunti, “Refined determination of the weak mixing angle at low energy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 3, (2024) 033005, [arXiv:2405.09416](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [38] T. N. Maity and C. Boehm, “First measurement of the weak mixing angle in direct detection experiments,” [arXiv:2409.04385](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [39] V. De Romeri, D. K. Papoulias, and C. A. Ternes, “Bounds on new neutrino interactions from the first CE $\nu$ NS data at direct detection experiments,” [arXiv:2411.11749](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [40] M. Cadeddu, C. Giunti, Y. F. Li, and Y. Y. Zhang, “Average CsI neutron density distribution from COHERENT data,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** no. 7, (2018) 072501, [arXiv:1710.02730](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [41] B. C. Canas, E. A. Garces, O. G. Miranda, A. Parada, and G. Sanchez Garcia, “Interplay between nonstandard and nuclear constraints in coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 3, (2020) 035012, [arXiv:1911.09831](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [42] P. Coloma, I. Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, and J. Menendez, “Determining the nuclear neutron distribution from Coherent Elastic neutrino-Nucleus Scattering: current results and future prospects,” *JHEP* **08** no. 08, (2020) 030, [arXiv:2006.08624](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [43] D. A. Sierra, “Extraction of neutron density distributions from high-statistics coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering data,” *Phys. Lett. B* **845** (2023) 138140, [arXiv:2301.13249](#) [[hep-ph](#)].

- [44] J. Barranco, O. G. Miranda, and T. I. Rashba, “Probing new physics with coherent neutrino scattering off nuclei,” *JHEP* **12** (2005) 021, [arXiv:hep-ph/0508299](#).
- [45] K. Scholberg, “Prospects for measuring coherent neutrino-nucleus elastic scattering at a stopped-pion neutrino source,” *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 033005, [arXiv:hep-ex/0511042](#).
- [46] J. Liao and D. Marfatia, “COHERENT constraints on nonstandard neutrino interactions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **775** (2017) 54–57, [arXiv:1708.04255 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [47] C. Giunti, “General COHERENT constraints on neutrino nonstandard interactions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 3, (2020) 035039, [arXiv:1909.00466 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [48] P. B. Denton and J. Gehrlein, “A Statistical Analysis of the COHERENT Data and Applications to New Physics,” *JHEP* **04** (2021) 266, [arXiv:2008.06062 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] A. Galindo-Uribarri, O. G. Miranda, and G. S. Garcia, “Novel approach for the study of coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105** no. 3, (2022) 033001, [arXiv:2011.10230 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] A. N. Khan, D. W. McKay, and W. Rodejohann, “CP-violating and charged current neutrino nonstandard interactions in  $CE\nu NS$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 1, (2021) 015019, [arXiv:2104.00425 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] D. Aristizabal Sierra, N. Mishra, and L. Strigari, “Implications of first neutrino-induced nuclear recoil measurements in direct detection experiments,” [arXiv:2409.02003 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] G. Li, C.-Q. Song, F.-J. Tang, and J.-H. Yu, “Constraints on neutrino non-standard interactions from COHERENT and PandaX-4T,” [arXiv:2409.04703 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [53] B. Dutta, Y. Gao, R. Mahapatra, N. Mirabolfathi, L. E. Strigari, and J. W. Walker, “Sensitivity to oscillation with a sterile fourth generation neutrino from ultra-low threshold neutrino-nucleus coherent scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** no. 9, (2016) 093002, [arXiv:1511.02834 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [54] M. Lindner, W. Rodejohann, and X.-J. Xu, “Coherent Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering and new Neutrino Interactions,” *JHEP* **03** (2017) 097, [arXiv:1612.04150 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [55] D. Aristizabal Sierra, V. De Romeri, and N. Rojas, “COHERENT analysis of neutrino generalized interactions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 075018, [arXiv:1806.07424 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [56] L. J. Flores, N. Nath, and E. Peinado, “ $CE\nu NS$  as a probe of flavored generalized neutrino interactions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105** no. 5, (2022) 055010, [arXiv:2112.05103 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [57] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [58] P. B. Denton, Y. Farzan, and I. M. Shoemaker, “Testing large non-standard neutrino interactions with arbitrary mediator mass after COHERENT data,” *JHEP* **07** (2018) 037, [arXiv:1804.03660 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [59] L. J. Flores, N. Nath, and E. Peinado, “Non-standard neutrino interactions in  $U(1)$ ’ model after COHERENT data,” *JHEP* **06** (2020) 045, [arXiv:2002.12342 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [60] M. Cadeddu, N. Cargioli, F. Dordei, C. Giunti, Y. F. Li, E. Picciau, and Y. Y. Zhang, “Constraints on light vector mediators through coherent elastic neutrino nucleus scattering data from COHERENT,” *JHEP* **01** (2021) 116, [arXiv:2008.05022 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [61] D. Aristizabal Sierra, V. De Romeri, and D. K. Papoulias, “Consequences of the Dresden-II reactor data for the weak mixing angle and new physics,” *JHEP* **09** (2022) 076, [arXiv:2203.02414 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [62] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [63] S.-y. Xia, “Measuring solar neutrino fluxes in direct detection experiments in the presence of light mediators,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **1009** (2024) 116738, [arXiv:2410.01167 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [64] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [65] J. Billard, J. Johnston, and B. J. Kavanagh, “Prospects for exploring New Physics in Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering,” *JCAP* **11** (2018) 016, [arXiv:1805.01798 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [66] G. Arcadi, M. Lindner, J. Martins, and F. S. Queiroz, “New physics probes: Atomic parity violation, polarized electron scattering and neutrino-nucleus coherent scattering,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **959** (2020) 115158, [arXiv:1906.04755 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [67] T. S. Kosmas, D. K. Papoulias, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Probing light sterile neutrino signatures at reactor and Spallation Neutron Source neutrino experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no. 6, (2017) 063013, [arXiv:1703.00054 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [68] O. G. Miranda, D. K. Papoulias, O. Sanders, M. Tórtola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Future CEνNS experiments as probes of lepton unitarity and light-sterile neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 113014, [arXiv:2008.02759 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [69] O. G. Miranda, D. K. Papoulias, O. Sanders, M. Tórtola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Low-energy probes of sterile neutrino transition magnetic moments,” *JHEP* **12** (2021) 191, [arXiv:2109.09545 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [70] P. M. Candela, V. De Romeri, and D. K. Papoulias, “COHERENT production of a dark fermion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108** no. 5, (2023) 055001, [arXiv:2305.03341 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [71] P. M. Candela, V. De Romeri, P. Melas, D. K. Papoulias, and N. Saoulidou, “Up-scattering production of a sterile fermion at DUNE: complementarity with spallation source and direct detection experiments,” *JHEP* **10** (2024) 032, [arXiv:2404.12476 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [72] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [73] V. De Romeri, D. K. Papoulias, G. Sanchez Garcia, C. A. Ternes, and M. Tórtola, “Neutrino electromagnetic properties and sterile dipole portal in light of the first solar CEνNS data,” [arXiv:2412.14991 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [74] H. Abele *et al.*, “Particle Physics at the European Spallation Source,” *Phys. Rept.* **1023** (2023) 1–84, [arXiv:2211.10396 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [75] D. Baxter *et al.*, “Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering at the European Spallation Source,” *JHEP* **02** (2020) 123, [arXiv:1911.00762 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [76] A. Parada and G. Sanchez Garcia, “Probing neutrino millicharges at the European Spallation Source,” [arXiv:2409.10652 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [77] S. S. Chatterjee, S. Lavignac, O. G. Miranda, and G. Sanchez Garcia, “Constraining nonstandard interactions with coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering at the European Spallation Source,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** no. 5, (2023) 055019, [arXiv:2208.11771 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [78] O. Tomalak, P. Machado, V. Pandey, and R. Plestid, “Flavor-dependent radiative corrections in coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering,” *JHEP* **02** (2021) 097, [arXiv:2011.05960 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [79] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, R. L. Workman *et al.*, “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [80] S. Weinberg, “A Model of Leptons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19** (1967) 1264–1266.
- [81] A. Salam, “Weak and Electromagnetic Interactions,” *Conf. Proc. C* **680519** (1968) 367–377.
- [82] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [83] M. Hoferichter, J. Menéndez, and A. Schwenk, “Coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering: EFT analysis and nuclear responses,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 7, (2020) 074018, [arXiv:2007.08529 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [84] R. H. Helm, “Inelastic and elastic scattering of 187-mev electrons from selected even-even nuclei,” *Phys. Rev.* **104** (Dec, 1956) 1466–1475.
- [85] J. Friedrich and N. Voegler, “The salient features of charge density distributions of medium and heavy even-even nuclei determined from a systematic analysis of elastic electron scattering form factors,” *Nucl. Phys. A* **373** (1982) 192–224.
- [86] B. Märkisch *et al.*, “Measurement of the Weak Axial-Vector Coupling Constant in the Decay of Free Neutrons Using a Pulsed Cold Neutron Beam,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** no. 24, (2019) 242501, [arXiv:1812.04666 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [87] H.-W. Lin, R. Gupta, B. Yoon, Y.-C. Jang, and T. Bhattacharya, “Quark contribution to the proton spin from 2+1+1-flavor lattice QCD,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 9, (2018) 094512, [arXiv:1806.10604 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [88] NIST Physical Measurement Laboratory, “Handbook of basic atomic spectroscopic data.” <https://www.nist.gov/pml/handbook-basic-atomic-spectroscopic-data>.
- [89] J. B. Mann, “SCF Hartree-Fock results for elements with two open shells and the elements francium to nobelium,” *Atom. Data Nucl. Data Tabl.* **12** (1973) 1–86.



- [90] I. Angeli and K. P. Marinova, “Table of experimental nuclear ground state charge radii: An update,” *Atom. Data Nucl. Data Tabl.* **99** no. 1, (2013) 69–95.
- [91] V. De Romeri, D. K. Papoulias, and C. A. Ternes, “Light vector mediators at direct detection experiments,” *JHEP* **05** (2024) 165, [arXiv:2402.05506 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [92] M. F. Mustamin and M. Demirci, “Study of Non-standard Neutrino Interactions in Future Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering Experiments,” *Braz. J. Phys.* **51** no. 3, (2021) 813–819.
- [93] D. G. Cerdeño, M. Fairbairn, T. Jubb, P. A. N. Machado, A. C. Vincent, and C. Boehm, “Physics from solar neutrinos in dark matter direct detection experiments,” *JHEP* **05** (2016) 118, [arXiv:1604.01025 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: *JHEP* 09, 048 (2016)].
- [94] J. Barranco, A. Bolanos, E. A. Garces, O. G. Miranda, and T. I. Rashba, “Tensorial NSI and Unparticle physics in neutrino scattering,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **27** (2012) 1250147, [arXiv:1108.1220 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [95] M. Cirelli, E. Del Nobile, and P. Panci, “Tools for model-independent bounds in direct dark matter searches,” *JCAP* **10** (2013) 019, [arXiv:1307.5955 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [96] M. Demirci and M. F. Mustamin, “Probing Light New Mediators on Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering,” in *Beyond Standard Model: From Theory to Experiment*. 2021.
- [97] E. Del Nobile, “The Theory of Direct Dark Matter Detection: A Guide to Computations,” [arXiv:2104.12785 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [98] P. Minkowski, “ $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$  at a Rate of One Out of  $10^9$  Muon Decays?,” *Phys. Lett. B* **67** (1977) 421–428.
- [99] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, “Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Nonconservation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44** (1980) 912.
- [100] T. Yanagida, “Horizontal Symmetry and Masses of Neutrinos,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **64** (1980) 1103.
- [101] M. Magg and C. Wetterich, “Neutrino Mass Problem and Gauge Hierarchy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **94** (1980) 61–64.
- [102] R. N. Mohapatra and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino Mass and Baryon Number Nonconservation in Superstring Models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **34** (1986) 1642.
- [103] R. Foot, H. Lew, X. G. He, and G. C. Joshi, “Seesaw Neutrino Masses Induced by a Triplet of Leptons,” *Z. Phys. C* **44** (1989) 441.
- [104] **LSND** Collaboration, A. Aguilar *et al.*, “Evidence for neutrino oscillations from the observation of  $\bar{\nu}_e$  appearance in a  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  beam,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 112007, [arXiv:hep-ex/0104049](#).
- [105] **MiniBooNE** Collaboration, A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.*, “Improved Search for  $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$  Oscillations in the MiniBooNE Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 161801, [arXiv:1303.2588 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [106] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino Masses in SU(2) x U(1) Theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **22** (1980) 2227.
- [107] F. J. Escrihuela, D. V. Forero, O. G. Miranda, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, “On the description of nonunitary neutrino mixing,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** no. 5, (2015) 053009, [arXiv:1503.08879 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 93, 119905 (2016)].
- [108] S. Centelles Chuliá, O. G. Miranda, and J. W. F. Valle, “Leptonic neutral-current probes in a short-distance DUNE-like setup,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109** no. 11, (2024) 115007, [arXiv:2402.00114 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [109] D. McKeen and M. Pospelov, “Muon Capture Constraints on Sterile Neutrino Properties,” *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 113018, [arXiv:1011.3046 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [110] V. Brdar, W. Rodejohann, and X.-J. Xu, “Producing a new Fermion in Coherent Elastic Neutrino-Nucleus Scattering: from Neutrino Mass to Dark Matter,” *JHEP* **12** (2018) 024, [arXiv:1810.03626 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [111] W.-F. Chang and J. Liao, “Constraints on light singlet fermion interactions from coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 7, (2020) 075004, [arXiv:2002.10275 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [112] Z. Chen, T. Li, and J. Liao, “Constraints on general neutrino interactions with exotic fermion from neutrino-electron scattering experiments,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 131, [arXiv:2102.09784 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [113] E. Nardi, E. Roulet, and D. Tommasini, “Limits on neutrino mixing with new heavy particles,” *Phys. Lett. B* **327** (1994) 319–326, [arXiv:hep-ph/9402224](#).
- [114] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa, and S. Sakata, “Remarks on the unified model of elementary particles,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **28** (1962) 870–880.
- [115] S. M. Bilenky and B. Pontecorvo, “Lepton Mixing and Neutrino Oscillations,” *Phys. Rept.* **41** (1978) 225–261.

- [116] E. Fernandez-Martinez, J. Hernandez-Garcia, and J. Lopez-Pavon, “Global constraints on heavy neutrino mixing,” *JHEP* **08** (2016) 033, [arXiv:1605.08774 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [117] F. J. Escrihuela, D. V. Forero, O. G. Miranda, M. Tórtola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Probing CP violation with non-unitary mixing in long-baseline neutrino oscillation experiments: DUNE as a case study,” *New J. Phys.* **19** no. 9, (2017) 093005, [arXiv:1612.07377 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [118] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino Decay and Spontaneous Violation of Lepton Number,” *Phys. Rev. D* **25** (1982) 774.
- [119] G. C. Branco, J. T. Penedo, P. M. F. Pereira, M. N. Rebelo, and J. I. Silva-Marcos, “Type-I Seesaw with eV-Scale Neutrinos,” *JHEP* **07** (2020) 164, [arXiv:1912.05875 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [120] L. Michel, “Interaction between four half spin particles and the decay of the  $\mu$  meson,” *Proc. Phys. Soc. A* **63** (1950) 514–531.
- [121] C. Bouchiat and L. Michel, “Theory of  $\mu$ -Meson Decay with the Hypothesis of Nonconservation of Parity,” *Phys. Rev.* **106** (1957) 170–172.
- [122] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, S. Navas *et al.*, “Review of particle physics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 3, (2024) 030001.
- [123] D. K. Papoulias, R. Sahu, T. S. Kosmas, V. K. B. Kota, and B. Nayak, “Novel neutrino-floor and dark matter searches with deformed shell model calculations,” *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2018** (2018) 6031362, [arXiv:1804.11319 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [124] R. Sahu, D. K. Papoulias, V. K. B. Kota, and T. S. Kosmas, “Elastic and inelastic scattering of neutrinos and weakly interacting massive particles on nuclei,” *Phys. Rev. C* **102** no. 3, (2020) 035501, [arXiv:2004.04055 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [125] T. S. Kosmas, V. K. B. Kota, D. K. Papoulias, and R. Sahu, “Coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scattering ( $\text{CE}\nu\text{NS}$ ) event rates for Ge, Zn, and Si detector materials,” *Phys. Rev. C* **104** no. 6, (2021) 064618, [arXiv:2111.08488 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [126] H. De Vries, C. W. De Jager, and C. De Vries, “Nuclear charge and magnetization density distribution parameters from elastic electron scattering,” *Atom. Data Nucl. Data Tabl.* **36** (1987) 495–536.
- [127] K. Patton, J. Engel, G. C. McLaughlin, and N. Schunck, “Neutrino-nucleus coherent scattering as a probe of neutron density distributions,” *Phys. Rev. C* **86** (2012) 024612, [arXiv:1207.0693 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [128] D. K. Papoulias and T. S. Kosmas, “Standard and Nonstandard Neutrino-Nucleus Reactions Cross Sections and Event Rates to Neutrino Detection Experiments,” *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2015** (2015) 763648, [arXiv:1502.02928 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [129] D. K. Papoulias, T. S. Kosmas, R. Sahu, V. K. B. Kota, and M. Hota, “Constraining nuclear physics parameters with current and future COHERENT data,” *Phys. Lett. B* **800** (2020) 135133, [arXiv:1903.03722 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [130] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [131] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [132] **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.
- [133] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [134] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [135] **NA64** Collaboration, Y. M. Andreev *et al.*, “Constraints on New Physics in Electron  $g - 2$  from a Search for Invisible Decays of a Scalar, Pseudoscalar, Vector, and Axial Vector,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** no. 21, (2021) 211802, [arXiv:2102.01885 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [136] **NA64** Collaboration, Y. M. Andreev *et al.*, “Search for a New B-L  $Z'$  Gauge Boson with the NA64 Experiment at CERN,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129** no. 16, (2022) 161801, [arXiv:2207.09979 \[hep-ex\]](#).



- [137] **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.
- [138] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [139] **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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [140] **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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [141] **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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [142] **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](#).
- [143] E. M. Riordan *et al.*, “A Search for Short Lived Axions in an Electron Beam Dump Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59** (1987) 755.
- [144] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [145] 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.
- [146] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [147] 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.
- [148] A. Konaka *et al.*, “Search for Neutral Particles in Electron Beam Dump Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57** (1986) 659.
- [149] 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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [150] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [151] **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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [152] **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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [153] **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 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [154] **LHCb** Collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, “Search for  $A' \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  Decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124** no. 4, (2020) 041801, [arXiv:1910.06926 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [155] P. Ilten, Y. Soreq, M. Williams, and W. Xue, “Serendipity in dark photon searches,” *JHEP* **06** (2018) 004, [arXiv:1801.04847 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [156] C. Baruch, P. Ilten, Y. Soreq, and M. Williams, “Axial vectors in DarkCast,” *JHEP* **11** (2022) 124, [arXiv:2206.08563 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [157] L. Heurtier and Y. Zhang, “Supernova Constraints on Massive (Pseudo)Scalar Coupling to Neutrinos,” *JCAP* **02** (2017) 042, [arXiv:1609.05882 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [158] J. H. Chang, R. Essig, and S. D. McDermott, “Revisiting Supernova 1987A Constraints on Dark Photons,” *JHEP* **01** (2017) 107, [arXiv:1611.03864 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [159] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [160] H. Esseili and G. D. Kribs, “Cosmological implications of gauged  $U(1)_{B-L}$  on  $\Delta N_{eff}$  in the CMB and BBN,” *JCAP* **05** (2024) 110, [arXiv:2308.07955 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [161] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [162] D. K. Ghosh, P. Ghosh, S. Jeesun, and R. Srivastava, “Neff at CMB challenges U(1)X light gauge boson scenarios,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 7, (2024) 075032, [arXiv:2404.10077 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [163] 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 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [164] 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 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [165] D. V. Forero, C. Giunti, C. A. Ternes, and M. Tortola, “Nonunitary neutrino mixing in short and long-baseline experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 7, (2021) 075030, [arXiv:2103.01998 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [166] P. A. Machado, O. Palamara, and D. W. Schmitz, “The Short-Baseline Neutrino Program at Fermilab,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **69** (2019) 363–387, [arXiv:1903.04608 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [167] V. Brdar, A. Greljo, J. Kopp, and T. Opferkuch, “The Neutrino Magnetic Moment Portal: Cosmology, Astrophysics, and Direct Detection,” *JCAP* **01** (2021) 039, [arXiv:2007.15563 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [168] R. Plestid, “Luminous solar neutrinos I: Dipole portals,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 075027, [arXiv:2010.04193 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [169] P. Coloma, P. A. N. Machado, I. Martinez-Soler, and I. M. Shoemaker, “Double-Cascade Events from New Physics in Icecube,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** no. 20, (2017) 201804, [arXiv:1707.08573 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [170] G. Magill, R. Plestid, M. Pospelov, and Y.-D. Tsai, “Dipole Portal to Heavy Neutral Leptons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 11, (2018) 115015, [arXiv:1803.03262 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [171] **NOMAD** Collaboration, J. Altegoer *et al.*, “The NOMAD experiment at the CERN SPS,” *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **404** (1998) 96–128.
- [172] S. N. Gninenko and N. V. Krasnikov, “Limits on the magnetic moment of sterile neutrino and two photon neutrino decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **450** (1999) 165–172, [arXiv:hep-ph/9808370](#).
- [173] N. W. Kamp, M. Hostert, A. Schneider, S. Vergani, C. A. Argüelles, J. M. Conrad, M. H. Shaevitz, and M. A. Uchida, “Dipole-coupled heavy-neutral-lepton explanations of the MiniBooNE excess including constraints from MINERvA data,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** no. 5, (2023) 055009, [arXiv:2206.07100 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [174] **T2K** Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, “Search for heavy neutrinos with the T2K near detector ND280,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 5, (2019) 052006, [arXiv:1902.07598 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [175] M.-S. Liu, N. Kamp, and C. A. Argüelles, “Constraints and Sensitivities for Dipole-Portal Heavy Neutral Leptons from ND280 and its Upgrade,” [arXiv:2412.15051 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [176] R. Plestid, “Luminous solar neutrinos: The notebooks.” <https://github.com/ryanplestid/luminous-solar-nu>, 2020.
- [177] R. A. Gustafson, R. Plestid, and I. M. Shoemaker, “Neutrino portals, terrestrial upscattering, and atmospheric neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 9, (2022) 095037, [arXiv:2205.02234 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [178] G. Chauhan, S. Horiuchi, P. Huber, and I. M. Shoemaker, “Probing the sterile neutrino dipole portal with SN1987A and low-energy supernovae,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 1, (2024) 015007, [arXiv:2402.01624 \[hep-ph\]](#).