

# Limits on New Lorentz-violating Bosons

P. Carenza<sup>1</sup>, J. Jaeckel<sup>2</sup>, G. Lucente<sup>2,3</sup>, T. K. Poddar<sup>4</sup>, N. Sherrill<sup>5,6</sup> and M. Spannowsky<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Oskar Klein Centre, Department of Physics,  
Stockholm University, Stockholm 106 91, Sweden*

<sup>2</sup> *Institut für theoretische Physik, Universität Heidelberg,  
Philosophenweg 16, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany*

<sup>3</sup> *SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory,  
2575 Sand Hill Rd, Menlo Park, CA 94025*

<sup>4</sup> *INFN Sezione di Napoli, Gruppo collegato di Salerno,  
Via Giovanni Paolo II 132 I-84084 Fisciano (SA), Italy,*

<sup>5</sup> *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sussex  
Brighton, BN1 9QH, United Kingdom*

<sup>6</sup> *Institut für Theoretische Physik, Leibniz Universität Hannover  
Appelstraße 2, Hannover, 30167, Germany*

<sup>7</sup> *Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology, Department of Physics,  
Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, United Kingdom*

## Abstract

We obtain novel constraints on new scalar fields interacting with Standard Model fermions through Lorentz-violating couplings, bridging searches for scalar particles and Lorentz-symmetry tests. These constraints arise from torsion-balance experiments, magnetometer searches, and an excessive energy loss in Red Giant stars. Torsion-balance experiments impose stringent constraints, benefitting from large macroscopic sources such as the Earth, Moon, and Sun. Magnetometer-based searches, which detect pseudo-magnetic fields through spin precession, offer additional limiting power to low-mass scalar fields. Meanwhile, observations of Red Giant stars place strong limits on additional energy loss mechanisms, extending these constraints to higher scalar mass ranges and a wider range of Lorentz-violating couplings. Combining data from laboratory experiments and astrophysical observations, this approach strengthens constraints on Lorentz-violating interactions and paves the way for future investigations into physics beyond the Standard Model.

# 1 Introduction

Searching for new physics has long relied on two primary avenues: the examination of fundamental symmetries and the search for new particles. Each approach has independently contributed to significant breakthroughs, including the discovery of parity violation in the weak interaction [1] and the subsequent identification of the  $W$  and  $Z$  bosons [2–4]. These successes highlight the value of considering more complex scenarios incorporating elements of both symmetry violations and particle searches. In this paper, we will follow this approach, considering Lorentz-symmetry violations in interactions with a new scalar particle.

Lorentz symmetry is a cornerstone of the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics and General Relativity (GR). Precision tests have demonstrated that Lorentz symmetry and the associated CPT (Charge conjugation-Parity-Time reversal) symmetry are upheld with extraordinary accuracy [5]<sup>1</sup>. However, these tests have not covered all energy and length scales, nor have they exhausted the multitude of routes these symmetries could be violated. Any deviation observed in suitable precision experiments from the standard predictions would point to new physics, challenging the universality of these foundational symmetries.

The Standard-Model Extension (SME) [7–9] framework provides a systematic parametrization for incorporating violations of Lorentz symmetry. This framework constructs all possible tensorial operators involving quantum and gravitational fields using an effective field theory approach. The coefficients of these new operators quantify the type and degree of Lorentz Violation (LV). Extensive studies have explored the stability [10,11] and renormalizability [12–14] of this extension, ensuring its theoretical consistency. Potential theories for Lorentz-symmetry violation include spontaneous symmetry breaking in string theory [15–17], phenomena in loop quantum gravity [18,19], variations in fundamental constants over spacetime [20,21], and non-commutative geometry [22,23], among others.

As already mentioned, the effects of LV have been probed with amazing precision [5]. However, most studies have been performed in the context of the SME, building on an effective field theory approach with *no new particles* within the accessible energy range. This limits interaction effects to be point-like and precludes effects from the production of new particles. Here, we want to explore both of these aspects, considering long-range interactions as well as the production of the new particles in stars leading to an additional energy-loss channel.

Concretely, an intriguing yet less extensively studied aspect is the possibility that the LV occurs (only) in interactions of a new, light scalar with SM fermions. At low energies, such interactions give rise to the Yukawa potentials and their derivatives, which are altered in the presence of Lorentz-violating effects. The theoretical foundation for such models has been outlined in [24–26]. Our study employs this framework to derive explicit constraints on a new scalar field coupled to SM fermions through Lorentz-violating interactions, with a particular focus on mass-dimension-4 terms in the Lagrangian. We consider potentials [26] arising from the virtual exchange of the scalar boson between test masses in an Earth-bound experiment and sources within the solar system and beyond. In addition, we are also considering scalar emission in scattering effects in an astrophysical environment, such as in Red Giant (RG) stars.

This approach allows for a systematic exploration of potential new physics by interfacing with both particle phenomenology and tests of fundamental symmetries. Concretely, we start

---

<sup>1</sup>For a phenomenological investigation into possible violations of the larger Poincare symmetry group see [6].

from a Lagrangian [26],

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2 - \phi \sum_F \bar{\psi}_F G_F \psi_F, \quad (1)$$

$$G_F = g_F + ig'_F\gamma_5 + I_\mu^F\gamma^\mu + J_\mu^F\gamma_5\gamma^\mu + \frac{1}{2}L_{\mu\nu}^F\sigma^{\mu\nu},$$

where  $m_\phi$  denotes the mass of the scalar field  $\phi$ ,  $g_F$  and  $g'_F$  are the conventional scalar and pseudoscalar couplings, respectively. The sum  $F$  runs over the SM fermion species. The dimensionless coefficients, parametrizing vector, pseudovector and second-rank tensorial coefficients for LV are  $I_\mu^F$ ,  $J_\mu^F$ , and  $L_{\mu\nu}^F$ . By assumption, these terms describe perturbative Lorentz- and CPT-violating effects around  $g_F$  and  $g'_F$ . Note that the vector ( $I_\mu^F$ ) and pseudovector ( $J_\mu^F$ ) coefficients also induce violations of CPT symmetry because the associated field operators are odd under CPT conjugation. The Yukawa interaction terms in Eq. (1) significantly impact the interaction potential between fermions, yielding unique signatures in non-relativistic and relativistic limits. This work explores these scenarios by examining how low-mass scalars ( $m_\phi \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10)$  keV) interacting with SM fermions can be constrained by laboratory experiments and astrophysical observations. To our knowledge, so far only a single study has assessed the sensitivity to the coefficient combination  $I_0^F + J_0^F$  from pions decaying to muons and neutrinos, yielding constraints at the  $10^{-10}$  level [27].

Our investigation begins in Sec. 2 by looking at long-range forces from the exchange of the light scalar. In particular we analyze torsion-balance experiments [28–30], which have been instrumental in testing potential fifth forces and deviations from known physics [31–36]. We also explore the sensitivity of magnetometer-based searches [37–51]. These highly sensitive devices measure spin-precession frequencies, providing a powerful tool for detecting spin-dependent interactions with external fields. In Sec. 3, we extend our analysis to astrophysical settings, mainly focusing on energy-loss processes in RG stars. Due to their large volume, high density and temperature, such stellar environments are known to be sensitive to energy loss caused by the production of new low-mass particles [52–55]. We use these systems to probe Lorentz-violating new scalars with masses up into the keV-range. Our results are summarized in Fig. 1. We offer concluding remarks in Sec. 4.

## 2 Probing scalar-mediated long-range Lorentz-violating potentials

For low-mass bosons, searches for new forces are usually a powerful tool (cf, e.g. [56] for a review and [57, 58] for some examples of early theory papers). In the non-relativistic limit, Eq. (1) implies Lorentz-violating modifications of fermion-fermion scattering [26].

We follow Ref. [26] by assuming LV only occurs at the vertex of fermion  $A$  with mass  $m_A$ , while the second fermion  $B$  with mass  $m_B$  is conventional in the sense of having only scalar and pseudoscalar couplings  $g_B$  and  $g'_B$ , respectively.

Let us briefly comment on why this simplification is justified in the cases of interest to us. To probe spin-dependent Lorentz-violating long-range potentials, torsion-balance and magnetometer experiments are ideal setups, with the experimental test mass consisting of  $A$ -type fermion spins. The source of the potential is taken as being composed of  $B$ -type fermions, which have a coupling with  $A$ -type fermion spins. For a macroscopic object (such as a star




Figure 1: Constraints on  $|g_S \tilde{J}_X^e|$  (cf. Eqs. (1) and (6)) as a function of the mediator mass  $m_\phi$  (bottom) and wavelength  $\lambda$  (top). Constraints on the  $Y$  and  $Z$  components are similar (see Table 1). The depicted limits for the potential tests and the sensitivity for the magnetometers are for the source coupling,  $g_S$ , being a coupling to nucleons. However, the limits for a source coupling to electrons are quite similar. The same holds for a Lorentz-violating coupling of the test mass to nucleons, except in the magnetometer case. The astrophysical (RG) constraints are for  $g_S = g_e$  only. For more details see the text in the following sections.

or a planet) consisting of  $B$ -type fermions, the net polarization is zero, and therefore, most of the Lorentz-violating effects (which are spin-dependent) cancel out. The only exception is  $I$ -dependent terms whose vectorial components are also velocity suppressed, which, in the following, we anyway will not constrain. Furthermore, we implicitly assume a hierarchy that the Lorentz-violating effects are small compared to the ordinary interactions. Hence, second-order Lorentz-violating effects are further suppressed. All in all, treating only  $A$  as Lorentz-violating is a reasonable approximation.

Under these assumptions there are two contributions<sup>2</sup>, [26]

$$V_f(r) = \left[ \tilde{g}_A - I_j^A (v_{\text{av}}^A)_j - J_0^A (v_{\text{av}}^A)_j \sigma_j^A + \tilde{J}_j^A \sigma_j^A + \epsilon_{jkl} \tilde{L}_j^A (v_{\text{av}}^A)_k \sigma_l^A \right] g_B f(r), \quad (2)$$

$$V_g(\vec{r}) = \frac{g_B}{2m_A} \left[ g'_A \sigma_j^A - \tilde{L}_j^A - \epsilon_{jkl} I_k^A \sigma_l^A \right] g_j(\vec{r}) - \frac{g'_B}{2m_B} \left[ \tilde{g}_A - I_k^A (v_{\text{av}}^A)_k - J_0^A (v_{\text{av}}^A)_k \sigma_k^A + \tilde{J}_k^A \sigma_k^A + \epsilon_{klm} \tilde{L}_k^A (v_{\text{av}}^A)_l \sigma_n^A \right] \sigma_j^B g_j(\vec{r}), \quad (3)$$

to the the total non-relativistic potential  $V_f(r) + V_g(\vec{r})$ . Here,  $\vec{v}_{\text{av}}^A$  is the average velocity of the scattered fermions at the Lorentz-violating vertex. Additionally, in Eqs. (2)-(3) we have introduced

$$f(r) = -\frac{e^{-m_\phi r}}{4\pi r}, \quad (4)$$

$$g_j(\vec{r}) = \partial_j f(r) = \frac{e^{-m_\phi r}}{4\pi} \left( \frac{m_\phi}{r} + \frac{1}{r^2} \right) \frac{x_j}{r} \equiv g(r) \frac{x_j}{r}, \quad (5)$$

and expressed the potentials  $V_f(r)$  and  $V_g(\vec{r})$  in the coefficient basis

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_F &= g_F + I_0^F, \\ \tilde{J}_j^F &= J_j^F + \epsilon_{jkl} L_{kl}^F, \\ \tilde{L}_j^F &= L_{0j}^F = -L_{j0}^F. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In the following, we exploit torsion-balance and magnetometer experiments to probe the Lorentz-violating potentials introduced above. Indeed, these experiments are sensitive to long-range interactions and ideally suited for probing the implications of Lorentz-violating potentials, particularly those involving large-scale sources like the Earth, Moon, and Sun. We discuss how such sources can significantly affect the constraints on scalar boson-mediated Lorentz-violating interactions due to their macroscopic nature and proximity to experimental setups. Laboratory setups are particularly valuable for studying long-range spin-dependent interactions because they allow the controlled creation of spin-polarized systems, enabling observing net spin effects on the coupling due to distant sources.

## 2.1 Constraints on $g\tilde{J}_j$ from torsion balances

Let us now consider experimental results from torsion balances constraining specific coupling coefficients. The Eöt-Wash group [29] has performed a time-dependent analysis of the spatially independent potential

$$V_e = -\sigma^e \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{b}}^e, \quad (7)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>See also Appendix A for the derivation details of the Lorentz-violating scalar-pseudovector potential.

where  $\tilde{b}_j^e$  are a combination of the spatial components of the coefficients for LV in the electron sector coupling to the electron's spin  $\sigma_j^e$  [30]. Constraints on the three spatial components  $\tilde{b}_X^e$ ,  $\tilde{b}_Y^e$ , and  $\tilde{b}_Z^e$  were placed at the  $10^{-31}$  GeV level, where the subscripts  $X, Y$ , and  $Z$  denote Cartesian equatorial or, equivalently in our case of interest, Sun-Centered Frame (SCF) coordinates [59–61]. The constraints are reproduced in Table 1. These results permit, under a proper interpretation, the extraction of constraints on a subset of coefficients from Eq. (2).

In Ref. [29], Eöt-Wash also examined the signatures of several Lorentz-invariant potentials with spatial dependence controlled by  $f(r)$  and  $g(r)$  defined in Eq. (4). Their torsion-balance apparatus with polarized electrons ( $e$ ) was treated as a test mass in several source potentials generated by a large number of nucleons ( $N$ ).

Comparing with Eq. (2) we can see that in our case, the Lorentz-violating potential has  $A = e$  and  $B = N$  fermion indices and is controlled by the  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ -type coefficients defined in Eq. (6),

$$V_{\tilde{\mathcal{J}}}(\vec{r}) = \left( \boldsymbol{\sigma}^e \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{J}}^e \right) \left[ g_N f(r) - \frac{g'_N}{2m_N} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}^N \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) g(\vec{r}) \right]. \quad (8)$$

The electron spins have a Lorentz-violating coupling and the resulting interaction potential is sourced by nucleons. In Eq. (8), the unit vector  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$  points from the Eöt-Wash apparatus of polarized electrons to an infinitesimal nucleon source element of density  $\rho(\vec{r})$ . Consistent with what we argued above, existing results are not sensitive to the polarization of the source nucleons  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^N$  as none of the considered sources contain a significant number of polarized nucleons<sup>3</sup>. Accordingly, the second piece within the brackets of Eq. (8) does not contribute. Therefore,

$$V_{\tilde{\mathcal{J}}}(\vec{r}) \rightarrow \left( \boldsymbol{\sigma}^e \cdot \tilde{\mathcal{J}}^e \right) g_N f(r). \quad (9)$$

This is simply an  $f(r)$ -dependent form of  $V_e$  in Eq. (7) and can be directly compared to the terms in Eq. (2).

So far the function  $f(r)$ , given in Eq. (4), describes a Yukawa potential function, between two point-like fermions separated by  $r$ . This must be generalized to the potential between a macroscopic object, the source of unpolarized nucleons, and an approximately point-like object, the apparatus. The considered sources include the Earth, Moon, and Sun. This can be done by using the source integral,

$$f(r) \rightarrow -\frac{1}{4\pi u} \int d^3r' \frac{\rho(\vec{r}')}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} e^{-|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|/\lambda}, \quad (10)$$

where  $u$  is the atomic mass unit and  $\lambda = 1/m_\phi$  is the wavelength of the boson mediator. Integrating over a source introduces a mass scale. We normalize  $f(r)$  to  $u \approx m_N$  to facilitate comparison with the point-source approximation and retain the same units.

Let us first consider the source to be the Sun, with radius  $r_\odot \approx 7 \times 10^5$  km and mass  $M_\odot \approx 2 \times 10^{30}$  kg [65,66]. We assume a uniform density,

$$\rho(\vec{r}') = \rho_{\text{Sun}} \approx \frac{3M_\odot}{4\pi r_\odot^3}. \quad (11)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Macroscopic sources could have a small amount of polarized electrons due to the spherical symmetry breaking of the sources or statistical fluctuation due to a magnetic field of the sources [62–64].

The approximate separation between the apparatus, and the Sun is  $r = R_\odot \approx 1 \text{ AU}$ .<sup>4</sup> The source integral in Eq. (10) evaluated at a separation,  $r = R_\odot$  gives

$$-\frac{M_\odot}{4\pi u R_\odot} \left[ \frac{\xi \cosh \xi - \sinh \xi}{\xi^3/3} \right] \exp \left[ -\frac{R_\odot}{\lambda} \right], \quad (12)$$

where  $\xi = r_\odot/\lambda$ . The expression in Eq. (12) obtains its largest magnitude in the massless-boson limit  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $\lambda \gg r_\odot, R_\odot$ , the bracketed and the exponential factors tend to unity and allow the following comparison to be made:

$$g_N \tilde{\mathcal{J}}^e \left( \frac{M_\odot}{4\pi u R_\odot} \right) \leftrightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{b}}^e. \quad (13)$$

Note that, though one could consider the detailed composition of the source as done, e.g., in Ref. [67], we follow Ref. [29] in assuming equal couplings for nucleons ( $g_N = g_p = g_n$ ) and  $g_e = 0$  for the Sun. Using these, we find the limit depicted as the orange region in Fig. 1. Notably, incredibly small values of the coupling product ( $g_N \tilde{\mathcal{J}}^e \gtrsim 10^{-60}$ ) can be tested.

Following a similar procedure, we can now include different source objects. As with Ref. [29], we also assume the Moon ( $R_\zeta \approx 3.84 \times 10^6 \text{ m}$  and  $M_\zeta \approx 7 \times 10^{22} \text{ kg}$  [65, 68]) to be of uniform density. The comparison in Eq. (13) also applies in this case, with the appropriate mass and distance replacements. However, this approximation cannot be carried over for Earth ( $M_\oplus \approx 6 \times 10^{24} \text{ kg}$  [65, 69]), due to significant density variations and its closeness to the experimental apparatus. To our knowledge, the relevant source integral in Eq. (12) in this case is unavailable. We instead use a common parametrization for the Earth’s density profile [70] to probe the parameter space resulting from an Earth source.

Using Eq. (13) and constraints on  $\tilde{b}_j^e$  in Table 1, the results for the Sun ( $\odot$ , orange), Moon ( $\zeta$ , blue), and Earth ( $\oplus$ , green) sources are displayed in Fig. 1. New parameter space from mass scales  $m_\phi \approx 5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ eV}$  through the massless limit is probed. In each of these three cases, the curves flatten at a magnitude controlled by  $M/R$  and remain valid through the massless limit. The parameter space covered by “Universe” (purple) takes over around  $m_\phi \sim 10^{-22} \text{ eV}$  and is discussed in the following section. Again, we point out the incredible sensitivity of all these constraints.

Parameter	Constraint (this work)	Parameter	Constraint (Ref. [29])
$ g_N \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_X^e $	$< 5 \times 10^{-61}$	$\tilde{b}_X^e$	$(-0.67 \pm 1.31) \times 10^{-31} \text{ GeV}$
$ g_N \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_Y^e $	$< 9 \times 10^{-61}$	$\tilde{b}_Y^e$	$(-0.18 \pm 1.32) \times 10^{-31} \text{ GeV}$
$ g_N \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_Z^e $	$< 3 \times 10^{-59}$	$\tilde{b}_Z^e$	$(-4 \pm 44) \times 10^{-31} \text{ GeV}$

Table 1: Constraints on  $g_N \tilde{\mathcal{J}}^e$ , assuming the Sun as a source. The limits are valid for the mass of the scalar  $m_\phi \lesssim 10^{-18} \text{ eV}$ . Constraints on  $\tilde{b}_j^e$  from Ref. [29] are given at 68% C.L.

<sup>4</sup>This is the approximate distance between the centre of the Earth and the centre of the Sun. This distance varies  $\sim 2\%$  over the year. As assumed by Eöt-Wash, we ignore these variations.

<sup>5</sup>We cut off the constrained region at a distance of 1 m due to uncertainties about the details of the geometry and composition of the apparatus.

Using the same sources, we can also obtain limits on the electron coupling of the source. Assuming the number of nucleons and electrons to be roughly equal up to a factor of order 1 (based on charge neutrality), the limits are essentially the same. Moreover, using the data from Ref. [39] we can also set constraints on a similar level for Lorentz-violating test body interactions with nucleons, cf. Eq. (1).

## 2.2 Constraints from magnetometer searches

The leading-order Lorentz-violating scalar potential term, Eq. (9), that can be searched for with the torsion balances can also be detected using magnetometers based on spin interactions (see Ref. [49] for some example proposals). This can be understood by comparing the Lorentz-violating interaction, Eq. (9), to the Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}$  of a particle  $f$  with spin  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_f$  in a magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$  [49],

$$\mathcal{H} = -\mu_f \boldsymbol{\sigma}_f \cdot \mathbf{B}. \quad (14)$$

Here, the particle's magnetic moment is given by  $\mu_f \boldsymbol{\sigma}_f$ .

Following this analogy, the unpolarized nucleons in the source, e.g. the Sun, generate a pseudo-magnetic field acting on electron spins,

$$B^{\text{LV}} = \frac{g_S \tilde{J}^e M}{\mu_e 4\pi u R} \left[ \frac{\xi \cosh \xi - \sinh \xi}{\xi^3/3} \right] \exp[-R/\lambda] \sim \frac{g_S \tilde{J}^e M}{\mu_e 4\pi u R} \exp[-R/\lambda]. \quad (15)$$

Here,  $g_S$  is the coupling of the source particles,  $\mu_e$  represents the magnetic moment of the electron,  $M$  is the mass of the source,  $R$  denotes the distance between the source and the Earth-based apparatus, and  $\xi = r/\lambda$  quantifies the size of the source relative to the range of the interaction. The simplification in the last step of Eq. (15) corresponds to the point source approximation or  $\xi \ll 1$ , where the wavelength of the boson is large compared to the size of the source.

We stress again that the magnetic field in Eq. (15) does not correspond to a real magnetic field generated through electromagnetic interactions. Instead, this field arises from the Lorentz-violating interaction and only acts on the spins of the particles in this interaction, in our case electrons. Therefore, it can only be detected in magnetometers that are based on the spin interaction of these particles. Nevertheless, for comparison with existing magnetometers, the magnetic field analogy is useful.

To see how sensitive such a setup could be, let us consider the Sun as a source object. The induced magnetic field, generated by the nucleons in the Sun, is given by,

$$B^{\text{LV}} \sim 2 \text{ aT} \left( \frac{g_S \tilde{J}^e}{10^{-60}} \right). \quad (16)$$

In the presence of such a pseudo-magnetic field, the electron spins precess just like in an ordinary magnetic field, see [49]. Importantly, the pseudo-magnetic field penetrates magnetic shielding and therefore can be measured in a magnetically shielded environment where ordinary magnetic fields are blocked [49]. In addition, the annual modulation of the signal can be used as an additional discriminator [49], detected using highly sensitive magnetometers. Finally, the signal can be measured more precisely by positioning magnetometers at various locations around the Earth, as done in experiments like GNOME [71]. The sensitivity of  $\mathcal{O}(\text{aT})$  with electron spin can be achieved with  $^3\text{He} - \text{K}$  co-magnetometers [47]. The QUAX- $g_p g_s$  experiment [46], which



probes scalar ( $g_s$ )–pseudoscalar ( $g_p$ ) interactions, utilizing a DC SQUID magnetometer, is also capable of detecting electron spin with comparable sensitivity. Assuming a final magnetic-field sensitivity  $B_{\text{sensitivity}} \sim 2 \text{ aT}$  [40, 46, 47, 49, 51]<sup>6</sup>, magnetometers would be able to probe values of the Lorentz-violating coupling

$$|g_S \tilde{J}_j^e| \sim 1 \times 10^{-60} \left( \frac{B_{\text{sensitivity}}}{2 \text{ aT}} \right), \quad (17)$$

for masses  $m_\phi \lesssim 1.3 \times 10^{-18} \text{ eV}$ , determined by the Earth-Sun distance. Hence, the magnetometer-based experiments can serve as complementary probes for Lorentz-violating interactions. This can also be seen in Fig. 1 where this sensitivity is indicated by a gold dashed line.

In a similar way, one can also use experiments sensitive to nuclear spins (see [37–39, 41, 42, 49]). In this case we can use already performed experiments with K-<sup>3</sup>He [39], <sup>199</sup>Hg-<sup>133</sup>Cs [41] and <sup>3</sup>He-<sup>129</sup>Xe [42] co-magnetometers, to set actual bounds. The resulting limits on nuclear couplings, which are even somewhat stronger, can be found in Tab. 2.<sup>7</sup>

Parameter	Constraint (this work)	Parameter	Constraint	Ref.
$ g_N \tilde{J}_\perp^p $	$< 5 \times 10^{-61}$	$\tilde{b}_\perp^p$	$< 6 \times 10^{-32} \text{ GeV}$	[39]
$ g_N \tilde{J}_Z^p $	$< 6 \times 10^{-58}$	$\tilde{b}_Z^p$	$< 7 \times 10^{-29} \text{ GeV}$	[41]
$ g_N \tilde{J}_X^n $	$< 7 \times 10^{-62}$	$\tilde{b}_X^n$	$(4.1 \pm 4.7) \times 10^{-34} \text{ GeV}$	[42]
$ g_N \tilde{J}_Y^n $	$< 7 \times 10^{-63}$	$\tilde{b}_Y^n$	$(2.9 \pm 6.2) \times 10^{-34} \text{ GeV}$	[42]
$ g_N \tilde{J}_Z^n $	$< 6 \times 10^{-59}$	$\tilde{b}_Z^n$	$< 7 \times 10^{-30} \text{ GeV}$	[41]

Table 2: Constraints on  $g_N \tilde{J}$  from co-magnetometer experiments, assuming the Sun as a source. The label  $\perp$  indicates the equatorial, i.e. the  $X$ - $Y$ , plane. The limits are valid for the mass of the scalar  $m_\phi \lesssim 10^{-18} \text{ eV}$ .

### 2.3 Potential peculiarities

Let us note a couple of peculiarities of the measured quantity given in Eqs. (9) and (14), (15) that can be calculated with Eq. (10). In contrast to the usual measurement in fifth force experiments, the measured quantity is not the force or some other derivative of the potential but effectively the potential itself. The reason is that the spin-dependent potential’s energy depends on the spin’s orientation with respect to the Lorentz-violating vector. When the experiment rotates relative to the fixed background, the energy changes by a size comparable to the effective potential. It acts like a fixed vectorial background field, akin to a magnetic field, as discussed in the previous section 2.2. The size of the background field is determined by the source integral in Eq. (10) and features a Yukawa-like behaviour approaching  $\sim 1/r$  in the massless limit. While the measured quantity in the end is a torque and, therefore, a force, its size is therefore determined by this much slower drop-off, which is different from the usual inverse square law.

<sup>6</sup>A sensitivity of  $\sim 200 \text{ aT}$  has already been achieved in [47].

<sup>7</sup>Note that, for the same magnetic field sensitivity, the limits are stronger because of the much smaller nuclear magnetic moment to be used in Eq. (15).

The first consequence is the incredible strength of the limits shown in Fig. 1, which are much stronger than the already strong constraints on Lorentz-preserving coefficients.

However, the peculiarity of this result goes a bit deeper. To see this, we note that, in Eq. (10), all sources contribute, and the only decoupling of very distant sources occurs due to the mass  $m_\phi$  of the scalar or equivalently, the range  $\lambda = 1/m_\phi$  of the potential. Approximating the Universe as homogeneous on very large distances, we can evaluate Eq. (10) with a homogeneous density  $\rho_{\text{average}}$  and integrate in a spherically symmetric way up to a distance  $R$ ,

$$f(r) = -\frac{\rho_{\text{average}}}{4\pi u} \int_0^R 4\pi r dr e^{-\frac{r}{\lambda}}. \quad (18)$$

After evaluating the integral, we obtain

$$f(R) = -\frac{\rho_{\text{average}}}{u} \left[ \lambda^2 (1 - e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}}) - \lambda R e^{-\frac{R}{\lambda}} \right]. \quad (19)$$

Eq. (19) yields two limiting solutions by comparing the sizes of  $\lambda$  and  $R$ .

1. *Long Range* ( $\lambda \gg R$ ). In this case, the range of the new force exceeds the size of the system, indicating that the mediator of the force is ultralight. As a result, the exponential term can be expanded, and Eq. (19) simplifies to

$$f \approx -\frac{\rho R^2}{u}. \quad (20)$$

2. *Short Range* ( $\lambda \ll R$ ). In this case, the range of the new force is shorter than the size of the system, indicating that the mediator is massive compared to the ultralight case (case 1). Consequently, in the short-range limit, the exponential term cannot be expanded, and Eq. (19) takes the following form

$$f \approx -\frac{\rho \lambda^2}{u}. \quad (21)$$

As we can see, the source integral diverges with the chosen distance  $R$  in the massless limit. Accordingly, the constraints get tighter and tighter as we include increasingly distant sources.<sup>8</sup> This rather strange behaviour is indicated by the purple line and region in Fig. 1.

Of course, we could argue that due to the non-static, expanding nature, the approximation of a static potential breaks down, and we should probably integrate no further than a distance of the order of the Hubble horizon before relativistic effects should be considered. Implementing this with a cutoff at a distance  $1/H$  this is visible by the flattening of the curves at low masses. Still, we also think that this behaviour indicates a potential sickness of the Lorentz-violating theory's long-distance infrared behaviour. Having noted this, we nevertheless proceed with our phenomenological analysis.

### 3 Red Giant bound on Lorentz violation

Searches for long-range forces, as discussed in Section 2, typically have sensitivity at very low scalar masses,  $m_\phi \ll 10^{-5}$  eV. At higher scalar masses  $m_\phi \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10)$  keV, astrophysical systems such as RGs are often sensitive to extra energy losses caused by particle production [72, 73].

<sup>8</sup>Due to the Lorentz-violating effect, there is also no cancellation of source contributions from the different directions in the centre of a homogeneously charged and isotropic source configuration.




Figure 2: Scalar emission through a Lorentz-violating coupling in electron-ion bremsstrahlung process.

In this section, we therefore consider the thermal production of a boson  $\phi$  in stars interacting with electrons via the Lagrangian in Eq. (1), where  $F = e$ . In particular, we focus on the bremsstrahlung process  $e^- + Ze \rightarrow e^- + Ze + \phi$  [52], in which an electron  $e$  scatters off an ion with charge  $Ze$ , emitting a boson  $\phi$  in the final state, as shown in Fig. 2 (see Ref. [55] for the case of axionic bremsstrahlung and Ref. [74] for the scalar case). Since in this process,  $\phi$  is emitted by an electron, with the “spectator” ion exchanging a photon with the incoming electron, the analysis in this section allows us to set new constraints only on Lorentz-violating interactions with electrons. Electron-ion bremsstrahlung is the dominant production channel for new scalars in RG stars. In this context, a subleading contribution to the  $\phi$  production comes from the electron-electron bremsstrahlung  $e^- + e^- \rightarrow e^- + e^- + \phi$ , in which an electron would emit the particle  $\phi$  after scattering off another electron. However, the latter process is suppressed due to the electron degeneracy in the RG core [72]. Therefore, here we will use the electron-ion bremsstrahlung process in RG stars to probe  $\phi$  interactions with electrons.

To constrain the energy loss via particle production, we use observations of RG stars. Let us briefly recall the main features relevant for this. Stars in the Main Sequence phase burn hydrogen in the core to produce energy and halt the gravitational collapse [75]. When there is no more hydrogen to burn, stars with a mass  $M \lesssim 2M_\odot$  will develop an inert helium core, which is too cold to ignite helium fusion, surrounded by a burning hydrogen shell. Such a star is called RG, characterized by expanding outer layers that increase the stellar luminosity because of the larger radius, even though the surface temperature decreases. While the hydrogen shell burns, the produced helium is continuously accumulated in the core, increasing its density and the electron degeneracy. Being a degenerate system, the core shrinks to increase the Fermi pressure, counteracting the collapse. However, in this process, the gravitational attraction on the core surface also increases, heating up this region. Together with the external layer, the inner core is heated up until it ignites the burning of helium, roughly at  $\rho \approx 10^6$  g/cm<sup>3</sup> and  $T \approx 10^8$  K = 8.6 keV [72, 75]. This process, the so-called helium flash, is extremely fast because the helium burning rate is steeply dependent on temperature. The properties of the RG when the helium flash happens determine the location of the so-called Red Giant Branch (RGB) tip in the colour-magnitude diagram [75, 76]. These properties are very sensitive to exotic energy emissions. As a matter of fact, exotic losses would delay the helium ignition, making the RGB tip brighter [52, 77, 78]. Through a comparison with numerical simulations [79], Ref. [73] proposed to constrain novel particle emission by requiring that for a one-zone RG model with

$T = 8.6$  keV and average density  $\rho = 2 \times 10^5$  g cm $^{-3}$  the exotic energy loss should not exceed about 10 erg g $^{-1}$  s $^{-1}$  (see also [77] for a more recent discussion). We mention here that at these conditions, the standard neutrino emission is about 4 erg g $^{-1}$  s $^{-1}$  [77]. Recently, constraints on the axion-electron coupling have been re-evaluated by inserting axions in stellar evolution codes and comparing the RGB tip obtained in the presence of axions with the observed ones. The most recent bound from observations of the RGB tip excludes  $g_{ae} \lesssim 1.5 \times 10^{-13}$  [53, 54].

In this work, in order to estimate the RG bound on Lorentz-violating interactions, inspired by the strategy proposed in [73], we evaluate the  $\phi$  production via electron-ion bremsstrahlung using a one-zone model with  $\rho = 2.5 \times 10^5$  g cm $^{-3}$  and temperature  $T = 8.6$  keV. A more refined analysis would require the inclusion of the  $\phi$  production rates in stellar evolution codes, but this is beyond the scope of this work, especially since the simplified approach is compatible with numerical results [73, 79].

### 3.1 Production via electron-ion bremsstrahlung

In the presence of Lorentz-violating interactions, the electron-ion bremsstrahlung matrix element is

$$\mathcal{M}_j = \frac{Z_j e^2}{|\mathbf{q}|(|\mathbf{q}|^2 + k_S^2)^{1/2}} \times \bar{u}(p_f) \left[ G_e \frac{1}{\not{P} - m_e} \gamma^0 + \gamma^0 \frac{1}{\not{Q} - m_e} G_e \right] u(p_i), \quad (22)$$

where  $G_e$  is given by Eq. (1),<sup>9</sup>  $u(p_i), u(p_f)$  are the electron spinors,  $p_i = (E_i, \mathbf{p}_i)$  and  $p_f = (E_f, \mathbf{p}_f)$  are the four-momenta of the initial and final electrons,  $P = p_f + p_\phi$ ,  $Q = p_i - p_\phi$ , and  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}_f + \mathbf{p}_\phi - \mathbf{p}_i$  is the momentum transfer, with  $p_\phi = (\omega_\phi, \mathbf{p}_\phi)$  the four-momentum of the  $\phi$  particle. The term  $[|\mathbf{q}|(|\mathbf{q}|^2 + k_S^2)^{1/2}]^{-1}$  is the Coulomb propagator in a plasma and  $k_S$  is the Debye screening scale given by [80]

$$k_S^2 = \frac{4\pi\alpha \sum_j Z_j^2 n_j}{T}, \quad (23)$$

where  $n_j$  the number density of ions with charge  $Z_j e$  and  $\alpha$  is the fine structure constant.

From the matrix element, we can compute the emission rate per unit volume and energy

$$\frac{d^2 n_\phi}{dt d\omega_\phi} = \int \frac{2d^3 \mathbf{p}_i}{(2\pi)^3 2E_i} \frac{2d^3 \mathbf{p}_f}{(2\pi)^3 2E_f} \frac{d\Omega_\phi \omega_\phi |\mathbf{p}_\phi|}{(2\pi)^3 2\omega_\phi} (2\pi) \delta(E_i - E_f - \omega_\phi) |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2 f_i (1 - f_f), \quad (24)$$

where  $\Omega_\phi$  is the solid angle over which  $\phi$  is emitted,  $f_{i,f}$  are the electron distribution functions, the factors 2 account for the electron spins, and  $|\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \sum_j n_j \sum_s |\mathcal{M}_j|^2$  is the matrix element in Eq. (22) averaged over the electron spins and summed over all the target ions. The explicit expression of  $|\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2$  depends on the considered interaction, as shown in Appendix B.

In the absence of Lorentz-violating interactions, the integrals in Eq. (24) can be reduced to a simpler form given in [55]. However, this simplification cannot be done when Lorentz-violating terms are included since the matrix element would feature terms involving the scalar product between  $I_\mu^e, J_\mu^e$  and the four-momenta  $p_i, p_f$  and  $p_\phi$ .

Finally, the emissivity, i.e. the energy emitted per unit mass and time via  $\phi$  emission is,

$$\varepsilon_\phi = \frac{1}{\rho} \int_{m_\phi}^{\infty} d\omega_\phi \omega_\phi \frac{d^2 n_\phi}{dt d\omega_\phi}. \quad (25)$$

<sup>9</sup>Here, for simplicity we neglect the Lorentz-violating second-rank tensorial coupling  $L_{\mu\nu}^e$  and focus on the vector and pseudovector coefficients.

## 3.2 Production in the Red Giant core

The integrations in Eqs. (24) and (25) involving Lorentz-violating vector and pseudovector coefficients can be done using a Monte Carlo simulation. To do so, we model the RG core as a He core with density  $\rho = 2.5 \times 10^5 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  and temperature  $T = 8.6 \text{ keV}$ . This implies that the Debye screening scale is  $k_S = 99.3 \text{ keV}$ , where in Eq. (23) we used  $Z^2 n = Z(Z/A)\rho/m_u$ , with  $A = 2Z = 4$  and  $m_u = 931 \text{ MeV}$ .

### 3.2.1 Scalar and pseudoscalar interactions

The emission via electron-ion bremsstrahlung induced by scalar and pseudoscalar interactions has already been considered in the literature; see, e.g. Refs. [55, 72, 74, 81]. Therefore, in order to check our simulations, we compared them against scalar and pseudoscalar cases.

If we consider only pseudoscalar interactions,  $G_e = i g'_e \gamma_5$ , our analysis would correspond to the axion case, i.e  $\phi = a$  and  $g'_e = g_{ae}$ . The axion emission via electron bremsstrahlung was computed in Ref. [55] for any degree of degeneracy. For RG conditions, one finds

$$\varepsilon_\phi = 2.0 \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \left( \frac{g'_e}{10^{-13}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{T}{\text{keV}} \right)^2 \mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}} \left( \eta, \frac{m_\phi}{T}, \frac{m_e}{T}, \frac{k_S}{T} \right), \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}}$  is a complicated function which includes the integrals in Eq. (24) and depends on the details of the  $\phi$  interactions with electrons described by  $|\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2$ . We stress that  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}}$  is a function of both the axion mass and stellar plasma properties, including the electron degeneracy parameter  $\eta = (\mu_e - m_e)/T = 6.16$  [55], with  $m_e$  and  $\mu_e$  the electron mass and chemical potential, respectively.<sup>10</sup>

Analogously, for  $G_e = g_e$  we obtain the scalar case, for which the emissivity is the same as in Eq. (26), but replacing  $g'_e \rightarrow g_e$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_s$ , a different function of the stellar properties taking into account the scalar interaction. The scalar emission via electron-nucleus bremsstrahlung was considered in Ref. [74]. Under RG conditions and assuming  $m_\phi \ll T$ , we find for the pseudoscalar case  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}} = 9.3 \times 10^{-3}$ , while  $\mathcal{F}_s = 23.0$ . These values imply the ratio  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}}/\mathcal{F}_s \approx 4.0 \times 10^{-4}$ . This is in good agreement with the results in Ref. [74], showing that for degenerate electrons, the ratio between the pseudoscalar and scalar production rates is  $\sim \pi^2/5 \times (T/m_e)^2$ . For our fixed conditions in the RG cores, electrons are partially degenerate and  $\pi^2/5 \times (T/m_e)^2 \approx 5.6 \times 10^{-4}$ , compatible with expectations. We numerically checked that the agreement improves for more degenerate conditions. Since electrons in RGs are partially degenerate, the integrals  $\mathcal{F}_s$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}}$  need to be evaluated for different values of the temperature. For highly degenerate conditions ( $\eta \gg 10$ )  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{ps}} \propto T^2$ , while  $\mathcal{F}_s$  is approximately independent of the temperature, implying that  $\varepsilon_{\text{ps}} \propto T^4$  for pseudoscalar and  $\varepsilon_s \propto T^2$  for scalar interactions, in accordance with literature (see, e.g., Ref. [74] for scalar and Ref. [81] for pseudoscalar particles).

### 3.2.2 Vector and pseudovector interactions

In the presence of the Lorentz-violating 4-vectors  $I_\mu^e$  and  $J_\mu^e$ , we need to consider the complete integral in Eq. (24). Additionally, one has to take into account that the incoming electron is

<sup>10</sup>The expression in Eq. (26) is different from Eq. (4) in Ref. [55], due to different conditions. Here, we consider a helium core with  $Z = 2$ , while in Ref. [55]  $Z = 1$  was considered for simplicity (see [55] for more details). Therefore, the relation  $k_s^2 T = 4\pi\alpha n$  was used, leading to a different expression.

boosted in a given direction  $\mathbf{v} = (v_X, v_Y, v_Z)$  compared to the  $I_\mu^e$  and  $J_\mu^e$  vectors. To calculate this effect, we perform a Monte Carlo by generating  $10^4$  times  $I_\mu^e$  and  $J_\mu^e$ , pointing in different directions, and for each case we compute the  $I_\mu^e$  and  $J_\mu^e$  vectors in the electron frame by transforming them with the appropriate Lorentz boost transformation, i.e.  $I_\mu^e \rightarrow \Lambda_\mu^\nu I_\nu^e$  and  $J_\mu^e \rightarrow \Lambda_\mu^\nu J_\nu^e$ . We fit the obtained emissivity with generic bilinears in  $I_0^e, I_i^e$  and  $J_0^e, J_i^e$ , where  $i = X, Y, Z$ , finding that the emissivity scales as  $a_1 |I_0^e|^2 + a_2 |\mathbf{I}^e|^2$  for vector interactions and as  $b_1 |J_0^e|^2 + b_2 |\mathbf{J}^e|^2$  for the pseudovector case, with  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  denote different coefficients. Both the emissivities are independent of mixed terms as  $I_0^e I_i^e$  and  $I_i^e J_j^e$ , since each contribution from an electron coming from a given direction is balanced by an electron coming from the opposite one. Also, in this case, the emissivity can be written as

$$\varepsilon_\phi = 2.0 \times 10^{26} \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \left( \frac{T}{\text{keV}} \right)^2 \mathcal{F}_v \left( |I_0^e|^2, |\mathbf{I}^e|^2, \eta, \frac{m_\phi}{T}, \frac{m_e}{T}, \frac{k_S}{T} \right). \quad (27)$$

The emissivity for the pseudovector interaction can be obtained by simply replacing  $\mathcal{F}_v \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{pv} \left( |J_0^e|^2, |\mathbf{J}^e|^2, \eta, \frac{m_\phi}{T}, \frac{m_e}{T}, \frac{k_S}{T} \right)$ . Again, since electrons in RGs are partially degenerate, one needs to evaluate the functions  $\mathcal{F}_v$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{pv}$  for the different temperatures. For highly degenerate electrons, both  $\mathcal{F}_v$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{pv}$  are independent of the temperature, implying that the emissivity scales as  $T^2$  for both the vector and the pseudovector cases.

If we assume that both the Lorentz-preserving ( $g_e$  and  $g'_e$ ) and the Lorentz-violating ( $I_\mu^e$  and  $J_\mu^e$ ) coefficients are non-vanishing, there will be some non-zero interference terms contributing to the emissivity. We find that only parity-even interference terms are non-vanishing, i.e. scalar-vector and pseudoscalar-pseudovector. In this case, for the fixed RG conditions ( $T = 8.6$  keV) and for  $m_\phi \ll T$  the emissivity can be written as

$$\varepsilon_\phi \approx 1.5 \times 10^{28} \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} (23 g_e^2 + 9.3 \times 10^{-3} g_e'^2 + 56 I_0^{e2} + 34 |\mathbf{I}^e|^2 + 97 J_0^{e2} + 38 |\mathbf{J}^e|^2 + 59 g_e I_0^e + 0.87 g_e' J_0^e). \quad (28)$$

A precise computation of  $\varepsilon_\phi$  would require us to evaluate the functions  $\mathcal{F}$  in Eq. (26) and Eq. (27) for any given condition. However, given the degeneracy of the electrons in the RG core, one can write as a good approximation

$$\varepsilon_\phi \approx 1.5 \times 10^{28} \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \times \left[ 23.0 g_e^2 \left( \frac{T}{8.6 \text{ keV}} \right)^2 + 9.3 \times 10^{-3} g_e'^2 \left( \frac{T}{8.6 \text{ keV}} \right)^4 + \left( 56 I_0^{e2} + 34 |\mathbf{I}^e|^2 \right) \left( \frac{T}{8.6 \text{ keV}} \right)^2 + \left( 97 J_0^{e2} + 38 |\mathbf{J}^e|^2 \right) \left( \frac{T}{8.6 \text{ keV}} \right)^2 + 59 g_e I_0^e \left( \frac{T}{8.6 \text{ keV}} \right)^2 + 0.87 g_e' J_0^e \left( \frac{T}{8.6 \text{ keV}} \right)^3 \right]. \quad (29)$$

### 3.3 Bounds from Red Giants

The most recent RG bound on axions excludes  $g'_e \gtrsim 1.5 \times 10^{-13}$  [53, 54]. Therefore, one can set a bound on the dimensionless coefficients by requiring that the emissivity for the fixed RG

Parameter	Constraint
$g_e$	$3.1 \times 10^{-15}$
$g'_e$	$1.5 \times 10^{-13}$
$I_0^e$	$2.0 \times 10^{-15}$
$ \mathbf{I}^e $	$2.5 \times 10^{-15}$
$J_0^e$	$1.5 \times 10^{-15}$
$ \mathbf{J}^e $	$2.4 \times 10^{-15}$

Table 3: RG constraints on the scalar and pseudoscalar couplings  $g_e$  and  $g'_e$ , as well as on the strength of the temporal and spatial components of the Lorentz-violating vector  $I_\mu^e = (I_0^e, \mathbf{I}^e)$  and pseudovector  $J_\mu^e = (J_0^e, \mathbf{J}^e)$  coefficients. Here we assume that  $m_\phi \ll \mathcal{O}(10)$  keV. Each limit is obtained by setting all the other couplings to zero in Eq. (32).

condition is equal to the axion case for  $g'_e = 1.5 \times 10^{-13}$ . For typical RG conditions, the axion emissivity can be written as

$$\varepsilon_a = \left( \frac{g'_e}{10^{-13}} \right)^2 1.45 \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}, \quad (30)$$

implying  $\varepsilon_a \lesssim 3.3 \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at the bound [53, 54].<sup>11</sup> By requiring  $\varepsilon_\phi < 3.3 \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , one obtains a constraint on the general combination of the couplings valid for  $m_\phi \ll \mathcal{O}(10)$  keV

$$\begin{aligned} (23 g_e^2 + 9.3 \times 10^{-3} g_e'^2 + 56 I_0^{e2} + 34 |\mathbf{I}^e|^2 \\ + 97 J_0^{e2} + 38 |\mathbf{J}^e|^2 + 59 g_e I_0^e + 0.87 g'_e J_0^e) < 2.2 \times 10^{-28}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

In Table 3, we report the values of the individual bounds for the considered couplings, obtained by setting all the other interactions to zero in Eq. (32). In particular, for the scalar interaction, we find a constraint  $g_e \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-15}$ , in close agreement with the result obtained in Ref. [74] by rescaling axion bounds from RGs. Here, it is worth mentioning that recent studies found stronger constraints also on the scalar interactions, excluding  $g_{\phi e} \gtrsim 0.7 \times 10^{-15}$  from resonant plasmon conversion in RGs [82] and  $g_{\phi e} \gtrsim 0.4 \times 10^{-15}$  using the white-dwarf luminosity function [74]. Therefore, it is plausible that astrophysical observations may lead to slightly stronger constraints (by factors of a few) on the vector and pseudovector couplings through a more refined analysis of the production in RGs or using a different observable. Similarly, the inclusion of the electron-electron bremsstrahlung, suppressed due to the electron degeneracy in the RG core [72], would slightly strengthen the RG bound by a few per cent without affecting our conclusions. Indeed, our goal here is to show that astrophysical observations offer the possibility to constrain different combinations of the Lorentz-violating couplings, probing masses several orders of magnitude larger than the ranges discussed in the previous sections.

We conclude this section with a comparison with the constraints on  $g_S \tilde{J}_X^e$  shown in Fig. 1<sup>12</sup>. Neglecting the tensorial coupling, from Eq. (6) we obtain  $\tilde{J}_i^e = J_i^e$ ,  $i = X, Y, Z$ . Therefore, the

<sup>11</sup>Notice that the requirement  $\varepsilon_a \lesssim 10 \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  would lead to the constraint  $g'_e \lesssim 2.6 \times 10^{-13}$ , in agreement with [73].

<sup>12</sup>Let us reiterate that, strictly speaking, the results from constraints on long-range potentials shown in Fig. 1 are for  $g_S = g_N$ , however limits on an electron coupling would have a similar order of magnitude.

bound on  $g_e \tilde{J}^e$  in RGs is obtained from the condition

$$(23 g_e^2 + 38 |\mathbf{J}^e|^2) < 2.2 \times 10^{-28}. \quad (32)$$

Due to the isotropy of the scattering, the direction of  $\mathbf{J}^e$  is not relevant in this case. Therefore, to make a comparison with constraints in Fig. 1, we assume  $\mathbf{J}^e$  pointing in the  $X$ -direction in the RG rest frame. This leads to the constraint on the product<sup>13</sup>  $g_e \tilde{J}_X^e \equiv g_e J_X^e < 3.7 \times 10^{-30}$  for  $m_\phi \lesssim 8$  keV. Note that, as our calculation is done for massless scalars, its validity is restricted to values less than the temperature. This represents our strongest constraint on  $g_e \tilde{J}_i^e$  in the  $5 \times 10^{-6}$  eV  $\lesssim m_\phi \lesssim 8$  keV range and is shown in red in Fig. 1.

## 4 Conclusions and Outlook

In this paper, we have obtained constraints on the dimensionless Lorentz-violating couplings in a setup where LV occurs via a relatively light new particle coupled to SM fermions that extends the SME [7–9] by an additional degree of freedom. This allows for long-range forces and real particle production in addition to Lorentz symmetry violation. Notably, at very low masses  $\ll 10^{-5}$  eV the strongest constraints arise from probing spin-dependent long-range forces in solar system scale, whereas at higher masses up to  $\sim 10$  keV astrophysical (RG) constraints dominate.

More concretely, we have considered an ultralight scalar coupling to polarized electrons or nucleons in Earth-based experiments and to unpolarized electrons or nucleons in the Sun, Moon, and Earth through Lorentz-violating interactions, mediating a long-range force. Using torsion-balance and magnetometer experiments, which are sensitive to such forces, we place constraints on Lorentz-violating couplings, particularly on a specific combination,  $g_S \tilde{J}_i^{e,N}$ , where  $g_S$  denotes the monopole coupling of the scalar with the nucleons or electrons in the source and  $\tilde{J}_i^{e,N}$  denotes a combination of pseudovector and rank two tensor couplings with direction  $i = X, Y, Z$  with the electron/nucleon spin. The obtained limits  $g_S \tilde{J}_i^e \sim 10^{-60}$  are extremely strong, benefitting from the long-range nature of the interactions as well as the tremendous precision of the experiments.

Constraining the combination  $g_S \tilde{J}_i^{e,N}$  is, of course, only a first step. Eq. (1) and consequently also Eqs. (2) and (3) contain a multitude of other Lorentz-violating coefficients. We think that many of them would also be amenable to being probed with suitable experiments similar to the ones considered in this paper. For example, the  $\tilde{L}_j$  coefficients generate a product of sidereal and (suppressed) annual variations. To the best of our knowledge, no experiments have probed this product of variations. However, it seems plausible that an Eöt-Wash type re-analysis, that jointly accounts for the Earth’s axial rotation and revolution about the Sun, could provide first constraints on these coefficients. Moreover, we have focused on constraining a velocity-independent, scalar-mediated Lorentz-violating potential generated by an unpolarized source. Other Lorentz-violating interactions, which include additional velocity suppression or require polarization of the source, are not considered here but can likely be constrained using similar methods.

Another important feature of including a new light particle is that it can also be produced as a real final state in interactions between SM particles. This opens a different route for probing this scenario. Following the established fact that stars are an excellent tool to search for

<sup>13</sup>The inequality  $a x^2 + b y^2 < c$ , with  $a, b, c$  constants and  $x, y$  variables, implies  $x y < \frac{c}{2\sqrt{ab}}$ .



very feeble interactions of reasonably light particles [72, 73, 77, 78] we also determine bounds on various Lorentz-violating couplings through the radiation of scalars produced in the electron-ion bremsstrahlung process, which contributes to the emissivity of RG stars. This allows us to set limits on the square of nearly<sup>14</sup> all individual Lorentz-violating and non-violating couplings to electrons at the  $\sim 10^{-30}$  level. Explicitly this also constrains the combination  $g_e \tilde{J}_i^e \leq 3.7 \times 10^{-30}$ . These limits hold for scalar masses  $m_\phi \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10)$  keV, as determined by the temperature of the RGs, allowing us to constrain a mass range significantly larger than the other probes discussed in this work. A further increase in the mass reach may be achieved through beam-dump experiments or collider searches, albeit at the price of requiring somewhat less feeble interactions.

Finally, at a more theoretical level, it would be interesting to understand better the causes and effects of several peculiarities associated with the Lorentz-violating scalar interactions. Notably, the measurable effects in potentials decrease with distance considerably slower than in the case of non-Lorentz-violating interactions. This holds in particular for spin-dependent interactions. Similarly, real particle production in stars also does not seem to exhibit the significant velocity suppression that is often associated with spin-dependent interactions.

All in all, this shows that going beyond the SME and including new light degrees of freedom may be an interesting and powerful road to probing Lorentz violation.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Rick Gupta for collaboration and discussions in the early stage of this project. GL and PC are grateful to Salvatore Bottaro and Arturo de Giorgi for helpful discussions. This article/publication is based on the work from COST Actions COSMIC WISPerS CA21106 and BridgeQG CA23130, supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology). PC is supported by the Swedish Research Council under contract 2022-04283. JJ acknowledges the EU for support via ITN HIDDEN (No 860881). GL acknowledges support from the U.S. Department of Energy under contract number DE-AC02-76SF00515 and, when this work was started, the EU for support via ITN HIDDEN (No 860881). NS acknowledges support from the U.K. Science and Technology Facilities Council under grants ST/T006048/1 and ST/Y004418/1, by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft under the Heinz Maier Leibnitz Prize BeyondSM HML-537662082, and by the Indiana University Center for Spacetime Symmetries. TKP is partially supported by the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN) through the “QGSKY” project.

## A Lorentz-violating scalar-pseudovector coupled potential mediated by an ultralight scalar boson

This appendix explicitly derives the Lorentz-violating scalar-pseudovector ( $\sim gJ$ ) coupling terms in the potential. The same procedure yields all other terms which have already been calculated in [26].

The amplitude of the electron-nucleon interaction mediated by an ultralight scalar, where the electron exhibits a Lorentz-violating pseudovector coupling and the nucleon interacts via a

---

<sup>14</sup>The tensorial coefficients should be amenable to being constrained with the same technique. However, the computation of the relevant matrix elements is more challenging and beyond the scope of this initial analysis.




Figure 3: Scalar-pseudovector coupled Lorentz-violating potential mediated by an ultralight scalar boson

scalar coupling, is shown in Fig. 3. It can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
 i\mathcal{M} &= \bar{u}_{s'_1}(p'_1)(iJ_\mu^e \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu)u_{s_1}(p_1) \frac{i}{q^2 - m_\phi^2} \bar{u}_{s'_2}(p'_2)(-ig_N)u_{s_2}(p_2) \\
 &= \frac{ig_N J_\mu^e}{q^2 - m_\phi^2} \bar{u}_{s'_1}(p'_1) \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 u_{s_1}(p_1) \bar{u}_{s'_2}(p'_2) u_{s_2}(p_2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where the momentum transfer is  $q = p_1 - p'_1 = p'_2 - p_2$  and  $s_1, s'_1, s_2, s'_2$  refer the spin of each fermion.

We work in the non-relativistic regime, where the components of the three-momentum for both electrons and nucleons are much smaller than their respective masses ( $m_i$ ). As a result, the particle's energy can be approximated as  $E_i \approx m_i$ . We choose the normalization condition  $u_{s'}^\dagger(p)u_s(p) = \delta_{ss'}$  and write the expression of the positive energy spinor in the NR limit as

$$u_s(p) = \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_i p_i}{2m}\right) \xi_s + \mathcal{O}(p^2). \tag{34}$$

Here,  $\xi_s$  is the normalized eigenvector which satisfies  $\xi_s^\dagger \gamma^0 = \xi_s^\dagger$ ,  $\gamma_0 \xi_s = \xi_s$ , and  $\gamma_i$  denotes the Dirac gamma matrices, where  $i$  runs from 1 to 3. Therefore, in the NR limit, we can write the Dirac bilinears using Eq. (34) as

$$\bar{u}_{s'}(p)u_s(p) = \delta_{s's}, \quad J_0^e \bar{u}_{s'}(p) \gamma^0 \gamma_5 u_s(p) = J_0^e \xi_{s'}^\dagger \gamma_5 \xi_s = 0, \quad J_i^e \bar{u}_{s'}(p) \gamma^i \gamma_5 u_s(p) = -(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{J}^e), \tag{35}$$

where in the last expression,  $s = s'$ .

Evaluating Eq. (33) in the non-relativistic limit, and with  $q^{02} \ll |\mathbf{q}^2|$ , we have,

$$i\mathcal{M} = -\frac{ig_N}{q^2 - m_\phi^2} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{J}^e) \approx \frac{ig_N}{|\mathbf{q}|^2 + m_\phi^2} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{J}^e). \tag{36}$$

With this, the potential reads

$$V(r) = -\int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \frac{g_N}{|\mathbf{q}|^2 + m_\phi^2} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{J}^e) = -g_N (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{J}^e) \left(\frac{e^{-m_\phi r}}{4\pi r}\right) = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{J}^e) g_N f(r), \tag{37}$$

where  $f(r) = -e^{-m_\phi r}/(4\pi r)$ .

To find the potential associated with  $J_0$ , we need to consider a higher order term,  $\mathcal{O}(p)$  of the spinor equation (Eq. (34)). Thus, we can write

$$\bar{u}_{s'}(p')\gamma^0\gamma_5u_s(p) = \frac{1}{2m}\xi_{s'}^\dagger(\gamma_i\gamma_5p'_i + \gamma_j\gamma_5p_j)\xi_s = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_i v'_i + \sigma_j v_j) = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\text{av}}^e), \quad (38)$$

where  $s = s'$  and  $v_{\text{av}}^e = (1/2)(v^e + v'^e)$  is the average velocity. Therefore, we can write Eq. (33) as

$$i\mathcal{M} = \frac{ig_N J_0^e}{q^2 - m_\phi^2} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\text{av}}^e). \quad (39)$$

Thus, the non-relativistic potential becomes

$$V(r) = \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \frac{g_N J_0^e}{|\mathbf{q}|^2 + m_\phi^2} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\text{av}}^e) = -(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_e \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\text{av}}^e) g_N J_0^e f(r). \quad (40)$$

Eqs. (37) and (40) denote the Lorentz-violating scalar-pseudovector coupled potential mediated by an ultralight scalar boson and the form of the potentials match to that of Eq. (2) that was obtained in [26]. Using a similar approach, the other possible potential functions, as presented in Eq. (2) and found in [26], can also be derived.

## B Spin averaged amplitude squared for the emission of Lorentz-violating scalar in electron-ion bremsstrahlung process

The emission of a Lorentz-violating scalar  $\phi$  via electron-ion bremsstrahlung is represented by the diagram in Fig. 2. Assuming an ion of charge  $Ze$ , the matrix element can be written as

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{Ze^2}{|\mathbf{q}|(|\mathbf{q}|^2 + k_S^2)^{1/2}} \times \bar{u}(p_f) \left[ G_e \frac{1}{\not{P} - m_e} \gamma^0 + \gamma^0 \frac{1}{\not{Q} - m_e} G_e \right] u(p_i). \quad (41)$$

In the above equation,  $G_e$  includes Lorentz-violating coefficients and it is given by Eq. (1),  $u(p_i), u(p_f)$  are the electron spinors,  $p_i = (E_i, \mathbf{p}_i)$  and  $p_f = (E_f, \mathbf{p}_f)$  are the four-momenta of the initial and final electrons with mass  $m_e$ ,  $P = p_f + p_\phi$ ,  $Q = p_i - p_\phi$ , and  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}_f + \mathbf{p}_\phi - \mathbf{p}_i$  is the momentum transfer, with  $p_\phi = (\omega_\phi, \mathbf{p}_\phi)$  the four-momentum of the  $\phi$  particle with mass  $m_\phi$ . The term  $[|\mathbf{q}|(|\mathbf{q}|^2 + k_S^2)^{1/2}]^{-1}$  is the Coulomb propagator in a plasma and  $k_S$  is the Debye screening scale given by [80]

$$k_S^2 = \frac{4\pi\alpha \sum_j Z_j^2 n_j}{T}, \quad (42)$$

where  $n_j$  the number density of ions with charge  $Z_j e$  and  $\alpha$  is the fine structure constant. From the matrix element, one can compute the spin averaged amplitude squared as

$$|\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \sum_j n_j \sum_s |\mathcal{M}_j|^2 = \sum_j n_j \frac{Z_j^2 e^4}{\mathbf{q}^2(|\mathbf{q}|^2 + k_s^2)} \frac{1}{4} \sum_s |M|^2, \quad (43)$$

where we sum over target species  $j$  and average over spins  $s$ . In the helium core of RGs, we can write

$$|\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2 = \frac{n_{\text{He}} Z_{\text{He}}^2 e^4}{\mathbf{q}^2(|\mathbf{q}|^2 + k_s^2)} \frac{1}{4} \sum_s |M|^2, \quad (44)$$

where  $\frac{1}{4} \sum_s |M|^2$  includes the details of the considered interactions. Assuming that both the scalar  $g^e$  and pseudoscalar  $g'^e$  Lorentz-preserving coefficients, as well the vector  $I_\mu^e \equiv I^e = (I_0^e, \mathbf{I}^e)$  and pseudovector  $J_\mu^e \equiv J^e = (J_0^e, \mathbf{J}^e)$  Lorentz-violating coefficients are non vanishing, we have,

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_s |M|^2 = \mathcal{T}_s + \mathcal{T}_{ps} + \mathcal{T}_v + \mathcal{T}_{pv} + \mathcal{T}_{s-v} + \mathcal{T}_{ps-pv}, \quad (45)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}_s$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{ps}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_v$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{pv}$  include only scalar, pseudoscalar, vector and pseudovector interactions, respectively, while  $\mathcal{T}_{s-v}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{ps-pv}$  are scalar-vector and pseudoscalar-pseudovector interference terms.

Explicitly, in the limit of vanishing  $m_\phi$  this results in the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_s = g_e^2 \times & \left[ \frac{m_e^2 (-p_\phi \cdot p_i - p_f \cdot p_i + 2E_i(\omega_\phi + E_f) + m_e^2)}{(p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2} \right. \\ & + \frac{(p_\phi \cdot p_i) (\omega_\phi(E_f - E_i) - 3m_e^2) - m_e^2 (p_f \cdot p_i + 2E_f(\omega_\phi - E_i)) + m_e^4}{(p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2} \\ & + \frac{(p_\phi \cdot p_f) (2m_e^2 - p_\phi \cdot p_i)}{2(p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2} \\ & + \frac{2(\omega_\phi^2 + 2m_e^2)(p_f \cdot p_i) - (p_\phi \cdot p_i)(p_\phi \cdot p_i + 2\omega_\phi(E_f - E_i) - 6m_e^2)}{2(p_\phi \cdot p_f)(p_\phi \cdot p_i)} \\ & \left. + \frac{2m_e^2(\omega_\phi + 2E_f)(\omega_\phi - 2E_i) - 4m_e^4}{2(p_\phi \cdot p_f)(p_\phi \cdot p_i)} + 1 \right], \quad (46) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{ps} = g_e'^2 \times \frac{2\omega_\phi^2(p_f \cdot p_i - m_e^2) + (p_\phi \cdot p_f - p_\phi \cdot p_i)(-p_\phi \cdot p_f + p_\phi \cdot p_i + 2\omega_\phi(E_f - E_i))}{2(p_\phi \cdot p_f)(p_\phi \cdot p_i)}, \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_v = & \frac{1}{2 \left( (p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 (p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 \right)} \times \\
& \left( (p_\phi \cdot p_f) (p_\phi \cdot p_i) \left( I^{e2} \left( (p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 + 2\omega_\phi^2 (m_e^2 - p_f \cdot p_i) + 2\omega_\phi (E_f - E_i) (p_\phi \cdot p_i) \right) \right. \right. \\
& + 2 (p_\phi \cdot I^e)^2 (-p_f \cdot p_i + 2E_f E_i + m_e^2) \\
& + 2 (p_\phi \cdot I^e) \left( (p_f \cdot p_i) (-p_f \cdot I^e + p_i \cdot I^e + 2\omega_\phi I_0^e) \right. \\
& + (2E_f E_i + m_e^2) (p_f \cdot I^e - p_i \cdot I^e) \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot p_i) (p_f \cdot I^e - 2E_f I_0^e) - 2\omega_\phi m_e^2 I_0^e \left. \right) \\
& + 2 (p_f \cdot I^e) \left( 2 (p_i \cdot I^e) (p_\phi \cdot p_i + p_f \cdot p_i - E_i (\omega_\phi + 2E_f) + \omega_\phi (\omega_\phi + E_f) - m_e^2) \right. \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot p_i) (p_f \cdot I^e - 2I_0^e (\omega_\phi + E_f + E_i)) \left. \right) \\
& - 2 (p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 \left( (I^{e2} - 2I_0^{e2}) (p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 \right. \\
& + (p_i \cdot I^e) (p_i \cdot I^e - p_\phi \cdot I^e) (p_f \cdot p_i + 2\omega_\phi E_f - 2E_f E_i - m_e^2) \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot p_i) \left( (p_i \cdot I^e) (2(p_f \cdot I^e) + p_i \cdot I^e + 2I_0^e (\omega_\phi - E_f - E_i)) \right. \\
& + \omega_\phi I^{e2} (E_f - E_i) + (p_\phi \cdot I^e) (2E_i I_0^e - p_i \cdot I^e) \left. \right) \\
& - 2 (p_f \cdot I^e) (p_\phi \cdot I^e + p_f \cdot I^e) (p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 (p_\phi \cdot p_i + p_f \cdot p_i - 2E_i (\omega_\phi + E_f) - m_e^2) \\
& \left. + \left( 2 (p_i \cdot I^e) (p_i \cdot I^e - p_\phi \cdot I^e) + I^{e2} (p_\phi \cdot p_i) \right) (p_\phi \cdot p_f)^3 \right), \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{\text{pv}} = & \frac{1}{4(p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 (p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2} \times \\
& \left[ -2(p_\phi \cdot p_f)(p_\phi \cdot p_i) \left( 2 \left( 2m_e^2 [(p_f \cdot J^e)^2 - 2J_0^e(\omega_\phi + E_f - E_i)(p_f \cdot J^e)] \right. \right. \right. \\
& + 2J_0^{e2}(m_e^2 - p_f \cdot p_i) \left. \left. \left. + m_e^2(p_i \cdot J^e)^2 - (p_i \cdot J^e) \left[ (p_f \cdot J^e)(p_f \cdot p_i - E_i(\omega_\phi + 2E_f) \right. \right. \right. \right. \\
& + \omega_\phi(\omega_\phi + E_f) + m_e^2) - 2m_e^2 J_0^e(\omega_\phi + E_f - E_i) \left. \left. \left. \right] + (p_\phi \cdot J^e)^2(p_f \cdot p_i - 2E_f E_i + m_e^2) \right. \right. \\
& + J^{e2} \left[ (\omega_\phi^2 + 2m_e^2)(p_f \cdot p_i) + m_e^2(\omega_\phi + 2E_f)(\omega_\phi - 2E_i) - 2m_e^4 \right] \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot J^e) \left[ (p_f \cdot p_i)(p_f \cdot J^e - p_i \cdot J^e - 2\omega_\phi J_0^e) \right. \\
& \left. \left. - (2E_f E_i - 3m_e^2)(p_f \cdot J^e - p_i \cdot J^e) - 2m_e^2 J_0^e(\omega_\phi + 2E_f - 2E_i) \right] \right) \\
& - J^{e2}(p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 + 2(p_\phi \cdot p_i) \left[ J^{e2}(-\omega_\phi E_f + \omega_\phi E_i + 3m_e^2) \right. \\
& + (p_f \cdot J^e) \left( -(p_f \cdot J^e) - 2(p_i \cdot J^e) + 2J_0^e(\omega_\phi + E_f + E_i) \right) \\
& \left. \left. + (p_\phi \cdot J^e)(2E_f J_0^e - p_f \cdot J^e) - 4m_e^2 J_0^{e2} \right] \right] \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 \left[ (8J_0^{e2} - 4J^{e2})(p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 + 4(p_\phi \cdot p_i) \left[ J^{e2}(-\omega_\phi E_f + \omega_\phi E_i + 3m_e^2) \right. \right. \\
& - (p_i \cdot J^e) \left( 2(p_f \cdot J^e) + (p_i \cdot J^e) + 2J_0^e(\omega_\phi - E_f - E_i) \right) \\
& \left. \left. + (p_\phi \cdot J^e)(p_i \cdot J^e - 2E_i J_0^e) - 4m_e^2 J_0^{e2} \right] \right. \\
& \left. + 4(m_e^2 J^{e2} + (p_i \cdot J^e)(p_\phi \cdot J^e - p_i \cdot J^e))(p_f \cdot p_i + 2\omega_\phi E_f - 2E_f E_i - m_e^2) \right] \\
& - 4(p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 \left[ (p_f \cdot J^e)(p_\phi \cdot J^e + p_f \cdot J^e) - m_e^2 J^{e2} \right] \\
& (p_\phi \cdot p_i + p_f \cdot p_i - 2E_i(\omega_\phi + E_f) - m_e^2) \\
& \left. + 2(p_\phi \cdot p_f)^3 \left[ J^{e2}(p_\phi \cdot p_i - 2m_e^2) + 2(p_i \cdot J^e)(p_i \cdot J^e - p_\phi \cdot J^e) \right] \right], \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{s-v} = & g_e \frac{1}{(p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 (p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2} \times \\
& m_e \left[ (p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 \left[ (p_\phi \cdot I - 2(p_i \cdot I))(p_f \cdot p_i + 2\omega_\phi E_f - 2E_f E_i - m_e^2) \right. \right. \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot p_i)(p_\phi \cdot I - 2(p_f \cdot I + 2(p_i \cdot I) + I_0(\omega_\phi - E_f - E_i))) \left. \left. \right] \right. \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot I + 2(p_f \cdot I))(p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 \left[ - (p_\phi \cdot p_i) - (p_f \cdot p_i) + 2E_i(\omega_\phi + E_f) + m_e^2 \right] \\
& - (p_\phi \cdot I - 2(p_i \cdot I))(p_\phi \cdot p_f)^3 \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot p_f)(p_\phi \cdot p_i) \left[ 2(p_f \cdot I + p_i \cdot I)(p_f \cdot p_i - E_i(\omega_\phi + 2E_f) + \omega_\phi(\omega_\phi + E_f) - m_e^2) \right. \\
& \left. \left. + (p_\phi \cdot p_i)(p_\phi \cdot I + 4(p_f \cdot I) + 2(p_i \cdot I) - 2I_0(\omega_\phi + E_f + E_i)) \right] \right], \tag{50}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_{ps-pv} = & g'_e \frac{1}{(p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 (p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2} \times \\
& m_e \left[ (p_\phi \cdot p_f)^2 \left[ (p_\phi \cdot J^e)(p_\phi \cdot p_i + p_f \cdot p_i + 2\omega_\phi E_f - 2E_f E_i - m_e^2) \right. \right. \\
& - 2(p_\phi \cdot p_i)(p_f \cdot J^e - p_i \cdot J^e + J_0^e(\omega_\phi - E_f + E_i)) \left. \left. \right] \right. \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot J^e)(p_\phi \cdot p_i)^2 (p_\phi \cdot p_i + p_f \cdot p_i - 2E_i(\omega_\phi + E_f) - m_e^2) - (p_\phi \cdot J^e)(p_\phi \cdot p_f)^3 \\
& + (p_\phi \cdot p_f)(p_\phi \cdot p_i) \left[ 2J_0^e \left( (\omega_\phi - E_f + E_i)(p_\phi \cdot p_i) + 2\omega_\phi(p_f \cdot p_i - m_e^2) \right) \right. \\
& + 2(p_f \cdot J^e - p_i \cdot J^e)(p_\phi \cdot p_i + \omega_\phi(\omega_\phi + E_f - E_i)) \\
& \left. \left. + (p_\phi \cdot J^e) \left( -p_\phi \cdot p_i - 2(p_f \cdot p_i) + 4E_f E_i + 2m_e^2 \right) \right] \right]. \tag{51}
\end{aligned}$$

## References

- [1] C. S. Wu, E. Ambler, R. W. Hayward, D. D. Hoppes, and R. P. Hudson, “Experimental Test of Parity Conservation in  $\beta$  Decay,” *Phys. Rev.* **105** (1957) 1413–1414.
- [2] **Gargamelle Neutrino** Collaboration, F. J. Hasert *et al.*, “Observation of Neutrino Like Interactions Without Muon Or Electron in the Gargamelle Neutrino Experiment,” *Phys. Lett. B* **46** (1973) 138–140.
- [3] **UA1** Collaboration, G. Arnison *et al.*, “Experimental Observation of Isolated Large Transverse Energy Electrons with Associated Missing Energy at  $\sqrt{s} = 540$  GeV,” *Phys. Lett. B* **122** (1983) 103–116.
- [4] **UA1** Collaboration, G. Arnison *et al.*, “Experimental Observation of Lepton Pairs of Invariant Mass Around 95-GeV/c\*\*2 at the CERN SPS Collider,” *Phys. Lett. B* **126** (1983) 398–410.

- [5] V. A. Kostelecky and N. Russell, “Data Tables for Lorentz and CPT Violation,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83** (2011) 11–31, [arXiv:0801.0287 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [6] R. S. Gupta, J. Jaeckel, and M. Spannowsky, “Probing Poincaré violation,” *JHEP* **11** (2023) 026, [arXiv:2211.04490 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [7] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecky, “CPT violation and the standard model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 6760–6774, [arXiv:hep-ph/9703464](#).
- [8] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecky, “Lorentz violating extension of the standard model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 116002, [arXiv:hep-ph/9809521](#).
- [9] V. A. Kostelecky, “Gravity, Lorentz violation, and the standard model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 105009, [arXiv:hep-th/0312310](#).
- [10] V. A. Kostelecky and R. Lehnert, “Stability, causality, and Lorentz and CPT violation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 065008, [arXiv:hep-th/0012060](#).
- [11] A. Kostelecky, R. Lehnert, M. Schreck, and B. Seradjeh, “Physical interpretation of large Lorentz violation via Weyl semimetals,” [arXiv:2412.18034 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [12] V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane, and A. G. M. Pickering, “One loop renormalization of Lorentz violating electrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 056006, [arXiv:hep-th/0111123](#).
- [13] D. Colladay and P. McDonald, “One-Loop Renormalization of QCD with Lorentz Violation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 085006, [arXiv:0712.2055 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [14] D. Colladay and P. McDonald, “One-Loop Renormalization of the Electroweak Sector with Lorentz Violation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 125019, [arXiv:0904.1219 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] V. A. Kostelecky and S. Samuel, “Spontaneous Breaking of Lorentz Symmetry in String Theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 683.
- [16] V. A. Kostelecky and R. Potting, “CPT and strings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **359** (1991) 545–570.
- [17] B. Altschul and V. A. Kostelecky, “Spontaneous Lorentz violation and nonpolynomial interactions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **628** (2005) 106–112, [arXiv:hep-th/0509068](#).
- [18] R. Gambini and J. Pullin, “Nonstandard optics from quantum space-time,” *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 124021, [arXiv:gr-qc/9809038](#).
- [19] J. Alfaro, H. A. Morales-Tecotl, and L. F. Urrutia, “Loop quantum gravity and light propagation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 103509, [arXiv:hep-th/0108061](#).
- [20] V. A. Kostelecky, R. Lehnert, and M. J. Perry, “Spacetime - varying couplings and Lorentz violation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 123511, [arXiv:astro-ph/0212003](#).
- [21] A. Ferrero and B. Altschul, “Radiatively Induced Lorentz and Gauge Symmetry Violation in Electrodynamics with Varying  $\alpha$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 125010, [arXiv:0910.5202 \[hep-th\]](#).



- [22] I. Mocioiu, M. Pospelov, and R. Roiban, “Low-energy limits on the antisymmetric tensor field background on the brane and on the noncommutative scale,” *Phys. Lett. B* **489** (2000) 390–396, [arXiv:hep-ph/0005191](#).
- [23] S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane, and T. Okamoto, “Noncommutative field theory and Lorentz violation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 141601, [arXiv:hep-th/0105082](#).
- [24] B. Altschul, “Lorentz Violation and the Yukawa Potential,” *Phys. Lett. B* **639** (2006) 679–683, [arXiv:hep-th/0605044](#).
- [25] A. Ferrero and B. Altschul, “Renormalization of Scalar and Yukawa Field Theories with Lorentz Violation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 065030, [arXiv:1104.4778 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] B. Altschul, “Lorentz and CPT Violation in Scalar-Mediated Potentials,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** no. 4, (2013) 045012, [arXiv:1211.6614 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] B. Altschul, “Lorentz Violation in Fermion–Antifermion Decays of Spinless Particles,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** no. 11, (2014) 116007, [arXiv:1403.2751 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] B. R. Heckel, C. E. Cramer, T. S. Cook, E. G. Adelberger, S. Schlamminger, and U. Schmidt, “New CP-violation and preferred-frame tests with polarized electrons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 021603, [arXiv:hep-ph/0606218](#).
- [29] B. R. Heckel, E. G. Adelberger, C. E. Cramer, T. S. Cook, S. Schlamminger, and U. Schmidt, “Preferred-Frame and CP-Violation Tests with Polarized Electrons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 092006, [arXiv:0808.2673 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [30] R. Bluhm and V. A. Kostelecky, “Lorentz and CPT tests with spin polarized solids,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84** (2000) 1381–1384, [arXiv:hep-ph/9912542](#).
- [31] A. Hees, O. Minazzoli, E. Savalle, Y. V. Stadnik, and P. Wolf, “Violation of the equivalence principle from light scalar dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 6, (2018) 064051, [arXiv:1807.04512 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [32] E. G. Adelberger, B. R. Heckel, and A. E. Nelson, “Tests of the gravitational inverse square law,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **53** (2003) 77–121, [arXiv:hep-ph/0307284](#).
- [33] E. Fischbach and C. Talmadge, “Ten years of the fifth force,” in *31st Rencontres de Moriond: Dark Matter and Cosmology, Quantum Measurements and Experimental Gravitation*, pp. 443–451. 1996. [arXiv:hep-ph/9606249](#).
- [34] A. S. Konopliv, S. W. Asmar, W. M. Folkner, Özgür Karatekin, D. C. Nunes, S. E. Smrekar, C. F. Yoder, and M. T. Zuber, “Mars high resolution gravity fields from mro, mars seasonal gravity, and other dynamical parameters,” *Icarus* **211** no. 1, (2011) 401–428.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019103510003830>.
- [35] J. Bergé, P. Brax, G. Métris, M. Pernot-Borràs, P. Touboul, and J.-P. Uzan, “MICROSCOPE Mission: First Constraints on the Violation of the Weak Equivalence Principle by a Light Scalar Dilaton,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** no. 14, (2018) 141101, [arXiv:1712.00483 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [36] D. Brzeminski, Z. Chacko, A. Dev, I. Flood, and A. Hook, “Searching for a fifth force with atomic and nuclear clocks,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 9, (2022) 095031, [arXiv:2207.14310 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [37] T. W. Kornack and M. V. Romalis, “Dynamics of two overlapping spin ensembles interacting by spin exchange,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (Dec, 2002) 253002. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.253002>.
- [38] T. W. Kornack, R. K. Ghosh, and M. V. Romalis, “Nuclear Spin Gyroscope Based on an Atomic Comagnetometer,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** no. 23, (2005) 230801.
- [39] J. M. Brown, S. J. Smullin, T. W. Kornack, and M. V. Romalis, “New limit on Lorentz and CPT-violating neutron spin interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 151604, [arXiv:1006.5425 \[physics.atom-ph\]](#).
- [40] S. A. Hoedl, F. Fleischer, E. G. Adelberger, and B. R. Heckel, “Improved Constraints on an Axion-Mediated Force,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** (2011) 041801.
- [41] S. K. Peck, D. K. Kim, D. Stein, D. Orbaker, A. Foss, M. T. Hummon, and L. R. Hunter, “Limits on local Lorentz invariance in mercury and cesium,” *Phys. Rev. A* **86** (2012) 012109, [arXiv:1205.5022 \[physics.atom-ph\]](#).
- [42] F. Allmendinger, W. Heil, S. Karpuk, W. Kilian, A. Scharth, U. Schmidt, A. Schnabel, Y. Sobolev, and K. Tullney, “New Limit on Lorentz-Invariance- and CPT-Violating Neutron Spin Interactions Using a Free-Spin-Precession  $^3\text{He}$  -  $^{129}\text{Xe}$  Comagnetometer,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** no. 11, (2014) 110801, [arXiv:1312.3225 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [43] D. Budker, P. W. Graham, M. Ledbetter, S. Rajendran, and A. Sushkov, “Proposal for a Cosmic Axion Spin Precession Experiment (CASPER),” *Phys. Rev. X* **4** no. 2, (2014) 021030, [arXiv:1306.6089 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [44] Y. Kahn, B. R. Safdi, and J. Thaler, “Broadband and Resonant Approaches to Axion Dark Matter Detection,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** no. 14, (2016) 141801, [arXiv:1602.01086 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [45] A. Garcon *et al.*, “The cosmic axion spin precession experiment (CASPER): a dark-matter search with nuclear magnetic resonance,” *Quantum Sci. Technol.* **3** no. 1, (2017) 014008, [arXiv:1707.05312 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [46] N. Crescini, C. Braggio, G. Carugno, P. Falferi, A. Ortolan, and G. Ruoso, “Improved constraints on monopole-dipole interaction mediated by pseudo-scalar bosons,” *Phys. Lett. B* **773** (2017) 677–680, [arXiv:1705.06044 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [47] J. Lee, A. Almasi, and M. Romalis, “Improved Limits on Spin-Mass Interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** no. 16, (2018) 161801, [arXiv:1801.02757 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [48] P. H. Chu, L. D. Duffy, Y. J. Kim, and I. M. Savukov, “Sensitivity of Proposed Search for Axion-induced Magnetic Field using Optically Pumped Magnetometers,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** no. 7, (2018) 072011, [arXiv:1802.01721 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).

- [49] D. Kim, Y. Kim, Y. K. Semertzidis, Y. C. Shin, and W. Yin, “Cosmic axion force,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 9, (2021) 095010, [arXiv:2105.03422 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] NASDUCK Collaboration, I. M. Bloch, R. Shaham, Y. Hochberg, E. Kuflik, T. Volansky, and O. Katz, “Constraints on axion-like dark matter from a SERF comagnetometer,” *Nature Commun.* **14** no. 1, (2023) 5784, [arXiv:2209.13588 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] P. Agrawal, N. R. Hutzler, D. E. Kaplan, S. Rajendran, and M. Reig, “Searching for axion forces with spin precession in atoms and molecules,” *JHEP* **07** (2024) 133, [arXiv:2309.10023 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] G. Raffelt and A. Weiss, “Red giant bound on the axion - electron coupling revisited,” *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 1495–1498, [arXiv:hep-ph/9410205](#).
- [53] F. Capozzi and G. Raffelt, “Axion and neutrino bounds improved with new calibrations of the tip of the red-giant branch using geometric distance determinations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 8, (2020) 083007, [arXiv:2007.03694 \[astro-ph.SR\]](#).
- [54] O. Straniero, C. Pallanca, E. Dalessandro, I. Dominguez, F. R. Ferraro, M. Giannotti, A. Mirizzi, and L. Piersanti, “The RGB tip of galactic globular clusters and the revision of the axion-electron coupling bound,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **644** (2020) A166, [arXiv:2010.03833 \[astro-ph.SR\]](#).
- [55] P. Carenza and G. Lucente, “Revisiting axion-electron bremsstrahlung emission rates in astrophysical environments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 12, (2021) 123024, [arXiv:2104.09524 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [56] E. G. Adelberger, J. H. Gundlach, B. R. Heckel, S. Hoedl, and S. Schlamminger, “Torsion balance experiments: A low-energy frontier of particle physics,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **62** (2009) 102–134.
- [57] J. E. Moody and F. Wilczek, “NEW MACROSCOPIC FORCES?,” *Phys. Rev. D* **30** (1984) 130.
- [58] B. A. Dobrescu and I. Mocioiu, “Spin-dependent macroscopic forces from new particle exchange,” *JHEP* **11** (2006) 005, [arXiv:hep-ph/0605342](#).
- [59] R. Bluhm, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane, and N. Russell, “Clock comparison tests of Lorentz and CPT symmetry in space,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** (2002) 090801, [arXiv:hep-ph/0111141](#).
- [60] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, “Signals for Lorentz violation in electrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 056005, [arXiv:hep-ph/0205211](#).
- [61] R. Bluhm, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane, and N. Russell, “Probing Lorentz and CPT violation with space based experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 125008, [arXiv:hep-ph/0306190](#).

- [62] L. Hunter, J. Gordon, S. Peck, D. Ang, and J. F. Lin, “Using the Earth as a Polarized Electron Source to Search for Long-Range Spin-Spin Interactions,” *Science* **339** no. 6122, (2013) 928–932.
- [63] N. B. Clayburn, A. Glassford, A. Leiker, T. Uelmen, J.-F. Lin, and L. R. Hunter, “Spherically symmetric Earth models yield no net electron spin,” *Phys. Rev. D* **111** no. 1, (2025) 015015, [arXiv:2411.08050](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.08050) [hep-ph].
- [64] T. K. Poddar and D. Pachhar, “Constraints on monopole-dipole potential from tests of gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108** no. 10, (2023) 103024, [arXiv:2302.03882](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03882) [hep-ph].
- [65] United States Naval Observatory and Her Majesty’s Nautical Almanac Office, *The Astronomical Almanac for the Year 2024*. U.S. Government Publishing Office and The Stationery Office, Washington, DC and London, 2024.
- [66] “Sun.” <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sun>.
- [67] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and A. J. Mansour, “Constraints on the variation of physical constants, equivalence principle violation, and a fifth force from atomic experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 5, (2024) 055022, [arXiv:2402.09643](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.09643) [hep-ph].
- [68] “Sun.” <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moon>.
- [69] “Sun.” <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth>.
- [70] A. M. Dziewonski and D. L. Anderson, “Preliminary reference earth model,” *Phys. Earth Planet. Interiors* **25** (1981) 297–356.
- [71] S. Afach *et al.*, “Search for topological defect dark matter with a global network of optical magnetometers,” *Nature Phys.* **17** no. 12, (2021) 1396–1401, [arXiv:2102.13379](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.13379) [astro-ph.CO].
- [72] G. G. Raffelt, *Stars as Laboratories for Fundamental Physics: The Astrophysics of Neutrinos, Axions, and Other Weakly Interacting Particles*. University Of Chicago Press, 1996. <https://wwwth.mpp.mpg.de/members/raffelt/mypapers/Stars.pdf>.
- [73] G. G. Raffelt, “Astrophysical axion bounds,” *Lect. Notes Phys.* **741** (2008) 51–71, [arXiv:hep-ph/0611350](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0611350).
- [74] S. Bottaro, A. Caputo, G. Raffelt, and E. Vitagliano, “Stellar limits on scalars from electron-nucleus bremsstrahlung,” *JCAP* **07** (2023) 071, [arXiv:2303.00778](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.00778) [hep-ph].
- [75] R. Kippenhahn, A. Weigert, and A. Weiss, *Stellar structure and evolution*. Astronomy and Astrophysics Library. Springer, 8, 2012.
- [76] B. Paczyński, “Evolution of Single Stars. I. Stellar Evolution from Main Sequence to White Dwarf or Carbon Ignition,” *Acta Astronomica* **20** (Jan., 1970) 47.
- [77] A. Caputo and G. Raffelt, “Astrophysical Axion Bounds: The 2024 Edition,” *PoS COSMICWISPerS* (2024) 041, [arXiv:2401.13728](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.13728) [hep-ph].

- [78] P. Carenza, M. Giannotti, J. Isern, A. Mirizzi, and O. Straniero, “Axion Astrophysics,” [arXiv:2411.02492 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [79] M. Catelan, J. A. d. Freitas Pacheco, and J. E. Horvath, “The helium-core mass at the helium flash in low-mass red giant stars: observations and theory,” *Astrophys. J.* **461** (1996) 231, [arXiv:astro-ph/9509062](#).
- [80] G. G. Raffelt, “Astrophysical axion bounds diminished by screening effects,” *Phys. Rev. D* **33** (1986) 897.
- [81] G. G. Raffelt, “Axion bremsstrahlung in red giants,” *Phys. Rev. D* **41** (1990) 1324–1326.
- [82] E. Hardy and R. Lasenby, “Stellar cooling bounds on new light particles: plasma mixing effects,” *JHEP* **02** (2017) 033, [arXiv:1611.05852 \[hep-ph\]](#).