

New bound on the vectorial axion-down-strange coupling from $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ data

Diego Guadagnoli,^{1,*} Axel Iohner,^{1,†} Cristina Lazzeroni,^{2,‡}
Diego Martínez Santos,^{3,§} Joel C. Swallow,^{4,¶} and Claudio Toni^{1,**}

¹*LAPTh, Université Savoie Mont-Blanc et CNRS, 74941 Annecy, France*

²*University of Birmingham, United Kingdom*

³*Ferrol Industrial Campus, Dr. Vázquez Cabrera, s/n, 15403, Universidade de A Coruña, Spain*

⁴*INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati*

We analyze publicly available $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ data collected by NA62 from 2016 to 2022 to constrain the vectorial axion-down-strange coupling or, equivalently, the Peccei-Quinn scale f_a rescaled by this coupling, obtaining $|(F_V)_{23}| > 1.1 \times 10^{12}$ GeV. Under the complementary assumption that axion production is dominated by weak amplitudes, we derive a model-independent bound on f_a , namely $f_a > 1.0 \times 10^5$ GeV. We also discuss the potential of applying the same approach to $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ data, from which we estimate the bound $|(F_A)_{23}| > 1.0 \times 10^8$ GeV. These constraints represent the strongest existing bounds inferred from controlled experimental setups.

Introduction— Axions are hypothetical but highly plausible particles, as they provide a uniquely elegant resolution to the strong- CP problem, namely the unexplained suppression of a dimension-4 operator violating CP symmetry in strong interactions. A dismissal of this issue as a mere accident of nature is unsatisfactory, given the amount of suppression, of $O(10^{-10})$ —and anthropic arguments do not seem viable either [1, 2]. Besides, from a purely observational perspective, axions provide a compelling framework for accounting for the fraction of the universe’s total density attributed to Dark Matter [3–5]. Finally, their generally small mass makes axions amenable to being produced, potentially even copiously, in controlled collider environments without the need to push the energy frontier.

Research on axions bifurcates into two major streams. The first focuses on the “invisible” [6–9] QCD axion [10–13], whose mass m_a and decay constant f_a are intrinsically linked: the smaller m_a , the weaker the axion’s interactions with known matter, that are parametrically suppressed as $1/f_a$. The second stream is a generalization of the first to so-called axion-like particles (ALPs), where m_a and f_a are treated as independent parameters constrained by an expanding range of laboratory experiments [14–16], astrophysical observations [17–19], cosmological probes [20], and theoretical considerations, see e.g. [21–23].

Among the many experimental approaches to probing the existence of axions, one of the most direct is their potential production in decays recorded at high-intensity facilities such as NA62. This approach is well motivated for several reasons. First, this method has for decades

been used to study decays to final-state neutrinos—now-established feebly interacting, uncharged, near-massless particles with properties largely analogous to those of axions. Neutrinos were unambiguously identified in controlled experimental setups thanks precisely to such decay studies [24]. Second, from a theoretical point of view *light* meson decays involving an axion admit a systematic, effective-theory description, known as Chiral Perturbation Theory (ChPT) [25, 26], which ensures reliable predictions with a controlled error. Axion interactions with light mesons can be incorporated in this description by a careful generalization [27] of the very same logic that leads to the construction of ChPT. In this construction, axion couplings to hadrons inherit from the Lagrangian terms

$$\mathcal{L}_a \supset \frac{\partial_\mu a}{2f_a} (\bar{q} \gamma^\mu k_V q + \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 k_A q) + c_{GG} \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} \frac{a}{f_a} G\tilde{G}, \quad (1)$$

with $q = (u, d, s)^T$. Once the $k_{V,A}$ coupling matrices are fixed, the ChPT couplings to hadrons are determined accordingly [28]. Third, the fundamental axion-quark couplings themselves are, like Yukawa couplings, free parameters from a theoretical standpoint. Therefore, predicted signals may well be within experimental reach in appropriate channels. In particular, there is no fundamental reason why the (complex) axion-down-strange couplings $(k_{V,A})_{23}$ —the only allowed off-diagonal entries in Eq. (1)—should be small. The strongest probe of $|(k_V)_{23}|$ are $K \rightarrow \pi a$ decays, whereas $|(k_A)_{23}|$, as well as the diagonal axial couplings $(k_A)_{ii}$ (reals), are best probed by Supernova cooling induced by axions radiated from strange matter in the star core [29, 30] as well as by Neutron Stars [31]. Here we prove that the data used in the most recent measurement of the decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ [32] can be recast to provide the strongest existing bound on $|(k_V)_{23}|$. We also argue that the very same approach, adapted to $K \rightarrow \pi \pi a$ data, would lead to the strongest existing bound on the axial counterpart $|(k_A)_{23}|$. Finally, we consider the alternative case where $|(k_{V,A})_{23}| = 0$, so that the above decays are generated by

* diego.guadagnoli@lapth.cnrs.fr

† axel.iohner@lapth.cnrs.fr

‡ cristina.lazzeroni@cern.ch

§ diego.martinez.santos@cern.ch

¶ joel.swallow@cern.ch

** claudio.toni@lapth.cnrs.fr

weak-amplitude contributions. In this case, our approach leads to a model-independent bound on f_a .

$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ is an ultrarare decay, and provides one of the most exquisite precision tests of the Standard Model (SM). The small branching fraction of the K^+ into this decay mode [33–35], which predicts that this process occurs less than once in ten billion K^+ decays, is dominated by short-distance contributions, and the necessary hadronic matrix element can be extracted from *data* using isospin. The decay is thus uniquely rare and uniquely clean theoretically. The NA62 experiment at CERN was designed with the measurement of $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}) \equiv \mathcal{B}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$ as its primary goal. It relies on the technique of decay-in-flight, and has delivered four measurements of this decay thus far, namely [36–38], based on 2016-2018 data, plus [32], based on 2021-2022 data.

Using *all* these results, a bound can be placed on decays to new particles with the same visible external states: in our case we consider the decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+a$, where a is an undetected axion. This would be seen as an excess above the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ process, which is a background to our signal. Intuitively, the uncertainty $\delta\mathcal{B}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$ on the measurement of the branching ratio (BR) quantifies the available leeway for the presence of our signal process, and thereby provides an estimate for the typical $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+a)$ limit achievable with the dataset [39]. The combination of the above NA62 measurements gives approximately $\delta\mathcal{B}_{\nu\bar{\nu}} = 3 \times 10^{-11}$, predominantly of statistical origin. In what follows, we present a procedure based on a rigorous, likelihood-based analysis relying on public data only. Nevertheless, this procedure is found to corroborate the basic argument given above.

Reinterpretation Technique— To bound the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+a$ decay through the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ measurements at NA62, we follow a variation of the procedure of Ref. [40]. We perform a fully frequentist hypothesis test using a shape analysis on the invisible invariant mass, and an unbinned profile likelihood ratio test statistic, based solely on public data. The likelihood function is constructed as the product of three contributions, *i.e.* $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1\mathcal{L}_2\mathcal{L}_3$.

The first term is a Poisson distribution for the total number of events n_{tot} with mean value equal to the total number of observed events n_{obs} . The variable n_{tot} can be decomposed as $n_{\text{tot}} = n_b + n_a$, with $n_{b,a}$ being the number of background and axion events, respectively.

The number n_a is related to the BR as $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+a) = n_a \times \mathcal{B}_{\text{SES}}$, where \mathcal{B}_{SES} denotes the associated single-event sensitivity (SES). $\mathcal{B}_{\text{SES}} = \mathcal{B}_{\text{SES}}(m_a)$ is provided in e.g. the rightmost panel of Figure 2 of Ref. [40], which pertains to the 2017 data. Limits for any other dataset may then be estimated using a simple rescaling by a factor equal to the ratio of the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ SESs. Note that n_b also includes the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ events, assuming $\mathcal{B}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^{\text{SM}} = 8.4 \times 10^{-11}$ as in Ref. [32][41].

Given n_{tot} , its two components are distributed as a function of the invisible invariant mass squared m_{inv}^2 ac-

cording to a multinomial likelihood, yielding \mathcal{L}_2 as

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \prod_{j=1}^{n_{\text{obs}}} \left[\frac{n_b}{n_{\text{tot}}} g_b(m_j^2) + \frac{n_a}{n_{\text{tot}}} g_a(m_j^2) \right], \quad (2)$$

where $g_b(m_{\text{inv}}^2)$ is a polynomial function. Its integral over the signal regions is normalised to unity, and is required to reproduce the distribution of the background events, taken from published data, *i.e.* from the right panel of Fig. 10 in Ref. [32]. Conversely, $g_a(m_{\text{inv}}^2)$ is a normal distribution centered at the axion mass value with uncertainty given by the invariant mass resolution at fixed m_a , $\sigma_{m_a^2}$, taken from the left panel of Figure 2 of Ref. [40]. Finally, the last likelihood factor, \mathcal{L}_3 , is a Poisson-distributed constraint term for the number of background events

$$\mathcal{L}_3 = \frac{(\tau n_b)^{n_{\text{off}}}}{n_{\text{off}}!} e^{-\tau n_b}, \quad (3)$$

with $\tau = \mu_b/\sigma_b^2$ and $n_{\text{off}} = (\mu_b/\sigma_b)^2$ [42] obtained from the estimated mean value μ_b and uncertainty σ_b of the number of background events. We neglect the uncertainty on the rest of the nuisance parameters considered in Ref. [40], namely the SES uncertainty, as well as the error on the parameters of the axion mass probability density function. By inspection, these uncertainties are subleading with respect to those discussed, and are expected to affect our results in a minor way.

Minimizing $\chi^2(n_b, n_a) \equiv -2 \log \mathcal{L}$, and demanding $\Delta\chi^2 \equiv \chi^2 - \chi_{\text{min}}^2 = \chi^2(90\%, 2 \text{ dof})$ we obtain a limit on $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+a)$ as a function of m_a . We tested this procedure by comparing our obtained limit with the NA62 results based on 2016-2018 [38] and 2017 data [40], respectively, finding very good agreement. The details of this validation, and plots quantifying the agreement, are




FIG. 1: Upper limit on $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+a)$ from the full NA62 dataset (2016-2022) on the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay. The gray dashed line shows the corresponding value of $\delta\mathcal{B}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$ for comparison.

provided in the supplemental Sec. A. If we apply this procedure to the full NA62 dataset available, encompassing data from 2016 to 2022, we obtain the limit shown in Fig. 1. At $m_a = 0$, it reads

$$\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ a) < 2.8 \times 10^{-11} \text{ at 90\% C.L.} \quad (4)$$

Compared to the theoretical prediction, this limit sets unprecedented bounds on the relevant axion coupling or, alternatively, on the axion scale, as detailed following our discussion of axion-meson interactions.

Theory Prediction— The axion, as the near-Goldstone boson of a global $U(1)$ Peccei-Quinn sym-

metry, can be incorporated into ChPT as elucidated in Ref. [27]. A generalization of this procedure allows to also include the effect of strangeness (S) changing weak interactions, see Refs. [43, 44]. We accordingly use two sets of interactions: the “strong” Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_s , and the $|\Delta S| = 1$ terms enhanced by the so-called $\Delta I = 1/2$ rule, here collectively indicated as \mathcal{L}_w . In the supplemental Sec. B we spell out our conventions and collect explicit formulae for the Lagrangians. The amplitude \mathcal{M} for the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ a$ decay can thus be decomposed into two pieces, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_s + \mathcal{M}_w$, induced by \mathcal{L}_s and \mathcal{L}_w , respectively. We find

$$i\mathcal{M}_s = \frac{m_K^2 (k_V)_{32}}{2f_a} (1 - x_{\pi K}), \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} i\mathcal{M}_w &= -\frac{N_8^*}{4f_a(4m_K^2 - m_\pi^2 - 3m_a^2)} \left(16c_{GG} (m_K^2 - m_a^2) (m_K^2 - m_\pi^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + m_K^4 C_K + m_K^2 m_\pi^2 C_{K\pi} + m_\pi^4 C_\pi + m_a^2 m_K^2 C_{aK} + m_a^2 m_\pi^2 C_{a\pi} + m_a^4 C_a \right) \\ &= -\frac{N_8^* m_K^2}{4f_a} \left(4c_{GG} + 2(k_A)_{11} + (k_A)_{22} + (k_A)_{33} + (k_V)_{22} - (k_V)_{33} + O(x_{aK}, x_{\pi K}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with $x_{ij} \equiv (m_i/m_j)^2$. The above amplitudes agree with the results in Ref. [43]. The C coefficients appearing on the second line of Eq. (6) are functions of the fundamental axion-quark couplings, given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_K &= 4 \left(2(k_A)_{11} + (k_A)_{22} + (k_A)_{33} + (k_V)_{22} - (k_V)_{33} \right), \\ C_{K\pi} &= -10(k_A)_{11} - 5(k_A)_{22} - 5(k_A)_{33} + 3(k_V)_{22} - 3(k_V)_{33}, \\ C_\pi &= 2(k_A)_{11} + (k_A)_{22} + (k_A)_{33} - (k_V)_{22} + (k_V)_{33}, \\ C_{aK} &= -8(k_A)_{11} - (k_A)_{22} - 3(k_A)_{33} - 7(k_V)_{22} + 7(k_V)_{33}, \\ C_{a\pi} &= 2 \left(4(k_A)_{11} + 2(k_A)_{22} - (k_V)_{22} + (k_V)_{33} \right), \\ C_a &= -3 \left((k_A)_{22} - (k_A)_{33} - (k_V)_{22} + (k_V)_{33} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

If one does not commit to a flavour theory that predicts the $k_{V,A}$ matrix entries, the different C couplings are generally of similar sizes with respect to one another. For this reason, the second line in Eq. (6) factors out the different mass combinations, ordered according to their expected numerical significance in the QCD-axion case where $x_{a\pi} \equiv m_a^2/m_\pi^2 \ll 1$, and also bearing in mind that $x_{\pi K} \equiv m_\pi^2/m_K^2 \ll 1$. In turn, the last line is an explicit expansion in these two small ratios [45].

Results— Equating the theory BR with the limit in Eq. (4), we can infer a bound on various combinations of the k couplings, normalized to f_a . We note that \mathcal{M}_s is the only amplitude component proportional to a flavour-

violating axion coupling, namely $(k_V)_{23}$; instead, \mathcal{M}_w depends on flavour-conserving k entries only [46], but has an overall parametric suppression of order $|N_8| \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-7}$. Flavour-violating axion couplings are not constrained to be small or non-existent by any established dynamical reason, thus in general the contribution of \mathcal{M}_s is dominant w.r.t. \mathcal{M}_w . In terms of the useful “coupling-rescaled f_a ”, defined as $(F_{V,A})_{ij} \equiv 2f_a/(k_{V,A})_{ij}$ [47], Eq. (4) thus implies, for $m_a = 0$,

$$|(F_V)_{23}| > 1.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ GeV}, \quad (8)$$

namely about a factor-of-2 increase w.r.t. the latest data-driven bound [47] on the effective scale of the underlying interaction. The bound Eq. (8) can equivalently be expressed as $\frac{|(k_V)_{23}|}{f_a/(1 \text{ TeV})} < 1.8 \times 10^{-9}$ ($m_a = 0$) [48]. In Fig. 2 (left) we show a generalization of Eq. (8) for any m_a in the range of values probed by NA62.

A separate case of interest occurs if $(F_V)_{23}$ is suppressed to be small enough by some dynamical reason. A first instance is provided by the so-called minimal QCD-axion solution to the flavour problem [49–54]. This implies a parametric suppression of order 0.1 for $|(k_V)_{23}|$, thus not sufficient for \mathcal{M}_s to become subdominant w.r.t. \mathcal{M}_w . Another strategy may be to enforce so-called Minimal Flavour Violation (MFV) [55–58] within axion models [59, 60]. This implies a minimal amount of flavour violation, induced solely by radiative effects, with a left-handed off-diagonal coupling scaling as $(k_L)_{23} \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^2} (V_{\text{CKM}})_{31}^* (V_{\text{CKM}})_{32}$ times flavour-*universal* logs of ratios of ultraviolet scales—i.e., factors that do not generally introduce further suppression. Moreover,




FIG. 2: *Left panel*: Lower limit on the flavour-violating “coupling-rescaled f_a ” if the strong amplitude dominates. *Right panel*: Lower limit on f_a if the weak amplitude—and more specifically its c_{GG} term (see text)—dominates.

since the right-handed counterpart is absent by definition in MFV, the above scaling implies $(k_{V,A})_{23} = O(10^{-6})$. Again, this suppression does not appear sufficient to warrant the dominance of the \mathcal{M}_w contribution over \mathcal{M}_s .

It is, however, interesting to posit $(k_{V,A})_{23} = 0$, in order to consider the implications of Eq. (4) on a BR prediction dominated by \mathcal{M}_w , Eq. (6). As mentioned, this amplitude depends solely on flavour-diagonal k couplings. The couplings $(k_A)_{11,22,33}$ can be identified with the axion-quark couplings $C_{u,d,s}$ of Refs. [61, 62]. At a renormalization scale $\mu \approx 1$ GeV, these couplings are generally predicted to be $O(10^{-2})$ or $O(10^{-1})$ within KSVZ [6, 7] or DFSZ models [8, 9], respectively. Model-independent bounds, inferred from Neutron-Star cooling [31] or from the SN 1987A event [63–68] are generally weaker, not below $O(1)$ [29]. It is reasonable to assume that the k -coupling combination appearing in the last line of Eq. (6) will be of the same order, namely $O(10^{-2})$ in KSVZ, $O(10^{-1})$ in DFSZ and $O(1)$ in a data-driven approach. Indeed, altering these orders of magnitude would require specific cancellations, yet no such cancellations are observed in the conceptually analogous case of Yukawa couplings.

Thus, assuming the \mathcal{M}_s contribution to be negligible, the weak amplitude in Eq. (6) and the new bound in Eq. (4) imply, for $m_a = 0$,

$$f_a \text{ (GeV)} > \{1.4, 1.2, 1.0\} \cdot 10^5, \quad (9)$$

under the data-driven, DFSZ, or KSVZ assumptions, respectively. The similarity between these bounds follows from the dominance of the c_{GG} -dependent term in Eq. (6) under any of these assumptions. We recall that $c_{GG} = 1/2$ given our ChPT conventions (see Supplemental Sec. B). Therefore, the bound $f_a > 10^5$ GeV is a *model-independent* consequence of Eq. (4), which can only be avoided if the parameters in the last parentheses of Eq. (6) conspire to a small value. In Fig. 2 (right) Eq. (9) is generalized for any m_a in the NA62 range of values. To produce the bound in this figure we have only kept the c_{GG} term.

The analysis we have described is only one example of a number of alternative Kaon-decay channels to pions plus an invisible, that can all be consistently pursued at NA62. We outline here the two-pion-plus-invisible case, allowing access to the $(k_A)_{23}$ coupling. In the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0 a$ channel, NA62 should be able to reach a BR as small as 10^{-7} [69], or two o.o.m. below the strongest existing limit [70]. This 10^{-7} figure can be corroborated with various independent arguments. First, starting from the limit obtained in the *one*-pion-plus-invisible case (Fig. 1), the requirement of an additional π^0 entails a decrease in sensitivity due to: a smaller trigger bandwidth by about $1/400$; a further factor of about $1/4$, corresponding to the geometric acceptance of having the two photons from the π^0 in the ECAL; a factor around $1/10$ due to the background increase in 2-body vs. 3-body processes at NA62. Meanwhile the reconstruction efficiencies for π^+ and π^0 are similar, which is a strength of the NA62 setup. This leads to $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0 a) \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-7}$. In addition, for the analogous K_L decay, the E391a experiment has provided an upper limit on $\mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0 a)$ at 90% CL of 7×10^{-7} [71] (although the smallest m_a value probed is 50 MeV). In the future KOTO and the proposed KOTO-II experiment [72] at J-PARC, could improve on this constraint. Therefore, the limit

$$\mathcal{B}(K \rightarrow \pi\pi a) \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-7} \quad (10)$$

appears to provide an informed estimate. The limit in Eq. (10), once also corroborated by a measurement from the NA62 data, can then be compared with the theory prediction in a similar way as done above for the single-pion-plus-invisible channel. We refrain from discussing explicitly the bound inferred from the weak-amplitude contribution. In fact, the latter has a similar structure as Eq. (6), which leads to a bound on $1/f_a$, that is however weaker than the one quoted in Eq. (9). Similarly, we omit the explicit discussion of the $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0 a$ case.

We obtain the following \mathcal{L}_s -induced contribution in the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0 a$ channel

$$i\mathcal{M}_s^{(\pi\pi a)} = \frac{(k_A)_{32}}{4F_0 f_a} (s - t), \quad (11)$$

where $m_a = 0$ and we defined $s \equiv (p_{\pi^0} + p_a)^2$ and $t = (p_{\pi^+} + p_a)^2$. Equating the predicted BR with Eq. (10) leads to the following $(F_A)_{23}$ bound

$$|(F_A)_{23}| > 1.0 \times 10^8 \text{ GeV} , \quad (12)$$

which exceeds the latest bound, quoted in Ref. [47], by one o.o.m. The result in Eq. (12), along with those in

Eq. (8) and (9), are of great interest, because of their strength, and because, at variance with limits inferred from astrophysical systems, they arise from a controlled experimental setup.

Acknowledgments— This work has received funding from the French ANR, under contracts ANR-19-CE31-0016 (‘GammaRare’) and ANR-23-CE31-0018 (‘InvISY-ble’), that we gratefully acknowledge.

-
- [1] L. Ubaldi, Effects of theta on the deuteron binding energy and the triple-alpha process, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 025011 (2010), arXiv:0811.1599 [hep-ph].
- [2] M. Dine, L. Stephenson Haskins, L. Ubaldi, and D. Xu, Some Remarks on Anthropic Approaches to the Strong CP Problem, *JHEP* **05**, 171, arXiv:1801.03466 [hep-th].
- [3] J. Preskill, M. B. Wise, and F. Wilczek, Cosmology of the Invisible Axion, *Phys. Lett. B* **120**, 127 (1983).
- [4] L. F. Abbott and P. Sikivie, A Cosmological Bound on the Invisible Axion, *Phys. Lett. B* **120**, 133 (1983).
- [5] M. Dine and W. Fischler, The Not So Harmless Axion, *Phys. Lett. B* **120**, 137 (1983).
- [6] J. E. Kim, Weak Interaction Singlet and Strong CP Invariance, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 103 (1979).
- [7] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, Can Confinement Ensure Natural CP Invariance of Strong Interactions?, *Nucl. Phys. B* **166**, 493 (1980).
- [8] M. Dine, W. Fischler, and M. Srednicki, A Simple Solution to the Strong CP Problem with a Harmless Axion, *Phys. Lett. B* **104**, 199 (1981).
- [9] A. R. Zhitnitsky, On Possible Suppression of the Axion Hadron Interactions. (In Russian), *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **31**, 260 (1980).
- [10] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440 (1977).
- [11] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1791 (1977).
- [12] S. Weinberg, A New Light Boson?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223 (1978).
- [13] F. Wilczek, Problem of Strong P and T Invariance in the Presence of Instantons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 279 (1978).
- [14] I. G. Irastorza and J. Redondo, New experimental approaches in the search for axion-like particles, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **102**, 89 (2018), arXiv:1801.08127 [hep-ph].
- [15] G. Lanfranchi, M. Pospelov, and P. Schuster, The Search for Feebly Interacting Particles, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **71**, 279 (2021), arXiv:2011.02157 [hep-ph].
- [16] P. Sikivie, Invisible Axion Search Methods, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 015004 (2021), arXiv:2003.02206 [hep-ph].
- [17] G. G. Raffelt, Astrophysical methods to constrain axions and other novel particle phenomena, *Phys. Rept.* **198**, 1 (1990).
- [18] G. G. Raffelt, Astrophysical axion bounds, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **741**, 51 (2008), arXiv:hep-ph/0611350.
- [19] A. Caputo and G. Raffelt, Astrophysical Axion Bounds: The 2024 Edition, in *1st Training School of the COST Action COSMIC WISPerS (CA21106)* (2024) arXiv:2401.13728 [hep-ph].
- [20] D. J. E. Marsh, Axion Cosmology, *Phys. Rept.* **643**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1510.07633 [astro-ph.CO].
- [21] J. E. Kim and G. Carosi, Axions and the Strong CP Problem, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 557 (2010), [Erratum: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 91, 049902 (2019)], arXiv:0807.3125 [hep-ph].
- [22] L. Di Luzio, M. Giannotti, E. Nardi, and L. Visinelli, The landscape of QCD axion models, *Phys. Rept.* **870**, 1 (2020), arXiv:2003.01100 [hep-ph].
- [23] K. Choi, S. H. Im, and C. Sub Shin, Recent Progress in the Physics of Axions and Axion-Like Particles, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **71**, 225 (2021), arXiv:2012.05029 [hep-ph].
- [24] C. L. Cowan, F. Reines, F. B. Harrison, H. W. Kruse, and A. D. McGuire, Detection of the free neutrino: A Confirmation, *Science* **124**, 103 (1956).
- [25] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Chiral Perturbation Theory to One Loop, *Annals Phys.* **158**, 142 (1984).
- [26] S. Weinberg, Phenomenological Lagrangians, *Physica A* **96**, 327 (1979).
- [27] H. Georgi, D. B. Kaplan, and L. Randall, Manifesting the Invisible Axion at Low-energies, *Phys. Lett. B* **169**, 73 (1986).
- [28] There is a reparametrization ambiguity [27], but it must cancel in physical observables [43].
- [29] M. Cavan-Piton, D. Guadagnoli, M. Oertel, H. Seong, and L. Vittorio, Axion Emission from Strange Matter in Core-Collapse SNe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 121002 (2024), arXiv:2401.10979 [hep-ph].
- [30] T. Fischer, J. Martin Camalich, H. Kochankovski, and L. Tolos, Hyperons during proto-neutron star deleptonization and the emission of dark flavored particles, (2024), arXiv:2408.01406 [astro-ph.HE].
- [31] M. Buschmann, C. Dessert, J. W. Foster, A. J. Long, and B. R. Safdi, Upper Limit on the QCD Axion Mass from Isolated Neutron Star Cooling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 091102 (2022), arXiv:2111.09892 [hep-ph].
- [32] E. Cortina Gil *et al.* (NA62), Observation of the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay and measurement of its branching ratio, (2024), arXiv:2412.12015 [hep-ex].
- [33] A. J. Buras and E. Venturini, The exclusive vision of rare K and B decays and of the quark mixing in the standard model, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 615 (2022), arXiv:2203.11960 [hep-ph].
- [34] G. Anzivino *et al.*, Workshop summary: Kaons@CERN 2023, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 377 (2024), arXiv:2311.02923 [hep-ph].
- [35] G. D’Ambrosio, A. M. Iyer, F. Mahmoudi, and S. Neshatpour, Anatomy of kaon decays and prospects for lepton flavour universality violation, *JHEP* **09**, 148, arXiv:2206.14748 [hep-ph].
- [36] E. Cortina Gil *et al.* (NA62), First search for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ using the decay-in-flight technique, *Phys. Lett. B* **791**,

- 156 (2019), arXiv:1811.08508 [hep-ex].
- [37] E. Cortina Gil *et al.* (NA62), An investigation of the very rare $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay, *JHEP* **11**, 042, arXiv:2007.08218 [hep-ex].
- [38] E. Cortina Gil *et al.* (NA62), Measurement of the very rare $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay, *JHEP* **06**, 093, arXiv:2103.15389 [hep-ex].
- [39] M. Cavan-Piton, D. Guadagnoli, A. Iohner, D. Martinez Santos, and L. Vittorio, Probing QCD Axions or Axion-like Particles in three-body K Decays, (2024), arXiv:2411.04170 [hep-ph].
- [40] E. Cortina Gil *et al.* (NA62), Search for a feebly interacting particle X in the decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ X$, *JHEP* **03**, 058, arXiv:2011.11329 [hep-ex].
- [41] Alternatively, one may treat $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ events as a separate component n_ν left as a free parameter. This approach will become viable in experimental analyses as the observed n_ν increases. For a fixed number of degrees of freedom (d.o.f.), we find that allowing n_ν to float strengthens the bounds by approximately 5-10% compared to fixing it to the SM value. However, we adhere to the latter approach to align fully with the procedure outlined in Ref. [40].
- [42] R. D. Cousins, J. T. Linnemann, and J. Tucker, Evaluation of three methods for calculating statistical significance when incorporating a systematic uncertainty into a test of the background-only hypothesis for a poisson process, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **595**, 480–501 (2008).
- [43] M. Bauer, M. Neubert, S. Renner, M. Schnubel, and A. Thamm, Consistent Treatment of Axions in the Weak Chiral Lagrangian, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 081803 (2021), arXiv:2102.13112 [hep-ph].
- [44] M. Bauer, M. Neubert, S. Renner, M. Schnubel, and A. Thamm, Flavor probes of axion-like particles, *JHEP* **09**, 056, arXiv:2110.10698 [hep-ph].
- [45] For the sake of completeness only, we provide here the well-known formula [73] for calculating the BR given the full amplitude \mathcal{M} :
- $$B(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ a) = \frac{\tau_{K^+} |\mathcal{M}|^2}{16\pi m_K} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{x_{aK}^2 + (1 - x_{\pi K})^2 - 2x_{aK}(1 + x_{\pi K})}}. \quad (13)$$
- [46] More precisely, \mathcal{M}_w depends on all the diagonal k_A couplings, and on the difference $(k_V)_{22} - (k_V)_{33}$, as expected.
- [47] J. Martin Camalich, M. Pospelov, P. N. H. Vuong, R. Ziegler, and J. Zupan, Quark Flavor Phenomenology of the QCD Axion, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 015023 (2020), arXiv:2002.04623 [hep-ph].
- [48] In this form, the coupling can, in principle, be compared with Ref. [44]. This work chooses to report the *strongest* limit found *within the mass range* probed by the 2016-2018 dataset of NA62, at 95% C.L. This prescription implies that the upper bound on the combination $\frac{|(k_V)_{23}|}{f_a/(1 \text{ TeV})}$ spans between a maximal value of 4.0×10^{-9} at $m_a = 261 \text{ MeV}$ and a minimal value of 1.4×10^{-9} at $m_a = 205 \text{ MeV}$. The latter is directly comparable with the value 1.2×10^{-9} quoted in Ref. [44]. Applying the same prescription to the 2016–2022 dataset, we find $\frac{|(k_V)_{23}|}{f_a/(1 \text{ TeV})}$ to span between 2.9×10^{-9} at $m_a = 261 \text{ MeV}$ and 1.0×10^{-9} at $m_a = 211 \text{ MeV}$.
- [49] Y. Ema, K. Hamaguchi, T. Moroi, and K. Nakayama, Flaxion: a minimal extension to solve puzzles in the standard model, *JHEP* **01**, 096, arXiv:1612.05492 [hep-ph].
- [50] L. Calibbi, F. Goertz, D. Redigolo, R. Ziegler, and J. Zupan, Minimal axion model from flavor, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 095009 (2017), arXiv:1612.08040 [hep-ph].
- [51] D. B. Reiss, Can the Family Group Be a Global Symmetry?, *Phys. Lett. B* **115**, 217 (1982).
- [52] F. Wilczek, Axions and Family Symmetry Breaking, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1549 (1982).
- [53] Y. H. Ahn, Flavored Peccei-Quinn symmetry, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 056005 (2015), arXiv:1410.1634 [hep-ph].
- [54] F. Björkeröth, E. J. Chun, and S. F. King, Accidental Peccei-Quinn symmetry from discrete flavour symmetry and Pati-Salam, *Phys. Lett. B* **777**, 428 (2018), arXiv:1711.05741 [hep-ph].
- [55] R. S. Chivukula and H. Georgi, Composite Technicolor Standard Model, *Phys. Lett. B* **188**, 99 (1987).
- [56] L. J. Hall and L. Randall, Weak scale effective supersymmetry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 2939 (1990).
- [57] G. D’Ambrosio, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori, and A. Strumia, Minimal flavor violation: An Effective field theory approach, *Nucl. Phys. B* **645**, 155 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0207036.
- [58] A. J. Buras, P. Gambino, M. Gorbahn, S. Jager, and L. Silvestrini, Universal unitarity triangle and physics beyond the standard model, *Phys. Lett. B* **500**, 161 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0007085.
- [59] K. Choi, S. H. Im, C. B. Park, and S. Yun, Minimal Flavor Violation with Axion-like Particles, *JHEP* **11**, 070, arXiv:1708.00021 [hep-ph].
- [60] F. Arias-Aragon and L. Merlo, The Minimal Flavour Violating Axion, *JHEP* **10**, 168, [Erratum: *JHEP* **11**, 152 (2019)], arXiv:1709.07039 [hep-ph].
- [61] K. Choi, H. J. Kim, H. Seong, and C. S. Shin, Axion emission from supernova with axion-pion-nucleon contact interaction, *JHEP* **02**, 143, arXiv:2110.01972 [hep-ph].
- [62] K. Choi, S. H. Im, H. J. Kim, and H. Seong, Precision axion physics with running axion couplings, *JHEP* **08**, 058, arXiv:2106.05816 [hep-ph].
- [63] R. M. Bionta *et al.*, Observation of a Neutrino Burst in Coincidence with Supernova SN 1987a in the Large Magellanic Cloud, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1494 (1987).
- [64] C. B. Bratton *et al.* (IMB), Angular Distribution of Events From Sn1987a, *Phys. Rev. D* **37**, 3361 (1988).
- [65] K. Hirata *et al.* (Kamiokande-II), Observation of a Neutrino Burst from the Supernova SN 1987a, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1490 (1987).
- [66] K. S. Hirata *et al.*, Observation in the Kamiokande-II Detector of the Neutrino Burst from Supernova SN 1987a, *Phys. Rev. D* **38**, 448 (1988).
- [67] E. N. Alekseev, L. N. Alekseeva, V. I. Volchenko, and I. V. Krivosheina, Possible Detection of a Neutrino Signal on 23 February 1987 at the Baksan Underground Scintillation Telescope of the Institute of Nuclear Research, *JETP Lett.* **45**, 589 (1987).
- [68] E. N. Alekseev, L. N. Alekseeva, I. V. Krivosheina, and V. I. Volchenko, Detection of the Neutrino Signal From SN1987A in the LMC Using the Inr Baksan Underground Scintillation Telescope, *Phys. Lett. B* **205**, 209 (1988).
- [69] E. Goudzovski *et al.*, New physics searches at kaon and

- hyperon factories, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **86**, 016201 (2023), arXiv:2201.07805 [hep-ph].
- [70] O. G. Tchikilev *et al.*, Search for light pseudoscalar sgoldstino in K- decays, *Phys. Lett. B* **602**, 149 (2004), arXiv:hep-ex/0308061.
- [71] R. Ogata *et al.* (E391a), Study of the $K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 052009 (2011), arXiv:1106.3404 [hep-ex].
- [72] J. Fry *et al.* (KOTO), Proposal of the KOTO II experiment, (2025), arXiv:2501.14827 [hep-ex].
- [73] S. Navas *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of particle physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [74] G. Ecker, A. Pich, and E. de Rafael, $K \rightarrow \pi$ Lepton+ Lepton- Decays in the Effective Chiral Lagrangian of the Standard Model, *Nucl. Phys. B* **291**, 692 (1987).




FIG. 3: Upper limit on $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ a)$ from the 2017 [40] and 2016-18 [38] datasets. The solid red line is the published result of NA62 collaboration. The gray dashed line shows the corresponding value of $\delta\mathcal{B}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}$ for comparison.

Supplemental Material

A: Validations of our reinterpretation procedure

We tested the procedure described in the main text by applying it to 2017 [40] and 2016-2018 data [38], and verifying that the obtained upper limits on $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ a)$ reproduce the published counterparts in Refs. [38, 40].

In Fig. 3 we show our results obtained for the accessible values of axion masses compared to the published ones from the collaboration. We find a very good agreement, to within a few percent, if we compare to the χ^2 value with 90% probability and 2 dof, which we understand to be due to neglecting the uncertainty of the knowledge of the SES.

B: ChPT conventions

We collect the Lagrangians relevant to our calculations. The “strong” Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L}_s = \frac{F_0^2}{4} \left(\text{Tr} D_\mu U (D^\mu U)^\dagger + 2B_0 \text{Tr} \left(\hat{M}_q U + U^\dagger \hat{M}_q^\dagger \right) \right). \quad (\text{B1})$$

The pion field $U \equiv \exp\left(i\frac{\phi^a}{F_0}\lambda^a\right)$ is normalized such that $(\phi^a \lambda^a)_{11} = \pi^0 + \eta_8/\sqrt{3}$, with $F_0 = 93 \text{ MeV}$, and transforms as $U \rightarrow RUL^\dagger$; $D_\mu U = \partial_\mu U - i\frac{\partial_\mu a}{f_a} \left(\hat{k}_R(a)U - U\hat{k}_L(a) \right) - ieA_\mu [Q, U]$, with $Q = \text{diag}(Q_u, Q_d, Q_s)$. As elucidated in Ref. [27], the above Lagrangian assumes that the $aG\tilde{G}$ coupling in Eq. (1), where we use the normalization $\tilde{G}_a^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}G_{\rho\sigma,a}$, has been removed in favour of an axion-dependent phase in the quark mass matrix $M_q = \text{diag}(m_u, m_d, m_s)$. We define this quark redefinition as $q \rightarrow \exp[-i(\delta + \kappa\gamma_5)c_{GG}a/f_a]q$, with $\text{Tr} \kappa = 1$ [27, 43]. The hermitian matrices δ, κ can be chosen as diagonal, implying $\hat{M}_q = \exp\left(-2ic_{GG}\frac{a}{f_a}\kappa\right)M_q$ [27, 43]. Note that the κ and δ dependence cancels out in physical amplitudes such as Eqs. (5)-(6), as expected. The $|\Delta S| = 1$ Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_w = -\frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}}(V_{CKM})_{11}^*(V_{CKM})_{12}g_8(L_\mu L^\mu)^{32} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

with the L_μ current

$$L_\mu^{ji} = i\frac{F_0^2}{2}\exp\{ia/f_a c_{GG}((\delta_i - \delta_j) - (\kappa_i - \kappa_j))\}[(D_\mu U)^\dagger U]^{ji}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

The \mathcal{L}_w coupling is often expressed in terms of $N_8 = -\sqrt{2}F_0^2 g_8 G_F (V_{\text{CKM}})_{11}^* (V_{\text{CKM}})_{12}$, where $(V_{\text{CKM}})_{ij}$ are Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix [73] entries, such that $|N_8| \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-7}$. Throughout, we mostly follow the conventions in Refs. [43, 44], with the exception of the convention on the chiral transformation properties of the meson field, the pion decay constant, and the g_8 definition, for which we comply with classical ChPT papers such as Ref. [74].