

The equivalent Electric Dipole Moment in SMEFT

Marco Ardu, Nicola Valori

Instituto de Física Corpuscular, Universidad de Valencia and CSIC, Edificio Institutos Investigación, C/Catedrático José Beltrán 2, 46980 Paterna, Spain

E-mail: marco.ardu@ific.uv.es, nicola.valori@uv.es

ABSTRACT: The Electric Dipole Moment of the electron (eEDM) is typically investigated in experiments using paramagnetic molecules. However, the physical observable in these searches consists in a linear combination of CP-violating interactions, rather than the eEDM alone, which is commonly referred to as the equivalent EDM of the system. Assuming the presence of new CP-odd physics from heavy degrees of freedom, we parameterize its effects within the Standard Model Effective Field Theory (SMEFT) framework. We systematically compute the contributions to the full low-energy direction probed by EDM searches, focusing on leading-order effects at dimension six and one-loop level, while also discussing selected two-loop and dimension-eight contributions. We find that eEDM experiments are sensitive to a broader class of SMEFT operators than previously recognized.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The equivalent electric dipole moment	3
2.1	Matching at the nucleon scale	5
3	Equivalent EDMs in SMEFT	7
3.1	Dimension eight effects	12
4	Conclusion	15

1 Introduction

The Standard Model (SM) of particle physics provides a remarkably precise description of fundamental interactions, successfully accounting for most observed phenomena up to energies near the TeV scale. However, despite its successes, several key observations remain unexplained within the SM framework. These include the existence of nonzero neutrino masses, the presence of dark matter, and the observed baryon asymmetry of the universe. Addressing these issues requires physics beyond the SM (BSM), motivating both theoretical developments and experimental searches for new interactions.

In particular, the baryon–antibaryon asymmetry of the universe cannot be dynamically generated within the SM alone [1, 2]. A key requirement for successful baryogenesis are additional sources of CP violation beyond those present in the CKM and PMNS matrices, which govern quark and lepton mixing respectively. This motivates experimental searches for CP-odd observables that could serve as direct signatures of new CP-violating interactions. Among these, Electric Dipole Moments (EDMs) of SM particles provide some of the most stringent probes of CP-violating BSM physics. Theoretically, EDMs are particularly well-suited for New Physics (NP) searches because their SM contributions are extremely suppressed. In the quark sector, CP violation is parametrized by the Jarlskog invariant [3], $J = \text{Im}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*V_{cd}V_{cb}^*) \sim 3 \times 10^{-5}$ [4], which leads to EDM contributions only appearing at three-loop order or higher due to the required multiple CKM insertions

EDM	Upper-Limit @ 90% CL
d_e	$4.1 \times 10^{-30} e \cdot \text{cm}$ [10]
d_μ	$1.8 \times 10^{-19} e \cdot \text{cm}$ [11]
d_τ	$\sim 10^{-17}$ [12]
d_n	$1.8 \times 10^{-26} e \cdot \text{cm}$ [13]

Table 1. Current upper-limit on the EDMs of charged leptons and the neutron. As explained in the text, the electron EDM bounds are found assuming that the coefficient of the semi-leptonic interactions that enter in the equivalent EDM of the paramagnetic HfF+ molecule is zero.

and the antisymmetry of J [5]¹. In the lepton sector, an analogous Jarlskog invariant can be constructed from the PMNS matrix, but no definite sign of CP violation in neutrino oscillations has been measured so far². Additionally, the PMNS induced EDMs also appear at high loop orders, leading to suppressed contributions. Experiments looking for EDMs are sensitive to much larger values than those predicted by the SM, and would thus be able to unambiguously detect or constraint CP-odd new physics interactions. The absence of EDM signals in present searches has led to stringent upper limits on the EDMs of leptons and the neutron, summarized in Table 1, with future experiments expected to further improve the sensitivities. The projection for future electron EDM searches anticipate an improvement of up to three order of magnitude [14–16]. Dedicated searches for a muon EDM at PSI are also expected to run in the upcoming years, with a target sensitivity of $d_\mu \lesssim 6 \times 10^{-23} e \cdot \text{cm}$ [17]. Improvement for the neutron EDM are also expected from the n2EDM experiment [18].

Assuming that new physics lies at a high energy scale, its low-energy effects can be systematically described in a model-independent manner using the Standard Model Effective Field Theory (SMEFT). In this approach, the contributions of the heavy degrees of freedom are encoded in the Wilson coefficients of higher-dimensional operators constructed from SM fields and observables can be calculated in terms of the operator coefficients. EDMs, in particular, are related to the imaginary coefficient of the dipole operator, and are sensitive to a wide variety of CP-odd operators that can contribute to it. A number of SMEFT analyses of EDMs exist in the literature, including complete studies of one-loop effects at dimension six [19, 20], as well as

¹Long distance contributions can lead to larger values [6, 7], but are still far from the experimental sensitivities

²Although there is a small preference for a non-zero Dirac phase when including SK-ATM data [8, 9]

selected two-loop contributions [21].

Given the exceptional sensitivity of electron EDM experiments, constraints derived from these measurements often set the most stringent limits on BSM CP violation. In the EFT framework, the experimental reach of electron EDM searches corresponds to the largest UV scales among all EDM observables. The state-of-the-art of electron EDM best limit come from searches of the EDMs of paramagnetic molecules, like HfF^+ and ThO . However, these experiments are sensitive not only to the permanent EDM of the electron, but also to other CP-odd interactions between the electron and the nuclei. They effectively constrain a combination of the electron EDM and semileptonic scalar interactions, collectively referred to as the "equivalent EDM" of the system (d^{equiv}). The reported upper limits on the electron EDM assume no contribution from the CP-odd scalar, an assumption that may not hold in general. If the CP-violating physics affects electron-nuclei interactions, paramagnetic EDM searches can provide direct constraints on its magnitude. For instance, it has been recently shown that paramagnetic systems can be used to bound the θ QCD term from its contribution to the semileptonic operator entering in the equivalent EDM [22].

The goal of this work is to systematically study the full experimental direction probed by paramagnetic EDM searches within the SMEFT framework. By including all relevant renormalization group mixing effects at the one-loop level and dimension six, we aim to provide a comprehensive analysis of how electron EDM experiments constrain the space of CP-violating operators. Selected two-loop and dimension eight contribution are also briefly discussed.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we review the low-energy operators that enter in the definition of the equivalent EDM, and discuss the combinations probed by the different paramagnetic molecules. In Section 3 we introduce the SMEFT Lagrangian and calculate the contributions of high-energy operators onto the low-energy experimental direction to constrain the SMEFT operator coefficients. Finally, we summarize our results in Section 4.

2 The equivalent electric dipole moment

As discussed in the Introduction, the most sensitive searches of the electron EDM (eEDM) are conducted on paramagnetic systems, where the EDM of the unpaired electrons is inferred from the frequency shift of paramagnetic atoms or molecules in the presence of an electric field. However, these energy shifts depend not only on the eEDM, but also on other CP-odd semileptonic interactions. At the experimental scale, the relevant interactions to which experiments are most sensitive can be

parametrized according to the Lagrangian [23]:

$$\mathcal{L} = -i\frac{d_e}{2}\bar{e}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5 e F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}C_S\bar{e}i\gamma_5 e\bar{N}N, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\sigma_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2}[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$, $N = (p, n)$ is the nucleon isospin doublet, G_F is the Fermi constant and C_S is a dimensionless Wilson coefficient. It is possible to define an equivalent eEDM ($d_e^{\text{equiv.}}$) in terms of operators in (2.1) that correspond to the observable measured in paramagnetic EDM searches. Currently, the best experimental sensitivity is obtained using HfF^+ molecular ions, where the equivalent EDM reads³ [24]

$$d_{\text{HfF}^+}^{\text{equiv}} = d_e + C_S \times 0.9 \times 10^{-20} e \cdot \text{cm}. \quad (2.2)$$

and is constrained to be [10]:

$$|d_{\text{HfF}^+}^{\text{equiv}}| < 4.1 \times 10^{-30} e \cdot \text{cm}. \quad (2.3)$$

Within the SM, d_e^{equiv} is predicted to be $\sim 10^{-35} e \cdot \text{cm}$ [25], which is still far from the reach of future eEDM experiments [14–16]. It is then possible to constrain CP-violating operators from the d_e^{equiv} upper-limit.

A single experiment cannot distinguish the contributions of the two operators in Eq. (2.1), making it impossible to determine whether a potential signal arises from d_e or C_S or to impose a model-independent bound on each coefficient. When considering one-operator-at-a-time and assuming the UV matching

$$d_e \sim \frac{v}{16\pi^2\Lambda^2} \quad C_S \sim \frac{1}{\Lambda^2 G_F}, \quad (2.4)$$

where $v \sim 174$ GeV is the electroweak Vacuum Expectation Value (VEV), the eEDM still remains the most sensitive observable to heavy new physics, given that it can probe energy scales $\Lambda \lesssim 10^7$ TeV which are $10 \sim 10^2$ times larger than those probed by the semileptonic contribution. However, the dipole coefficient could be suppressed by small couplings or loop factors, potentially allowing the scalar contribution to compete or dominate in d_e^{equiv} .

Since the low-energy EFT space spanned by the eEDM and the semileptonic scalar operator is two-dimensional, a pair of experiments using different molecules would, in principle, be sufficient to resolve the degeneracy. This holds true provided

³We are neglecting the isospin breaking effects that are proportional to the coefficient of the semileptonic operator $\bar{e}i\gamma_5 e\bar{N}\tau^3 N$, with τ^3 being the diagonal Pauli matrix, because they are suppressed by the small $Z - N$ difference in the molecule, where Z is the number of protons and N the number of neutrons

that the experimental sensitivities define sufficiently orthogonal directions in the coefficient plane; otherwise, both experiments would probe nearly the same linear combination of operators, leaving the distinction ambiguous.

Searches for a permanent EDM in thorium monoxide ThO are sensitive to the equivalent EDM combination

$$d_{\text{ThO}}^{\text{equiv}} = d_e + C_S \times 1.5 \times 10^{-20} e \cdot \text{cm} \quad (2.5)$$

which is currently bounded to be $< 1.1 \times 10^{-29} e \cdot \text{cm}$ [26]. The HfF^+ direction can be decomposed into a projection onto $d_{\text{ThO}}^{\text{equiv}}$ and the perpendicular direction as

$$d_{\text{HfF}^+} \sim 0.75(\cos \phi d_{\text{ThO}} + \sin \phi d_{\text{ThO}\perp}) \quad (2.6)$$

where $\sin \phi \simeq 0.25$ and the orthogonal combination is

$$d_{\text{ThO}\perp} = 1.5 d_e - C_S \times 10^{-20} e \cdot \text{cm}. \quad (2.7)$$

From Eq. (2.6), in case of successful detection of d^{equiv} , the two directions can be disentangled if the two measurements have a relative accuracy of order $\sim \tan \phi$, rendering possible to measure d_e and C_S separately. A global fit of the current two independent measures leads to [10]:

$$|d_e| < 2.1 \times 10^{-29} e \cdot \text{cm} \quad |C_S| < 1.9 \times 10^{-9} \quad (2.8)$$

at 90% C.L., which is roughly one order of magnitude milder than the bounds inferred from the most sensitive measure assuming that one of the two coefficients is negligible. Note that the loss in sensitivity could be traced to the less precise measurement on ThO, but even with comparable precision the loss of one-order of magnitude in the combined bound is expected from Eq. (2.6), because the two experimental directions are aligned up to the small angle $\sin \phi \sim 0.25$.

2.1 Matching at the nucleon scale

In this section, we derive the matching conditions at $\mu \sim 2 \text{ GeV}$, the scale where QCD becomes non-perturbative, relating nucleon-level and quark-level operators relevant for the interactions contributing to the equivalent EDMs. We consider operators with chiral fields because it facilitates the matching with the SMEFT.

The scalar quark operators relevant for the matching onto the CP-odd semi-leptonic operator of Eq. (2.1) are

$$O_{XY}^{eq} = (\bar{e} P_X e) (\bar{q} P_Y q) \quad (2.9)$$

	$q = u$	$q = d$	$q = s$
$G_S^{p,q}$	9	8.2	0.42
$G_S^{m,q}$	8.1	9	0.42

Table 2. Values of the scalar matching coefficients from [27]. The values for u, d result from χ PT calculations [28, 29], while for $q = s$ lattice results are also used [30]

where $P_{X,Y}$ stands for the chirality projectors with $X, Y = L, R$, and q labels the SM quarks. These are added to the Lagrangian as

$$\mathcal{L}_q = \sum_q \sum_{X,Y=L,R} \frac{C_{XY}^{eq}}{\Lambda^2} O_{XY}^{eq} \quad (2.10)$$

where we have divided for the appropriate power of the energy scale Λ to have dimensionless coefficients. Starting from the chiral operators, the interaction featuring a leptonic pseudoscalar current and a quark scalar current corresponds to the combination

$$\frac{i}{2} \text{Im} [C_{RL}^{eq} + C_{RR}^{eq}] (\bar{e}\gamma_5 e)(\bar{q}q) \equiv C_s^q (\bar{e}i\gamma_5 e)(\bar{q}q), \quad (2.11)$$

since the Hermiticity of the Lagrangian imposes that $C_{XY}^* = C_{\bar{X}\bar{Y}}$, where $\bar{L} = R$ and $\bar{R} = L$.

Operators with valence quarks ($q = u, d, s$) match directly onto the nucleon-level operators because the scalar light-quark currents have non-zero matrix elements with the nucleon state, $\langle N | \bar{q}q | N \rangle \sim G_S^{N,q} \langle N | \bar{N}N | N \rangle$, where the QCD form factors $G_S^{N,q}$ are given in Tab. 2. Scalar operators with heavy quarks ($Q = c, b, t$) instead match at the one-loop level with the dimension-seven gluon operator $O_{eG} = (\bar{e}i\gamma_5 e)(G_{\mu\nu}^a G_a^{\mu\nu})$ [31]

$$C_{eG} = -\frac{\alpha_s(m_Q)}{12\pi^2 m_Q} C_s^Q(m_Q), \quad (2.12)$$

and the gluon bilinear in turn matches onto the nucleon current at the confinement scale $\mu \sim 2$ GeV [31–33]:⁴

$$\langle N | G_{\mu\nu}^a G_a^{\mu\nu} | N \rangle = -\frac{8\pi m_N}{9\alpha_s(\mu)} \langle N | \bar{N}N | N \rangle. \quad (2.13)$$

Taking into account the QCD running of the gluon operator coefficient C_{eG} (which has the same anomalous dimension as α_s), we can write down a general expression for the matching onto the CP-odd scalar with nucleons:

⁴These contributions are depicted in the diagram of Fig. 1. Note that the scalar contact interactions represented in the diagram could also result from CP-odd Higgs couplings stemming from modified Yukawa interactions




Figure 1. Contribution to the semi-leptonic interaction C_S from closing a heavy quark loop in a CP-odd scalar contact interaction, and gluons are exchanged with the nucleons.

$$\frac{\Lambda^2 G_F}{\sqrt{2}} C_S(\mu) = \sum_{q=u,d,s} G_s^{N,q} C_s^q(\mu) + \sum_{Q=c,b,t} \frac{2m_N}{27m_Q} C_s^Q(m_Q) \quad (2.14)$$

3 Equivalent EDMs in SMEFT

Assuming the presence of heavy physics above the electroweak scale, we can parametrize the low-energy effects with the SMEFT Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SMEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_d \sum_{i,\xi} \frac{C_i^\xi}{\Lambda^{d-4}} O_i^\xi, \quad (3.1)$$

where i runs over all the operators of a given dimension d and ξ represents the flavour indices. We define the SM fields and interactions in the notation of [34]. Here, we neglect the contributions of operator with dimension higher than six, which we take in the on-shell Warsaw basis [35, 36]. Dimension eight contributions are discussed in Section 3.1. We define left-handed quark doublets in the up-basis, where the up Yukawa matrix is diagonal and the quark doublets are defined as

$$q_L = \begin{pmatrix} u_L \\ d'_L \end{pmatrix}; \quad d'_{L,i} = V_{\text{CKM}}^{ij} d_{L,j}, \quad (3.2)$$

where primed fields are the down-type quarks in the weak basis, while the unprimed are the corresponding fields in the mass eigenstate basis. Flavour change involving the up-sector is possible in matching at the electroweak scale because the operator \mathcal{O}_{uH} contributes to the quark masses when the Higgs acquires a VEV. Note that quark flavour mixing already occurs at the renormalizable level, because CKM causes the matrix Y_d and Y_u to rotate with the renormalization scale, and also contribute

to off-diagonal wave function corrections. Since we work in the up-basis, the flavour changing effects are controlled by matrix elements of $Y_d^\dagger Y_d$, which due to the small down-type Yukawas leads to relatively small rotation angles. For this reason, although we rotate back to the up-basis at lower scales, we do not find interesting flavour changing effects from the dimension four Renormalization Group Equations (RGEs)⁵.

We also consider singlet and doublet lepton fields in the charged lepton mass eigenstate basis, so the lepton Yukawas can have off-diagonal entries in the presence of the operator \mathcal{O}_{eH} . However, we consider only lepton flavour conserving operators in our analysis.

Contact interactions dressed with SM loops generally lead to divergences, which, after renormalization, cause the operator coefficients in Eq. (3.1) to evolve with the renormalization scale according to their RGEs. The solution to the dimension six RGEs, which are fully known at the one-loop level [37–39], takes the following form

$$\vec{C}(\mu_f) = \vec{C}(\mu_i)U(\mu_f, \mu_i) \quad (3.3)$$

having aligned the operator coefficients in a row vector \vec{C} and where $U(\mu_f, \mu_i)$ is an evolution matrix that is related to the anomalous dimension of the coefficients. Hence, operators at the high scale will in general mix with each other at lower energy, allowing to constrain operators that are otherwise difficult to probe directly.

Starting from a single SMEFT operator at a time at the scale $\mu \sim \Lambda$, we run down to the electroweak scale, where the heavy SM particles (t quark and H , W and Z bosons) are integrated out. At this stage, the operators generated in the SMEFT RGEs evolution are matched onto effective interactions that are invariant under $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{em}$. Then, we continue running the low-energy operators down to the relevant energy scales, and we subsequently match onto the EDM experimental direction of Eq. (2.2). The matching onto C_S is given in Eq. (2.14), where semileptonic scalar operators involving light quarks are evolved down to the confinement scale $\mu \sim 2$ GeV, while the coefficients of operators involving heavy quarks cease running at their respective mass thresholds. Note that in using Eq. (2.14) we are not including the running of C_S from 2 GeV to the electron mass $\mu \sim m_e$, which is the scale of the EDM experiments. We comment on the impact of some sub-GeV effects later in the text.

Below the electroweak scale, we parametrise the dipole operator with the electrons as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{dip} = C_{e\gamma} \bar{e} \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R e F^{\mu\nu} + h.c., \quad (3.4)$$

⁵With the exception of operators mixing with the top tensor $C_{lequ(3)}^{eett}$, which we include in Fig. 2




Figure 2. Sensitivities on the imaginary part of the SMEFT Wilson coefficients for the operators that primarily contribute to d_e , from the EDM limit in Eq. (2.3), assuming $\Lambda = 10$ TeV as the initial scale for the running. The first four columns refer to the real part of the correspondent Wilson coefficients, due to the fact that the violation of CP stems from the operators themselves and not from an imaginary coupling.

which directly matches onto the eEDM of Eq. (2.1) through the relation

$$d_e = -2 \text{Im}[C_{e\gamma}(m_e)], \quad (3.5)$$

where the operator coefficient $C_{e\gamma}(m_e)$ is at the electron mass scale.

The full one-loop running, as well as the tree level matching between the SMEFT and the Low Energy EFT, is performed using the public package *wilson* [40].

We take $\Lambda = 10$ TeV as the initial energy scale for the running and normalization of the operators. The one-loop RGE evolution is computed numerically, so it includes effects beyond the leading-log approximation.

Operators for which the contribution to d_e dominates over the semileptonic term C_S are shown in Fig. (2). For these operators, considering d^{equiv} or d_e as the experimental observable does not change the results. The operators $O_{\varphi\tilde{V}(V)}$ and $C_{lequ(3)}$ are the only ones that mix directly with the dipole at one-loop. In contrast, operators such as $O_{lequ(1)}$, $O_{\tilde{W}}$ and O_{fV} , with $f \neq e$, contribute to the dipole operators via second-order effects in the one-loop RGEs. We obtain results compatible with [20], although we relaxed the assumption of minimal flavour violation so we do not define chirality-flipping operators with a built-in Yukawa suppression. In general, we do not

account for finite one-loop mixing effects⁶, as they are known to depend on the renormalization scheme, the choice of evanescent operators [43] and the treatment of γ_5 [44]. This dependence introduces ambiguities in the UV matching and would require the inclusion of the two-loop RGEs to obtain scheme-independent observables. Selected two-loop effects have been computed in [21], including the mixing of the vector operator $C_{le}^{e\tau\tau e}$ and the scalar operator C_{ledq}^{eebb} with the dipole via insertions of the τ and b Yukawa couplings. The operators $C_{le}^{e\tau\tau e}$ and C_{ledq}^{eebb} also contribute to the dipole operator at higher orders in the one-loop RGEs through a chain of mixings. Specifically, they first mix with $C_{lequ(1)}^{eett}$ via a Yukawa insertion involving either the τ lepton or b quark, which then mixes into the tensor operator with tops before ultimately contributing to the dipole. While this process is formally suppressed at three loops, it is also enhanced by a cubic logarithm, $\log^3(\Lambda/m_t)$, whereas the direct two-loop mixing contains only a single power of $\log(\Lambda/m_t)$. Moreover, the anomalous dimensions in the one-loop mixing chain are sizable, particularly in the tensor-to-dipole diagrams, while the two-loop mixing coefficient is comparatively suppressed. We account for the leading-log two-loop running of the scalar operator C_{ledq}^{eebb} , resumming the one-loop QCD running, following the results of [21]. However, we find that the ratio between the two-loop contribution and the higher-order one-loop RGE-induced mixing is

$$\frac{C_{e\gamma}^{1\text{-loop,RGEs}}}{C_{e\gamma}^{2\text{-loop}}} \sim 100. \quad (3.6)$$

We also do not consider effects beyond the one-loop RGEs mixing for the vector $C_{le}^{e\tau\tau e}$ because the result would be scheme-dependent⁷ and its contribution to C_S is suppressed, so previous eEDM SMEFT analyses would apply even when considering d^{equiv} . In contrast, C_{ledq}^{eebb} contributes significantly to the semileptonic operator featuring in d^{equiv} , so it can be constrained directly via the matching onto the scalar.

In addition to the contributions from operators that mix with C_{eV} in the RGEs, there are additional effects due to the modification of SM couplings when matching operators at the electroweak scale. Indeed, after spontaneous symmetry breaking, $C_{\psi\varphi}$ modifies the SM Yukawas, which are not anymore proportional to the fermion

⁶With the only exception of $O_{\bar{W}}$, where the one-loop finite mixing has been computed in Dimensional Regularization (DR) and it is found to be comparable to the second order contribution in the one-loop RGE. While the finite contribution depends on the regularization scheme, we stress out that the only scheme consistent with an EFT approach is DR [41, 42].

⁷The authors of [21] compute the two-loop mixing with the dipole of the four-lepton scalar $(\bar{l}_e e_e)(\bar{e}_\tau l_\tau)$, which is Fierz equivalent to $C_{le}^{e\tau\tau e}$ in $d = 4$ dimensions. However, in $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$ a set of evanescent operators should be specified in order to translate the results for the vector, which may also result in one-loop finite mixing as discussed in [20].




Figure 3. Comparison between the sensitivities on the imaginary part of SMEFT Wilson coefficients from $d_{\text{HFF}^+}^{\text{equiv.}}$ and d_e , considering the experimental limit in Eq. (2.3) and $\Lambda = 10$ TeV as the initial scale for the running. The figure shows only the operators where the upper bound from $d_{\text{HFF}^+}^{\text{equiv.}}$ is stronger than from d_e .

mass matrix. As a result, if $C_{\psi\varphi}$ is complex, a CP-odd interaction with the Higgs and the SM fermions survives even after rotating the fields in their mass eigenstate basis. The dominant contributions to the eEDM from modified Yukawa interactions stem from the Barr-Zee diagrams [45]. This is a two-loop effect where the external photon is attached to a loop of charged particles, which is then connected to the lepton line via a photon and a Higgs boson. This contribution dominates over the one-loop, which is suppressed by the small electron Yukawa, because in the Barr-Zee the Higgs couples to a heavy particle in the loop. The largest contribution arises from a top or W loop, with the CP-violating phase coming from a $C_{e\varphi}$ insertion in the electron line. A complex $C_{e\varphi}$ also contributes to the CP-odd scalar operators discussed in Section 2.1, when the Higgs boson is removed at the electroweak scale⁸. However, since d_e is more sensitive to heavy new physics than C_S , contributions to the semileptonic interaction, though sizeable, are subdominant.

Fig. (3) compares the sensitivities on Wilson coefficients from d_e and $d_{\text{HFF}^+}^{\text{equiv.}}$, for the operators where the contribution to C_S is sizable. The semileptonic operators that are diagonal in the quark flavour match directly onto C_S and the dominant

⁸Since the top is also integrated out at the same time, there is a $\propto C_{eH}$ matching contribution at one-loop to the gluon operator $(\bar{e}i\gamma_5 e)(G_{\mu\nu}^a G_a^{\mu\nu})$, following from a diagram similar to Fig. 1 with a t loop and the crossed dot replaced by a Higgs exchange.

RGE effect is the QCD running that rescales the operator coefficients. We find that the relative scaling between the different generations is in agreement with Eq. (2.14). As a result, this class of operators gives the most significant contribution to C_S , with the only exception of $C_{lequ(1)}^{1133}$, where the corresponding matching coefficient is suppressed by m_N/m_t and its contribution to eEDM dominates. This is due to the fact that the mixing with the dipole occurs at second-order but it is enhanced by a large anomalous dimension and features the Yukawa of the top.

Tensor operators $C_{lequ(3)}$ mix to both the eEDM and semileptonic scalar at one-loop but with different anomalous dimensions. In the former case, the one loop mixing is proportional to the Yukawa of the up-type quarks while, for the latter, the mixing occurs via electroweak gauge bosons exchange. Therefore, as a consequence of the Yukawa suppression, $d_{\text{HF}^+}^{\text{equiv.}}$ is significantly more sensitive to operators with the up quark compared to d_e alone, while for operators with tops and tensor with charms C_S is negligible with respect to d_e . We remind that we are only including perturbative contributions above 2 GeV. However, it has been shown that sub-GeV mixing with the dipole in χ PT can be significant for scalar and tensor operators involving first-generation quarks [46]. While these effects are estimated to be one to two orders of magnitude larger than the RGE-induced mixing above 2 GeV, they do not alter the conclusion that d^{equiv} remains the most sensitive observable, because the contributions to C_S are still several orders of magnitude larger.

3.1 Dimension eight effects

Given the exceptional sensitivity of EDM experiments to NP interactions, the next to leading effects in the EFT expansion can fall within the experimental reach. These appear with dimension eight operators, which are added to the SMEFT Lagrangian as specified in Eq. (3.1), so they are suppressed by four powers of the NP scale Λ . Complete on-shell basis for dimension eight SMEFT operators can be found in [47, 48], and we adopt the notation of Ref. [47]. In this section, we only provide estimates for the contribution of selected dimension eight operators, because a complete analysis is beyond the scope of this work and would require the dimension eight RGEs, which are largely unknown, although some partial results are available [49–57]. We also disregard the contribution of derivative operators, as they are expected to be suppressed at low energies (at least at the tree-level), as well as operators that differ from a dimension-six operator only by an additional $\varphi^\dagger\varphi$ factor, since it is unlikely that a UV model would generate the dimension-eight term without also generating its dimension-six counterpart.

Tensor operators involving down-type fermions—either down-type quarks or

charged leptons– which are non-zero only if the chirality projector in the two-fermion bilinears is the same ($P_X \otimes P_X$, with $X = L, R$), as well as scalar operators with the same structure, appear at leading order at dimension eight. This is because gauge-invariant interactions of this type require the insertion of two Higgs fields. The relevant operators are⁹

$$\mathcal{O}_{l^2 e^2 \varphi^2(4)}^{ijkl} = (l_i \varphi \sigma_{\alpha\beta} e_j)(l_k \varphi \sigma^{\alpha\beta} e_l) \quad (3.7)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{leqd\varphi^2(3)}^{ijkl} = (l_i \varphi e_j)(q_k \varphi d_l) \quad \mathcal{O}_{leqd\varphi^2(4)}^{ijkl} = (l_i \varphi \sigma_{\alpha\beta} e_j)(q_k \varphi \sigma^{\alpha\beta} d_l) \quad (3.8)$$

and their respective Hermitian conjugates. The tensor operator will mix with the dimension eight dipoles with a Yukawa suppressed mixing, and contribute to the eEDM as

$$d_e \sim \frac{C_T}{16\pi^2} \frac{m_f}{\Lambda^2} \frac{v^2}{\Lambda^2} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{m_f}\right) \quad (3.9)$$

where C_T is the dimension eight tensor coefficient, and m_f is the mass of the respective fermion running in the loop. As in the dimension six case, the tensor operator can also mix with the associated scalar via gauge boson exchanges, which in turn will match onto four-fermion interactions with a v^2/Λ^2 suppression when the electroweak symmetry is broken¹⁰, and contribute to the semileptonic interaction of the equivalent EDM as described in Eq. (2.14). The tensors with quarks lighter than the strange contribute predominantly to the semileptonic operator by mixing with the scalar via gauge interactions, while the tensors with bottom quarks and τ leptons mainly contribute to the dipole as estimated in Eq. (3.9). By analogy with dimension-six operators involving up-type quarks, dimension eight scalar operators with bottom quarks are expected to contribute comparably to both the semileptonic operator and the dipole, with the latter arising via an intermediate mixing with the tensor. Another class of four-fermion operators that are not present at dimension six are scalars with up quarks having the chirality structure $P_R \otimes P_L$

$$C_{lequ\varphi^2(5)}^{ijkl} = (\bar{l}_i \varphi e_j)(\bar{u}_k \tilde{\varphi}^\dagger q_l), \quad (3.10)$$

and the respective Hermitian conjugates. These operators will match onto C_S because they give tree-level contributions to the scalars of Eq. (2.14) with up-type quarks. Note that contrary to the dimension six case, the scalar $C_{lequ\varphi^2(5)}^{ceft}$ should

⁹The tensor operators with leptons that we consider here is Fierz equivalent to a combination of scalars $\mathcal{O}_{l^2 e^2 \varphi^2(3)}^{ijkl} = (l_i \varphi e_j)(l_k \varphi e_l)$ present in the basis of Ref. [47].

¹⁰The full tree-level matching at $\mathcal{O}(1/\Lambda^4)$ between SMEFT and the low-energy EFT can be found in [58].

contribute more to C_S than d_e , because there is no tensor with the same chirality structure to mix with as an intermediate step.

Finally, the operator

$$\mathcal{O}_{leG^2\varphi}^{ee} = (\bar{l}_e\varphi e)G_{\mu\nu}^A G^{A\mu\nu} \quad (3.11)$$

matches onto the gluon operator \mathcal{O}_{eG} of Section 2.1 when the Higgs acquires a VEV, and contribute to the semileptonic C_S at the QCD confinement scale as described by Eq. (2.13).

Additional dimension-eight effects include flavour-changing operators in the up-quark and lepton sectors that contribute to the EDM¹¹. This arises because the operators $\mathcal{O}_{e\varphi}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{u\varphi}$ modify fermion masses when electroweak symmetry is broken, leading to non-diagonal Yukawa matrices in the mass eigenstate basis. Consequently, if the SMEFT is initially defined in a basis where up-type quark or charged-lepton Yukawas are diagonal, matching onto low-energy interactions requires rotating the fields to their mass eigenstates, potentially introducing flavour violation. The rotation angles are determined by the size of the $\mathcal{O}_{\psi\varphi}$ coefficient, allowing flavour-changing operators to induce contributions to the flavour-conserving interactions relevant for the equivalent EDM. For instance, if at the electroweak scale both the operator $C_{lequ(1)}^{eeij}$ and $C_{u\varphi}^{ji}$ are present, then

$$C_{lequ(1)}^{eejj}(m_W) \sim C_{lequ(1)}^{eeij} C_{u\varphi}^{ji} \frac{v^3}{(\max(m_i, m_j)\Lambda^2)}. \quad (3.12)$$

Neglecting terms suppressed by small Yukawa couplings, the rotation angles of the quark doublets are proportional to the matrix elements $C_{u\varphi}^{ij}$ with $j > i$. In contrast, the mixing of right-handed up-type quarks, which is not suppressed by Yukawa couplings, is governed by the size of the lower-left block, i.e the elements $C_{u\varphi}^{ji}$ with $j > i$. Note that this rotation is formally a double insertion of dimension six operators, hence a consistent treatment of these contributions may also require calculating the dimension eight RGEs proportional to the product of two dimension six operators. In the charged lepton sector a similar rotation should be performed in the presence of $\mathcal{O}_{e\varphi}^{ij}$, with $i \neq j$. However, we do not consider lepton flavour violating operators in this work, which we aim to explore in a future project. The estimated sensitivities on the dimension eight coefficients, and on dimension six flavour changing operators in the up quark sector are summarised in Table 3.

¹¹We do not discuss down quarks because in the up-basis the down Yukawa features CKM mixing which clearly dominates over the dimension eight effects

Operator	$d_{\text{HfF}^+}^{\text{equiv}}$ sensitivity on $\text{Im}(C)$
$C_{l^2 e^2 \varphi^2(4)}^{ee\tau\tau}$	$\lesssim 10^{-4}$
$C_{leqd\varphi^2(3)}^{eedd}$	$\lesssim 10^{-5}$
$C_{leqd\varphi^2(4)}^{eedd}$	$\lesssim 10^{-4}$
$C_{leqd\varphi^2(3)}^{eess}$	$\lesssim 10^{-3}$
$C_{leqd\varphi^2(4)}^{eess}$	$\lesssim 10^{-2}$
$C_{leqd\varphi^2(3)}^{eebb}$	$\lesssim 10^{-2}$
$C_{leqd\varphi^2(4)}^{eebb}$	$\lesssim 10^{-5}$
$C_{lequ\varphi^2(5)}^{eeuu}$	$\lesssim 10^{-5}$
$C_{lequ\varphi^2(5)}^{eecc}$	$\lesssim 10^{-3}$
$C_{lequ\varphi^2(5)}^{eett}$	$\lesssim 10^{-1}$
$C_{leG^2\varphi}^{ee}$	$\lesssim 10^{-2}$
$C_{lequ(1)}^{ee11} \sim C_{lequ(1)}^{eei1} C_{u\varphi}^{1i}, C_{lequ(1)}^{ee1i} C_{u\varphi}^{i1}$	$\lesssim 10^{-5}/y_{u_i}$
$C_{lequ(3)}^{ee11} \sim C_{lequ(3)}^{eei1} C_{u\varphi}^{1i}, C_{lequ(3)}^{ee1i} C_{u\varphi}^{i1}$	$\lesssim 10^{-4}/y_{u_i}$
$C_{lequ(1)}^{ee22} \sim C_{lequ(1)}^{ee12} C_{u\varphi}^{12}, C_{lequ(1)}^{ee21} C_{u\varphi}^{21}$	$\lesssim 10^{-3}/y_c$
$C_{lequ(3)}^{ee22} \sim C_{lequ(3)}^{ee12} C_{u\varphi}^{12}, C_{lequ(3)}^{ee21} C_{u\varphi}^{21}$	$\lesssim 10^{-5}/y_c$
$C_{lequ(1)}^{ee22} \sim C_{lequ(1)}^{ee32} C_{u\varphi}^{23}, C_{lequ(1)}^{ee23} C_{u\varphi}^{32}$	$\lesssim 10^{-3}/y_t$
$C_{lequ(3)}^{ee22} \sim C_{lequ(3)}^{ee32} C_{u\varphi}^{23}, C_{lequ(3)}^{ee23} C_{u\varphi}^{32}$	$\lesssim 10^{-5}/y_t$
$C_{lequ(1)}^{ee33} \sim C_{lequ(1)}^{eej3} C_{u\varphi}^{j3}, C_{lequ(1)}^{ee3j} C_{u\varphi}^{3j}$	$\lesssim 10^{-4}/y_t$
$C_{lequ(3)}^{ee33} \sim C_{lequ(3)}^{eej3} C_{u\varphi}^{j3}, C_{lequ(3)}^{ee3j} C_{u\varphi}^{3j}$	$\lesssim 10^{-7}/y_t$

Table 3. Estimated sensitivities of $d_{\text{HfF}^+}^{\text{equiv}}$ on the imaginary part of dimension eight coefficients or double insertion of dimension six operators, with operators normalized at $\Lambda = 10$ TeV. The index i can take values $i = 2, 3$ while $j = 1, 2$

4 Conclusion

The search for sources of CP violation beyond the Standard Model is essential for shedding light on the mechanism behind baryogenesis. At the present time, one of the best place to look for such effects are electron EDM experiments, which can probe NP scales up to $\sim 10^7$ TeV. Currently, the best upper limit on the eEDM is given by measurements on paramagnetic molecules. However, these experiments are sensitive to a linear combination of CP-violating interactions known as the equivalent EDM d^{equiv} , which contains the eEDM and the Wilson coefficient C_S of a semileptonic operator with electrons and nuclei. We review the definition of d^{equiv} in Section 2 for different paramagnetic molecules.

In this work, we study the contributions of higher dimensional SMEFT operators to the equivalent EDM of HfF^+ molecular ions, which currently has the most stringent

upper limit $|d_{\text{HF}^+}^{\text{equiv}}| < 4.1 \times 10^{-30} e \cdot \text{cm}$. To do so, we consider one SMEFT operator at a time for a fixed initial scale of $\Lambda = 10 \text{ TeV}$, which we run down to the scale of the experiments to compute the low-energy contributions. The one-loop RGEs running, as well as all the matching between the different effective theories when crossing the SM particles masses, has been performed with the public package *wilson*. Selected two-loop running effects are also included. The matching at the QCD confinement scale between quark-level and nucleon level operators relevant for the semileptonic interactions entering in d^{equiv} are given in Eq. (2.14) of Section 2.1, where the effects of heavy quarks have also been included.

We divide the discussion of the results (Section 3) in two parts. First, we show in Fig. (2) the sensitivity on classes of operators where the eEDM dominates over C_S . Our results are compatible with previous SMEFT analysis of the eEDM. The new results of this work are summarized in Fig. (3), which presents the single-operator limits on the coefficients of those operators that contribute more significantly to d_e^{equiv} than to d_e alone. Semileptonic scalars and tensors are found to give larger contribution to C_S than d_e , with the only exception of operators with top quarks and tensors with charms.

Finally, in Section 3.1, we discuss selected dimension eight effects which, given the impressive sensitivities of EDM experiments, are estimated to be within the reach of the experimental searches.

Acknowledgments

We thank Sacha Davidson for her useful comments on the manuscript. We acknowledge financial support from the Spanish Grant PID2023-151418NB-I00 funded by MCIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/ FEDER, UE and from Generalitat Valenciana projects CIPROM/2021/054 and CIPROM/2022/66

References

- [1] M.B. Gavela, P. Hernandez, J. Orloff and O. Pene, *Standard model CP violation and baryon asymmetry*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **9** (1994) 795 [[hep-ph/9312215](#)].
- [2] P. Huet and E. Sather, *Electroweak baryogenesis and standard model CP violation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 379 [[hep-ph/9404302](#)].
- [3] C. Jarlskog, *Commutator of the Quark Mass Matrices in the Standard Electroweak Model and a Measure of Maximal CP Nonconservation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985) 1039.

- [4] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, *Review of Particle Physics*, [PTEP **2022** \(2022\) 083C01](#).
- [5] M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, *Ckm benchmarks for electron electric dipole moment experiments*, [Phys. Rev. D **89** \(2014\) 056006](#).
- [6] Y. Yamaguchi and N. Yamanaka, *Large long-distance contributions to the electric dipole moments of charged leptons in the standard model*, [Phys. Rev. Lett. **125** \(2020\) 241802](#).
- [7] Y. Yamaguchi and N. Yamanaka, *Quark level and hadronic contributions to the electric dipole moment of charged leptons in the standard model*, [Phys. Rev. D **103** \(2021\) 013001](#).
- [8] I. Esteban, M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz and A. Zhou, *The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations*, [JHEP **09** \(2020\) 178 \[2007.14792\]](#).
- [9] F. Capozzi, E. Di Valentino, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, A. Melchiorri and A. Palazzo, *Unfinished fabric of the three neutrino paradigm*, [Phys. Rev. D **104** \(2021\) 083031 \[2107.00532\]](#).
- [10] T.S. Roussy, L. Caldwell, T. Wright, W.B. Cairncross, Y. Shagam, K.B. Ng et al., *An improved bound on the electron's electric dipole moment*, [Science **381** \(2023\) 46–50](#).
- [11] MUON (G-2) collaboration, *An Improved Limit on the Muon Electric Dipole Moment*, [Phys. Rev. D **80** \(2009\) 052008 \[0811.1207\]](#).
- [12] BELLE collaboration, *An improved search for the electric dipole moment of the τ lepton*, [JHEP **04** \(2022\) 110 \[2108.11543\]](#).
- [13] C. Abel et al., *Measurement of the Permanent Electric Dipole Moment of the Neutron*, [Phys. Rev. Lett. **124** \(2020\) 081803 \[2001.11966\]](#).
- [14] A. Hiramoto et al., *SiPM module for the ACME III electron EDM search*, [Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **1045** \(2023\) 167513 \[2210.05727\]](#).
- [15] N.J. Fitch, J. Lim, E.A. Hinds, B.E. Sauer and M.R. Tarbutt, *Methods for measuring the electron's electric dipole moment using ultracold ybf molecules*, [Quantum Science and Technology **6** \(2020\) 014006](#).
- [16] A.C. Vutha, M. Horbatsch and E.A. Hessels, *Orientation-dependent hyperfine structure of polar molecules in a rare-gas matrix: A scheme for measuring the electron electric dipole moment*, [Phys. Rev. A **98** \(2018\) 032513 \[1806.06774\]](#).
- [17] M. Sakurai et al., *muEDM: Towards a Search for the Muon Electric Dipole Moment at PSI Using the Frozen-spin Technique*, [JPS Conf. Proc. **37** \(2022\) 020604 \[2201.06561\]](#).

- [18] n2EDM collaboration, *The design of the n2EDM experiment: nEDM Collaboration*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 512 [[2101.08730](#)].
- [19] J. Aebischer, W. Dekens, E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar, D. Sengupta and P. Stoffer, *Effective field theory interpretation of lepton magnetic and electric dipole moments*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2021** (2021) .
- [20] J. Kley, T. Theil, E. Venturini and A. Weiler, *Electric dipole moments at one-loop in the dimension-6 SMEFT*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 926 [[2109.15085](#)].
- [21] G. Panico, A. Pomarol and M. Rimbau, *EFT approach to the electron Electric Dipole Moment at the two-loop level*, *JHEP* **04** (2019) 090 [[1810.09413](#)].
- [22] H. Mulder, R. Timmermans and J. de Vries, *Probing the QCD $\bar{\theta}$ term with paramagnetic molecules*, [2502.06406](#).
- [23] M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, *Electric dipole moments as probes of new physics*, *Annals Phys.* **318** (2005) 119 [[hep-ph/0504231](#)].
- [24] T. Chupp, P. Fierlinger, M. Ramsey-Musolf and J. Singh, *Electric dipole moments of atoms, molecules, nuclei, and particles*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91** (2019) 015001 [[1710.02504](#)].
- [25] Y. Ema, T. Gao and M. Pospelov, *Standard model prediction for paramagnetic electric dipole moments*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129** (2022) 231801.
- [26] ACME collaboration, *Improved limit on the electric dipole moment of the electron*, *Nature* **562** (2018) 355.
- [27] S. Davidson, *Completeness and complementarity for $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma\mu \rightarrow e\bar{e}e$ and $\mu A \rightarrow eA$* , *JHEP* **02** (2021) 172 [[2010.00317](#)].
- [28] M. Hoferichter, J. Ruiz de Elvira, B. Kubis and U.-G. Meißner, *High-Precision Determination of the Pion-Nucleon σ Term from Roy-Steiner Equations*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** (2015) 092301 [[1506.04142](#)].
- [29] J.M. Alarcon, J. Martin Camalich and J.A. Oller, *The chiral representation of the πN scattering amplitude and the pion-nucleon sigma term*, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 051503 [[1110.3797](#)].
- [30] P. Junnarkar and A. Walker-Loud, *Scalar strange content of the nucleon from lattice QCD*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 114510 [[1301.1114](#)].
- [31] S. Davidson, Y. Kuno, Y. Uesaka and M. Yamanaka, *Probing $\mu e\gamma\gamma$ contact interactions with $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 115043 [[2007.09612](#)].
- [32] V. Cirigliano, R. Kitano, Y. Okada and P. Tuzon, *On the model discriminating power of $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in nuclei*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 013002 [[0904.0957](#)].

- [33] M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Remarks on Higgs Boson Interactions with Nucleons*, *Phys. Lett. B* **78** (1978) 443.
- [34] J. Aebischer, J. Kumar and D.M. Straub, *Wilson: a Python package for the running and matching of Wilson coefficients above and below the electroweak scale*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 1026 [[1804.05033](#)].
- [35] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, *Effective Lagrangian Analysis of New Interactions and Flavor Conservation*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **268** (1986) 621.
- [36] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak and J. Rosiek, *Dimension-Six Terms in the Standard Model Lagrangian*, *JHEP* **10** (2010) 085 [[1008.4884](#)].
- [37] R. Alonso, E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators III: Gauge Coupling Dependence and Phenomenology*, *JHEP* **04** (2014) 159 [[1312.2014](#)].
- [38] E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators I: Formalism and lambda Dependence*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 087 [[1308.2627](#)].
- [39] E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators II: Yukawa Dependence*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 035 [[1310.4838](#)].
- [40] J. Aebischer, J. Kumar and D.M. Straub, *: a python package for the running and matching of wilson coefficients above and below the electroweak scale*, *The European Physical Journal C* **78** (2018) .
- [41] F. Boudjema, K. Hagiwara, C. Hamzaoui and K. Numata, *Anomalous moments of quarks and leptons from nonstandard WW γ couplings*, *Phys. Rev. D* **43** (1991) 2223.
- [42] B. Gripaios and D. Sutherland, *Searches for cp -violating dimension-6 electroweak gauge boson operators*, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 076004.
- [43] S. Herrlich and U. Nierste, *Evanescent operators, scheme dependences and double insertions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **455** (1995) 39 [[hep-ph/9412375](#)].
- [44] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, L. Reina and L. Silvestrini, *Leading order QCD corrections to $b \rightarrow s$ gamma and $b \rightarrow s$ g decays in three regularization schemes*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **421** (1994) 41 [[hep-ph/9311357](#)].
- [45] S.M. Barr and A. Zee, *Electric Dipole Moment of the Electron and of the Neutron*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 21.
- [46] W. Dekens, E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar and P. Stoffer, *Non-perturbative effects in $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$* , *JHEP* **01** (2019) 088 [[1810.05675](#)].
- [47] C.W. Murphy, *Dimension-8 operators in the Standard Model Effective Field Theory*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 174 [[2005.00059](#)].

- [48] H.-L. Li, Z. Ren, J. Shu, M.-L. Xiao, J.-H. Yu and Y.-H. Zheng, *Complete set of dimension-eight operators in the standard model effective field theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 015026 [[2005.00008](#)].
- [49] L. Vale Silva, *Effects of squared four-fermion operators of the standard model effective field theory on meson mixing*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 016006 [[2201.03038](#)].
- [50] M. Chala, *Constraints on anomalous dimensions from the positivity of the S matrix*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 015031 [[2301.09995](#)].
- [51] M. Chala and X. Li, *Positivity restrictions on the mixing of dimension-eight SMEFT operators*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 065015 [[2309.16611](#)].
- [52] S.D. Bakshi, M. Chala, A. Díaz-Carmona, Z. Ren and F. Vilches, *Renormalization of the SMEFT to dimension eight: Fermionic interactions I*, *JHEP* **12** (2025) 214 [[2409.15408](#)].
- [53] S. Das Bakshi, M. Chala, A. Díaz-Carmona and G. Guedes, *Towards the renormalisation of the Standard Model effective field theory to dimension eight: bosonic interactions II*, *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **137** (2022) 973 [[2205.03301](#)].
- [54] M. Chala, G. Guedes, M. Ramos and J. Santiago, *Towards the renormalisation of the Standard Model effective field theory to dimension eight: Bosonic interactions I*, *SciPost Phys.* **11** (2021) 065 [[2106.05291](#)].
- [55] S. Davidson and M. Gorbahn, *Charged lepton flavor change and nonstandard neutrino interactions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 015010 [[1909.07406](#)].
- [56] M. Ardu, S. Davidson and M. Gorbahn, *Sensitivity of $\mu \rightarrow e$ processes to τ flavor change*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 096040 [[2202.09246](#)].
- [57] R. Boughezal, Y. Huang and F. Petriello, *Renormalization-group running of dimension-8 four-fermion operators in the SMEFT*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 116015 [[2408.15378](#)].
- [58] S. Hamoudou, J. Kumar and D. London, *Dimension-8 SMEFT matching conditions for the low-energy effective field theory*, *JHEP* **03** (2023) 157 [[2207.08856](#)].