

Comment on ‘‘Observability of the Neutrino Charge Radius’’

K. Fujikawa¹ and R. Shrock²

¹ *Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113, Japan*

² *Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY 11790 USA*

Electromagnetic properties of neutrinos are of fundamental importance and serve as a probe of physics beyond the Standard Model (SM). The conventional understanding of the neutrino charge radius (NCR) is that it is not a physical quantity [1,2], as shown by the fact that it is gauge-dependent [2]. In [3] (denoted BPV; see also [4]), BPV claim that they can extract a gauge-independent NCR which is, therefore, a physical observable. We show here that the BPV claim is incorrect by demonstrating that the NCR is, in general, gauge-dependent. To examine the BPV claim, we use their simplification of neglecting neutrino masses (so that Dirac and Majorana neutrinos are equivalent and there is no lepton mixing). The relevant matrix element is then $\langle \nu_\ell(p') | J_{em,\alpha} | \nu_\ell(p) \rangle = \bar{\nu}_\ell(p') \gamma_\alpha F_1(t) (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_\ell(p)$, and the NCR is $\langle r_{\nu_\ell}^2 \rangle = 6dF_1(t)/dt|_{t=0} \equiv 6F_1'(0)$, where $q = p - p'$ and $t = q^2$. BPV consider the amplitude $A = A_{tree} + A_{1-loop}$ for the reaction $\nu_\mu(p) + e_R(k) \rightarrow \nu_\mu(p') + e_R(k')$ in the high-energy limit where the electron mass can be neglected on external lines so that + helicity = R chirality, where $\psi_{L,R} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma_5)\psi$. In the SM the 2- W exchange diagrams then vanish. Now $d\sigma/dt = |A_{tree}|^2 + 2Re(A_{tree}A_{1-loop}^*)$ plus higher-order terms. To isolate terms, BPV consider the sum [5] $d\sigma(\nu_\mu e_R \rightarrow \nu_\mu e_R)/dt + d\sigma(\bar{\nu}_\mu e_R \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu e_R)/dt$; equivalently we consider $d\sigma(\nu_\mu e_R \rightarrow \nu_\mu e_R)/dt + d\sigma(\nu_\mu e_L^c \rightarrow \nu_\mu e_L^c)/dt$ (specifically the $t \rightarrow 0$ limit). Since for the second term, A_{tree} reverses sign but the 2- Z exchange graphs do not, this sum removes terms from the 2- Z graphs (which are gauge-invariant by themselves). So for this sum, the A_{1-loop} terms arise from the graphs involving γ exchange with ν_ℓ vertex correction (VC) (we give graphs in U gauge but have done the analysis in R_ξ gauge [6]) and Z -exchange with (i) ν_μ VC, (ii) e_R VC, and (iii) Z propagator correction, and a graph with a γ coupling to e_R , mixing to form a Z which couples to ν_μ . In this way, one can extract the gauge-invariant quantity

$$A_{1-loop} = e^2 \left[\frac{F_1(t)}{t} + \frac{F_Z^{\nu\nu}(t) + F_Z^{ee}(t)}{t - M_Z^2} - \frac{\Pi_{ZZ}(t)}{(t - M_Z^2)^2} - \frac{\Pi_{\gamma Z}(t)}{t(t - M_Z^2)} \right] [\bar{u}_R \gamma^\alpha u_R] [\bar{\nu}_\mu \gamma_\alpha (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_\mu] \quad (1)$$

Next, in principle, by measuring the difference $[d\sigma(\nu_\mu + e_R)/dt + d\sigma(\nu_\mu + e_L^c)/dt] - [d\sigma(\nu_\tau + e_R)/dt + d\sigma(\nu_\tau + e_L^c)/dt]$, and using the fact that F_Z^{ee} , Π_{ZZ} , and $\Pi_{\gamma Z}$ are independent of neutrino type, one can extract the difference of $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} [F_1(t)/t + F_Z^{\nu\nu}(t)/(t - M_Z^2)]$ for ν_μ minus ν_τ [3]; this is gauge-invariant and is denoted $(1/6)\Delta\langle r^2 \rangle_{EW,\nu_\mu\nu_\tau}$. However, this does not allow one to

isolate $\Delta F_1'(0)_{\nu_\mu\nu_\tau} = F_1'(0)_{\nu_\mu} - F_1'(0)_{\nu_\tau}$. Indeed, explicit calculation (eqs. (2.30),(2.54) of [2]; see also [7]) shows that $\Delta F_1'(0)_{\nu_\mu\nu_\tau}$ contains a gauge-dependent term which diverges as $(g^2/(2^8\pi^2 M_W^2))(m_\mu^2 - m_\tau^2)/M_W^2 \ln(1/\xi)$ as $\xi \rightarrow 0$. Hence one cannot isolate a physical $\Delta F_1'(0)_{\nu_\mu\nu_\tau}$, much less the individual ν_ℓ NCR's. Note that BPV showed $F_Z^{\nu\nu}(0) = 0$ with their pinch technique (to try to show the observability of $\Delta F_1'(0)_{\nu_\mu\nu_\tau}$) only up to terms of order m_ℓ^2/M_W^2 , but one cannot neglect the gauge-dependent $O(m_\ell^2/M_W^2)$ terms, which can be made arbitrarily large by gauge choice. In the SM, $\Delta\langle r^2 \rangle_{EW,\nu_\mu\nu_\tau}$ describes the interaction with the hypercharge gauge field B_α , not the photon; its gauge invariance allows one to consider the leading term (from eq. (2.57) of [2]), $g^2/(16\pi^2 M_W^2)[\ln(M_W^2/m_\mu^2) - \ln(M_W^2/m_\tau^2)]$. We conclude that, contrary to the BPV claim, one cannot extract a gauge-invariant NCR.

Since a motivation is to probe for new physics, we note that, in general, using the reaction $\nu_\mu + e_R \rightarrow \nu_\mu + e_R$ does not simplify the analysis. Consider beyond-SM theories with strong-EW gauge groups $G_{LR} = SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ and $G_{422} = SU(4)_{PS} \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ (PS=Pati-Salam). Here, the first step in the extraction process fails; the A_L^\pm and A_R^\pm mix to form the mass eigenstates $W_{1,2}^\pm$, and hence one is not able to remove the 2- W exchange diagrams by considering $\nu_\mu e_R \rightarrow \nu_\mu e_R$. Neutrino masses affect neutrino electromagnetic properties (e.g. [2,8]), and our comment also applies to the gauge-dependence of the vector NCR (which vanishes anyway for Majorana neutrinos) and its axial-vector analogue.

-
- [1] W. Bardeen et al., Nucl. Phys. **B46**, 319 (1972).
 - [2] B.W. Lee, R. Shrock, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1444 (1977).
 - [3] J. Bernabeu, J. Papavassiliou, J. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 101802 (2002); erratum *ibid.* **89**, 229902(E) (2002).
 - [4] J. Bernabeu et al., Phys. Rev. D **D62**, 113012 (2000); J. Bernabeu, J. Papavassiliou, J. Vidal, hep-ph/0210055.
 - [5] S. Sarantakos, A. Sirlin, W. Marciano, Nucl. Phys. **B217**, 84 (1983); G. Degrassi et al., Phys. Rev. D **D39**, 287 (1989).
 - [6] K. Fujikawa, B. W. Lee, A. I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. D **6**, 2923 (1972).
 - [7] J. Lucio et al. Phys.Rev.D **D29**, 1539 (1984)(agrees with [2]).
 - [8] M.A.B. Beg et al., Phys Rev. D **17**, 1395 (1978); K. Fujikawa, R. Shrock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 963 (1980); B. Kayser, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 1662 (1982); R. Shrock, Nucl. Phys. **B206**, 359 (1982).