

Field theory of the Fermi function

Richard J. Hill^{1,2,*} and Ryan Plestid^{1,2,3,†}

¹*University of Kentucky, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Lexington, KY 40506, USA*

²*Fermilab, Theoretical Physics Department, Batavia, IL 60510, USA*

³*Walter Burke Institute for Theoretical Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, 91125 USA*

The Fermi function $F(Z, E)$ accounts for QED corrections to beta decays that are enhanced at either small electron velocity β or large nuclear charge Z . For precision applications, the Fermi function must be combined with other radiative corrections and with scale- and scheme-dependent hadronic matrix elements. We formulate the Fermi function as a field theory object and present a new factorization formula for QED radiative corrections to beta decays. We provide new results for the anomalous dimension of the corresponding effective operator complete through three loops, and resum perturbative logarithms and π -enhancements with renormalization group methods. Our results are important for tests of fundamental physics with precision beta decay and related processes.

Introduction. Many precision measurements and new physics searches involve charged leptons interacting with nucleons or nuclei. Examples include neutrino scattering to obtain fundamental neutrino parameters [1–6]; muon-to-electron conversion to search for charged lepton flavor violation [7–10]; and beta decay to measure fundamental constants [11–23] and search for new physics [24–29]. It is important to control radiative corrections to these processes [30–35]. QED corrections are enhanced relative to naive power counting in the fine structure constant $\alpha \approx 1/137$ for large- Z nuclei and for small- β leptons (Z denotes the nuclear charge, and β the lepton velocity). In this *Letter* we present new results for long-distance QED corrections to beta decay [36–38].

The Fermi function in beta decay is an extremely large QED effect [39], representing an $O(1)$ correction to beta decay rates [40]. It describes the enhancement (suppression) for negatively (positively) charged leptons propagating in a nuclear Coulomb field. For a nuclear charge Z and electron energy E it is defined as [39, 40]:

$$F(Z, E) = \frac{2(1 + \eta)}{[\Gamma(2\eta + 1)]^2} [\Gamma(\eta + i\xi)]^2 e^{\pi\xi} (2pr)^{2(\eta-1)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\eta \equiv \sqrt{1 - (Z\alpha)^2}$, $\xi = Z\alpha/\beta$, $p = \sqrt{E^2 - m^2}$ and m is the electron mass. The quantity r denotes a short distance regulator identified approximately as

the nuclear size [41]. Several questions arise in the application of $F(Z, E)$ to physical processes: 1) What is the scale r^{-1} and how does it relate to conventional renormalization in quantum field theory? 2) How can other radiative corrections be included systematically? 3) What is the relation between the Fermi function with $Z = 1$ and the radiative correction to neutron beta decay? Answers to these questions impact the interpretation of modern beta decay experiments. For example, corrections at order $\alpha(Z\alpha)^2 \log(\Lambda_{\text{nuc.}}/E)$ impact beta decay rates of moderate Z nuclei at permille level and must be included at the current precision ($\sim 3 \times 10^{-4}$) of $|V_{ud}|$ extractions [21]. To answer these questions, we re-formulate the Fermi function in effective field theory (EFT), and study its interplay with subleading radiative corrections.

Factorization and all-orders matching. Factorization arises from the separation of different energy scales involved in a physical process [42–44]. In a sequence of EFTs, the components of a factorization formula are identified with a corresponding sequence of matching coefficients, and a final low-energy matrix element.

Consider the corrections to a tree-level contact interaction with a relativistic electron in the final state. Ladder diagrams from a Coulomb potential with source charge $+Ze$ correct the tree level amplitude, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{tree}}$, with explicit loop integrals given by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(p)\mathcal{M} = & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (Ze^2)^n \int \frac{d^D L_1}{(2\pi)^D} \int \frac{d^D L_2}{(2\pi)^D} \cdots \int \frac{d^D L_n}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{1}{\mathbf{L}_1^2 + \lambda^2} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{L}_1 - \mathbf{p})^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 - i0} \\ & \times \frac{1}{(\mathbf{L}_1 - \mathbf{L}_2)^2 + \lambda^2} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{L}_2 - \mathbf{p})^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 - i0} \cdots \frac{1}{(\mathbf{L}_{n-1} - \mathbf{L}_n)^2 + \lambda^2} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{L}_n - \mathbf{p})^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 - i0} \\ & \times \bar{u}(p)\gamma^0(\not{p} - \not{L}_1 + m)\gamma^0(\not{p} - \not{L}_2 + m) \cdots \gamma^0(\not{p} - \not{L}_n + m)\mathcal{M}_{\text{tree}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Integrals are evaluated in dimensional regularization with

$D = 3 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions, and we have included a photon

mass, λ , to regulate infrared divergences [45].

In contrast with the analogous non-relativistic problem [46], the relativistic expression (2) is UV divergent beginning at two-loop order, indicating sensitivity to short-distance structure. The factorization theorem reads [37]

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_S(\lambda/\mu_S)\mathcal{M}_H(p/\mu_S, p/\mu_H)\mathcal{M}_{\text{UV}}(\Lambda/\mu_H), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_H = e^{\frac{\pi}{2}\xi+i\phi_H} \frac{2\Gamma(\eta-i\xi)}{\Gamma(2\eta+1)} \sqrt{\frac{\eta-i\xi}{1-i\xi\frac{m}{E}}} \sqrt{\frac{E+\eta m}{E+m}} \sqrt{\frac{2\eta}{1+\eta}} \left(\frac{2p}{e^{\gamma_E}\mu_H}\right)^{\eta-1} \left[\frac{1+\gamma^0}{2} + \frac{E+m}{E+\eta m} \left(1-i\xi\frac{m}{E}\right) \frac{1-\gamma^0}{2}\right], \quad (4)$$

where $\phi_H = \xi \left(\log \frac{2p}{\mu_S} - \gamma_E\right) - (\eta-1)\frac{\pi}{2}$, γ^0 is a Dirac matrix, and $\gamma_E \approx 0.577$ is the Euler constant.

The leading-in- Z radiative correction to unpolarized observables from the soft and hard functions is given by

$$\langle |\mathcal{M}_H|^2 \rangle = F(Z, E)|_{r_H} \times \frac{4\eta}{(1+\eta)^2}, \quad (5)$$

where we define $r_H^{-1} = \mu_H e^{\gamma_E}$. The angle brackets denote contraction with lepton spinors, $\mathcal{M}_H \rightarrow \bar{e}\mathcal{M}_H\gamma^0\nu_L$, sum over final state spins, and division by the same expression in the absence of Coulomb corrections. Note that there is a finite multiplicative correction relating the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ hard function to $F(Z, E)$.

Effective operators and anomalous dimension.

The structure-dependent factor \mathcal{M}_{UV} appearing in Eq. (3) depends on the process of interest. Important examples are beta decay transitions $[A, Z] \rightarrow [A, Z+1]e^-\bar{\nu}_e$ or $[A, Z+1] \rightarrow [A, Z]e^+\nu_e$. Superallowed beta decays are governed by an EFT consisting of QED for electrons, and heavy charged scalar fields [50–53],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\mathcal{C}(\phi_v^{[A, Z+1]})^* \phi_v^{[A, Z]} \bar{e}\not{p}(1-\gamma_5)\nu_e + \text{H.c.}, \quad (6)$$

where $\phi_v^{[A, Z]}$ denotes a heavy scalar with electric charge Z whose momentum fluctuations are expanded about $p^\mu = M_{[A, Z]}v^\mu$, with $v^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ in the nuclear rest frame. For neutron decay, the EFT involves spin-1/2 heavy fields [50–53],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -\bar{h}_v^{(p)} (\mathcal{C}_V \not{v}^\mu + \mathcal{C}_A \gamma^\mu \gamma_5) h_v^{(n)} \bar{e}\not{v}^\mu (1-\gamma_5)\nu_e + \text{H.c.}, \quad (7)$$

where $h_v^{(p)}$ and $h_v^{(n)}$ denote spin-1/2 heavy fields with electric charge 1 and 0, respectively. Matching to the EFT represented by Eqs. (6) or (7), we identify the components of (3) in terms of operator coefficients and matrix elements: \mathcal{M}_{UV} is proportional to (a linear combination of) \mathcal{C}_i , while \mathcal{M}_H and \mathcal{M}_S give the hard and soft contributions to the EFT matrix element. In \mathcal{M}_H , at each

counting $p \sim m \sim E$ and where Λ denotes the scale of hadronic and nuclear structure. After $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization, to all orders in $Z\alpha$, the soft function is given by $\mathcal{M}_S = \exp(i\xi \log \frac{\mu}{\lambda})$ [47, 48]. Our result for the hard function is new [37], and is given (again to all orders in $Z\alpha$) by [49]

order in α , the leading power of Z is given by the explicit expression (4).

We may proceed to analyze the renormalization group properties of weak-current operators in the EFT. Radiative corrections enhanced by large logarithms, $L \sim \log(\Lambda_{\text{nuc.}}/E)$, are determined by the anomalous dimensions of the operators in (6) and (7), which are spin-structure independent, i.e., $\gamma_A = \gamma_V = \gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$. Writing

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mathcal{O}} &= \frac{d \log \mathcal{C}}{d \log \mu} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} \left(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\right)^{n+1} \gamma_n^{(i)} Z^{n+1-i} \\ &\equiv \gamma^{(0)}(Z\alpha) + \alpha\gamma^{(1)}(Z\alpha) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

we note several interesting all-orders properties:

- Powers of Z greater than the power of α do not appear [54].
- The leading series involving $(Z\alpha)^n$ sums to

$$\gamma^{(0)} = \sqrt{1 - (Z\alpha)^2} - 1. \quad (9)$$

This result is obtained by differentiating Eq. (4) with respect to μ_H .

- At each order in perturbation theory, the leading and first subleading powers of Z are related [55],

$$\gamma_{2n-1}^{(1)} = n\gamma_{2n-1}^{(0)}, \quad \gamma_{2n}^{(2)} = n\gamma_{2n}^{(1)} \quad (n \geq 1). \quad (10)$$

When $Z = 0$, the problem reduces to a heavy-light current operator. Using our new result for $\gamma_2^{(1)} = 16\pi^2(6 - \pi^2/3)$ [36] and property (10), the complete result through three-loop order at arbitrary Z is

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mathcal{O}} &= \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} \gamma_0^{(1)} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\right)^2 \left[-8\pi^2 Z(Z+1) + \gamma_1^{(2)}\right] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\right)^3 \left[16\pi^2 Z(Z+1) \left(6 - \frac{\pi^2}{3}\right) + \gamma_2^{(3)}\right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\gamma_{n-1}^{(n)}$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, are known from the heavy quark literature [56]. Our result for $\gamma_2^{(1)}$ disagrees




FIG. 1. Radiative correction to the beta decay rate as a function of nuclear charge, normalized to leading Fermi function. Black, red, blue and green curves show results correct through resummed order α^0 , $\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}$, α and $\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}$ respectively. Illustrative values $E_0 = 2$ MeV, $\Delta_0 = 5$ MeV, $\Lambda_0 = 100$ MeV are used for the electron energy, nuclear mass difference (which enters the one-loop matrix element [30]), and fixed renormalization scale $\mu_H = \Lambda_0$. The width of the curves is given by varying $m_e < \mu_L < \Delta_0$.

with Ref. [31]. Note that properties (9) and (10) also determine the anomalous dimension at order $Z^4\alpha^4$ and $Z^3\alpha^4$.

Renormalization group analysis. Consider the solution to the renormalization group equation

$$d \log \mathcal{C} = \frac{\gamma(\alpha)}{\beta(\alpha)} d\alpha, \quad (12)$$

where α is the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ QED coupling (for one dynamical electron flavor) and $\beta = d\alpha/d \log \mu = -2\alpha[\beta_0\alpha/(4\pi) + \beta_1\alpha^2/(4\pi)^2 + \dots]$ [57]. Expanding γ and β in powers of α and Z , then integrating, we obtain a systematic expansion for the ratio of the renormalized operator coefficient at different scales, $C(\mu_H)/C(\mu_L)$. Setting $\mu_H \sim \Lambda$ and

$\mu_L \sim m$, we thus resum large logarithms $\log(\Lambda/m)$. Let us consider several regimes of Z :

- *Large Z asymptotics.*

Consider a large Z nucleus, counting $\log^2(\Lambda/m) \sim \alpha^{-1}$ and $Z \sim \alpha^{-1}$. Through $O(\alpha^{1/2})$,

$$\log \left(\frac{C(\mu_L)}{C(\mu_H)} \right) = \left[-\gamma^{(0)}(Z\alpha_L)L \right] + \left[b_0\alpha_L L^2 \frac{(Z\alpha_L)^2}{2\sqrt{1-(Z\alpha_L)^2}} \right] + \left[b_0^2\alpha_L^2 L^3 \frac{(Z\alpha_L)^2(3-2(Z\alpha_L)^2)}{6(1-(Z\alpha_L)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \alpha_L L \gamma^{(1)}(Z\alpha_L) \right], \quad (13)$$

where $\alpha_{H,L} \equiv \alpha(\mu_{H,L})$, $L = \log(\mu_H/\mu_L)$, and $b_0 = -\beta_0/(2\pi)$. Resummation in $Z\alpha$ is an important effect for large Z nuclei [40]. Consider separately the terms in $\gamma^{(1)}$ with odd and even powers of $(Z\alpha)$. Using property (10),

$$\gamma_{\text{odd}}^{(1)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial(Z\alpha)} \gamma^{(0)} = \frac{-Z\alpha}{2\sqrt{1-(Z\alpha)^2}}. \quad (14)$$

The corresponding decay rate corrections involve (less the known $Z\alpha^2$ correction)

$$\delta \frac{|C(\mu_L)|^2}{|C(\mu_H)|^2} - \alpha(Z\alpha) \log \frac{\Lambda}{E} = \alpha \log \frac{\Lambda}{E} \left[\frac{1}{2}(Z\alpha)^3 + \frac{3}{8}(Z\alpha)^5 + \dots \right]. \quad (15)$$

This exact result replaces the ansatz of Wilkinson [40, 58], with differences beginning at order $Z^3\alpha^4$. The even series, $\gamma_{\text{even}}^{(1)}$, is determined through three loop order by Eq. (11).

- *Intermediate Z .*

Consider a medium Z nucleus, counting $\log^2(\Lambda/m) \sim Z^2 \sim \alpha^{-1}$. Through $O(\alpha^{3/2})$, the scale dependence is

$$\log \left(\frac{C(\mu_L)}{C(\mu_H)} \right) = \frac{\gamma_0^{(1)}}{2\beta_0} \left\{ \left[\log \frac{a_H}{a_L} + \frac{Z^2\gamma_1^{(0)}}{\gamma_0^{(1)}} (a_H - a_L) \right] + \left[\frac{Z\gamma_1^{(1)}}{\gamma_0^{(1)}} (a_H - a_L) \right] + \left[\left(\frac{\gamma_1^{(2)}}{\gamma_0^{(1)}} - \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0} \right) (a_H - a_L) + \left(\frac{Z^2\gamma_2^{(1)}}{\gamma_0^{(1)}} - \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0} \frac{Z^2\gamma_1^{(0)}}{\gamma_0^{(1)}} \right) \frac{1}{2}(a_H^2 - a_L^2) + \frac{Z^4\gamma_3^{(0)}}{\gamma_0^{(1)}} \frac{1}{3}(a_H^3 - a_L^3) \right] \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where $a_{H,L} = \alpha(\mu_{H,L})/(4\pi)$ and the square brackets

account for effects at order $\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}$, α^1 , $\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}$, etc.

This “intermediate” regime of Z applies to typical nuclei employed for V_{ud} determinations using super-allowed nuclear beta decay, with $\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sim Z \sim \log(\Lambda^2/m^2) \sim 10$. Achieving permille precision thus demands proper treatment of terms through resummed order $\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}$ in Eq. (16). This result replaces (and disagrees with) logarithmically enhanced contributions at order $Z^2\alpha^3$ in the “heuristic estimate” of Sirlin and Zucchini [59]. Using our new result for $\gamma_2^{(1)}$ [36] we investigate the convergence of perturbation theory in Fig. 1. Here we fix μ_H , and plot the product of $|C(\mu_L)/C(\mu_H)|^2$ and the squared operator matrix element at μ_L , varying μ_L as an estimate of perturbative uncertainty [60]. We note that the results presented here are in fact sufficient for a resummation valid through $O(\alpha^2)$, although for practical applications this would demand currently unknown operator matrix elements.

- *Neutron beta decay.*

Neutron beta decay corresponds to the case $Z = 0$; we therefore define $\gamma_{n-1} \equiv \gamma_{n-1}^{(n)}$. Again counting $\log^2(\Lambda/m) \sim \alpha^{-1}$, the resummation is [61]

$$\log\left(\frac{C(\mu_L)}{C(\mu_H)}\right) = \frac{\gamma_0}{2\beta_0} \left\{ \log\frac{a_H}{a_L} + \left(\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_0} - \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0}\right) (a_H - a_L) \right\}, \quad (17)$$

where the first term is of order $\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and the second term is of order $\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}$. The complete result, correct through order $\alpha^{\frac{3}{2}}$, is obtained using (17) together with the one-loop low-energy matrix element

Even after resumming logarithms in the ratio of hadronic and electron mass scales, $\log(\Lambda/m)$, large coefficients remain in the perturbative expansion of the hard matrix element. While the class of amplitudes summed in the Fermi function are enhanced at small β and large Z , neither limit holds for neutron beta decay [62]. The large coefficients can instead be traced to an analytic continuation of the decay amplitude from spacelike to timelike values of momentum transfers. The enhancements are systematically resummed by renormalization of the hard factor \mathcal{M}_H in the factorization formula (3) from negative to positive values of μ_S^2 [38] (*cf.* Refs. [63, 64]). The dependence of \mathcal{M}_H on μ_S is governed (to all orders) by the cusp anomalous dimension,

$$\mathcal{M}_H(\mu_{S+}) = e^{i\alpha\phi_\beta} \exp\left[\frac{\pi\alpha}{2\beta}\right] \mathcal{M}_H(\mu_{S-}^2), \quad (18)$$

with $\mu_{S\pm}^2 = \pm 4p^2 - i0$ and the phase $\phi_\beta = \frac{1}{2}(-1 + \frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta})$. The hard contribution to the physical

matrix element is given on the right hand side of Eq. (18) in terms of an irrelevant phase factor, an enhancement factor $\exp[\pi\alpha/(2\beta)]$, and \mathcal{M}_H evaluated at negative μ_S^2 . The latter matrix element is free of π -enhancements. This analysis systematically resums π -enhanced contributions, and does not rely on a non-relativistic approximation. The result (18) differs from the nonrelativistic Fermi function ansatz [32, 65] beginning at two loop order.

Discussion. We have studied the all-orders factorization of long-distance QED corrections in beta decay. This includes leading- Z resummation traditionally treated with the Fermi function, and subleading corrections in α . Our EFT analysis allows us to systematically resum large perturbative logarithms, and to incorporate corrections that are suppressed by $1/Z$ or E/Λ . New results include:

1. New coefficients in the expansion of the anomalous dimension for beta decay operators. We have computed the order $Z^2\alpha^3$ coefficient for the first time [66], and found a new symmetry linking leading- Z and subleading- Z terms in the perturbative expansion. Using our new result, and the existing HQET literature, we show that the first unknown coefficient occurs at four loops, at order $Z^2\alpha^4$ [36].
2. New results for the large- Z asymptotics of QED radiative corrections to beta decay. We supply the infinite series of terms of order $\alpha(Z\alpha)^{2n+1} \log(\Lambda/E)$, replacing Wilkinson’s ansatz, and present a new result for the term of order $\alpha(Z\alpha)^2 \log(\Lambda/E)$, replacing Sirlin’s heuristic estimate. We provide the EFT matrix element to all orders in $Z\alpha$ and clarify its relation to the historically employed Fermi function [37].
3. An all-orders resummation of “ π -enhanced” terms in neutron beta decay, replacing the Fermi function ansatz. This substantially improves the convergence of perturbation theory, and is important for modern applications to neutron beta decay [38].

Each of these results has important phenomenological implications for ongoing and near-term precision beta decay programs [13, 16, 22, 67–82]. Detailed computations are presented elsewhere [36–38]. Related work on new eikonal identities for charged current processes is presented in Ref. [83]. The same formalism applies to any situation where a charged lepton appears in a reaction with a nucleus, provided its energy is small compared to the inverse nuclear radius. Future work will address factorization at subleading power, and investigate the impact on phenomenology including hadronic [12, 35] and nuclear [15, 84] matching uncertainties.

Acknowledgments. We thank Susan Gardner and Oleksandr Tomalak for useful discussions regarding radiative corrections for beta decays, and Peter Vander Griend for collaboration on Ref. [38]. RP thanks the Institute for Nuclear Theory at the University of Washington for its kind hospitality and stimulating research environment during program INT 23-1B. This research was supported in part by the INT’s U.S. Department of Energy grant No. DE-FG02-00ER41132. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, under Award DE-SC0019095. Fermilab is operated by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the United States Department of Energy. RP is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, under Award Number DE-SC0011632 and by the Walter Burke Institute for Theoretical Physics. RP acknowledges support from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, under Award Number DE-SC0011632 and the Neutrino Theory Network Program Grant under Award Number DEAC02-07CH11359 and the US DOE under Award Number DE-SC0020250. RJH gratefully acknowledges support from the Institute for Advanced Study, where a part of this work was completed.

* richard.hill@uky.edu

† rplestid@caltech.edu

- [1] H. Nunokawa, S. J. Parke, and J. W. F. Valle, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **60**, 338 (2008), arXiv:0710.0554 [hep-ph].
- [2] K. Abe et al. (Hyper-Kamiokande Working Group) (2014) arXiv:1412.4673 [physics.ins-det].
- [3] M. V. Diwan, V. Galymov, X. Qian, and A. Rubbia, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **66**, 47 (2016), arXiv:1608.06237 [hep-ex].
- [4] M. A. Acero et al. (NOvA), *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 032004 (2022), arXiv:2108.08219 [hep-ex].
- [5] K. Abe et al. (T2K), *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 112008 (2021), arXiv:2101.03779 [hep-ex].
- [6] B. Abi et al. (DUNE), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 978 (2020), arXiv:2006.16043 [hep-ex].
- [7] A. de Gouvea and P. Vogel, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **71**, 75 (2013), arXiv:1303.4097 [hep-ph].
- [8] R. H. Bernstein and P. S. Cooper, *Phys. Rept.* **532**, 27 (2013), arXiv:1307.5787 [hep-ex].
- [9] M. Lee, *Front. in Phys.* **6** (2018), 10.3389/fphy.2018.00133.
- [10] R. H. Bernstein (Mu2e), *Front. in Phys.* **7**, 1 (2019), arXiv:1901.11099 [physics.ins-det].
- [11] P. Bopp, D. Dubbers, L. Hornig, E. Klemt, J. Last, H. Schutze, S. J. Freedman, and O. Scharpf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 919 (1986), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **57**, 1192 (1986)].
- [12] S. Ando, H. W. Fearing, V. P. Gudkov, K. Kubodera, F. Myhrer, S. Nakamura, and T. Sato, *Phys. Lett. B* **595**, 250 (2004), arXiv:nucl-th/0402100.
- [13] G. Darius et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 042502 (2017).
- [14] C.-Y. Seng, M. Gorchtein, H. H. Patel, and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 241804 (2018), arXiv:1807.10197 [hep-ph].
- [15] C. Y. Seng, M. Gorchtein, and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 013001 (2019), arXiv:1812.03352 [nucl-th].
- [16] J. Fry et al., *EPJ Web Conf.* **219**, 04002 (2019), arXiv:1811.10047 [nucl-ex].
- [17] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano, and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 073008 (2019), arXiv:1907.06737 [hep-ph].
- [18] L. Hayen, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 113001 (2021), arXiv:2010.07262 [hep-ph].
- [19] C.-Y. Seng, X. Feng, M. Gorchtein, and L.-C. Jin, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 111301 (2020), arXiv:2003.11264 [hep-ph].
- [20] M. Gorchtein and C.-Y. Seng, *JHEP* **10**, 053 (2021), arXiv:2106.09185 [hep-ph].
- [21] J. C. Hardy and I. S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **102**, 045501 (2020).
- [22] F. M. Gonzalez et al. (UCN τ), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 162501 (2021), arXiv:2106.10375 [nucl-ex].
- [23] K. Shiells, P. G. Blunden, and W. Melnitchouk, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 033003 (2021), arXiv:2012.01580 [hep-ph].
- [24] V. Cirigliano, S. Gardner, and B. Holstein, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **71**, 93 (2013), arXiv:1303.6953 [hep-ph].
- [25] A. Glick-Magid, Y. Mishnayot, I. Mukul, M. Hass, S. Vaintraub, G. Ron, and D. Gazit, *Phys. Lett. B* **767**, 285 (2017), arXiv:1609.03268 [nucl-ex].
- [26] M. González-Alonso, O. Naviliat-Cuncic, and N. Severijns, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **104**, 165 (2019), arXiv:1803.08732 [hep-ph].
- [27] A. Glick-Magid, C. Forssén, D. Gazda, D. Gazit, P. Gysbers, and P. Navrátil, *Phys. Lett. B* **832**, 137259 (2022), arXiv:2107.10212 [nucl-th].
- [28] A. Falkowski, M. González-Alonso, A. Palavrić, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, (2021), arXiv:2112.07688 [hep-ph].
- [29] M. Brodeur et al. (2023) arXiv:2301.03975 [nucl-ex].
- [30] A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev.* **164**, 1767 (1967).
- [31] W. Jaus, *Phys. Lett. B* **40**, 616 (1972).
- [32] D. H. Wilkinson, *Nucl. Phys. A* **377**, 474 (1982).
- [33] A. Sirlin and R. Zucchini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 1994 (1986).
- [34] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano, and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 093006 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0406324 [hep-ph].
- [35] V. Cirigliano, J. de Vries, L. Hayen, E. Mereghetti, and A. Walker-Loud, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 121801 (2022), arXiv:2202.10439 [nucl-th].
- [36] R. J. Hill and R. Plestid, “Renormalization of beta decay at three and four loops,” In preparation (2023).
- [37] R. J. Hill and R. Plestid, “All orders factorization and the Coulomb problem,” To appear (2023).
- [38] P. Vander Griend, R. J. Hill, and R. Plestid, “Resummation of infrared π -enhancements and neutron beta decay,” In preparation (2023).
- [39] E. Fermi, *Z. Phys.* **88**, 161 (1934).
- [40] L. Hayen, N. Severijns, K. Bodek, D. Rozpedzik, and X. Mougeot, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015008 (2018), arXiv:1709.07530 [nucl-th].
- [41] The ambiguity in defining r is often resolved by including an explicit nuclear charge density distribution [40]. This procedure does not address how to interface the Fermi function with EFT matching conditions, or how to prop-

- erly interface with higher-order radiative corrections.
- [42] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. F. Sterman, *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.* **5**, 1 (1989), arXiv:hep-ph/0409313.
- [43] G. T. Bodwin, E. Braaten, and G. P. Lepage, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 1125 (1995), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* **55**, 5853 (1997)], arXiv:hep-ph/9407339.
- [44] C. W. Bauer, S. Fleming, D. Pirjol, I. Z. Rothstein, and I. W. Stewart, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 014017 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0202088.
- [45] Parameter λ may be interpreted physically as the scale of atomic screening, which influences decay rates at sub-leading power [40].
- [46] The classic Sommerfeld enhancement is obtained in a perturbative expansion by replacing the Dirac structures in the last line of (2) with $2m$ in every propagator. This renders the problem UV finite. See Ref. [37] for a more detailed discussion.
- [47] D. Yennie, S. C. Frautschi, and H. Suura, *Annals Phys.* **13**, 379 (1961).
- [48] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, B516 (1965).
- [49] Covariant expressions are obtained by replacing $\beta \rightarrow \sqrt{1 - E^2/m^2}$, $\gamma_0 \rightarrow v_\mu \gamma^\mu$, and $E \rightarrow v_\mu p^\mu$ where v_μ is the reference vector introduced in Eqs. (6) and (7).
- [50] W. E. Caswell and G. P. Lepage, *Phys. Lett. B* **167**, 437 (1986).
- [51] H. Georgi, *Phys. Lett. B* **240**, 447 (1990).
- [52] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, *Heavy quark physics*, Vol. 10 (2000).
- [53] G. Paz, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **30**, 1550128 (2015), arXiv:1503.07216 [hep-ph].
- [54] This can be shown explicitly using heavy particle Feynman rules in Coulomb gauge, and confirms an old theorem due to Sirlin and Bég [85].
- [55] More generally, the anomalous dimension at a given order n in α is a linear combination of powers $Z^i(1+Z)^i$, where $2i \leq n$. This is a consequence of symmetries that emerge in the limit of a massless lepton [36].
- [56] The relevant results are $\gamma_0^{(1)} = -3$ [30] at one-loop, $\gamma_1^{(2)} = -16\zeta_2 + \frac{5}{2} + \frac{10}{3}n_e$ at two-loops [86], and $\gamma_2^{(3)} = -80\zeta_4 - 36\zeta_3 + 64\zeta_2 - \frac{37}{2} + n_e(-\frac{176}{3}\zeta_3 + \frac{448}{9}\zeta_2 + \frac{470}{9}) + \frac{140}{27}n_e^2$ at three-loops [87] with $n_e = 1$ for the number of dynamical charged leptons. The application of $\gamma_0^{(1)}$, $\gamma_1^{(2)}$ and $\gamma_2^{(3)}$ to neutron beta decay has been discussed in Ref. [65].
- [57] Analytic results for the QED beta function are available through five loops [88, 89]. For our purposes we require $\beta_0 = -(4/3)n_f$ and $\beta_1 = -4n_f$ (for $n_f = 1$), cf. Ref. [90].
- [58] D. Wilkinson, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **401**, 275 (1997).
- [59] The heuristic estimate [33] uses results from Ref. [31] and is defined relative to the contributions contained in $F(Z, E)(1 + \delta_1 + \delta_2)$, where $F(Z, E)$ is the classical Fermi function, δ_1 determines the order α correction, and δ_2 determines the $Z\alpha^2$ correction.
- [60] We include the full $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ matrix element [30] (translated to $\overline{\text{MS}}$ in heavy particle effective theory). For this comparison we include only the scale-dependent logarithm, $\log(\mu/m_e)$, in the $\alpha(Z\alpha)$ matrix element [33].
- [61] The two-loop anomalous dimension γ_1 and other sub-leading two-loop corrections were omitted in the leading-logarithm analysis of Ref. [34]. Reference [65] included γ_1 in the RGE evolution between nucleon and electron-mass scales.
- [62] At tree level, less than 0.1% of the total decay rate involves electron velocity $\beta < 0.1$, and less than 10% of the rate involves $\beta < 0.5$.
- [63] V. Ahrens, T. Becher, M. Neubert, and L. L. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 033013 (2009), arXiv:0808.3008 [hep-ph].
- [64] V. Ahrens, T. Becher, M. Neubert, and L. L. Yang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **62**, 333 (2009), arXiv:0809.4283 [hep-ph].
- [65] V. Cirigliano, W. Dekens, E. Mereghetti, and O. Tomalak, (2023), arXiv:2306.03138 [hep-ph].
- [66] Existing calculations [31] for order $Z^2\alpha^3$ terms included only a subset of diagrams and are therefore incomplete estimates.
- [67] M. A. P. Brown et al. (UCNA), *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 035505 (2018), arXiv:1712.00884 [nucl-ex].
- [68] P. D. Shidling et al., *Phys. Rev. C* **90**, 032501 (2014), arXiv:1407.1742 [nucl-ex].
- [69] M. Eibach et al., *Phys. Rev. C* **92**, 045502 (2015).
- [70] M. G. Sternberg et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 182501 (2015).
- [71] K. Gulyuz et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 012501 (2016).
- [72] B. Fenker et al., *New J. Phys.* **18**, 073028 (2016), arXiv:1602.04526 [physics.atom-ph].
- [73] J. Long et al., *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 015502 (2017).
- [74] B. Fenker et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 062502 (2018), arXiv:1706.00414 [nucl-ex].
- [75] M. Brodeur, J. Kelly, J. Long, C. Nicoloff, and B. Schultz, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. B* **376**, 281 (2016).
- [76] Shidling, P. D. and others, *Phys. Rev. C* **98**, 015502 (2018).
- [77] A. A. Valverde et al., *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 035503 (2018).
- [78] P. D. O'Malley et al., *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. B* **463**, 488 (2020).
- [79] D. P. Burdette et al., *Phys. Rev. C* **101**, 055504 (2020).
- [80] J. Long et al., *Phys. Rev. C* **101**, 015501 (2020).
- [81] P. Müller et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 182502 (2022), arXiv:2206.00742 [nucl-ex].
- [82] J. Long et al., *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, 045501 (2022).
- [83] R. Plestid, "Generalized eikonal identities for charged currents," To appear (2023).
- [84] M. Gennari et al., "Standard model corrections to fermi transitions in light nuclei," (2023), INT PROGRAM 23-1B, *New physics searches at the precision frontier*.
- [85] M. A. B. Beg, J. Bernstein, and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 270 (1969).
- [86] X.-D. Ji and M. J. Musolf, *Phys. Lett. B* **257**, 409 (1991).
- [87] K. G. Chetyrkin and A. G. Grozin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **666**, 289 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0303113.
- [88] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn, and J. Rittinger, *JHEP* **07**, 017 (2012), arXiv:1206.1284 [hep-ph].
- [89] F. Herzog, B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J. A. M. Vermaseren, and A. Vogt, *JHEP* **02**, 090 (2017), arXiv:1701.01404 [hep-ph].
- [90] R. J. Hill, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 013001 (2017), arXiv:1605.02613 [hep-ph].