

Improved precision in inverse beta decay cross section

Giulia Ricciardi,^{a,b,*} Natascia Vignaroli^{c,d} and Francesco Vissani^e

^a*Departmento di Fisica E. Pancini, Università di Napoli Federico II,
Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo, Via Cinthia, Napoli (NA), Italy*

^b*INFN, Sezione di Napoli,
Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo, Via Cinthia, Napoli (NA), Italy*

^c*Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica E. De Giorgi, Università del Salento, 73100 Lecce (LE), Italy*

^d*INFN, Sezione di Lecce, 73100 Lecce (LE), Italy*

^e*INFN, Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso,
67100 Assergi, L'Aquila (AQ), Italy.*

*E-mail: giulia.ricciardi2@iunina.it, natascia.vignaroli@le.infn.it,
francesco.vissani@lngs.infn.it*

We analyze the cross section for inverse beta decay, focusing on the moderate energies (a few MeV to hundreds of MeV) relevant for reactor and supernova neutrinos. We discuss the updated evaluations of values and uncertainties in the cross section, and the effect of second-class currents. The estimate of theoretical precision is important for current and future experiments, when large data samples are or become available.

*Speaker

1. Introduction

The cross section of the inverse beta decay (IBD) is by far the most important mechanism of interaction of low-energy antineutrinos at relatively low energies for detectors that are based on water or hydrocarbons, i.e. the most commonly used detectors such as scintillators or Cherenkov light detectors.

We mainly follow Ref. [1], which updates previous estimates of IBD cross section provided more than 20 years ago [2, 3]. The update considers recent experimental advances, improvements in reaction parameters, and the role of second-class currents (SCCs), which were previously omitted. We emphasize the importance of refining both the cross-section value and its uncertainty in an energy ranges about 3-70 MeV. That concerns the detection of reactor antineutrinos, e.g. at Daya Bay, whose full data sample contains 5.55×10^6 reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$ candidates identified as IBD interactions, and at the future detector JUNO, which expects to collect 83 events/day. That also concerns studies of neutrinos from supernovae, e.g. at Super-Kamiokande and JUNO, which anticipate to collect more than 5000 IBD events for a typical galactic distance of 10kpc. An higher statistics is expected from the future Hyper-Kamiokande detector, which will have a mass about 10 times greater than Super-Kamiokande. The conservative 0.4% uncertainty estimate found in older papers [3] turns out to be quite significant for large statistical samples, calling for a reassessment of the estimate.

Within these energy ranges, we identify [1] the primary uncertainties for the required level of accuracy, which are due to:

- the Cabibbo angle and the axial coupling (at lower energies);
- the vector axial radius r_A (at higher energies).

In the following, we describe the key points of the theoretical cross section calculation and discuss the associated uncertainties.

2. Inverse beta decay cross section

One possible formulation of the most general matrix element of the charged weak current between proton and neutron states is

$$\mathcal{J}_\mu = \bar{u}_n \left(f_1 \gamma_\mu + g_1 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 + i f_2 \sigma_{\mu\nu} \frac{q^\nu}{2M} + g_2 \frac{q_\mu}{M} \gamma_5 + f_3 \frac{q_\mu}{M} + i g_3 \sigma_{\mu\nu} \frac{q^\nu}{2M} \gamma_5 \right) u_p \quad (1)$$

This current includes all possible independent terms which can be constructed from the Dirac γ matrices and the hadronic quadrivectors p_p and p_n . The six scalar form factors depend upon the four-momentum transfer squared $t = q^2 = -Q^2$, where $q = p_\nu - p_e = p_n - p_p$. The form factors f_1 , f_2 and f_3 are generally referred to, respectively, as vector, weak magnetism and scalar. The terms including them represent the vector part of the current. The terms including g_1 , g_2 and g_3 represent the axial part of the current. The vector and axial-vector currents of the SM with form factors f_1 , f_2 , g_1 and g_2 are first class currents, the vector and axial vector currents with form factors f_3 and g_3 are second class currents.

We have calculated the cross section for the inverse beta decay, that is the process

$$\bar{\nu}_e(p_\nu) + p(p_p) \rightarrow e^+(p_e) + n(p_n) \quad (2)$$

We have defined

$$\Delta = m_n - m_p \approx 1.293 \text{ MeV} \quad M = \frac{m_n + m_p}{2} \approx 938.9 \text{ MeV} \quad (3)$$

The differential cross section is given by

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \frac{G_F^2 \cos^2 \theta_C}{64\pi(s - m_p^2)^2} \overline{|\mathcal{M}^2|} \quad (4)$$

where G_F is the Fermi coupling, θ_C the Cabibbo angle (that is linked to the $u - d$ element of the CKM matrix by $\cos \theta_C = V_{ud}$) and the matrix element is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} = & \bar{v}_\nu \gamma^a (1 - \gamma_5) v_e \cdot \\ & \bar{u}_n \left(f_1 \gamma_a + g_1 \gamma_a \gamma_5 + i f_2 \sigma_{ab} \frac{q^b}{2M} + g_2 \frac{q_a}{M} \gamma_5 + f_3 \frac{q_a}{M} + i g_3 \sigma_{ab} \frac{q^b}{2M} \gamma_5 \right) u_p. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

A straightforward calculation gives

$$\overline{|\mathcal{M}^2|} = A_{\bar{\nu}}(t) - (s - u) B_{\bar{\nu}}(t) + (s - u)^2 C_{\bar{\nu}}(t) \quad (6)$$

where $s = (p_\nu + p_p)^2$, $t = q^2 = (p_\nu - p_e)^2 < 0$, $u = (p_\nu - p_n)^2$ are the usual Mandelstam variables. The analytical formulas of the functions $A_{\bar{\nu}}(t)$, $B_{\bar{\nu}}(t)$, $C_{\bar{\nu}}(t)$, which include second class currents, are given in Ref. [1].

3. Uncertainties

The radiative corrections in QED to the cross section are calculated at leading order and included. Corrections at the next order and other effects, such as isospin breaking, are estimated to be small. Hence, the primary uncertainties arise from input parameters, whose significance is different at lower or higher energies [1]:

1. The main source for uncertainty on the IBD cross section under a few tens of MeVs is due to the uncertainties on two input constants: the value of the CKM matrix element V_{ud} , that multiplies the amplitude of transition, and that of the axial coupling $g_1(0) = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} g_1(q^2)$ in Eq. (1).
2. At higher energies, on the other hand, the uncertainty depends also on the behavior of the form factors as Q^2 varies and thus on the parameters that describe such behavior, such as the axial mass M_A , or more precisely, the axial radius r_A .

We discuss these two regions separately.

3.1 The lower energy region

The direct way to extract $V_{ud} = \cos \theta_C$ is to use the measurements of the super-allowed (s.a.) $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ charged current transitions. Being pure vector transitions, they only depend on the better understood vector form factors. From 2006 to 2020, Hardy and Towner produced analyses of all decays this way, with the more recent estimate [4] $|V_{ud}(\text{s.a.})| = 0.9737(3)$, which we have adopted

in Ref. [1]. The extraction of $|V_{ud}(s.a.)|$ depends on the so-called inner or universal electroweak radiative corrections (RC) to superallowed nuclear beta decays. These have been recently calculated by a dispersion relation (DR) calculational approach [5]. An average including the DR result has been provided in Ref. [6] and give a more precise value for the RC corrections, which leads to $|V_{ud}(s.a.)| = 0.97367(11)_{exp}(13)_{RC}(27)_{NS}$, where RC and NS are the uncertainties associated to the radiative corrections and nuclear structure, respectively. The first lattice QCD calculation of the RC contributions yields $|V_{ud}(s.a.)| = 0.97386(11)_{exp}(9)_{RC}(27)_{NS}$ [7]. The two have the same the total error, (32), and are consistent. These new results confirm the reasoning leading to choice made in Ref. [1].

An indirect determination of $|V_{us}|$ follows from noting that, in the context of the SM, the CKM matrix is unitary. Using the value $|V_{ud}(s.a.)|$ along with two determinations of $|V_{us}| = 0.22431(85)$ with $S=2.5$ [8] and $|V_{ub}| = 3.84(26) \times 10^{-3}$ given by averaging inclusive and exclusive decays [9], which is consistent with CKMfitter $|V_{ub}| = 3.64(7) \times 10^{-3}$ at 0.8σ , the first row unitarity requirement seems to be violated. According to which experiment to measure the CKM parameters and inputs, this discrepancy goes from (about) 1 to 3σ . This has fueled speculation regarding possible BSM models that could be driving deviations of the CKM matrix from unitarity. However, considering the statistical consistency of this relatively weak inference and the success of the SM at the relevant energies, we believe it is reasonable to assume that this anomaly simply indicates the limits of current interpretations and measurements.

The axial coupling is often expressed as the ratio $\lambda = -g_1(0)/f_1(0)$, which is possible to measure directly. The average value is $\lambda = 1.2754(13)$ [8], which is not far from the lattice average in Ref. [10]. The parameters λ and V_{ud} are linked to the average lifetime of the neutron τ_n by the theoretical prediction [11]

$$\frac{1}{\tau_n} = \frac{V_{ud}^2 (1 + 3\lambda^2)}{4906.4 \pm 1.7s}, \quad (7)$$

which holds since the average lifetime of the neutron and the IBD cross section depends on the same matrix element. By propagating the errors, including RC, one can find a prediction for τ_n . Vice versa, by measuring τ_n it is possible to constrain λ and V_{ud} .

The neutron decay lifetime plays a key role also in cosmology. The neutron/proton ratio during nucleosynthesis depends strongly on the neutron lifetime and its uncertainty stands in the way of precise predictions in Standard Big Bang Nucleosynthesis. There are two methods to measure τ_n , usually indicated as the bottle and the beam method. In the former, ultra-cold neutrons (UCN) are trapped and their number is measured over time, yielding $\tau_n^{bottle} = 878.4 \pm 0.5$ s [8]. In the beam method, neutron decay products are counted relative to the number of incident neutrons, determining the average lifetime of $\tau_n^{beam} = 888.0 \pm 2.0$ s. The discrepancy between the two methods is known as the neutron lifetime puzzle, raising concerns about the reliability of neutron lifetime measurements. The value predicted by Eq. (7) is closer to the lower value, which has prompted Ref. [1] to use only data obtained by the bottle method. The assumption is that the dataset from beam experiment is affected by a systematic deviation, not yet fully understood. Recently, an experiment has been performed with the beam method but differing from previous experiments that measured protons. Instead, it detected electrons, enabling measurements with distinct systematic uncertainties. The result is $\tau_n^{beam} = 877.2 \pm 1.7_{stat}^{+4.0}_{-3.6stat}$ s [13]. This value is consistent with

bottle method measurements but exhibits a 2.3σ tension with the average value obtained from the proton-detection-based beam method.

3.2 The higher energy region

There is not an unique way to express the dependence on t of the form factors. A rather common procedure is to adopt *phenomenological* descriptions of the behaviour of the form factors of the nucleons [15]. It should be noted that the phenomenological form factors, especially the dipolar approximation, are not optimized at low energies, and in some cases, the differences can be significant. Alternatively, the form factors can be constrained by using analytic methods, crossing symmetry and global fits, which include several intermediate states and continuum contributions. Finally, the form factors can be calculated *ab initio*, in particular, by exploiting lattice QCD.

Regardless of the full form factor dependence on t , when the relevant energies are relatively low, we can confidently assert that only the first terms of its Taylor expansion are needed to assess its uncertainty. In the case of supernova neutrino detection, for instance, we have $Q_{\max}^2 \sim (2E)^2 \lesssim 0.01 \text{ GeV}^2$ ($Q^2 = -t > 0$) and the higher order terms in Q^2 can be safely neglected. Hence we will use the form factors in their linearized form. The axial vector form factor $g_1(t)$ is the one that causes the largest uncertainty. Following conventional usage, we define a vector axial radius $\sqrt{\langle r_A^2 \rangle}$ where

$$\langle r_A^2 \rangle = \frac{6}{g_1(0)} \left. \frac{dg_1(t)}{dt^2} \right|_{t=0} \quad (8)$$

The linear expansions in terms of the vector axial radius becomes

$$\frac{g_1(t)}{g_1(0)} \equiv 1 - \frac{\langle r_A^2 \rangle Q^2}{6} + \mathcal{O}(Q^4). \quad (9)$$

In this framework, we can define

$$M_A^2 \equiv -2 \frac{g_1'(0)}{g_1(0)} = \frac{12}{\langle r_A^2 \rangle} \quad (10)$$

which can be used to compare with the description adopting the traditional dipole parametrization. For the energies of interest for the detection of supernova neutrinos, we have $Q_{\max}^2 \sim (2E)^2 \lesssim 0.01 \text{ GeV}^2$ for $E < 50 \text{ MeV}$. T

The vector axial radius is traditionally probed using: 1) direct measurements of charged current interactions, in particular muon neutrinos on Deuterium targets; 2) muon capture on proton 3) single pion production by electrons on nucleons.

In νN direct measurements using muon neutrinos on Deuterium, the formal errors are very small, giving $r_A^2 = 0.453 \pm 0.023 \text{ fm}^2$ [14, 16], These measurements are obtained at higher energies than those we are interested in, and therefore cannot be used without an extrapolation. According to [17] this extrapolation is not without dangers, hence Ref. [14] suggests to use $r_A^2 = 0.46 \pm 0.22 \text{ fm}^2$, which does not rely on the dipole approximation and is consistent with the previous results, but has a considerably larger error.

The muon capture on proton, $\mu + p \rightarrow \nu_\mu + n$, due to crossing invariance, probes the exact form factors at small Q^2 we are interested in, making it highly relevant to our case. The MuCap (Muon Capture on the Proton) experiment has collected data from 2004–2007 at the Paul Scherrer

Institute (PSI) in Switzerland using a time projection chamber to detect low-energy muons. It has given results that are quite accurate and consistent with those of the previous method, with errors of similar magnitude [14].

Experiments on single pion production by electrons on nucleons give extremely precise results, and values consistent with previous ones [14, 16], that - formally - cover precisely the most interesting Q^2 region, see e.g. [18]. Unfortunately they require using the theory in a regime where its reliability, according to [14], can be doubted.

Recently, the Minerva collaboration has measured the axial vector form factor from antineutrino-proton scattering [19]. A muon antineutrino elastically scatters off the free proton from the hydrogen atom, turning the neutrino into the positively charged muon and the proton into a neutron. The reaction $\bar{\nu}_\mu + p \rightarrow \mu^+ + n$ is free from nuclear theory corrections in scattering from deuterium and provides a direct measurement of g_1 . It is also a two-body reaction with a nucleon at rest; therefore, the neutrino direction and the final-state muon momentum fully specify the interacting system. The beam produced at the NuMI neutrino beamline at Fermilab has an average energy of 5.4 GeV. The resulting value is $r_A = 0.73 \pm 0.17$ fm.

4. Conclusions

Neutrinos of varying energies are detected in different experiments. We focus on the energy range that on the low side encompasses reactor neutrinos (up to approximately 10 MeV) and on the higher side neutrino fluxes from supernovae (up to 50 MeV).

We have discussed the theoretical uncertainty of the IBD cross section, which depends critically upon the set of three parameters V_{ud} , λ and the vector axial radius r_A . Reliable measurements of key parameters are essential to meet the precision advocated by present and future experiments. Theoretical advances in lattice QCD are anticipated, which will lead to estimates with uncertainties smaller than the present ones. Meanwhile, significant experimental progress in the determination and analysis of these parameters has been made in recent years.

Acknowledgments

G.R. thanks the Organizing Committee of the XVIth Quark Confinement and Hadron Spectrum Conference ("Confinement24", Cairns, Australia, 19-24 August, 2024) for the kind invitation. This work is partially supported by the INFN research initiative ENP.

References

- [1] G. Ricciardi, N. Vignaroli and F. Vissani, *JHEP* **08** (2022), 212 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2022)212 [arXiv:2206.05567 [hep-ph]].
- [2] P. Vogel and J. F. Beacom, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999), 053003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.60.053003 [arXiv:hep-ph/9903554 [hep-ph]].
- [3] A. Strumia and F. Vissani, *Phys. Lett. B* **564** (2003), 42-54 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(03)00616-6 [arXiv:astro-ph/0302055 [astro-ph]].

- [4] J. C. Hardy and I. S. Towner, *Phys. Rev. C* **102** (2020) no.4, 045501 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.102.045501
- [5] C. Y. Seng, M. Gorchtein, H. H. Patel and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (2018) no.24, 241804 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.241804 [arXiv:1807.10197 [hep-ph]].
- [6] V. Cirigliano, A. Crivellin, M. Hoferichter and M. Moulson, *Phys. Lett. B* **838** (2023), 137748 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137748 [arXiv:2208.11707 [hep-ph]].
- [7] P. X. Ma, X. Feng, M. Gorchtein, L. C. Jin, K. F. Liu, C. Y. Seng, B. G. Wang and Z. L. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132** (2024) no.19, 191901 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.191901 [arXiv:2308.16755 [hep-lat]].
- [8] S. Navas *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) no.3, 030001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.110.030001
- [9] L. Cao *et al.* [Belle], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** (2023) no.21, 211801 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.211801 [arXiv:2303.17309 [hep-ex]].
- [10] Y. Aoki *et al.* [Flavour Lattice Averaging Group (FLAG)], [arXiv:2411.04268 [hep-lat]].
- [11] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, “Radiative Corrections to Neutron and Nuclear Beta Decays Revisited,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.7, 073008
- [12] F. M. Gonzalez *et al.* [UCN τ], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** (2021) no.16, 162501 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.162501 [arXiv:2106.10375 [nucl-ex]].
- [13] Y. Fuwa, T. Hasegawa, K. Hirota, T. Hoshino, R. Hosokawa, G. Ichikawa, S. Ieki, T. Ino, Y. Iwashita and M. Kitaguchi, *et al.*
- [14] R. J. Hill, P. Kammel, W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **81** (2018) no.9, 096301 doi:10.1088/1361-6633/aac190 [arXiv:1708.08462 [hep-ph]]. [arXiv:2412.19519 [nucl-ex]].
- [15] C. H. Llewellyn Smith, *Phys. Rept.* **3** (1972), 261-379
- [16] A. Bodek, S. Avvakumov, R. Bradford and H. S. Budd, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **53** (2008), 349-354 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0491-4 [arXiv:0708.1946 [hep-ex]].
- [17] B. Bhattacharya, R. J. Hill and G. Paz, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011), 073006 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.073006 [arXiv:1108.0423 [hep-ph]].
- [18] V. Bernard, L. Elouadrhiri and U. G. Meissner, *J. Phys. G* **28** (2002), R1-R35 doi:10.1088/0954-3899/28/1/201 [arXiv:hep-ph/0107088 [hep-ph]].
- [19] T. Cai *et al.* [MINERvA], *Nature* **614** (2023) no.7946, 48-53 doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05478-3