

# Weak Interactions in Atoms and Nuclei: The Standard Model and Beyond

M.J. Ramsey-Musolf

*Kellogg Radiation Laboratory, Caltech, Pasadena, CA 91125 and  
Department of Physics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269*

J. Seirstad

*Department of Physics, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187*

## Abstract

Studies in nuclear and atomic physics have played an important role in developing our understanding of the Standard Model of electroweak interactions. We review the basic ingredients of the Standard Model, and discuss some key nuclear and atomic physics experiments used in testing these ideas. We also summarize the conceptual issues of the Standard Model that motivate the search for new physics.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The quest for a unified description of all known forces of nature is something of a “holy grail” for physicists. At present, we possess a partial description, known as the Standard Model[1]. In a nutshell, the Standard Model (SM) is a unified gauge theory of the strong, weak, and electromagnetic interactions, the content of which is summarized by the group structure

$$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \quad , \quad (1)$$

where the first factor refers to the theory of strong interactions, or Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), and the latter two factors describe the theory of electroweak interactions. Although the theory remains incomplete, its development represents a triumph for modern physics. Historically, nuclear and atomic physics have played an important role in uncovering the structure of the strong and electroweak interactions. In this series of lectures, I will attempt to give you some sense of that history, as well as some feel for the parts being played by nuclear and atomic physics in looking for physics beyond the SM. I will focus on the electroweak sector of the theory, though you should keep in mind that studies of QCD constitute one of the primary thrusts of nuclear physics today.

Before delving into the details of the SM, it is important to appreciate just what an achievement Eq. (1) represents. One way to do this is to consider some of the basic properties of the four forces of nature.

Interaction	Range(fm)	Strength	TimeScale	$\sigma(\mu b)$
Gravity	$\infty$	$G_N M_p^2$	$\times$	$\times$
Weak	$10^{-3}$	$G_F M_p^2$	$\geq 10^{-8}$	$10^{-8}$
Strong	$\leq 1$	$\alpha_S(r)$	$10^{-23}$	$10^4$
EM	$\infty$	$\alpha$	$10^{-20}$	10

In addition to this seemingly disparate set of characteristics, each of the forces has some unique features of its own. For example, the gravitational and EM interactions get weaker the farther apart the given “charges” are, whereas the strong interaction behaves just the

opposite, as the distance  $r$  increases,  $\alpha_S$  grows. This feature is related to the fact that one never sees individual unbound quarks and that strong interaction effects at distance scales at about 1 fm are hard to compute.

Another set of unique features has to do with how each interaction obeys different “discrete” symmetries:

Parity	P	$\vec{x} \rightarrow -\vec{x}$	$t \rightarrow t$	$\vec{s} \rightarrow -\vec{s}$
Time Reversal	T	$\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{x}$	$t \rightarrow -t$	$\vec{s} \rightarrow -\vec{s}$
Charge Conjugation	C	$Q \rightarrow -Q$	$e^+ \rightarrow e^-$	<i>etc.</i>

A simple way to visualize these symmetries is as follows. A parity transformation (P) involves an inversion of a physical system through the origin of co-ordinates. This inversion can be completed in two steps. First, reflect the system in a mirror. Second, rotate the reflected system by  $180^\circ$  about the normal to the mirror. However, since fundamental interactions are rotationally invariant (angular momentum is conserved), we may omit the second step. Thus, a parity transformation is essentially a mirror reflection. Note that the “handedness” of a particle – the relative orientation of its momentum and spin – reverses under mirror reflection. A time reversal transformation (T) amounts first to thinking of a physical process as being like a movie. Under T, the movie is run backwards through the projector. Finally, a charge conjugation transformation (C) turns a particle into its antiparticle.

Here’s how the different interactions rate with respect to these symmetries:

Symmetry “Score Card”

Symmetry	Strong	EM	Weak
P	yes	yes	no
C	yes	yes	no
T	yes	yes	no
PCT	yes	yes	yes

Clearly, the weak interaction is a flagrant symmetry violator, whereas the strong interaction and EM interactions respect P,C, and T individually. So how can it be that all three forces

fall into a unified model?

Given these differences, it is truly remarkable that physicists have figured out how to describe three out of four forces in a unified theory. It's a highly non-trivial accomplishment.

Now let's look in detail at the essential elements of the electroweak part of the Standard Model.

## II. BASIC INGREDIENTS OF THE STANDARD MODEL

The essential building blocks of the electroweak sector of the Standard Model are the following:

1. Gauge Symmetry  $\iff$  gauge bosons, parity violation
2. Representations  $\iff$  bosons and quarks
3. Family Replication, mixing and universality  $\iff$  CP Violation
4. Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking  $\iff$  Higgs Boson,  $M_Z, M_W \neq 0$

### A. Gauge Symmetry

Let's start with the more familiar case of the electromagnetism and see how the properties can all be derived from the principle of gauge invariance.

Consider the Dirac equation for a free electron:

$$(i\cancel{\partial} - m)\psi = 0 \quad . \quad (2)$$

Suppose we now make the local transformation:

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x)e^{i\alpha(x)} = \psi'(x) \quad . \quad (3)$$

This is called a U(1) transformation.

The Dirac equation is not invariant under this transformation. If  $\psi'$  satisfies (2) then one

has:

$$(i\cancel{\partial} - m)e^{i\alpha(x)}\psi = (i\cancel{\partial} - m)\psi - \psi\cancel{\partial}\alpha = 0 \quad . \quad (4)$$

To make (2) invariant under (3), one can replace  $\partial_\mu$  by the covariant derivative  $D_\mu$ :

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu \quad , \quad (5)$$

where  $A_\mu$  is a gauge field identified with the photon. We require  $A_\mu$  to transform in such away as to remove the unwanted term in (4).

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A'_\mu = A_\mu + \frac{1}{e}\partial_\mu\alpha \quad (6)$$

when  $\psi \rightarrow \psi' = e^{i\alpha}\psi$

Thus, we obtain a new Dirac equation:

$$(i\cancel{\mathcal{D}} - m)\psi = 0 \quad . \quad (7)$$

Under a gauge transformation, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (i\cancel{\mathcal{D}}' - m)\psi' &= 0 \quad \longrightarrow \\ &= [i(\cancel{\partial} - ieA'_\mu) - m]\psi' = [i(\cancel{\partial} - ieA_\mu - i\cancel{\partial}\alpha) - m]\psi \\ &= e^{i\alpha}[i(\cancel{\partial} - ieA) - m]\psi + e^{i\alpha}(\cancel{\partial}\alpha)\psi - e^{i\alpha}(\cancel{\partial}\alpha)\psi \\ &= e^{i\alpha}(i\cancel{\mathcal{D}} - m)\psi = 0 \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Cancelling through the  $e^{i\alpha}$  yields

$$(i\cancel{\mathcal{D}} - m)\psi = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad (i\cancel{\mathcal{D}}' - m)\psi' = 0 \quad . \quad (9)$$

One recognizes the replacement of  $\partial_\mu \rightarrow D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu$  as the usual minimal substitution that gives us the interaction of the electrons with the vector potential in quantum mechanics. Apparently, requiring the Dirac equation to be invariant under U(1) gauge transformation (3) and (6) leads to a familiar result from quantum mechanics.

This idea can be generalized to other symmetry transformations. A simple generalization is a group of transformations called SU(2). Let's define the following matrices:

$$\tau_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \tau_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \tau_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad . \quad (10)$$

They satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \frac{\tau_i}{2}, \frac{\tau_j}{2} \right] &= i\epsilon_{ijk} \frac{\tau_k}{2} \\ \left[ \frac{\tau_i}{2}, \frac{\tau_j}{2} \right]_+ &= \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ij} \\ \text{Tr} \left( \frac{\tau_i}{2} \frac{\tau_j}{2} \right) &= \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ij} \quad . \end{aligned}$$

One defines a group of transformations – called SU(2) – whose elements are:

$$U(\vec{\alpha}) = e^{i\vec{\alpha}(x) \cdot \vec{\tau}} \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\alpha}(x) &= (\alpha_1(x), \alpha_2(x), \alpha_3(x)) \\ \vec{\tau} &= (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3) \quad , \end{aligned}$$

with the  $\alpha_i$ 's being a continuously varying function of  $x^\mu = (t, \vec{x})$ . The transformations  $U(\vec{\alpha})$  act on a two component vector. For example, let

$$\Psi_l = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_\nu(x) \\ \psi_e(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

denote a lepton wavefunction<sup>1</sup>. Then under the transformation (11)

$$\Psi_l \rightarrow \Psi'_l = U(\vec{\alpha})\Psi_l \quad (13)$$

In order for the Dirac equation to be invariant under (13), one must define a new gauge covariant derivative for SU(2):

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig\frac{\tau}{2} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu \quad , \quad (14)$$

where  $g$  is an SU(2) analog of electric charge and

$$\vec{W}_\mu = (W_\mu^1, W_\mu^2, W_\mu^3) \quad (15)$$

is a set of 3 fields analogous to  $A_\mu$ . It turns out that if  $\vec{W}_\mu$  transforms as

$$W_\mu^i \rightarrow W_\mu^{i'} = W_\mu^i - \epsilon^{ijk}\alpha_j W_\mu^k - \frac{1}{g}\partial_\mu\alpha_i \quad (16)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Here,  $\psi_{\nu,e}$  are four-component Dirac spinors.

when

$$\Psi_l \rightarrow U(\vec{\alpha})\Psi_l = \Psi'_l \quad (17)$$

then the Dirac equation for  $\psi_\nu$  and  $\psi_e$  will be invariant under the transformations (13) and (16):

$$(i\cancel{\partial} + g\frac{\vec{\tau}}{2} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu - \hat{M})\Psi_l = 0 \quad . \quad (18)$$

Note that the extra term in the transformation law for  $W_\nu^i$  – the  $\epsilon^{ijk}\alpha_j W_\nu^k$  term – is a consequence of the fact that this group of transformations is non-Abelian, that is  $\tau_i$  and  $\tau_j$  do not commute.

Note also that in Eq. (18) we have introduced a mass term ( $\hat{M}$ ), whose origins I will discuss later.

As in the case of the  $U(1)_{EM}$  gauge field  $A_\mu$ , which we corresponds to the photon, the  $SU(2)$  gauge fields  $W_\nu^i$  should also be associated with spin-one particles. To identify the character of these particles, first define:

$$\tau_+ = \frac{1}{2}(\tau_1 + i\tau_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\tau_- = \frac{1}{2}(\tau_1 - i\tau_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and  $W_\mu^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(W_\mu^1 \pm iW_\mu^2)$ . Then

$$\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu = \sqrt{2}(\tau_+ W_\mu^- + \tau_- W_\mu^+) + \tau_3 W_\mu^3 \quad . \quad (19)$$

Now

$$\tau_+ \Psi_l = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_\nu \\ \psi_e \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_e \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad . \quad (20)$$

In short, acting with  $\tau_+$  on the lepton wavefunction transforms an electron wavefunction into one for a neutrino:  $\psi_e \rightarrow \psi_\nu$ . Similarly,

$$\tau_- \Psi_l = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_\nu \\ \psi_e \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \psi_\nu \end{pmatrix} \quad . \quad (21)$$

This turns a neutrino into an electron:  $\psi_\nu \rightarrow \psi_e$ . One can represent the action of  $\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu$  on  $\Psi_l$  in Fig. 1:




FIG. 1: Charge raising weak interaction current.

From the fact that weak interactions turn  $e \leftrightarrow \nu$ , one is lead to identify the  $W_\mu^\pm$  fields with the  $W^\pm$  particles.

It would be tempting to identify the  $W_\mu^3$  with the  $Z^0$  boson. However, it turns out to be impossible to do that and end up with the right masses for the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  bosons. Moreover, since there exists another neutral boson – the massless photon,  $\gamma$  – one needs two neutral fields to make the  $Z^0$  and  $\gamma$ . A nice way to produce both bosons is to *mix* the  $W_\mu^3$  with another gauge boson – called  $B_\mu$  – that transforms as a singlet under SU(2) transformations. In short,  $(W_\mu^3, B_\mu) \rightarrow (A_\mu, Z_\mu)$ .

Before fleshing this idea out, however, we need to revisit the parity transformation discussed earlier. To that end, let's define:

$$\psi_L = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma_5)\psi \quad (22)$$

$$\psi_R = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5)\psi \quad . \quad (23)$$

One can show that if  $\psi$  is massless, then  $\psi_L$  always has negative helicity and  $\psi_R$  always has positive helicity.

In short:

$$\psi_L : \quad h = \hat{s} \cdot \hat{p} = -1$$

$$\psi_R : \quad h = \hat{s} \cdot \hat{p} = +1$$



Under a parity transformation,  $\hat{s} \cdot \hat{p}$  changes sign which is equivalent to saying that  $\psi_L \leftrightarrow \psi_R$ . One knows that processes like  $\mu$ -decay or  $\beta$ -decay, the neutrinos always come with helicity  $h=-1$ , which implies parity symmetry is broken. Only left handed particles participate in these types of weak interactions.

Since the interactions of  $W_\mu^\pm$  with leptons arises in Eq. (18) because of SU(2) invariance, and one needs only left handed particles to have interactions with the  $W_\mu^\pm$ , one must modify the transformations rule:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SU}(2) &\rightarrow \text{SU}(2)_L \\ \Psi_l^L &\rightarrow U(\vec{\alpha})\Psi_l^L \quad (\text{doublet}) \\ \psi_{e_R} &\rightarrow \psi_{e_R} \quad (\text{singlet}) \quad . \end{aligned}$$

In short, only left-handed particles undergo SU(2) transformations, while right-handed particles are unaffected. Thus, the Dirac equation for  $\psi_{e_R} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5)\psi_e$  is unchanged under SU(2)<sub>L</sub> so there is no need for the  $\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu$  term to maintain invariance. Hence, one has the SU(2)<sub>L</sub> in SU(2)<sub>L</sub> × U(1)<sub>Y</sub>. Note that we have not included a transformation  $\psi_{\nu_R}$  in the list of transformations. The reason is that prior to the discovery of neutrino oscillations, right-handed neutrinos were not observed to participate in low-energy weak interactions.

Now back to the  $Z^0$  and  $\gamma$ . Nature gives us four bosons in the electroweak interaction: two charged particles ( $W^\pm$ ) and two neutral particles ( $Z^0$ ,  $\gamma$ ). So far, we have identified two charged and one neutral gauge boson. We need to include one more neutral gauge boson having no accompanying particles. The way to accomplish this is to introduce one more set of U(1) transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &\rightarrow e^{i\alpha(x)}\psi = \psi' \\ \partial_\mu &\rightarrow \partial_\mu - ig' \frac{Y}{2} B_\mu \\ B_\mu &\rightarrow B'_\mu = B_\mu + \frac{1}{g'} \partial_\mu \alpha \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Here Y is called *hypercharge* (to distinguish it from the general EM charge). Now the Dirac equation for electrons and neutrinos is the following:

$$(i \not{\partial} + \frac{g}{2} \vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{W} + \frac{g'}{2} Y \mathcal{B} - \hat{M}) \Psi_l^L = 0 \quad (24)$$

$$(i \not{\partial} + \frac{g'}{2} Y \mathcal{B} - m_e) \psi_e^R = 0 \quad . \quad (25)$$

Rewriting (24) slightly:

$$\begin{aligned}
& [i \not{\partial} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}(\tau_+ W_- + \tau_- W_+) \\
& \quad + \frac{g}{2}\tau_3 W_3 + \frac{g'}{2}Y\mathcal{B} - \hat{M}] \Psi_l^L = 0 \quad .
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Now to get EM interactions for both the  $e_R$  and  $e_L$  and to make sure the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  are different in mass, one needs the  $Z^0$  and  $\gamma$  to be linear combinations of the  $W_3$  and  $B$ . One can accomplish this by utilizing a unitary transformation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_\mu^0 \\ A_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_W & -\sin \theta_W \\ \sin \theta_W & \cos \theta_W \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_\mu^3 \\ B_\mu \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{27}$$

The angle  $\theta_W$  is a supremely important parameter in the electroweak standard model. It is called the ‘‘Weinberg angle’’, or ‘‘weak mixing angle’’. Inverting (27), one can substitute into (24) and (25) for  $W_\mu^3$  and  $B_\mu$  to obtain:

Left-handed leptons:

$$\begin{aligned}
& [i \not{\partial} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}(\tau_+ W_- + \tau_- W_+) \\
& \quad + (g \sin \theta_W \frac{\tau_3}{2} + g' \cos \theta_W \frac{Y}{2}) \mathcal{A} \\
& \quad + (g \cos \theta_W \frac{\tau_3}{2} - g' \sin \theta_W \frac{Y}{2}) Z^0 - \hat{M}] \Psi_l^L = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Right-handed leptons:

$$[i \not{\partial} + (g' \cos \theta_W \frac{Y}{2}) \mathcal{A} - (g' \sin \theta_W \frac{Y}{2}) Z^0 - m_e] \psi_{e_R} = 0 \tag{29}$$

In order to restore the original EM gauge transformation law, one needs to identify:

$$g' \cos \theta_W \frac{Y_R}{2} = eQ \tag{30}$$

$$g \sin \theta_W \frac{\tau_3}{2} + g' \cos \theta_W \frac{Y_L}{2} = eQ \quad . \tag{31}$$

This works if one takes:

$$\begin{aligned}
g' \cos \theta_W &= g \sin \theta_W = e \\
Y_R &= 2Q \\
Y_L &= 2(Q - T_3^L)
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where  $T_3^L \Psi_l^L = (\tau_3/2) \Psi_l^L$ .

From Eqs. (32) one also has

$$\sin \theta_W = \frac{e}{g} \quad \text{and} \quad \tan \theta_W = \frac{g'}{g} . \quad (33)$$

Thus, the  $SU(2)_L$  and  $U(1)_{EM}$  interactions depend on three parameters:

$$g, g', \text{ and } \sin \theta_W$$

or

$$g, e, \text{ and } \sin \theta_W$$

*etc.*

Lastly, let's rewrite our  $Z^0$  couplings by eliminating  $g'$  in terms of  $g$  and  $\sin \theta_W$ :

For the right handed sector:

$$-g' \frac{Y_R}{2} = -g \frac{\sin^2 \theta_W}{\cos \theta_W} Q \equiv \frac{g Q_R^W}{\cos \theta_W} \quad (34)$$

For the left handed sector:

$$\begin{aligned} g \cos \theta_W \frac{\tau_3}{2} - g' \sin \theta_W \frac{Y_L}{2} &= \\ g \cos \theta_W \frac{\tau_3}{2} - g \frac{\sin^2 \theta_W}{\cos \theta_W} (Q - \frac{\tau_3}{2}) &= \\ \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} (T_3^L - \sin^2 \theta_W Q) &\equiv \\ \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} Q_L^W &, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where  $Q_{L,R}^W$  denote the left- and right-handed ‘‘weak charges’’ of the leptons. To summarize, then, we have:

$$[i \not{\partial} + e Q \mathcal{A} + \frac{g Q_R^W}{\cos \theta_W} \mathcal{Z} - m_e] \psi_{e_R} = 0 \quad (36)$$

$$[i \not{\partial} + e Q \mathcal{A} + \frac{g Q_L^W}{\cos \theta_W} \mathcal{Z} \quad (37)$$

$$+ \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} (\tau_+ W_- + \tau_- W_+) - \hat{M}] \Psi_l^L = 0 \quad , \quad (38)$$

where

$$g = \frac{e}{\sin \theta_W} \quad (39)$$

$$Q_R^W = -\sin^2 \theta_W Q \quad (40)$$

$$Q_L^W = T_3^L - \sin^2 \theta_W Q \quad . \quad (41)$$

## B. Representations

The assignment of different  $SU(2)_L$  and  $U(1)_Y$  transformation properties to left- and right-handed fermions is called a choice of representations. Left-handed fermions are assigned to a doublet representations of  $SU(2)_L$ ; right-handed fermions transform under the singlet representation.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix} & \nu_R & e_R \\ \text{doublet} & \text{singlet} & \text{singlet} \end{array}$$

Note that although the  $\nu_R$  transforms as a singlet, it has no weak interactions according to Eq. (40) since its electromagnetic charge is zero.

One can make the same assignment for quarks:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{pmatrix} u_L \\ d_L \end{pmatrix} & u_R & d_R \\ \text{doublet} & \text{singlet} & \text{singlet} \end{array}$$

Note that unlike the the right-handed neutrinos, both right-handed quarks have weak interactions since  $Q_u \neq 0$  and  $Q_d \neq 0$

## C. Family Replication, Universality, and Mixing

Of course electrons, neutrinos, up quarks, and down quarks are not all the elementary leptons and quarks. They constitute the first generation. The remaining are assigned to the

second and third generations:

Second:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu^L \\ \mu_L \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s \end{pmatrix} \quad \mu_R, c_R, s_R$$

Third:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_\tau^L \\ \tau_L \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} t \\ b \end{pmatrix} \quad \tau_R, t_R, b_R$$

This repeated pattern of assignment is called fermion family replication.

An important feature of the standard model is that for each family, the structure of the interactions with gauge bosons is the same. In other words, there is a *family universality*.

Moreover, the overall strength of the charged current interactions and neutral current interactions is set by the same parameter,  $g$ . This feature is known as *charged current/neutral current universality*.

Now this nice pattern of universality gets somewhat clouded for quarks because the quark eigenstates of the weak interaction can differ from the quark eigenstates of the mass operator. The origin of this effect has to do with how the electroweak symmetry is broken, as discussed below. The relationship between the two sets of eigenstates can be expressed by letting each negative charged quark weak eigenstate be written as a linear combination of the three mass eigenstates:

$$\begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}_{\text{WEAK}} = \hat{V} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}_{\text{MASS}}, \quad (42)$$

where  $\hat{V}$  is a  $3 \times 3$  matrix known as the Cabbibo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix[2]. In general, it is unitary and parameterized by 3 angles and a phase.

It turns out that one need not to write a similar relation for the positive quarks for algebraic reasons that will not be discussed here. To illustrate, then, the weak quark doublet of the first generation is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ \tilde{d} \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad \tilde{d} = V_{11}d + V_{12}s + V_{13}b$$

with

$$|V_{11}|^2 + |V_{12}|^2 + |V_{13}|^2 = 1 \tag{43}$$

following from the unitarity of  $\hat{V}$ .

Then the  $\tau_+W$  term in the Dirac equation leads to the transitions shown in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2: Transition diagrams

The parameters  $V_{ij}$  are not known *a priori*, but rather must be set by experiment. The most precise determination of any of the  $V_{ij}$  comes from a nuclear experiment – namely, nuclear  $\beta$ -decay[3], from which one extracts a value for  $V_{11}$ .

The study of the CKM matrix is an important component of electroweak physics. Unfortunately, we will not be able to discuss these studies in any detail in these lectures. However, a few comments are worth making here: (i) The elements of  $\hat{V}$  are often labeled by the relevant charged currents transition:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{11} &\rightarrow V_{ud} \\ V_{12} &\rightarrow V_{us} \\ &etc. \quad , \end{aligned}$$

that is, the element  $V_{11}$  governs the strength of the transition  $d \rightarrow u + W^-$ , *etc.* (ii) The phase in the matrix  $e^{i\delta}$  is responsible for CP-violation. In order for such a phase to appear in  $\hat{V}$ , one needs at least 3 generations of massive quarks. (iii) For  $m_\nu=0$  as assumed by the Standard Model, there is no CKM matrix for leptons. The neutrinos weak and mass eigenstates are identical, and that is enough to evade the need for a CKM mixing matrix. However, now that neutrino oscillations have been observed and we know neutrinos have mass, we are forced to write down an analog of the CKM matrix for leptons. The study of the corresponding mixing angles and phase(s) are now a topic of intense study in nuclear and particle physics<sup>2</sup>. (iv) The neutral current interactions are independent of the  $V_{ij}$ , and they entail no transitions among quark generations. In short, the Standard Model forbids flavor changing neutral current (FCNC) at lowest order in  $g$ .

#### D. Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking, Mass Generation, and the Higgs

So far not much has been said much about quark, lepton, and gauge boson masses. Naively, one might think that simply putting in mass operators into the Dirac equation as in Eqs.

---

<sup>2</sup> If neutrinos are Majorana particles, there exist additional CP violating phases beyond the single phase associated with mixing of three generations of massive Dirac particles.

(28,29) would take care of fermion masses. However, life is more complicated than that. One needs to work with the Lagrangian from which the Dirac equation is derived:

$$L = \bar{\psi}(i\mathcal{D} - m)\psi \quad . \quad (44)$$

It is straightforward to show that the mass term has the following decomposition:

$$m\bar{\psi}\psi = m\bar{\psi}_L\psi_R + m\bar{\psi}_R\psi_L \quad . \quad (45)$$

Now, under  $SU(2)_L$  we have:

$$\psi_L \rightarrow e^{i\vec{\alpha}\cdot\frac{\tau}{2}}\psi_L \quad (46)$$

$$\psi_R \rightarrow \psi_L \quad , \quad (47)$$

so that the mass term breaks  $SU(2)_L$  invariance in the Lagrangian. A similar problem arises for the gauge bosons. For a massless gauge boson like the  $\gamma$ , the Lagrangian is given by:

$$L_\gamma = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \quad , \quad (48)$$

where

$$F_{\mu\nu} = [D_\mu, D_\nu] = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu \quad . \quad (49)$$

Since  $F_{\mu\nu}$  is built from  $D_\mu$ 's, it is manifestly gauge invariant. Similarly, one could write down an  $SU(2)_L$  gauge-invariant Lagrangian for the weak gauge bosons in the limit that they were massless:

$$L_{GB} = -\frac{1}{4}\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 F_{\mu\nu}^\alpha F^{\alpha\mu\nu} \quad , \quad (50)$$

where

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu W_\nu^a - \partial_\nu W_\mu^a + g\epsilon^{abc}W_\mu^b W_\nu^c \quad (51)$$

The extra term in  $F_{\mu\nu}^a$  is needed to maintain invariance under the non-Abelian transformation (16). To get the masses for the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$ , one would naively think to add the mass term:

$$L_M = \frac{1}{2}M^2 W_\mu^a W^{\mu a} \quad (52)$$

to (50). However (52) is again not invariant under (16). Since our goal is to write a Lagrangian having  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  gauge symmetry, adding mass terms as in (45) and (52) would be a disaster. How then, do we give particles their masses? The resolution is the



so-called Higgs Mechanism[4]. The idea is introduce a new particle described by a two component vector which transforms as a doublet under  $SU(2)_L$ :

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+ \\ \phi^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (53)$$

$$Y(\Phi) = 2(Q - T_3^L) = 1 \quad . \quad (54)$$

Using  $\Phi$ , we add new terms to the gauge boson (GB)-fermion(F)  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  invariant Lagrangian:

$$L = L_{GB} + L_f + L_H + L_Y \quad , \quad (55)$$

where  $L_{GB}$  is given by (50) for both the  $W_\mu^a$  and  $B_\mu$  and  $L_f$  is given by (44) with the mass term removed. The new terms are:

$$L_H = (D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger (D_\mu \Phi) - V(\Phi) \quad (56)$$

$$V(\Phi) = -\mu^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \lambda (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \quad (57)$$

$$D_\mu \Phi = (\partial_\mu - ig \frac{\vec{\tau}}{2} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu - ig' \frac{Y}{2} B_\mu) \Phi \quad , \quad (58)$$

and

$$L_Y = f^{(e)} \bar{\Psi}_l^L \Phi \psi_e^R + f^{(u)} \bar{\Psi}_q^L \tilde{\Phi} \psi_u^R + f^{(d)} \bar{\Psi}_q^L \tilde{\Phi} \psi_d^R \quad , \quad (59)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Phi} = i\tau_2 \Phi^* \quad \text{and} \quad Y(\tilde{\Phi}) = -1 \quad . \quad (60)$$

There are a few observations to make: (1) The terms in  $L_H$  and  $L_f$  are all invariant under  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  transformations.

(2) The first term in (56) involves interactions of the type:

$$g^2 \Phi^\dagger \frac{\vec{\tau}}{2} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu \Phi + g'^2 \Phi^\dagger \frac{Y}{2} B_\mu \frac{Y}{2} B^\mu \Phi \quad (61)$$

plus cross terms involving  $\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{W}_\mu$  and  $B_\mu$ .

(3) The potential  $V(\Phi)$  has a minimum for  $\Phi \neq 0$  if  $\mu^2, \lambda > 0$ . Specifically, the minimum occurs for  $\Phi^\dagger \Phi = \mu^2/(2\lambda)$ . The field  $\Phi$  likes to sit at this point. It is energetically favorable to do so. That means the expectation value of  $\Phi$  in the ground state of the universe, that is, the vacuum, should be non-zero:

$$\langle 0 | \Phi | 0 \rangle \neq 0 \quad . \quad (62)$$

In short,  $\Phi$  has a non-zero expectation value (VEV). One can arrange things to put  $\langle 0|\Phi|0 \rangle$  at the minimum of the potential by taking

$$\langle 0|\Phi|0 \rangle = \Phi_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} \neq 0 \quad (63)$$

and letting

$$\Phi = \Phi_0 + \delta\Phi \quad , \quad (64)$$

where  $\delta\Phi$  denotes fluctuations of this field, called the Higgs field, about  $\Phi_0$ . Now observe what happens if one substitutes (64) into (61) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{v^2}{8} [ g^2(W_\mu^1 W^{\mu 1} W_\mu^2 W^{\mu 2}) \\ & + (gW_\mu^3 - g'B_\mu)(gW^{\mu 3} - g'B^\mu) + O(\delta\Phi) \\ & = \frac{v^2}{8}(2g^2 W_\mu^\dagger W^{\mu -} + (g^2 + g'^2)Z_\mu Z^\mu) + O(\delta\Phi) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Note that these terms look suspiciously like mass terms if makes the identifications:

$$\frac{v^2 g^2}{4} = M_W^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{v^2}{4}(g^2 + g'^2) = M_Z^2 \quad (66)$$

$$\frac{M_W}{M_Z} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} = \cos \theta_W \quad . \quad (67)$$

The beauty of this idea is that (a) one gets the masses for the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  without spoiling the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  invariance of the Lagrangian, and (b) the photon stays massless. One says that the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  symmetry is *spontaneously broken* by the vacuum down to  $U(1)_{EM}$  by giving the Higgs a vacuum expectation value:

$$SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{EM} \quad .$$

Similarly one will notice from the Lagrangian  $L_Y$  that leptons and quarks get masses from  $\Phi_0$  without spoiling the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  invariance of the fermion part of the theory.

Now, there is one last important observation. The gauge boson masses,  $\theta_W$ ,  $e$ ,  $g$ ,  $g'$  and  $v$  are all inter-related. In fact, only *three* of these parameters are independent. Once three

parameters have been specified the others are now determined. For example, we may choose the gauge boson masses and EM charge as the independent parameters. Then the other parameters are determined as follows:

$$(M_W, M_Z, e) \rightarrow \cos \theta_W = \frac{M_W}{M_Z}$$

$$g = \frac{e}{\sin \theta_W} \tag{68}$$

$$v^2 = \frac{M_W^2(M_Z^2 - M_W^2)}{\pi\alpha M_Z^2}$$

$$\approx (242 \text{ GeV})^2 \tag{69}$$

The quantity  $v \approx 242 \text{ GeV}$  is known as the *weak scale*, that is the scale or dimensionful parameter associated with the symmetry breakdown  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{EM}$  and the quantity which sets the scale of the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  masses. In practice, one takes the independent inputs to be  $\alpha$ ,  $M_Z$ , and  $G_F$  (the Fermi constant) measured in  $\mu$ -decay which can be related to  $g$  in terms of  $\alpha$  and  $M_Z$ .

### E. Additional Observations

Let's close this section with two observations. First, the electroweak sector of the Standard Model contains a sizeable number of *a priori* unknown parameters. They are: (i) Gauge sector:  $g, M_Z, e$  (3 parameters) (ii) Higgs sector:  $M_H$  (1) (iii) Fermion sector: lepton and quark masses (9) and CKM angles and phase (4) Hence, the electroweak sector presents 17 independent parameters which must be taken from experiment. This is a fairly unsatisfying situation. In fact, one motivation for seeking a larger theory in which to embed the SM is to try and understand the origin of these parameters.

Second, you may wonder why we refer to the weak interaction as “weak”, since its coupling constant  $g$  is not too different from the coupling for electromagnetic interactions. The reason for this terminology has to do with the low-energy properties of probability amplitudes for

various processes. To illustrate, let's compare electron-muon scattering with muon decay ( $\mu^- \rightarrow \nu_\mu + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$ ). The amplitude for the former, which is purely electromagnetic, is governed by the photon propagator, which goes as  $1/q^2$ , where  $q_\mu$  is the momentum transfer in the scattering. The  $\mu$ -decay amplitude, in contrast, is governed by the  $W$ -boson propagator, which goes as  $1/(q^2 - M_W^2)$ . Since the energy released in  $\mu$ -decay is tiny compared to  $M_W$ , this amplitude goes as  $1/M_W^2$ . Thus, the ratio of the two amplitudes is

$$\frac{\text{WEAK}}{\text{EM}} \sim \frac{q^2}{M_W^2} \ll 1 \quad (70)$$

at low-energies. In short, low-energy weak interactions are “weak” in comparison to EM interactions because the  $W^\pm$  is quite massive while the  $\gamma$  is massless. Note, however, that at higher energies, the strengths of the two interactions may become comparable.

### III. LOW-ENERGY TESTS OF THE STANDARD MODEL

So far, considerable attention has been spent on the elegant structure of the Standard Model. It has been demonstrated how it provides a unified framework for weak and EM interactions based on gauge symmetry, allows masses to be generated by spontaneous symmetry breaking, accounts for parity and CP-violation, and explains the disparate low-energy strengths and ranges of the weak and EM interactions. The Standard Model also makes a number of predictions:

1. Charged current interactions are purely left-handed
2. Electroweak coupling strengths are universal
3. The charged vector currents have a simple relation to isovector electromagnetic currents
4. The weak neutral current is a mixture of  $SU(2)_L$  and  $U(1)_{EM}$  currents, with the degree of mixing characterized by  $\sin^2 \theta_W$
5. Neutral current interactions conserve flavor

and so on. Low-energy experiments in nuclei and atoms have played important role in establishing these properties to a high degree of accuracy. The following is a review of some of the classic ways in which this has been done.

### A. Muon Decay

The decay  $\mu^- \rightarrow \nu_\mu e^- \bar{\nu}_e$  is governed at lowest order by the amplitude in Fig. 3.




FIG. 3: Muon decay

The amplitude is proportional to  $g^2/M_W^2$ , a combination of constants that is related to the Fermi constant:

$$\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{g^2}{8M_W^2} \quad (71)$$

Higher order corrections to this amplitude arise from  $\gamma$  exchanges as illustrated in Fig. 4.

The effect on the total muon decay rate of these purely QED radiative correction can be computed precisely. The result is

$$\tau_\mu^{-1} = \Gamma = \frac{G_F^2 m_\mu^5}{192\pi^3} \left[ 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \left( \pi^2 - \frac{25}{4} \right) \right] f\left(\frac{m_e^2}{m_\mu^2}\right) \left( 1 + \frac{3}{5} \frac{m_\mu^2}{m_W^2} \right) \quad (72)$$

$$f(x) = 1 - 8x + 8x^3 - x^4 + 12x^2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)$$




FIG. 4: QED radiative corrections to muon decay




FIG. 5: Electroweak radiative corrections to muon decay.

The point of writing this expression is that if  $\tau$  can be measured very accurately,  $G_F$  can be extracted extremely precisely since all the QED effects can be computed. Moreover, since  $G_F$  is related to  $g$  and  $M_W$ , it can be used as one of the three inputs into the gauge sector of the Standard Model. The muon life time is now known to the precision:

$$\tau_\mu = 2.197035(40) \times 10^{-6}$$

From which one obtains[5]:

$$G_F = 1.16637(1) \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$$

For reasons which will become apparent later, let's denote this value of  $G_F \rightarrow G_\mu$ . It is an experimental parameter. It can be related it to the gauge sector parameters of the Standard Model using equation (71). However, at this level of precision, one must take into account electroweak radiative corrections shown in Fig. 5: The presence of these effects, which can

be computed in the Standard Model, is to modify (71):

$$\frac{g^2}{8M_W^2}(1 + \Delta r_\mu) = \frac{G_\mu}{\sqrt{2}} \quad , \quad (73)$$

where  $\Delta r_\mu$  denotes the corrections induced by the processes in Fig. 5. One can then use relation (73) to compute other electroweak observables where the value of  $g$  is needed very precisely, or to test the self-consistency of the electroweak measurements. Letting  $g = e/\sin\theta_W$ ,  $e^2 = 4\pi\alpha$ , and treating  $\Delta r_\mu$  as small leads to

$$G_\mu = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}M_W^2 \sin^2\theta_W(1 - \Delta r_\mu)} \quad (74)$$

One can then take  $M_W, \alpha$ , and  $\sin^2\theta_W$  from experiment, compute  $\Delta r_\mu$ , and “predict”  $G_\mu$ . In this case, one obtains[6]:

$$G_\mu^{SM} = 1.1661(\mp 0.0018) \begin{pmatrix} +0.0005 \\ -0.0004 \end{pmatrix} \times 10^{-5} \text{GeV}^{-2} \quad .$$

The level at agreement between this prediction and the result of  $\tau_\mu$  is impressive, and suggests that the way one puts together the gauge sector of the Standard Model is right.

Other features of the Standard Model can be tested with  $\mu$ -decay. For example, the outgoing  $e^-$  in  $\mu^-$ -decay should be left-handed. In the limit where one neglects  $m_e$ , this implies  $h(e^-) = -1$ . Similarly, the Standard Model predicts  $h(e^+) = +1$  in  $\mu^+$ -decay. The experimental limits are[7]:

$$\begin{aligned} h(e^-) &= -0.89 \pm 0.28 \\ h(e^+) &= +.94 \pm 0.08 \end{aligned}$$

consistent with the Standard Model.

Another handle on the Standard Model is to consider the decay of polarized muons. The rate can be written in terms of the so-called Michel parameters[8]. The rate is a function of:

$$X = \frac{|\vec{p}_e|}{|\vec{p}_e, max|}$$

and  $\theta$ , the angle between  $\vec{p}_e$  and the  $\vec{\mu}$  spin. The parameters  $\rho$  and  $\delta$  characterize the spectral shape for large  $X$ , and  $\eta$  characterizes the low energy region. The parameter  $\xi$  is an asymmetry parameter that characterizes the strength of a term in the rate proportional to  $\cos\theta$ . The Standard Model predictions (for purely left-handed weak interactions) and experimental results are[7]:

Parameter	Experiment	Standard Model
$\xi$	$-1.0045 \pm 0.0086$	-1.0
$\rho$	$0.7578 \pm 0.0026$	$\frac{3}{4}$
$\eta$	$-0.007 \pm 0.013$	0
$\delta$	$0.7486 \pm 0.0038$	$\frac{3}{4}$

Again, the level of agreement with the Standard Model is quite impressive. As in the case of  $G_\mu$ , one can use experimental results for the Michel parameters to put limits on possible physics “beyond” the Standard Model. Plans are currently being made to measure  $G_\mu$  even more precisely, and a new experiment to determine the Michel parameters is being performed at TRIUMF by the TWIST collaboration.

## B. Pion Decay and Lepton Universality

The reactions:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^+ &\rightarrow e^+ \nu_e \\ \pi^+ &\rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu\end{aligned}$$

occur at lowest order when a  $u\bar{d}$  quark pair annihilates into a  $W^+$ . According to the Standard Model, the coupling of the  $W^+$  to a  $u\bar{d}$  is proportional to:

$$\frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} \bar{d} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u = J_\mu^{CC} \quad (75)$$



where ‘‘CC’’ stands for ‘‘charged current.’’ The matrix element of  $J_\mu^{CC}$  in the decay of the  $\pi^+$  is:

$$\langle 0 | J_\mu^{CC} | \pi^+(q) \rangle = i \frac{F_\pi}{\sqrt{\omega_\pi}} q_\mu \quad , \quad (76)$$

where  $F_\pi \approx 93$  MeV is the  $\pi$  decay constant. It parameterizes all the strong interaction(QCD) physics responsible for binding the  $u\bar{d}$  into a  $\pi^+$  – physics one can’t calculate reliably. Hence,  $F_\pi$  is taken from experiment. The total rate for  $\pi^+ \rightarrow l^+ \nu_l$  in the Standard Model is:

$$\Gamma = G_\mu^2 \frac{|V_{ud}|^2}{4\pi} F_\pi^2 m_l^2 m_\pi \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{m_l^2}{m_\pi^2} \right) \right]^2 \quad (77)$$

note that in the ratio of partial rates

$$R_{e/\mu} = \frac{\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu)}{\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu)} \quad (78)$$

the dependences on  $G_\mu$ ,  $|V_{ud}|$  and  $F_\pi$  cancel out. The only difference in the  $\pi^+ \rightarrow e\nu$  and  $\pi^+ \rightarrow l\nu$  rates came from the lepton masses. Thus, the Standard Model makes a very precise prediction for  $R_{e/\mu}$ , even after including electroweak radiative corrections of the type that enter  $\Delta r_\mu$ .

Importantly, the ratio is insensitive to the  $\pi^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm$  component of the decay matrix element, which is the same for both types of lepton final state. Hence, determining  $R_{e/\mu}$  is a way to test the Standard Model prediction that the  $W^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu_e$  and  $W^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$  couplings are the same, that is, universal.

Recently,  $R_{e/\mu}$  has been determined very precisely at PSI[9] and TRIUMF[10]. The comparison of experiment (exp) with the Standard Model prediction (SM) yields[11]:

$$\frac{R_{e/\mu}^{\text{exp}}}{R_{e/\mu}^{\text{SM}}} = 0.9958 \pm 0.0033(\text{exp}) \pm 0.0004(\text{theory}) \quad . \quad (79)$$

Note the impressive precision both of the experiment( $\sim 0.3\%$ ) and theory (0.04%). The result is a clear indication of the  $e$ - $\mu$  universality of the Standard Model.

### C. Nuclear $\beta$ -Decay: Lepton-hadron CC Universality and CKM Mixing

One of the classic and critically important nuclear physics processes used to test the Standard Model is nuclear  $\beta$ -decay. Nuclear  $\beta$ -decay can occur via one of the following processes:

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e \quad (80)$$

$$p \rightarrow n + e^+ + \nu_e \quad (81)$$

where the second reaction occurs when a proton is bound in a nucleus. As in the case of the  $\pi$ -decay, the currents on the left hand side of these diagrams are given by:

$$\text{Charge lowering} : \frac{gV_{ud}}{2\sqrt{2}}\bar{d}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)u \quad (82)$$

$$\text{Charge raising} : \frac{gV_{ud}}{2\sqrt{2}}\bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d \quad (83)$$

For the moment, let's focus on the vector part of the quark currents, omitting the constants  $g, V_{ud}$ , etc.. One has:

$$J_\mu^+ = \bar{u}\gamma_\mu d \quad (84)$$

$$J_\mu^- = \bar{d}\gamma_\mu u \quad (85)$$

Compare these currents with the isovector EM current:

$$J_\mu^{T=1}(EM) = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}\gamma_\mu u - \bar{d}\gamma_\mu d) \quad (86)$$

A compact way of writing Eqs. (84-86) is to use:

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix} \quad \bar{Q} = (\bar{u} \bar{d})$$

So that

$$\begin{aligned} J_\mu^+ &= \bar{Q}\gamma_\mu\tau_+Q \\ J_\mu^- &= \bar{Q}\gamma_\mu\tau_-Q \\ J_\mu^{T=1} &= \bar{Q}\gamma_\mu\frac{\tau_3}{2}Q \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

Now an astute observer will realize that the set of currents (87) form an isospin triplet, satisfying the commutation relations:

$$[I_{\pm}, J_{\mu}^{T=1,EM}] = \mp J_{\mu}^{\pm} \quad (88)$$

$$[I_3, J_{\mu}^{\pm}] = \pm 2J_{\mu}^{\pm} \quad (89)$$

where

$$I_k = \int d^3x \bar{Q} \gamma_0 \frac{\tau_k}{2} Q \quad (90)$$

In short,  $\{J_{\mu}^{\pm}, J_{\mu}^{T=1,EM}\}$  satisfy the same commutation relations as  $\{I^{\pm}, I_3\}$ . Consequently, matrix elements of the currents (84-86) must be related in the same way as matrix elements of the isospin operators (up to angular momentum properties). This property of the Standard Model is known as the ‘‘conserved vector current’’ property, or CVC. It implies that:

- (i) Matrix elements of  $J_{\mu}^{\pm}$  between nuclear states of different total isospin (I) must vanish.
- (ii) Matrix elements of  $J_0^{\pm}$  satisfy:

$$\langle I, I_z \pm 1 | J_0^{\pm} | I, I_z \rangle = [(I \mp I_z)(I \pm I_z + 1)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (91)$$

at  $q^2 = 0$ . A special set of nuclear decays sensitive to the matrix element (91) are the ‘‘superallowed’’ Fermi decays involving transitions:

$$(J^{\pi} = 0^+, I, I_z) \rightarrow (J^{\pi} = 0^+, I, I_z \pm 1)$$

Since the initial and final states have the same parity and zero total angular momentum, the axial current cannot connect them. Moreover, since the initial and final nuclear spins  $J_f = J_i = 0$ , only the vector charge operator can connect the two states. Letting  $H_{fi}$  denote the total transition amplitude, one has

$$H_{fi} = \frac{g^2 V_{ud}}{8M_W^2} [(I \mp I_z)(I \pm I_z + 1)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (92)$$

so that

$$|H_{fi}|^2 = \frac{G_{\mu}^2 |V_{ud}|^2}{2} [(I \mp I_z)(I \pm I_z + 1)] \quad (93)$$

at  $q^2 = 0$ . Amazingly, the value of  $|H_{fi}|^2$  for *any* superallowed decay depends only on the muon decay Fermi constant,  $|V_{ud}|^2$  from the CKM matrix, and the isospin factor. In the expression for (93), there appears no dependence on the nuclear wavefunction—no matter how complex it is! Thus, if one takes the rate for any superallowed decay and divides out the kinematical and the isospin factors, one should get the same answer as for any other superallowed decay. If this works, then the CVC prediction of the Standard Model is right. Moreover, by comparing this common rate with  $G_\mu$ , one can test charged current universality for the leptons and quarks (the overall strength is  $\approx G_\mu$ ) and extract the quark mixing parameter  $|V_{ud}|$ . Let's see how this works in detail:

The differential decay rate is, from Fermi's Golden Rule:

$$d\Gamma = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |H_{fi}|^2 \rho_f \delta(E_0 - E_e - E_\nu) \quad (94)$$

where  $E_0 =$  is the energy released to the leptons and

$$\rho_f \frac{d^3 p_e}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \frac{d^3 p_\nu}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \quad (95)$$

is the density of final states. As an aside, consider for the moment the possibility<sup>3</sup> that  $m_{\nu_e} \neq 0$ . Putting in the factors of  $c$ , we have

$$E_\nu = (c^2 p_\nu^2 + m_\nu^2 c^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (96)$$

$$c p_\nu = (E_\nu^2 - m_\nu^2 c^4)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (97)$$

Integrating over  $d^3 p_\nu$  gives

$$d\Gamma = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |H_{fi}|^2 \frac{4\pi}{c^3} (E_0 - E_e)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{(m_\nu c^2)^2}{(E_0 - E_e)^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{p_e^2 dp_e d\Omega}{(2\pi\hbar)^6} \quad (98)$$

Note that for a given detector setting which accepts all counts in a solid angle  $\Delta\Omega = \sin\theta\Delta\theta\Delta\pi$ , the number of electrons counted in a momentum slice  $\Delta p_e$  is

$$\Delta N \equiv N(p_e)\Delta p_e \propto (E_0 - E_e)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{(m_\nu c^2)^2}{(E_0 - E_e)^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} p_e^2 \quad (99)$$

Now let's think about a plot of

$$\frac{\sqrt{N(p_e)}}{p_e} \propto (E_0 - E_e) \left[ 1 - \frac{(m_\nu c^2)^2}{(E_0 - E_e)^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \quad (100)$$

---

<sup>3</sup> In the SM, one has  $m_\nu = 0$ . However, the results from a variety of neutrino oscillation experiments have taught us that neutrinos have mass.

This graph is known as a *Kurie plot*. The curve intercepts the  $x$ -axis at  $E_e = E_0 - m_\nu c^2$ . Thus, deviations from linearity at the “endpoint” would indicate  $m_\nu \neq 0$ . One of the most precise upper limits on neutrino mass comes from analyzing the endpoint of the decay[12]:

$${}^3\text{H} \rightarrow {}^3\text{He} + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e \quad , \quad (101)$$

which yields  $m_{\bar{\nu}_e} \leq 15\text{eV}$ . So until recent observations of neutrino oscillations, nuclear  $\beta$ -decay confirmed at a very high level that  $m_\nu = 0$  as implied by the Standard Model:

$$\frac{m_{\bar{\nu}_e}}{m_e} \leq 3 \times 10^{-5} \quad . \quad (102)$$

Now, back to super allowed decays. Converting  $dp_e$  to  $dE_e$  and putting in all the  $\hbar$ 's and  $c$ 's, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Gamma}{dE_e} &= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi^3 \hbar^4 c^6} \right) |H_{fi}|^2 \\ &\times E_e [E_e^2 - (m_e c^2)^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} (E_0 - E_e)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{(m_\nu c^2)^2}{(E_0 - E_e)^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

after integrating over  $d\Omega_e$ . Letting  $\epsilon = E_e/m_e c^2$ :

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{d\epsilon} = \left( \frac{m_e^5 c^4}{2\pi^3 \hbar^7} \right) |H_{fi}|^2 \epsilon (\epsilon^2 - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\epsilon_0 - \epsilon)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{(\epsilon_0 - \epsilon)^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad , \quad (104)$$

where  $\lambda = m_{\nu_e}/m_e$ . Now, we should correct for the fact that the outgoing electron wavefunction is distorted by the nucleus and other atomic electrons. One can solve for the appropriate correction factor very precisely. Let's denote this factor by  $F(Z, \epsilon)$ . Multiplying (104) by this factor and integrating over  $\epsilon$  gives the total rate:

$$\Gamma = \left( \frac{m_e^5 c^4}{2\pi^3 \hbar^7} \right) |H_{fi}|^2 f(Z) \quad (105)$$

where where  $f(Z)$  results from including  $f(Z, \epsilon)$  in the integral. For  $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$  transitions, the Standard Model value for  $|H_{fi}|^2$  is  $\epsilon$ -independent and is given by:

$$|H_{fi}|^2 = \frac{G_\mu^2}{2} |V_{ud}|^2 [(I \mp I_z)(I \pm I_z + 1)] \times 2 \quad (106)$$

as in Eq. (93), so that

$$\Gamma = \left( \frac{m_e^5 c^4}{2\pi^3 \hbar^7} \right) G_\mu^2 |V_{ud}|^2 [(I \mp I_z)(I \pm I_z + 1)] f(Z) \quad . \quad (107)$$

The additional factor of 2 in Eq. (106) results from the purely leptonic part of the matrix element. Now an aside on units. The quantity  $G_\mu(m_e c^2)^2/(\hbar c)^3$  is dimensionless. Thus, the dimensions of (105) are

$$[\Gamma] : \left[ G_\mu \frac{(m_e c^2)^2}{(\hbar c)^3} \right]^2 \frac{m_e c^2}{\hbar} \quad (108)$$

while

$$\frac{m_e c^2}{\hbar} = \frac{m_e c^2}{\hbar c} \times c \quad . \quad (109)$$

Thus,  $[m_e c^2/\hbar] = (\text{MeV}/\text{MeV}f) \times (f/s) = 1/s$ , so the dimensions work out just right, with  $\Gamma$  having the dimensions of a rate. The time dependence of decay is described by:

$$N = N_0 e^{-\Gamma t} \quad . \quad (110)$$

For  $t = t_{\frac{1}{2}}$  denoting the half-life, at which time  $N = N_0/2$  we have

$$\Gamma t_{\frac{1}{2}} = \ln 2 \quad (111)$$

or

$$f t_{\frac{1}{2}} = \left( \frac{2\pi^3 \ln 2 \hbar^7}{m_e^5 c^4} \right) \frac{1}{G_\mu^2 |V_{ud}|^2} \frac{1}{[(I \mp I_z)(I \pm I_z + 1)]} \quad . \quad (112)$$

The quantity in Eq. (112) is called the “ft” value for the decay. It turns out that for all the experimentally studied superallowed transitions, the isospin factor in the denominator of Eq. (112) is the same. Thus, the ft values should be the same for all  $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$  transition if CVC is right. In fact, nine superallowed decays have been studied. The “ft” values for the decays agree at an impressive level of precision. Thus, to an extremely high precision, the SU(2) character of the weak charged currents are confirmed by nuclear  $\beta$ -decay. One last important feature: the superallowed decays can test lepton-quark universality of the charged current weak interaction *and* the unitarity of the CKM matrix. To see how, let:

$$G_F^\beta = G_\mu |V_{ud}| (1 + \Delta r_\beta - \Delta r_\mu) \quad , \quad (113)$$

where  $\Delta r_\beta$  and  $\Delta r_\mu$  denote *radiative corrections* to  $\beta$ -decay and  $\mu$ -decay, respectively. The correction  $\Delta r_\beta$  appears because of higher-order effects in the semileptonic ( $d \rightarrow u e^- \bar{\nu}_e$ ) amplitude. On the other hand,  $-\Delta r_\mu$  appears because the Fermi constant has been taken from the muon lifetime, and we need to subtract out radiative corrections to the muon decay amplitude because they are contained in  $G_\mu$  but don't affect  $\beta$ -decay. These corrections

must be computed from the Standard Model. Using the result of these calculations and the experimental muon lifetime and  $\beta$ -decay ft values, we have:

$$G_F^\beta = 1.16637(1) \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2} \quad (114)$$

and

$$|V_{ud}|^2 = \frac{G_F^\beta}{G_\mu(1 + \Delta r_\beta - \Delta r_\mu)} = 0.9740 \pm 0.0005 \quad . \quad (115)$$

From  $K_{\ell 3}$  and hyperon decays we have  $|V_{us}| = 0.2196 \pm 0.0023$  while  $B$ -meson decays give  $|V_{ub}| = 0.0032 \pm 0.009$  . Now unitarity of the CKM matrix requires:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{ub}|^2 = 1 \quad . \quad (116)$$

The experimental results give:

$$|V_{ud}|_{\text{exp}}^2 + |V_{us}|_{\text{exp}}^2 + |V_{ub}|_{\text{exp}}^2 = 0.9968 \pm 0.0015 \quad , \quad (117)$$

corresponding to a  $2.2 \sigma$  deviation from the SM requirement of CKM unitarity.

Note that at the one percent level, charged current lepton-quark universality and CKM unitarity are confirmed by  $\beta$ -decay,  $\mu$ -decay,  $K_{l3}$ -decays, and B-decays. However, at the level of precision now achieved by experiment, these features of the Standard Model almost hang together-though not quite. There is a hint that maybe there is more to the electroweak interactions than the Standard Model, and that this “new physics” may be responsible for the very tiny deviation from lepton-quark universality and CKM unitarity. As an aside, one might wonder why one chooses to focus on nuclear decays rather than the decay of the free neutron. In fact,  $\tau_n$  has been measured very precisely:

$$\tau_n = 886.7 \pm 1.9s \quad . \quad (118)$$

However, it is a more complicated matter to extract  $G_F^\beta$  from these decays. Because the neutron has spin 1/2, both the vector and axial vector weak quark currents contribute to the decay rate. The axial vector current is not protected by a CVC type symmetry, and it gets important renormalizations due to the strong interaction. At present, we cannot compute these strong interaction effects with the kind of precision we’d need in order to extract  $|V_{ud}|^2$  from  $\tau_n$  alone. In order to circumvent this problem, one can perform measurements of parity-violating asymmetries associated with, *e.g.*, the direction of the outgoing  $e^-$  relative

to the direction of neutron spin. Knowing both  $\tau_n$  and one of these asymmetries allows one to determine separately the vector and axial vector contributions. From the former, we can obtain a value for  $|V_{ud}|^2$  without having to worry about incalculable strong interaction effects.

It is only recently that experiments have begun to determine these asymmetries with the kind of precision needed to determine  $|V_{ud}|^2$  with the same precision as obtained from  $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$  decays. At present, there is an active research program underway at Los Alamos that will use polarized, ultracold neutrons to measure the  $\beta$ -decay asymmetries. The goal of this program is to match or even exceed the precision on  $|V_{ud}|^2$  obtained from the superallowed decays.

#### D. Parity violating DIS and Weak Neutral currents

So far, we've seen how low energy experiments have provided important confirmation of several features of the charged current weak interaction. What about the weak neutral current?

There exists a basic difficulty in this case. Nature has given us two neutral currents, the electromagnetic (EM) and weak neutral current (NC):

$$J_\mu^{EM} = \sum_f Q_f \bar{f} \gamma_\mu f \quad (119)$$

$$J_\mu^{NC} = \sum_f \bar{f} \gamma_\mu (g_V^f + g_A^f \gamma_5) f \quad , \quad (120)$$

where the sum runs over all species of fermions,  $Q_f$  denotes the EM charge of fermion  $f$ , and  $g_V^f$  ( $g_A^f$ ) is the vector (axial vector) coupling of  $f$  to the  $Z^0$  boson. In a low energy charge neutral process, amplitudes associated with both enter. So the problem will be how to separate them.

To be concrete, consider the scattering of electrons from quarks inside a hadronic target. The total amplitude for the process of  $eq$  scattering is:

$$M = M_{EM} + M_{NC} \quad , \quad (121)$$



while the cross section is  $\propto |M^2|$ :

$$|M|^2 = |M_{EM}|^2 + 2\text{Re}(M_{EM}^* M_{NC}) + |M_{NC}|^2 \quad . \quad (122)$$

Consequently, the neutral current cross section can be separated into three terms:

$$\sigma^{\text{tot}} = \sigma^{EM} + \sigma^{\text{int}} + \sigma^{NC} \quad . \quad (123)$$

Here,  $\sigma^{EM}$ ,  $\sigma^{\text{int}}$ , and  $\sigma^{NC}$  denote the purely electromagnetic contribution, the part arising from the interference of EM and weak NC amplitudes, and a purely weak NC contribution (corresponding to the three terms in (122)). The coupling strengths entering the amplitudes are  $e$  for the EM amplitude and  $gM_Z/4M_W$  for the weak NC amplitude. With this normalization one has :

$$g_V^f = 2T_3^f - 4Q_f \sin^2 \theta_W \quad (124)$$

$$g_A^f = -2T_3^f \quad . \quad (125)$$

This allows us to write:

$$|M_{EM}|^2 \propto \left(\frac{e^2}{q^2}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{4\pi\alpha}{q^2}\right)^2 \quad , \quad (126)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 2\text{Re}(M_{EM}^* M_{NC}) &\propto 2 \left(\frac{e^2}{q^2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{gM_Z}{4M_W}\right)^2 \frac{1}{M_Z^2 - q^2} \\ &\rightarrow 2 \times \frac{4\pi\alpha}{q^2} \frac{G_\mu}{2\sqrt{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

at  $q^2 = 0$ , and

$$|M_{NC}|^2 \propto \left[ \left(\frac{gM_Z}{4M_W}\right)^2 \frac{1}{M_W^2 - q^2} \right]^2 \propto \frac{G_\mu^2}{8} \quad (128)$$

at  $q^2 = 0$ . Now consider the relative strengths of the corresponding cross sections at low-energies. The ratio of the interference cross section  $\sigma^{\text{int}}$  to the EM cross section  $\sigma^{EM}$  goes as

$$\frac{\sigma^{\text{int}}}{\sigma^{EM}} = \frac{2\text{Re}(M_{EM}^* M_{NC})}{|M_{EM}|^2} \propto \frac{G_\mu}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{q^2}{4\pi\alpha} \quad (129)$$

Letting  $|q^2| \propto (1\text{GeV})^2 \propto m_p^2$  (units where  $\hbar = c = 1$ ) be a typical momentum transfer for a low-energy scattering reaction, we have

$$\alpha \approx \frac{1}{137} \quad (130)$$

$$G_\mu \sim \frac{10^{-5}}{m_p^2} \quad , \quad (131)$$

leads to:

$$\frac{\sigma^{\text{int}}}{\sigma^{EM}} \approx 10^{-4} \quad . \quad (132)$$

The magnitude of  $\sigma^{NC}/\sigma^{EM}$  is even smaller. So how is one ever going to see weak neutral current effects at low energies? The basic idea is to use the fact that  $M_{NC}$  contains pieces that are odd under parity, where as  $M_{EM}$  is parity even. Letting

$$V_\mu^f = \bar{f}\gamma_\mu f \quad (133)$$

$$A_\mu^f = \bar{f}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 f \quad (134)$$

one has

$$J_\mu^{EM} = \sum_f Q_f V_\mu^f \quad (135)$$

$$J_\mu^{NC} = \sum_f g_V^f V_\mu^f + \sum_f g_A^f A_\mu^f \quad (136)$$

Now, let's look at the e-q amplitudes again, as illustrated in Fig. 6. In schematic terms, one




FIG. 6: Electron-quark scattering diagrams

has

$$M_{EM} \sim Q_e Q_q V_e \cdot V_q \quad (137)$$

$$M_{NC} \sim \frac{G}{2\sqrt{2}} [g_V^e g_V^q V_e \cdot V_q + g_A^e g_A^q A_e \cdot A_q + g_V^e g_A^q V_e \cdot A_q + g_A^e g_V^q A_e \cdot V_q] \quad (138)$$

The last two terms in  $M_{NC}$  transform as pseudoscalars; they are odd (change sign) under parity. All the other terms in Eqs. (137,138) are parity-even. Thus, to the extent that one can experimentally isolate these terms by measuring an observable which is parity-odd, one has a way to “filter out” the much larger EM interaction and get one’s hands on the effects of the weak NC.

Now consider the following experiment. A beam of electrons with with spin and momentum vectors parallel (helicity  $h = +1$ ), elastically scatter from a nucleon. Subsequently, the incident electron's spin is flipped, so that its spin and momentum vectors are anti-parallel ( $h = -1$ ). One may then form the helicity-difference or “left-right” asymmetry:

$$A_{LR} = \frac{N(h = +1) - N(h = -1)}{N(h = +1) + N(h = -1)} \quad , \quad (139)$$

where  $N(h)$  denotes the number of events for electrons having incident helicity  $h$ . Since  $h = \hat{s} \cdot \hat{k} \rightarrow -\hat{s} \cdot \hat{k}$  under parity, the asymmetry  $A_{LR}$  must be proportional to the parts of  $|M|^2$  which contain pseudoscalars. In fact, one has

$$\begin{aligned} A_{LR} &= \frac{2Re(M_{EM}^* M_{NC}^{PV})}{|M_{EM}|^2 + \dots} \approx \frac{2Re(M_{EM}^* M_{NC}^{PV})}{|M_{EM}|^2} \\ &= \frac{G_\mu q^2}{4\sqrt{2}\pi\alpha} \frac{g_V^e g_A^q V_e \cdot A_q + g_A^e g_V^q A_e \cdot V_q}{Q_e Q_q V_e \cdot V_q} \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

Here I have not performed a sum over quark spins nor integrated over energies, angles of the outgoing quarks, *etc.* The expression is essentially schematic, illustrating the basic physics ingredients in the asymmetry. Now, it takes a little algebra to perform this calculation, but it is doable. In addition, one can analyze  $e^-N$  or  $e^-A$  scattering *as if* one were scattering off individual quarks and then summing over different types of quarks in the nucleon. To do this one needs to work in a kinematic regime where

$$W^2 = (P_{target} + q)^2 = q^2 + 2M_t\nu + M^2 \gg M_T^2 \quad (141)$$

where  $\nu = q_0$  is the energy transfer to the target (having mass  $M_T$ ), which is just the energy loss of the electron.

This kind of experiment is called deep inelastic scattering (DIS). One of the first experiments to test the neutral current structure of the Standard Model was carried out at SLAC in the 1970's using parity-violating (PV) DIS from a deuterium target[13]. The L-R asymmetry for this scattering is:

$$A_{LR}^{DIS}(\vec{e}D) = \frac{G_\mu q^2}{4\sqrt{2}\pi\alpha} \left(\frac{9}{10}\right) \left[ \tilde{a}_1 + \tilde{a}_2 \frac{1 - (1 - y)^2}{1 + (1 - y)^2} \right] \quad (142)$$

where:

$$\tilde{a}_1 = \frac{1}{3} g_A^e (2g_V^u - g_V^d) = 1 - \frac{20}{9} \sin^2 \theta_W \quad (143)$$

$$\tilde{a}_2 = \frac{1}{3} g_V^e (2g_A^u - g_A^d) = 1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_W \quad (144)$$

and

$$y = \frac{\nu}{E_e} \quad (145)$$

in the lab frame. The SLAC experiment was carried out at four energies in the range:

$$\begin{aligned} 16.2 &\geq E_e \geq 22.2 \text{ GeV} \\ \langle Q^2 \rangle &= 1.6 \text{ (GeV}/c)^2 \quad . \end{aligned}$$

The  $A_{LR}$  was measured as a function of  $y$ , which allowed a separation of  $\tilde{a}_1$  and  $\tilde{a}_2$ . The best fit to the results can be used to extract a value of  $\sin^2 \theta_W$ :

$$\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.224 \pm 0.020 \quad . \quad (146)$$

Note that  $\sin^2 \theta_W \approx \frac{1}{4}$  which implies that  $\tilde{a}_2 \approx 0$ . This result corresponds to  $A_{LR}$  having almost no dependence on the kinematic variable  $y$ . Thus, the SLAC data is consistent with the Standard Model picture of  $SU(2)_L$  and  $U(1)_Y$  mixing in the neutral current sector with the mixing parameter,  $\sin^2 \theta_W$ , being close to  $\frac{1}{4}$ . At the time the experiment was performed, there existed competing electroweak models which predicted a more dramatic  $y$ -dependence of  $A_{LR}$ . These models were ruled out by the results of this experiment.

The SLAC value for  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  was later confirmed in a series of purely leptonic experiments[14]:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\mu + e &\rightarrow \nu_\mu + e \\ \bar{\nu}_\mu + e &\rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu + e \\ \bar{\nu}_e + e &\rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e + e \\ e^+ e^- &\rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \quad , \end{aligned}$$

where the last measurement involved studying the the forward-backward asymmetry. Taken together, these leptonic experiments implied that  $\sin^2 \theta_W \approx 0.22$ , in agreement with the SLAC result. Thus, lepton-quark universality also holds for the neutral current sector of the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  theory, with a common set of couplings ( $g, g'$ ) and mixing parameter ( $\sin^2 \theta_W$ ) governing both leptonic and semileptonic interactions.

## E. Atomic PV and Weak Neutral Currents

Additional confirmation of the Standard Model structure of the weak neutral currents comes from atomic physics, where one looks for PV asymmetries associated with the weak interaction between atomic electrons and the nucleus. In fact, one of the most precise determinations of the weak neutral current  $eq$  interaction has been performed by the Boulder group using atomic parity-violation (APV) in cesium[15]. The idea behind these experiments was developed by the Bouchiat[16] in Paris in the mid 1970's-about the same time the SLAC experiment was underway.

As in the case of PV DIS, the use of APV to get at the weak neutral current relies on an interference effect between the parity violating weak neutral current atomic matrix elements and the electromagnetic matrix elements. However, unlike PV DIS, APV relies on a coherent sum over the individual electron-quark amplitudes. The basic physics is that an atomic electron interacts with the nucleus by exchanging both a  $\gamma$  and a  $Z^0$  boson. The probability amplitude for the PV part of the latter is

$$M_{PV} \sim \frac{G_\mu}{2\sqrt{2}} [g_A^e A_e \cdot \langle N | \sum_q g_V^q V_q | N \rangle + g_V^e V_e \cdot \langle N | g_A^q A_q | N \rangle] . \quad (147)$$

This amplitude, which contains two distinct terms, causes the atomic states of the opposite parity to mix. In the atomic Hamiltonian derived from this amplitude, one finds that the first term is dominated by the time components of the currents, whereas the second part is dominated by the space components. For the first term, we have

$$\langle N | \sum_q g_V^q V_q^{\mu=0} | N \rangle = \langle N | \sum_q g_V^q q^+ q | N \rangle . \quad (148)$$

Now  $q^\dagger q$  just counts the number of quarks of flavor  $q$ . Thus the matrix element (148) gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N | \sum_q g_V^q V_q^{\mu=0} | N \rangle &= (2N + Z)g_V^d + (2Z + N)g_V^u \\ &= N(2g_V^d + g_V^u) + Z(2g_V^u + g_V^d) \equiv Q_W , \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

where  $Q_W$  is the ‘‘weak charge’’ of the nucleus. Now

$$g_V^u = -1 + \frac{4}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \quad (150)$$

$$g_V^d = 1 - \frac{8}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \quad (151)$$

so that the weak charges of the proton and neutron, respectively, are

$$Q_W^p = 2g_V^u + g_V^d = 1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_W \quad (152)$$

$$Q_W^n = 2g_V^d + g_V^u = -1 \quad . \quad (153)$$

In terms of these quantities, the weak charge of an atomic nucleus is

$$Q_W = NQ_W^n + ZQ_W^p \quad (154)$$

$$= -N + Z(1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_W) \quad . \quad (155)$$

Note that  $\sin^2 \theta_W \approx 0.231$  so that  $Q_W^p = 1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_W \sim 0.1$  whereas  $Q_W^n = -1$ . Hence, in contrast to the  $\gamma$  charge couplings  $Q_{EM}^p = 1$  and  $Q_{EM}^n = 0$ , the  $Z^0$  has a vector coupling to the neutron of strength unity and a tiny coupling to protons. In short, the  $\gamma$  see mostly protons, whereas the  $Z^0$  sees mostly neutrons. Now using  $g_A^e = 1$  the first term in (147) becomes:

$$\frac{G_\mu}{2\sqrt{2}} Q_W e^+ \gamma_5 e \quad (156)$$

The second term is more complicated, since  $\langle N | \sum_q A_q^\mu | N \rangle$  is not coherent and depends on the nuclear spin (the first term does not). Moreover,  $g_V^e = -1 + 4 \sin^2 \theta_W$  further suppresses this term.

To get some intuition into the structure of the resulting Hamiltonian, one can take the limit of a non-relativistic electron in the field at a point like nucleus:

$$\hat{H}_W^{PV} = \hat{H}_W^{PV}(NSID) + \hat{H}_W^{PV}(NSD) \quad (157)$$

where

$$\hat{H}_W^{PV}(NSID) = \frac{G_\mu}{4\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{m_e c} Q_W \{ \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p}, \delta^3(\vec{r}) \} \quad (158)$$

$$\hat{H}_W^{PV}(NSD) = \frac{G_\mu}{4\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{m_e c} (1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_W) g_A^N \{ \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p}, \delta^3(\vec{r}) \} \quad . \quad (159)$$

So how does an experiment which probes these interactions actually work? The most precise result is from APV in cesium, which has  $Z = 55$  and  $N = 78$ . The ground state of the atom is a 6S state. The PV interaction (157) mixes a bit of the 6P state into this S state. Similar mixing occurs for the excited states. Now, what the Colorado experiment does is apply an

external electric field, which causes mixing of the S and P states due to the Stark effect. In this case, one can obtain an E1 transition which is proportional to  $\vec{E}$ . The atoms are excited into the 7S state with circularly polarized light and the transition rate is measured. This rate can be expressed as:

$$\Gamma(6S \rightarrow 7S) = \beta^2 E^2 \epsilon_z^2 \left[ 1 + K \frac{E1_{PV}}{\beta E} \frac{\epsilon_x}{\epsilon_z} \right] , \quad (160)$$

where  $\beta$  is the Stark-induced amplitude, K is a geometric factor (dependent on the  $m$ -quantum numbers),  $\epsilon_{x,z}$  are laser polarization components, and  $(E1)_{PV}$  is the PV-induced amplitude. By reversing  $\vec{E}$  or the laser polarization, one can experimentally isolate the interference term containing  $E1_{PV}$ .

It also turns out that one can experimentally isolate the effects of H(NSID), containing  $Q_W$ , and H(NSD) by looking at sums and difference of the rates for different E1 hyperfine transitions. When all is said and done, one then can extract the following quantity:

$$\xi Q_W \quad , \quad (161)$$

where  $\xi$  is a quantity which depends on an atomic calculation of the PV atomic mixing matrix element

$$\langle P_{1/2} | \{ \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p}, \delta^3(\vec{r}) \} | s_{1/2} \rangle \quad . \quad (162)$$

Taking into account the latest atomic theory computations of  $\xi$ , the result of the Boulder measurement gives[17]:

$$Q_W^{\text{exp}} = -72.81 \pm 0.28(\text{exp}) \pm 0.36(\text{atomic theory}) \quad , \quad (163)$$

whereas the Standard Model prediction for  $Q_W$  is[5, 18]:

$$Q_W^{SM} = -73.17 \pm 0.03 \quad . \quad (164)$$

Until recently, the values of  $Q_W^{\text{exp}}$  and  $Q_W^{SM}$  differed by up to more than two standard deviations. However, in the past year, atomic theorists have included some rather subtle, nucleus-dependent effects in the radiative corrections that have changed the value of  $\xi$  and moved the weak charge into agreement with the SM prediction. Thus, taken together

with the SLAC experiment and the low-energy charged current measurements discussed earlier, cesium APV provides a substantial vote of confidence in the essential ingredients of the Standard Model.

#### IV. PHYSICS BEYOND THE STANDARD MODEL

As the previous sections have tried to illustrate, low-energy experiments in nuclear and atomic physics have played an important role in verifying some of the basic ingredients of the Standard Model. Of course, tests have been performed over a wide range of energy scales, with some of the most decisive having been carried out at high energy colliders. The existence of the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  bosons was discovered in collider experiments at CERN, while measurements in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at center of mass energies  $\sqrt{s} \approx 90$  GeV – both at CERN and at SLAC – have tested the properties of the neutral current sector of the Standard Model with sub-one percent precision. Similarly, the discovery of the top quark in  $p\bar{p}$  collisions at the Tevatron represented an important triumph for the Standard Model, since the mass of the top quark is consistent with what one expects based on the  $m_t$ -dependence of electroweak radiative corrections to a variety of other measured electroweak observables. From these standpoints, the Standard Model has been an enormously successful theory.

Nevertheless, there exist many reasons for believing that the Standard Model is not the end of the story. Perhaps the most obvious is the number of independent parameters that must be put in by hand. As we saw earlier, the electroweak sector of the theory alone contains 17 *a priori* unknown parameters. The  $SU(3)_C$  sector (QCD) introduces two more, the strong coupling,  $g_s$ , and  $\theta$ . The latter parameterizes a term in the Lagrangian:

$$L_\theta^{QCD} = \theta \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} G_a^{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a \quad (165)$$

$$\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} G^{\alpha\beta} \quad , \quad (166)$$

with  $G_{\mu\nu}^a$  being the gluon field strength tensor and  $a = 1, \dots, 8$ . Note that  $L_\theta$  is both a pseudoscalar and odd under time reversal. It is also even under charge conjugation, so the interaction (165) is CP-violating. Measurements of the electric dipole moment of the neutron



and neutral atoms imply that  $\theta \leq 10^{-9} - 10^{-10}$ . This seems “un-natural”, given the size of the other parameters in the Standard Model. Hence the questions:

What is the origin of the various parameters in the Standard Model?

Why do they have the values one observes them to have?

Why is  $\theta_{QCD}$  so tiny? (This is the “strong CP Problem”)

There exists already some need to go beyond the Standard Model simply to answer these questions. But there is even more motivation:

### 1. Coupling Unification

There exists a strongly held belief among particle physicists and cosmologists that in the first moments of the life of the universe, all the forces of nature were “unified”, that is, they all fit into a single gauge group structure whose interaction strengths were described by a single coupling parameter,  $g_U$ . It is a remarkable idea, and an intellectually appealing one.

The scenario goes in the following manner: as the universe cooled down, spontaneous symmetry breaking occurred, giving gauge bosons masses and changing the way the interaction strength for various forces evolved or “ran” down to lower energies/temperatures. To see how this idea works, one must work out how the couplings(which are not constants!) run with the energy scale,  $\mu$ . The origin of this running is renormalization. Fermion and gauge boson wave functions, as well as interaction vertices, get the following contributions as seen in Fig. 7 for the vertex, Fig. 8 for the fermion wave function and Fig. 9 for the gauge boson wavefunction.




FIG. 7: Lowest order diagrams for the renormalizing the gauge boson-fermion vertex.




FIG. 8: Lowest order diagrams renormalizing the fermion wavefunction.




FIG. 9: Lowest order diagrams renormalizing the gauge boson wavefunction.

Each of these diagrams is infinite. This means that the theory was not constructed correctly to begin with, and some redefinitions must be made:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \psi &\rightarrow \psi_0 = \sqrt{Z_2}\psi \\
 W_\mu^a &\rightarrow W_{\mu 0}^a = \sqrt{Z_3}W_\mu^a \\
 g &\rightarrow g_0 = g \frac{Z_1}{Z_2\sqrt{Z_3}}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{167}$$

The constants  $Z_i$  are defined in such a way that when one computes the loops with the redefined quantities and add them to the tree level quantities, one gets a finite answer. The only hitch is that in making these definitions one has to specify the energy scale  $\mu$  at which one is working. Hence:

$$Z_i = Z_i(\mu)
 \tag{168}$$

This is because the graphs depend on  $\mu$ . Now, the Lagrangian can't depend on  $\mu$ ; it must hold for all scales. Since the Lagrangian depends on the “bare parameters”,  $\psi_0$ ,  $W_{\mu 0}^a$ , and

$g_0$ , these parameters can't depend on  $\mu$  either. Thus, one has:

$$\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} g_0 = 0 \quad (169)$$

Comparing (167) and (169) one sees that  $g$  must vary with  $\mu$  in order to compensate for the  $\mu$ -dependence of the  $Z_i$ . Thus, one obtains

$$\mu \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu} = \beta(g) \quad (170)$$

where  $\beta(g)$  depends on the group structure and fermion content of the theory. It dictates how  $g(\mu)$  runs with  $\mu$ . This relationship between  $g(\mu)$  and  $\beta(g)$  is known as a renormalization group equation. One can just as well convert Eq. (170) to an equation for the running of:

$$\alpha_k(\mu) = \frac{g_k(\mu^2)}{4\pi} \quad ,$$

where the subscript  $k$  indicates the gauge group to which  $g_k$  pertains. The renormalization group equations for the running of  $\alpha_k$  are ,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \alpha_k^{-1} = -\frac{b_k}{2\pi}$$

where  $t = \ln(\mu/\mu_0)$ ,  $\mu_0$  is a reference scale, and

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &= \frac{41}{20}, & g_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}} g' \\ b_2 &= -\frac{19}{6}, & g_2 &= g \\ b_3 &= -7, & g_3 &= g_s \end{aligned}$$

We can see that  $\alpha_2(\mu)$  and  $\alpha_3(\mu)$  – the couplings for the non-Abelian groups – decrease with  $\mu$  whereas the  $U(1)_Y$  coupling increases with  $\mu$ . In the case of QCD, this feature is known as asymptotic freedom.

If one were to plot the running couplings as a function of  $\mu$ , one would see that the three Standard Model couplings almost meet at a common point around  $\mu \sim 10^{16}$  GeV, but not quite. This result is tantalizing from the standpoint of unification. It is one of the motivations

for believing something else is out there, as this something else could modify the running of the couplings and produce unification<sup>4</sup>.

An aside on some terminology: One often hears reference made to the high-energy “desert.” This desert is the region in  $\mu$  between the weak scale,

$$M_{\text{weak}} \sim 250 \text{ GeV}/c^2 \quad (171)$$

and the scale where one believes gravity becomes strong. The obvious parameter which defines this scale is Newton’s gravitational constant,

$$G_N = 6.67259(85) \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ s}^2 \quad (172)$$

From this one may define the Planck mass:

$$M_{\text{pl}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G_N}} \cong 1.22 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV}/c^2 \quad . \quad (173)$$

The “desert” then refers to the region

$$M_{\text{weak}} \leq \mu \leq M_{\text{pl}} \quad . \quad (174)$$

The interest in looking for physics beyond the Standard Model, or “new” physics, is really about learning what else lies in the desert. If, in fact, the desert is just that – a particle physics wasteland devoid of anything new – then one seemingly cannot get unification.

## 2. The hierarchy problem

Suppose there does exist some new particle or particles in the desert having mass  $m \gg M_{\text{weak}}$ . To be concrete, suppose the particle is a fermion. Presumably, this particle interacts with the Higgs boson, which is responsible for particle masses. This interaction will affect the mass of the Higgs through higher order diagrams. After renormalization, this diagram yields a finite contribution to the mass of the Higgs:

$$\delta m_H^2 = \frac{3|\lambda_f|^2}{8\pi^2} m_f^2 \ln \frac{\mu}{m_f} + \dots \quad (175)$$

---

<sup>4</sup> I have not discussed how the gravitational interaction gets incorporated into unification. That is a separate, very difficult problem, for which string theory may ultimately provide a solution.

Now, we know that  $m_H$  itself must be on the order of  $M_{\text{weak}}$  or below. The reason is that one can rewrite the Higgs potential as:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Phi) &= -\mu^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \lambda (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} m_H^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \lambda (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (176)$$

with

$$M_{\text{weak}} = v = \left( \frac{m_H^2}{2\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sim 250 \text{ GeV}/c^2 \quad (177)$$

or  $m_H \sim \sqrt{2\lambda} \times 250 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . It would be unnatural for  $\lambda$  (a dimensionless quantity) to be significantly different from unity, so one expects that  $m_H \sim M_{\text{weak}}$ . On the other hand, if  $m_f \gg M_{\text{weak}}$ , one has  $\delta m_H^2 \gg m_H^2 \sim M_{\text{weak}}^2$ ! In short, any particles which exist deep in the desert give huge corrections to  $m_H$ , making it unbelievable that  $m_H$  comes out close to  $M_{\text{weak}}$ .

To put it another way, the electroweak scale is destabilized by radiative corrections involving heavy particles. It starts out at  $\sim 250 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  at tree level but grows as heavy particles come into the theory. This is not a desirable situation for any good theory. The problem is known as the ‘‘hierarchy problem’’: How does the weak scale remain stable if the desert becomes populated?

Another aspect of the hierarchy problem is the spectrum of the Standard Model masses themselves:

$$M_{\text{weak}} \sim M_{W,Z} \sim m_{\text{top}} \gg m_b \gg m_\tau \gg m_e \gg m_\nu \quad (178)$$

How does one explain this hierarchy of masses? The Standard Model gives us no clue as to how to handle the hierarchy problem. Evidently, something new is needed.

### 3. Quantization of Electric Charge

Recall from Eq. (32) that

$$Q = T_3^L + \frac{Y}{2} \quad (179)$$

For any particle,  $T_3^L$  is quantized in integer or half-integer units. This follows from the algebra of SU(2):

$$[T_i, T_j] = i\epsilon_{ijk} T_k \quad . \quad (180)$$

On the other hand, a  $U(1)$  group has no such algebra, and therefore the eigenvalues of the group generator  $Y$  are not restricted. Equation (179), however implies that  $Y$  must take on integer values for leptons and fractional values for quarks, in order to reproduce the known fermion charges. This seems rather arbitrary from the standpoint of symmetry. Why, then, is  $Y$  – and therefore  $Q$  – also quantized? The Standard Model does not motivate electromagnetic charge quantization, but simply takes it as an input. The deeper origin of  $Q$  quantization is not apparent from the Standard Model.

#### 4. Discrete Symmetry Violation

By construction, the Standard Model is maximally parity-violating; it was built to account for observations that weak c.c. processes only involve left handed particles (or right handed anti-particles). But why this mismatch between right-handedness and left-handedness? Again, no deeper reason for the violation of parity is apparent from the Standard Model.

Similarly, the Standard Model allows CP-violation to creep in two places:

- (i) a phase in the CKM matrix
- (ii) the QCD  $\theta$  term

Already the  $\theta$  mystery has been discussed; it is incredibly tiny for no obvious reason in the SM. What about  $\delta$ , the CKM phase factor? Where did it come from? In some sense, its appearance is an artifact of the mathematics for three generations of massive quarks. But the reason for the existence of three generations, and again the magnitude of the phase factor is not explained by the Standard Model. It would be desirable to have answers to these questions, but it will take some new framework to provide them.

#### 5. Baryon Asymmetry of the Universe (BAU)

Why do we observe more matter than anti-matter? This is a problem for both cosmology and the Standard Model. To quantify this problem, let  $n_B = n_b - n_{\bar{b}}$ , difference in the number of baryons and anti baryons per unit volume, and let  $n_\gamma$  be the photon number density at temperature  $T$ . Standard cosmology makes very accurate predictions for the cosmological abundance of H,  $^3\text{He}$ ,  $^4\text{He}$ ,  $^2\text{H}$ , B, and  $^7\text{Li}$  given that  $\eta \equiv n_B/n_\gamma$  has been constant since

nucleosynthesis. The primordial abundances of  $^2\text{H}$  and  $^3\text{He}$  imply:

$$3 \times 10^{-10} \leq \eta \leq 10 \times 10^{-10} \quad (181)$$

If  $\eta = 0$  at the Big Bang, then standard cosmology implies that  $\eta \leq 10^{-18}$  – much smaller than the range in (181). Hence, the early universe must have  $\eta \neq 0$  to explain primordial element abundances.

What is the connection to the Standard Model? It was provided by Sakharov, who pointed out that a non-vanishing  $\eta$  may exist in the early universe if:

(i) Baryon number is violated (ii) Both C and CP are violated (iii) At some point, there has been a departure from thermal equilibrium. These are known as the Sakharov criteria[19].

The reason for (i) is clear. The violation of both C and CP is needed so that:

$$\Gamma(\text{baryon production}) \neq \Gamma(\text{anti - baryon production}) \quad .$$

The third Sakharov criterion is needed to get a non-zero thermal average of B. Now, it is known that in the Standard Model, B+L is broken by instanton effects. Similarly, the Standard Model has maximal C-violation. Consider, for example, the charged current interaction

$$\bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d W_\mu^- \quad .$$

The axial vector part of this interaction is C-odd because

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5d \xrightarrow{C} +\bar{u}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5d \\ W_\mu \xrightarrow{C} -W_\mu \quad . \end{aligned}$$

CP violation enters via the CKM phase factor  $\delta$  as well as the  $\theta$  parameter. As noted earlier,  $\theta$  is incredibly tiny – far too small to provide the necessary amount of CP-violation for the baryon asymmetry. Similarly, the magnitude of  $\delta$ 's contribution to the baryon/antibaryon asymmetry is significantly smaller than needed to produce the required value of  $\eta$ .<sup>5</sup> Thus, if one is going to live within standard cosmology, one needs additional sources of large

---

<sup>5</sup> The magnitude of this contribution depends not only on  $\delta$  but also on the other angles appearing in the CKM matrix.

CP-violation beyond the Standard Model to explain BAU.

To summarize, despite the triumphant successes of the Standard Model, there exist conceptual motivations for believing that there is something more, that the high energy desert is not so barren after all.

One of the goals in experimental high energy physics – as well as in precision low energy electroweak experiments – is to go looking for new physics. In fact, the results of these searches can constrain the new physics scenarios people have invented, or at least dictate what some of the parameters in these scenarios must be. Some of the most popular such scenarios include supersymmetry (SUSY), extended gauge symmetry, and extra dimensions. The appeal of SUSY is that it provides a natural solution to the hierarchy problem, produces unification of gauge couplings, and contains new CP-violating effects that could help produce a sufficiently large BAU. Extended gauge theories, on the other hand, can also produce gauge unification, provide a natural mechanism for electric charge quantization, and can account for the violation of parity invariance in low-energy weak interactions. Finally, the idea that we live in more than four spacetime dimensions – which has been motivated by string theory – gives an alternative solution to the hierarchy problem than contained in SUSY. The implications of this paradigm for the phenomenology of electroweak interactions is now a lively area of research in particle physics.

Given the scope of these lectures, I do not have the time and space to discuss these scenarios in any depth. At the very least, however, I hope to have provoked your curiosity and motivation for learning more about them. We should always keep in mind, that however one seeks to extend the Standard Model, one should take care to respect the basic ingredients of the Standard Model and its phenomenological successes:

Gauge symmetry

Universality

V-A dominance

Quark Mixing



neutral currents and  $\sin^2 \theta_W$   
conserved vector currents  
etc.


Any deviations from the Standard Model predictions based on these ideas must be small, and any new physics scenario must explain why it only produces small deviations in a natural way.

### Acknowledgments


This work was supported in part under U.S. Department of Energy contracts DE-FG02-00ER41146, DE-FG03-02ER41215, DE-FG03-88ER40397, DE-FG03-00ER41132 and NSF Award PHY-0071856.

- 
- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1264 (1967); A. Salam, In *Elementary particle physics (Nobel Symposium No. 8)*, Ed. N. Svartholm; Almqvist and Wilsell, Stockholm (1968); S.L. Glashow, Nucl. Phys. **22**, 579 (1961); D. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1343 (1973); S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 494 (1973); H. Fritzsche, M. Gell-Mann, H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. B **47**, 365 (1973);
  - [2] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and M. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
  - [3] See, *e.g.*, J.C. Hardy and I.S. Towner, Eur. Phys. J. A **15**, 223 (2002).
  - [4] P.W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **12**, 132 (1964); Phys. Rev. **145**, 1156 (1966).
  - [5] The Particle Data Group, Review of Particle Physics, Phys. Rev. D **66**: 010001 (2002).
  - [6] W. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D **60**: 093006 (1999).
  - [7] For a discussion and references, see *e.g.*, E.D. Commins and P.H. Bucksbaum, *Weak Interactions of Leptons and Quarks*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1983).

- [8] L. Michel, Proc. Phys. Soc. London, Sect. A63, 153 (1950); C. Bouchiat and L. Michel, Phys. Rev. **106**, 170 (1957).
- [9] G. Czapek, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 17 (1993).
- [10] D.I. Britton, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3000 (1992).
- [11] W. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3629 (1993).
- [12] V.M. Lobashev, *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **460**, 227 (1999); Ch. Weinheimer, *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **460**, 219 (1999).
- [13] C.Y. Prescott, *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **77**, 347 (1978); Phys. Lett. B **84**, 524 (1979).
- [14] For a discussion and references, see *e.g.*, T.-P. Cheng and L.-F. Li, *Gauge Theory of Elementary Particle Physics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1984).
- [15] C.S. Wood *et al.*, Science **275**, 1759 (1997); S.C. Bennett and C.E. Wieman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2484 (1999).
- [16] M.A. Bouchiat and C. Bouchiat, Phys. Lett. B **48**, 111 (1974); J. Phys. (Paris) **35**, 899 (1974); J. Phys. (Paris), **36**, 493 (1975).
- [17] A.I. Milstein, O.P. Sushkov, and I.S. Terekhov, [hep-ph/0212072]; V.A. Dzuba, V.V. Flambau, and J.S.M. Ginges, Phys. Rev. D **66**: 076013 (2002).
- [18] J. Erler, A. Kurylov, and M.J. Ramsey-Musolf, [hep-ph/0302149].
- [19] A.D Sakharov, JETP Lett. **5**, 24 (1967).





$\Psi_v$



$\tau_+$

$\Psi_e$






$\psi_e$

$\tau_-$

$\psi_\nu$

$W_\mu^+$

A Feynman diagram illustrating the decay of a tau lepton ( $\tau_-$ ). The diagram shows a vertex where an incoming tau lepton line (solid line) splits into an outgoing electron line ( $\psi_e$ ) and an outgoing muon neutrino line ( $\psi_\nu$ ). A W boson line (wavy line) is emitted from the vertex and decays into a muon ( $\mu$ ) and an anti-muon neutrino ( $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ ).





$\Psi_e$

$\tau_3$

$\Psi_\nu$

$\mathbf{W}_\mu^3$

The diagram illustrates a vertex interaction. Two solid lines, representing fermions, meet at a central point. The upper line is labeled  $\Psi_e$  and the lower line is labeled  $\Psi_\nu$ . The vertex is labeled  $\tau_3$ . From this vertex, a wavy line extends to the right, representing a gauge boson, which is labeled  $\mathbf{W}_\mu^3$ .