

Beta Decays and Non-Standard Interactions in the LHC Era

Vincenzo Cirigliano¹, Susan Gardner², and Barry Holstein³

¹ Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory,
Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

² Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kentucky,
Lexington, KY 40506-0055 USA

³ Department of Physics-LGRT, University of Massachusetts,
Amherst, MA 01003 USA

February 25, 2022

Abstract

We consider the role of precision measurements of beta decays and light meson semi-leptonic decays in probing physics beyond the Standard Model in the LHC era. We describe all low-energy charged-current processes within and beyond the Standard Model using an effective field theory framework. We first discuss the theoretical hadronic input which in these precision tests plays a crucial role in setting the baseline for new physics searches. We then review the current and upcoming constraints on the various non-standard operators from the study of decay rates, spectra, and correlations in a broad array of light-quark systems. We finally discuss the interplay with LHC searches, both within models and in an effective theory approach. Our discussion illustrates the independent yet complementary nature of precision beta decay measurements as probes of new physics, showing them to be of continuing importance throughout the LHC era.

1 Introduction

Beta decays played a central role in determining the $V - A$ structure of the weak interactions and in shaping what we now call the Standard Model (SM) [1, 2, 3]. We focus here on the set of semi-leptonic “charged current” (CC) processes that are mediated in the SM by tree-level W exchange, up to radiative corrections. In the SM the CC weak processes are characterized by two main features: (i) the hadronic and leptonic bilinear densities involved in the process have a dominant $V - A$ component, with other types of couplings— $V + A, S, P, T$ —arising at higher order in radiative corrections or in recoil momentum; (ii) the effective Fermi constants extracted in beta decays obey lepton universality as well as quark-lepton, or Cabibbo, universality, which is equivalent in the SM to the unitarity of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark mixing matrix. Universality relations can only emerge once the process-dependent radiative corrections are removed. Currently precision beta-decay measurements involving neutrons, nuclei, and mesons are used to probe the existence of non-SM interactions which effectively induce violations of the universality relations and/or novel non- $(V - A)$ structures or corrections to the dominant vector and axial-vector couplings.¹ The low-energy charged-current-interaction Hamiltonian is sensitive to many classes of SM extensions. In this sense, beta decay measurements can be considered as “broad band” probes of physics beyond the Standard Model (BSM): while by themselves they do not allow us to reconstruct the ultraviolet dynamics, they provide, at 0.1%-level precision, powerful boundary conditions and diagnostics on virtually any TeV-scale SM extension.

Considerable experimental progress is ongoing or expected in a few-year time scale on several fronts, using both cold and ultracold neutrons [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], trapped nuclei [21, 22], and rare pion and kaon decays [23, 24, 25, 26]. Some of the measurements plan to reach sensitivities between 10^{-3} and 10^{-4} ; this makes such observables very interesting probes of new physics effects originating at the TeV scale, because such effects are expected to have size $\mathcal{O}((v/\Lambda_{\text{BSM}})^2)$, where $v = (2\sqrt{2}G_F)^{-1/2} \approx 174$ GeV and Λ_{BSM} denotes the mass scale where BSM physics appears.

As in previous reviews [27, 28, 29, 30], the overall goal of this article is to discuss the discovery potential and discriminating power of planned precision beta-decay measurements with neutrons, nuclei, and mesons, in light of other existing precision electroweak tests and high-energy collider searches, such as at the Tevatron and the LHC. In order to achieve our goal, we work within an effective field theory (EFT) framework, in which the dynamical effects of new heavy BSM degrees of freedom are parameterized by local operators of dimension higher than four built with SM fields.² All model-specific analyses of beta decays can be cast in the EFT language and the limits on the effective operators we derive can be readily converted into constraints on the parameters of any SM extension. In the absence of an emerging picture of new dynamics from collider searches, the EFT analysis is the first necessary step to establish the motivation and significance of this set of low-energy probes. Subsequently, we will also discuss well-motivated models such as the Left-Right Symmetric Model and supersymmetric extensions of the SM in order to show the discriminating power that combinations of beta decay measurements can have on explicit models.

Probing short-distance BSM couplings through precision phenomenology of beta decays requires knowing the relevant hadronic and nuclear matrix elements to a precision comparable to the size of the new physics effects one could expect to appear. This means that one needs to know the hadronic matrix elements of the SM operators, that is, of the V and A currents, to the level of $\mathcal{O}((v/\Lambda_{\text{BSM}})^2)$, i.e. of 10^{-3} or better. This is a necessary condition for beta decays to function as competitive probes: we are in search of a small BSM signal, and hence we need to know the SM “background” to a level comparable

¹In this review we consider the decays involving the light quarks u, d , and s exclusively.

²The EFT analysis can be applied to all low-energy probes of CC interactions. It is also valid for collider searches as long as the particles which mediate the new interactions are above particle-production threshold at the operating center-of-mass energy. In this case, a direct comparison of low-energy and collider constraints can be performed, as we discuss in Section 5.

to that of the signal for which we are looking. One also needs to know the matrix elements of the BSM operators, such as the S, T, P densities, because all the observables are sensitive to the product of the short-distance BSM coupling with the appropriate hadronic/nuclear matrix element. Consequently if a certain matrix element is suppressed, the sensitivity to the corresponding BSM coupling is also suppressed. Moreover, were such an anomalous suppression absent, the fractional uncertainty on the BSM matrix element still determines how well we can constrain that BSM coupling. For BSM operators, the precision required of the relevant hadronic matrix element is much less severe; an uncertainty at the $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$ level is acceptable. Motivated by these considerations, we pay special attention to the hadronic and nuclear uncertainties which appear.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we set up the theoretical framework for the analysis of all low-energy CC processes within and beyond the SM. In Section 3 we discuss the status of Cabibbo universality tests (Sec. 3.1) and lepton universality tests (Sec. 3.2) and explore the implications for BSM physics. In Section 4 we focus on differential decay distributions in beta decays and discuss the implications for non- $(V - A)$ couplings. In Section 5 we explore the constraints on non-standard CC couplings that can be obtained from LHC data. In Section 6 we illustrate how the precision tests can be used to probe the parameter space of models such as the Left-Right Symmetric Model and the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), and we present our concluding remarks in Section 7.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Effective Lagrangian

In this review we take the point of view that the Standard Model emerges as the low-energy limit of a more fundamental theory characterized by the scale Λ at which new particles appear. Consequently, at energies scales below Λ , namely, $\Lambda > E > M_{Z,W}$, the new degrees of freedom are no longer present; they have been “integrated out,” yielding an effective Lagrangian comprised of the SM Lagrangian augmented by a string of $d > 4$ operators constructed with the low-energy SM fields, suppressed by Λ^{d-4} [31], that respect the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ gauge symmetry of the SM. Flavor physics observables constrain the appearance of non-SM invariant operators to energies far beyond the weak scale [32, 33, 34]. The building blocks of the gauge-invariant local operators are: the gauge fields G_μ^A , W_μ^a , B_μ , corresponding to $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, respectively, the six fermionic gauge multiplets, including a singlet right-handed neutrino state,

$$q^i = \begin{pmatrix} u_L^i \\ d_L^i \end{pmatrix} \quad u^i = u_R^i \quad d^i = d_R^i \quad l^i = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L^i \\ e_L^i \end{pmatrix} \quad e^i = e_R^i \quad \nu^i = \nu_R^i, \quad (2.1)$$

the Higgs doublet φ

$$\varphi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^+ \\ \varphi^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.2)$$

and the covariant derivative

$$D_\mu = I \partial_\mu - ig_s \frac{\lambda^A}{2} G_\mu^A - ig \frac{\sigma^a}{2} W_\mu^a - ig' Y B_\mu. \quad (2.3)$$

In the above expression, I is the identity matrix, λ^A are the $SU(3)$ Gell-Mann matrices; σ^a are the $SU(2)$ Pauli matrices; g_s , g , and g' are the gauge couplings; and Y is the hypercharge of a given multiplet. The introduction of three light, right-handed neutrinos to accommodate the existence of neutrino masses illustrates explicitly that new light degrees of freedom can be included in the EFT if we assign their $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ quantum numbers. The impact of other light, new physics is left as an exercise for future work.

The leading operators which modify CC interactions are of dimension six, though it is worth noting that new physics can also modify the radiative corrections and hence the couplings with which the SM operators appear. The minimal set of operators contributing to low-energy semi-leptonic charged current processes can be divided into two groups: operators built out of SM fields, noting the left column below, in which we follow the notation of Refs. [35, 36], and operators involving the singlet R-handed neutrino field ν [37], which are displayed in the right column below. Furthermore, within each group the operators can be divided into two classes—four-fermion contact interactions and vertex corrections. The vertex correction operators are written in SU(2)-invariant form and therefore involve the Higgs doublet: after electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB) they include terms involving a W (or Z) boson, a fermion, and an anti-fermion. Here is the list:

Four-fermion operators:

$$O_{lq}^{(3)} = (\bar{l}\gamma^\mu\sigma^a l)(\bar{q}\gamma_\mu\sigma^a q) \quad O_{evud} = (\bar{e}\gamma^\mu\nu)(\bar{u}\gamma_\mu d) + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.4a)$$

$$O_{ledq} = (\bar{l}e)(\bar{d}q) + \text{h.c.} \quad O_{qu\nu} = (\bar{l}\nu)(\bar{u}q) + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.4b)$$

$$O_{lequ}^{(1)} = (\bar{l}_a e)\epsilon^{ab}(\bar{q}_b u) + \text{h.c.} \quad O_{lvqd}^{(1)} = (\bar{l}_a \nu)\epsilon^{ab}(\bar{q}_b d) + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.4c)$$

$$O_{lequ}^{(3)} = (\bar{l}_a \sigma^{\mu\nu} e)\epsilon^{ab}(\bar{q}_b \sigma_{\mu\nu} u) + \text{h.c.} \quad O_{lvqd}^{(3)} = (\bar{l}_a \sigma^{\mu\nu} \nu)\epsilon^{ab}(\bar{q}_b \sigma_{\mu\nu} d) + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.4d)$$

Vertex corrections:

$$O_{\varphi ud} = i(\varphi^T \epsilon D_\mu \varphi)(\bar{u}\gamma^\mu d) + \text{h.c.} \quad O'_{\varphi \nu e} = i(\varphi^T \epsilon D_\mu \varphi)(\bar{\nu}\gamma^\mu e) + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.5a)$$

$$O_{\varphi q}^{(3)} = (\varphi^\dagger i \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu^a \varphi)(\bar{q}\gamma_\mu\sigma^a q) \quad (2.5b)$$

$$O_{\varphi l}^{(3)} = (\varphi^\dagger i \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu^a \varphi)(\bar{l}\gamma_\mu\sigma^a l) . \quad (2.5c)$$

Denoting by Λ_i the effective dimensionful coupling associated with the operator O_i , we can write the effective Lagrangian as

$$\mathcal{L}^{(\text{eff})} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_i \frac{1}{\Lambda_i^2} O_i \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \frac{1}{v^2} \sum_i \hat{\alpha}_i O_i, \quad \text{with } \hat{\alpha}_i = \frac{v^2}{\Lambda_i^2}, \quad (2.6)$$

where in the last step we have set the correct dimensions using the Higgs vacuum expectation value (VEV) $v = \langle \varphi^0 \rangle = (2\sqrt{2}G_F)^{-1/2}$ and defined the dimensionless new-physics couplings $\hat{\alpha}_i$, which in general are matrices in both the quark and lepton flavor spaces. In this framework one can derive the low-energy effective Lagrangian at $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$ for semi-leptonic transitions. It receives contributions from both W -exchange diagrams, with modified W -fermion couplings, and the four-fermion operators. After including the electroweak radiative corrections to the SM operator [38], the matching procedure leads to a low-energy quark level effective Lagrangian involving ten dimension-six operators:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{CC}} = & -\frac{G_F^{(0)} V_{ud}}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\left(1 + \delta_\beta\right) \bar{e}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)\nu_e \cdot \bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d \right. \\ & + \epsilon_L \bar{e}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d + \tilde{\epsilon}_L \bar{e}\gamma_\mu(1 + \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d \\ & + \epsilon_R \bar{e}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 + \gamma_5)d + \tilde{\epsilon}_R \bar{e}\gamma_\mu(1 + \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 + \gamma_5)d \\ & + \epsilon_S \bar{e}(1 - \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}d + \tilde{\epsilon}_S \bar{e}(1 + \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}d \\ & - \epsilon_P \bar{e}(1 - \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\gamma_5 d - \tilde{\epsilon}_P \bar{e}(1 + \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\gamma_5 d \\ & \left. + \epsilon_T \bar{e}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1 - \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\sigma^{\mu\nu}(1 - \gamma_5)d + \tilde{\epsilon}_T \bar{e}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1 + \gamma_5)\nu_\ell \cdot \bar{u}\sigma^{\mu\nu}(1 + \gamma_5)d + \text{h.c.} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

In the above equation $G_F^{(0)}/\sqrt{2} = g^2/(8M_W^2)$ is the tree-level SM Fermi constant, and δ_β encodes the effect of SM electroweak radiative corrections to semi-leptonic transitions, noting that the Fermi theory

QED contributions have been subtracted [39, 40, 38, 41, 42, 43]. The coupling $G_F^{(0)}$ can be expressed in terms of the Fermi constant $G_\mu = 1.166371(6) \times 10^{-5} \text{GeV}^{-2}$ precisely measured in muon decay [44]. In order to do so, one has to consider the low-energy effective Lagrangian describing muon decay [45],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu \rightarrow e \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\mu} = -4 G_F^{(0)} (1 + \delta_\mu + \epsilon_\mu) \bar{e}_L \gamma_\mu \nu_{eL} \cdot \bar{\nu}_{\mu L} \gamma^\mu \mu_L + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $G_\mu \equiv G_F^{(0)}(1 + \delta_\mu + \epsilon_\mu)$. Here δ_μ represents the SM electroweak radiative corrections [46] to purely leptonic transitions, noting that the Fermi theory QED contributions have been subtracted, and ϵ_μ encodes possible new physics contributions, so that $G_F^{(0)} = G_\mu(1 - \delta_\mu - \epsilon_\mu)$ ³.

The BSM effective couplings in Eq. (2.7) are denoted by ϵ_α and $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$, using the self-explanatory notation $\alpha, \beta = L, R, S, P, T$. These couplings can be expressed in terms of the weak-scale couplings $\hat{\alpha}_j$ [45, 47, 37]. In the effective Lagrangian of Eq. (2.7), e, u , and d denote the electron, up-, and down-quark mass eigenfields, whereas ν_ℓ represents the neutrino flavor fields. In general we can have $\ell \neq e$ —in what follows, we suppress lepton flavor indices. Finally, identical CC effective operators appear for other quark flavors. For example, the operators obtained by replacing the d quark with the strange quark s describe $|\Delta S| = 1$ semileptonic processes.

Next, we discuss some noteworthy points in regards to the effective Lagrangian of Eq. (2.7):

- The effective couplings denoted by ϵ_α involve L-handed neutrinos, whereas $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$ involve R-handed neutrinos. Therefore, the $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$ appear in decay rates and distributions either quadratically or linearly, but the latter appears multiplied by the small factor m_ν/E_ν , as it is realized through interference of the SM and BSM couplings. In contrast, the ϵ_α couplings contribute linearly to the decay rates without m_ν/E_ν suppression. As a consequence, the bounds on the ϵ 's are much stronger than the bounds on the $\tilde{\epsilon}$'s.
- There are twelve $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)$ -invariant operators that contribute to beta decays, though there are only ten quark-level $\text{U}(1)_{EM}$ -invariant operators. This is because the correction ϵ_L to the SM operator encodes contributions from three weak-scale operators of Eqs. (2.4) and (2.5), namely, the contact operator $O_{lq}^{(3)}$ and the quark and lepton vertex corrections, $O_{\varphi q}^{(3)}$ and $O_{\varphi l}^{(3)}$. All other low-energy operators are in one-to-one correspondence with the TeV scale $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)$ -invariant operators. It is interesting to note that $\text{SU}(2)$ gauge invariance implies that the same couplings mediate not only charged-current processes but also “neutral current” processes such as $\bar{e}e \leftrightarrow \bar{u}u, \bar{d}d$.
- While the physical amplitudes are renormalization scale and scheme independent, the individual effective couplings $\epsilon_{S,P,T}$ ($\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,P,T}$) and the corresponding hadronic matrix elements display a strong scale dependence in quantum chromodynamics (QCD) already at one-loop order (see Ref. [48] and references therein). Throughout the paper, we quote estimates and bounds for the ϵ_i ($\tilde{\epsilon}_i$) at the renormalization scale $\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}$ in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, unless otherwise specified.

The Lagrangian of Eq. (2.7) mediates all leading, low-energy charged-current weak processes involving up and down quarks. In some charged-current processes involving first-generation quarks the theoretical and experimental precision has reached, or will soon reach, a level that allows stringent bounds on new-physics effective couplings. To set the stage for this discussion, we now provide an overview of how the various BSM couplings of Eq. (2.7) can be probed experimentally—we explore these points in detail in the following sections. For context, we note that detailed expressions of the non- $(V-A)$ contributions to neutron and nuclear beta decay correlation coefficients can be found in the papers by Jackson, Treiman, and Wyld [49, 50], where one can re-express the Lee-Yang couplings [51] they employ in terms of the ϵ_α and $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$ using the expressions given in Eqs. (2.17) below.

³Our notation in Eqs.(2.7) and (2.8) corresponds to that of Ref. [30] if we replace $\delta_\beta \rightarrow \Delta \hat{r}_\beta$ and $\delta_\mu \rightarrow \Delta \hat{r}_\mu$.

- The combinations $(\epsilon_L \pm \epsilon_R)$ affect the overall normalization of the effective Fermi constant in processes mediated by the vector and axial-vector current, respectively. As discussed below, the hadronic matrix elements of the vector current are known very precisely up to corrections due to QCD flavor symmetry breaking, that is, quark mass differences, whereas the axial-vector matrix elements require non-perturbative calculations. Therefore, while the difference $(\epsilon_L - \epsilon_R)$ remains relatively unconstrained, the sum $(\epsilon_L + \epsilon_R)$ is strongly constrained by quark-lepton universality tests, which are tantamount to CKM unitarity tests. These tests involve a precise determination of V_{ud} and V_{us} from processes mediated by the vector current, such as $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear decays and $K \rightarrow \pi \ell \nu$. An extensive analysis of the constraints on $(\epsilon_L + \epsilon_R)$ from universality tests and precision electroweak observables at the Z -pole was performed in Ref. [45]. In this context it was shown that constraints from low-energy are at the same level or stronger—depending on the operator—than those from Z -pole observables and $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ cross-section measurements at LEP.
- The right-handed coupling ϵ_R affects the relative normalization of the axial and vector currents. In all beta decays ϵ_R can be absorbed in a redefinition of the axial coupling, and, up to calculable radiative corrections [42, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56], experiments determine the combination $(1 - 2\epsilon_R)g_A/g_V$, where g_V and g_A are the vector and axial form factors at zero momentum transfer, to be precisely defined below. Disentangling ϵ_R requires precision measurements of $(1 - 2\epsilon_R)g_A/g_V$ and precision calculations of g_A/g_V in lattice QCD, which, unfortunately, are not yet at the required sub-percent level.
- The effective pseudoscalar coupling ϵ_P contributes to the leptonic decays of the pion. It is strongly constrained by the helicity-suppressed ratio $R_\pi \equiv \Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu[\gamma])/\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu[\gamma])$. Moreover, as discussed in Refs. [57, 58, 59], the low-energy coupling ϵ_P receives contributions proportional to $\epsilon_{S,T}$ through electroweak radiative corrections.
- Both the scalar and tensor couplings ϵ_S and ϵ_T contribute at linear order to the Fierz interference term b in the beta decays of neutrons and nuclei, as well as to the neutrino-asymmetry correlation coefficient B in polarized neutron and nuclear decays. The empirical determination of the beta-asymmetry correlation coefficient A and the electron-neutrino correlation a in neutron and nuclear beta decays, as well as positron polarization measurements therein, entrain sensitivity to the Fierz interference term as well. Thus bounds on ϵ_S and ϵ_T can also be obtained from these observables. Moreover, the quadratic dependence on these couplings is useful in limiting their imaginary parts as well. Finally, the tensor coupling ϵ_T can also be constrained through Dalitz-plot studies of the radiative pion decay $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$.
- Neglecting neutrino masses, all the $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$ couplings contribute to decay rates as per $\propto |\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta|^2$, so that it is more challenging to set limits on their appearance at low energies.
- All of the operators of Eq. (2.7) can produce collider signatures. Before the advent of the LHC, collider bounds on the chirality-flipping scalar and tensor couplings $\epsilon_{S,P,T}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,P,T}$ were very weak, because their interference with the SM amplitude appears with factors of m_f/E_f , where m_f is a light fermion mass with $f \in \{e, u, d\}$, which at collider energies strongly suppresses the whole effect. At the LHC, however, the contributions which appear as $|\epsilon_\beta|^2$ or $|\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta|^2$ can be boosted by a factor involving the energy in the numerator, noting that we replace $(v/\Lambda_{\text{BSM}})^4 \rightarrow (E/\Lambda_{\text{BSM}})^4$, thus increasing the sensitivity to these couplings. We will discuss these bounds and show that with higher center-of-mass energy and integrated luminosity they become competitive with low-energy searches for $\epsilon_{S,T}$ or stronger than low-energy bounds for $\tilde{\epsilon}_{R,S,T}$. This analysis, of course, makes sense only for $\Lambda_{\text{BSM}} \gtrsim \text{few TeV}$.

The above considerations and more are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of the most sensitive direct low-energy probes of non-standard charged-current couplings. Left column: combination of couplings. Right column: probe. The effective couplings are defined in Eq. (2.7). The decay parameters a, b, B, A are defined in Eq. (4.41). If the new interactions originate at mass scales above the TeV, the LHC provides constraints on all non-standard couplings through the process $pp \rightarrow e + \nu + X$.

Non-standard coupling	Probe
$\epsilon_L + \epsilon_R$	CKM unitarity
$\epsilon_L - \epsilon_R, \epsilon_P, \tilde{\epsilon}_P$	R_π
ϵ_S	$b, B [a, A]$
ϵ_T	$b, B [a, A], \pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$
$\tilde{\epsilon}_{\alpha \neq P}$	a, b, B, A

2.2 Hadronic and nuclear matrix elements

Hadronic and nuclear transition amplitudes always involve products of short-distance couplings, evolved to the appropriate matching scale, and hadronic matrix elements. Thus in order to extract information on the former, we need to know the latter. Specifically, we need to match the quark-level effective theory of Eq. (2.7) to a low-energy effective theory written in terms of meson and baryon degrees of freedom. In QCD, this effective theory is Chiral Perturbation Theory (ChPT) [60, 61, 62]. In the baryon sector, the low-energy structure of the theory is more complicated, and heavy baryon chiral perturbation theory is employed [63], where we refer the reader to Ref. [64] for a review. Different systematic approaches to remedy its limitations have been developed, improving the theory’s convergence, notably the “small scale expansion” of Refs. [65, 66, 67, 68], as well as Ref. [69]. As we have discussed, the precision with which we know the matrix elements of the SM operators limits our ability to constrain new physics. If we wish to probe scales such that $(v/\Lambda_{\text{BSM}})^2 \sim 10^{-3}$, we need to know the SM matrix elements with commensurate precision. This requires including all of the electromagnetic, isospin-breaking, and recoil-order effects in the calculation. Since the operators appearing in Eq. (2.7) have the factorized structure $J_{\text{quark}} \times J_{\text{lepton}}$, we need not present the ChPT framework but rather can describe the purely hadronic effects in terms of meson and nucleon matrix elements of quark bilinears. Nevertheless, the full ChPT machinery should ultimately be employed to compute long-distance radiative corrections. In the case of neutron decay, this has been done in Ref. [70], finding results consistent with non-ChPT based calculations [42, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 71]. In this review, we will not further discuss long-distance radiative corrections to neutron decay and refer the reader to Refs. [70] and [42] for recent detailed accounts.

2.2.1 Meson matrix elements

Leptonic ($M \rightarrow l\nu$) and semi-leptonic ($M_1 \rightarrow M_2 l\nu$) decays of pseudoscalar mesons provide strong constraints on the CC BSM couplings. The relevant one-meson matrix elements are parameterized in terms of the pion and kaon decay constants $F_{\pi,K}$ as follows (in our normalization $F_\pi \simeq 92$ MeV):

$$\langle 0 | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 d | \pi^-(p) \rangle = -i\sqrt{2} F_\pi p_\mu \quad (2.9)$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 s | K^-(p) \rangle = -i\sqrt{2} F_K p_\mu \quad (2.10)$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{u} \gamma_5 d | \pi^-(p) \rangle = i \frac{m_\pi^2}{m_u + m_d} \sqrt{2} F_\pi \quad (2.11)$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{u} \gamma_5 s | K^-(p) \rangle = i \frac{m_K^2}{m_u + m_s} \sqrt{2} F_K. \quad (2.12)$$

The pseudoscalar matrix elements follow from the axial-vector ones by using the operator relation $\partial_\mu \bar{q}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 q_j = i(m_i + m_j) \bar{q}_j \gamma_5 q_i$. Matrix elements of the other bilinears vanish by parity.

The two-meson matrix elements of vector and scalar densities can be parameterized in terms of two form factors. Specializing to the $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^-$ transitions, we have, noting the momentum transfer $q = p - k$:

$$\langle \pi^-(k) | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu u | K^0(p) \rangle = (p+k)_\mu f_+(q^2) + (p-k)_\mu f_-(q^2) \quad (2.13)$$

$$\langle \pi^-(k) | \bar{s} u | K^0(p) \rangle = -\frac{m_K^2 - m_\pi^2}{m_s - m_u} f_0(q^2), \quad (2.14)$$

where $f_0(q^2) = f_+(q^2) + (q^2/(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2))f_-(q^2)$ and the operator relation $\partial_\mu \bar{q}_i \gamma^\mu q_j = i(m_i - m_j) \bar{q}_j q_i$ has been used to relate the vector and scalar matrix elements. In the $SU(3)_f$ limit the light quark masses obey $m_u = m_d = m_s$, so that $f_+(0) = 1$ —the Ademollo-Gatto theorem [72, 73] ensures that the corrections to the flavor symmetry limit start at second order: $f_+(0) = 1 + \mathcal{O}((m_s - m_d)^2)$.⁴ Finally, for completeness, we report the tensor matrix element, which involves a new dynamical form factor $B_T(q^2)$ [74]:

$$\langle \pi^-(k) | \bar{s} \sigma_{\mu\nu} u | K^0(p) \rangle = i \frac{p_\mu k_\nu - p_\nu k_\mu}{m_K} B_T(q^2). \quad (2.15)$$

The decay constants and form-factors can be calculated in lattice QCD (LQCD) and we will review the relevant results as needed.

2.2.2 Nucleon matrix elements

At the one-nucleon level, we require the matrix elements between the neutron and proton of all possible quark bilinears of dimension three. These can be parameterized in terms of Lorentz-invariant form

⁴Note, however, that in the case of charged $K_{\ell 3}$ decay the existence of $\pi^0 - \eta, \eta'$ mixing implies that corrections to $f_+(0) = 1$ occur at first order in $(m_d - m_u)/(m_s - \hat{m})$, with $\hat{m} = (m_d + m_u)/2$.

factors as follows [75]:

$$\langle p(p_p) | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu d | n(p_n) \rangle = \bar{u}_p(p_p) \left[g_V(q^2) \gamma_\mu - i \frac{\tilde{g}_{T(V)}(q^2)}{2M_N} \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu + \frac{\tilde{g}_S(q^2)}{2M_N} q_\mu \right] u_n(p_n) \quad (2.16a)$$

$$\langle p(p_p) | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 d | n(p_n) \rangle = \bar{u}_p(p_p) \left[g_A(q^2) \gamma_\mu - i \frac{\tilde{g}_{T(A)}(q^2)}{2M_N} \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu + \frac{\tilde{g}_P(q^2)}{2M_N} q_\mu \right] \gamma_5 u_n(p_n) \quad (2.16b)$$

$$\langle p(p_p) | \bar{u} d | n(p_n) \rangle = g_S(q^2) \bar{u}_p(p_p) u_n(p_n) \quad (2.16c)$$

$$\langle p(p_p) | \bar{u} \gamma_5 d | n(p_n) \rangle = g_P(q^2) \bar{u}_p(p_p) \gamma_5 u_n(p_n) \quad (2.16d)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p(p_p) | \bar{u} \sigma_{\mu\nu} d | n(p_n) \rangle &= \bar{u}_p(p_p) \left[g_T(q^2) \sigma_{\mu\nu} + g_T^{(1)}(q^2) (q_\mu \gamma_\nu - q_\nu \gamma_\mu) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + g_T^{(2)}(q^2) (q_\mu P_\nu - q_\nu P_\mu) + g_T^{(3)}(q^2) (\gamma_\mu \not{q} \gamma_\nu - \gamma_\nu \not{q} \gamma_\mu) \right] u_n(p_n), \end{aligned} \quad (2.16e)$$

where $u_{p,n}$ are the proton and neutron spinors, $P = p_n + p_p$, $q = p_n - p_p$ is the momentum transfer, and $M_N = (M_n + M_p)/2$ denotes a common nucleon mass.⁵ Note that the above spinor contractions are $\mathcal{O}(1)$, except for $\bar{u}_p \gamma_5 u_n$, which is $\mathcal{O}(q/M_N)$.

In order to make contact with the standard references on neutron and nuclear beta-decay phenomenology [51, 49, 50, 29], we note that upon neglecting recoil order terms Eq. (2.16) can be viewed as the matching conditions from our quark-level effective theory Eq. (2.7) to the nucleon-level effective theory originally written down by Lee and Yang [51]. The Lee-Yang effective couplings C_i , C'_i ($i \in \{V, A, S, T\}$) can be expressed in terms of our parameters as follows [37]⁶

$$C_i = \frac{G_F^{(0)}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} \bar{C}_i \quad (2.17a)$$

$$\bar{C}_V = g_V (1 + \delta_\beta + \epsilon_L + \epsilon_R + \tilde{\epsilon}_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_R) \quad (2.17b)$$

$$\bar{C}'_V = g_V (1 + \delta_\beta + \epsilon_L + \epsilon_R - \tilde{\epsilon}_L - \tilde{\epsilon}_R) \quad (2.17c)$$

$$\bar{C}_A = -g_A (1 + \delta_\beta + \epsilon_L - \epsilon_R - \tilde{\epsilon}_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_R) \quad (2.17d)$$

$$\bar{C}'_A = -g_A (1 + \delta_\beta + \epsilon_L - \epsilon_R + \tilde{\epsilon}_L - \tilde{\epsilon}_R) \quad (2.17e)$$

$$\bar{C}_S = g_S (\epsilon_S + \tilde{\epsilon}_S) \quad (2.17f)$$

$$\bar{C}'_S = g_S (\epsilon_S - \tilde{\epsilon}_S) \quad (2.17g)$$

$$\bar{C}_P = g_P (\epsilon_P - \tilde{\epsilon}_P) \quad (2.17h)$$

$$\bar{C}'_P = g_P (\epsilon_P + \tilde{\epsilon}_P) \quad (2.17i)$$

$$\bar{C}_T = 4 g_T (\epsilon_T + \tilde{\epsilon}_T) \quad (2.17j)$$

$$\bar{C}'_T = 4 g_T (\epsilon_T - \tilde{\epsilon}_T) . \quad (2.17k)$$

Using these relations and the results of Ref. [49] one can easily work out the dependence of beta decay observables on the short-distance parameters ϵ_i and $\tilde{\epsilon}_i$.

Our goal is to identify TeV-scale induced new physics contaminations of typical size $\epsilon_\alpha \sim (v/\Lambda_{\text{BSM}})^2 \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ to the decay amplitude, so that they are comparable in size to the recoil corrections of $\mathcal{O}(q/M_N) \sim 10^{-3}$ and the radiative corrections of $\mathcal{O}(\alpha/\pi)$. Thus, it is useful to organize the discussion in terms of a simultaneous expansion in new physics contributions, recoil, and radiative corrections

⁵In the case of vector and axial bilinears, the Gordon decomposition can be used to trade the induced tensor term proportional to $\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu$ for an independent scalar term proportional to P_μ . Here we choose to follow the parameterization of Ref. [75].

⁶Various metrics and conventions appear in the literature. Lee and Yang [51] employ the “ict” metric, which in this case maps to the metric we employ if we let $\gamma_5 \rightarrow -\gamma_5$ in their effective theory, noting $\gamma_5 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3$. Refs. [76] and [21] employ the metric we do but flip the sign of the γ_5 terms.

keeping terms through first order only. Higher-order terms may prove negligible in light of anticipated experimental sensitivities, but we indicate the role of certain, more significant ones. Employing this simultaneous expansion in ϵ_α , q/M_N , and α/π , we now discuss the contributions from the quark-bilinear operators:

- **Vector current:** The form factor $g_V(0)$ contributes at $\mathcal{O}(1)$ to the amplitude, whereas $\tilde{g}_{T(V)}(0)$ and $\tilde{g}_S(0)$ contribute at $\mathcal{O}(q/M_N)$. Also, in the $SU(2)_f$, or isospin, limit, the weak magnetism form factor $\tilde{g}_{T(V)}(0)$ is related to the difference of the empirical proton and neutron magnetic moments, which are well-known, and the induced-scalar form factor $\tilde{g}_S(q^2)$, reflective of the presence of a second-class current, vanishes [75]. Corrections to the isospin limit are of $\mathcal{O}((M_n - M_p)/M_N) \sim q/M_N$. Since \tilde{g}_S multiplies one power of q_μ/M_N , its contribution to the decay amplitude is effectively of second order in the recoil expansion.
- **Axial current:** The form factor $g_A(0)$ contributes at $\mathcal{O}(1)$, whereas $\tilde{g}_{T(A)}(0)$ and $\tilde{g}_P(0)$ contribute at $\mathcal{O}(q/M_N)$. The induced-tensor form factor $\tilde{g}_{T(A)}(q^2)$ vanishes in the isospin limit [75], so that its contribution to the decay amplitude is of second order in q/M_N . Similarly, the contribution associated with the induced-pseudoscalar form factor \tilde{g}_P is quadratic in our counting, because the pseudoscalar bilinear is itself of order q/M_N , and is accompanied by an explicit q/M_N suppression⁷; it can be studied in muon capture, note Ref. [77, 78] for reviews.
- **Pseudoscalar bilinear:** The pseudoscalar bilinear $\bar{u}_p \gamma_5 u_n$ is itself of order q/M_N . Since it necessarily multiplies a BSM effective coupling ϵ_P because there is no pseudoscalar coupling in the SM, this term is also of second order in our expansion.
- **Scalar and tensor bilinears:** These bilinears enter into the analysis multiplied by new-physics effective couplings $\epsilon_{S,T}$. Computing the corresponding matrix elements to zeroth order in the recoil expansion suffices to identify $g_S(0)$ and $g_T(0)$. Note that $g_T^{(1,2,3)}(q^2)$ appear only in $\mathcal{O}(q/M_N)$, and $g_T^{(3)}(q^2)$ vanishes in the isospin limit [75].

In summary, to the order we are working, the amplitudes depend only on $g_i \equiv g_i(0)$ with $i \in \{V, A, S, T\}$ and $\tilde{g}_{T(V)}(0)$. Up to second-order corrections in isospin breaking, one has $g_V = 1$ [72, 79, 80]. We define the ratio of the axial to vector form factors as $\lambda \equiv g_A/g_V$, where $\lambda > 0$ under our conventions. As we have noted, the neutron-decay amplitude in the presence of non-standard right-handed interactions is actually a function of $\tilde{\lambda} \equiv \lambda(1 - 2\epsilon_R)$. The parameter $\tilde{\lambda}$ is extracted very precisely from beta-asymmetry measurements in polarized neutron decay, leading to $\tilde{\lambda} = 1.2701(25)$ [81]; this number is essentially g_A . There are no direct experimental handles on $g_{S,P,T}$.

A first principles calculation of $g_{A,S,P,T}$, however, is possible with LQCD. The status of LQCD calculations of these charges is critically reviewed in [47], and in which the first estimate of g_S from LQCD is provided. Different calculations give results in the range $1.12 < g_A < 1.26$; the errors are much larger than the experimental uncertainty. In contrast, the new estimates for the scalar and tensor charge in the \overline{MS} scheme and at $\mu = 2$ GeV are $g_S = 0.8 \pm 0.4$ and $g_T = 1.05 \pm 0.35$. Besides statistical uncertainties, which are particularly large for g_S , the dominant LQCD systematic effects in $g_{S,T}$ arise from extrapolation in the quark mass to the physical point and from the renormalization constants, noting perturbative calculations were used to arrive at the reported results, and the non-perturbative calculation is in progress. More recently Ref. [82] provided improved results for the scalar and tensor charges, $g_S = 1.08 \pm 0.28$ and $g_T = 1.038 \pm 0.011$, with the uncertainty associated with statistics and chiral extrapolation. These results, however, do not include an estimate of the systematic error

⁷This term, however, is enhanced. Using the partially conserved axial current one can show that the form factor \tilde{g}_P is of order $M_N/m_q \sim 100$, making a $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ contribution to the amplitude. The effect of \tilde{g}_P on beta-decay rates has been worked out in Ref. [76], and it should be included when the experiments reach that level of precision.

associated with finite volume and finite lattice spacing extrapolations. Therefore, in what follows we use the results of Ref. [47] as the baseline lattice results.

2.2.3 Nuclear matrix elements

In moving from neutron decay to a general nuclear beta decay, a number of important differences appear. For one thing, numerous spin sequences are possible. Also the daughter state may well itself be unstable under electromagnetic or strong interactions. Finally, the Q -value, defined as the maximum electron (positron) kinetic energy, is generally much larger than the 0.8 MeV found in neutron beta decay and in some cases can be as large as 10-15 MeV. The electron/positron energy dependence of the decay observables are then much more appreciable.

The spins are easily dealt with by the use of Clebsch-Gordan coefficients $C_{J_1, J_2; J}^{M_1, M_2; M}$ together with the Wigner-Eckart theorem to define reduced matrix elements. Thus the general form for a vector and axial-vector nuclear matrix element between parent and daughter states having spins J, M and J', M' and masses M_1 and M_2 , respectively, is [76]⁸

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell^\mu < \beta | V_\mu | \alpha > &= \left(a(q^2) \frac{P \cdot \ell}{2M_A} + e(q^2) \frac{q \cdot \ell}{2M_A} \right) \delta_{JJ'} \delta_{MM'} + i \frac{\tilde{b}(q^2)}{2M_A} C_{J'1; J}^{M'k; M} (\vec{q} \times \vec{\ell})_k \\
&+ C_{J'2; J}^{M'k; M} \left[\frac{f(q^2)}{2M_A} C_{11; 2}^{nn'; k} \ell_n q_{n'} + \frac{g(q^2)}{(2M_A)^3} P \cdot \ell \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} Y_2^k(\hat{q}) \vec{q}^2 + \dots \right] \\
\ell^\mu < \beta | A_\mu | \alpha > &= C_{J'1; J}^{M'k; M} \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{ij\lambda\eta} \frac{1}{4M_A} \left[c(q^2) \ell^\lambda P^\eta - d(q^2) \ell^\lambda q^\eta + \frac{1}{(2M_A)^2} h(q^2) q^\lambda P^\eta q \cdot \ell \right] \\
&+ C_{J'2; J}^{M'k; M} C_{12; 2}^{nn'; k} \ell_n \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} Y_2^{n'}(\hat{q}) \frac{\vec{q}^2}{(2M_A)^2} j_2(q^2) \\
&+ C_{J'3; J}^{M'k; M} C_{12; 3}^{nn'; k} \ell_n \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} Y_2^{n'}(\hat{q}) \frac{\vec{q}^2}{(2M_A)^2} j_3(q^2) + \dots,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where ℓ^μ denotes the leptonic current and $M_A = (M_1 + M_2)/2$. Here each term corresponds to one in the analogous neutron transition via

$$\begin{aligned}
a &\rightarrow g_V, & c &\rightarrow g_A \sqrt{3} \\
\tilde{b} &\rightarrow \tilde{g}_{T(V)} \sqrt{3}, & d &\rightarrow \tilde{g}_{T(A)} \sqrt{3} \\
e &\rightarrow \tilde{g}_S, & h &\rightarrow \tilde{g}_P \sqrt{3}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

In addition, there exist terms f, g, j_2, j_3 which have no $J = \frac{1}{2} \rightarrow J' = \frac{1}{2}$ analog since they involve $\Delta J = 2, 3$.

For each form factor there exist known one-body operator, or impulse approximation, predictions.

⁸Here we discuss only allowed decays, for which $\Delta J = 0, \pm 1$ with no change in nuclear parity.

Defining the nuclear mass difference $\Delta = M_1 - M_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
a(q^2) &\simeq (1 + \frac{\Delta}{2M_A})^{-1} g_V(q^2) \times [\mathcal{M}_F + \frac{1}{6}(q^2 - \Delta^2)\mathcal{M}_{r^2} + \frac{\Delta}{3}\mathcal{M}_{r.p}] \\
\tilde{b}(q^2) &\simeq A[\tilde{g}_{T(V)}(q^2)\mathcal{M}_{GT} + g_V(q^2)\mathcal{M}_L] \\
c(q^2) &\simeq (1 + \frac{\Delta}{2M_A})^{-1} g_A(q^2)[\mathcal{M}_{GT} + \frac{1}{6}(q^2 - \Delta^2)\mathcal{M}_{\sigma r^2} + \frac{1}{6\sqrt{10}}\mathcal{M}_{1\mathcal{Y}}(2\Delta^2 + q^2) \\
&\quad + A\frac{\Delta}{2M_A}\mathcal{M}_{\sigma L} + \frac{\Delta}{2}\mathcal{M}_{\sigma rp}] \\
d(q^2) &\simeq (1 + \frac{\Delta}{2M_A})^{-1} g_A(q^2)[- \mathcal{M}_{GT} - \frac{1}{6}(q^2 - \Delta^2)\mathcal{M}_{\sigma r^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}\mathcal{M}_{1\mathcal{Y}}(M_A\Delta + \frac{1}{6}(\Delta^2 - q^2)) \\
&\quad + A\mathcal{M}_{\sigma L} + M_A\mathcal{M}_{\sigma rp}] \pm A\tilde{g}_{T(A)}(q^2)\mathcal{M}_{GT} \\
e(q^2) &\simeq (1 + \frac{\Delta}{2M_A})^{-1} g_V(q^2)[\mathcal{M}_F + \frac{1}{6}(q^2 - \Delta^2)\mathcal{M}_{r^2} - \frac{2M_A}{3}\mathcal{M}_{r.p}] \pm A\tilde{g}_S(q^2)\mathcal{M}_F \\
f(q^2) &\simeq g_V(q^2)2M_A\mathcal{M}_{\{r,p\}} \\
g(q^2) &\simeq -g_V(q^2)\frac{4M_A^2}{3}\mathcal{M}_Q \\
h(q^2) &\simeq -(1 + \frac{\Delta}{2M_A})^{-1} \times [g_A(q^2)\frac{2M_A^2}{\sqrt{10}}\mathcal{M}_{1\mathcal{Y}} + \tilde{g}_P(q^2)A^2\mathcal{M}_{GT}] \\
j_i(q^2) &\simeq -\frac{2M_A^2}{3}g_A(q^2)\mathcal{M}_{i\mathcal{Y}}, \quad i = 2, 3,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

where the upper (lower) sign refers to electron (positron) emission and the \mathcal{M} 's represent reduced, nonrelativistic matrix elements, namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_F &= \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm || \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_{GT} &= \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm \vec{\sigma}_i || \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_{r^2} &= \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm r_i^2 || \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_{\sigma r^2} &= \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm r_i^2 \vec{\sigma}_i || \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_{r.p} &= \frac{i}{2M_N} \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm (\vec{r}_i \cdot \vec{p}_i + \vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{r}_i) || \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_{\sigma L} &= \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm \vec{\sigma}_i \times (\vec{r}_i \times \vec{p}_i) || \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_{K\mathcal{Y}} &= \sqrt{\frac{16\pi}{5}} \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm r_i^2 C_{12;K}^{nn';k} \times \sigma_{in} Y_2^{n'}(\hat{r}_i) || \alpha \rangle, \quad K = 1, 2, 3 \\
\mathcal{M}_{\sigma rp} &= \frac{i}{2M_N} \langle \beta || \sum_i \tau_i^\pm [\{\vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{r}_i, \vec{p}_i\} + \{\vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{p}_i, \vec{r}_i\}] || \alpha \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_Q &= \langle \beta | \sum_i \tau_i^\pm r_i^2 Y_2^k(\hat{r}_i) | \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_{\{r,p\}} &= \frac{i}{2M_N} \langle \beta | \sum_i \tau_i^\pm C_{11;2}^{nn';k} \times (r_{in} p_{in'} + p_{in} r_{in'}) | \alpha \rangle \\
\mathcal{M}_L &= \langle \beta | \sum_i \tau_i^\pm (\vec{r}_i \times \vec{p}_i) | \alpha \rangle .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

One expects meson exchange, or two-body, corrections to these predictions at the order of 5 to 10% or so [83].

If we neglect recoil effects, which is generally a good approximation because they enter the nuclear matrix elements at $\mathcal{O}(\Delta/M_N)$, there exist only the leading Fermi and Gamow-Teller form factors $a = g_V \mathcal{M}_F$ and $c = g_A \mathcal{M}_{GT}$. Most experiments are analyzed in terms of only these quantities. In the SM the vector weak charge is also the isospin raising operator, so that the Fermi form factor $a(0)$ must vanish unless the parent and daughter states are isotopic analogs. Moreover, if the parent-daughter analog states have spin-parity 0^+ , then the Gamow-Teller form factor vanishes— $c(q^2) = 0$ —and the Fermi matrix element becomes a simple numerical factor, namely, for unit isotopic spin $a(0) = \sqrt{2}$, which is an exact prediction up to isospin breaking effects. The calculation of the latter effects has been an area of active investigation [84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91]. In simple terms, one needs to take into account that the “last” proton in the parent positron emitter is less strongly bound than the “last” neutron in the daughter state. An extensive analysis of data by Hardy and Towner, taking into account isospin breaking, has yielded the very precise value $V_{ud} = 0.97425(22)$ [92].

No symmetry principle determines the size of Gamow-Teller matrix elements, and these must either be determined empirically from lifetime or correlation coefficient measurements or calculated from nuclear wavefunctions, though the latter can only be done precisely if meson exchange effects are included. In the case of BSM matrix elements, wavefunction calculations of the requisite matrix elements are required.

3 Cabibbo and lepton universality

Beta decays provide stringent constraints on non-standard couplings through two classes of observables. (i) Total decay rates, after inclusion of radiative corrections, provide information on the strength of weak interactions, thus enabling precision tests of Cabibbo and lepton universality. (ii) Differential decay distributions, including spectra and correlations, are sensitive to the Lorentz structure of the underlying weak interaction, thus enabling searches for small non- $(V - A)$ components. In this section we focus on universality tests.

3.1 Cabibbo Universality

In the SM the effective Fermi constant G_β controlling semi-leptonic transitions $u_i \leftrightarrow d_j$ for $i, j \in 1, 2, 3$ is related to G_μ by

$$G_\beta = G_\mu V_{ij} \left(1 + \delta_\beta - \delta_\mu \right), \tag{3.23}$$

where $G_\beta \equiv V_{ij} G_F^{(0)} (1 + \delta_\beta)$, the unitary CKM matrix V_{ij} parameterizes quark mixing, and δ_β and δ_μ encode electroweak radiative corrections (see Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8)). We can thus test Cabibbo (or quark-lepton) universality by testing whether $|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{ub}|^2 = 1$. Beta decay rates permit access to the CKM matrix elements V_{ud} and V_{us} . Since both the SM prediction and the experimental

measurements have reached the sub-percent level, these observables provide strong constraints on new physics, through the parameter Δ_{CKM} defined as

$$\Delta_{\text{CKM}} \equiv |\bar{V}_{ud}|^2 + |\bar{V}_{us}|^2 + |\bar{V}_{ub}|^2 - 1. \quad (3.24)$$

Here \bar{V}_{ij} are the CKM elements determined phenomenologically from semileptonic decays assuming only SM dynamics. The ratio \bar{V}_{ij}/V_{ij} is parameterized in terms of the BSM couplings, as exemplified by Eqs. (3.25) and (3.29). In the unitarity sum, $|\bar{V}_{ub}| = 3.51(^{+15}_{-14}) \times 10^{-3}$ [81] plays no role; \bar{V}_{ud} and \bar{V}_{us} are both important and can be determined with high precision in a number of channels. The degree of needed theoretical input varies, depending on the component of the weak current which contributes to the hadronic matrix element. Roughly speaking, one can group the channels leading to $\bar{V}_{ud,us}$ into three classes:

- Semileptonic decays in which only the vector component of the weak current contributes: These are theoretically favorable in the SM because the matrix elements of the vector current at zero momentum transfer are known in the $\text{SU}(2)_f$ ($\text{SU}(3)_f$) limit of equal light quark masses. Moreover, corrections to the symmetry limit are quadratic in $m_{s,d} - m_u$ [73, 72]. Super-allowed nuclear beta decays ($0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$), pion beta decay ($\pi^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu_e$), and $K \rightarrow \pi \ell \nu$ decays belong to this class. The determination of $\bar{V}_{ud,us}$ from these modes requires theoretical input on radiative corrections [41, 42, 43, 93, 94, 95] and hadronic matrix elements via analytic methods [96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102], or lattice QCD methods [103, 104, 105, 106, 107].
- Semileptonic transitions in which both the vector and axial component of the weak current contribute: Neutron decay ($n \rightarrow p e \bar{\nu}$) and hyperon decays ($\Lambda \rightarrow p e \bar{\nu}, \dots$), as well as nuclear mirror transitions, belong to this class. In this case the matrix elements of the axial current must be determined experimentally [108, 109]. Inclusive τ lepton decays $\tau \rightarrow h \nu_\tau$ also belong to this class as both V and A currents contribute, though the relevant matrix elements can be calculated theoretically via the Operator Product Expansion [110, 111].
- Leptonic transitions in which only the axial component of the weak current contributes: In this class one finds meson decays such as $\pi(K) \rightarrow \mu \nu$ but also exclusive τ decays such as $\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau \pi(K)$. Experimentally one can determine the products $\bar{V}_{ud} F_\pi$ and $\bar{V}_{us} F_K$. With the advent of precision calculations of F_K/F_π in lattice QCD [112, 113, 114, 115, 116], this class of decays provides a useful constraint on the ratio $\bar{V}_{us}/\bar{V}_{ud}$ [117, 118].

Currently, the determination of \bar{V}_{ud} is dominated by $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ super-allowed nuclear beta decays [96, 92], leading to $\bar{V}_{ud} = 0.97425(22)$, while the best determination of \bar{V}_{us} arises from $K_{\ell 2}, K_{\ell 3}$ decays, leading to the best fit $\bar{V}_{us} = 0.2256(9)$ [119, 118]. These determinations lead to $\Delta_{\text{CKM}} = (1 \pm 6) \times 10^{-4}$, in remarkable agreement with the CKM unitarity of the SM. This is illustrated in Fig. 1. Next, we discuss the implications on BSM physics in a model-independent framework.

3.1.1 Model independent constraints

Each element \bar{V}_{ij} receives a universal, or channel independent, correction due to possible new physics corrections in muon decay, parameterized by ϵ_μ in Eq. (2.8). Additionally, \bar{V}_{ij} receives channel-dependent BSM contributions, which are linear combinations of the ϵ 's defined in Eq. (2.7). Given the hierarchy $|V_{ud}|^2 \gg |V_{us}|^2$, we discuss in detail only the BSM contributions to \bar{V}_{ud} , beginning with the $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear transitions.

From each $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ transition, working in the impulse approximation, one extracts the quantity

$$|\bar{V}_{ud}|_{0^+ \rightarrow 0^+}^2 = |V_{ud}|^2 \left[1 + 2 \text{Re}(\epsilon_L + \epsilon_R - \epsilon_\mu) + c_{0^+}^S(Z) g_S \text{Re} \epsilon_S \right], \quad (3.25)$$




Figure 1: Graphical representation of the current status of $|V_{ud}|$, $|V_{us}|$, and the corresponding CKM unitarity test. The horizontal band represents the constraint from $K_{\ell 3}$ decays, the thin vertical band the constraint from $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear decays, the oblique band the constraint from $K_{\mu 2}/\pi_{\mu 2}$, whereas the ellipse is the 1σ fit region. Figure reproduced with permission from Ref. [118].

where the first correction reflects the BSM shift in the vector operator minus the shift in the Fermi constant extracted in muon decay. The second correction, proportional to $\text{Re } \epsilon_S$, arises from a non-vanishing Fierz interference term; this distorts the electron spectrum and therefore the phase space integrals. The correction depends on the individual nuclear transitions, through [47, 42]

$$c_{0^+}^S(Z) = -2\sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 Z^2} \frac{I_1(Q_{EC}/m_e)}{I_0(Q_{EC}/m_e)} \quad , \quad I_k(x_0) = \int_1^{x_0} x^{1-k} (x_0 - x)^2 \sqrt{x^2 - 1} \, dx \quad , \quad (3.26)$$

where $Q_{EC} = M_1 - M_2$ with m_e the electron mass. The transition strengths, or ft values, after the application of transition-dependent radiative corrections and isospin-symmetry-breaking corrections to the nuclear matrix elements, are remarkably constant with the Z of the daughter nucleus, supporting the Conserved-Vector-Current (CVC) “hypothesis”, though CVC is simply a consequence of the SM. Moreover, CVC is also tested by studies of nuclear mirror transitions, albeit with lesser precision [109]. The computation of the isospin-symmetry-breaking corrections, noting e.g. Ref. [85], has been criticized [89, 90], but the employed procedure has been experimentally validated in a system for which the correction is particularly large [120]. For a discussion of the various methods to compute isospin-breaking effects, see Ref. [91]. From the constancy of the corrected ft values with the Z of the daughter nucleus, Hardy and Towner [96] obtain the combined bound

$$-1.0 \times 10^{-3} < g_S \text{Re } \epsilon_S < 3.2 \times 10^{-3} \quad (90\% \text{ C.L.}) \quad . \quad (3.27)$$

It is the most stringent bound on scalar interactions from low-energy probes. Moreover, the Δ_{CKM} constraint implies

$$\text{Re}(\epsilon_L + \epsilon_R - \epsilon_\mu) < 5 \times 10^{-4} \quad (90\% \text{ C.L.}) \quad . \quad (3.28)$$

This is one of the strongest precision constraints on new physics. It corresponds to effective scales $\Lambda > 11$ TeV [45]. The resulting constraints on the weak-scale couplings $\hat{\alpha}_j$ [45, 47, 37] are comparable to that obtained from Z-pole experiments, and are stronger than the ones obtained from $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q})$ at LEP.

In principle, neutron decay allows for an extraction of \bar{V}_{ud} free of nuclear structure uncertainties. Assuming no BSM effects one has $V_{ud} = [4908.7(1.9)s/(\tau_n(1 + 3g_A^2))]^{1/2}$ [42, 43]. An extraction of \bar{V}_{ud} competitive with nuclear decays requires $\delta g_A/g_A \sim 0.025\%$ and $\delta\tau_n \sim 0.35s$ ($\delta\tau_n/\tau_n = 0.04\%$). In turn, a determination of g_A at the required level necessitates a measurement of the beta asymmetry A at the 0.1% level. The expression for $|\bar{V}_{ud}|^2 \Big|_{n \rightarrow pe\bar{\nu}}$ reads [47]

$$|\bar{V}_{ud}|^2 \Big|_{n \rightarrow pe\bar{\nu}} = |V_{ud}|^2 \left[1 + 2 \operatorname{Re}(\epsilon_L + \epsilon_R - \epsilon_\mu) + \frac{2}{1 + 3\lambda^2} \left(g_S \operatorname{Re} \epsilon_S - 12\lambda g_T \operatorname{Re} \epsilon_T \right) \left(\frac{I_1(x_0)}{I_0(x_0)} - \frac{6\lambda^2}{1 + 3\lambda^2} c \right) \right], \quad (3.29)$$

where $\lambda \equiv g_A/g_V$, $x_0 = E_0/m_e$, with E_0 the electron endpoint energy. The constant c is a certain $\mathcal{O}(1)$ number that depends on the specific experimental analysis used to extract λ from measurements of the beta asymmetry A , presuming the presence of spectrum contaminations due to scalar and tensor operators. A different correction would appear if one extracted λ from a different observable, such as a (see the discussion in Ref. [47]).

3.2 Lepton Universality

The ratio $R_\pi \equiv \Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu[\gamma])/\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu[\gamma])$ is helicity-suppressed in the SM, due to the $V - A$ structure of charged current couplings. It is therefore a sensitive probe of all SM extensions that induce axial and especially pseudoscalar currents, as well as of non-universal corrections to the charged current lepton couplings. The quantity R_π can be predicted very precisely in the SM because the leading hadronic input, namely, the pion decay constant F_π , cancels in the ratio. Once one includes electroweak radiative corrections, hadronic structure effects do appear, and the SM prediction can be organized within the ChPT power counting as follows:

$$R_\pi^{\text{SM}} = R_\pi^{(0)} \left[1 + \Delta_{e^2 p^2} + \Delta_{e^2 p^4} + \dots \right] \quad (3.30)$$

$$R_\pi^{(0)} = \frac{m_e^2}{m_\mu^2} \left(\frac{m_\pi^2 - m_e^2}{m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2} \right)^2. \quad (3.31)$$

The leading electromagnetic correction $\Delta_{e^2 p^2}$ corresponds to the point-like approximation for the pion [121, 122]. The NNLO (two-loop) correction $\Delta_{e^2 p^4}$ has been calculated within ChPT in Refs. [123, 124]. The two-loop effective theory results have been complemented by a large- N_c calculation of an associated counterterm and by summation of leading logarithms $\alpha^n \ln^n(m_\mu/m_e)$ [122] giving [123, 124]

$$R_\pi = (1.2352 \pm 0.0001) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (3.32)$$

The central value of R_π is in agreement with the results of previous calculations [122, 125], pushing the theoretical uncertainty below the 0.1 per-mille level.

3.2.1 Model independent constraints

The ratio $R_\pi \equiv \Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu[\gamma])/\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu[\gamma])$ probes more than the effective low-energy pseudoscalar coupling ϵ_P defined earlier as the coefficient of the operator $\bar{e}(1 - \gamma_5)\nu_e \cdot \bar{u}\gamma_5 d$. In fact, since (i) R_π

is defined as the ratio of electron-to-muon decay and (ii) the neutrino flavor is not observed in either decay, this observable is sensitive to the whole set of parameters $\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_P^{\alpha\beta}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} \supset \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} \left[\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta} \bar{e}_\alpha (1 - \gamma_5) \nu_\beta \cdot \bar{u} \gamma_5 d + \tilde{\epsilon}_P^{\alpha\beta} \bar{e}_\alpha (1 + \gamma_5) \nu_\beta \cdot \bar{u} \gamma_5 d \right] \quad (3.33)$$

where $\alpha \in \{e, \mu\}$ refers to the flavor of the charged lepton and $\beta \in \{e, \mu, \tau\}$ refers to the neutrino flavor. One generically expects SM extensions to generate non-diagonal components in $\epsilon_{P,S,T}^{\alpha\beta}$. In the new notation the previously defined pseudoscalar, scalar, and tensor couplings read $\epsilon_{P,S,T} \equiv \epsilon_{P,S,T}^{ee}$. It is important to note that only ϵ_P^{ee} and $\epsilon_P^{\mu\mu}$ can interfere with the SM amplitudes, while the remaining $\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_P^{\alpha\beta}$ each enter as an absolute square in the numerator and denominator of R_π . In summary, allowing for non-standard axial and pseudoscalar interactions and factoring out the SM prediction for R_π , one can write: [47]

$$\frac{R_\pi}{R_\pi^{\text{SM}}} = \frac{\left[\left| 1 + \epsilon_L^{ee} - \epsilon_R^{ee} - \frac{B_0}{m_e} \epsilon_P^{ee} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{B_0}{m_e} \epsilon_P^{e\mu} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{B_0}{m_e} \epsilon_P^{e\tau} \right|^2 + \sum_\alpha \left| \frac{B_0}{m_e} \tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha} \right|^2 \right]}{\left[\left| 1 + \epsilon_L^{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_R^{\mu\mu} - \frac{B_0}{m_\mu} \epsilon_P^{\mu\mu} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{B_0}{m_\mu} \epsilon_P^{\mu e} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{B_0}{m_\mu} \epsilon_P^{\mu\tau} \right|^2 + \sum_\alpha \left| \frac{B_0}{m_\mu} \tilde{\epsilon}_P^{\mu\alpha} \right|^2 \right]} \equiv 1 + \Delta_{e/\mu}, \quad (3.34)$$

where we note that the BSM couplings can be complex. In the above equation the factors of $B_0/m_{e,\mu} \epsilon_P$ represent the ratio of the new-physics amplitude over the SM amplitude. The latter is proportional to the charged-lepton mass due to angular-momentum conservation arguments, while the former is proportional to $\langle 0 | \bar{u} \gamma_5 d | \pi \rangle$, characterized by the scale- and scheme-dependent parameter⁹

$$B_0(\mu) \equiv \frac{M_\pi^2}{m_u(\mu) + m_d(\mu)}. \quad (3.35)$$

Since $B_0^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(\mu = 1 \text{ GeV}) = 1.85 \text{ GeV}$ (using the PDG [126] central values for the light quark masses) and consequently $B_0/m_e = 3.62 \times 10^3$, R_π has enhanced sensitivity to $\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}$, and one needs to keep quadratic terms in these new physics coefficients. We discuss bounds on $\epsilon_A \equiv \epsilon_L - \epsilon_R$ and $\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}, \tilde{\epsilon}_P^{\alpha\beta}$ separately. First, setting $\epsilon_A = 0$, inspection of Eq. (3.34) reveals that if the new-physics couplings respect $\epsilon_P^{\mu\alpha}/m_e = \epsilon_P^{\mu\alpha}/m_\mu$, then $R_\pi/R_\pi^{\text{SM}} = 1$, and there are no constraints on these couplings. On the other hand, if the effective couplings $\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}$ are all of similar size, one can neglect the entire denominator in Eq. (3.34), as it is suppressed with respect to the numerator by powers of m_e/m_μ . We will assume the second scenario operates. In this case the constraint in Eq. (3.34) forces the couplings $\epsilon_P^{ee}, \epsilon_P^{e\mu}, \epsilon_P^{e\tau}, \tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha}$ to live in a spherical shell of radius $m_e/B_0 \sqrt{R_\pi^{\text{exp}}/R_\pi^{\text{SM}}} \approx 2.75 \times 10^{-4}$ centered at $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ee}) = m_e/B_0 \approx 2.75 \times 10^{-4}$, $\epsilon_P^{e\mu} = \epsilon_P^{e\tau} = \tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha} = 0$. The thickness of the shell is numerically 1.38×10^{-6} and is determined by the current combined uncertainty in R_π^{exp} [127, 128, 129] and R_π^{SM} [124, 123]: $R_\pi^{\text{exp}}/R_\pi^{\text{SM}} = 0.996(5)$ (90% C.L.). This is illustrated in Fig. 2, where we plot the allowed region in the two-dimensional plane given by $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ee})$ and a generic “wrong-flavor” coupling denoted by ϵ_P^{ex} ($x \neq e$) — or this can be $\text{Im}(\epsilon_P^{ee})$ or any of the real or imaginary parts of ϵ_P^{ex} and $\tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha}$. Note that the allowed region is given by the thickness of the curve in the figure, thus enforcing a strong correlation between ϵ_P^{ee} and ϵ_P^{ex} . Since ϵ_P^{ex} and others of that sort are essentially unconstrained by other measurements, though we expect they can be of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$, we can neglect all of the couplings but one to obtain a bound on that one. The resulting bounds using R_π at 90%-C.L. are

$$-1.4 \times 10^{-7} < \text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ee}) < 5.5 \times 10^{-4}, \quad \text{or} \quad -2.75 \times 10^{-4} < \text{Im}(\epsilon_P^{ee}) < 2.75 \times 10^{-4}, \quad (3.36)$$

⁹Note that the scale and scheme dependence of $B_0(\mu)$ is compensated in physical quantities by the scale and scheme dependence of the Wilson coefficients $\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}$.




Figure 2: Illustration of the allowed region in the two-dimensional plane $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ee})$ - $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ex})$ (with $x \neq e$) determined by R_π , which is given by an annulus of thickness 1.38×10^{-6} . In the absence of information on $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ex})$, the 90 % C.L. bound on $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ee})$ is $-1.4 \times 10^{-7} < \text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ee}) < 5.5 \times 10^{-4}$. Note that $\text{Im}(\epsilon_P^{ee})$, $\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha})$, and $\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha})$ are subject to the same bound as $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ex})$. Figure adapted from Ref. [47].

Note that $\text{Re}(\epsilon_P^{ex})$ and $\text{Im}(\epsilon_P^{ex})$, as well as $\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha})$ and $\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_P^{e\alpha})$, are all subject to the same bound as $\text{Im}(\epsilon_P^{ee})$. Our results are in qualitative agreement with the findings of Refs. [58, 27].

Alternatively, neglecting the pseudoscalar couplings, one obtains the following combined limit on the axial combination of new couplings:

$$-4.5 \times 10^{-3} < \text{Re}(\epsilon_A^{ee} - \epsilon_A^{\mu\mu}) < 0.5 \times 10^{-3} \quad . \quad (3.37)$$

Finally, we discuss how R_π is also sensitive to non-standard scalar and tensor couplings. As originally discussed in Refs. [57, 58, 59], the pseudoscalar coupling ϵ_P^{ee} can be radiatively generated starting from nonzero $\epsilon_{S,T}$. Hence, the stringent constraint in Eq. (3.36) puts constraints on the same $\epsilon_{S,T}$ that can be probed in beta decays. The physics of the effect is this: once the scalar, pseudoscalar, and tensor operators are generated by some non-standard physics at the matching scale Λ , electroweak radiative corrections induce mixing among these three operators. Thus even if $\epsilon_P(\Lambda)$ vanishes at the matching scale, known SM physics generates a nonzero $\epsilon_P(\mu)$ at some lower energy scale μ via loop diagrams. The general form of the constraint can be worked out by using the three-operator mixing results from Ref. [59]. The leading-order result is

$$\epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}(\mu) = \epsilon_P^{\alpha\beta}(\Lambda) \left(1 + \gamma_{PP} \log \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \right) + \epsilon_S^{\alpha\beta}(\Lambda) \gamma_{SP} \log \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} + \epsilon_T^{\alpha\beta}(\Lambda) \gamma_{TP} \log \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \quad (3.38a)$$

$$\gamma_{PP} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{\alpha_2}{\pi} + \frac{113}{72} \frac{\alpha_1}{\pi} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{-2} \quad (3.38b)$$

$$\gamma_{SP} = \frac{15}{72} \frac{\alpha_1}{\pi} \approx 6.7 \times 10^{-4} \quad (3.38c)$$

$$\gamma_{TP} = -\frac{9}{2} \frac{\alpha_2}{\pi} - \frac{15}{2} \frac{\alpha_1}{\pi} \approx -7.3 \times 10^{-2} \quad , \quad (3.38d)$$

where $\alpha_1 = \alpha / \cos^2 \theta_W$ and $\alpha_2 = \alpha / \sin^2 \theta_W$ are the $U(1)$ and $SU(2)_L$ weak couplings, expressed in terms of the fine-structure constant and the weak mixing angle. Setting $\epsilon_P^{ee}(\Lambda) = 0$ and neglecting the small $\mathcal{O}(\alpha/\pi)$ fractional difference between $\epsilon_{S,T}(\Lambda)$ and the observable $\epsilon_{S,T}(\mu)$ at the low scale, the constraints on ϵ_S and ϵ_T using R_π at 90% C.L. read

$$\frac{-1.4 \times 10^{-7}}{\log(\Lambda/\mu)} < \gamma_{SP} \text{Re}(\epsilon_S) + \gamma_{TP} \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) < \frac{5.5 \times 10^{-4}}{\log(\Lambda/\mu)}, \quad (3.39)$$

and

$$|\gamma_{SP} \text{Im}(\epsilon_S) + \gamma_{TP} \text{Im}(\epsilon_T)| < \frac{2.75 \times 10^{-4}}{\log(\Lambda/\mu)}, \quad (3.40)$$

Assuming $\log(\Lambda/\mu) \sim 10$, so that, e.g., $\Lambda \sim 10$ TeV and $\mu \sim 1$ GeV, and using the numerical values of $\gamma_{SP,TP}$, one finds that the individual constraints are at the level of $|\text{Re}(\epsilon_S)| \lesssim 8 \times 10^{-2}$, $|\text{Im}(\epsilon_S)| \lesssim 4 \times 10^{-2}$, $|\text{Re}(\epsilon_T)| \lesssim 10^{-3}$, and $|\text{Im}(\epsilon_T)| \lesssim 0.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. These bounds become logarithmically more stringent as the new-physics scale Λ grows. It is worth noting that analogous studies are also possible in kaon decays, and new results are expected from NA62 at CERN [25] and TREK at J-PARC [130].

Constraints on $\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,T}$ can be worked out similarly [59], resulting in $|\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_S)| \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-2}$, $|\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_S)| \lesssim 2.5 \times 10^{-2}$, $|\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_T)| \lesssim 0.6 \times 10^{-3}$, and $|\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_T)| \lesssim 0.3 \times 10^{-3}$, which together with $\tilde{\epsilon}_P$ are the strongest low-energy bounds on the $\tilde{\epsilon}$ couplings [37].

4 Decay correlations and non- $(V - A)$ couplings

Differential decay distributions in beta decays are very sensitive to the Lorentz structure of the underlying weak interaction, thus enabling searches for small non- $(V - A)$ components. Following Ref. [49], one writes the differential decay distribution in the nuclear decay $P \rightarrow D e^- \bar{\nu}$ ($e^+ \nu$) as a function of electron (positron) energy and lepton directions as follows,

$$\frac{d^3\Gamma}{dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^5} p_e E_e (E_0 - E_e)^2 \xi \left\{ 1 + b \frac{m_e}{E_e} + a \frac{\vec{p}_e \cdot \vec{p}_\nu}{E_e E_\nu} + \langle \frac{\vec{J}}{J} \rangle \cdot \left[A \frac{\vec{p}_e}{E_e} + B \frac{\vec{p}_\nu}{E_\nu} + D \frac{\vec{p}_e \times \vec{p}_\nu}{E_e E_\nu} \right] + \dots \right\}, \quad (4.41)$$

where P and D represent the parent and daughter nuclei, $\langle \vec{J} \rangle / J$ represents the parent nucleus polarization, if any, and $\vec{p}_{e,\nu}$ are the electron (positron) and antineutrino (neutrino) three-momenta. We have omitted the additional parity-conserving term which appears if $J \neq 1/2$, as indicated by the ellipsis. The coefficient b is the Fierz interference term, a is the electron-antineutrino correlation, A is the beta asymmetry, B is the antineutrino asymmetry, and the coefficient D is T odd in that the associated triple product of vectors is motion-reversal odd. All these quantities contain combinations of the Lee-Yang effective coefficients as delineated in Ref. [49], as does ξ , and are related to our parameters as per Eq. (2.17). Additional terms are present if one can measure the polarization of the emitted electron or positron [49]. Note, too, that the various correlation coefficients become E_e dependent once corrections of radiative and recoil order are included.

The decay correlations can be measured in neutron and nuclear decays, and substantial progress is expected in the next few years. In neutron decay, both cold and ultracold neutrons, implying distinct experimental techniques and hence entirely independent sources of systematic error, are used to measure these correlations. In the future we can expect experiments poised to take advantage of cold neutron beams of much greater intensity at the FRM-III (PERC) [5], the New Guide Hall at NIST [131], and the SNS (Nab) [14]. Concerning nuclear decays, the development of atomic trapping techniques has allowed the precise detection of daughter nucleus recoil momenta, which in turn permits better measurements of the electron-antineutrino correlation parameter a .

In the absence of radiative corrections, recoil corrections, and BSM contributions, the correlation coefficients $a(E_e)$, $A(E_e)$, and $B(E_e)$ reduce to simple expressions, while $b, D = 0$ vanish. For example, for a pure Gamow-Teller decay we have the prediction $a_{GT} = -1/3$, whereas for a pure Fermi transition we have $a_F = 1$. For mixed Fermi-Gamow-Teller transitions there is also a precise prediction once the ratio of Fermi to Gamow-Teller strengths is known—and this can be determined from the lifetime. In the case of neutron decay, which is a mixed transition, one obtains:

$$a(E_e) \rightarrow \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{1 + 3\lambda^2}, \quad A(E_e) \rightarrow \frac{2\lambda(1 - \lambda)}{1 + 3\lambda^2}, \quad B(E_e) \rightarrow \frac{2\lambda(1 + \lambda)}{1 + 3\lambda^2}, \quad (4.42)$$

where $\lambda \equiv g_A/g_V$ and the limiting value of $B(E_e)$, e.g., is termed B_0 .

Going beyond the SM, the dependence of the correlations a, b, A, B , and D on the short-distance couplings ϵ_i and $\tilde{\epsilon}_i$ can be determined using their dependence on the couplings $C_i \pm C'_i$ given in Ref. [49] and the relations given in Eq. (2.17). The full expressions are quite complicated, but simplify considerably if one considers the leading *linear* corrections only. In regards to these, the salient points are:

- As mentioned previously, the right-handed coupling ϵ_R to linear order induces the shift $\lambda \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda} = \lambda(1 - 2\epsilon_R)$. In order to probe ϵ_R from correlation measurements, one needs to know $\lambda \equiv g_A/g_V$ independently; this can come from a LQCD calculation.
- The scalar and tensor couplings $\epsilon_{S,T}$ appear at linear order only through the Fierz interference term b and the analogous term b_ν in the antineutrino asymmetry parameter, where b_ν is defined by $B(E_e) = B_0 + b_\nu m_e/E_e$. Different nuclear transitions probe different combinations of the BSM couplings. For example, the Fierz term b in a pure Fermi or Gamow-Teller transition probes exclusively the scalar or tensor coupling, according to $b_F = \mp 2\gamma g_S \text{Re}(\epsilon_S)$ and $b_{GT} = \pm(8\gamma g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T))/\lambda$, where $\gamma = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2 Z^2}$ and the sign distinguishes β^\pm emitters [50]. Mixed transitions such as neutron decay probe a linear combination of scalar and tensor couplings. For neutron decay one has [50]:

$$b = \frac{2\gamma}{1 + 3\lambda^2} \left[g_S \text{Re}(\epsilon_S) - 12\lambda g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) \right], \quad (4.43a)$$

$$b_\nu = \frac{2\gamma}{1 + 3\lambda^2} \left[g_S \text{Re}(\epsilon_S) \lambda - 4g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) (1 + 2\lambda) \right]. \quad (4.43b)$$

- Measurements of the correlation coefficients a, A , and B always include contributions from the Fierz interference term b , and are therefore sensitive to $\epsilon_{S,T}$ to linear order. This dependence arises because correlation measurements involve the construction of asymmetry ratios [132], and the dependence on b does not cancel in the asymmetry denominators. For example, in order to isolate $A(E_e)$ one constructs the ratio

$$A_{\text{exp}}(E_e) = \frac{N_+(E_e) - N_-(E_e)}{N_+(E_e) + N_-(E_e)}, \quad (4.44)$$

where $N_\pm(E_e)$ are the spectra corresponding to events with $\vec{J} \cdot \vec{p}_e > 0$ and $\vec{J} \cdot \vec{p}_e < 0$, respectively, so that sensitivity to b does indeed appear through the denominator. In general, asymmetry measurements probe

$$\tilde{Y}(E_e) = \frac{Y(E_e)}{1 + b m_e/E_e + \dots}, \quad Y \in \{A, B, a, \dots\}, \quad (4.45)$$

where the ellipsis denotes other possible corrections of radiative and recoil order whose appearance depend on the correlation considered. It is worth noting that simultaneous analysis of $a(E_e)$ and $A(E_e)$, e.g., yields more powerful constraints on the underlying BSM contributions than either correlation alone [133].

The dependence on $\tilde{\epsilon}_\alpha$ couplings appears only to quadratic order, together with additional effects quadratic in the ϵ_β 's. In this section, we have considered beta-decay correlations only, though strong constraints on BSM couplings also come from the study of light meson decays. We now review constraints on the various BSM couplings which appear in Eq. (2.17).

4.1 Model-independent constraints on scalar and tensor couplings

We now summarize the current best constraints on the scalar and tensor structures, and highlight prospects for future improvements. Currently, the most stringent constraint on the scalar coupling ϵ_S arises from $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear beta decays, as discussed in Section 3.1.1, whereas the most stringent bound on the tensor effective coupling ϵ_T arises from the Dalitz-plot study of the radiative pion decay $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu_e \gamma$. That is, an analysis of the Dalitz plot of this decay from the PIBETA collaboration [134] puts constraints on the product $\text{Re}(\epsilon_T f_T)$ of the short-distance coupling ϵ_T and the hadronic form factor f_T defined by [135]

$$\langle \gamma(\epsilon, p) | \bar{u} \sigma_{\mu\nu} \gamma_5 d | \pi^+ \rangle = -\frac{e}{2} f_T (p_\mu \epsilon_\nu - p_\nu \epsilon_\mu) , \quad (4.46)$$

where p_μ and ϵ_μ are the photon four-momentum and polarization vector, respectively. The analysis of Ref. [135], based on a large- N_c -inspired resonance-saturation model, provides $f_T = 0.24(4)$ at the renormalization scale $\mu = 1$ GeV, with the parametric uncertainty induced by the uncertainty in the quark condensate. The 90%-C.L. experimental constraint¹⁰ $-2.0 \times 10^{-4} < f_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) < 2.6 \times 10^{-4}$, when combined with the above estimate for f_T evolved to 2 GeV implies

$$-1.1 \times 10^{-3} < \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) < 1.36 \times 10^{-3} \quad (90\% \text{ C.L.}) . \quad (4.47)$$

This is the most stringent constraint on the tensor coupling from low-energy experiments. The next best constraints arise from measurements of nuclear beta decays [29].

Bounds on scalar and tensor interactions can be obtained from a number of observables in nuclear beta decays, other than $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ transitions. Although these bounds are currently not competitive, we summarize them here for completeness. The leading sensitivity to scalar and tensor operators appears through the Fierz interference term b . Significant constraints on b arise from the electron-polarization observables [49] as well as from measurements of A and a in Fermi, Gamow-Teller, and mixed transitions. Here is a summary of current bounds on $\epsilon_{S,T}$ [29]:

- The most stringent constraint from the beta asymmetry in pure Gamow-Teller transitions (\tilde{A}_{GT}) arises from ^{60}Co measurements and implies [136]

$$-2.9 \times 10^{-3} < g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) < 1.5 \times 10^{-2} \quad (90\% \text{ C.L.}) . \quad (4.48)$$

Similar bounds can be obtained from measurements of \tilde{A}_{GT} in ^{114}In decay [137]: $-2.2 \times 10^{-2} < g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) < 1.3 \times 10^{-2}$ (90 % C.L.).

- Measurements of the ratio P_F/P_{GT} from the longitudinal polarization of the positron emitted in pure Fermi and Gamow-Teller transitions [138, 139] imply

$$-0.76 \times 10^{-2} < g_S \text{Re}(\epsilon_S) + \frac{4}{\lambda} g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T) < 1.0 \times 10^{-2} \quad (90\% \text{ C.L.}) . \quad (4.49)$$

¹⁰Note that there is a factor of 2 difference in the normalization of the tensor coupling ϵ_T compared to what was used in Refs. [58, 134].

- Preliminary results have been reported on the measurement of the longitudinal polarization of positrons emitted by polarized ^{107}In nuclei [140]. The corresponding 90 % C.L. sensitivity to tensor interactions, $|g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T)| < 3.1 \times 10^{-3}$, is quite promising although not yet competitive with radiative pion decay.
- Finally, the beta-neutrino correlation a has been measured in a number of nuclear transitions [141, 142, 143, 144]. The resulting constraints on scalar and tensor interactions are summarized in Fig. 7 of Ref. [141]. In terms of the coupling constants used here, the 90 % C.L. combined bound on the tensor interaction reads $|g_T \text{Re}(\epsilon_T)| < 5 \times 10^{-3}$, again not competitive with radiative pion decay.

Future improvements can be expected from both neutron and nuclear decay measurements. In the case of neutrons [4, 5], future measurements of the beta asymmetry A [12, 13, 14, 15], the antineutrino asymmetry B [16, 14], the electron-neutrino correlation a [17, 18, 19], and the Fierz interference term b [17, 20] should exceed 10^{-3} precision. On the nuclear side, measurements of a and b in the pure Gamow-Teller decay of ^6He [22] should also reach the 10^{-3} level in precision. In Fig. 3 we summarize the current constraints on ϵ_S and ϵ_T (horizontal bands) and assess the impact of future measurements in both neutron and nuclear decays, where we assume $|b, b_\nu| < 10^{-3}$ from neutron decay and $|b_{\text{GT}}| < 10^{-3}$ from nuclear decays at 90% CL. The future neutron constraints are represented by the diagonal bands, whereas the constraint from ^6He is represented by the vertical other band in the plot. In Fig. 3 the left panel represents the constraints using quark model input for the scalar and tensor matrix elements $g_{S,T}$, whereas the right panel uses our preferred LQCD estimates [47], which still have a 50% uncertainty in g_S . In the near future one can expect $\delta g_S/g_S$ to reach the 20% level from LQCD, thus increasing the constraining power of these measurements, so that the thickness of the bands will shrink. With current uncertainties on $g_{S,T}$, measurements of 10^{-3} -level precision will probe effective scales $\Lambda_{S,T} > 7$ TeV.

4.2 Nuclear and neutron probes of recoil effects

SM recoil effects can be tested to high accuracy via experiments involving correlations between final state electron/positrons and the polarization or alignment of the parent state, which have the form

$$\frac{d^3\Gamma}{dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu} \sim 1 + A(E_e) P \frac{\hat{z} \cdot \vec{p}_e}{E_e} + F(E_e) \Lambda \left(\frac{1}{E_e^2} \hat{z} \cdot \vec{p}_e \hat{z} \cdot \vec{p}_e - \frac{p_e^2}{3E_e^2} \right) \quad (4.50)$$

where $P = \langle J_z \rangle / J$ is the polarization and $\Lambda = 1 - 3 \langle J_z^2 \rangle / (J(J+1))$ is the alignment. The beta correlation A receives both leading order and recoil corrections, whereas the alignment correlation F is purely a recoil order effect. However, both have been measured as functions of E_e and provide measures of the recoil form factors. In this regard, it is important to point out that the axial tensor form factor $d(q^2)$, which vanishes in the SM from isotopic spin invariance in the case of transitions between isotopic analog states such as in neutron beta decay or tritium decay, is in general *nonvanishing*. Indeed, it is in general comparable in size to the weak magnetism term $\tilde{b}(q^2)$ ¹¹. In the case of mirror transitions the size of the axial tensor must be identical for electron and positron decays, and this is subject to test. A theoretical prediction for the weak magnetism term \tilde{b} in terms of the difference between parent and daughter magnetic moments exists for transitions between isotopic analogs, and in the case of mirror transitions the size of the weak magnetism term is given by the electromagnetic M1 width of the transition from the excited isotopic analog state of the daughter nucleus—another CVC test [146]. One expects corrections to this result which are linear in isospin-breaking, both in $\tilde{b}(0)$ itself and from possible second-class current contribution in the SM. In neutron beta decay, through study of $a(E_e)$ and $A(E_e)$, the second-class current contribution to $d(0)$ can be determined independently of $\tilde{b}(0)$, implying

¹¹Note that the vanishing of $d(0)$ for transitions between isotopic analog states is a SM prediction and is violated by so-called second class currents which can arise if quarks have an additional quantum number[145].




Figure 3: Current and prospective 90% C.L. allowed regions in the $\text{Re}(\epsilon_S)$ - $\text{Re}(\epsilon_T)$ plane implied by (i) the existing bounds on b_F and $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$ (horizontal (green) band); (ii) projected measurements of b and b_ν in neutron decay (inner (red) and outer (blue) bow-tie shaped regions, respectively) at the 10^{-3} level; (iii) projected measurements of b_{GT} at the 10^{-3} level from ${}^6\text{He}$ decays (vertical (ocher) band). Left panel: hadronic matrix elements taken in the ranges $0.25 < g_S < 1.0$, $0.6 < g_T < 2.3$ [27]. Right panel: scalar and tensor charges taken from LQCD, $g_S = 0.8(4)$ and $g_T = 1.05(35)$. Note that by reducing the uncertainty in g_S the constraint on ϵ_S from b_F becomes stronger, independent of any future neutron measurement. The effective couplings $\epsilon_{S,T}$ are defined in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme at 2 GeV. Figure adapted from Ref. [47].

that the CVC test can be made without assumptions regarding second-class currents [147]. Generally, since the form of the recoil effects to all observables has been given, together with electromagnetic corrections, these SM predictions are all testable [76].

An alternate route for testing the SM recoil predictions is to utilize decays where the daughter state is unstable and itself decays

- i) electromagnetically such as in the mirror transitions in the $A = 20$ system to the 2^+ 1.63 MeV excited state of ${}^{20}\text{Ne}$, which in turn decays via photon emission to the 0^+ ground state [148];
- ii) strongly such as in the mirror transitions in the $A = 8$ system to the 2^+ 2.90 MeV excited state of ${}^8\text{Be}$, which in turn decays via the emission of two alpha particles [149].

In the former case there exists a beta-gamma correlation

$$\frac{d^3\Gamma}{dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\gamma} \sim 1 + \frac{1}{2}G(E_e) \left(\left(\frac{\vec{p}_e \cdot \hat{p}_\gamma}{E_e} \right)^2 - \frac{p_e^2}{3E_e^2} \right), \quad (4.51)$$

whereas in the latter there is a beta-alpha correlation

$$\frac{d^3\Gamma}{dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\alpha} \sim 1 + G(E_e) \left(\left(\frac{\vec{p}_e \cdot \hat{p}_\alpha}{E_e} \right)^2 - \frac{p_e^2}{3E_e^2} \right) - 2 \frac{\vec{p}_e \cdot \hat{p}_\alpha}{Mv*}, \quad (4.52)$$

noting v^* is the velocity of the alpha particle in the daughter rest frame. Here the decay correlation coefficient G is purely of recoil order, so that it is sensitive to recoil form factors. The form of G as well as of the radiative corrections have been calculated [76].

4.3 Couplings involving right-handed neutrinos: $\tilde{\epsilon}_{L,R,S,T,P}$

Neglecting neutrino masses, all the $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$ couplings enter the decay rates quadratically, i.e., as per $\propto |\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta|^2$. Detailed expressions of the contributions to neutron and nuclear beta decay correlation coefficients can be found in Ref. [50], though one needs to re-express the Lee-Yang couplings in terms of the ϵ_α and $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$ using Eq. (2.17). The corresponding bounds can be obtained from the analysis of Ref. [29], in particular from the fits to beta decay data allowing for non-zero $\tilde{\epsilon}_L, \tilde{\epsilon}_R$ only, implying $|\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_L + \tilde{\epsilon}_R)| < 6.4 \times 10^{-2}$, $|\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_L - \tilde{\epsilon}_R)| < 5.8 \times 10^{-2}$, and $\tilde{\epsilon}_S, \tilde{\epsilon}_T$ only, implying $|g_S \text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_S)| < 5.5 \times 10^{-2}$, $|g_T \text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_T)| < 2.1 \times 10^{-2}$ at 90% CL. Decay correlations set also bounds on the imaginary parts of these couplings. For example, using the measurements of a in the decay ^{32}Ar [143] and ^6He [150, 151], one gets $|\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_S)| < 0.17$ and $|\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_T)| < 0.05$ at 90% CL. We expect that these bounds can be improved by future more precise measurements.

4.4 T -odd correlations

Triple-product decay correlations can only be motion-reversal-odd and thus cannot be true tests of T-invariance [152]. As a consequence final-state interactions (FSI) can simulate a seeming T-odd correlation without a fundamental violation of T-invariance. In beta-decays the energy release is sufficiently small that the FSI are electromagnetic in nature, so that they are calculable with minimal hadronic ambiguity at accessible levels of precision [153, 154, 155]. Nevertheless, under an assumption of CPT invariance, such “T-odd” correlations are sensitive to new sources of CP violation, and thus to new physics, though an observation of such a correlation in excess of SM expectations would not allow one to conclude that T itself is violated [156].

T-odd correlations have been studied in kaon, neutron, hyperon [157, 158], and nuclear beta-decays. In K^+ decay, namely, $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu \gamma$, the transverse muon polarization is studied, and the expected SM correlation is small [159, 160] with respect to that possible in models of new physics [161, 159]. Existing experimental studies are consistent with no T-violation in this and related processes [162, 163], but new results of greater sensitivity are expected from TREK at J-PARC [164, 165]. In ordinary beta-decay, a T-odd correlation is possible only if the initial state is polarized, or if the final-state polarization of one of the particles is observed. In the decay of polarized neutrons one can construct $\vec{J} \cdot (\vec{p}_e \times \vec{p}_\nu)$, i.e., the D correlation, or $\vec{J} \cdot (\vec{p}_e \times \vec{\sigma}_e)$, i.e., the R correlation, if the polarization of the emitted electron $\propto \vec{\sigma}_e$ is observed. Recently significant experimental efforts in regard to each of these correlations have been concluded. The emiT collaboration has presented the best limit on D in beta decay [166, 167], finding $D_n = (-0.94 \pm 1.89 \pm 0.97) \times 10^{-4}$ in neutron decay, a substantial improvement over earlier measurements [168, 169, 29]. As for D_{FSI} , the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ correction vanishes in the zero-recoil limit, and $D_{FSI} \approx 10^{-5}$ [153, 170]. This calculation has been updated to employ the techniques of heavy-baryon chiral effective field theory by Ando et al. [155]; they reproduce the Callan-Treiman result in $\mathcal{O}(\alpha \bar{Q}/M_N)$ with $\bar{Q} \sim M_n - M_p - m_e$ and include the leading piece of the N³LO correction to realize D_{FSI} with an estimated accuracy of better than 1%. In terms of our non-standard couplings D in neutron decay can be written as [49]

$$D_{BSM} = \frac{1}{1 + 3\lambda^2} \left[4\lambda \text{Im}(\epsilon_R) + 8g_S g_T \text{Im}(\epsilon_S \epsilon_T^* + \tilde{\epsilon}_S \tilde{\epsilon}_T^*) \right] \quad (4.53)$$

Neglecting small quadratic effects in scalar and tensor couplings, the emiT limit translates to the 90% C.L. constraint $-5 \times 10^{-4} < \text{Im}(\epsilon_R) < 3 \times 10^{-4}$, where we have used $\hat{\lambda}$ [81] for λ . For $\text{Im}(\epsilon_{S,T})$ and $\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,T})$ the analysis is more involved. D provides bounds on products such as $\text{Re}(\epsilon_T) \text{Im}(\epsilon_S)$, etc., so that no bounds on the imaginary parts can be obtained unless non-zero real parts of the exotic couplings are assumed or discovered.

Recent results also exist for R . In the first neutron experiment both transverse components of the electron polarization are measured, to yield both R and N [171]. The correlation N probes $\vec{J} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_e$ and is appreciably non-zero from FSI; the experimental measurement is consistent with the SM expectation, offering a sensitivity check of the setup [172]. They find $R_n = 0.004 \pm 0.012 \pm 0.005$, limiting the imaginary parts of scalar and tensor interactions via:

$$R_n = \frac{1}{1 + 3\lambda^2} \left[-8g_T(2\lambda + 1)\text{Im}(\epsilon_T) - 2g_S\lambda\text{Im}(\epsilon_S) \right]. \quad (4.54)$$

In comparison the measurement of R in ^8Li decay yields $R_{s\text{Li}} = 0.0009(22)$ [173], which through

$$R_{s\text{Li}} = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{8g_T}{g_A} \text{Im}(\epsilon_T) \quad (4.55)$$

implies a limit $-3.1 \times 10^{-3} < \text{Im}(\epsilon_T) < 1.8 \times 10^{-3}$ at 90% C.L. after R_{FSI} has been removed. Consequently, the R_n limit is most usefully interpreted as a limit on $\text{Im}(\epsilon_S)$, namely $-0.15 < \text{Im}(\epsilon_S) < 0.11$ at 90% C.L. Looser constraints (at the 20%-level) on the imaginary parts of the scalar and tensor couplings come from the measurement of a in $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ transitions [143, 142] and in ^6He decay [144], respectively—note Fig. 22 of Ref. [166] for a useful compilation.

The possibility of constraining T-odd P-even couplings, including β decay parameters, via T-odd P-odd observables such as EDMs has been considered earlier in Ref. [174]. The basic idea is that through loop diagrams involving electroweak gauge boson exchanges, T-odd P-even interactions can generate T-odd P-odd interactions. The resulting bounds depend on the scale at which parity invariance is restored [175, 176]. In this context, the D correlation has been recently studied in Ref. [177], considering how large D can be in light of constraints from electric dipole moment (EDM) searches. Focusing on the leading contribution to D (proportional to $\text{Im}(\epsilon_R)$) the authors show that via a loop diagram the same phase contributes to the neutron and other EDMs. If this is the leading (or only) contribution to the neutron EDM, then one can conclude that the neutron EDM currently provides the strongest constraint on D , which is $10 - 10^3$ times stronger than current direct limits on D , depending on the model. Of course, the bounds on D can be weakened if other operators, other than the 4-fermion ones, contribute to the neutron EDM, and this is natural in many theories, interfering destructively with the contribution proportional to $\text{Im}(\epsilon_R)$. The numerical evaluation of the effect of such operators becomes a model-dependent question, and one anticipates that the connection between d to D can be weakened completely, though detailed investigation is warranted [178].

In radiative β decay one can form a T-odd correlation from momenta alone, so that one probes new spin-independent sources of CP violation. A triple momentum correlation has been previously studied in $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 l^+ \nu_l \gamma$ [179], and its sensitivity to physics BSM considered [180]. In K^+ decay both electromagnetic and strong, i.e., pion-mediated, radiative corrections can mimic the T-odd effect, but the electromagnetic-induced FSI are orders of magnitude larger [179, 181, 182]. Finally, a spin-independent T-odd correlation can be constructed in the radiative beta decay of neutron and nuclei [183], proportional to $\vec{p}_\gamma \cdot (\vec{p}_e \times \vec{p}_\nu)$, offering the opportunity to study the imaginary part of the pseudo-Chern-Simons term [184] first found as a consequence of the baryon vector current anomaly and $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)$ gauge invariance at low energies [185, 186, 187]. In Ref. [183], the effect of FSI on this new correlation have been computed, establishing the baseline for possible future searches of BSM CP-violating interactions.

5 Collider limits on non-standard CC interactions

The BSM interactions probed at low energy can also be directly probed at high-energy colliders. The collider signals, however, depend on whether the particles that generate the 4-fermion interactions are kinematically accessible at the collider energies. Model-independent statements can be made under




Figure 4: Projected joint 90% CL constraints on $\text{Re}(\epsilon_S)$ and $\text{Re}(\epsilon_T)$ from future beta decays measurements and the LHC at $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV. The low-energy constraints correspond to 0.1% measurements of B, b in neutron decay and b in ${}^6\text{He}$ decay, under two different scenarios for the lattice QCD uncertainties in $g_{S,T}$. The LHC bounds are obtained by requiring less than 3 $e\nu$ -produced signal events with: (i) $m_T > 2.5$ TeV and 10 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity (solid, red ellipse); and (ii) $m_T > 4$ TeV and 300 fb^{-1} (dashed, yellow ellipse). Cuts are chosen to reduce the expected leading background to be below 1 event. To obtain the projection it is assumed no events are found. Note that the effective couplings $\epsilon_{S,T}$ are defined in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme at 2 GeV. Figure adapted from Ref. [47].

the assumption that the non-standard interactions remain point-like at TeV-scale energies; i.e., the mediators are not accessible at the LHC. In this case collider searches directly probe the various non-standard couplings ϵ_α and $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$, that contribute to the parton-level amplitude for $pp \rightarrow e\nu + X$. Since the non-standard amplitudes do not interfere with the SM amplitude (except for terms proportional to ϵ_L), the LHC probes at the same level both the real and imaginary parts of the new couplings. In Ref. [47] bounds are derived on $\epsilon_{S,T}$ by analyzing LHC data in the $pp \rightarrow e\nu + X$ channel at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and 1 fb^{-1} integrated luminosity. In Ref. [37] the analysis has been extended to all non-standard charged-current couplings with integrated luminosity of 5 fb^{-1} , using both the $pp \rightarrow e\nu + X$ and $pp \rightarrow e^+e^- + X$ channels through $\text{SU}(2)_L$ gauge invariance.

The $pp \rightarrow e\nu + X$ channel is directly related to beta decays, since the parton-level process is $\bar{u}d \rightarrow e\bar{\nu}$. In order to put bounds on the BSM couplings one uses the (cumulative) transverse mass distribution [188], noting that the transverse mass of the lepton pair is defined as $m_T \equiv \sqrt{2E_T^e E_T^\nu (1 - \cos \Delta\phi_{e\nu})}$. At high m_T the SM background falls off while the BSM interactions would produce events and thus increase their number. Similarly, for $pp \rightarrow e^+e^- + X$ one uses the dilepton invariant mass distribution [189], dubbed m_{ee} , to constrain the presence of possible contact interactions.

A comparison of the best bounds available for each interaction from low- and high-energy experiments is shown in Tables 2, 3 (for $\text{Re}(\epsilon_\alpha)$ and $\text{Im}(\epsilon_\alpha)$) and 4, 5 (for $\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_\alpha)$ and $\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_\alpha)$). Note that in these tables we report only direct bounds, leaving out bounds on the real and imaginary parts of $\epsilon_{S,T}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,T}$ from R_π as they can be evaded by cancellation. All of the tabulated results refer to a bound on the absolute value of the parameter unless a range is specified. The main points can be summarized as

follows [37] (see also Ref. [190]). For the pseudo-scalar couplings ϵ_P and $\tilde{\epsilon}_P$ the low-energy constraints from pion decay are at the 10^{-4} level, which are very hard to reach at the LHC in the near future. The same applies to the vector interactions $\epsilon_{L,R}$, for which both the CKM-unitarity bound ($\text{Re}(\epsilon_{L,R})$) and the emiT bound ($\text{Im}(\epsilon_R)$) are at the 0.5×10^{-3} -level.

For scalar and tensor interactions with left-handed neutrinos, low-energy experiments have traditionally yielded stronger bounds on $\text{Re}(\epsilon_S)$ and $\text{Re}(\epsilon_T)$, but the current LHC bounds have caught up; and both probes are at the 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} level for $\text{Re}(\epsilon_S)$ and $\text{Re}(\epsilon_T)$, respectively. In the next few years we expect improvements in the bounds from both the LHC and low-energy experiments, through neutron [15, 14, 16, 17, 12, 20] and ^6He decay [22] measurements at the 0.1% level and beyond. Projected future bounds from both beta decays at the 10^{-3} level and the LHC on $\text{Re}(\epsilon_{S,T})$ are shown in Figure 4. These results show that low-energy searches with 10^{-4} sensitivity would have unmatched constraining potential, even in the LHC era. Concerning the imaginary parts, for $\text{Im}(\epsilon_T)$ bounds from low-energy (R correlation in ^8He) and the LHC are at the same level, while for $\text{Im}(\epsilon_S)$ the LHC bound is stronger than the one derived from the R correlation in neutron decay.

Finally, for scalar and tensor interactions with right-handed neutrinos, $\tilde{\epsilon}_S$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_T$, the LHC bounds are also at the 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} level respectively, significantly better than the current and future low-energy limits for both $\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,T})$ and $\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,T})$. To match the LHC bound one needs measurements of the electron-neutrino correlation a in Gamow-Teller transitions at the level of $\delta a_{GT}/a_{GT} \sim 0.05\%$.¹² Similar remarks apply to $\tilde{\epsilon}_R$, for which the LHC bound is 5×10^{-3} , and no significant limit is available from low-energy probes.

Table 2: Summary of 90% CL bounds (in units of 10^{-2}) on the real parts of non-standard couplings ϵ_α obtained from low-energy and LHC searches (5 fb^{-1} at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$). In order to deduce the low-energy bounds on the scalar and tensor couplings we used $g_S = 0.8(4)$ and $g_T = 1.05(35)$ [47]. Using $g_S = 1.08(28)$ [82] would lead to the stronger bound $|\text{Re}(\epsilon_S)| < 0.4 \times 10^{-2}$. The couplings $\epsilon_{S,P,T}$ are evaluated in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme at $\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}$.

	$\text{Re}(\epsilon_L)$	$\text{Re}(\epsilon_R)$	$\text{Re}(\epsilon_P)$	$\text{Re}(\epsilon_S)$	$\text{Re}(\epsilon_T)$
β decays	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.8	0.1
LHC ($e\nu$)	$(-0.3, +0.8)$	–	1.3	1.3	0.3
LHC (e^+e^-)	–	–	1.0	1.0	0.1

6 Model constraints

Our discussion has focused on model-independent constraints emergent from precise universality tests and correlation coefficient measurements, in terms of the effective couplings ϵ_α and $\tilde{\epsilon}_\beta$. As we have mentioned, ultraviolet extensions of the SM will generate these non-standard effective couplings at some level, which are then functions of the model parameters. Therefore, the results we have presented

¹²Within a given NP model the ratio $\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu)/\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu)$ is likely to produce the strongest bound not only on ϵ_P and $\tilde{\epsilon}_P$, but also on $\epsilon_{S,T}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,T}$, through their loop-induced contribution. However, since these bounds are based on naturalness arguments, they could be circumvented by cancellations between different contributions, so that in a model-independent analysis the LHC offers the strongest constraint on $\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,T}$.

Table 3: Summary of 90% CL bounds (in units of 10^{-2}) on the imaginary parts of non-standard couplings ϵ_α obtained from low-energy (using hadronic input as per Table 2) and LHC searches (5 fb^{-1} at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$). The couplings $\epsilon_{S,P,T}$ are evaluated in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme at $\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}$.

	$\text{Im}(\epsilon_L)$	$\text{Im}(\epsilon_R)$	$\text{Im}(\epsilon_P)$	$\text{Im}(\epsilon_S)$	$\text{Im}(\epsilon_T)$
β decays	–	$(-0.05, +0.03)$	0.02	$(-15, +11)$	$(-0.3, +0.2)$
LHC ($e\nu$)	0.5	–	1.3	1.3	0.3
LHC (e^+e^-)	–	–	1.0	1.0	0.1

Table 4: Summary of 90% CL bounds, in units of 10^{-2} , on the real parts of the non-standard couplings $\tilde{\epsilon}_\alpha$ obtained from low-energy and LHC searches (5 fb^{-1} at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$). In order to deduce the low-energy bounds on the scalar and tensor couplings we used $g_S = 0.8(4)$ and $g_T = 1.05(35)$ [47]. Using $g_S = 1.08(28)$ [82] would lead to the stronger bound $|\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_S)| < 6.9 \times 10^{-2}$. The couplings $\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,P,T}$ are evaluated in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme at $\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}$.

	$\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_L)$	$\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_R)$	$\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_P)$	$\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_S)$	$\text{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_T)$
β decays	6	6	0.02	14	3.0
LHC ($e\nu$)	–	0.5	1.3	1.3	0.3

can be used to constrain the parameter space of any SM extension. Moreover, within a given SM extension, the low-energy effective couplings will show peculiar dependencies on the underlying model parameters, resulting in correlations among low-energy beta decay signatures and other observables. In this subsection we briefly illustrate these ideas by discussing non-standard CC interactions within the Left-Right Symmetric Model [191, 192] and the MSSM, for which detailed studies can be found in Refs. [193, 194, 195, 196, 197]. For more extensive reviews of underlying models we refer to [27].

6.1 Left-Right Symmetric Model

The Left-Right Symmetric Model [191] is based on an extended gauge group $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R \times \text{U}(1)$, in which in addition to the SM gauge assignments, the right-handed fermions transform as doublets under $\text{SU}(2)_R$. After spontaneous symmetry breaking, the charged gauge bosons W_L and W_R mix into light SM-like W_1 , which is predominantly left-handed, and heavier W_2 , which is predominantly right-handed, states which mediate charged current processes:

$$W_L = W_1 \cos \zeta + W_2 \sin \zeta \quad W_R = -W_1 \sin \zeta + W_2 \cos \zeta, \quad (6.56)$$

with the mixing angle $\sin \zeta \sim (v/v_R)^2$ proportional to the ratio of the weak scale over the scale at which the $\text{SU}(2)_R$ group is spontaneously broken, $v_R \sim M_{W_2}$, thus leading to the breaking of parity. To

Table 5: Summary of 90% CL bounds, in units of 10^{-2} , on the imaginary parts of the non-standard couplings $\tilde{\epsilon}_\alpha$ obtained from low-energy (using hadronic input as per Table 2) and LHC searches (5 fb^{-1} at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$). The couplings $\tilde{\epsilon}_{S,P,T}$ are evaluated in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme at $\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}$.

	$\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_L)$	$\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_R)$	$\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_P)$	$\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_S)$	$\text{Im}(\tilde{\epsilon}_T)$
β decays	–	–	0.02	17	5.0
LHC ($e\nu$)	–	0.5	1.3	1.3	0.3

leading order in $(v/v_R)^2$, this model generates the following correlated CC non-standard couplings

$$\epsilon_L = \epsilon_\mu = 0, \quad \epsilon_R = -\zeta, \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_L = -\zeta, \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_R = \frac{M_{W_1}^2}{M_{W_2}^2}, \quad (6.57)$$

with no dependence on the lepton mass—all other couplings are vanishing. It is clear then, that this minimal and manifestly left-right symmetric model predicts no appreciable deviations from the SM in lepton flavor universality tests. On the other hand, the model predicts $\Delta_{\text{CKM}} = -2\zeta$, so that the mixing angle, and therefore the scale of spontaneous parity breaking, is strongly constrained by Cabibbo universality tests. Stronger bounds still emerge from the K_L - K_S mass difference [198], though the role of long-distance contributions to the mass difference limit the severity of the constraint [199, 200]. Given the strong bounds on ζ , the model would also predict unobservably small effects in decay correlations sensitive to $|\tilde{\epsilon}_{L,R}|^2 \sim \zeta^2$.

6.2 CC processes in the MSSM

Within the MSSM with R-parity, the CC effective couplings ϵ_α are generated through loop diagrams (vertex corrections and box diagrams such as those depicted in Fig. 5), resulting in expressions that are not nearly as simple as the ones in Eq. (6.57).

The chirality flipping couplings $\epsilon_{S,T}$ [201] require the presence of left-right mixing between sfermions running in the box diagrams of Fig. 5, which is proportional to the small Yukawa couplings or the trilinear soft “A” terms. Ref. [201] analyzed the phenomenological constraints on such mixing and determined the range of the allowed contributions to the weak decay coefficients b and B , arguing that they may provide unique probes of left-right mixing in the first generation scalar fermion sector, provided a precision between 10^{-4} and 10^{-3} can be achieved.

Concerning the universality tests, in Ref. [197] it was shown that the magnitude of the corrections Δ_{CKM} and $\Delta_{e/\mu}$ can be on the order of 10^{-3} , which is consistent with precision electroweak tests and LHC direct searches for supersymmetric particles. The size of the universality violations is controlled by the splitting in the squark versus slepton spectra (Cabibbo universality) or in the selectron versus smuon spectra (lepton universality). Moreover, Ref. [197] showed that a comparison of the first row CKM unitarity tests with measurements of $R_{e/\mu}$ can provide unique probes of the spectrum of first generation squarks and first and second generation sleptons, as illustrated in Figure 6 and explained in the figure caption. As a consequence, universality tests will be powerful diagnostic tools if supersymmetric partners are discovered at the LHC.

Finally, a discussion of the impact of Cabibbo and lepton universality tests within the R-parity violating MSSM can be found in Refs. [195, 196].




Figure 5: A subset of the Feynman diagrams giving rise to non-standard CC operators in the MSSM.

7 Conclusions

In this article we have reviewed the role of precision beta decays measurements in probing physics beyond the Standard Model in the LHC era. As for all precision tests, theoretical calculations of the SM amplitudes play a crucial role in setting the stage for BSM searches. Here we have tried to convey the flavor of the needed theoretical inputs, emphasizing the increasing role played by lattice QCD both in the meson sector, in regard to the determination of V_{us} , and in the nucleon sector, in probing non-standard scalar and tensor couplings through decay correlations.

Concerning BSM physics, we have emphasized a model-independent EFT approach to beta decays, assuming that new physics is emergent at high energies, based on a quark-lepton level effective Lagrangian. This approach has a dual benefit. On one hand, it allows an unambiguous comparison of the physics reach of probes involving different hadrons, such as pions and nucleons, and nuclei, limited only by our ability to compute the requisite matrix elements. Moreover, as stated at the start, in the absence of an emerging picture of new dynamics from collider searches, the EFT analysis is the first necessary step to establishing the motivation and significance of this set of low-energy probes. The current bounds on the real and imaginary parts of the non-standard couplings $\epsilon_{L,R,S,P,T}$ (involving left-handed neutrinos) and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{L,R,S,P,T}$ (involving right-handed neutrinos) are summarized in Tables 2, 3, 4, 5. The outlook is very positive: the effective couplings of all the BSM CC operators involving left-handed neutrinos are currently probed or will be soon probed in low-energy experiments at the level of 10^{-3} or better. This corresponds to probing maximal BSM physics scales Λ ranging from 7 TeV (for scalar and tensor interactions) to 11 TeV (for vector interactions), to $\mathcal{O}(100)$ TeV (for pseudoscalar interactions, assuming no cancellations and no mass or Yukawa suppressions).

In all cases, the effective scale probed overlaps with the LHC reach: therefore, if new particles are found at the LHC, beta decays will play an important role in the “LHC inverse problem”, i.e. in establishing the properties of the new BSM dynamics. This is also explicitly illustrated in the case of the MSSM (see Section 6 and Fig. 6). Moreover, if new BSM dynamics is above the LHC reach, sometimes termed the “nightmare scenario,” one can analyze LHC data on the process $pp \rightarrow e\nu + X$ in terms of the same EFT used at low energy, modulo the known QCD running of the various couplings. Even in this pessimistic scenario, recent theoretical results [37] show that beta decay measurements at the 10^{-3} -level can be more sensitive than the LHC in probing non-standard CC interactions, noting once




Figure 6: Correlation between Δ_{CKM} and $\Delta_{e/\mu}$ in the MSSM. The red points (dark grey) arise from a generic parameter space scan. The green points (light grey) arise after applying the constraints from precision electroweak tests. The black points arise after applying the constraints from direct searches at the LHC. The three branches correspond to the following scenarios for the sfermion spectra: the vertical branch corresponds to light squarks, which are been largely ruled out by the LHC, and heavy sleptons; the right branch corresponds to light smuons and heavy selectrons and squarks; the left branch corresponds to light selectrons and heavy smuons and squarks. Figure reprinted with permission from S. Bauman, J. Erler, M. Ramsey-Musolf, “Charged current universality and the MSSM”, atXiv:1205.0035 [hep-ph] [197].

again Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and Fig. 4, and that 10^{-4} -level measurements would have unmatched sensitivity. These considerations illustrate the relevance of precision beta decay measurements throughout the LHC era.

Acknowledgements

We thank Michael Ramsey-Musolf for carefully reading the manuscript and Martín González-Alonso and Alejandro Garcia for discussions and correspondence. We also thank Doug Bryman, Geoffrey Greene, Brad Plaster, and Fred Wietfeldt for comments on the manuscript. SG acknowledges partial support from the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-FG02-96ER40989. The work of VC is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy and the LDRD program at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

References

- [1] R.P. Feynman and Murray Gell-Mann. Theory of Fermi interaction. *Phys.Rev.*, 109:193–198, 1958, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.109.193.
- [2] E.C.G. Sudarshan and R.e. Marshak. Chirality invariance and the universal Fermi interaction. *Phys.Rev.*, 109:1860–1860, 1958, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.109.1860.
- [3] Steven Weinberg. V-A was the key. *J.Phys.Conf.Ser.*, 196:012002, 2009, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/196/1/012002.

- [4] Hartmut Abele. The neutron. Its properties and basic interactions. *Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys.*, 60:1–81, 2008, doi:10.1016/j.ppnp.2007.05.002.
- [5] Dirk Dubbers and Michael G. Schmidt. The neutron and its role in cosmology and particle physics. 2011, [arXiv:1105.3694](#).
- [6] Fred E. Wietfeldt and Geoffrey L. Greene. *Colloquium* : The neutron lifetime. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 83:1173–1192, Nov 2011, doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.83.1173.
- [7] M. Dewey, K. Coakley, D. Gilliam, G. Greene, A. Laptev, J. Nico, W. Snow, F. Wietfeldt, and A. Yue. Prospects for a new cold neutron beam measurement of the neutron lifetime. *Nucl.Instr.Meth.*, A611(2–3):189–192, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2009.07.069.
- [8] S. Arzumanov, L. Bondarenko, P. Geltenbort, V. Morozov, V.V. Nesvizhevsky, Yu. Panin, and A. Strepetov. A new project to measure the neutron lifetime using storage of ultracold neutrons and detection of inelastically scattered neutrons. *Nucl.Instr.Meth.*, A611(2–3):186–188, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2009.07.070.
- [9] P.L. Walstrom, J.D. Bowman, S.I. Penttila, C. Morris, and A. Saunders. A magneto-gravitational trap for absolute measurement of the ultra-cold neutron lifetime. *Nucl.Instr.Meth.*, A599(1):82–92, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2008.11.010.
- [10] S. Materne, R. Picker, I. Altarev, H. Angerer, B. Franke, E. Gutsmedl, F.J. Hartmann, A.R. Müller, S. Paul, and R. Stoepler. PENeLOPE—on the way towards a new neutron lifetime experiment with magnetic storage of ultra-cold neutrons and proton extraction. *Nucl.Instr.Meth.*, A611(2–3):176–180, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2009.07.055.
- [11] K.K.H. Leung and O. Zimmer. Proposed neutron lifetime measurement using a hybrid magnetic trap for ultra-cold neutrons. *Nucl.Instr.Meth.*, A611(2–3):181–185, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2009.07.087.
- [12] B. Markisch et al. The new neutron decay spectrometer PERKEO III. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.*, A611:216–218, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2009.07.066.
- [13] B. Plaster, R. Carr, B.W. Filippone, D. Harrison, J. Hsiao, et al. A Solenoidal electron spectrometer for a precision measurement of the neutron β -asymmetry with ultracold neutrons. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.*, A595:587–598, 2008, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2008.07.143, [arXiv:0806.2097](#).
- [14] R. Alarcon et al. Precise Measurement of Neutron Decay Parameters, 2007, http://nab.phys.virginia.edu/abba_proposal_2007.pdf.
- [15] D. Dubbers, H. Abele, S. Baessler, B. Maerkisch, M. Schumann, et al. A Clean, bright, and versatile source of neutron decay products. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.*, A596:238–247, 2008, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2008.07.157, [arXiv:0709.4440](#).
- [16] W.S. Wilburn et al. Measurement of the neutrino-spin correlation Parameter B in neutron decay using ultracold neutrons. *Rev. Mex. Fis.*, Suppl. 55(2):119, 2009.
- [17] Dinko Pocanic et al., Nab Collaboration. Nab: Measurement Principles, Apparatus and Uncertainties. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.*, A611:211–215, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2009.07.065, [arXiv:0810.0251](#).
- [18] S. S. Baessler et al. First measurements with the neutron decay spectrometer aSPECT. *Eur.Phys.J.*, A38:17–26, 2008, doi:10.1140/epja/i2008-10660-0.

- [19] F.E. Wietfeldt et al. aCORN: An experiment to measure the electron-antineutrino correlation in neutron beta decay. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.*, A611:207–210, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2009.07.064.
- [20] K. P. Hickerson. The Fierz Interference Term in Beta-Decay Spectrum of UCN, 2009, http://neutron.physics.ncsu.edu/UCN_Workshop_09/Hickerson_SantaFe_2009.pdf. UCN Workshop, November 6–7 2009, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- [21] Nathal Severijns and Oscar Naviliat-Cuncic. Symmetry tests in nuclear beta decay. *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.*, 61:23–46, 2011, doi:10.1146/annurev-nucl-102010-130410.
- [22] A. Knecht et al. A high-intensity source of 6he atoms for fundamental research. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.*, A660(1):43–47, 2011, doi:10.1016/j.nima.2011.09.033.
- [23] D. Pocanic, PIBETA and PEN Collaborations. Fundamental physics in rare pion and muon decays. *AIP Conf.Proc.*, 1423:273–280, 2012, doi:10.1063/1.3688814.
- [24] Chloe Malbrunot, A.A. Aguilar-Arevalo, M. Aoki, M. Blecher, D.I. Britton, et al. The PIENU experiment at TRIUMF : A sensitive probe for new physics. *J.Phys.Conf.Ser.*, 312:102010, 2011, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/312/10/102010.
- [25] C. Lazzeroni et al., NA62 collaboration. Test of Lepton Flavour Universality in $K^+ \rightarrow l^+ \nu$ Decays. *Phys.Lett.*, B698:105–114, 2011, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.02.064, [arXiv:1101.4805](https://arxiv.org/abs/1101.4805).
- [26] Douglas Bryman, William J. Marciano, Robert Tschirhart, and Taku Yamanaka. Rare kaon and pion decays: Incisive probes for new physics beyond the standard model. *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.*, 61:331–354, 2011, doi:10.1146/annurev-nucl-102010-130431.
- [27] P. Herczeg. Beta decay beyond the standard model. *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, 46:413–457, 2001, doi:10.1016/S0146-6410(01)00149-1.
- [28] Jens Erler and Michael J. Ramsey-Musolf. Low energy tests of the weak interaction. *Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys.*, 54:351–442, 2005, doi:10.1016/j.ppnp.2004.08.001, [arXiv:hep-ph/0404291](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0404291).
- [29] Nathal Severijns, Marcus Beck, and Oscar Naviliat-Cuncic. Tests of the standard electroweak model in beta decay. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 78:991–1040, 2006, doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.78.991, [arXiv:nuc1-ex/0605029](https://arxiv.org/abs/nuc1-ex/0605029).
- [30] M.J. Ramsey-Musolf and S. Su. Low Energy Precision Test of Supersymmetry. *Phys.Rept.*, 456:1–88, 2008, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2007.10.001, [arXiv:hep-ph/0612057](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0612057).
- [31] Thomas Appelquist and J. Carazzone. Infrared Singularities and Massive Fields. *Phys.Rev.*, D11:2856, 1975, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.11.2856.
- [32] Gino Isidori, Yosef Nir, and Gilad Perez. Flavor Physics Constraints for Physics Beyond the Standard Model. *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.*, 60:355, 2010, doi:10.1146/annurev.nucl.012809.104534, [arXiv:1002.0900](https://arxiv.org/abs/1002.0900).
- [33] M. Bona et al., UTfit Collaboration. Model-independent constraints on $\Delta F=2$ operators and the scale of new physics. *JHEP*, 0803:049, 2008, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/03/049, [arXiv:0707.0636](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0707.0636).

- [34] J. Charles et al., CKMfitter Group. CP violation and the CKM matrix: Assessing the impact of the asymmetric B factories. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C41:1–131, 2005, doi:10.1140/epjc/s2005-02169-1, arXiv:hep-ph/0406184.
- [35] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler. Effective Lagrangian Analysis of New Interactions and Flavor Conservation. *Nucl. Phys.*, B268:621, 1986, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(86)90262-2.
- [36] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak, and J. Rosiek. Dimension-Six Terms in the Standard Model Lagrangian. *JHEP*, 1010:085, 2010, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2010)085, arXiv:1008.4884.
- [37] Vincenzo Cirigliano, Martin Gonzalez-Alonso, and Michael L. Graesser. Non-standard Charged Current Interactions: beta decays versus the LHC. 2012, arXiv:1210.4553.
- [38] A. Sirlin. Large $m(W)$, $m(Z)$ Behavior of the $O(\alpha)$ Corrections to Semileptonic Processes Mediated by W . *Nucl. Phys.*, B196:83, 1982, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(82)90303-0.
- [39] A. Sirlin. Current Algebra Formulation of Radiative Corrections in Gauge Theories and the Universality of the Weak Interactions. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 50:573, 1978, doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.50.573.
- [40] A. Sirlin. Radiative corrections to $g(v)/g(\mu)$ in simple extensions of the $su(2) \times u(1)$ gauge model. *Nucl. Phys.*, B71:29–51, 1974, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(74)90254-5.
- [41] W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin. Radiative Corrections to beta Decay and the Possibility of a Fourth Generation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 56:22, 1986, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.56.22.
- [42] Andrzej Czarnecki, William J. Marciano, and Alberto Sirlin. Precision measurements and CKM unitarity. *Phys. Rev.*, D70:093006, 2004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.093006, arXiv:hep-ph/0406324.
- [43] William J. Marciano and Alberto Sirlin. Improved calculation of electroweak radiative corrections and the value of V_{ud} . *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:032002, 2006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.032002, arXiv:hep-ph/0510099.
- [44] D.B. Chitwood et al., MuLan Collaboration. Improved measurement of the positive muon lifetime and determination of the Fermi constant. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 99:032001, 2007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.032001, arXiv:0704.1981.
- [45] Vincenzo Cirigliano, James Jenkins, and Martin Gonzalez-Alonso. Semileptonic decays of light quarks beyond the Standard Model. *Nucl. Phys.*, B830:95–115, 2010, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2009.12.020, arXiv:0908.1754.
- [46] Timo van Ritbergen and Robin G. Stuart. On the precise determination of the Fermi coupling constant from the muon lifetime. *Nucl. Phys.*, B564:343–390, 2000, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00572-6, arXiv:hep-ph/9904240.
- [47] Tanmoy Bhattacharya, Vincenzo Cirigliano, Saul D. Cohen, Alberto Filipuzzi, Martin Gonzalez-Alonso, et al. Probing Novel Scalar and Tensor Interactions from (Ultra)Cold Neutrons to the LHC. 2011, arXiv:1110.6448.
- [48] David J. Broadhurst and A.G. Grozin. Matching QCD and HQET heavy - light currents at two loops and beyond. *Phys. Rev.*, D52:4082–4098, 1995, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.52.4082, arXiv:hep-ph/9410240.

- [49] J. D. Jackson, S. B. Treiman, and H. W. Wyld. Possible tests of time reversal invariance in Beta decay. *Phys. Rev.*, 106:517–521, 1957, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.106.517.
- [50] J. D. Jackson, S. B. Treiman, and H. W. Wyld. Coulomb corrections in allowed beta transitions. *Nuclear Physics*, 4:206–212, 1957, doi:10.1016/0029-5582(87)90019-8.
- [51] T.D. Lee and Chen-Ning Yang. Question of Parity Conservation in Weak Interactions. *Phys.Rev.*, 104:254–258, 1956, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.104.254.
- [52] R.T. Shann. Electromagnetic effects in the decay of polarized neutrons. *Nuovo Cim.*, A5:591–596, 1971, doi:10.1007/BF02734566.
- [53] Y. Yokoo, S. Suzuki, and M. Morita. Radiative corrections to asymmetry and energy spectrum of beta rays from polarized nuclei. *Prog.Theor.Phys.*, 50:1894–1907, 1973, doi:10.1143/PTP.50.1894.
- [54] A. Garcia and M. Maya. First Order Radiative Corrections to Asymmetry Coefficients in Neutron Decay. *Phys.Rev.*, D17:1376–1380, 1978, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.17.1376.
- [55] F. Glück and K. Toth. Order alpha radiative corrections for semileptonic decays of polarized baryons. *Phys.Rev.*, D46:2090–2101, 1992, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.46.2090.
- [56] Masataka Fukugita and Takahiro Kubota. Full one-loop radiative corrections to the asymmetry parameter of polarised neutron beta decay. *Phys.Lett.*, B598:67–75, 2004, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2004.07.054, [arXiv:hep-ph/0405298](#).
- [57] M.B. Voloshin. Upper bound on tensor interaction in the decay $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$. *Phys.Lett.*, B283:120–122, 1992, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(92)91439-G.
- [58] P. Herczeg. On the question of a tensor interaction in $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$ decay. *Phys.Rev.*, D49:247–253, 1994, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.247.
- [59] Bruce A. Campbell and David W. Maybury. Constraints on scalar couplings from $\pi \rightarrow e\nu$. *Nucl.Phys.*, B709:419–439, 2005, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.12.015, [arXiv:hep-ph/0303046](#).
- [60] Steven Weinberg. Phenomenological Lagrangians. *Physica*, A96:327, 1979.
- [61] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler. Chiral Perturbation Theory to One Loop. *Annals Phys.*, 158:142, 1984, doi:10.1016/0003-4916(84)90242-2.
- [62] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler. Chiral Perturbation Theory: Expansions in the Mass of the Strange Quark. *Nucl.Phys.*, B250:465, 1985, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(85)90492-4.
- [63] Elizabeth Ellen Jenkins and Aneesh V. Manohar. Baryon chiral perturbation theory using a heavy fermion Lagrangian. *Phys.Lett.*, B255:558–562, 1991, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)90266-S.
- [64] V. Bernard, Norbert Kaiser, and Ulf-G. Meißner. Chiral dynamics in nucleons and nuclei. *Int.J.Mod.Phys.*, E4:193–346, 1995, doi:10.1142/S0218301395000092, [arXiv:hep-ph/9501384](#).
- [65] Thomas R. Hemmert, Barry R. Holstein, and Joachim Kambor. Systematic $1/M$ expansion for spin $3/2$ particles in baryon chiral perturbation theory. *Phys.Lett.*, B395:89–95, 1997, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(97)00049-X, [arXiv:hep-ph/9606456](#).
- [66] Thomas R. Hemmert, Barry R. Holstein, Joachim Kambor, and Germar Knochlein. Compton scattering and the spin structure of the nucleon at low-energies. *Phys.Rev.*, D57:5746–5754, 1998, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.57.5746, [arXiv:nucl-th/9709063](#).

- [67] Thomas R. Hemmert, Barry R. Holstein, and Joachim Kambor. Chiral Lagrangians and $\delta(1232)$ interactions: Formalism. *J.Phys.*, G24:1831–1859, 1998, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/24/10/003, [arXiv:hep-ph/9712496](#).
- [68] Veronique Bernard, Harold W. Fearing, Thomas R. Hemmert, and Ulf-G. Meißner. The form-factors of the nucleon at small momentum transfer. *Nucl.Phys.*, A635:121–145, 1998, doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(98)00175-4, [arXiv:hep-ph/9801297](#).
- [69] Thomas Becher and H. Leutwyler. Baryon chiral perturbation theory in manifestly Lorentz invariant form. *Eur.Phys.J.*, C9:643–671, 1999, doi:10.1007/s1005300550518, [arXiv:hep-ph/9901384](#).
- [70] S. Ando, H.W. Fearing, Vladimir P. Gudkov, K. Kubodera, F. Myhrer, et al. Neutron beta decay in effective field theory. *Phys.Lett.*, B595:250–259, 2004, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2004.06.037, [arXiv:nucl-th/0402100](#).
- [71] A.N. Ivanov, M. Pitschmann, and N.I. Troitskaya. Neutron Beta-Decay as Laboratory for Test of Standard Model. 2012, [arXiv:1212.0332](#).
- [72] M. Ademollo and Raoul Gatto. Nonrenormalization Theorem for the Strangeness Violating Vector Currents. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 13:264–265, 1964, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.264.
- [73] R. E. Behrends and A. Sirlin. Effect of mass splittings on the conserved vector current. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 4:186–187, 1960, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.4.186.
- [74] D. Becirevic, V. Lubicz, G. Martinelli, and F. Mescia, SPQcdR Collaboration. First lattice calculation of the electromagnetic operator amplitude $\langle \pi^0 | Q_{+\gamma} | K^0 \rangle$. *Phys.Lett.*, B501:98–105, 2001, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)00099-5, [arXiv:hep-ph/0010349](#).
- [75] Steven Weinberg. Charge symmetry of weak interactions. *Phys.Rev.*, 112:1375–1379, 1958, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.112.1375.
- [76] Barry R. Holstein. Recoil Effects in Allowed beta Decay: The Elementary Particle Approach. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 46:789, 1974, doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.46.789.
- [77] Tim Gorringer and Harold W. Fearing. Induced pseudoscalar coupling of the proton weak interaction. *Rev.Mod.Phys.*, 76:31–91, 2004, doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.76.31, [arXiv:nucl-th/0206039](#).
- [78] Veronique Bernard, Latifa Elouadrhiri, and Ulf-G. Meißner. Axial structure of the nucleon: Topical Review. *J.Phys.*, G28:R1–R35, 2002, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/28/1/201, [arXiv:hep-ph/0107088](#).
- [79] John F. Donoghue and D. Wyler. Isospin breaking and the precise determination of V_{ud} . *Phys.Lett.*, B241:243, 1990, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(90)91287-L.
- [80] Norbert Kaiser. Isospin breaking in neutron beta decay and SU(3) violation in semileptonic hyperon decays. *Phys.Rev.*, C64:028201, 2001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.64.028201, [arXiv:nucl-th/0105043](#).
- [81] J. Beringer et al., Particle Data Group. Review of particle physics (RPP). *Phys.Rev.*, D86:010001, 2012, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.010001.
- [82] J.R. Green, J.W. Negele, A.V. Pochinsky, S.N. Syritsyn, M. Engelhardt, et al. Nucleon Scalar and Tensor Charges from Lattice QCD with Light Wilson Quarks. 2012, [arXiv:1206.4527](#).

- [83] M. Chemtob and Mannque Rho. Meson exchange currents in nuclear weak and electromagnetic interactions. *Nucl.Phys.*, A163:1–55, 1971, doi:10.1016/0375-9474(71)90520-3.
- [84] W.E. Ormand and B. Alex Brown. Isospin-mixing corrections for fp-shell Fermi transitions. *Phys.Rev.*, C52:2455–2460, 1995, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.52.2455, arXiv:nuc1-th/9504017.
- [85] J. C. Hardy and I. S. Towner. Superaligned $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear β decays: A critical survey with tests of CVC and the standard model. *Phys. Rev.*, C71:055501, 2005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.71.055501, arXiv:nuc1-th/0412056.
- [86] N. Auerbach. Coulomb corrections to superallowed beta decay in nuclei. *Phys.Rev.*, C79:035502, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.79.035502, arXiv:0811.4742.
- [87] Haozhao Liang, Nguyen Van Giai, and Jie Meng. Isospin corrections for superallowed Fermi beta decay in self-consistent relativistic random-phase approximation approaches. *Phys.Rev.*, C79:064316, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.79.064316, arXiv:0904.3673.
- [88] W. Satula, J. Dobaczewski, W. Nazarewicz, and M. Rafalski. Isospin mixing in nuclei around $N=Z$ and the superallowed beta-decay. *Acta Phys.Polon.*, B42:415–426, 2011, doi:10.5506/APhysPolB.42.415, arXiv:1010.3099.
- [89] G.A. Miller and A. Schwenk. Isospin-symmetry-breaking corrections to superallowed Fermi beta decay: Formalism and schematic models. *Phys.Rev.*, C78:035501, 2008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.78.035501, arXiv:0805.0603.
- [90] G.A. Miller and A. Schwenk. Isospin-symmetry-breaking corrections to superallowed Fermi beta decay: Radial excitations. *Phys.Rev.*, C80:064319, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.80.064319, arXiv:0910.2790.
- [91] I.S. Towner and J.C. Hardy. Comparative tests of isospin-symmetry-breaking corrections to superallowed $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear β decay. *Phys.Rev.*, C82:065501, 2010, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.82.065501, arXiv:1007.5343.
- [92] I.S. Towner and J.C. Hardy. The evaluation of $V(\text{ud})$ and its impact on the unitarity of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa quark-mixing matrix. *Rept.Prog.Phys.*, 73:046301, 2010, doi:10.1088/0034-4885/73/4/046301.
- [93] V. Cirigliano, M. Knecht, H. Neufeld, H. Rupertsberger, and P. Talavera. Radiative corrections to K_{l3} decays. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C23:121–133, 2002, doi:10.1007/s100520100825, arXiv:hep-ph/0110153.
- [94] V. Cirigliano, H. Neufeld, and H. Pichl. K_{e3} decays and CKM unitarity. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C35:53–65, 2004, doi:10.1140/epjc/s2004-01780-x, arXiv:hep-ph/0401173.
- [95] Vincenzo Cirigliano, Maurizio Giannotti, and Helmut Neufeld. Electromagnetic effects in K_{l3} decays. *JHEP*, 11:006, 2008, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/11/006, arXiv:0807.4507.
- [96] J.C. Hardy and I.S. Towner. Superaligned $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ nuclear β decays: A New survey with precision tests of the conserved vector current hypothesis and the standard model. *Phys.Rev.*, C79:055502, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.79.055502, arXiv:0812.1202.
- [97] H. Leutwyler and M. Roos. Determination of the Elements $V(\text{us})$ and $V(\text{ud})$ of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix. *Z. Phys.*, C25:91, 1984, doi:10.1007/BF01571961.

- [98] Johan Bijnens and Pere Talavera. $K(l3)$ decays in chiral perturbation theory. *Nucl. Phys.*, B669:341–362, 2003, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(03)00581-9, arXiv:hep-ph/0303103.
- [99] Matthias Jamin, Jose Antonio Oller, and Antonio Pich. Order p^6 chiral couplings from the scalar $K\pi$ form-factor. *JHEP*, 02:047, 2004, arXiv:hep-ph/0401080.
- [100] V. Cirigliano et al. The $\langle SPP \rangle$ Green function and SU(3) breaking in $K(l3)$ decays. *JHEP*, 04:006, 2005, arXiv:hep-ph/0503108.
- [101] Richard J. Hill. Constraints on the form factors for K to $\pi l \nu$ and implications for $V(us)$. *Phys.Rev.*, D74:096006, 2006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.096006, arXiv:hep-ph/0607108.
- [102] Veronique Bernard, Micaela Oertel, Emilie Passemar, and Jan Stern. Dispersive representation and shape of the $K(l3)$ form factors: Robustness. *Phys.Rev.*, D80:034034, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.034034, arXiv:0903.1654.
- [103] D. Becirevic et al. The $K \rightarrow \pi$ vector form factor at zero momentum transfer on the lattice. *Nucl. Phys.*, B705:339–362, 2005, doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.11.017, arXiv:hep-ph/0403217.
- [104] C. Dawson, T. Izubuchi, T. Kaneko, S. Sasaki, and A. Soni. Vector form factor in K_{l3} semileptonic decay with two flavors of dynamical domain-wall quarks. *Phys. Rev.*, D74:114502, 2006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.114502, arXiv:hep-ph/0607162.
- [105] P. A. Boyle et al. $Kl3$ semileptonic form factor from 2+1 flavour lattice QCD. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100:141601, 2008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.141601, arXiv:0710.5136.
- [106] V. Lubicz, F. Mescia, S. Simula, C. Tarantino, and for the ETM Collaboration. $K \rightarrow \pi$ Semileptonic Form Factors from Two-Flavor Lattice QCD. 2009, arXiv:0906.4728.
- [107] P.A. Boyle et al., RBC-UKQCD Collaboration. $K \rightarrow \pi$ form factors with reduced model dependence. *Eur.Phys.J.*, C69:159–167, 2010, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1405-4, arXiv:1004.0886.
- [108] Nicola Cabibbo, Earl C. Swallow, and Roland Winston. Semileptonic hyperon decays. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 53:39–75, 2003, doi:10.1146/annurev.nucl.53.013103.155258, arXiv:hep-ph/0307298.
- [109] O. Naviliat-Cuncic and N. Severijns. Test of the Conserved Vector Current Hypothesis in $T=1/2$ Mirror Transitions and New Determination of $V(ud)$. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 102:142302, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.142302, arXiv:0809.0994.
- [110] E. Braaten, Stephan Narison, and A. Pich. QCD analysis of the tau hadronic width. *Nucl. Phys.*, B373:581–612, 1992, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(92)90267-F.
- [111] E. Gamiz, M. Jamin, A. Pich, J. Prades, and F. Schwab. Determination of $m(s)$ and $V(us)$ from hadronic tau decays. *JHEP*, 01:060, 2003, arXiv:hep-ph/0212230.
- [112] C. Aubin et al., MILC. Light pseudoscalar decay constants, quark masses, and low energy constants from three-flavor lattice QCD. *Phys. Rev.*, D70:114501, 2004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.114501, arXiv:hep-lat/0407028.
- [113] S. R. Beane, P. F. Bedaque, K. Orginos, and M. J. Savage. f_K/f_{π} in Full QCD with Domain Wall Valence Quarks. *Phys. Rev.*, D75:094501, 2007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.094501, arXiv:hep-lat/0606023.

- [114] E. Follana, C. T. H. Davies, G. P. Lepage, and J. Shigemitsu, HPQCD. High Precision determination of the π , K, D and D_s decay constants from lattice QCD. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100:062002, 2008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.062002, [arXiv:0706.1726](#).
- [115] B. Blossier et al. Pseudoscalar decay constants of kaon and D-mesons from Nf=2 twisted mass Lattice QCD. 2009, [arXiv:0904.0954](#).
- [116] A. Bazavov et al. Full nonperturbative QCD simulations with 2+1 flavors of improved staggered quarks. 2009, [arXiv:0903.3598](#).
- [117] William J. Marciano. Precise determination of $|V_{us}|$ from lattice calculations of pseudoscalar decay constants. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 93:231803, 2004, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.231803, [arXiv:hep-ph/0402299](#).
- [118] Vincenzo Cirigliano and Helmut Neufeld. A note on isospin violation in $\text{Pl2}(\gamma)$ decays. *Phys.Lett.*, B700:7–10, 2011, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.04.038, [arXiv:1102.0563](#).
- [119] M. Antonelli, V. Cirigliano, G. Isidori, F. Mescia, M. Moulson, et al. An Evaluation of $|V_{us}|$ and precise tests of the Standard Model from world data on leptonic and semileptonic kaon decays. *Eur.Phys.J.*, C69:399–424, 2010, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-010-1406-3, [arXiv:1005.2323](#).
- [120] D. Melconian, S. Triambak, C. Bordeanu, A. Garcia, J.C. Hardy, et al. Experimental Validation of the Largest Calculated Isospin-Symmetry-Breaking Effect in a Superaligned Fermi Decay. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 107:182301, 2011, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.182301, [arXiv:1108.5312](#).
- [121] Toichiro Kinoshita. Radiative corrections to $\pi - e$ decay. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 2:477, 1959, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.2.477.
- [122] William J. Marciano and A. Sirlin. Radiative corrections to $\pi(\text{lepton } 2)$ decays. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 71:3629–3632, 1993, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.3629.
- [123] Vincenzo Cirigliano and Ignasi Rosell. Two-loop effective theory analysis of $\pi(K) \rightarrow e\bar{\nu}_e[\gamma]$ branching ratios. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 99:231801, 2007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.231801, [arXiv:0707.3439](#).
- [124] Vincenzo Cirigliano and Ignasi Rosell. $\pi/K \rightarrow e\bar{\nu}_e$ branching ratios to $O(e^2p^4)$ in Chiral Perturbation Theory. *JHEP*, 0710:005, 2007, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/10/005, [arXiv:0707.4464](#).
- [125] Markus Finkemeier. Radiative corrections to $\pi(12)$ and $K(12)$ decays. *Phys.Lett.*, B387:391–394, 1996, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(96)01030-1, [arXiv:hep-ph/9505434](#).
- [126] K. Nakamura et al., Particle Data Group. Review of particle physics. *J.Phys.*, G37:075021, 2010, doi:10.1088/0954-3899/37/7A/075021.
- [127] D.I. Britton, S. Ahmad, D.A. Bryman, R.A. Burnham, E.T.H. Clifford, et al. Measurement of the $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+\nu$ branching ratio. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 68:3000–3003, 1992, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.3000.
- [128] D.I. Britton, S. Ahmad, D.A. Bryman, R.A. Burnham, E.T.H. Clifford, et al. Measurement of the $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+\nu$ branching ratio. *Phys.Rev.*, D49:28–39, 1994, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.28.
- [129] G. Czapek, A. Federspiel, A. Fluckiger, D. Frei, B. Hahn, et al. Branching ratio for the rare pion decay into positron and neutrino. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 70:17–20, 1993, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.17.

- [130] S. Shimizu, J-PARC TREK Collaboration. Test of lepton flavor universality by precise $\text{Gamma}(\text{K}(\text{e}2))/\text{Gamma}(\text{K}(\mu2))$ measurement using stopped positive kaons at J-PARC. *AIP Conf.Proc.*, 1441:338–340, 2012, doi:10.1063/1.3700548.
- [131] J.C. Cook. *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 80:023101, 2009.
- [132] F. Glück, I. Joo, and J. Last. Measurable parameters of neutron decay. *Nucl.Phys.*, A593:125–150, 1995, doi:10.1016/0375-9474(95)00354-4.
- [133] Susan Gardner and Bradley Plaster, 2013. Work in preparation.
- [134] M. Bychkov, D. Pocanic, B.A. VanDevender, V.A. Baranov, Wilhelm H. Bertl, et al. New Precise Measurement of the Pion Weak Form Factors in $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$ Decay. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 103:051802, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.051802, arXiv:0804.1815.
- [135] V. Mateu and J. Portoles. Form-factors in radiative pion decay. *Eur.Phys.J.*, C52:325–338, 2007, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0393-5, arXiv:0706.1039.
- [136] F. Wauters, I.S. Kraev, D. Zakoucky, M. Beck, M. Breitenfeldt, et al. Precision measurements of the ^{60}Co β -asymmetry parameter in search for tensor currents in weak interactions. *Phys.Rev.*, C82:055502, 2010, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.82.055502, arXiv:1005.5034.
- [137] F. Wauters, I. Kraev, M. Tandecki, E. Traykov, S. Van Gorp, et al. β asymmetry parameter in the decay of ^{114}In . *Phys.Rev.*, C80:062501, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.80.062501, arXiv:0901.0081.
- [138] A.S. Carnoy, J. Deutsch, T.A. Girard, and R. Prieels. Limits on nonstandard weak currents from the polarization of ^{14}O and ^{10}C decay positrons. *Phys.Rev.*, C43:2825–2834, 1991, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.43.2825.
- [139] V.A. Wickers, T.R. Hageman, J. Van Klinken, H.W. Wilschut, and D. Atkinson. Bounds on Right-handed Currents from Nuclear Beta Decay. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 58:1821–1824, 1987, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.58.1821.
- [140] N. Severijns et al. Fundamental Weak Interaction Studies using Polarised Nuclei and Ion Traps. *Hyperfine Interactions*, 129:223–236, 2000, doi:10.1023/A:1012665917625.
- [141] P.A. Vetter, J.R. Abo-Shaeer, S.J. Freedman, and R. Maruyama. Measurement of the β - ν correlation of ^{21}Na using shakeoff electrons. *Phys.Rev.*, C77:035502, 2008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.77.035502, arXiv:0805.1212.
- [142] A. Gorelov, D. Melconian, W.P. Alford, D. Ashery, G. Ball, et al. Scalar interaction limits from the β - ν correlation of trapped radioactive atoms. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 94:142501, 2005, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.94.142501, arXiv:nuc1-ex/0412032.
- [143] E.G. Adelberger et al., ISOLDE Collaboration. Positron neutrino correlation in the $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$ decay of ^{32}Ar . *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 83:1299–1302, 1999, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.1299, arXiv:nuc1-ex/9903002.
- [144] C.H. Johnson, Frances Pleasonton, and T.A. Carlson. Precision Measurement of the Recoil Energy Spectrum from the Decay of ^6He . *Phys.Rev.*, 132:1149–1165, 1963, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.132.1149.
- [145] Barry R. Holstein and S.B. Treiman. Second Class Currents. *Phys.Rev.*, D13:3059, 1976, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.13.3059.

- [146] Murray Gell-Mann. Test of the Nature of the Vector Interaction in beta Decay. *Phys.Rev.*, 111:362–365, 1958, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.111.362.
- [147] Susan Gardner and C. Zhang. Sharpening low-energy, standard model tests via correlation coefficients in neutron beta decay. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 86:5666–5669, 2001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.5666, arXiv:hep-ph/0012098.
- [148] K. Minamisono, T. Nagatomo, K. Matsuta, C.D.P. Levy, Y. Tagishi, et al. Low-energy test of second-class current in beta decays of spin-aligned F-20 and Na-20. *Phys.Rev.*, C84:055501, 2011, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.84.055501.
- [149] T. Sumikama, K. Matsuta, T. Nagatomo, M. Ogura, T. Iwakoshi, et al. Test of the Conserved Vector Current Hypothesis by beta-ray Angular Distribution Measurement in the Mass-8 System. *Phys.Rev.*, C83:065501, 2011, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.83.065501, arXiv:1105.1584.
- [150] C. H. Johnson, Frances Pleasonton, and T. A. Carlson. Precision measurement of the recoil energy spectrum from the decay of he^6 . *Phys. Rev.*, 132:1149–1165, Nov 1963, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.132.1149.
- [151] F. Glück. Order α radiative correction to ^6He and ^{32}Ar decay recoil spectra. *Nuclear Physics A*, 628(3):493–502, 1998, doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(97)00643-X.
- [152] R.G. Sachs. THE PHYSICS OF TIME REVERSAL, 1987.
- [153] Curtis G. Callan and S.B. Treiman. Electromagnetic Simulation of T Violation in Beta Decay. *Phys.Rev.*, 162:1494–1496, 1967, doi:10.1103/PhysRev.162.1494.
- [154] L.B. Okun and I.B. Khriplovich. C odd correlation in the $\text{K}0(\mu3)$ decay and the pion electromagnetic form-factor. *Sov.J.Nucl.Phys.*, 6:598–602, 1968.
- [155] Shung-ichi Ando, Judith A. McGovern, and Toru Sato. The D coefficient in neutron beta decay in effective field theory. *Phys.Lett.*, B677:109–115, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2009.04.088, arXiv:0902.1194.
- [156] L. Wolfenstein. The search for direct evidence for time reversal violation. *Int.J.Mod.Phys.*, E8:501–511, 1999, doi:10.1142/S0218301399000343.
- [157] I.B. Khriplovich. Electromagnetic T-odd correlations in hyperon decays. *Yad. Fiz.*, 7:1261–1266, 1968.
- [158] C. Marchioro, A. Pugliese, and A. Prosperetti. T violation in hyperon beta decay. *Lett.Nuovo Cim.*, 1S1:473–478, 1969.
- [159] Gudrun Hiller and Gino Isidori. The CP conserving contribution to the transverse muon polarization in $\text{K}^+ \rightarrow \text{gt}; \mu^+ \text{ neutrino } \gamma$. *Phys.Lett.*, B459:295–300, 1999, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(99)00653-X, arXiv:hep-ph/9903284.
- [160] V.V. Braguta, A.E. Chalov, and A.A. Likhoded. Muon transverse polarization in the $\text{K}(12 \text{ } \gamma)$ decay in SM. *Phys.Rev.*, D66:034012, 2002, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.034012, arXiv:hep-ph/0205203.
- [161] Guo-Hong Wu and John N. Ng. T violation in $\text{K}^+ \rightarrow \text{gt}; \mu^+ \text{ neutrino } \gamma$ decay and supersymmetry. *Phys.Rev.*, D55:2806–2816, 1997, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.55.2806, arXiv:hep-ph/9610533.

- [162] V.V. Anisimovsky et al., KEK E246 Collaboration. First measurement of the T violating muon polarization in the decay $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu \gamma$; $\mu^+ \rightarrow \nu \gamma$. *Phys.Lett.*, B562:166–172, 2003, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(03)00576-8, [arXiv:hep-ex/0304027](#).
- [163] M. Abe, M. Aliev, V. Anisimovsky, M. Aoki, Y. Asano, et al. Search for T-violating transverse muon polarization in the $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu \pi^0$ decay. *Phys.Rev.*, D73:072005, 2006, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.73.072005.
- [164] Michael Kohl, J-PARC TREK Collaboration. TREK: A search for time reversal symmetry violation in charged kaon decays. *AIP Conf.Proc.*, 1265:316–321, 2010, doi:10.1063/1.3480192.
- [165] Chaden Djalali, TREK Collaboration. The TREK program at J-PARC. *AIP Conf.Proc.*, 1423:297–302, 2012, doi:10.1063/1.3688817.
- [166] T.E. Chupp, R.L. Cooper, K.P. Coulter, S.J. Freedman, B.K. Fujikawa, et al. Search for a T-odd, P-even Triple Correlation in Neutron Decay. *Phys.Rev.*, C86:035505, 2012, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.86.035505, [arXiv:1205.6588](#).
- [167] H.P. Mumm, T.E. Chupp, R.L. Cooper, K.P. Coulter, S.J. Freedman, et al. A New Limit on Time-Reversal Violation in Beta Decay. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 107:102301, 2011, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.102301, [arXiv:1104.2778](#).
- [168] L.J. Lising et al., emiT Collaboration. New limit on the D coefficient in polarized neutron decay. *Phys.Rev.*, C62:055501, 2000, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.62.055501, [arXiv:nuc1-ex/0006001](#).
- [169] T. Soldner, L. Beck, C. Plonka, K. Schreckenbach, and O. Zimmer. New limit on T violation in neutron decay. *Phys.Lett.*, B581:49–55, 2004, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2003.12.004.
- [170] Barry R. Holstein. ELECTROMAGNETIC SIMULATION OF T NONINVARIANCE IN NUCLEAR BETA DECAY. *Phys.Rev.*, C28:342–344, 1983, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.28.342.
- [171] A. Kozela, G. Ban, A. Bialek, K. Bodek, P. Gorel, et al. Measurement of the Transverse Polarization of Electrons Emitted in Free Neutron Decay. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 102:172301, 2009, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.172301, [arXiv:0902.1415](#).
- [172] A. Kozela, G. Ban, A. Bialek, K. Bodek, P. Gorel, et al. Measurement of Transverse Polarization of Electrons Emitted in Free Neutron Decay. *Phys.Rev.*, C85:045501, 2012, doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.85.045501, [arXiv:1111.4695](#).
- [173] R. Huber, J. Lang, S. Navert, J. Sromicki, K. Bodek, et al. Search for time reversal violation in the beta decay of polarized Li-8 nuclei. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 90:202301, 2003, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.202301, [arXiv:nuc1-ex/0301010](#).
- [174] I.B. Khriplovich. What do we know about T odd but P even interaction? *Nucl.Phys.*, B352:385–401, 1991, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(91)90448-7.
- [175] M.J. Ramsey-Musolf. Electric dipole moments and the mass scale of new T violating, P conserving interactions. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 83:3997–4000, 1999, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3997, [arXiv:hep-ph/9905429](#).
- [176] A. Kurylov, G.C. McLaughlin, and M.J. Ramsey-Musolf. Constraints on T odd, P even interactions from electric dipole moments, revisited. *Phys.Rev.*, D63:076007, 2001, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.076007, [arXiv:hep-ph/0011185](#).

- [177] John Ng and Sean Tulin. D versus d: CP Violation in Beta Decay and Electric Dipole Moments. *Phys.Rev.*, D85:033001, 2012, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.033001, [arXiv:1111.0649](#).
- [178] Susan Gardner, 2013. Work in preparation.
- [179] V.V. Braguta, A.A. Likhoded, and A.E. Chalov. T odd correlation in the $K(l3 \gamma)$ decay. *Phys.Rev.*, D65:054038, 2002, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.054038, [arXiv:hep-ph/0106147](#).
- [180] V.V. Braguta, A.A. Likhoded, and A.E. Chalov. T odd correlation in the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \nu \gamma$ decays beyond standard model. *Phys.Rev.*, D68:094008, 2003, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.094008, [arXiv:hep-ph/0305067](#).
- [181] I.B. Khriplovich and A.S. Rudenko. $K_{l3\gamma}^+$ decays revisited: branching ratios and T-odd momenta correlations. *Phys.Atom.Nucl.*, 74:1214–1222, 2011, [arXiv:1012.0147](#).
- [182] Eike H. Muller, Bastian Kubis, and Ulf-G. Meißner. T-odd correlations in radiative $K(l3)^+$ decays and chiral perturbation theory. *Eur.Phys.J.*, C48:427–440, 2006, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-006-0033-5, [arXiv:hep-ph/0607151](#).
- [183] Susan Gardner and Daheng He. A T-odd Momentum Correlation in Radiative beta-Decay. 2012, [arXiv:1202.5239](#).
- [184] Susan Gardner and Daheng He. Radiative Beta Decay for Studies of CP Violation. 2013, [arXiv:1302.1862](#).
- [185] Jeffrey A. Harvey, Christopher T. Hill, and Richard J. Hill. Anomaly mediated neutrino-photon interactions at finite baryon density. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 99:261601, 2007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.261601, [arXiv:0708.1281](#).
- [186] Jeffrey A. Harvey, Christopher T. Hill, and Richard J. Hill. Standard Model Gauging of the Wess-Zumino-Witten Term: Anomalies, Global Currents and pseudo-Chern-Simons Interactions. *Phys.Rev.*, D77:085017, 2008, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.085017, [arXiv:0712.1230](#).
- [187] Richard J. Hill. Low energy analysis of $\nu N \rightarrow \nu N \gamma$ in the Standard Model. *Phys.Rev.*, D81:013008, 2010, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.013008, [arXiv:0905.0291](#).
- [188] Serguei Chatrchyan et al., CMS Collaboration. Search for leptonic decays of W' bosons in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s}=7$ TeV. 2012, [arXiv:1204.4764](#).
- [189] Serguei Chatrchyan et al., CMS Collaboration. Search for narrow resonances in dilepton mass spectra in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. 2012, [arXiv:1206.1849](#).
- [190] Martin Gonzalez-Alonso and Oscar Naviliat-Cuncic. Prospects for precision measurements in β decays in the LHC era, 2013. Work in preparation.
- [191] Rabindra N. Mohapatra and Goran Senjanovic. Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Violation. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 44:912, 1980, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.44.912.
- [192] Barry R. Holstein and S.B. Treiman. Tests of Spontaneous Left-Right Symmetry Breaking. *Phys.Rev.*, D16:2369–2372, 1977, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.2369.
- [193] Riccardo Barbieri, C. Bouchiat, A. Georges, and P. Le Doussal. QUARK - LEPTON NONUNIVERSALITY IN SUPERSYMMETRIC MODELS. *Phys. Lett.*, B156:348, 1985, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(85)91623-5.

- [194] Kaoru Hagiwara, S. Matsumoto, and Y. Yamada. Supersymmetric contribution to the quark - lepton universality violation in charged currents. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 75:3605–3608, 1995, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.3605, [arXiv:hep-ph/9507419](#).
- [195] A. Kurylov and M. J. Ramsey-Musolf. Charged current universality in the MSSM. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 88:071804, 2002, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.071804, [arXiv:hep-ph/0109222](#).
- [196] Michael J. Ramsey-Musolf, Shufang Su, and Sean Tulin. Pion Leptonic Decays and Supersymmetry. *Phys.Rev.*, D76:095017, 2007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.095017, [arXiv:0705.0028](#).
- [197] Sky Bauman, Jens Erler, and Michael Ramsey-Musolf. Charged Current Universality and the MSSM. 2012, [arXiv:1204.0035](#).
- [198] G. Beall, Myron Bander, and A. Soni. Constraint on the Mass Scale of a Left-Right Symmetric Electroweak Theory from the K(L) K(S) Mass Difference. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 48:848, 1982, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.48.848.
- [199] John F. Donoghue, Eugene Golowich, and Barry R. Holstein. LONG DISTANCE CHIRAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE K(L) K(S) MASS DIFFERENCE. *Phys.Lett.*, B135:481, 1984, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(84)90320-4.
- [200] Ikaros I.Y. Bigi and A.I. Sanda. AN ESTIMATE OF THE LONG DISTANCE EFFECTS IN THE K(L) K(S) MASS DIFFERENCE. *Phys.Lett.*, B148:205, 1984, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(84)91639-3.
- [201] Stefano Profumo, Michael J. Ramsey-Musolf, and Sean Tulin. Supersymmetric contributions to weak decay correlation coefficients. *Phys.Rev.*, D75:075017, 2007, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.075017, [arXiv:hep-ph/0608064](#).