

Spin-dependent potentials: spurious singularity and bounds on contact terms

Pavel Fadeev,¹ Filip Ficek,² Mikhail G. Kozlov,^{3,4} Dmitry Budker,^{1,5} and Victor V. Flambaum^{1,6}

¹*Helmholtz Institute Mainz, Johannes Gutenberg University, 55128 Mainz, Germany*

²*Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Łojasiewicza 11, 30-348 Kraków, Poland*

³*Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute of NRC “Kurchatov Institute”, Gatchina 188300, Russia*

⁴*St.Petersburg Electrotechnical University LETI, Prof. Popov Str. 5, 197376 St.Petersburg, Russia*

⁵*Department of Physics, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720-7300, USA*

⁶*School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales 2052, Australia*

(Dated: November 15, 2019)

This work applies a recent theoretical treatment of spin-dependent potentials to experimental searches, in particular in antiprotonic helium. The considered spin-dependent potentials between fermions or spin-polarised macroscopic objects result from an exchange of exotic spin-0 or spin-1 bosons. We address a superficial singularity in one of the potentials, as well as technical issues with contact terms, and use the results to obtain a bound on the pseudovector coupling constants and boson masses.

Recent work [1] presented the coordinate-space non-relativistic potentials induced by the exchange of spin-0 and spin-1 exotic bosons between fermions. These are of interest in the search for new physics in nuclear, atomic, and molecular phenomena [2, 3]. We encountered two types of potentials that may lead to apparent divergences:

(a) A potential proportional to the inverse square of the intermediate boson mass seems to diverge in the regime where the boson mass tends to zero.

(b) Potentials that include contact terms, when used to calculate expectation values, may lead to incorrect results for boson mass exceeding the fermion mass.

In this note we provide recipes for properly dealing

with these issues. Using the solutions for (a) and (b), we obtain a bound on pseudovector-pseudovector coupling constants as a function of the boson mass. This is the first time such a bound is presented using the potential in (a).

A. Potential proportional to $1/M^2$

Among the nine potentials derived in [1] which describe the exchange of an exotic boson between two fermions (see Fig. 1) or macroscopic objects¹, the pseudovector-pseudovector potential is the only one with a term inversely proportional to the boson mass (squared):

$$V_{AA}(\mathbf{r}) = -g_1^A g_2^A \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \frac{e^{-Mr}}{4\pi r}}_{\mathcal{V}_2} - \frac{g_1^A g_2^A m_1 m_2}{M^2} \underbrace{\left[\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \left[\frac{1}{r^3} + \frac{M}{r^2} + \frac{4\pi}{3} \delta(\mathbf{r}) \right] - (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) \left[\frac{3}{r^3} + \frac{3M}{r^2} + \frac{M^2}{r} \right] \right]}_{\mathcal{V}_3} \frac{e^{-Mr}}{4\pi m_1 m_2}. \quad (1)$$

Here, g^A are dimensionless interaction constants that parametrize the pseudovector interaction strength, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2$ denote the Pauli spin-matrix vectors of the two fermions, m_1 and m_2 are the masses of the fermions, M is the mass of the boson, $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ is the unit vector directed from fermion (or polarised mass) 2 to fermion 1, and r is the distance between the two fermions. We work in natural relativistic units, $\hbar = c = 1$.




FIG. 1. Elastic scattering of two fermions with masses m_1 and m_2 and spins \mathbf{s}_1 and \mathbf{s}_2 , respectively, mediated by a boson of mass M with four-momentum q^μ that is transferred from fermion 2 to fermion 1.

¹ To find the interaction for composite systems one should sum the interaction in Eq. (1) over all fermion constituents (electrons, protons, and neutrons), each with its own interaction constants. The result will be proportional to the nuclear or atomic spin operators s_1 and s_2 , similar to the usual magnetic interaction among atoms in a crystal. For uses of composite systems and higher spin states in the experimental search for spin-dependent potentials, see [4, 5], for example.

The \mathcal{V}_3 term in Eq. (1) arises from a longitudinal polarisation mode for a massive spin-1 boson and nonconservation of the axial-vector current [1, 6]. This term

seems to have a singularity in the limit of the boson mass $M \rightarrow 0$. However, in renormalizable theory there should be no divergence. Consider this scenario based on the standard-model Lagrangian. We will see that as $M \rightarrow 0$, the combination of parameters $g_1^A g_2^A / M^2$ remains finite. Consider Z -boson exchange between two fermions, where the Z boson would have purely pseudovector interactions and not mix with the photon [$\sin(\theta_W) = 0$, where θ_W is the weak mixing angle]. Then, the Z boson mass is given by $M = gv/2$, where v is the Higgs vacuum expectation value and g is the (universal) electroweak interaction constant [7]. For finite fermion masses $m_f = fv/\sqrt{2}$ (f is a species-dependent interaction constant), the ratio $g^2/M^2 = 4/v^2$ remains finite as $M \rightarrow 0$, since the right-hand-side is a constant. Thus, it is appropriate to place constraints on $g_1^A g_2^A / M^2$ of the \mathcal{V}_3 term in Eq. (1). The association with renormalizability (with the Higgs mechanisms of mass generation) makes this case worthy of experimental study.

In the special case of a massless vector boson, $M = 0$, only the \mathcal{V}_2 term remains in Eq. (1) because a massless vector boson does not have a longitudinal polarisation

mode, and so the \mathcal{V}_3 term does not appear in this case.

B. Bounds on contact terms

The second issue we address is determining a bound on the properties of spin-0 and spin-1 exotic bosons by using a potential that includes the contact term $\delta(\mathbf{r})$, such as the one appearing in Eq. (1) and other potentials in [1]. Contact terms were omitted in Ref. [8], and appeared in Refs. [6, 9]. To illustrate the challenge of setting such bounds, we use the results and methods for bounds on spin-dependent potentials between an electron and an antiproton in [10]. As in [10], we compare experimental results for the hyperfine structure of the antiprotonic helium from [11] with theoretical QED-based calculations for this system from [12]. Then, we numerically calculate the expectation values of spin-dependent potentials, and deduce their contributions to the transition energies of the antiproton in antiprotonic helium. Let us use the pseudoscalar-pseudoscalar potential, which appears in [10] and contains a contact term:

$$V_{pp}(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{g_1^p g_2^p}{4} \underbrace{\left[\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 \left[\frac{1}{r^3} + \frac{M}{r^2} + \frac{4\pi}{3} \delta(\mathbf{r}) \right] - (\sigma_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) (\sigma_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) \left[\frac{3}{r^3} + \frac{3M}{r^2} + \frac{M^2}{r} \right] \right]}_{\mathcal{V}_3} \frac{e^{-Mr}}{4\pi m_1 m_2}. \quad (2)$$




FIG. 2. Constraints for the interaction between an electron and an antiproton at 90% confidence level on the coupling constants as a function of boson mass, using the V_{pp} potential with the contact term [Eq. (2)] in numerical integration. The bound after the “bump” at 10^5 eV is false. For the correct bound, see Fig. 3.




FIG. 3. Constraints for the interaction between an electron and an antiproton at 90% confidence level on the coupling constants as a function of boson mass, using the V_{pp} potential of Eq. (3) in numerical integration.

Naively, we would get a bound plot as appears in Fig. 2. In this plot, apparently we obtained a bound on the coupling constants for any boson mass M . However, this bound plot is incorrect for boson masses much larger than the fermion masses.²

In calculating numerically the expectation value of V_{pp} , the contact term results in a constant after integration.

² By focusing on $M < m_1, m_2$ we avoided the issue of finite nu-

To complement the spherical case considered in [1], we offer an explanation based on the relevant scales in the system. What happens is that the contact term seems to be not applicable for $M > m_1, m_2$, as then the scale corresponding to boson mass is smaller than the scale corresponding to fermion masses, and thus smaller than the scale of the contact term. In other words, the contact term, with units of inverse length, has a typical scale which is the Compton wavelength of the fermion. Another scale in the system is the Compton wavelength of the boson $\lambda = \hbar/(Mc)$, setting the interaction range of the boson exchange. For $M > m_1, m_2$ the boson probes length-scales which are smaller than the cut-off range of the contact term.

The solution we propose is to use a different form of the potential in numerical calculations, a form which appeared during the derivation of the potentials and contains the operator ∇ . Such a form for Eq. (2) is:

$$V_{pp}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{g_1^p g_2^p}{16\pi m_1 m_2} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \cdot \nabla) (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \cdot \nabla) \left(\frac{e^{-Mr}}{r} \right). \quad (3)$$

Then, calculating expectation values with Eq. (3), use integration by parts to avoid possible numerical issues of the contact term. From integration by parts of Eq. (3) we see that there is no physical problem, only a numerical one.

In Eq. (2) correct large- M asymptotic is achieved due to delicate cancellation of different terms. This is hard to achieve in a numerical calculation. However, in Eq. (3) there is only one term, so no cancellation is required and correct asymptotic is immediately seen ($e^{-Mr}/r \rightarrow \delta(\mathbf{r}) 4\pi/M^2$).

Using Eq. (3) instead of Eq. (2) and integrating by parts, we arrive at Fig. 3 — a bound on the $|g_1^p g_2^p|$ coupling constants as a function of boson mass. As in [10], the bound in Fig. 3 weakens (the curve bends upwards) for bosons with masses larger than several keV/ c^2 . That is because the probed system, the antiprotonic helium atom, is less sensitive to interactions mediated by bosons with a Compton wavelength much shorter than the size of this atom.

Note that in [10] the bound was placed on the coefficient f_3 , which relates to the pseudoscalar coupling constants in the following way [8]:

$$f_3 = -\frac{g_e^p g_{\bar{p}}^p m_e}{4m_{\bar{p}}}, \quad (4)$$

where m_e is the mass of the electron and $m_{\bar{p}}$ the mass of the antiproton. Due to this relation, the bound on the coupling constants in Fig. 3 is four orders of magnitude

merical precision in large boson masses in the exclusion plot of Fig. 3 (b) in [10]. This ensured that the plot in [10], which includes the contribution of the contact term, is correct in the range considered.

higher than the bounds on f_3 , since $4 \cdot 1836 \approx 10^4$ (the antiproton is 1836 times heavier than the electron).

Our bounds are set on coupling constants, following the classification in [1]. Nowadays, bounds are set in some cases on coefficients f_i [4, 10, 13, 14] [for example, Eq. (4)], and in other cases on the coupling constants g_i [15–18]. Each coefficient f_i is a result of sorting the spin-dependent potentials according to their spin-momentum structure, as was done in [8]. We choose to sort the potentials according to the type of interactions (scalar, vector, etc.) [1]. In our view, the coupling constants are more fundamental than the constants f_i (for example, unlike the f_i , the coupling constants do not contain masses of the fermions), hence it is worthwhile to present bounds on the couplings.

C. New bound using $1/M^2$ term

Now we are in a position to combine the two parts discussed above. We need both of them in order to produce a bound based on the \mathcal{V}_3 term in Eq. (1). From the first part we know that this term is physically meaningful even for $M \rightarrow 0$. From the second part we know that in order to avoid numerical issues as $M \rightarrow \infty$, the form of Eq. (3), instead of Eq. (2), ought to be used in calculating expectation values for the exclusion plot, followed by integration by parts. Thus we construct Fig. 4. To our knowledge, this is the first bound in the literature produced by the term proportional to $1/M^2$ in V_{AA} . Other authors [19] may obtain such a bound in the future, for example using the results in [15]. Note further that the bound in Fig. 4 is for a semileptonic spin-dependent interaction between matter (electron) and antimatter (antiproton).




FIG. 4. Constraints for the interaction between an electron and an antiproton at 90% confidence level on the coupling constants as a function of boson mass, using \mathcal{V}_3 in V_{AA} , Eq. (1). The plot is based on the experimental data from [11] and theoretical calculations from [12], beside our numerical estimate of the spin-dependent contribution.

In this note we addressed some issues relevant to

the search for exotic bosons. Specifically, we explained the behavior of V_{AA} as $M \rightarrow 0$ and showed how to obtain bounds on the coupling constants as a function of the boson mass when dealing with contact terms. We have used these insights to obtain a bound on pseudovector-pseudovector interaction (using \mathcal{V}_3 in V_{AA}) in the system of antiprotonic helium. In doing so, we apply the theoretical treatment of spin-dependent potentials [1] to arrive at bounds on the properties of exotic bosons (Figs. 3 and 4) based on measurements.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Yevgeny V. Stadnik, Derek Jackson Kimball, Szymon Pustelny, and Eric Adelberger for their valuable remarks. We thank Anne Fabricant for editing the manuscript. The authors acknowledge the support by the DFG Reinhart Koselleck project, the European Research Council Dark-OsT advanced grant under project ID 695405, and the Simons and the Heising-Simons Foundations. V.V.F. was supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) and the JGU Gutenberg Research Fellowship. M.G.K. is supported by RFBR grant 17-02-00216 and is grateful to JGU for hospitality.

-
- [1] P. Fadeev, Y. V. Stadnik, F. Ficek, M. G. Kozlov, V. V. Flambaum, and D. Budker, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 022113 (2019).
 - [2] M.S. Safronova, D. Budker, D. DeMille, Derek F. Jackson Kimball, A. Derevianko, and Charles W. Clark, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 025008 (2018).
 - [3] Y. V. Stadnik and V. V. Flambaum, arXiv:1806.03115.
 - [4] T. M. Leslie, E. Weisman, R. Khatiwada, and J. C. Long, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 114022 (2014).
 - [5] W. Ji, C. B. Fu, and H. Gao, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 075014 (2017).
 - [6] P. C. Malta, L. P. R. Ospedal, K. Veiga, and J. A. Helayël-Neto, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2016**, 2531436 (2016).
 - [7] K. Gordon, *Modern Elementary Particle Physics*, (Cambridge University Press, UK, 2017).
 - [8] B. A. Dobrescu and I. Mocioiu, *JHEP* **2006**, 005 (2006).
 - [9] J. E. Moody and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 130 (1984).
 - [10] F. Ficek, P. Fadeev, V. V. Flambaum, D. F. J. Kimball, M. G. Kozlov, Y. V. Stadnik, and D. Budker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 183002 (2018).
 - [11] T. Pask, D. Barn, A. Dax, R. S. Hayano, M. Hori, D. Horvth, S. Friedreich, B. Juhsz, O. Massiczek, N. Ono, A. Ster, and E. Widmann, *Phys. Lett. B* **678**, 55 (2009).
 - [12] V. I. Korobov and D. Bakalov, *J. Phys. B* **34**, L519 (2001).
 - [13] F. Ficek, D. F. Jackson Kimball, M. G. Kozlov, N. Leefer, S. Pustelny, D. Budker, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 032505 (2017).
 - [14] Y. J. Kim, P. H. Chu, and I. Savukov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 091802 (2018).
 - [15] A. Almasi, J. Lee, H. Winarto, M. Smiciklas, and M. V. Romalis, arXiv: 1811.03614 (2018).
 - [16] L. R. Hunter and D. G. Ang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 091803 (2014).
 - [17] Y. J. Kim, P. H. Chu, I. Savukov, and S. Newman, *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 2245 (2019).
 - [18] M. Jiao, X. Rong, H. Liang, Y. F. Cai, and J. Du, arXiv:1904.09428.
 - [19] Private correspondence with Michael V. Romalis.