

An on-shell perspective on neutrino oscillations and non-standard interactions

Gustavo F. S. Alves, Enrico Bertuzzo and Gabriel M. Salla

Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C.P. 66.318, 05315-970 São Paulo, Brazil

E-mail: gustavo.figueiredo.alves@usp.br, bertuzzo@if.usp.br,
gabriel.massoni.salla@usp.br

ABSTRACT: We apply on-shell amplitude techniques to the study of neutrino oscillations in vacuum, focussing on processes involving W bosons. We start by determining the 3-point amplitude involving one neutrino, one charged lepton and one W boson, highlighting all the allowed kinematic structures. The result we obtain contains terms generated at all orders in an expansion in the cutoff scale of the theory, and we explicitly determine the lower dimensional operators behind the generation of the different structures. We then use this amplitude to construct the 4-point amplitude in which neutrinos are exchanged in the s-channel, giving rise to oscillations. We also study in detail how flavor enters in the amplitudes, and how the PMNS matrix emerges from the on-shell perspective.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	A brief review of on-shell scattering amplitudes	3
3	$\nu\bar{e}W$ 3-point amplitude	7
4	Flavor and the PMNS matrix	10
5	Oscillations from the 4-point amplitude	13
6	Conclusions	15
A	Connection with the usual field theoretical derivation	16
B	Explicit formulas for the 4-point amplitudes	17

1 Introduction

Many decades after their discovery, neutrino oscillations are still among the most interesting and subtle observed phenomena, and one of the few clearly established evidences of Beyond the Standard Model (BSM) physics [1, 2]. Two complementary approaches have been used to describe oscillations: a Quantum Mechanical one, in which the neutrino wave packet propagates between the production and detection locations, and a Quantum Field Theory one, in which production, propagation and detection are considered as a unique process. For a review and a comparison between the two formalisms we refer the reader to [3] and references therein. In addition to pointing to the need of BSM physics, neutrino oscillations are themselves affected by New Physics (NP), either modifying the production and detection processes or generating new interactions that affect neutrino propagation. NP effects are traditionally encoded in the so-called Non-Standard Interaction (NSI) parameters [4]. The ultra-violet (UV) origin of the NSI parameters can be traced to specific models or, more generally, to higher dimensional operators constructed out of SM fields [5–7]. The Effective Field Theory (EFT) constructed out of SM fields is known as SMEFT. A complete classification of the SMEFT operators is available for operators of dimension five [8], six [9], seven [10], eight [11, 12] and nine [13]. A second EFT relevant for neutrino physics is the so-called ν SMEFT, in which right handed neutrinos are added

to the SM particle content. A complete classification is available up to operators of dimension 7 [14–19].

Although of paramount importance, the use of EFTs is hindered by the fact that not all operators that can be written at a fixed dimension are independent. Indeed, fields redefinitions can be used to eliminate certain operators in favor of others, making the determination of a basis of independent operators a non-straightforward task. Even worse, although the physics cannot depend on the chosen basis, the physical effects of individual operators may be transparent in one basis and opaque in another.¹

Such problems can be circumvented using the on-shell amplitudes formalism [22–24]. This approach bypasses the need for quantum fields and Lagrangians, constructing scattering amplitudes in terms of physical states and “fundamental” 3-point amplitudes. Such objects can be simply determined from the covariance of the S-matrix under little group transformations. Once the 3-point amplitudes are known, they can be “glued” together to construct higher-point amplitudes simply imposing locality, i.e. requiring that poles appear only when an intermediate particle is exchanged on-shell. This formalism not only allows to derive very strong results for massless theories (for instance, that the only consistent theory of massless spin-2 particles is general relativity or that, conversely, the only consistent theory of interacting massless spin-1 particles is Yang-Mills [25–27]), but is an effective way to treat the Standard Model (SM) [28] and even EFTs [29–35]: once the particle content of the n -point amplitude is chosen, on-shell techniques allow to enumerate all possible kinematic structures permitted by the little group, independently of the order in the EFT at which they are generated for the first time. Scattering amplitudes are thus a powerful tool to include all-order effects without having to worry about operators basis and fields redefinitions.

In this paper we apply the on-shell amplitudes formalism to describe neutrino oscillations. Recall that oscillations are a phenomenon with intrinsic finite-distance (and time) dependence, and as such appropriate wave functions must be introduced to localize the neutrino creation and detection processes. Following [36], we write the overall amplitude for the neutrino creation and detection processes as

$$\mathcal{M} = \int d^4x_1 \int d^4x_2 \Psi_P(x_1, X_P) \Psi_D(x_2, X_D) M(x_1, x_2), \quad (1.1)$$

where the wave functions $\Psi_A(x, X_A)$ are localized at the production (X_P) and detection (X_D) spacetime points, and the amplitude $M(x_1, x_2)$ can be Fourier transformed according to

$$M(x_1, x_2) = \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \mathcal{A}_q e^{-iq(x_1 - x_2)}. \quad (1.2)$$

¹For fixed dimension, the total number of independent operators can be computed without resorting on explicit expressions [20]. For the $d = 6$ operators of the SMEFT automatic tools are available for the conversion between different basis [21].

Alternative expressions that give physically equivalent results can be found in [3, 7]. Once the production and detection channels are fixed, on-shell techniques will allow us to compute the amplitude in momentum space \mathcal{A}_q . For simplicity, we will focus on production and detection occurring with a W boson and a charged lepton. As we are going to see, the scattering amplitude we will obtain contains all possible modifications of the $\nu e W$ amplitude, and not only the SM term. Needless to say, the flavor structure must be carefully taken into account to correctly account for oscillations. We do this by identifying first the only SM structure appearing in the 3-point amplitude $\nu e W$ and then extending the discussion to the additional structures appearing.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We start in Sec. 2 with a brief overview of the scattering amplitudes techniques for massless and massive particles. In Sec. 3 we write the 3-point amplitude $\mathcal{A}(\nu \bar{e} W)$ for massive particles. We will also describe a “dictionary” between the terms in the amplitude and the operators that generate them in the usual EFT approach. In Sec. 4 we discuss explicitly flavor and how the PMNS matrix appears in our approach. Sec. 5 is instead devoted to the construction of the 4-point amplitude $W W e \bar{e}$, which will provide us with neutrino oscillations. Finally, we conclude in Sec. 6. We also add two Appendices: App. A is devoted to the explicit connection between the on-shell amplitudes and the usual field theory computation, while App. B contains explicit formulas for the amplitudes appearing in Sec. 5.

2 A brief review of on-shell scattering amplitudes

As it is well-known, one-particle states in a quantum theory transform in irreducible representations of the Little Group (LG) [37]. For massive particles $\text{LG} = SU(2)$, while for massless particles $\text{LG} = U(1)$. Invariance of the S-matrix under Lorentz transformations thus implies covariance of the scattering amplitudes under LG transformations [23, 37]:

$$\mathcal{A}[\{p_1, \sigma_1\}, \dots, \{p_N, \sigma_N\}] \rightarrow D_{\sigma'_1 \sigma_1}^{(j_1)} \dots D_{\sigma'_N \sigma_N}^{(j_N)} \mathcal{A}[\{\Lambda p_1, \sigma'_1\}, \dots, \{\Lambda p_N, \sigma'_N\}]. \quad (2.1)$$

In the previous equation we have denoted by $\{p_i, \sigma_i\}$ the momentum and spin (helicity) of massive (massless) particles, while $D_{\sigma'_i \sigma_i}^{(j_i)}$ is the LG transformation. For massive particles this is the usual $2j_i + 1$ dimensional representation of $SU(2)$, while for massless particles it is simply given by a phase.

The on-shell amplitudes formalism consists in constructing all possible terms satisfying Eq. (2.1) without introducing quantum fields nor Lagrangians. It is convenient to employ helicity variables to construct amplitudes. This is motivated by the well-known relation between the Lorentz group $SO(1, 4)$ and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$, that allows writing the 4-momentum p of a particle as a 2×2 matrix according to

$$p^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \equiv p_\mu \bar{\sigma}^{\mu\dot{\alpha}\alpha}, \quad p_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \equiv p_\mu \sigma_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^\mu, \quad (2.2)$$

where α and $\dot{\alpha}$ denote the $(1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 1/2)$ representation of the Lorentz group, respectively. For a comprehensive review see [38]. As usual, $\sigma^\mu = (1, \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and $\bar{\sigma}^\mu = (1, -\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. The two 4-vectors are related by

$$\bar{\sigma}^{\mu\dot{\alpha}\alpha} = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \sigma_{\beta\dot{\beta}}^\mu, \quad (2.3)$$

where ϵ is the Levi-Civita symbol in two dimensions. We fix $\epsilon^{12} = 1 = -\epsilon_{12}$. The ϵ matrix is used to raise and lower the spinor indices α and $\dot{\alpha}$. The momentum matrices transform according to $p \rightarrow \mathcal{L} p \mathcal{L}^\dagger$ under Lorentz transformations.

For massless particles, the matrix p has rank 1 (because $\det p = 0$) and can be written as the product of helicity spinors. Those transforming as the $(1/2, 0)$ representation of the Lorentz group will be denoted by angle brackets $|p\rangle_\alpha$ and $\langle p|^\alpha$, while those transforming in the $(0, 1/2)$ representation will be denoted by square brackets $[p]_{\dot{\alpha}}$ and $[p]^{\dot{\alpha}}$:

$$p_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = |p\rangle [p], \quad p^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} = [p] \langle p|. \quad (2.4)$$

We leave implicit the spinor indices, since their position is fixed by consistency between the left and right sides. For reasons that will be justified later on, we will also take complex momenta. Under a Lorentz transformation, the helicity spinors behave as the one-particle states of the theory [23, 37]: they will transform with an $SU(2)$ matrix acting on their spinor index and under the $U(1)$ LG as well. Concretely, we have

$$|p\rangle_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\alpha^\beta t |p\rangle_\beta, \quad [p]^{\dot{\alpha}} \rightarrow (\mathcal{L}^*)_{\dot{\beta}}^{\dot{\alpha}} t^{-1} [p]^{\dot{\beta}}, \quad (2.5)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the spinor representation of the Lorentz transformation and t is a complex number related to the LG transformation². Analogous transformations apply to $\langle p|$ and $[p]$. As expected, the momentum matrix is invariant under LG transformations.

In the massive case things are slightly more complicated: since p is now a rank 2 matrix, we need to introduce a pair of helicity variables to correctly take into account the degrees of freedom. We will call them $|p^I\rangle$ and $[p^I]$, with $I = 1, 2$. Again we leave implicit the spinor indices because their position will be determined univocally once we write the momentum matrix in terms of these variables. We interpret the index I appearing in the helicity variables as the $SU(2)$ LG index. Once more, a Lorentz transformation acts on all the indices separately:

$$|p^I\rangle_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\alpha^\beta W_J^I |p^I\rangle_\beta, \quad [p^I]^{\dot{\alpha}} \rightarrow (\mathcal{L}^*)_{\dot{\beta}}^{\dot{\alpha}} W_J^I [p^I]^{\dot{\beta}}. \quad (2.6)$$

As in Eq. (2.5) the matrix \mathcal{L} is the spinor representation of the Lorentz transformation, while W is the $SU(2)$ LG transformation. Momentum invariance under LG transformations is then guaranteed provided we define

$$p^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \equiv \epsilon_{IJ} |p^I\rangle \langle p^J|, \quad p_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \equiv -\epsilon_{IJ} [p^I] [p^J]. \quad (2.7)$$

²For real momenta t reduces to a phase $t = e^{i\theta/2}$, where θ parametrizes the LG transformation.

The minus sign in the second term is necessary to have consistency with the expression obtained lowering the spinor indices in $p^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha}$. Before going back to scattering amplitudes, let us write explicit expressions for the helicity spinors. Using the spherical decomposition $\mathbf{p} = p(\sin\theta \cos\phi, \sin\theta \sin\phi, \cos\theta)$ for the three dimensional momentum we obtain

$$\langle p^I | = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{E+pc} & -\sqrt{E-pc} \\ \hline \sqrt{E+ps^*} & \sqrt{E-pc} \end{array} \right), \quad |p^I] = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} (\sqrt{E-pc})^* & (\sqrt{E+pc})^* \\ \hline -(\sqrt{E-pc})^* & (\sqrt{E+ps^*})^* \end{array} \right), \quad (2.8)$$

where $c = \cos(\theta/2)$, $s = \sin(\theta/2)e^{i\phi}$ and $\sqrt{E \pm pc}$ is a complex number. The first column refers to $I = 1$, while the second corresponds to $I = 2$. The spinors $|p^I\rangle$ and $[p^I|$ can be obtained by simply lowering the spinor index. The helicity variables so defined satisfy the massive Weyl equations

$$\begin{aligned} p |p^I\rangle &= M |p^I], & p |p^I] &= M^\dagger |p^I\rangle, \\ [p^I| p &= -M^\dagger \langle p^I|, & \langle p^I| \bar{p} &= -M [p^I|, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where the complex number M is defined as $MM^\dagger = m^2$, with m the physical mass of the particle. The Weyl equations written in this form are valid provided

$$\langle p^I p^J \rangle = M \epsilon^{IJ}, \quad [p^I p^J] = -M^\dagger \epsilon^{IJ}, \quad (2.10)$$

where we have defined the Lorentz invariant products

$$\langle \lambda \chi \rangle \equiv \langle \lambda |^\alpha | \chi \rangle_\alpha, \quad [\lambda \chi] \equiv [\lambda]_{\dot{\alpha}} | \chi \rangle^{\dot{\alpha}}. \quad (2.11)$$

For our purposes it is useful to notice that products like $\langle p^I q^J \rangle$ or $[p^I q^J]$ are Lorentz invariant but transform as tensors under the massive LG. The same is true for the invariant products of massless spinor variables, which are themselves covariant under $U(1)$ transformations.

A virtue of the explicit expression in Eq (2.8) is that it makes obvious what happens in the high energy limit:

$$\langle p^I | \xrightarrow{p \rightarrow E} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{2E} c & 0 \\ \hline \sqrt{2E} s^* & 0 \end{array} \right), \quad |p^I] \xrightarrow{p \rightarrow E} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & (\sqrt{2E} c)^* \\ \hline 0 & (\sqrt{2E} s^*)^* \end{array} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

We define the massless helicity variables

$$\langle p | = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{2E} c & \\ \hline \sqrt{2E} s^* & \end{array} \right), \quad |p] = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} (\sqrt{2E} c)^* & \\ \hline (\sqrt{2E} s^*)^* & \end{array} \right). \quad (2.13)$$

Let us now finally discuss how to determine the expression of on-shell amplitudes. We will begin with the massive case, which will be our starting point in Section 3. The idea is straightforward: we need to list all possible structures transforming according to Eq. (2.1) constructed out of the helicity variables transforming as in

Eq. (2.6). First of all we see that only Lorentz invariant combinations can appear, i.e. only the invariant products of Eq. (2.11) are allowed in the amplitude. Second, to correctly reproduce the $SU(2)$ LG transformation of a spin- j object we use the well known result that the spin- j representation of $SU(2)$ can be constructed taking the symmetric combination of $2j$ spinors [39, 40]. For instance, a 3-point amplitude involving three particles of momentum and spin (p_i, j_i) , $i = 1, 2, 3$ must be an $SU(2)$ tensor of the form

$$\mathcal{A} \left[1_{j_1}^{\{I_1 \dots I_{2j_1}\}} 2_{j_2}^{\{J_1 \dots J_{2j_2}\}} 3_{j_3}^{\{K_1 \dots K_{2j_3}\}} \right], \quad (2.14)$$

where the each index transforms according to $O^I \rightarrow W^I{}_J O^J$ in terms of the two-dimensional LG representation. We have denoted by 1, 2 and 3 the momenta of the particles, a notation that we will use throughout the paper. The curly brackets indicate complete symmetrization of the indices included in order to obtain the desired spin- j representation. The explicit form of the amplitude will depend on the spin of the particles involved, and no general expression is available. We will discuss an explicit example in Sec. 3, and refer the reader to [23, 31–34] for more examples.

Massless amplitudes can be obtained by applying the same procedure. We will take all momenta incoming. As is well known, 3-point amplitudes involving on-shell massless particles vanish identically due to kinematics. This motivates our choice of complexify the momentum in (2.5), since for complex momenta it is no longer true that 3-points amplitude vanishes. With this choice the massless amplitude must transform under the LG as

$$\mathcal{A} [1^{h_1} 2^{h_2} 3^{h_3}] \rightarrow t_1^{-2h_1} t_2^{-2h_2} t_3^{-2h_3} \mathcal{A} [1^{h_1} 2^{h_2} 3^{h_3}]. \quad (2.15)$$

It can be shown [23, 25] that the 3-point amplitude is completely fixed by LG covariance up to an overall constant:

$$\mathcal{A} [1^{h_1} 2^{h_2} 3^{h_3}] = \begin{cases} g \langle 12 \rangle^{h_3-h_1-h_2} \langle 13 \rangle^{h_2-h_1-h_3} \langle 23 \rangle^{h_1-h_2-h_3} & \text{when } \sum h_i < 0 \\ \bar{g} [12]^{h_1+h_2-h_3} [13]^{h_1+h_3-h_2} [23]^{h_2+h_3-h_1} & \text{when } \sum h_i > 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

As briefly mentioned in the Introduction, the simplicity of the structure has far reaching consequences. High point amplitudes do not have the same structural simplicity as 3-point amplitudes, but can be determined using the same LG covariance. An additional ingredient of fundamental importance in determine $n > 3$ -point amplitudes is the factorization in the various kinematical channels. We will use this factorization in Sec. 5 to construct the 4-point amplitude. We defer a more thorough discussion to that section.

We conclude this section by listing a number of identities satisfied by the spinor variables that will be necessary for the following computations. For all incoming particles, momentum conservation can be recast as

$$\sum_i p_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^i = \sum_i |i\rangle [i] = 0, \quad (2.17)$$

where p^i can be either a massive or massless momentum. The following Schouten identity for the Levi-Civita symbol is also useful,

$$\epsilon^{\delta\alpha}\epsilon^{\delta\alpha} + \epsilon^{\delta\beta}\epsilon^{\gamma\alpha} + \epsilon^{\delta\gamma}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta} = 0, \quad (2.18)$$

in particular when contracted with spinor variables. For instance, contracting the equation above with three massless angle spinors results in

$$|i\rangle\langle jk\rangle + |j\rangle\langle ki\rangle + |k\rangle\langle ij\rangle = 0. \quad (2.19)$$

An analogous identity holds for dotted indices and square bracket spinors. We also have identities involving spinor variables of the same type:

$$|p^I\rangle_\alpha\langle p_I|^\beta = M\delta_\alpha^\beta, \quad [p^I]^{\dot{\alpha}}[p_I]_{\dot{\beta}} = -M^\dagger\delta_{\dot{\beta}}^{\dot{\alpha}}. \quad (2.20)$$

Finally, the scalar product between two 4-vectors p and q is equal to

$$2p \cdot q = \langle p^I q^J \rangle [q_J p_I], \quad (2.21)$$

where, as usual, repeated indices are contracted.

3 $\nu\bar{e}W$ 3-point amplitude

We now apply the techniques outlined in Sec. 2 to write the massive amplitude involving one neutrino, one charged lepton and one W boson. According to our discussion, since the amplitude involves two fermions and one spin-1 particles, it must be of the form

$$\mathcal{A} \left[1_\nu^I 2_{\bar{e}}^J 3_W^{\{K_1 K_2\}} \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Since the brackets $\langle\lambda\chi\rangle$ and $[\lambda\chi]$ are antisymmetric, the combinations $\langle 3^{\{K_1} 3^{K_2\}} \rangle$ and $[3^{\{K_1} 3^{K_2\}}]$ vanish identically. This implies that only the angle or square bracket products involving the helicity variables (1, 3) and (2, 3) can appear, and we are left with only 4 terms satisfying the correct LG transformation: $\langle 1^I 3^{\{K_1} \rangle} \langle 2^J 3^{K_2\} \rangle$, $\langle 1^I 3^{\{K_1} \rangle} [2^J 3^{K_2\}]$, $[1^I 3^{\{K_1}] \langle 2^J 3^{K_2\} \rangle$ and $[1^I 3^{\{K_1}] [2^J 3^{K_2\}]$. All the terms are independent, and each of them will appear with an independent coupling in the amplitude. We will omit flavor indices at this stage, getting back to this issue in Sec. 4. To avoid cluttering in the notation due to the LG indices, we follow Ref. [23] and introduce the bold notation: massive spinor helicity variables will be denoted in bold, leaving implicit the symmetrization operation. With this convention the amplitude reads

$$\mathcal{A}[1_\nu 2_{\bar{e}} 3_W] = \frac{y_L}{M} \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle + \frac{g_L}{m_W} \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}] + \frac{g_R}{m_W} [\mathbf{13}] \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle + \frac{y_R}{M} [\mathbf{13}] [\mathbf{23}]. \quad (3.2)$$

Our result agrees with what was found in Ref. [32]. In four dimensions a n -point amplitude has dimension $4 - n$. The angle and square brackets each have dimension

1, implying that the coefficients of the four terms appearing in the previous equation must have dimension -1 . We make this explicit by introducing a mass scale in the denominator. Our choice will become clear later on (see discussion below Eq. (3.5)). Let us now discuss the UV origin of the different terms. To understand the helicity and chirality of the particles involved in each of the terms it is useful to take the high energy limit in which all the particles become massless. This amounts to unbolding the amplitude and apply a $U(1)$ LG transformation as in Eq. (2.5), with $e^{i\theta/2} = t$ as explained in the previous Section. Once this is done, one can infer the helicity of the particles involved by simply comparing with Eqs. (2.15) and (2.16).

The high energy limit of the terms involving only angle or square brackets are straightforward and read

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{y_L}{M} \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle &\rightarrow \frac{y_L}{M} \langle 13 \rangle \langle 23 \rangle = \mathcal{A} [1_\nu^- 2_{\bar{e}}^- 3_W^{-1}], \\ \frac{y_R}{M} [\mathbf{13}] [\mathbf{23}] &\rightarrow \frac{y_R}{M} [13] [23] = \mathcal{A} [1_\nu^+ 2_{\bar{e}}^+ 3_W^{+1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Using the explicit formulas of App. A we obtain that a negative-helicity massless fermion maps to a field with left handed chirality, while a negative-helicity massless antifermion maps to a field with right handed chirality. Inverting the helicity corresponds to an inversion of the chirality. Since these terms involve a fermion-antifermion pair with the same helicity, they must correspond to dipole operators in the Lagrangian language. More specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle &\text{ is generated by the dipole operator } \bar{e}_R \sigma^{\mu\nu} \nu_L W_{\mu\nu}^-, \\ [\mathbf{13}] [\mathbf{23}] &\text{ is generated by the dipole operator } \bar{e}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} \nu_R W_{\mu\nu}^-. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Explicit computation of the amplitude using the results of App. A confirms this conclusion.

The high energy limit of the remaining two terms is richer, since in this case both the positive and negative helicity of the spin-1 particle can be reached. To be more precise, the correct form of the amplitude in the UV can be reached allowing the masses to vanish one at a time. Since the result will be important in Sec. 4, it is worth to show it in detail. We have

$$\frac{g_L}{m_W} \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}] \xrightarrow{m_1 \rightarrow 0} \frac{g_L}{m_W} \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}] \xrightarrow{m_2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{g_L}{m_W} \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}] = -g_L \frac{\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle^2}{\langle 12 \rangle} = g_L \frac{[\mathbf{23}]^2}{[12]}, \quad (3.5)$$

where in the last step we have used momentum conservation and the Weyl equations to obtain a factor of m_W that cancel with the denominator. This justifies our choice of writing the coefficient as g_L/m_W since the presence of the vector mass in the denominator is necessary for a consistent massless limit within the SM. The term $\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle^2 / \langle 12 \rangle$ unbolds to $\mathcal{A}[1_\nu^- 2_{\bar{e}}^+ 3_W^{-1}]$, while $[\mathbf{23}]^2 / [12]$ unbolds to $\mathcal{A}[1_\nu^- 2_{\bar{e}}^+ 3_W^{+1}]$. Analogous reasoning can be applied to the $[\mathbf{13}] \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle$ term, which unbolds to $\mathcal{A}[1_\nu^+ 2_{\bar{e}}^- 3_W^{\pm 1}]$. Since all these amplitudes involve a fermion-antifermion pair with opposite helicity

amplitude	$U(1)_{EM}$ theory	$SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ theory
$\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle$	$\bar{e}_R \sigma^{\mu\nu} \nu_L W_{\mu\nu}^-$ ($d = 5$)	$\bar{e}_R \sigma^{\mu\nu} H^\dagger \tau^a L W_{\mu\nu}^a$ ($d = 6$)
$[\mathbf{13}] [\mathbf{23}]$	$\bar{e}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} \nu_R W_{\mu\nu}^-$ ($d = 5$)	$(\bar{L} H) \sigma^{\mu\nu} (H^T \epsilon \tau^a L^c) W_{\mu\nu}^a$ ($d = 7$, Majorana) $\bar{L} \sigma^{\mu\nu} \tau^a N_R \epsilon H^* W_{\mu\nu}^a$ ($d = 6$, Dirac)
$\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}]$	$\bar{e}_L \gamma^\mu \nu_L W_\mu^-$ ($d = 4$)	$\bar{L} \gamma^\mu \tau^a L W_\mu^a$ ($d = 4$)
$[\mathbf{13}] \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle$	$\bar{e}_R \gamma^\mu \nu_R W_\mu^-$ ($d = 4$)	$\bar{e}_R \gamma^\mu (H^\dagger \epsilon L^c) H^\dagger \epsilon D_\mu H^*$ ($d = 7$, Majorana) $\bar{e}_R \gamma^\mu N_R H^\dagger \epsilon D_\mu H^*$ ($d = 6$, Dirac)

Table 1. Amplitude/operators dictionary. In the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ invariant theory we list the smallest dimensional operators contributing to the corresponding amplitude, distinguishing between the Majorana and Dirac cases, if needed.

we conclude that they must generated, in field theory language, by the following terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}] & \text{ is generated by the operator } \bar{e}_L \gamma^\mu \nu_L W_\mu^-, \\
[\mathbf{13}] \langle \mathbf{23} \rangle & \text{ is generated by the operator } \bar{e}_R \gamma^\mu \nu_R W_\mu^-.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.6}$$

It is now straightforward to determine the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ operators that generate the terms in Eqs. (3.4) and (3.6). They can be found in Tab. 1. For Majorana neutrinos we have $\nu_R = \nu_L^c$, while for Dirac neutrinos this is an independent degree of freedom $\nu_R = N_R$. The table emphasizes one of the crucial points raised in the Introduction: on-shell amplitudes automatically include structures that (i) appear at different order in an expansion over the cutoff scale and (ii) that traditionally belong to different EFTs: the SMEFT for the terms involving L^c and the ν SMEFT for the terms involving N_R (see discussion in the Introduction).³ Moreover, we observe from Tab. 1 that the structures involving the right handed neutrino helicity are more suppressed for Majorana than for Dirac neutrinos when embedded in an EFT framework.

Comparing the terms in Eq. (3.2) with the operators in Tab. 1 it is possible to infer the correct Λ dependence of the scale M . For the terms generated by $d = 6$ operators we have $M = \Lambda^2/v$, while for the terms generated at $d = 7$ we have $M = \Lambda^3/v^2$. Can this be done from a purely on-shell perspective? An apparent obstacle to this program is the fact that only the $\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}]$ structure can be directly UV completed into the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ invariant 3-point amplitudes (we will write such amplitudes later on in Eq. (4.2)). According to Tab. 1 all other terms should be generated by higher-point amplitudes. Two arguments can be used to perform the IR/UV matching between amplitudes involving a different number of particles. The

³Typically, in the ν SMEFT the right handed neutrinos are supposed to be heavier than the left handed ones and are responsible for the generation of neutrino masses. Since we are considering Dirac neutrinos, we are implicitly assuming that the Majorana term for the N_R fields is forbidden by some symmetry.

first one was presented in Ref. [32], and amounts to notice that, in the soft limit in which the Higgs boson momentum vanishes, amplitudes involving the Higgs boson are indistinguishable from amplitudes without the Higgs boson. To compensate for the dimension mismatch between higher and lower points amplitudes, a new mass scale must be introduced, analogous to the Higgs vev. A second argument has been presented in Ref. [33] and amounts to impose correlations between coefficients to tame a possible growth with energy of the amplitude. In our case this procedure can be applied to the [13] ⟨23⟩ structure. Focussing for simplicity on Dirac neutrinos, the procedure amounts to “glue” the 3-point amplitudes $\nu\bar{e}W^\pm$ and $hW^\pm W^0$ (where W^0 denotes the longitudinal component of the W boson and W^\pm the transverse ones) to obtain the 4-point amplitude $\nu\bar{e}W^0H$. The last amplitude can be UV completed in $\nu\bar{e}H^\dagger H$, which is $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ invariant and has a coefficient given at leading order by $1/\Lambda^2$. Demanding this 4-point amplitude not to grow with the energy requires $g_R \sim m_W^2/\Lambda^2$, apart from an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coefficient. A similar reasoning applies to the Majorana case, in which however we need to construct the 5-point amplitude $L^c\bar{e}H^*H^*H^*$ to obtain an $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ object. There is in any case an obstruction to the application of the same procedure to the dipole amplitudes, since these are generated at loop level. Although interesting, this point lies outside the scope of this paper, and will be explored elsewhere.

Before concluding, we observe that the kinematic structure of Eq. (3.2) is completely generic, and applies to any 3-point interaction involving two spin-1/2 and one spin-1 particle. In particular, the same expression will be valid – with different coefficients – for charged interactions involving quarks and for neutral interactions involving leptons or quarks.

4 Flavor and the PMNS matrix

In this section we discuss how flavor is implemented in the 3-point amplitude of Eq. (3.2). Clearly, we could use directly the operators in Tab. 1 to infer the flavor structure of the interactions. Nevertheless, it is interesting to study how we can obtain the same result using the on-shell formalism only. We will not assume any mismatch between flavor and mass basis as is usually done in the traditional QFT computation, since in the on-shell formalism there is no mass term in the Lagrangian to be diagonalized.

Our derivation rests on one important assumption: in the absence of mass, no quantum number can be used to distinguish between 1-particle states of different generations. In the massless limit we thus gain the freedom to perform unitary transformations on the states of each species. In our case these flavor transformations

amount to

$$|\nu_i(\mathbf{p}, h)\rangle \rightarrow (U_\nu^*)_{ji} |\nu_j(\mathbf{p}, h)\rangle, \quad |\bar{e}_i(\mathbf{p}, h)\rangle \rightarrow (U_e)_{ji} |\bar{e}_j(\mathbf{p}, h)\rangle^4, \quad (4.1)$$

where U_ν and U_e are unitary matrices. At the same time, in the massless limit the spinor variables depend only on the particle momentum, and are thus flavor blind. This means that all the flavor dependence must be encoded in the coefficients in front of each term in the amplitude, which must thus have non-trivial flavor transformations. Stated in another way: when a certain type of particle becomes massless, the amplitude must be a covariant tensor under a flavor transformation of that type of particles. Notice that this is not the case for massive amplitudes, in which also the spinor variables depend on the particle mass.

We are now going to use these observations to deduce the flavor structures of the coefficients $g_{L,R}$ and $y_{L,R}$. In order to do so, we are going to take the limit in which each type of particle becomes massless one at a time: first all the neutrinos, then all the charged leptons and finally the W boson. When all the particles are massless we will match into a SM gauge amplitude [28, 41]:

$$\mathcal{A}_{SM} \left[1_{L_{A,i}}^-, 2_{L_{B,j}}^+, 3_{W^a}^{-1} \right] = g^{ij}(T^a)_{AB} \frac{\langle 13 \rangle^2}{\langle 12 \rangle}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{SM} \left[1_{L_{A,i}}^-, 2_{L_{B,j}}^+, 3_{W^a}^{+1} \right] = g^{ij}(T^a)_{AB} \frac{[13]^2}{[12]}, \quad (4.2)$$

where L is the usual lepton doublet and T^a is a gauge generator. We have written explicitly the gauge indices (A and B) as well as the flavor indices (i and j). As observed above, in the massless limit only the coefficients can depend on flavor. The hypothesis of flavor universality we are using allows us to employ a L flavor transformation to make the g^{ij} coefficients proportional to the identity: $g^{ij} \rightarrow g\delta^{ij}$, where g is the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling.

We now have all the ingredients to discuss the flavor dependence of the couplings. To fix our notation, we rewrite Eq. (3.2) making explicit the flavor indices:

$$\mathcal{A} [1_{\nu_i} 2_{\bar{e}_j} 3_W] = \frac{y_L^{ij}}{M} \langle \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{3} \rangle \langle \mathbf{2}_j \mathbf{3} \rangle + \frac{g_L^{ij}}{m_W} \langle \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{3} \rangle [\mathbf{2}_j \mathbf{3}] + \frac{g_R^{ij}}{m_W} [\mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{3}] \langle \mathbf{2}_j \mathbf{3} \rangle + \frac{y_R^{ij}}{M} [\mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{3}] [\mathbf{2}_j \mathbf{3}]. \quad (4.3)$$

At this stage, all the coefficients are complex matrices in flavor space. Before taking the massless limits, we observe that, following the discussion in Sec. 3, only the $\langle \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{3} \rangle [\mathbf{2}_j \mathbf{3}]$ has the correct particle content to be matched into the SM amplitudes (4.2). Let us first discuss this term. The various massless limits can be achieved following Eq. (3.5). At each stage we gain the freedom to perform a flavor transformation of the specie that became massless. To remember this freedom we will explicitly apply a generic flavor transformation at each stage. Focussing on the

⁴We take the usual transformation in which antiparticles transform in the conjugate representation with respect to particles.

coefficients only and writing them as matrices in flavor space we obtain

$$\frac{g_L}{m_W} \xrightarrow{m_\nu \rightarrow 0} \frac{U_\nu^\dagger g_L}{m_W} \xrightarrow{m_e \rightarrow 0} \frac{U_\nu^\dagger g_L U_e}{m_W} \xrightarrow{m_W \rightarrow 0} U_\nu^\dagger g_L U_e = g\mathbf{1}, \quad (4.4)$$

where in the last step we have matched onto the SM amplitude with coefficient proportional to the identity in flavor space. The last identity can be true only if g_L is proportional to a unitary matrix. We will thus make contact with the usual notation and write

$$g_L = gU, \quad (4.5)$$

where U is the PMNS matrix. Notice that we have obtained the PMNS matrix without having to ever talk about mass diagonalization and mismatches between flavor and mass basis. Having established that g_L is proportional to a unitary matrix we also observe that, as soon as the neutrinos become massless, it is possible to use the freedom of rotating the neutrino states to make g_L proportional to the identity. This matches, as it should, the usual QFT conclusion that no PMNS matrix appears in the limit of massless neutrinos. Furthermore, it is interesting to observe that the standard counting of PMNS parameters is guaranteed thanks to the possibility of applying arbitrary phase transformations to the neutrino and charged antilepton 1-particle states. For Dirac neutrinos the phase transformations can be deduced directly from Eq. (4.1) by identifying $(U_\nu)_{ij} \equiv e^{i\alpha_i} \delta_{ij}$ and $(U_e)_{ij} \equiv e^{i\beta_i} \delta_{ij}$. With this identification we are back to the usual textbook deduction of the number of phases [42]. The situation is different for Majorana neutrinos, since in this case particle and antiparticle coincide. Given that the latter transforms in the conjugate representation, consistency is ensured requiring $U_\nu = U_\nu^*$, i.e. the transformation is constrained to be orthogonal. This means that no phase transformation can be applied in a consistent way on the Majorana neutrino 1-particle states, leaving us with 3 phases in U . Once more, we recover the usual parameter counting for the PMNS matrix.

When the other terms in the amplitude are turned on, a similar reasoning applies. A crucial difference emerges, however, since they cannot be matched into any SM 3-point amplitude. We thus cannot conclude that the $y_{L,R}$ and g_R coefficients are unitary unless a special ‘‘conspiracy’’ aligns the flavor structure to the flavor identity in the UV. Comparing with the operators in Tab. 1 we confirm the validity of our argument.

We conclude this section observing that the same line of reasoning that led us to the PMNS matrix can be applied to charged interactions between quarks. Although the quark and W mass hierarchy forbids separate massless limits, the UV matching can be done taking all the particles massless at the same time. We again conclude that the coefficient of the $\langle \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{3} \rangle [\mathbf{2}_j \mathbf{3}]$ term must be proportional to a unitary matrix, to be identified with the CKM matrix. The main difference with respect to the

present case is the UV origin of the other three terms.⁵ Analogous reasoning will also apply to neutral currents, which are relevant to the computation of the neutrino matter potential. We defer the study of this issue from the on-shell perspective to future work.

5 Oscillations from the 4-point amplitude

We are finally in the position of discussing the main point of the paper: how neutrino oscillations follow from the 4-point amplitude involving two charged leptons and two W bosons. As mentioned in the Introduction, we use this amplitude as a proxy to study neutrino oscillations in the on-shell formalism. We will comment later on more realistic production processes involving mesons or lepton decays.

The 4-point amplitude can be written in full generality as

$$\mathcal{A}[1_W 2_W 3_{\bar{e}_j} 4_{e_k}] \equiv \mathcal{A}_{WWjk} = \sum_i \frac{\mathcal{R}_s^i}{s - m_{\nu_i}^2} + \mathcal{A}_{\text{contact}}, \quad (5.1)$$

where we have defined a lighter notation for the amplitude symbol that will be used from now on. The first term is the one obtained exchanging a neutrino in the s -channel and will be obtained “gluing” together two 3-point amplitudes. The second one consists of all the additional contact terms that cannot be obtained from lower point amplitudes. More specifically, while the first term has a pole for $s \rightarrow m_{\nu_i}^2$, the second one is regular in this limit. The quantity \mathcal{R}_s^i is the residue at the $s = m_{\nu_i}^2$ pole that, as we will see, can be completely fixed by unitarity arguments. Notice that the amplitude is dominated by the kinematic region in which the exchanged neutrinos are closed to their mass-shell. For this reason we will discard the massive contact terms in what follows (see however [43] for a classification of the terms appearing). Another way to see that contact terms do not contribute follows from the fact that such terms are related to local interactions, and thus will not be relevant to the macroscopic propagation of the neutrino.

The residue at the pole in the s -channel of the 4-point amplitude can be computed according to [23]

$$\mathcal{R}_s^i = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 1_W \quad \quad \quad 2_W \\ \swarrow \quad \quad \quad \searrow \\ \quad \quad \quad \xrightarrow{P} \quad \quad \quad \\ \quad \quad \quad \nu_i \quad \quad \quad \\ \swarrow \quad \quad \quad \searrow \\ 3_{\bar{e}_j} \quad \quad \quad 4_{e_k} \end{array} \end{array} = \lim_{P^2=s \rightarrow m_{\nu_i}^2} \mathcal{A}[1_W 3_{\bar{e}_j} (-P)_{\nu_i}^I] \epsilon_{IJ} \mathcal{A}[P_{\nu_i}^J 2_W 4_{e_k}]. \quad (5.2)$$

⁵For completeness we report here the operators that generate the various terms in the $\mathcal{A}[1_u 2_{\bar{d}} 3_W]$ amplitude: the term $\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle$ is generated at leading order by the operator $\bar{d}_R \sigma^{\mu\nu} \tau^a H^\dagger Q W_{\mu\nu}^a$; $[\mathbf{13}] [\mathbf{23}]$ by $\bar{Q} \tilde{H} \sigma^{\mu\nu} \tau^a u_R W_{\mu\nu}^a$; $\langle \mathbf{13} \rangle [\mathbf{23}]$ by the SM operator $\bar{Q} \gamma^\mu \tau^a Q W_\mu^a$; finally, $[\mathbf{13}] \langle \mathbf{13} \rangle$ is generated by $\bar{d}_R \gamma^\mu u_R H^\dagger \epsilon D_\mu H^*$.

The main idea is that, close to the s-channel mass shell, the 4-point amplitude must factorize into the product of two 3-point amplitudes [37]. To take into account negative momenta we use the analytic continuation

$$|-\mathbf{P}\rangle = |\mathbf{P}\rangle, \quad |-\mathbf{P}] = -|\mathbf{P}], \quad (5.3)$$

which is compatible with the Weyl equations and the definition of momentum in terms of spinor variables. The amplitude with an antineutrino and a charged lepton can be obtained from the one with a neutrino and a charged antilepton (see Eq. (4.3)) simply by complex conjugation, i.e. $\langle ij \rangle^* = [ji]$. The two 3-point amplitudes appearing in Eq. (5.2) are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}[1_W 3_{\bar{e}_j}(-P)_{\nu_i}^I] &= \frac{y_L^{ij}}{M} \langle \mathbf{P}_i^I \mathbf{1} \rangle \langle \mathbf{3}_j \mathbf{1} \rangle + \frac{g U^{ij}}{m_W} \langle \mathbf{P}_i^I \mathbf{1} \rangle [\mathbf{3}_j \mathbf{1}] \\ &\quad - \frac{g_R^{ij}}{m_W} [\mathbf{P}_i^I \mathbf{1}] \langle \mathbf{3}_j \mathbf{1} \rangle - \frac{y_R^{ij}}{M} [\mathbf{P}_i^I \mathbf{1}] [\mathbf{3}_j \mathbf{1}] \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}[P_{\nu_i}^J 2_W 4_{e_k}] &= \frac{y_L^{*ik}}{M} [\mathbf{P}_i^J \mathbf{2}] [\mathbf{4}_k \mathbf{2}] + \frac{g U^{*ik}}{m_W} [\mathbf{P}_i^J \mathbf{2}] \langle \mathbf{4}_k \mathbf{2} \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{g_R^{*ik}}{m_W} \langle \mathbf{P}_i^J \mathbf{2} \rangle [\mathbf{4}_k \mathbf{2}] + \frac{y_R^{*ik}}{M} \langle \mathbf{P}_i^J \mathbf{2} \rangle \langle \mathbf{4}_k \mathbf{2} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

The residue and the factorizable part of the 4-point amplitude can now be computed using the identities listed in Sec. (2). They can be classified in (i) pure SM interactions, (ii) SM/NP interference and (iii) pure NP contribution. The different terms of the 4-point amplitude are the following: the pure SM contribution reads

$$\mathcal{A}_{WWjk}^{\text{SM} \times \text{SM}} = \frac{g^2}{m_W^2} \left(U^T \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} U^* \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M} \overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{SM}}^{jk}, \quad (5.6)$$

the interference between the SM and NP contributions is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{WWjk}^{\text{SM} \times \text{NP}} &= \frac{g}{m_W} \left[\left(U^T \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_L^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M} \overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},1}^{jk} + \left(U^T \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{g_R^*}{m_W} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M} \overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},2}^{jk} \right. \\ &\quad + \left(U^T \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_R^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M} \overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},3}^{jk} + \left(\frac{y_L}{M} \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} U^* \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M} \overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},4}^{jk} \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{g_R}{m_W} \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} U^* \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M} \overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},5}^{jk} + \left(\frac{y_R}{M} \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} U^* \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M} \overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},6}^{jk} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

and finally the pure NP contribution is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{WWjk}^{\text{NP}\times\text{NP}} = & \left[\left(\frac{y_L}{M} \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_L^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},1}^{jk} + \left(\frac{y_L}{M} \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{g_R^*}{m_W} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},2}^{jk} \right. \\
& + \left(\frac{y_L}{M} \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_R^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},3}^{jk} + \left(\frac{g_R}{m_W} \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_L^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},4}^{jk} \\
& + \left(\frac{g_R}{m_W} \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{g_R^*}{m_W} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},5}^{jk} + \left(\frac{g_R}{m_W} \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_R^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},6}^{jk} \\
& + \left(\frac{y_R}{M} \frac{m_\nu}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_L^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},7}^{jk} + \left(\frac{y_R}{M} \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{g_R^*}{m_W} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},8}^{jk} \\
& \left. + \left(\frac{y_R}{M} \frac{1}{s - m_\nu^2} \frac{y_R^*}{M} \right)_{jk} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},9}^{jk} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Explicit expressions for the $\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ terms are presented in App. B. These objects are independent from neutrino masses and depend only on the flavor of the external charged leptons. Notice that the coefficient of the pure SM term in Eq. (5.6) is precisely what is expected from the usual QFT treatment of neutrino oscillations. In our approach, however, we automatically obtain also the contributions due to BSM physics. In this sense, our procedure is similar in spirit to the one of Ref. [7], in which NP effects are considered together with the SM ones. Interestingly, some of the contributions appearing in the SM/NP interference and pure NP term are not only suppressed by the high scale MM , but by the smallness of neutrino masses as well. With the 4-point amplitude at our disposal it is now a simple matter of algebra to compute the oscillation probability in terms of the PMNS matrix and of the coefficients g_R and $y_{L,R}$. Since the computation is standard and can be found in Refs. [3, 7], we will not report it explicitly here. Useful formulas for the computation of the squared matrix element with spinor variables can be found in [44].

6 Conclusions

In this work we have taken the first steps towards the application of on-shell amplitude technique to phenomenological issues. We have chosen to analyze in detail how the formalism of neutrino oscillations in vacuum emerge in this framework, focussing for simplicity on processes involving the W boson. We have first determined the structure of the 3-point amplitude and then used the factorization of higher-point amplitudes into lower-point amplitudes close to the kinematical poles to determine the structure of the 4-point amplitude in which neutrinos are exchanged in the s -channel. We have also discussed how the PMNS matrix emerges in this framework, since no mass terms to be diagonalized and no Lagrangians are available. To the best

of our knowledge, this is the first time that the flavor properties of amplitudes are discussed from a completely on-shell perspective. Our main results are summarized in Eqs. (5.6) – (5.8), in which we show the 4-point amplitudes. This result can be used to compute the neutrino oscillation probability in the standard way. As can be seen, the SM term corresponds to the usual result, as it should. Additional terms appear, however, highlighting an important feature of on-shell amplitude techniques: all possible kinematic structures appear, independently of their UV origin. In this sense, the on-shell approach allows us to perform an all-order computation. We have explicitly determined the UV origin (in operator language) of the different terms appearing in the 3-point amplitude in Sec. 3, finding differences between the Dirac and Majorana neutrino cases. Notice that another virtue of the on-shell formalism is to allow to perform the equivalent of an EFT computation without having to worry about operator basis and operator redundancies.

Our study can be extended in several directions. First of all, neutrino oscillations in matter can be analyzed using the neutrino interactions with the Z boson. Moreover, neutrino oscillations can be studied using as starting point the 4-point amplitude involving two leptons and two quarks or four leptons. This should allow to make a more concrete connection with the physical processes involved in neutrino production and detection. Finally, it would be interesting to determine the experimental bounds on the various coefficients appearing in the 3-point amplitudes solely from the on-shell perspective. We plan to explore some of these issues in forthcoming papers.

Acknowledgments

We thank Renata Zukanovich Funchal for carefully reading the manuscript and for raising interesting points. GFSA acknowledges financial support from FAPESP under contracts 2019/04837-9 and 2020/08096-0. EB acknowledges financial support from FAPESP under contracts 2019/15149-6 and 2019/04837-9. GMS acknowledges financial support from CAPES, Grant No. 88887.601945/2021-00.

A Connection with the usual field theoretical derivation

We now explicitly outline how the spinor helicity variables match into the more common notation in terms of Dirac spinors. Since we are discussing the interactions between fermions and vectors, it will be important to have the explicit expression for the polarization vectors. For a massive spin-1 particle we have [32]

$$\epsilon_\mu(p) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{p} | \sigma_\mu | \mathbf{p} \rangle}{\sqrt{2m}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

while for massless spin-1 particles we can write [32]

$$\epsilon_\mu^{(+)}(p) = \frac{\langle q|\sigma_\mu|p\rangle}{\sqrt{2}\langle pq\rangle}, \quad \epsilon_\mu^{(-)}(p) = \frac{\langle p|\sigma_\mu|q\rangle}{\sqrt{2}[pq]}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where q is an arbitrary a reference momentum. The spinor wave functions read [38]

$$\begin{aligned} u^I(p) &= \begin{pmatrix} |p^I\rangle \\ |p^I\rangle \end{pmatrix}, & \bar{u}^I(p) &= (\langle p^I|, [p^I|), \\ v^I(p) &= \begin{pmatrix} |p^I\rangle \\ -|p^I\rangle \end{pmatrix}, & \bar{v}^I(p) &= (-\langle p^I|, [p^I|), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and we are using the Weyl representation of the Dirac matrices.

For the monopole interactions of massive particles we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}_2\gamma^\mu P_L u_1 \epsilon_\mu(p_3) &= [\mathbf{2}|\bar{\sigma}^\mu|\mathbf{1}\rangle \frac{\langle \mathbf{3}|\sigma_\mu|\mathbf{3}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}m_3} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}\langle \mathbf{13}\rangle[\mathbf{23}]}{m_3}, \\ \bar{v}_2\gamma^\mu P_R u_1 \epsilon_\mu(p_3) &= -[\mathbf{1}|\bar{\sigma}^\mu|\mathbf{2}\rangle \frac{\langle \mathbf{3}|\sigma_\mu|\mathbf{3}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}m_3} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\langle \mathbf{23}\rangle[\mathbf{13}]}{m_3}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where we have used the identity $\bar{\sigma}^{\mu\dot{\beta}\beta}\sigma_{\mu\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = 2\delta_\alpha^\beta\delta_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\dot{\beta}}$. As observed around Eq. (3.5), choosing the coefficient to be inversely proportional to the vector mass ensures the consistency of the massless limit. We see here that the same factor appears from the direct computation of the amplitude.

For dipole interactions we instead obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}_2\sigma^{\mu\nu} P_L u_1 (p_{3\mu}\epsilon_\nu(3) - p_{3\nu}\epsilon_\mu(3)) &= -2\sqrt{2}\langle \mathbf{13}\rangle\langle \mathbf{23}\rangle, \\ \bar{v}_2\sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R u_1 (p_{3\mu}\epsilon_\nu(3) - p_{3\nu}\epsilon_\mu(3)) &= -2\sqrt{2}[\mathbf{13}][\mathbf{23}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

B Explicit formulas for the 4-point amplitudes

We collect in this appendix the explicit definitions of the production/detection amplitudes of Eqs. (5.6) – (5.8):

- The pure SM contribution is

$$(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{SM}}^{jk} = -[\mathbf{13}_j]\langle \mathbf{24}_k\rangle (m_W[\mathbf{12}] - \langle \mathbf{1}|\mathbf{3}_j|\mathbf{2}\rangle), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

- The interference between the SM and the NP contributions is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},1}^{jk} &= -[\mathbf{13}_j][\mathbf{24}_k] (m_W[\mathbf{12}] - \langle \mathbf{1}|\mathbf{3}_j|\mathbf{2}\rangle), \\ (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},2}^{jk} &= -[\mathbf{13}_j][\mathbf{24}_k]\langle \mathbf{12}\rangle, \\ (\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},3}^{jk} &= -[\mathbf{13}_j]\langle \mathbf{24}_k\rangle\langle \mathbf{12}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},4}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle \langle \mathbf{24}_k \rangle (m_W [\mathbf{12}] - \langle \mathbf{1|3}_j|\mathbf{2} \rangle), \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},5}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle \langle \mathbf{24}_k \rangle [\mathbf{12}], \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{int},6}^{jk} &= -[\mathbf{13}_j] \langle \mathbf{24}_k \rangle [\mathbf{12}],
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

- The pure NP contribution reads

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},1}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle [\mathbf{24}_k] (m_W [\mathbf{12}] - \langle \mathbf{1|3}_j|\mathbf{2} \rangle), \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},2}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle [\mathbf{24}_k] \langle \mathbf{12} \rangle, \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},3}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle \langle \mathbf{24}_k \rangle \langle \mathbf{12} \rangle, \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},4}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle [\mathbf{24}_k] [\mathbf{12}], \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},5}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle [\mathbf{24}_k] (m_W \langle \mathbf{12} \rangle - [\mathbf{1|3}_j|\mathbf{2}]), \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},6}^{jk} &= -\langle \mathbf{13}_j \rangle \langle \mathbf{24}_k \rangle (m_W \langle \mathbf{12} \rangle - [\mathbf{1|3}_j|\mathbf{2}]), \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},7}^{jk} &= -[\mathbf{13}_j] [\mathbf{24}_k] [\mathbf{12}], \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},8}^{jk} &= -[\mathbf{13}_j] [\mathbf{24}_k] (m_W \langle \mathbf{12} \rangle - [\mathbf{1|3}_j|\mathbf{2}]), \\
(\mathcal{M}\overline{\mathcal{M}})_{\text{NP},9}^{jk} &= -[\mathbf{13}_j] \langle \mathbf{24}_k \rangle (m_W \langle \mathbf{12} \rangle - [\mathbf{1|3}_j|\mathbf{2}]).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

References

- [1] C. Giunti and K. C. Wook, *Fundamentals of Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics*. Oxford Univ., Oxford, 2007.
- [2] V. Barger, D. Marfatia, and K. Whisnant, *The Physics of Neutrinos*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [3] E. K. Akhmedov and J. Kopp, *Neutrino Oscillations: Quantum Mechanics vs. Quantum Field Theory*, *JHEP* **04** (2010) 008, [[arXiv:1001.4815](#)]. [Erratum: *JHEP* **10**, 052 (2013)].
- [4] *Neutrino Non-Standard Interactions: A Status Report*, vol. 2, 2019.
- [5] W. Altmannshofer, M. Tamaro, and J. Zupan, *Non-standard neutrino interactions and low energy experiments*, *JHEP* **09** (2019) 083, [[arXiv:1812.0277](#)].
- [6] I. Bischer and W. Rodejohann, *General neutrino interactions from an effective field theory perspective*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **947** (2019) 114746, [[arXiv:1905.0869](#)].
- [7] A. Falkowski, M. González-Alonso, and Z. Tabrizi, *Consistent QFT description of non-standard neutrino interactions*, *JHEP* **11** (2020) 048, [[arXiv:1910.0297](#)].
- [8] S. Weinberg, *Baryon and Lepton Nonconserving Processes*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43** (1979) 1566–1570.

- [9] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak, and J. Rosiek, *Dimension-Six Terms in the Standard Model Lagrangian*, *JHEP* **10** (2010) 085, [[arXiv:1008.4884](#)].
- [10] L. Lehman, *Extending the Standard Model Effective Field Theory with the Complete Set of Dimension-7 Operators*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014), no. 12 125023, [[arXiv:1410.4193](#)].
- [11] C. W. Murphy, *Dimension-8 operators in the Standard Model Effective Field Theory*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 174, [[arXiv:2005.0005](#)].
- [12] H.-L. Li, Z. Ren, J. Shu, M.-L. Xiao, J.-H. Yu, and Y.-H. Zheng, *Complete Set of Dimension-8 Operators in the Standard Model Effective Field Theory*, [arXiv:2005.0000](#).
- [13] H.-L. Li, Z. Ren, M.-L. Xiao, J.-H. Yu, and Y.-H. Zheng, *Complete Set of Dimension-9 Operators in the Standard Model Effective Field Theory*, [arXiv:2007.0789](#).
- [14] M. L. Graesser, *Broadening the Higgs boson with right-handed neutrinos and a higher dimension operator at the electroweak scale*, *Phys. Rev. D* **76** (2007) 075006, [[arXiv:0704.0438](#)].
- [15] M. L. Graesser, *Experimental Constraints on Higgs Boson Decays to TeV-scale Right-Handed Neutrinos*, [arXiv:0705.2190](#).
- [16] F. del Aguila, S. Bar-Shalom, A. Soni, and J. Wudka, *Heavy Majorana Neutrinos in the Effective Lagrangian Description: Application to Hadron Colliders*, *Phys. Lett. B* **670** (2009) 399–402, [[arXiv:0806.0876](#)].
- [17] A. Aparici, K. Kim, A. Santamaria, and J. Wudka, *Right-handed neutrino magnetic moments*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 013010, [[arXiv:0904.3244](#)].
- [18] S. Bhattacharya and J. Wudka, *Dimension-seven operators in the standard model with right handed neutrinos*, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016), no. 5 055022, [[arXiv:1505.0526](#)]. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 95, 039904 (2017)].
- [19] Y. Liao and X.-D. Ma, *Operators up to Dimension Seven in Standard Model Effective Field Theory Extended with Sterile Neutrinos*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017), no. 1 015012, [[arXiv:1612.0452](#)].
- [20] B. Henning, X. Lu, T. Melia, and H. Murayama, *2, 84, 30, 993, 560, 15456, 11962, 261485, ...: Higher dimension operators in the SM EFT*, *JHEP* **08** (2017) 016, [[arXiv:1512.0343](#)]. [Erratum: *JHEP* 09, 019 (2019)].
- [21] A. Falkowski, B. Fuks, K. Mawatari, K. Mimasu, F. Riva, and V. Sanz, *Rosetta: an operator basis translator for Standard Model effective field theory*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015), no. 12 583, [[arXiv:1508.0589](#)].
- [22] L. J. Dixon, *A brief introduction to modern amplitude methods*, in *Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics: Particle Physics: The Higgs Boson and Beyond*, pp. 31–67, 2014. [arXiv:1310.5353](#).

- [23] N. Arkani-Hamed, T.-C. Huang, and Y.-t. Huang, *Scattering Amplitudes For All Masses and Spins*, [arXiv:1709.0489](#).
- [24] M.-Z. Chung, Y.-T. Huang, J.-W. Kim, and S. Lee, *The simplest massive S-matrix: from minimal coupling to Black Holes*, *JHEP* **04** (2019) 156, [[arXiv:1812.0875](#)].
- [25] H. Elvang and Y.-t. Huang, *Scattering Amplitudes*, [arXiv:1308.1697](#).
- [26] P. Benincasa and F. Cachazo, *Consistency Conditions on the S-Matrix of Massless Particles*, [arXiv:0705.4305](#).
- [27] D. A. McGady and L. Rodina, *Higher-spin massless S-matrices in four-dimensions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014), no. 8 084048, [[arXiv:1311.2938](#)].
- [28] N. Christensen and B. Field, *Constructive standard model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018), no. 1 016014, [[arXiv:1802.0044](#)].
- [29] Y. Shadmi and Y. Weiss, *Effective Field Theory Amplitudes the On-Shell Way: Scalar and Vector Couplings to Gluons*, *JHEP* **02** (2019) 165, [[arXiv:1809.0964](#)].
- [30] T. Ma, J. Shu, and M.-L. Xiao, *Standard Model Effective Field Theory from On-shell Amplitudes*, [arXiv:1902.0675](#).
- [31] R. Aoude and C. S. Machado, *The Rise of SMEFT On-shell Amplitudes*, *JHEP* **12** (2019) 058, [[arXiv:1905.1143](#)].
- [32] G. Durieux, T. Kitahara, Y. Shadmi, and Y. Weiss, *The electroweak effective field theory from on-shell amplitudes*, *JHEP* **01** (2020) 119, [[arXiv:1909.1055](#)].
- [33] B. Bachu and A. Yellespur, *On-Shell Electroweak Sector and the Higgs Mechanism*, *JHEP* **08** (2020) 039, [[arXiv:1912.0433](#)].
- [34] G. Durieux and C. S. Machado, *Enumerating higher-dimensional operators with on-shell amplitudes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 9 095021, [[arXiv:1912.0882](#)].
- [35] J. Gu and L.-T. Wang, *Sum Rules in the Standard Model Effective Field Theory from Helicity Amplitudes*, [arXiv:2008.0755](#).
- [36] E. K. Akhmedov and A. Y. Smirnov, *Neutrino oscillations: Entanglement, energy-momentum conservation and QFT*, *Found. Phys.* **41** (2011) 1279–1306, [[arXiv:1008.2077](#)].
- [37] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum theory of fields. Vol. 1: Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 6, 2005.
- [38] H. K. Dreiner, H. E. Haber, and S. P. Martin, *Two-component spinor techniques and Feynman rules for quantum field theory and supersymmetry*, *Phys. Rept.* **494** (2010) 1–196, [[arXiv:0812.1594](#)].
- [39] A. Zee, *Group Theory in a Nutshell for Physicists*. In a Nutshell. Princeton University Press, 2016.
- [40] W. Tung, *Group Theory in Physics*. World Scientific, 1985.

- [41] P. Baratella, C. Fernandez, and A. Pomarol, *Renormalization of Higher-Dimensional Operators from On-shell Amplitudes*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **959** (2020) 115155, [[arXiv:2005.0712](#)].
- [42] C. Giganti, S. Lavignac, and M. Zito, *Neutrino oscillations: The rise of the pmns paradigm*, *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* **98** (Jan, 2018) 1–54.
- [43] G. Durieux, T. Kitahara, C. S. Machado, Y. Shadmi, and Y. Weiss, *Constructing massive on-shell contact terms*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 175, [[arXiv:2008.0965](#)].
- [44] N. Christensen, B. Field, A. Moore, and S. Pinto, *Two-, three-, and four-body decays in the constructive standard model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 6 065019, [[arXiv:1909.0916](#)].