

QED radiative corrections for accelerator neutrinos

Oleksandr Tomalak,^{1,2,3,*} Qing Chen,^{1,4,5} Richard J. Hill,^{1,2} and Kevin S. McFarland⁶

¹*University of Kentucky, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Lexington, KY 40506, USA*

²*Fermilab, Theoretical Physics Department, Batavia, IL 60510, USA*

³*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

⁴*Interdisciplinary Center for Theoretical Study, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

⁵*Peng Huanwu Center for Fundamental Theory, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

⁶*University of Rochester, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rochester, NY 14627, USA*

Abstract

Neutrino oscillation experiments at accelerator energies [1–6] aim to establish CP violation in the neutrino sector by measuring the energy-dependent rate of ν_e appearance and ν_μ disappearance in a ν_μ beam. These experiments can precisely measure ν_μ cross sections at near detectors, but ν_e cross sections are poorly constrained and require theoretical inputs. In particular, QED radiative corrections are different for electrons and muons. These corrections are proportional to the small QED coupling, $\alpha \approx 1/137$; however, the large separation of scales between the neutrino energy and the proton mass (\sim GeV), and the electron mass and soft-photon detection thresholds (\sim MeV) introduces large logarithms in the perturbative expansion. The resulting flavor differences exceed the percent-level experimental precision [7–10], and depend on nonperturbative hadronic structure. We establish a novel factorization theorem for exclusive charged-current (anti)neutrino scattering cross sections. The first flavor universal factor depends on hadron and nuclear structure and can be constrained by high-statistics ν_μ data. The second factor is non-universal and contains logarithmic enhancements, but can be calculated exactly in perturbation theory. We demonstrate the cancellation of uncertainties in the predicted ratio of ν_e and ν_μ cross sections. We point out the potential impact of non-collinear energetic photons and the distortion of the visible lepton spectra, and provide precise predictions for fully inclusive observables.

Main

Current and future accelerator neutrino oscillation experiments [1–6] observe primarily muon neutrinos and antineutrinos in their near detectors, but must precisely interpret electron neutrino and antineutrino interactions in far detectors to measure oscillation probabilities. Over much of the available parameter space, discovery of CP violation at next generation experiments will require, as-yet unachieved, percent-level control over ν_e appearance signals. Precise calculation of differences between muon and electron neutrino interactions, including QED radiative corrections, is therefore a critical input to such experiments. In this work, we describe a new computational framework for these calculations, and present results for the basic (anti)neutrino-nucleon charged-current elastic scattering process. We show how important flavor ratios are insensitive to uncertain hadronic and nuclear parameters, so that our results can be applied to experiments with nuclear targets.

The separation of scales between the large neutrino energy and the smaller lepton masses and soft-photon detection thresholds allows us to apply powerful effective field theory techniques to neutrino scattering. In particular, soft-collinear effective theory (SCET) [11–19] establishes the following factorization theorem for the charged-current elastic cross section depicted in Fig. 1 [20]:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dQ^2 dx} \propto H\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\mu}\right) J\left(\frac{m_\ell}{\mu}, \Delta\theta \frac{E_\ell}{m_\ell}, x\right) S\left(\frac{\Delta E}{\mu}, x\right). \quad (1)$$

Here x denotes the fraction of the total of lepton and photon energy carried by the charged lepton, m_ℓ and E_ℓ are the charged lepton mass and energy, and μ is the renormalization scale. The hard scale is $\Lambda \sim M \sim E_\nu \sim Q$, where M is the nucleon mass and Q^2 denotes the momentum transfer between initial and final nucleons. The quantities ΔE and $\Delta\theta$ denote soft energy and angular acceptance parameters. In neutrino detectors, photons are spatially localized when

*Electronic address: tomalak@lanl.gov




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of charged-current elastic event. Photons that are within an angle $\Delta\theta$ of the charged lepton, or that have energy below ΔE , are included in the cross section.

they are sufficiently energetic that e^+e^- pair production is their dominant scattering mechanism. Such a photon is absorbed into the reconstructed electron when its direction with respect to the electron is within the angular size of the electron’s shower in the detector. These two considerations dictate choices for ΔE and $\Delta\theta$, respectively.

The effective theory is constructed as an expansion in powers of the small parameter $\lambda \sim \Delta E/\Lambda$. The lepton mass satisfies $m_\ell \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda}\Lambda$, and the jet angular resolution satisfies $\Delta\theta \lesssim \sqrt{\lambda}$. For the T2K/HyperK, NOvA, and DUNE experiments, appropriate choices are $\Delta E \sim \text{few} \times 10 \text{ MeV}$ and $\Delta\theta \lesssim 10^\circ$, and therefore these conditions are satisfied with the power counting parameter λ at the percent level. The factorization formula is valid up to power corrections of relative size $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$. For numerical evaluations, we include the complete lepton mass dependence for tree-level cross sections. The separate hard (H), jet (J) and soft (S) factors in equation (1) do not contain large perturbative logarithms when evaluated at $\mu \sim \Lambda$, $\mu \sim \sqrt{\lambda}\Lambda$, and $\mu \sim \lambda\Lambda$, respectively. To control large logarithms, we renormalize to a common scale, and include terms enhanced by emission of multiple photons [21–24].

The soft and jet functions are trivial at leading order, $S = 1$ and $J = 1$, and higher orders can be computed in perturbation theory [19, 25–36]; see [20] for details of this calculation. The hard function contains hadronic physics [37–42] and is nonperturbative.

Our general exclusive observable, depicted in Fig. 1 and described by equation (1), is defined to contain all photons that have energy below ΔE or are within angle $\Delta\theta$ of the charged lepton direction. We focus on two important cases relevant for neutrino experiments. For electron flavor events, energetic collinear photons are reconstructed together with the electron. Thus the “jet observable”, with appropriate choice of ΔE and $\Delta\theta$, applies. For muon flavor, collinear photons are only a small fraction of all photons above the soft-photon energy threshold, both because the effective $\Delta\theta$ for muons in realistic detectors is smaller and because angles of typical photons, $\sim \frac{m_\ell}{E_\ell + m_\ell}$, are larger. Thus for muon flavor events, the formal limit $\Delta\theta \rightarrow 0$ is a good approximation, i.e., only soft photons with energy below ΔE are included in the observable.

Results for Flavor Ratios

The ratio of electron to muon cross sections is a critical ingredient in neutrino oscillation analyses. We display this ratio in Fig. 2. For the exclusive case, we focus on our default observables with electron plus collinear and soft radiation, and muon plus soft-only radiation. For comparison, we display also the result when only soft radiation is included for the electron. In either case, dependence on hadronic physics is identical for e and μ at the same value of hadronic momentum transfer, according to equation (1), leaving only a small perturbative uncertainty on the ratio.

As explained in the Methods section below, besides the exclusive case we consider inclusive observables that include all photon events in the cross section. For this case, we focus on the blue dash-double-dotted curve with the filled band in Fig. 2, corresponding to our default inclusive observables: including all photon events in the cross section, but reconstructing Q^2 using only collinear and soft radiation for the electron, and only soft radiation for the muon. For comparison, we also display in Fig. 2 the results when both electron and muon events are reconstructed using only soft radiation (E_ℓ spectrum), and when both are reconstructed using all radiation ($E_\ell + E_\gamma$ spectrum). Integrating over kinematics, we present the ratio of the total electron to muon cross sections for two kinematic setups without cuts on the lepton energy in Table I.




FIG. 2: Radiatively corrected ratio of ν_e versus ν_μ cross section for exclusive observables (left plots) and inclusive observables (right plots). The top plots are for neutrino scattering, and the bottom for antineutrino scattering. For exclusive observables, the ratio of cross sections with soft photons of energy below $\Delta E = 10$ MeV is represented by black dash-dotted lines. The tree-level ratio is shown by blue solid lines. Red dashed lines with a legend “soft and collinear photons” represent the ratio of jet observable including photons in $\Delta\theta = 10^\circ$ cone for ν_e scattering to the observable excluding collinear photons for ν_μ scattering. For inclusive observables, we display the E_ℓ spectrum (green dotted lines), $E_\ell + E_\gamma$ spectrum (red dashed lines), and “energy in cone” spectrum (blue dash-double-dotted lines and filled band). For the “energy in cone” spectrum, Q^2 is reconstructed from energy in $\Delta\theta = 10^\circ$ cone for electron flavor and from lepton energy for muon flavor.

Implications for Neutrino Oscillation Experiments

The precise predictions for fully inclusive cross sections in Table I have important implications for the T2K and NOvA experiments: the total cross section for electron neutrino charged-current quasielastic (CCQE) events is precisely predicted in terms of observed muon neutrino CCQE events. T2K and NOvA currently assume 2% uncertainties on the extrapolation from muon (anti)neutrino to electron (anti)neutrino due to radiative corrections. In place of this assumption, our results provide a precise prediction, with reduced uncertainty. We also demonstrate that radiative correction uncertainty for both exclusive and inclusive observables can be controlled to the higher precision needed

	E_ν , GeV		$\left(\frac{\sigma_e}{\sigma_\mu} - 1\right)_{\text{LO}}$, %	$\frac{\sigma_e}{\sigma_\mu} - 1$, %
T2K/HyperK	0.6	ν	2.47 ± 0.06	$2.54 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.09$
		$\bar{\nu}$	2.04 ± 0.08	$1.82 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.23$
NOvA/DUNE	2.0	ν	0.322 ± 0.006	$0.51 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.18$
		$\bar{\nu}$	0.394 ± 0.003	$0.23 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.11$

TABLE I: Inclusive electron to muon cross-section ratios for neutrinos and antineutrinos without kinematic cuts. Uncertainties at leading order are from vector and axial nucleon form factors. For the final result, we include an additional hadronic uncertainty from the one-loop correction to the first uncertainty, and provide a second uncertainty as the magnitude of the radiative correction.

by the future DUNE and HyperK experiments. Before this work, the assumptions made by the current and future experiments were not justified by rigorous theoretical evaluation.

Our calculations also validate another implicit or explicit [43] assumption of modern experiments: that the probability for a muon to be accompanied by a collinear photon which is so energetic as to confuse a particle identification algorithm looking for a penetrating muon track is very small: less than a few $\times 10^{-4}$ for NOvA and DUNE, and less than 10^{-4} for T2K/HyperK.

Experiments do not measure neutrino interactions in a way that is truly inclusive of final state photons. The rate for events with non-collinear hard photons is between one percent and several percent of the total event rate, which is larger than the planned precision of future experiments. The experiments currently assume that non-collinear hard photons are absent, but such photons could disrupt event selection, particularly the separation of electrons from neutral pions or the exclusive identification of quasielastic events. Another effect of real photon radiation is the distortion of the reconstructed lepton energy spectrum, resulting in an enhancement of lower momentum leptons and depletion of higher momentum ones, cf. Fig. 2. Because the inclusion of real photons is different for muon and electron reconstruction, this may change the relative efficiency of reconstructing the different neutrino flavors. Our results can be used to precisely account for these effects.

Current data on neutrino interactions do not have the precision to validate or challenge our precise calculations because of the sparse data on electron neutrino and anti-neutrino scattering at these energies [44–48]. Experiments must therefore rely on this and other theoretical calculations to determine the effects of radiative corrections. Such effects can be potentially constrained by recent and forthcoming measurements with electrons [49, 50] and muons.

Methods

Form Factors in the Hard Function

In the evaluation of the hard function, we use form factors and uncertainties extracted from other data [51, 52] for the tree-level contributions [38], and a form factor insertion model [53–56] with conservative uncertainties for the one-loop contributions. The form factor insertion ansatz dresses point-particle Feynman diagrams with onshell form factors at hadronic vertices. A naive implementation of the ansatz violates electromagnetic gauge invariance; we modify the electroweak vertex by suitable “counterterms” to avoid spurious collinear singularities. For the one-loop hard function, electromagnetic form factors are represented by dipoles with mass parameters varied as $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow (1 \pm 0.1)\Lambda^2$. Uncertainties due to the insertion of onshell hadronic vertices and the neglect of inelastic intermediate states are estimated by a simple ansatz that adds the neutron onshell vertex to each of the neutron and proton electromagnetic vertices.

Exclusive Jet Observables

We must specify which real photons are to be included in the observable. While this specification depends in detail on detector capabilities and analysis strategies, an important class of observables is determined as follows: (1) soft radiation below ΔE is unobserved (but contributes to the cross section), independent of angle with respect to charged lepton direction; (2) collinear radiation accompanying electrons, within an angle $\Delta\theta$ of the electron direction, is included as part of the same electromagnetic shower; (3) collinear radiation accompanying muons is excluded. Figure 3 displays the ratio of the cross section to the leading-order (LO) result, $d\sigma/d\sigma_{\text{LO}}$, for default values $\Delta E = 10$ MeV and $\Delta\theta = 10^\circ$, as a function of nucleon momentum transfer Q^2 . In the electron case, we compare our default jet observable (including energetic radiation within 10° cone) to the soft-photon-only observable; the large, $\sim 15\%$, correction in this case results from a logarithmic enhancement $\sim \ln(E_\nu/m_e)\ln(E_\nu/\Delta E)$. The factorization theorem of equation (1) enforces a cancellation of hadronic uncertainty in the ratio of the corrected cross section to tree level, up to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$, resulting in the small uncertainty for the cross sections in Fig. 3 (after the NLO resummation analysis, perturbative uncertainty is at or below permille level). For comparison, the plots also show the tree-level uncertainty on the cross section due to uncertain (dominantly axial-vector) nucleon form factors. This uncertainty cancels in flavor ratios.

Specification of Inclusive Observables

The above “exclusive” observables incorporate real photon radiation that is either unobservable by the detector (photon below ΔE in energy) or indistinguishable from the charged lepton (photon above ΔE in energy but within angle $\Delta\theta$ of the electron) [21, 57–59]. Other hard photons are excluded from the cross section. Oscillation experiments




FIG. 3: Radiatively corrected cross-section ratio to the tree-level result in neutrino scattering for exclusive observables. The legend corresponds to left plots in Fig. 2. The tree-level uncertainty is represented by green dotted line as a deviation of the ratio from unity. The left plot is for electron flavor and the right plot is for muon flavor.




FIG. 4: Radiatively corrected cross-section ratio to the tree-level result in neutrino scattering for inclusive observables. The legend corresponds to right plots in Fig. 2. The left plot is for electron flavor and the right plot is for muon flavor.

such as NOvA and DUNE that attempt to identify all neutrino charged-current interactions and determine neutrino energy by measuring the sum of lepton and recoil energy are likely to include such events. Non-collinear hard photons introduce new hadronic structure beyond the hard function appearing in equation (1). We estimate this effect by extending the form factor insertion ansatz to describe real hard photon emission, employing the same gauge-invariant model as for the exclusive process. We retain the complete charged lepton mass dependence for the inclusive cross-section calculation.

Radiative corrections to the total cross section and inclusive $E_\ell + E_\gamma$ spectrum are free from soft or collinear enhancements and mass-dependent contributions are suppressed as m_ℓ^2/Λ^2 , $m_\ell^2 \ln(m_\ell/\Lambda)/\Lambda^2$. The E_ℓ and energy-in-cone spectra (for small $\Delta\theta$) at a given Q_{rec}^2 receive collinear enhancements; in a photon splitting approximation these contributions arise from primary leptons emitted at smaller Q^2 . To illustrate the impact of radiative corrections on kinematic reconstruction, we compute the spectrum with respect to several different variables (“reconstructed Q^2 ”):

$$Q_{\text{rec}}^2 = 2M(E_\nu - E_\ell - E_X) \quad (2)$$

where for events without energetic photons we have $E_X = 0$, and for events with an energetic photon of energy E_γ we take (i) $E_X = 0$ (“ E_ℓ spectrum”); (ii) $E_X = E_\gamma$ when the photon is within $\Delta\theta = 10^\circ$ of the electron, and $E_X = 0$ otherwise (“energy in cone”); or (iii) $E_X = E_\gamma$ (“ $E_\ell + E_\gamma$ spectrum”).

The results are displayed in Fig. 4 for neutrino scattering and in Fig. 5 for antineutrino scattering. There are several notable features of these curves. First, let us compare to the exclusive case displayed in Fig. 3. For electrons, the red dashed curves in the figures both represent spectra with respect to hadronic momentum transfer; the \sim few % larger cross section in Fig. 4 corresponds to the additional contribution from non-collinear energetic photons. Similarly




FIG. 5: Same as Fig. 4 but for antineutrino scattering.

for muons, the dash-dotted black curve in Fig. 3 and the red dashed curve in Fig. 4 both represent spectra with respect to hadronic momentum transfer, and their difference is identified with the contribution of energetic photons (of any angle). Second, although the three curves for ν_e in Figs. 4 and 5 (or two curves for ν_μ) integrate to the same total cross section, they differ significantly in their dependence on Q_{rec}^2 . It is essential to account for the correct kinematic dependence of radiative corrections when analysis cuts and acceptance effects are incorporated in practical experiments.

Consideration of Subleading and Nuclear Effects

We have developed formalism and computed radiative corrections to exclusive and inclusive observables of neutrino-nucleon scattering, presenting flavor ratios and ratios of cross sections to leading-order results. Neglected isospin-violating [60–68] and higher-order perturbative and power corrections impact cross sections at or below the permille level.

Although the study was performed with neutrino-nucleon scattering, important cross-section ratios are insensitive to the explicit form of the nonperturbative hard function and similar conclusions are valid for scattering on nuclei. First, the radiative corrections to the exclusive cross sections in Fig. 3, and the corresponding ratios in Fig. 2, are dominated by large perturbative logarithms that are independent of nuclear or hadronic parameters. Second, for the inclusive cross sections displayed in Table I, constraints on the lepton mass dependence [58, 59] imply small modifications to radiative corrections from nuclear effects. An explicit evaluation within the standard impulse approximation accounting for nucleon binding energy, initial state Fermi motion, and final state Pauli blocking yields corrections to σ_e/σ_μ of order 10^{-4} at $E_\nu = 2$ GeV, and of order 10^{-3} at $E_\nu = 0.6$ GeV, already contained in the hadronic error bars of Table I.

Extensions to Future Work

Applications to neutrino energy reconstruction, radiative corrections with pion and resonance production, and the inclusion of Coulomb and nuclear effects to general exclusive and inclusive observables, will be investigated in future work.

-
- [1] K. Abe et al. (T2K), Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **659**, 106 (2011), 1106.1238.
 - [2] K. Abe et al. (T2K), Nature **580**, 339 (2020), [Erratum: Nature 583, E16 (2020)], 1910.03887.
 - [3] D. S. Ayres et al. (NOvA) (2007).
 - [4] M. A. Acero et al. (NOvA), Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 151803 (2019), 1906.04907.
 - [5] B. Abi et al. (DUNE) (2020), 2002.03005.
 - [6] K. Abe et al. (Hyper-Kamiokande), PTEP **2015**, 053C02 (2015), 1502.05199.
 - [7] V. Sudakov, Sov. Phys. JETP **3**, 65 (1956).

- [8] A. De Rujula, R. Petronzio, and A. Savoy-Navarro, Nucl. Phys. B **154**, 394 (1979).
- [9] M. Day and K. S. McFarland, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 053003 (2012), 1206.6745.
- [10] M. Fukugita and T. Kubota, Acta Phys. Polon. B **35**, 1687 (2004), hep-ph/0403149.
- [11] C. W. Bauer, S. Fleming, and M. E. Luke, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 014006 (2000), hep-ph/0005275.
- [12] C. W. Bauer, S. Fleming, D. Pirjol, and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 114020 (2001), hep-ph/0011336.
- [13] C. W. Bauer and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Lett. B **516**, 134 (2001), hep-ph/0107001.
- [14] C. W. Bauer, D. Pirjol, and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 054022 (2002), hep-ph/0109045.
- [15] J. Chay and C. Kim, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 114016 (2002), hep-ph/0201197.
- [16] M. Beneke, A. P. Chapovsky, M. Diehl, and T. Feldmann, Nucl. Phys. B **643**, 431 (2002), hep-ph/0206152.
- [17] R. J. Hill and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **657**, 229 (2003), hep-ph/0211018.
- [18] T. Becher, A. Broggio, and A. Ferroglia, Introduction to Soft-Collinear Effective Theory, vol. 896 (Springer, 2015), 1410.1892.
- [19] R. J. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 013001 (2017), 1605.02613.
- [20] O. Tomalak, Q. Chen, R. J. Hill, and K. S. McFarland (2021), in preparation.
- [21] D. Yennie, S. C. Frautschi, and H. Suura, Annals Phys. **13**, 379 (1961).
- [22] S. Mukhi and G. F. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B **206**, 221 (1982).
- [23] G. Curci and M. Greco, Phys. Lett. B **79**, 406 (1978).
- [24] A. V. Smilga, Nucl. Phys. B **161**, 449 (1979).
- [25] G. Burgers, Phys. Lett. B **164**, 167 (1985).
- [26] G. Korchemsky and A. Radyushkin, Nucl. Phys. B **283**, 342 (1987).
- [27] B. A. Kniehl, Phys. Lett. B **237**, 127 (1990).
- [28] W. Kilian, P. Manakos, and T. Mannel, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 1321 (1993).
- [29] A. Hoang, J. H. Kuhn, and T. Teubner, Nucl. Phys. B **452**, 173 (1995), hep-ph/9505262.
- [30] P. Mastrolia and E. Remiddi, Nucl. Phys. B **664**, 341 (2003), hep-ph/0302162.
- [31] W. Bernreuther, R. Bonciani, T. Gehrmann, R. Heinesch, T. Leineweber, P. Mastrolia, and E. Remiddi, Nucl. Phys. B **706**, 245 (2005), hep-ph/0406046.
- [32] T. Becher and K. Melnikov, JHEP **06**, 084 (2007), 0704.3582.
- [33] T. Becher and M. Neubert, JHEP **06**, 081 (2009), [Erratum: JHEP 11, 024 (2013)], 0903.1126.
- [34] T. Becher and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 125004 (2009), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 80, 109901 (2009)], 0904.1021.
- [35] A. Arbuzov and T. Kopylova, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, 603 (2015), 1510.06497.
- [36] O. Tomalak and R. J. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 033006 (2020), 1907.03379.
- [37] S. Galster, H. Klein, J. Moritz, K. Schmidt, D. Wegener, and J. Bleckwenn, Nucl. Phys. B **32**, 221 (1971).
- [38] C. Llewellyn Smith, Phys. Rept. **3**, 261 (1972).
- [39] G. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2157 (1980).
- [40] S. Kopecky, P. Riehs, J. Harvey, and N. Hill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2427 (1995).
- [41] S. Kopecky, M. Krenn, P. Riehs, S. Steiner, J. A. Harvey, N. Hill, and M. Pernicka, Phys. Rev. C **56**, 2229 (1997).
- [42] J. Kelly, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 068202 (2004).
- [43] K. Iwamoto, Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester (2017), URL <http://hdl.handle.net/1802/33290>.
- [44] J. Blietschau et al. (Gargamelle), Nucl. Phys. B **133**, 205 (1978).
- [45] K. Abe et al. (T2K), Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 241803 (2014), 1407.7389.
- [46] J. Wolcott et al. (MINERvA), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 081802 (2016), 1509.05729.
- [47] K. Abe et al. (T2K), Phys. Rev. D **91**, 112010 (2015), 1503.08815.
- [48] K. Abe et al. (T2K), JHEP **10**, 114 (2020), 2002.11986.
- [49] A. Papadopoulou et al. (electrons for neutrinos), Phys. Rev. D **103**, 113003 (2021), 2009.07228.
- [50] R. Cruz-Torres et al. (Jefferson Lab Hall A Tritium), Phys. Lett. B **797**, 134890 (2019), 1902.06358.
- [51] A. S. Meyer, M. Betancourt, R. Gran, and R. J. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 113015 (2016), 1603.03048.
- [52] K. Borah, R. J. Hill, G. Lee, and O. Tomalak, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 074012 (2020), 2003.13640.
- [53] L. C. Maximon and J. A. Tjon, Phys. Rev. C **62**, 054320 (2000), nucl-th/0002058.
- [54] P. Blunden, W. Melnitchouk, and J. Tjon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 142304 (2003), nucl-th/0306076.
- [55] K. M. Graczyk, Phys. Lett. B **732**, 315 (2014), 1308.5581.
- [56] O. Tomalak and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 013006 (2014), 1405.1600.
- [57] F. Bloch and A. Nordsieck, Phys. Rev. **52**, 54 (1937).
- [58] T. Kinoshita, J. Math. Phys. **3**, 650 (1962).
- [59] T. Lee and M. Nauenberg, Phys. Rev. **133**, B1549 (1964).
- [60] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **112**, 1375 (1958).
- [61] R. Behrends and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **4**, 186 (1960).
- [62] V. Dmitrasinovic and S. Pollock, Phys. Rev. C **52**, 1061 (1995), hep-ph/9504414.
- [63] H. Shiomi, Nucl. Phys. A **603**, 281 (1996), hep-ph/9601329.
- [64] G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C **57**, 1492 (1998), nucl-th/9711036.
- [65] J. Govaerts and J.-L. Lucio-Martinez, Nucl. Phys. A **678**, 110 (2000), nucl-th/0004056.
- [66] K. Minamisono et al., Phys. Rev. C **65**, 015501 (2002).
- [67] B. Kubis and R. Lewis, Phys. Rev. C **74**, 015204 (2006), nucl-th/0605006.
- [68] R. Lewis, Eur. Phys. J. A **32**, 409 (2007), nucl-th/0608079.

Acknowledgments

We thank Clarence Wret for checking the leading order calculations presented here against generator calculations, Kaushik Borah for an independent validation of antineutrino-proton cross-section expression, Emanuele Mereghetti and Ryan Plestid for discussions. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, under Awards DE-SC0019095 and DE-SC0008475. Fermilab is operated by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the United States Department of Energy. OT acknowledges support by the Visiting Scholars Award Program of the Universities Research Association, theory groups at Fermilab and Institute for Nuclear Physics at JGU Mainz for warm hospitality. OT is supported by the US Department of Energy through the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by Triad National Security, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration of U.S. Department of Energy (Contract No. 89233218CNA000001). This research is funded by LANL's Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD/PRD) program under project number 20210968PRD4. QC acknowledges KITP Graduate Fellow program supported by the Heising-Simons Foundation, the Simons Foundation, and National Science Foundation Grant No. NSF PHY-1748958. RJH acknowledges support from the Neutrino Theory Network at Fermilab. KSM acknowledges support from a Fermilab Intensity Frontier Fellowship during the early stages of this work, and from the University of Rochester's Steven Chu Professorship in Physics.