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- Neutron-antineutron oscillation matrix elements
- Quark momentum and spin

Quark contributions to the nucleon momentum
Nucleon spin puzzle and quark spin and angular momentum

## Hadron Correlators in Lattice QCD

Lattice Field Theory $\Leftrightarrow$ Numerical evaluation of the Path Integral

$$
\begin{gathered}
(I D+m) \cdot q=0 \\
\text { quark motion in } \\
\text { gluon background }
\end{gathered}
$$



Each quark line $=(\not D+m)^{-1} \cdot \psi$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \langle N(T) \mathcal{O}(\tau) N(0)\rangle=\sum_{n, m} Z_{m} e^{-E_{n}(T-\tau)}\langle n| \mathcal{O}|m\rangle e^{-E_{m} \tau} Z_{n}^{*} \\
& \underset{T \rightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} Z_{00} e^{-M_{N} T}[\left\langle P^{\prime}\right| \mathcal{O}|P\rangle+\mathcal{O}(\underbrace{e^{-\Delta E_{10} T}, e^{-\Delta E_{10} \tau}, e^{-\Delta E_{10}(T-\tau)}}_{\text {excited states }})]
\end{aligned}
$$

Excited states contribute to correlators and may (and do) bias results

## Computational Challenges in Lattice QCD

Taking limit $V \rightarrow \infty, \quad a \rightarrow 0, \quad m_{\pi} \rightarrow m_{\pi}^{\text {phys }}$ is challenging

- MC noise is determined by the lightest degree of freedom

$$
\left|\left(I D+m_{q}\right)_{x, y}^{-1}\right| \sim e^{-\frac{1}{2} m_{\pi}|x-y|}
$$

for N quarks, $\quad$ Noise $\sim \exp \left[-\frac{N m_{\pi}}{2} t\right]$
for nucleons, $\quad \frac{\text { Signal }}{\text { Noise }} \sim \exp \left[-\left(m_{N}-\frac{3}{2} m_{\pi}\right) t\right]$
[Lepage (1989)]


- finite volume effects

$$
\text { require box size } \quad L \gtrsim(4 \ldots 6) \cdot \frac{1}{m_{\pi}}
$$

as $m_{\pi} \rightarrow$ physical, excited states become denser
Excited state corrections to the ground state:

$$
\sim \mathcal{O}\left(\left|Z_{10}\right|^{2} e^{-\Delta E_{10} T}\right)
$$

Addressing excited states requires
(e) Multi-state fits
(e) Variational methods


## Nucleon Electromagnetic Form Factors

$$
\langle P+q| \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu} q|P\rangle=\bar{U}_{P+q}\left[F_{1}\left(Q^{2}\right) \gamma^{\mu}+F_{2}\left(Q^{2}\right) \frac{i \sigma^{\mu \nu} q_{\nu}}{2 M_{N}}\right] U_{P}
$$

○ JLab@12GeV : explore form factors at $\mathrm{Q}^{2} \geqslant 10 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$

- $\left(F_{1} / F_{2}\right)$ scaling at $\mathrm{Q}^{2}->\infty$
- $\left(G_{E} / G_{M}\right)$ dependence up to $Q^{2}=18 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
- $u$-, $d$-flavor contributions to form factorsProton radius puzzle: $7 \sigma$ difference
- JLab pRAD experiment
- MUSE@PSI : $\mathrm{e}^{ \pm} / \mu^{ \pm}$-scattering off the proton

[Research Mgmt. Plan for SBS(JLab Hall A)]



## Nucleon (p-n) Form Factors vs Pheno



$$
\langle P+q| \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu} q|P\rangle=\bar{U}_{P+q}\left[F_{1}\left(Q^{2}\right) \gamma^{\mu}+F_{2}\left(Q^{2}\right) \frac{i \sigma^{\mu \nu} q_{\nu}}{2 M_{N}}\right] U_{P}
$$

Lattice calculations with $\mathrm{m} \pi=149 \mathrm{MeV}$ [J.Green, SNS, et al 1209.1687; PLB734:290] vs phenomenology [W.M.Alberico et al, PRC79:065204(2009)]



Elastic scattering with electromagnetic probes $e^{ \pm}, \mu^{ \pm}$

## Proton Form Factors vs Pheno (conn. only)



$$
\langle P+q| \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu} q|P\rangle=\bar{U}_{P+q}\left[F_{1}\left(Q^{2}\right) \gamma^{\mu}+F_{2}\left(Q^{2}\right) \frac{i \sigma^{\mu \nu} q_{\nu}}{2 M_{N}}\right] U_{P}
$$

Lattice calculations with $\mathrm{m} \pi=149 \mathrm{MeV}$ [J.Green, SNS, et al 1209.1687; PLB734:290] vs phenomenology
[W.M.Alberico et al, PRC79:065204(2009)]



Elastic scattering with electromagnetic probes $e^{ \pm}, \mu^{ \pm}$

No disconnected part! (negligible in this case)

## Dirac Radius vs. $\mathrm{m}_{\pi}$ and Proton Size Puzzle

$F_{1}^{p-n}\left(Q^{2}\right)=F_{1}^{u-d}\left(Q^{2}\right) \approx 1-\frac{1}{6} Q^{2}\left\langle r_{1}^{2}\right\rangle^{u-d}+O\left(Q^{2}\right)$


ChPT predicts divergence $\sim \log m_{\pi}^{2}$

$$
G_{E p}\left(Q^{2}\right) \approx 1-\frac{1}{6} Q^{2}\left\langle r_{E}^{2}\right\rangle^{p}+O\left(Q^{4}\right)
$$


[MuSE white-paper, 1303.2160]
Issues with e-p experiments?

- underestimated combined error
- use $Q^{2}$ fits up to $1 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$


## Dirac Radius vs. $\mathrm{m}_{\pi}$ and Proton Size Puzzle

$F_{1}^{p-n}\left(Q^{2}\right)=F_{1}^{u-d}\left(Q^{2}\right) \approx 1-\frac{1}{6} Q^{2}\left\langle r_{1}^{2}\right\rangle^{u-d}+O\left(Q^{2}\right)$

$$
G_{E p}\left(Q^{2}\right) \approx 1-\frac{1}{6} Q^{2}\left\langle r_{E}^{2}\right\rangle^{p}+O\left(Q^{4}\right)
$$


s with e-p experiments? iderestimated combined error se $Q^{2}$ fits up to $1 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$

## Isovector Magnetic Moment vs. $\mathbf{m}_{\pi}$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\langle P+q| \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu} q|P\rangle=\bar{U}_{P+q}\left[F_{1}\left(Q^{2}\right) \gamma^{\mu}+F_{2}\left(Q^{2}\right) \frac{i \sigma^{\mu \nu} q_{\nu}}{2 M_{N}}\right] U_{P} \\
F_{2}^{u-d}\left(Q^{2}\right) \approx \kappa_{v}\left[1-\frac{1}{6} Q^{2}\left\langle r_{2}^{2}\right\rangle^{v}+\mathcal{O}\left(Q^{4}\right)\right]
\end{gathered}
$$



$m_{\pi}=149 \mathrm{MeV} N_{f}=2+1$ clover-imp.Wilson [J.R.Green, SNS et al (LHPC)]
$\mathrm{F}_{2}(0)$ value is extrapolated from $Q_{\text {min }} \approx 0.05 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \quad F_{2}\left(Q^{2}\right)=\frac{\kappa}{\left(1+Q^{2} / M^{2}\right)^{2}}$
Larger $L_{s}$, smaller $Q_{\text {min }}^{2}$ are desirable
OR use twisted boundary conditions

## Expansion in Boundary Conditions

Derivative of correlators w.r.t. momentum $=$ infinitesimal BC twisting
Rome method: (Phys. Lett. B 718, 589 (2012) [arXiv:1208.5914])

$\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial p_{k}} G(x, y ; \vec{p})\right|_{\vec{p}=0}=-i \sum_{z} G(x, z) \Gamma_{V}^{k} G(z, y)$
Physical point $m_{\pi}=134 \mathrm{MeV}$

[N.Hasan, J.Green, S.Meinel et at (LHPc), Lattice 2016]

## Strangeness in EM form factors

Strange quark contribution to EM: the next after light quarks

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{E, M}^{p, \gamma} & =\frac{2}{3} G_{E, M}^{u}-\frac{1}{3}\left(G_{E, M}^{d}+G_{E, M}^{s}\right) \\
G_{E, M}^{n, \gamma} & =\frac{2}{3} G_{E, M}^{d}-\frac{1}{3}\left(G_{E, M}^{u}+G_{E, M}^{s}\right) \\
G_{E, M}^{p, Z} & =\left(1-\frac{8}{3} s_{W}^{2}\right) G_{E, M}^{u}+\left(-1+\frac{4}{3} s_{W}^{2}\right)\left(G_{E, M}^{d}+G_{E, M}^{s}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$G_{E, M}^{s}$ are measured e.g. in e-p elastic scattering asymmetry (SAMPLE, HAPPEX, G0, A4) from


## Disconnected Contractions for Nucleon FF's



Calculation with<br>$\mathrm{m} \pi=319 \mathrm{MeV}$<br>\[ \begin{gathered} (USQCD/JLab lattices)<br>\left|G_{E, M}^{s, u / d(d i s c)}\right| \lesssim 1 \%\left|G_{E, M}\right| \end{gathered} \]



Strange contributions to EM radii and magnetic moment of the proton

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(r_{E}^{2}\right)^{2}=-0.00535(89)(56)(113)(20) \mathrm{fm}^{2} \\
&\left(r_{M}^{2}\right)^{2}=-0.0147(61)(28)(34)(5) \mathrm{fm}^{2} \\
& \mu^{s}=-0.0184(45)(12)(32)(1) \mu_{N}^{\text {lat }} \\
& \text { [J. Green, S. Meinel, et al (LHPc) } \\
& \text { PRD92:031501(2014)] }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Strange Form Factors : PVES vs. Lattice



HAPPEX, G0, A4 data
[PRL108:102001(2012)]
vs.
Lattice QCD ( $m_{\pi}=317 \mathrm{MeV}$ )
[J. Green, S. Meinel, et al (LHPc)
PRD92:031501(2014)]
$\left(G_{E}^{s}+\eta G_{M}^{s}\right) \sim \begin{aligned} & \text { Strange part in the elastic e-p scattering } \\ & \text { asymmetry (forward angles) }\end{aligned}$
$\eta=\frac{\tau G_{M}^{p}}{\epsilon G_{E}^{p}} \simeq \frac{Q^{2}}{G e V^{2}}$

## Magnetic moment from strange quarks

Data for strange \& light quarks: use PQChPT-inspired linear extrapolation in $\left(\mathrm{m}_{\text {loop }}\right)^{2} \sim\left(m_{\text {light }}+m_{\text {disconn }}\right)$
[J. Green, S. Meinel, et al (LHPc) PRD92:031501(2014)]


## Nucleon Axial Charge and Form Factors

$$
\langle P+q| \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5} q|P\rangle=\bar{U}_{P+q}\left[G_{A}\left(Q^{2}\right) \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5}+G_{P}\left(Q^{2}\right) \frac{\gamma^{5} q^{\mu}}{2 M_{N}}\right] U_{P}
$$

- Axial form factor $G_{A}\left(Q^{2}\right)$
- Interaction with neutrinos: MiniBooNEInduced pseudoscalar form factor $G_{p}\left(Q^{2}\right)$
- Charged pion electroproduction
- Muon capture (MuCAP): $g_{p} \sim G_{p}\left(Q^{2}=0.88 m_{\mu}{ }^{2}\right)$Strange axial form factor $G_{A}^{s}\left(Q^{2}\right)$ : studied at MiniBooNE


[Andreev et al (muCap), PRL110:012504(2012)]


## Axial Charge

Neutron $\beta$-decay, forward limit of axial form factor

$$
\langle p| \bar{u} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5}|n\rangle=g_{A} \bar{u}_{p} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5} u_{n}
$$



Lattice data summary
[S.Collins, LATTICE 2016]

## Axial Charge

Neutron $\beta$-decay, forward limit of axial form factor $G_{A}\left(Q^{2}\right) \longrightarrow G_{A}(0)=g_{A}$

$$
\langle p| \bar{u} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5}|n\rangle=g_{A} \bar{u}_{p} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5} u_{n}
$$



## Nucleon Axial Form Factor $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{A}}\left(\mathrm{Q}^{2}\right)$

$$
\langle P+q| \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5} q|P\rangle=\bar{U}_{P+q}\left[G_{A}\left(Q^{2}\right) \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5}+G_{P}\left(Q^{2}\right) \frac{\gamma^{5} q^{\mu}}{2 M_{N}}\right] U_{P}
$$


[C.Alexandrou (ETMC), 1303.5979]

## Nucleon Axial Radius



- v-scattering off $p, n$,nuclei
- $\pi^{ \pm}$electroproduction
- $v$-scattering off ${ }^{16} \mathrm{O},{ }^{12} \mathrm{C}$
$G_{A}\left(Q^{2}\right) \simeq \frac{g_{A}}{\left(1+Q^{2} / M_{A}^{2}\right)^{2}}$
- $5 \%$ discrepancy between averages of $v$-scattering and $\pi^{ \pm}$production [V.Bernard et al, JPhysG28:R1-35(2001)]
- Reliance on dipole fits leads to underestimated errors [B.Bhattacharya, R.Hill, G.Paz, PRD]


## Nucleon Pseudoscalar Form Factor $\mathrm{Gp}_{\mathrm{p}}\left(\mathrm{Q}^{2}\right)$



- Is Gp dominated by the pion pole?




## $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{p}}$ Form Factor and $\mu$-capture




Muon-capture coupling $g_{P}^{*}=\frac{m_{\mu}}{m_{N}} g_{P}\left(0.88 m_{\mu}^{2}\right)$
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{f}}=2$ calculation with Wilson-Clover fermions
[G.Bali et al (RQCD), PRD91:054501]
pion-pole extrapolation to extract $g_{p}{ }^{*}$

$$
\frac{m_{\mu}}{m_{N}} g_{P}\left(Q^{2}\right)=\frac{b_{1}}{Q^{2}+m_{\pi}^{2}}+b_{2}+b_{3} Q^{2}
$$

Fit \& exptrapolation to phys.point
$g_{P}^{*}\left(m_{\pi}^{2}\right)=\frac{a_{1}}{a_{2}+m_{\pi}^{2}} \longrightarrow 8.40(40)$

Agrees with MuCap result [PRL 110:012504]

$$
g_{P}^{*}=8.06(55)
$$

## Strangeness in the Axial form factor



## Light-strange Mixing in Axial Structure



$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\begin{array}{c}
A_{\mu}^{R, u-d} \\
A_{\mu}^{R, u+d} \\
A_{\mu}^{R, s}
\end{array}\right) & =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
Z_{A}^{3,3} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & Z_{A}^{u+d, u+d} & Z_{A}^{u+d, s} \\
0 & Z_{A}^{s, u+d} & Z_{A}^{s, s}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
A_{\mu}^{u-d} \\
A_{\mu}^{u+d} \\
A_{\mu}^{s}
\end{array}\right) \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0.8623(1)(71) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0.8662(26)(45) & 0.0067(8)(5) \\
0 & 0.0029(10)(5) & 0.9126(11)(98)
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
A_{\mu}^{u-d} \\
A_{\mu}^{u+d} \\
A_{\mu}^{s}
\end{array}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Light-strange Mixing in Axial Structure



## Neutron-Antineutron Oscillations

Motivation for searches :

- Baryon number must be violated for baryogenesis (Sakharov's conditions)

$N$->Nbar transition : $\Delta B=2$
Proton decay: $\Delta B=1$
Which one (or both?) realized in nature?
- Nuclear matter stability

Decay of nuclei through (nn)-annihilation


- Probing BSM physics : $\Delta(B-L)=2$

Connections to lepton number violation $\Delta L=2$ ?
to neutrino mass mechanism?
unification with Majorana neutrinos ?
e.g. [R.Mohapatra, R.Marshak (1980)]

## Searches for $n \rightarrow \bar{n}$ in Nuclei

Nucleus lifetime:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
T_{d}=R \tau_{n \bar{n}}^{2} & \text { Some nuclear model dependence: } \\
R \sim 10^{23} \mathrm{~s}^{-1} & \text { e.g. } \sim 10-15 \% \text { for }{ }^{16} \mathrm{O} \\
{[\text { E.Friedman, A.Gal (2008)] }}
\end{array}
$$



Stability of nuclei :${ }^{56} \mathrm{Fe}$ [Soudan 2] $T_{d}\left({ }^{56} \mathrm{Fe}\right)>0.72 \cdot 10^{32} \mathrm{yr} \longrightarrow \tau_{n \bar{n}}>1.4 \cdot 10^{8} \mathrm{~s}$

- ${ }^{16} \mathrm{O}$ [Super-K]
$T_{d}\left({ }^{16} \mathrm{O}\right)>1.77 \cdot 10^{32} \mathrm{yr} \longrightarrow \tau_{n \bar{n}}>3.3 \cdot 10^{8} \mathrm{~s}$${ }^{2} H$ [SNO]
$T_{d}\left({ }^{2} H\right)>0.54 \cdot 10^{32} \mathrm{yr} \longrightarrow \tau_{n \bar{n}}>1.96 \cdot 10^{8} \mathrm{~s}$


Sensitivity is limited by atmospheric neutrinos

## Searches for $n \rightarrow \bar{n}:$ Reactor Neutrons

Quasi-free neutrons ( $\Delta E t \ll 1$ ) in vacuum:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{n \rightarrow \bar{n}}(t) \approx(\delta m t)^{2}=\left(t / \tau_{n \bar{n}}\right)^{2} \\
& N_{\text {events }}=\mathrm{eff} \cdot \Phi_{n} \cdot T \cdot\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{n \bar{n}}}\right)^{2}\left(\frac{L}{v}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$



ILL Grenoble high-flux reactor, 1990 [M.Baldo-Ceolin et al, 1994)]


## Searches for $n \rightarrow \bar{n}$ : Proposed Improvements

## [Phillips et al, arXiv:1410.1100]

(1) Free-neutron oscillation (similar to ILL):

Maximize oscillation Probability $\sim N_{n}{ }^{*}\left(t_{\text {tree }}\right)^{2}$

$\downarrow$ Neutrons from spallation sources:
e.g. European Spallation source: x12 neutron flux

- Elliptic mirror for slow neutrons (reflect $\sim 70 \%$ of $v_{\perp} \leqslant 40 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ neutrons)
$\checkmark$ Better mag.field shielding $(B<1 \mathrm{nT}) \Rightarrow$ longer flight time


Expected to increase sensitivity $\times \mathbf{1 0}^{2}-\mathbf{1 0}^{3} \mathrm{ILL}, \tau_{n-n} \geqslant 10^{9}-10^{10} \mathrm{~s}$

- Other proposed experiments:
$\checkmark$ stored ultra-cold neutrons ( $4-5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ )
$\downarrow$ vertical cold neutron beams


## Neutron $\leftrightarrow$ Antineutron Transitions and QCD

Effective $\Delta B=2$ operator: (quark field) ${ }^{6}$
From Standard Model extensions:
interaction with a massive Majorana lepton, unified theories, etc
[T.K.Kuo, S.T.Love, PRL45:93 (1980)]
[R.N.Mohapatra, R.E.Marshak, PRL44:1316 (1980)]


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{eff}}=\sum_{i}\left[c_{i} \mathcal{O}_{i}^{6 q}+\text { h.c. }\right] \\
& \delta m=-\langle\bar{n}| \int d^{4} x \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{eff}}|n\rangle=-\sum_{i} \frac{c_{i}}{M_{X}^{5}} \underbrace{\langle\bar{n}| \mathcal{O}_{i}^{6 \mathrm{q}}|n\rangle} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { BSM scale suppression of } \\
\text { 6-quark Dim-9 operators } \\
\text { What is the scale for }
\end{array} \\
& \text { new physics behind } n \leftrightarrow \bar{n} ?
\end{aligned}
$$

BN-violating eff.interactions

- Current experimental lower bound on $\tau_{n-\bar{n}}$ requires $M_{x} \approx 10^{2} \mathrm{TeV}$
- baryon asymmetry puts upper bound on $\tau_{n-\bar{n}}$ in models with $\Delta B=2$ mechanism (assuming SM-only CPv) e.g. [Babu et al, PRD87:115019(2013)]


## Lattice Results \& Comparison to Bag Model



$$
\left\langle N_{\uparrow}^{(+)}\left(t_{2}\right) \mathcal{O}^{6 \mathrm{q}}(0) N_{\downarrow}^{(-)}\left(-t_{1}\right)\right\rangle \underset{t_{1}, t_{2}, t_{1}+t_{2} \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} e^{-M_{n}\left(t_{2}+t_{1}\right)}\left\langle n_{\uparrow}\right| \mathcal{O}^{6 \mathrm{q}}\left|\bar{n}_{\uparrow}\right\rangle
$$

On a lattice: Calculations with physical chirally symmetric quarks [SNS, M.Buchoff, J.Wasem, C.Schroeder (LATTICE 2015)]

|  | $\mathcal{O}^{\overline{M S}(2 \mathrm{GeV})}$ | Bag "A" | $\frac{\mathrm{LQCD}}{\text { Bag "A" }}$ | Bag "B" | $\frac{\mathrm{LQCD}}{\mathrm{Bag}} \text { "B" }$ | Lattice Results, In preparation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left[(R R R)_{3}\right]$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |
| $\left[(R R R)_{\mathbf{1}}\right]$ | 45.4(5.6) | 8.190 | 5.5 | 6.660 | 6.8 |  |
| $\left[R_{\mathbf{1}}(L L)_{\mathbf{0}}\right]$ | 44.0(4.1) | 7.230 | 6.1 | 6.090 | 7.2 | EW-singlet n - n tree-lev. |
| $\left[(R R)_{\mathbf{1}} L_{\mathbf{0}}\right]$ | -66.6(7.7) | -9.540 | 7.0 | -8.160 | 8.1 |  |
| $\left[(R R)_{\mathbf{2}} L_{1}\right]^{(1)}$ | -2.12(26) | 1.260 | -1.7 | -0.666 | 3.2 | $\} \begin{gathered} \text { EW non-singlet } \\ n-\bar{n} \text { at } 1 \text { loop } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\left[(R R)_{\mathbf{2}} L_{\mathbf{1}}\right]^{(2)}$ | 0.531(64) | -0.314 | -1.7 | 0.167 | 3.2 |  |
| $\left[(R R)_{\mathbf{2}} L_{\mathbf{1}}\right]^{(3)}$ | -1.06(13) | 0.630 | -1.7 | -0.330 | 3.2 |  |
|  | $\left[10^{-5} \mathrm{GeV}^{-6}\right]$ | $\left[10^{-5} \mathrm{GeV}^{-6}\right]$ |  | $\left[10^{-5} \mathrm{GeV}^{-6}\right]$ |  |  |

Comparison to MIT Bag model results [S.Rao, R.Shrock, PLB116:238 (1982)]
$n$ - $\bar{n}$ oscillation is $x(5-10)$ more sensitive to BSM physics and (Hopefully) will motivate new $n-\bar{n}$ experiments

## Constraints from Post-Sphaleron Baryogenesis

Baryogenesis below the $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{EW}}$ in quark-lepton unified model [K. Babu, et al, PRD87:115019 (2013)]

Assuming SM-only CPv the prediction

$$
\tau_{n-\bar{n}} \lesssim 5 \cdot 10^{10} \mathrm{~s}
$$

relying on the Bag model $n-\bar{n}$ calculation for m.e.

$$
\left.\langle\bar{n}| \mathcal{O}_{R L R}^{2}|n\rangle\right|_{\text {bag }}=(-0.34 \ldots+0.17) \cdot 10^{-5} \mathrm{GeV}^{-6}
$$

Lattice QCD calculation yields


$$
\left.\langle\bar{n}| \mathcal{O}_{R L R}^{2}|n\rangle\right|_{L Q C D} \approx 0.78(9) \cdot 10^{-5} \mathrm{GeV}^{-6}
$$

and improves the upper bound for osc.time

$$
\tau_{n-\bar{n}} \lesssim 2 \cdot 10^{10} \mathrm{~s}
$$

## Summary

- Calculations near the physical point produce encouraging results

Vector form factors, radii, magnetic moment

- Lattice QCD gives access to quantities hard for experiments
E.g. strangeness contributions to the nucleon form factors
- Coupling of nucleons to BSM effective operators
neutron-antineutron transition, proton decay, tensor charge...


## Proton Spin Puzzle

EMC experiment (1989): polarized Deep-Inelastic $\mu-p$ Scattering :

Spin of Quarks

$$
S_{q}=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{q}(\Delta q+\Delta \bar{q}) \approx \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0.3
$$



Quark spin $=33 \%$ of the Proton Spin
Where is the rest?
Quark Orbital Motion?
Gluon Angular Momentum ?
structure functions from polarized beam \& target

$$
g_{1}(x)=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{q} e_{q}^{2}[\Delta q(x)+\Delta \bar{q}(x)]
$$



## Proton Spin Decomposition and Sum Rule



## Proton Spin Decomposition and Sum Rules

Angular momentum

$$
J^{i}=\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{i j k} \int d^{3} x\left[x^{j} T^{0 k}-x^{k} T^{0 j}\right]
$$

Belinfante-Rosenfeld energy-momentum tensor in QCD:

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{\mu \nu}^{q} & =\bar{q} \gamma_{\{\mu} \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\nu\}} q & & \text { Quarks } \\
T_{\mu \nu}^{\text {glue }} & =G_{\mu \lambda}^{a} G_{\nu \lambda}^{a}-\frac{1}{4} \delta_{\mu \nu}\left(G_{\mu \nu}\right)^{2} & & \text { Gluons }
\end{aligned}
$$

Nucleon form factors of the EM tensor

$$
\langle N(p+q)| T_{\mu \nu}^{q, g l u e}|N(p)\rangle \rightarrow\left\{A_{20}, B_{20}, C_{20}\right\}\left(Q^{2}\right)
$$

$=$ Mellin Moments of GPDs

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{20}\left(Q^{2}\right) & =\int d x x H\left(x, 0, Q^{2}\right) \\
B_{20}\left(Q^{2}\right) & =\int d x x E\left(x, 0, Q^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Quark \& Gluon Angular Momentum

$$
J_{q, \text { glue }}=\frac{1}{2}\left[A_{20}^{q, \text { glue }}(0)+B_{20}^{q, \text { glue }}(0)\right] \quad[\text { X.Ji, PRL 78:610 (1997)] }
$$

Quark spin

$$
\langle N(p)| \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5} q|N(p)\rangle=\left(\Delta \Sigma_{q}\right)\left[\bar{u}_{p} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5} u_{p}\right]
$$

## Light Quark Angular Momenta in the Proton



Challenges for Lattice QCD:

- "disconnected" quarks
- gluon angular momentum
- renormalization \& mixing


## Light Quark Spin



(*) not including disconnected diagrams! $^{*}$

## Quark Orbital Angular Momentum $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{q}}=\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{q}}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{q}}$



## Quark OAM vs Quark Anomalous Magnetization

Light Cone Wave functions: Quark OAM is required for non-zero anomalous magnetization from quarks

$$
\left|L^{u}+L^{d}\right| \ll\left|L^{u}\right|,\left|L^{d}\right| \Longrightarrow\left|\kappa^{u}+\kappa^{d}\right| \ll\left|\kappa^{u}\right|,\left|\kappa^{d}\right|
$$

[S.J.Brodsky and S.D.Drell (1980); M.Burkardt and G.Schnell (2006); X.-D.Ji, J.-P.Ma, and F.Yuan (2003)]
(same prediction for certain TMD PDFs)


