

Restricting q^2l^2 operators from $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$

Mathew Thomas Arun,^{1,*} Priyanka Lamba,^{2,†} and Sudhir K. Vempati^{3,‡}

¹*School of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Thiruvananthapuram, India*

²*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Poland*

³*Centre for High Energy Physics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India*

In this paper we consider semileptonic lepton flavor violating operators of the type q^2l^2 in low energy effective theory (LEFT). At the chiral scale, we match these operators to chiral perturbation theory (χ PT) and place constraints from the process $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$. These bounds are shown to depend on the chiral nature of the operators. The scalar operators are significantly more constrained compared to the vector operators. We then compare the limits from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Nuclei and show that the limits on scalar operators are within an order of magnitude of the corresponding limits from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Ti. On the other hand, the limits on vector operators are however much weaker. Towards the end, we evolve the LEFT operators to W-boson mass scale using RGE, and match them to the Standard Model effective field theory (SMEFT) operators. We, then, derive the constraints on the parameter space of Leptoquark models that could generate these SMEFT operators at tree level.

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutral pion decays of the type $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$ are excellent probes for studying lepton number and flavour violation. To our knowledge the first searches for this process constrains the Branching fraction of neutral pions decaying to the combination $(\mu^+e^- + \mu^-e^+)$ to 1.72×10^{-8} [1]. Whereas, later experiments performed at Brookhaven AGS, BNL E777[2], BNL E865[3], searching for the decays of $K_L^0 \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$ [3], $K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \mu^\pm e^\mp$ [4, 5] and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \mu^+ e^-$ ($K_{\pi\mu e}$)[6], in particular, the one looking for Lepton Flavour Violating $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \ell \ell'$ decays, restricts the process $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$ through the subprocess $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 (\rightarrow \mu e)$. The Brookhaven experiments, using them, place an upper limit on the Branching Fraction for the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$ process as $BR(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-) < 3.8 \times 10^{-10}$ and $BR(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^- e^+) < 3.4 \times 10^{-9}$. Later, the KTeV collaboration at the Fermilab has improved the limits on the combination to $BR(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^\mp e^\pm) < 3.59 \times 10^{-10}$ [7] and recently, the NA62 experiment

*Electronic address: mathewthomas@iisertvm.ac.in

†Electronic address: priyanka.lamba@fuw.edu.pl

‡Electronic address: vempati@iisc.ac.in

at CERN constraint them further to $\text{BR}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^- e^+) < 3.2 \times 10^{-10}$ [8]. A summary of the present limits is presented in Table I.

Process	Experiment	Limit
$\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$	E865 BNL	3.4×10^{-10} [6]
$\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^- e^+$	NA62 CERN	3.2×10^{-10} [8]
$\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^\mp e^\pm$	KTeV Fermilab	3.6×10^{-10} [7]

TABLE I: A list of the present limits on the Lepton number violating process $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$.

It would be interesting to study the limits from these experiments on low energy effective operators. For this, one needs to match the effective operators to chiral perturbation theory. We do that in this article and derive the limits. To our knowledge this is first time this process is used to obtain the limits ¹. In general, due to the presence of large hadronic uncertainties, pion decays (mostly charged ones) are more suitable for studying ratios like lepton flavor universality etc, where purely leptonic processes like $\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$ are good to study the lepton number/flavour violation in the leptonic sector. However, there exists other decay modes like $K_L \rightarrow \mu e$ which provide strong constraints on the effective theory operators.

Large flavor violation in the neutral lepton sector is very well established through neutrino oscillation phenomenology. The (large) neutrino transitions should typically lead to charged lepton flavor violation(cLFV). If neutrinos attain masses through interactions with Higgs of the Standard Model, the resultant cLFV is understood to be very small, leading to the Branching Fraction of the most prominent channel $BR(\mu \rightarrow e \gamma) \sim 10^{-48}$. However, in the presence of new particles, with Weak scale masses, we expect the cLFV rates to be within the range of present and future upcoming experiments. The cLFV is a highly model dependent phenomena, such that, the predicted rates for various cLFV processes vary significantly from one UV model to another and with the parameter space of the model. For example in supersymmetric models the rates can be large for supersymmetric particles between masses of a few hundred GeV and several TeV. For a review please see Calibbi et. al [10, 11]. For the kind of the operators we are interested in this work, the relevant leptonic number violating process would be $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Nuclei. This process has been well studied and the limits are reasonably well known (for a review, please see [12]), though uncertainties concerning form factors in various Nuclei persist. The best limit on $\mu \rightarrow e$

¹ While finishing this paper, Ref.[9] appeared on the arxiv, addressing the same issue but in a way complementary to our work.

comes from the **SINDRUM II** collaboration, which puts the limits on the Branching fraction to be $\mathbf{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e)$ in Ti (Au) is $6.1(7) \times 10^{-13}$ [13, 14].

In the following we would like to compare the limits from $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$ to those from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Nuclei. We do the comparison in the set of low energy operators determined by the LEFT. In this approach, the cLFV would appear as a contact interaction, four Fermi operators at the scale far below the scale of new physics. The operators can be written at the scale of the experiments which is typically far below the scale of the Standard Model. The full effective theory at this scale is called the low energy effective theory (LEFT). This theory is obtained from the Standard Model lagrangian after integrating out the top, Higgs, W and Z particles. The resultant theory contains several operators which could be classified as follows:

Scalar	Vector	
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{SRR} = (\bar{e}_{Li} e_{Rj})(\bar{u}_{Lw} u_{Rt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V LL} = (\bar{e}_{Li} \gamma_\mu e_{Lj})(\bar{u}_{Lw} \gamma^\mu u_{Lt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V LR} = (\bar{e}_{Li} \gamma_\mu e_{Lj})(\bar{u}_{Rw} \gamma^\mu u_{Rt})$
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{SRL} = (\bar{e}_{Li} e_{Rj})(\bar{u}_{Rw} u_{Lt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V RR} = (\bar{e}_{Ri} \gamma_\mu e_{Rj})(\bar{u}_{Rw} \gamma^\mu u_{Rt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V RL} = (\bar{e}_{Ri} \gamma_\mu e_{Rj})(\bar{u}_{Lw} \gamma^\mu u_{Lt})$
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{SRR} = (\bar{e}_{Li} e_{Rj})(\bar{d}_{Lw} d_{Rt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V LL} = (\bar{e}_{Li} \gamma_\mu e_{Lj})(\bar{d}_{Lw} \gamma^\mu d_{Lt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V LR} = (\bar{e}_{Li} \gamma_\mu e_{Lj})(\bar{d}_{Rw} \gamma^\mu d_{Rt})$
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{SRL} = (\bar{e}_{Li} e_{Rj})(\bar{d}_{Rw} d_{Lt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V RR} = (\bar{e}_{Ri} \gamma_\mu e_{Rj})(\bar{d}_{Rw} \gamma^\mu d_{Rt})$	$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V RL} = (\bar{e}_{Ri} \gamma_\mu e_{Rj})(\bar{d}_{Lw} \gamma^\mu d_{Lt})$

TABLE II: LEFT semileptonic scalar and vector operators. Notation: e, u & d are used for lepton sector, up quark sector and down quark sector respectively. And i, j, w, t are generation indices. For $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$ value of $i=\mu, j=e, (w, t)=(u,u),(d,d)$

At the scale of LEFT, these operators can be considered independent. Of course, they could be matched with SMEFT at some high scale and there could be correlations within the operators. In the present work, we assume these operators are independent and derive the limits on them. We find that for the scalar operators, the limits obtained from $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$ can be comparable with those obtained from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Ti. For the vector operators, however, the limits from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion dominate significantly. The ratio of the matrix element with the scalar operators to the vector operators is roughly enhanced by a factor B_0 which is a low energy constant appearing in the scalar densities (in the scalar condensates) of the chiral perturbation theory. The constant is measured on the lattice and it is typically large $\sim GeV$ [15].

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In the next section, we recap the low energy effective theory and the chiral perturbation theory. In section II, we do the matching of the chiral perturbation theory to that of the low energy effective theory at tree level and derive the limits from $BR(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-)$ in section III. We also derive the limits from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion. In section IV, we discuss the Leptoquark completion at high scale through a SMEFT matching with LEFT.

Thus constraining the parameter space of the Leptoquark models we have considered. We then close with a summary in the last section.

II. LOW-ENERGY EFFECTIVE FIELD THEORY

Low Energy Effective Field Theory (LEFT) [16, 17] is modeled to lie between the Standard Model Theory (SM) scale and the QCD non-perturbative scale. The top quark, the Higgs and the massive gauge bosons are integrated out, and hence LEFT has light quarks, photon and gluon as the dynamical degrees of freedom. Within this framework, running and mixing of effective operators can be computed using perturbative renormalization-group (RG) equations up to the Λ_{QCD} scale below which QCD becomes non-perturbative. At which scale the theory must be matched with the χ PT. There are a total of 80 dimension-6 operators out of which 2 are pure gauge (X^3) and 78 are four-fermion contact operators (ψ^4). And there exists 6 dimension-5 operators which have mixed fermion gauge structure ($\psi^2 X$). These operators are further divided by their chirality. In general they could be vector, scalar, and tensor like ψ^4 operators and are denoted by V, S , and T superscripts.

A. χ PT Lagrangian

In this subsection we give a brief outline of the chiral Lagrangian. For a complete version we refer the reader to [18, 19]. In the limit of vanishing quark masses the QCD Hamiltonian has an enhanced symmetry under the chiral group $SU(N_f) \times SU(N_f)$, where N_f is the number of quark flavour. This symmetry is then assumed to be broken by the ground state of the theory to give rise to $N_f^2 - 1$ Goldstone fields. χ PT is modeled through the addition of quark bilinears using spurion fields which are $N_f \times N_f$ hermitian matrices in flavour space, $v_\mu(x), a_\mu(x), s(x), p(x), t_{\mu\nu}(x)$ associated with vector, axial vector, scalar, pseudo-scalar and tensor currents respectively. The generating functional for the Greens function corresponding to the vacuum-to-vacuum transition amplitude is then obtained from the Lagrangian,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}^0 + \bar{q}\gamma^\mu \left(v_\mu(x) + \gamma^5 a_\mu(x) \right) q - \bar{q} \left(s(x) - i\gamma^5 p(x) \right) q \\ &\quad + \bar{q}\sigma^{\mu\nu} t_{\mu\nu}(x) q \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}^0 &= -\frac{1}{2g_s^2} G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} + \bar{q}i\gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu - iG_\mu \right) q, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the field strength tensor of the gluon (G_μ). For future simplicity, it will be simpler to match with the LEFT operators if we write the above Lagrangian in the chiral notation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}^0 + \bar{q}_L \gamma^\mu l_\mu(x) q_L + \bar{q}_R \gamma^\mu r_\mu(x) q_R \\ & + \bar{q}_L S(x) q_R + \bar{q}_R S^\dagger(x) q_L \\ & + \bar{q}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} t_{\mu\nu}(x) q_R + \bar{q}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} t_{\mu\nu}^\dagger(x) q_R , \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_\mu(x) &= v_\mu(x) + a_\mu(x) , \\ l_\mu(x) &= v_\mu(x) - a_\mu(x) , \\ S(x) &= s(x) - ip(x) . \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The three light quark mass matrix are contained in S where are the heavy quarks are integrated out and will not contribute to the low energy effective chiral Lagrangian.

Considering three flavour, $N_f = 3$, the 8 Goldstone fields corresponding to the spontaneous symmetry breaking of $SU(3) \times SU(3)$ to $SU(3)$ is collected in the unitary 3×3 matrix $U(x)$. This matrix transforms as

$$U'(x) = V_R U(x) V_L^\dagger(x),$$

under the chiral $SU(3) \times SU(3)$. In accordance with the above transformation relation we can write, $U(x) = \exp\left(i \frac{\lambda^a \phi^a(x)}{F_0}\right)$, where ϕ^a are the 8 Goldstone fields, λ^a the Gell-Mann matrices and F_0 the pion decay constant. In the non-linear representation in chiral symmetry $U(x)$ can be written as [20]

$$U(x) \equiv \exp \left[i \frac{\sqrt{2}}{F_0} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & -\frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & -\frac{2\eta}{\sqrt{6}} \end{pmatrix} \right] \quad (4)$$

The Chiral Lagrangian could be written in terms of these fields as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 \tag{5} \\
\mathcal{L}_1 &= \frac{1}{4}F_0^2 \{tr(D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U) + tr(\chi^\dagger U + \chi U^\dagger)\}, \\
\mathcal{L}_2 &= L_1 \langle D^\mu U^\dagger D_\mu U \rangle^2 + L_2 \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U \rangle \langle D^\mu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle \\
&+ L_3 \langle D^\mu U^\dagger D_\mu U (\chi^\dagger U + U^\dagger \chi) \rangle \\
&+ L_6 \langle \chi^\dagger U + \chi U^\dagger \rangle^2 + L_7 \langle \chi^\dagger U - \chi U^\dagger \rangle \\
&+ L_8 \langle \chi^\dagger U \chi^\dagger U + \chi U^\dagger \chi U^\dagger \rangle \\
&- iL_9 \langle F_{R\mu\nu} D^\mu U D^\nu U^\dagger + F_{L\mu\nu} D^\mu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle \\
&+ L_{10} \langle U^\dagger F_{R\mu\nu} U F_L^{\mu\nu} \rangle + H_1 \langle F_{R\mu\nu} F_R^{\mu\nu} + F_{L\mu\nu} F_L^{\mu\nu} \rangle + H_2 \langle \chi^\dagger \chi \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \rangle$ represents the trace of the matrix within and $F_R^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu r_\nu - \partial_\nu r_\mu - i[r_\mu, r_\nu]$ and $F_L^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu l_\nu - \partial_\nu l_\mu - i[l_\mu, l_\nu]$ are the field strength tensors with r_μ and l_μ as defined in Eq.(3).

Finally, the low energy constants (L_i) are fixed from experimental information on D-wave $\pi\pi$ scattering lengths, electro-magnetic charge radius of the pion, decay of $\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$, $K\pi$ scattering and large- N_c arguments (Zweig rule). These are presented in Table III. The contact term H_2 has no physical significance, but are needed as counter-terms for renormalization. A more complete expression for a general Lagrangian up to order p^4 along with the values computed for the low-energy constants are given in [19].

L_1	$(0.9 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$	L_2	$(1.7 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$
L_3	$(-4.4 \pm 2.5) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$	L_4	$(0 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$
L_5	$(2.2 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$	L_6	$(0 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$
L_7	$(-0.4 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$	L_8	$(1.1 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$
L_9	$(7.4 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$	L_{10}	$(-6.0 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3} \times m_\pi^+$

TABLE III: All values for the low energy coupling constants are taken from [19].

III. MATCHING AND LEPTON FLAVOUR VIOLATING PION DECAY

For momentum transfers below Λ_{QCD} , the quark bilinears in scalar and vector LEFT operators should be matched to χ PT Lagrangian given in Eq.(5). Since we are interested in the Lepton flavour violating decays of neutral pion, lets consider the Hamiltonian matrix element

$$\langle \ell_i \ell_j | \mathcal{O} | \pi^0 \rangle, \tag{6}$$

where the matrix element \mathcal{O} corresponds to the LEFT operators that contributes to the process. In principle, for a UV complete model, all the operators should contribute with the appropriate UV scale, but for simplicity lets consider the scalar and vectors independently.

Before proceeding further, a note is in order. Not all of the operators contribute to the decay. At tree level only 6 ψ^4 type of operators will generate the Lepton flavour violating neutral pion decay. These operators are given in Table II. Regarding tensor operators, for quark bilinears that transforms as a tensor the χ PT replacement rule is given as,

$$\bar{q}_{Lw}\sigma^{\mu\nu}q_{Rt} = F_1\langle U_{wt}F_L^{\mu\nu} + F_R^{\mu\nu}U_{wt}\rangle + iF_2\langle D^\mu U_{wr}U_{rs}^\dagger D^\nu U_{st}\rangle + \mathcal{O}(p^6). \quad (7)$$

On matching with χ PT it can be seen that tensor operators will always have a photon in the final state. and hence will contribute in the process $\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-\gamma$, for which the world average for the decay fraction, $\frac{\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-\gamma)}{\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)} = 1.188\%$ [21], is measured and matched with the theoretical value to -0.3σ precision. And hence, tensor operators will not be further discussed here.

A. Scalar operator

From Table II, there are two scalar operators that contribute to the lepton flavour violating pion decay process. Using these operators, the Hamiltonian given in Eq.(6) could be written as,

$$\langle \mu e | \left(L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RL} \mathcal{O}_{e u_i}^{SRL} + L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RR} \mathcal{O}_{e u_i}^{SRR} \right) | \pi^0 \rangle \quad (8)$$

where $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RL}$, & $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RR}$ are the Wilson Coefficients. Here, for brevity we have used the notation $u_i = u, d$.

At low energies the $\bar{u}_i u_i$ condenses and at order p^4 in chiral counting, the quark bilinear in the scalar operators are matched with the chiral Lagrangian. The replacement rule as given in [18, 22] is,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_{iLw}u_{iRt} = & -2B_0 \left\{ \frac{1}{4}F_0^2 U_{tw} + L_4 \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle U_{tw} \right. \\ & + L_5 \langle U D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle_{tw} + 2L_6 \langle U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U \rangle U_{tw} - 2L_7 \langle U^\dagger \chi - \chi^\dagger U \rangle U_{tw} \\ & \left. + 2L_8 \langle U \chi^\dagger U \rangle_{tw} + H_2 \chi_{tw} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(p^6), \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where F_0 is the pion decay constant in the chiral limit, B_0, L_i and H_i are the non-perturbative low energy constants and $u_i = u, d$ in our case. $\chi = -2B_0 S^\dagger$ where ‘S’ is mass matrix $M_{u_i} = \text{diag}(m_u, m_d, m_s)$. At leading order F_0 and B_0 is sufficient to determine the low-energy behaviour.

	In GeV		In GeV
m_π^0	134.97×10^{-3}	F_0	92.3×10^{-3} [22]
m_μ	105.65×10^{-3}	m_e	0.51×10^{-3}
m_u	2.16×10^{-3}	m_d	4.67×10^{-3}
$\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-)$	2.97×10^{-18}	$B_0 = \frac{m_{\pi^0}^2}{m_u + m_d}$	2.667

TABLE IV: Input values in GeV. m_u, m_d are MS bar masses at 2 GeV. All values are taken from PDG[23].

To constraint the Wilson Coefficients responsible for the pion decay process, the terms $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$ in chiral counting are subdominant [19]. Hence, keeping the expansion to order p^2 in Eq.(9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{SRR} &= (\bar{\mu}_L e_R)(\bar{u}_i L w u_i R t) \\ &= (\bar{\mu}_L e_R) \left[-2B_0 \frac{1}{4} F_0^2 U_{tw} \right] + \mathcal{O}(p^4), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{SRL} &= (\bar{\mu}_L e_R)(\bar{u}_i R w u_i L t) \\ &= (\bar{\mu}_L e_R) \left[-2B_0 \frac{1}{4} F_0^2 U_{tw}^\dagger \right] + \mathcal{O}(p^4), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

in χ PT.

To study the effect of operators Eq.(10) and Eq.(11) in $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$, we need to expand the matrix in Eq.(4) to the leading order, $1 + i \frac{\lambda^a \phi^a}{F_0}$, and the corresponding Hamiltonian element then becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e\mu | \left(L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RL} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{SRL} + L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RR} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{SRR} \right) | \pi^0 \rangle &= - \left(\frac{iB_0 F_0}{2} \right) \left(L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RL} + L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RL} \right) \\ &\times \langle e\mu | (\bar{\mu}_L e_R) \pi^0 | \pi^0 \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The amplitude, $\mathcal{M}_{\pi^0 \mu^+ e^-}$, for the process computed from the matrix element above, is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\pi^0(p^{\pi^0}) \rightarrow \mu^+(p_\mu) e^-(p_e)) &= - \left(\frac{iB_0 F_0}{2} \right) \left(L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RL} + L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RL} \right) \\ &\times \bar{u}(p_e) \frac{1}{2} (1 - \gamma^5) v(p_\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For the rate, the square of the amplitude is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{spin} |\mathcal{M}_{\pi^0 \mu^+ e^-}|^2 &= \left| - \left(\frac{iB_0 F_0}{2} \right) \left(L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RL} + L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RL} \right) \right|^2 \\ &\sum_{spin} \left(\bar{u}(p_e) \frac{1}{2} (1 - \gamma^5) v(p_\mu) \right) \left(\bar{u}(p_e) \frac{1}{2} (1 - \gamma^5) v(p_\mu) \right)^\dagger \\ &= \frac{B_0^2}{4} F_0^2 \left| \left(L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RL} + L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RL} \right) \right|^2 \left(m_\pi^2 - (m_e + m_\mu)^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Using the masses given in Table IV and Eq.(13), the decay width of $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$ could be directly computed to be,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-) &= \frac{|p_\mu|}{8\pi m_\pi^2} |\mathcal{M}_{\pi^0 \mu^+ e^-}|^2 \\ &= \left| \left(L_{\mu eu}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu ed}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu eu}^{S,RL} + L_{\mu ed}^{S,RL} \right) \right|^2 (6.007 \times 10^{-6}) \text{ GeV}^5 \\ &\leq 2.97 \times 10^{-18} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

And the constraint on Wilson Coefficients becomes,

$$\left(L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RL} \right) \leq 7.03 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}^{-2} \quad (16)$$

where the definitions $L_{\mu e u_i}^{S,RR} = L_{\mu eu}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu ed}^{S,RR}$ and $L_{\mu e u_i}^{S,RL} = L_{\mu eu}^{S,RL} - L_{\mu ed}^{S,RL}$ have been used.

The bounds derived so far are at the scale close to mass of the pion and are thus close to QCD scale $\Lambda_{QCD} \sim 2 \text{ GeV}$. If one would like to see the value of the coupling close to the electro-weak scale, then, one needs to utilise the RGE of the low energy effective theory. These RGE take into consideration the running effects on the couplings between the scales $\sim 2 \text{ GeV}$ to 100 GeV . The relevant anomalous dimensions are presented in [16] and reproduced in the Appendix VA. It is understood that these couplings mix under the anomalous dimension matrix, as an example the scalar couplings $L_{1211}^{S,RR}$ are mixed with $L_{1222}^{S,RR}$ and $L_{1233}^{S,RR}$. If all the three couplings $L_{1211}^{S,RR}$, $L_{1222}^{S,RR}$, $L_{1233}^{S,RR}$ are of similar order, then the considered bounds from $\pi \rightarrow \mu e$ on $L_{1211}^{S,RR}$ are not significantly affected by the running of the RGE to the high scale. Similar argument also holds for mixing between tensor operators though we have not explicitly given examples of them here. In summary RGE effects do not play an important role and can be safely neglected.

The result could be seen in Fig. 1, where we have plotted on the left hand side the couplings $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RL}$ vs $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RR}$. The cut-off scale has been chosen to be 100 GeV . RGE effects have been taken into consideration while doing this plot. As can be seen, the limits on these couplings are $\sim \text{few} \times 10^{-7}$ (boundary of the shaded region) and weakens when there are cancellations, along the diagonal of the plot.

We now proceed to compare the limits from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Nuclei. At the leading order the $\text{Br}(\mu N \rightarrow e N)$ is given for scalar operators as (in the notation of [24]):

$$\text{Br}(\mu N \rightarrow e N) = \frac{2G_F^2 (G_S^{(d,p)} S^{(p)} + G_S^{(d,n)} S^{(n)})^2 (|g_{LS(d)}|^2 + |g_{RS(d)}|^2)}{w_{\text{capt}}}, \quad (17)$$

where G_F stands for the Fermi constant and $G_S^{(d,p)}$, $S^{(p)}$, $G_S^{(d,n)}$, $S^{(n)}$ correspond to various form factors and number densities represented in terms of overlap integrals. w_{capt} is the capture rate.




FIG. 1: On the left hand side, we plot $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RL}$ vs $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RR}$ with the cut-off scale $\Lambda = 100$ GeV. In the shaded regions experimental limits from $\text{BR}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e)$ are satisfied. On the right hand side, the couplings A_{RR} vs A_{LL} are plotted with the shaded region showing the limits from $\text{BR}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e)$.

Using the values quoted for T_i we have the limit on the scalar couplings to be:

$$\sqrt{(|g_{LS(d)}|^2 + |g_{RS(d)}|^2)} \leq 7.8 \times 10^{-7}. \quad (18)$$

The limit is of similar order of magnitude as one gets from Pion LFV decay.

B. Vector operators

The NP can also contribute to the process $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$ through effective vector operators. The corresponding Lepton Flavour violating Hamiltonian element is,

$$\langle \ell_i \ell_j | \mathcal{O} | \pi^0 \rangle, \quad (19)$$

where \mathcal{O} is now the vector operators given in Table II. Using these operators the above matrix element could be written as,

$$\langle e \mu | \left(L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,LL} \mathcal{O}_{e u_i}^{VLL} + L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,LR} \mathcal{O}_{e u_i}^{VLR} + L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,RR} \mathcal{O}_{e u_i}^{VRR} + L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,RL} \mathcal{O}_{e u_i}^{VRL} \right) | \pi^0 \rangle \quad (20)$$

where $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,LL}$, $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,LR}$, $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,RR}$ and $L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{V,RL}$ are the Wilson Coefficient. And as before $u_i = u, d$.

Like for the scalar operators, at low energies the $\bar{u}_i u_i$ condenses and then quark bilinear in the vector operators should be matched with the chiral Lagrangian. The replacement rule for vector

LEFT quark bilinear could be written as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{u}_{iL}\gamma^\mu u_{iL} &= \frac{i}{2}F_0^2\langle D_\mu U U^\dagger \rangle + 4iL_1\langle D_\nu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle\langle D_\mu U U^\dagger \rangle + 4iL_2\langle D^\mu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle\langle D_\nu U U^\dagger \rangle \\
&+ 2iL_3\langle (U^\dagger D^\mu U - D^\mu U^\dagger U) D_\nu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle + 2iL_4\langle D_\mu U U^\dagger \rangle\langle U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U \rangle \\
&+ iL_5\langle (U^\dagger D^\mu U - D^\mu U^\dagger U) (U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U) \rangle \\
&+ L_9\left[-\langle F_R^{\mu\nu} D_\nu U U^\dagger \rangle - \langle U D_\nu U^\dagger F_R^{\mu\nu} \rangle + \langle D_\nu U F_L^{\mu\nu} U^\dagger \rangle + \langle U F_L^{\mu\nu} D_\nu U^\dagger \rangle\right] \\
&- iL_9\langle D^\nu (D_\mu U D_\nu U^\dagger - D_\nu U D_\mu U^\dagger) \rangle + 2L_{10}\langle D_\nu (U F_L^{\mu\nu} U^\dagger) \rangle \\
&+ 4H_1\langle D_\nu F_R^{\mu\nu} \rangle + \epsilon \text{ terms} + \mathcal{O}(p^6), \tag{21}
\end{aligned}$$

where $F_R^{\mu\nu}$ and $F_L^{\mu\nu}$ are the field strength tensors as defined previously. Similarly $\bar{u}_{iR}\gamma^\mu u_{iR}$ matching is same as in Eq.(21) by replacing $U \rightarrow U^\dagger$, $\chi \rightarrow \chi^\dagger$.

To the most dominant term, contributing to the process $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$, in the order in expansion of chiral Lagrangian becomes,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VLL} &= (\bar{\mu}_L \gamma_\mu e_L)(\bar{u}_{iLw} \gamma^\mu u_{iLt}) & \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VLR} &= (\bar{\mu}_L \gamma_\mu e_L)(\bar{u}_{iRw} \gamma^\mu u_{iRt}) \\
&= (\bar{\mu}_L \gamma^\mu e_L)\left(\frac{i}{2}F_0^2(D_\mu U U^\dagger)_{tw}\right) & &= (\bar{\mu}_L \gamma^\mu e_L)\left(\frac{i}{2}F_0^2(D_\mu U^\dagger U)_{tw}\right) \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VRL} &= (\bar{\mu}_R \gamma_\mu e_R)(\bar{u}_{iLw} \gamma^\mu u_{iLt}) & \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VLR} &= (\bar{\mu}_R \gamma_\mu e_R)(\bar{u}_{iRw} \gamma^\mu u_{iRt}) \\
&= (\bar{\mu}_R \gamma^\mu e_R)\left(\frac{i}{2}F_0^2(D_\mu U U^\dagger)_{tw}\right) & &= (\bar{\mu}_R \gamma^\mu e_R)\left(\frac{i}{2}F_0^2(D_\mu U^\dagger U)_{tw}\right) \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

where the neutral pion arises from $(D_\mu U U^\dagger)_{uu} \rightarrow \frac{i}{F_0}\partial_\mu \pi^0$, $(D_\mu U U^\dagger)_{dd} \rightarrow -\frac{i}{F_0}\partial_\mu \pi^0$ and $(D_\mu U^\dagger U)_{uu} \rightarrow -\frac{i}{F_0}\partial_\mu \pi^0$, and $(D_\mu U^\dagger U)_{dd} \rightarrow \frac{i}{F_0}\partial_\mu \pi^0$, in the expansion of $U(x)$ given in Eq.(3) up to first order in $\frac{1}{F_0}$.

Then, to study the effect of the operators in Eq.(22) and Eq.(23) in the Lepton flavour violating neutral pion decay process, the matrix element could be derived as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle e\mu | \left(L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LL} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VLL} + L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LR} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VLR} + L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RR} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VRR} + L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RL} \mathcal{O}_{eu_i}^{VRL} \right) | \pi^0 \rangle &= \tag{24} \\
\langle e\mu | \left(L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LR} - L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LL} \right) (\bar{\mu}_L \gamma^\mu e_L) \frac{F_0}{2} \partial_\mu \pi^0 | \pi^0 \rangle &+ \\
\langle e\mu | \left(L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RR} - L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RL} \right) (\bar{\mu}_R \gamma^\mu e_R) \frac{F_0}{2} \partial_\mu \pi^0 | \pi^0 \rangle &
\end{aligned}$$

where $L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,AB} = L_{\mu eu}^{V,AB} - L_{\mu ed}^{V,AB}$. For simplicity, lets define

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{LL} &= L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LR} - L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LL} \\
A_{RR} &= L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RR} - L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RL} \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding amplitude can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\pi^0(p^{\pi^0}) \rightarrow \mu^+(p_\mu)e^-(p_e)) &= \frac{F_0}{2} \left(A_{LL}(\bar{u}(p_e)\gamma^\mu \frac{(1-\gamma^5)}{2}v(p_\mu))p_\mu^{\pi^0} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A_{RR}(\bar{u}(p_e)\gamma^\mu \frac{(1+\gamma^5)}{2}v(p_\mu))p_\mu^{\pi^0} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Squaring this amplitude we get,

$$\sum_{spin} |\mathcal{M}_{\pi\mu e}|^2 = \frac{F_0^2}{4} \left[2(|A_{LL}|^2 + |A_{RR}|^2) \frac{1}{2} \left(m_{\pi^0}^2(m_\mu^2 + m_e^2) - (m_\mu^2 - m_e^2)^2 \right) \right] \quad (27)$$

In limit $m_e \rightarrow 0$, using masses in Table IV and Eq.(26), the decay width of neutral pion decay process could be computed to be,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu^+e^-) &= \frac{|\vec{p}_\mu|}{8\pi m_{\pi^0}^2} \sum_{spin} |\mathcal{M}_{\pi^0\mu^+e^-}|^2 \\ &= (|A_{LL}|^2 + |A_{RR}|^2) \times (9.57 \times 10^{-9}) \text{ (GeV)}^5 \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

This puts a constraint on the combination of the Wilson Coefficients as

$$(|A_{LL}|^2 + |A_{RR}|^2) \leq 3.104 \times 10^{-10} \text{ (GeV)}^{-4} \quad (29)$$

We now compare the limits for the same from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Ti. Following [24] we have:

$$Br(\mu N \rightarrow eN) = \frac{2G_F^2(V^{(p)})^2(|\bar{g}_{LV}^{(p)}|^2 + |\bar{g}_{RV}^{(p)}|^2)}{w_{capt}}, \quad (30)$$

where $V^{(p)}$ represents vectorial form factors. For Ti, we find the limits to be

$$(|\bar{g}_{LV}^{(p)}|^2 + |\bar{g}_{RV}^{(p)}|^2) < 4.0 \times 10^{-14}, \quad (31)$$

which is far stronger than the one from Pion LFV decay. In Fig. 1 we show limit (shaded region) in the plane of A_{RR} and A_{RL} , as can be seen the limit is of the order of $\sim 10^{-4}$ which becomes weaker along the diagonal due to cancellations. As mentioned before RGE corrections are taken in to consideration while plotting this graph.

IV. DISCUSSION

Though the results are be adaptable for any BSM NP model, in this section we rely on Lepto-Quarks to generate the flavour violating coupling. Renormalisable Lagrangian of scalar and vector

Lepto-Quarks that couple to SM without generating tree level proton decay operators[25] could be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_\Delta = \left(\lambda_{Lu}^{ij} \bar{L}_L^i u_R^j + \lambda_{eQ}^{ij} \bar{e}_R^i \tau_2 Q_L^j \right) \Delta_{-\frac{7}{6}} \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_V = \left(g_{LQ} \bar{L}_L \gamma_\mu Q_L + g_{ed} \bar{e}_R \gamma_\mu d_R \right) V_{-2/3}^\mu + g_{eu} \bar{e}_R \gamma_\mu u_R V_{-5/3}^\mu + g'_{LQ} \bar{L}_L \gamma_\mu \tau^a Q_L V_{-2/3}^{\mu a} \quad (33)$$

where $\Delta_{-7/6}$ is the scalar and $V_{-2/3}^\mu, V_{-5/6}^\mu, V_{-2/3}^{\mu a}$, are the vector Lepto-Quarks.

Using the above Lagrangian, let us discuss the tree level matching of the LEFT Wilson coefficients that contribute to the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$ process with the Standard Model Effective Field Theory (SMEFT) operators generated from the model.

Scalar operators :

At tree level,

$$L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RR} = -C_{lequ}^{(1)}(\mu e u u) = \frac{\lambda_{Lu}^{ij} \lambda_{eQ}^{*ij}}{M_{\Delta_{7/6}}^2}, L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RR} = 0 \quad (34)$$

At tree level,

$$L_{\mu e d d}^{S,RL} = \sum_{i=d,s,b} V_{di} C_{ledq}(\mu e d i) = 0, L_{\mu e u u}^{S,RL} = 0 \quad (35)$$

Then, from the constraint equation

$$\left(L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RR} - L_{\mu e u_i u_i}^{S,RL} \right) \leq 7.03 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}^{-2} \quad (36)$$

we get

$$\frac{\lambda_{Lu}^{ij} \lambda_{eQ}^{*ij}}{M_{\Delta_{7/6}}^2} \leq 7.03 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}^{-2} \quad (37)$$

Vector Fields :

At tree level,

$$L_{\mu e u u}^{V,LL} = C_{lq}^{(1)}(\mu e q_1 q_1) - C_{lq}^{(3)}(\mu e q_1 q_1) = 0 \quad (38)$$

At tree level, assuming Lepto-Quark coupling to be universal,

$$L_{\mu e d d}^{V,LL} = \sum_{i,j=d,s,b} \left(C_{lq}^{(1)}(\mu e i j) + C_{lq}^{(3)}(\mu e i j) \right) V_{jd} V_{di}^\dagger = \frac{g_{LQ} g_{ed}^*}{M_{V_{2/3}}^2} \quad (39)$$

At tree level,

$$L_{\mu e u u}^{V,LR} = C_{lu}(\mu e u u) = 0, C_{\mu e d d}^{V,LR} = L_{\mu e d d}^{V,LL} = 0 \quad (40)$$

At tree level,

$$L_{\mu eu}^{V,RR} = C_{eu}(\mu e uu) = \frac{g_{eu} g_{eu}^*}{M_{V_{5/3}}^2}, L_{\mu ed}^{V,RR} = C_{ed}(\mu e dd) = \frac{g_{ed} g_{ed}^*}{M_{V_{2/3}}^2} \quad (41)$$

At tree level,

$$L_{\mu eu}^{V,RL} = C_{qe}(\mu e uu) = 0, L_{\mu ed}^{V,RL} = C_{qe}(\mu e dd) = 0 \quad (42)$$

From the constraint on the vector LEFT operator's Wilson coefficients

$$(|A_{LL}|^2 + |A_{RR}|^2) \leq 3.104 \times 10^{-10} \text{ (GeV)}^{-4}, \quad (43)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{LL} &= L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LR} - L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,LL} \\ A_{RR} &= L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RR} - L_{\mu eu_i u_i}^{V,RL} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

we get,

$$\left| \frac{g_{LQ} g_{ed}^*}{M_{V_{2/3}}^2} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{g_{eu} g_{eu}^*}{M_{V_{5/3}}^2} - \frac{g_{ed} g_{ed}^*}{M_{V_{2/3}}^2} \right|^2 \leq 3.104 \times 10^{-10} \text{ (GeV)}^{-4} \quad (45)$$

In Table IV, we give the summary of the matching done at M_W scale, for detailed calculation refer to the Appendix VB.

LeptoQuark Model	Coupling	Limit
Scalar LQ ($\Delta_{-\frac{7}{6}}$)	$\frac{\lambda_{Lu}^i \lambda_{eQ}^{*ij}}{M_{\Delta_{7/6}}^2}$	$\leq 7.03 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$
Vector LQ ($V_{-\frac{2}{3}}^\mu, V_{-\frac{5}{3}}^\mu$)	$\left \frac{g_{LQ} g_{ed}^*}{M_{V_{2/3}}^2} \right ^2 + \left \frac{g_{eu} g_{eu}^*}{M_{V_{5/3}}^2} - \frac{g_{ed} g_{ed}^*}{M_{V_{2/3}}^2} \right ^2$	$\leq 3.104 \times 10^{-10} \text{ (GeV)}^{-4}$

TABLE V: Limits on first two generation flavour violating couplings of Scalar and Vector LeptoQuarks

A. Summary

In this paper we derived the model independent bounds on Lepton flavour violating LEFT operators in neutral pion decay process which involves only the first generation quarks. By using LEFT- χ PT matching it is clear that only scalar and vector operators contribute to the process. Tensor operators, as shown in Eq.(7), will always result in a photon emission along with the dileptons. We have also shown that constraint on scalar operators are much stringent than the one

on vector operators. This is because of the scalar amplitudes are enhanced by the condensation parameter B_0 compared to the vector ones.

It is generally believed that $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in Nuclei gives the strong bounds on the first two generational lepton number/flavour violating operators of the $q^2 l^2$ type. While this is generally true, the limits on the process $\pi^0 \rightarrow \mu e$ also give comparable constraints on scalar $q^2 l^2$ operators for vector operators, the limits are weaker than those from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion.

Acknowledgments

We are thankful to B. Ananthanarayan and G. D'Ambrosio for extensive discussions. M.T.A. acknowledges financial support of DST through INSPIRE Faculty grant [DST/INSPIRE/04/2019/002507]. SKV acknowledges support from the Institute of Excellence grants from IISc. P.L. partially supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, under research grant 2017/26/E/ST2/00135.

V. APPENDIX

A. RGE

The needed LEFT Renormalization Group Equations [16] for the operators given in Table II is given as,

$$\dot{L}_{eu\ prst}^{S,RR} = - [6e^2(q_e^2 + q_u^2) + 6g^2 C_F] L_{eu\ prst}^{S,RR} - 96e^2 q_e q_u L_{eu\ prst}^{T,RR} - 192e^2 q_e q_u L_{e\gamma\ pr\ st} L_{u\gamma}, \quad (46)$$

$$\dot{L}_{ed\ prst}^{S,RR} = - [6e^2(q_e^2 + q_d^2) + 6g^2 C_F] L_{ed\ prst}^{S,RR} - 96e^2 q_e q_d L_{ed\ prst}^{T,RR} - 192e^2 q_e q_d L_{e\gamma\ pr\ st} L_{d\gamma}, \quad (47)$$

$$\dot{L}_{eu\ prst}^{S,RL} = - [6e^2(q_e^2 + q_u^2) + 6g^2 C_F] L_{eu\ prst}^{S,RL} - 192e^2 q_e q_u L_{e\gamma\ pr\ st} L_{u\gamma}, \quad (48)$$

$$\dot{L}_{ed\ prst}^{S,RL} = - [6e^2(q_e^2 + q_d^2) + 6g^2 C_F] L_{ed\ prst}^{S,RL} - 192e^2 q_e q_d L_{e\gamma\ pr\ st} L_{d\gamma}, \quad (49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{L}_{eu\ prst}^{V,LL} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2 q_e \delta_{pr} \left[N_c q_d \left(L_{ud\ stww}^{V,LL} + L_{ud\ stww}^{V,LR} \right) + N_c q_u \left(2L_{uu\ stww}^{V,LL} + L_{uu\ stww}^{V,LR} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q_e \left(L_{wust}^{V,LL} + L_{stww}^{V,LR} \right) + 2q_u L_{swt}^{V,LL} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2 q_u \delta_{st} \left[N_c q_d \left(L_{ed\ prww}^{V,LL} + L_{ed\ prww}^{V,LR} \right) + N_c q_u \left(L_{eu\ prww}^{V,LL} + L_{eu\ prww}^{V,LR} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q_e \left(4L_{ee\ prww}^{V,LL} + L_{ee\ prww}^{V,LR} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + 12e^2 q_e q_u L_{eu\ prst}^{V,LL} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2 q_e q_u L_{uG\ sw} L_{uG\ tw}^* \delta_{pr} + 8C_F e g q_e \left(L_{uG\ sw} L_{u\gamma\ tw}^* + L_{u\gamma\ sw} L_{uG\ tw}^* \right) \delta_{pr} \\ &\quad + e^2 \left(24q_u^2 + \frac{32}{3}q_e q_u \right) L_{e\gamma\ pw} L_{e\gamma\ rw}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(24q_e^2 + \frac{32}{3}q_e q_u \right) L_{u\gamma\ sw} L_{u\gamma\ tw}^* \delta_{pr} \\ &\quad + 2e^2 q_e q_u \zeta_e \delta_{pr} \delta_{st}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{L}_{ed\ prst}^{V,LL} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2 q_e \delta_{pr} \left[N_c q_u \left(L_{ud\ wust}^{V,LL} + L_{du\ stww}^{V,LR} \right) + N_c q_d \left(2L_{dd\ stww}^{V,LL} + L_{dd\ stww}^{V,LR} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q_e \left(L_{ed\ wust}^{V,LL} + L_{de\ stww}^{V,LR} \right) + 2q_d L_{swt}^{V,LL} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2 q_d \delta_{st} \left[N_c q_d \left(L_{ed\ prww}^{V,LL} + L_{ed\ prww}^{V,LR} \right) + N_c q_u \left(L_{eu\ prww}^{V,LL} + L_{eu\ prww}^{V,LR} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + q_e \left(4L_{ee\ prww}^{V,LL} + L_{ee\ prww}^{V,LR} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + 12e^2 q_d q_e L_{ed\ prst}^{V,LL} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2 q_e q_d L_{dG\ sw} L_{dG\ tw}^* \delta_{pr} + 8C_F e g q_e \left(L_{dG\ sw} L_{d\gamma\ tw}^* + L_{d\gamma\ sw} L_{dG\ tw}^* \right) \delta_{pr} \\ &\quad + e^2 \left(24q_d^2 + \frac{32}{3}q_e q_d \right) L_{e\gamma\ pw} L_{e\gamma\ rw}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(24q_e^2 + \frac{32}{3}q_e q_d \right) L_{d\gamma\ sw} L_{d\gamma\ tw}^* \delta_{pr} \\ &\quad + 2e^2 q_e q_d \zeta_e \delta_{pr} \delta_{st}, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{L}_{prst}^{V,LR} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_e\delta_{pr} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wvst}^{V1,LR} + L_{stvw}^{V1,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wvst}^{V1,LR} + 2L_{stvw}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wvst}^{V,LR} + L_{wvst}^{V,RR} \right) + 2\mathbf{q}_u L_{swvt}^{V,RR} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_u\delta_{st} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{prvw}^{V,LL} + L_{prvw}^{V,LR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{prvw}^{V,LL} + L_{prvw}^{V,LR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(4L_{prvw}^{V,LL} + L_{prvw}^{V,LR} \right) \right] \\
&- 12e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u L_{prst}^{V,LR} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u L_{us}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} + 8C_F e g \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{us}^* L_{wt} + L_{us}^* L_{wt} \right) \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u - 24\mathbf{q}_u^2 \right) L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u - 24\mathbf{q}_e^2 \right) L_{us}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + 2e^2\mathbf{q}_u\mathbf{q}_e\zeta_e\delta_{pr}\delta_{st}, \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{L}_{prst}^{V,LR} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_e\delta_{pr} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wvst}^{V1,LR} + 2L_{stvw}^{V,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wvst}^{V1,LR} + L_{stvw}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wvst}^{V,LR} + L_{wvst}^{V,RR} \right) + 2\mathbf{q}_d L_{swvt}^{V,RR} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_d\delta_{st} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{prvw}^{V,LL} + L_{prvw}^{V,LR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{prvw}^{V,LL} + L_{prvw}^{V,LR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(4L_{prvw}^{V,LL} + L_{prvw}^{V,LR} \right) \right] \\
&- 12e^2\mathbf{q}_d\mathbf{q}_e L_{prst}^{V,LR} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d L_{us}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} + 8C_F e g \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{us}^* L_{wt} + L_{us}^* L_{wt} \right) \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d - 24\mathbf{q}_d^2 \right) L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d - 24\mathbf{q}_e^2 \right) L_{us}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + 2e^2\mathbf{q}_d\mathbf{q}_e\zeta_e\delta_{pr}\delta_{st}, \tag{53}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{L}_{prst}^{V,RR} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_e\delta_{pr} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wvst}^{V,LR} + L_{stvw}^{V,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wvst}^{V,LR} + 2L_{stvw}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wvst}^{V,LR} + L_{wvst}^{V,RR} \right) + 2\mathbf{q}_u L_{swvt}^{V,RR} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_u\delta_{st} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wvpr}^{V,LR} + L_{prvw}^{V,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wvpr}^{V,LR} + L_{prvw}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wvpr}^{V,LR} + 4L_{prvw}^{V,RR} \right) \right] \\
&+ 12e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u L_{prst}^{V,RR} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u L_{us}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} + 8C_F e g \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{us}^* L_{wt} + L_{us}^* L_{wt} \right) \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + e^2 \left(24\mathbf{q}_u^2 + \frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u \right) L_{wp}^* L_{wr}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(24\mathbf{q}_e^2 + \frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u \right) L_{us}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + 2e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u\zeta_e\delta_{pr}\delta_{st}, \tag{54}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{L}_{ed\ prst}^{V,RR} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_e\delta_{pr} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + 2L_{stww}^{V,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + L_{wwst}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + L_{wwst}^{V,RR} \right) + 2\mathbf{q}_d L_{swwt}^{V,RR} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_d\delta_{st} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wwpr}^{V,LR} + L_{prww}^{V,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wwpr}^{V,LR} + L_{prww}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wwpr}^{V,LR} + 4L_{prww}^{V,RR} \right) \right] \\
&+ 12e^2\mathbf{q}_d\mathbf{q}_e L_{prst}^{V,RR} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d L_{ws}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} + 8C_F e g \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{ws}^* L_{wt}^* L_{d\gamma} + L_{ws}^* L_{wt}^* L_{dG} \right) \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + e^2 \left(24\mathbf{q}_d^2 + \frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d \right) L_{wp}^* L_{wr}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(24\mathbf{q}_e^2 + \frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d \right) L_{ws}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + 2e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d \zeta_e \delta_{pr} \delta_{st}, \tag{55}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{L}_{ue\ prst}^{V,LR} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_u\delta_{pr} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + L_{stww}^{V,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + L_{stww}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + 4L_{stww}^{V,RR} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_e\delta_{st} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{prww}^{V1,LL} + L_{prww}^{V1,LR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(2L_{prww}^{V,LL} + L_{prww}^{V1,LR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wupr}^{V,LL} + L_{pruw}^{V,LR} \right) + 2\mathbf{q}_u L_{pwur}^{V,LL} \right] \\
&- 12e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u L_{prst}^{V,LR} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* \delta_{st} + 8C_F e g \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* L_{u\gamma} + L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* L_{uG} \right) \delta_{st} \\
&\quad + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u - 24\mathbf{q}_e^2 \right) L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_u - 24\mathbf{q}_u^2 \right) L_{ws}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + 2e^2\mathbf{q}_u\mathbf{q}_e \zeta_e \delta_{pr} \delta_{st}, \tag{56}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{L}_{de\ prst}^{V,LR} &= \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_d\delta_{pr} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + L_{stww}^{V,RR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + L_{stww}^{V,RR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wwst}^{V,LR} + 4L_{stww}^{V,RR} \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{3}e^2\mathbf{q}_e\delta_{st} \left[N_c\mathbf{q}_d \left(2L_{prww}^{V,LL} + L_{prww}^{V1,LR} \right) + N_c\mathbf{q}_u \left(L_{wupr}^{V1,LL} + L_{pruw}^{V1,LR} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{wupr}^{V,LL} + L_{pruw}^{V,LR} \right) + 2\mathbf{q}_d L_{pwur}^{V,LL} \right] \\
&- 12e^2\mathbf{q}_d\mathbf{q}_e L_{prst}^{V,LR} - \frac{16}{3}C_F e^2\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* \delta_{st} + 8C_F e g \mathbf{q}_e \left(L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* L_{d\gamma} + L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* L_{dG} \right) \delta_{st} \\
&\quad + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d - 24\mathbf{q}_e^2 \right) L_{pw}^* L_{rw}^* \delta_{st} + e^2 \left(\frac{32}{3}\mathbf{q}_e\mathbf{q}_d - 24\mathbf{q}_d^2 \right) L_{ws}^* L_{wt}^* \delta_{pr} \\
&\quad + 2e^2\mathbf{q}_d\mathbf{q}_e \zeta_e \delta_{pr} \delta_{st}, \tag{57}
\end{aligned}$$

B. SMEFT matching

Scalar Operators	Matching
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{S,RR}$	$-C_{lequ}^{(1)}{}_{prst}$
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{S,RR}$	0
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{S,RL}$	0
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{S,RL}$	$C_{ledq}{}_{prst}$

TABLE VI: LEFT-SMEFT matching of Scalar operators at tree level [17].

Vector Operators	Matching
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V,LL}$	$C_{lq}^{(1)}{}_{prst} - C_{lq}^{(3)}{}_{prst} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{e_L}]_{pr} [Z_{u_L}]_{st}$
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V,LL}$	$C_{lq}^{(1)}{}_{prst} + C_{lq}^{(3)}{}_{prst} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{e_L}]_{pr} [Z_{d_L}]_{st}$
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V,RR}$	$C_{prst}{}^{eu} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{e_R}]_{pr} [Z_{u_R}]_{st}$
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V,RR}$	$C_{prst}{}^{ed} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{e_R}]_{pr} [Z_{d_R}]_{st}$
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V,LR}$	$C_{prst}{}^{lu} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{e_L}]_{pr} [Z_{u_R}]_{st}$
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V,LR}$	$C_{prst}{}^{ld} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{e_L}]_{pr} [Z_{d_R}]_{st}$
$\mathcal{O}_{eu}^{V,RL}$	$C_{prst}{}^{qe} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{u_L}]_{pr} [Z_{e_R}]_{st}$
$\mathcal{O}_{ed}^{V,RL}$	$C_{prst}{}^{qe} - \frac{\bar{g}_Z^2}{M_Z^2} [Z_{d_L}]_{pr} [Z_{e_R}]_{st}$

TABLE VII: LEFT-SMEFT matching of Vector operators at tree level [17].

where

$$[Z_{e_L}]_{pr} = \left[\delta_{pr} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \bar{s}^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{HI}^{(1)}{}_{pr} - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{HI}^{(3)}{}_{pr} \right], \quad [Z_{e_R}]_{pr} = \left[\delta_{pr} \left(+\bar{s}^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{He}{}_{pr} \right], \quad (58)$$

$$[Z_{u_L}]_{pr} = \left[\delta_{pr} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \bar{s}^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{Hq}^{(1)}{}_{pr} + \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{Hq}^{(3)}{}_{pr} \right], \quad [Z_{u_R}]_{pr} = \left[\delta_{pr} \left(-\frac{2}{3} \bar{s}^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{Hu}{}_{pr} \right], \quad (59)$$

$$[Z_{d_L}]_{pr} = \left[\delta_{pr} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \bar{s}^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{Hq}^{(1)}{}_{pr} - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{Hq}^{(3)}{}_{pr} \right], \quad [Z_{d_R}]_{pr} = \left[\delta_{pr} \left(+\frac{1}{3} \bar{s}^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} v_T^2 C_{Hd}{}_{pr} \right]. \quad (60)$$

[1] C. Caso *et al.*, “Review of particle physics. Particle Data Group,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 3, pp. 1–794, 1998.

- [2] N. Nagaosa and P. A. Lee, “Normal-state properties of the uniform resonating-valence-bond state,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 64, pp. 2450–2453, May 1990.
- [3] D. Ambrose *et al.*, “New limit on muon and electron lepton number violation from $K^0(L) \rightarrow \mu^+ e^-$ decay,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 81, pp. 5734–5737, 1998.
- [4] K. Arisaka *et al.*, “Search for the lepton-family number violating decays $K(L) \rightarrow \pi^0 \mu^+ e^-$,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 432, pp. 230–234, 1998.
- [5] R. Appel *et al.*, “Search for lepton flavor violation in K^+ decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 85, pp. 2877–2880, 2000.
- [6] R. Appel *et al.*, “An Improved limit on the rate of decay $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \mu^+ e^-$,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 85, pp. 2450–2453, 2000.
- [7] E. Abouzaid *et al.*, “Search for lepton flavor violating decays of the neutral kaon,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 100, p. 131803, 2008.
- [8] E. Cortina Gil *et al.*, “Search for Lepton Number and Flavor Violation in K^+ and π^0 Decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 127, no. 13, p. 131802, 2021.
- [9] M. Hoferichter, J. Menéndez, and F. Noël, “Improved limits on lepton-flavor-violating decays of light pseudoscalars via spin-dependent $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion in nuclei,” 4 2022.
- [10] L. Calibbi, A. Faccia, A. Masiero, and S. K. Vempati, “Lepton flavour violation from SUSY-GUTs: Where do we stand for MEG, PRISM/PRIME and a super flavour factory,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 74, p. 116002, 2006.
- [11] L. Calibbi and G. Signorelli, “Charged Lepton Flavour Violation: An Experimental and Theoretical Introduction,” *Riv. Nuovo Cim.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 71–174, 2018.
- [12] Y. Kuno and Y. Okada, “Muon decay and physics beyond the standard model,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 73, pp. 151–202, 2001.
- [13] J. Kaulard *et al.*, “Improved limit on the branching ratio of $\mu^- \rightarrow e^+$ conversion on titanium,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 422, pp. 334–338, 1998.
- [14] W. H. Bertl *et al.*, “A Search for muon to electron conversion in muonic gold,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 47, pp. 337–346, 2006.
- [15] Y. Aoki *et al.*, “FLAG Review 2021,” 11 2021.
- [16] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and P. Stoffer, “Low-Energy Effective Field Theory below the Electroweak Scale: Anomalous Dimensions,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 084, 2018.
- [17] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and P. Stoffer, “Low-Energy Effective Field Theory below the Electroweak Scale: Operators and Matching,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 016, 2018.
- [18] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, “Chiral Perturbation Theory to One Loop,” *Annals Phys.*, vol. 158, p. 142, 1984.
- [19] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, “Chiral Perturbation Theory: Expansions in the Mass of the Strange Quark,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 250, pp. 465–516, 1985.
- [20] D. S. M. Alves and N. Weiner, “A viable QCD axion in the MeV mass range,” *JHEP*, vol. 07, p. 092,

- 2018.
- [21] Beddall, A. and Beddall, A., “Measurement of the dalitz-decay branching ratio of the,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 365–370, 2008.
 - [22] W. Dekens, E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and P. Stoffer, “Non-perturbative effects in $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 088, 2019.
 - [23] P. Zyla *et al.*, “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP*, vol. 2020, no. 8, p. 083C01, 2020.
 - [24] R. Kitano, M. Koike, and Y. Okada, “Detailed calculation of lepton flavor violating muon electron conversion rate for various nuclei,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 66, p. 096002, 2002. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 76, 059902 (2007)].
 - [25] N. Assad, B. Fornal, and B. Grinstein, “Baryon Number and Lepton Universality Violation in Leptoquark and Diquark Models,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 777, pp. 324–331, 2018.