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QCD in many regimes critical to extracting fundamental physics in the neutrino sector
. CP violation


## Neutrino-nucleus grassroots points for discussion

I) HEP should take ownership

- critical for assessing sensitivity and establishing discovery
- HEP tools are critical (QCD analysis, radiative corrections, lattice, ...)
- broader context of intensity frontier searches and measurements

Neutrino-nucleus grassroots points for discussion
2) Connections with nuclear theory and generator/modeling

- connection goes both ways
- two paradigms
I) determine elementary ( $\mathrm{NN}, \mathrm{N} \Delta, \mathrm{N} N \pi, \ldots$ ) amplitudes (elementary targets, lattice, ...) then constrain nuclear models from data

2) determine elementary amplitudes (elementary targets, lattice, ...) then compute nuclear effects "ab initio"

- critical to have realistic assessment of error bars from all sources


## example 1: CCQE and the nucleon axial form factor



Every neutrino-nucleus cross section prediction relies on nucleonlevel amplitudes constrained by deuterium experiments of the 1970's, 80 's, fit to simple models. What is the actual uncertainty?

HEP toolbox is being applied to precision lepton-nucleon scattering
Underlying QCD tells us that Taylor expansion in appropriate variable is rapidly convergent


Systematically improvable, quantifiable uncertainties

- FA with complete error budget: [Meyer, Betancourt, Gran, Hill, 1603.03048]

$$
\begin{gathered}
{\left[a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}, a_{4}\right]=[2.30(13),-0.6(1.0),-3.8(2.5), 2.3(2.7)]} \\
C_{i j}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0.350 & -0.678 & 0.611 \\
0.350 & 1 & -0.898 & 0.367 \\
-0.678 & -0.898 & 1 & -0.685 \\
0.611 & 0.367 & -0.685 & 1
\end{array}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$





$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { New module for z } \\
& \text { expansion and reweighting } \\
& \text { in GENIE event generator } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

A. Meyer




- previous extractions biased by unjustified dipole ansatz
- QCD analysis uncovers an underestimated systematic

- nuclear predictions on larger nuclei cannot be better than these inputs
example 2: $V_{e} / \nu_{\mu}$ cross sections and radiative corrections


Electromagnetic radiative corrections, especially for electron, are large and detector-dependent. Consider analogous e-p scattering process.

Some facts about the Rydberg constant puzzle (a.k.a. proton radius puzzle)
I) It has generated a lot of attention and controversy
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2) The most mundane resolution necessitates:

- $5 \sigma$ shift in fundamental Rydberg constant
- discarding or revising decades of results in e-p scattering and hydrogen spectroscopy

Some facts about the Rydberg constant puzzle (a.k.a. proton radius puzzle)
I) It has generated a lot of attention and controversy

2) The most mundane resolution necessitates:

- $5 \sigma$ shift in fundamental Rydberg constant - discarding or revising decades of results in e-p scattering and hydrogen spectroscopy

"The good news is that it's not my problem"

Some facts about the Rydberg constant puzzle (a.k.a. proton radius puzzle)
I) It has generated a lot of attention and controversy

2) The most mundane resolution necessitates:

- $5 \sigma$ shift in fundamental Rydberg constant
- discarding or revising decades of results in e-p scattering and hydrogen spectroscopy

This is HEP's problem:
3) Systematic effects in electron-proton scattering impact neutrino-nucleus scattering, at a level large compared to DUNE precision requirements

"Tre good news is tha it's not my problem"




## Neutrino-nucleus grassroots points for discussion

I) HEP should take ownership

- critical for assessing sensitivity and establishing discovery
- HEP tools are critical (QCD analysis, radiative corrections, lattice, ...)
- broader context of intensity frontier searches and measurements

2) Connections with nuclear theory and generator/modeling

- connection goes both ways
- two paradigms
- critical to have realistic assessment of error bars from all sources
experimental landscape: electron-proton scattering


## G. Lee, J. Arrington, RJH, 2015



$$
\begin{aligned}
& r_{E}^{\text {Mainz }}=0.895(14)(14) \mathrm{fm} \\
& \hline r_{E}^{\text {world }}=0.918(24) \mathrm{fm}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Dipole and z expansion yield different $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{A}}$



(recall floating normalization and selfconsistent flux: different $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{A}}$ can yield similar $d N / \mathrm{dQ}^{2}$ in fit range)


## Cross sections key to discoveries in the neutrino sector

## Particle theory has a critical role to play

- precision hadron physics: model-independent amplitudes, error bars
- radiative corrections: critical for control over $v_{\mathrm{e}} / \mathrm{V}_{\mu}$ ratios
- lattice QCD: completely different systematics vs. elementary targets

Important connections: other intensity frontier initiatives

- radiative corrections: neutrinos, $g$ - 2 , proton radius puzzle, CKM, ...
- lattice QCD \& baryons: neutrinos, DM, proton radius puzzle, nEDM, ...
- interplay of nucleon amplitudes and nuclear effects: energy reconstruction in V-N scattering; atmospheric bkgd. to proton decay, next generation WIMP searches, neutrinoless double beta decay, ...

