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Neutrino-induced coherent pion production is an interaction between a neutrino and a target nucleus under conditions of low momentum transfer that leaves the nucleus in the ground state. This interaction is easily reconstructed, so it is a promising candidate to constrain neutrino flux in the Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE). However, its cross section is poorly defined due to uncertainties on the nucleon axial form factor. In this work, we have compared three form factor descriptions: a dipole approximation based on axial mass, \( M_A \), a \( z \) power series expansion based on deuterium bubble chamber data, and \( z \) expansions for two Lattice QCD calculations. Over relevant variable ranges, the curves for the form factors as a function of momentum transfer were compared along with reweighted event data for kinematic variables in events simulated using GENIE. The relative differences between various form factors and the dipole approximation with \( M_A = 1.00 \text{ GeV} \) were under 11%. The relative differences for the momentum transferred from the neutrino, momentum transferred to the nucleus only, and energy of the neutrino were under 13%. With this in mind, neutrino-induced coherent pion production can be used to constrain neutrino flux in DUNE within these uncertainties.

I. INTRODUCTION

There are yet a great many questions about the fundamental properties of neutrinos. Questions regarding the ordering of the mass states of the various flavors, mixing angles between the mass and flavor eigenstates, and the charge-parity violating phase abound and motivate modern neutrino experiments to search for methods by which to constrain these values. Since the number of interactions at various energies is the method by which these values intrinsic to neutrinos can be determined, it is imperative that oscillation experiments such as the Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE) have knowledge of the energy and number distribution of neutrinos that pass through their detectors.

This energy-number distribution is known as the neutrino flux, and it is predictably difficult to get an accurate count of how many neutrinos are passing through a detector. Even if one had an estimate of how many neutrinos would be produced at the proton target upstream of the detector, due to neutrino oscillations and the wide angle of the beam, it is often difficult to determine the energy or number of neutrinos at the detector to precision levels necessary for experiments solely using beam data. Instead, neutrino flux is more effectively determined at the detector. This is done by starting with an interaction that has a well defined cross section and is “clean” enough for the detector to easily reconstruct the incident neutrino energy. If one knows the chance of an interaction occurring, the number of those interactions that occur within the detector, and the reconstructed energies of the incident neutrinos that caused these interactions, then one is able to deduce the flux at the detector.

Neutrino-electron scattering has been proposed as one of these such interactions for DUNE [1], and, while being very well understood, this interaction suffers from a low cross section. Since high statistics are vital to neutrino experiments, it is therefore logical to consider an interaction with a greater cross section.

Neutrino-induced coherent pion production is presented as a strong candidate for this greater-cross section interaction. Although more theoretically complex than neutrino-electron scattering, it is believed that the recent advancements in theory surrounding the interaction [2–10] will allow for a neutrino flux constraint to be extracted using this process. This interaction has great potential to be used as a flux constraint since it quantifies what few approximations it utilizes, it is applicable at both low and high energies with the correct kinematic cuts employed, the effects of final state interactions are negligible [9], and the incident neutrino energy can be reconstructed to high confidence. At the same time, understanding this interaction is crucial as it is a potentially problematic background in \( \nu_e \) oscillation experiments [9, 11].

The main setback with neutrino-induced coherent pion production is the uncertainty in cross section due to lack of precise knowledge of the axial form factor [2, 4, 7, 10, 12–18]. This problem has been taken on by many groups [14–17, 19–23] seeking to constrain this form factor through various methods. Since few of the results of these experiments are in total agreement with one another, it is useful to compare their respective form factors and quantify the effects of their differences on measured quantities of neutrino interactions.

In this paper, these various form factor descriptions will be laid out and explained before being directly compared with one another over the relevant momentum transfer ranges. Next, these form factors will be used...
to reweight events simulated using the GENIE neutrino event generator to ascertain the physical manifestations predicted by the descriptions, finally an analysis and conclusion will be given on the results of the comparison.

The paper is structured in the following manner. Sec. II begins by providing background information foundational to the process of neutrino-induced coherent pion production. Next, Sec. III provides a light summary to the process of neutrino-induced coherent pion production 

\[ Q^2 = -q^2 = -(p_\nu - p_l)^2, \]

where \( p_\nu \) is the four-momentum of the neutrino, and \( p_l \) is the four-momentum of the outgoing lepton. Only interactions under a certain \( Q^2 \) threshold are relevant for consideration for coherent pion production, which is the main kinematic cut that must be made when considering the interaction. However, while \( Q^2 \) is a useful kinematic variable for most cuts and important in determining how the neutrino will “see” the target nucleus, there is also some momentum transfer to the pion, and \( Q^2 \) fails to differentiate momentum transfer to the pion from transfer to the nucleus itself. The variable \( t \) is introduced to remedy this. It is properly the squared four-momentum transfer from the neutrino-lepton-pion system to the nucleus, which is laid out as

\[ t = (p_\nu - p_l - p_\pi)^2, \]

where \( p_\pi \) is the four-momentum of the outgoing pion. This variable is the best measure of coherence, and it is useful in tandem with \( Q^2 \) for analyzing the kinematics of interactions.

The cross section for neutrino-induced coherent pion production [11, 18, 24] is given as

\[
\frac{d\sigma}{dx dy dt} = \frac{G_F^2 m_N f_\pi^2 E_\nu (1 - y)}{2\pi^2 g_A} \times F_A(Q^2) \frac{d\sigma(\pi^0 + N \rightarrow \pi^0 + N)}{dt},
\]

where \( G_F \) is the Fermi coupling constant, \( m_N \) is the nucleon mass, \( f_\pi \) is the pion decay constant, \( E_\nu \) is the energy of the incoming neutrino, \( y = \frac{E_\nu - E_l}{p_\nu} \) with \( E_l \) as the energy of the outgoing lepton, \( g_A \) is the axial coupling constant
constant, \( \frac{d\sigma(\pi^0+N\rightarrow\pi^0+N)}{dt} \) is the pion-nucleus cross section, and \( F_A(Q^2) \) is the nucleon axial form factor, which is known to be a function of \( Q^2 \).

All variables other than the pion-nucleus cross section and \( F_A(Q^2) \) are known to high confidence. Accordingly, these two variables must be constrained to calculate the coherent pion production cross section. The pion-nucleus cross section can be directly measured by DUNE, so it is expected that this value will come into focus through experiments in the coming years. Conversely, \( F_A(Q^2) \) can only be directly measured through measurements on free nucleons, which cannot be done within DUNE. Due to the difficulty of conducting such an experiment, \( F_A(Q^2) \) must instead be determined by using data from other experiments and through theory, and these proposed values must be rigorously cross examined to determine the most accurate description for \( F_A(Q^2) \). Descriptions offering answers to the question of the shape of \( F_A(Q^2) \) will now be laid out in the following section.

III. DISCUSSION OF FORM FACTOR DESCRIPTIONS

Descriptions for \( F_A(Q^2) \) range from rough approximations to complex parameterizations. No matter the idea, all descriptions must, in some way, consider the data from the bubble chamber experiments from Argonne National Laboratory (ANL), [20–22], Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) [19], and Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL) [23] that provide experimental data to constrain the form of \( F_A(Q^2) \).

A. Axial Dipole Approximation

The simplest of the models for \( F_A(Q^2) \) is the dipole approximation. This model is rigorously defined in Refs. [4–7, 15], and is treated as an assumption that, while known to be imperfect, is a reasonable fit at low \( Q^2 \) where \( F_A(Q^2) \) is relevant to coherent pion production. The equation for the dipole approximation is given as

\[
F_A^{\text{Dip}}(Q^2) = \frac{g_A}{(1 + \frac{Q^2}{M_A^2})^2} \tag{4}
\]

where \( g_A \) is the axial coupling constant, and \( M_A \) is the axial mass.

While \( F_A^{\text{Dip}}(Q^2) \) is only dependent on a single unknown quantity, the value of \( M_A \) is poorly constrained by experiments, which raises reasonable doubts that \( F_A^{\text{Dip}}(Q^2) \) is an oversimplified model and should not be used as the description for \( F_A(Q^2) \). \( M_A \) has been measured [19–23] for decades now, but there still exist severe tensions between various experiments, with the only strong consensus being that \( 1.00 \text{ GeV} \leq M_A \leq 1.40 \text{ GeV} \). Even over this seemingly small range, these different values for \( M_A \) generate quite different curves for \( F_A^{\text{Dip}}(Q^2) \) as will be shown in Sec. IV A. Nevertheless, the relatively simple expression for \( F_A^{\text{Dip}}(Q^2) \) combined with the research done in the past [19–23, 26] make the dipole approximation a good baseline for \( F_A(Q^2) \) in flux constraint considerations.

B. \( z \) Expansion

In response to the simple, but poorly constrained, dipole approximation model description, the \( z \) expansion presents a method of defining \( F_A(Q^2) \) independently of any model. Instead of considering the physical distribution of \( F_A(Q^2) \), the \( z \) expansion employs a power series expansion to fit the shape of \( F_A(Q^2) \). A proper mathematical treatment of this theory is given in Refs. [2, 3, 14], but a brief description similar to that in Ref.[12] will also be given here.

In Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), the function \( F_A(Q^2) \) is analytic for \( Q^2 = -t > -t_{\text{cut}} \) where \( t_{\text{cut}} \) denotes the location of a \( t \)-channel cut. Therefore, a new analytic function \( z(Q^2) \) can be defined:

\[
z(Q^2) = \frac{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} + Q^2} - \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}}{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} + Q^2} + \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} - t_0}} \tag{5}
\]

with \( t_0 \) as a somewhat arbitrary parameter that collaborations utilizing descriptions based on the \( z \) expansion formalism will define differently. In all examinations, \( t_{\text{cut}} \) is chosen to be \( t_{\text{cut}} \equiv (3m_\pi)^2 \), which is the three-pion kinematic threshold [16]. \( F_A(Q^2) \) can now be expanded as a power series in \( z(Q^2) \) since \( |z| < 1 \):

\[
F_A^z(Q^2) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z(Q^2)^k \approx \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\text{max}}} a_k z(Q^2)^k, \quad (6)
\]

which can in turn be truncated to an approximation by only running the summation over a finite number of coefficients as shown in Eq. 6.

There have been two families of endeavors to determine the values of \( a_k \): experimentally, by using deuterium data, and theoretically, by using Lattice Quantum Chromodynamics calculations. Both of these methods will be addressed in the following two subsections.

1. Deuterium Data

Using a fit to the bubble chamber experiments’ data [19–23], Ref. [14] constrains \( a_k \) as shown in Table I.

---

1 In the dipole approximation, \( g_A = 1.2723 \) as defined in Ref.[25]. However, the other descriptions may use slightly different values for \( g_A \).
TABLE I: Coefficients for the deuterium data $z$ expansion fit to the combined datasets from all bubble chamber experiments [19–23].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_0$</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
<th>$a_3$</th>
<th>$a_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_5$</td>
<td>$a_6$</td>
<td>$a_7$</td>
<td>$a_8$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-0.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Coefficients from LQCD calculations done by Bali et al. [15].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_0$</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$a_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>-1.274</td>
<td>-0.379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III: Coefficients from LQCD calculations done by Djukanovic et al. [16].

They never explicitly define $t_0$, instead defining $z$ as

$$z(Q^2) = \frac{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} + Q^2} - \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}}}}{\sqrt{t_{\text{cut}} + Q^2} + \sqrt{t_{\text{cut}}}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

However, it can be noted that this is the same as the $z$ definition from the other works with $t_0 = 0$.

Now that all of the parameters regarding the various descriptions of $F_A(Q^2)$ have been defined, direct comparisons and visualizations of the behavior of $F_A(Q^2)$ for these descriptions will be presented in the following section.

IV. AXIAL FORM FACTOR COMPARISON

We made a direct comparison of the shapes of the $F_A(Q^2)$ curves for each description in order to assess the magnitude of variation between them. These descriptions were first analyzed within their own families and later compared comprehensively against all other descriptions. Two ranges of $Q^2$ were used for these analyses, both starting at $Q^2_{\text{min}} = 0.00$ GeV$^2$ but with $Q^2_{\text{max}} = 1.00$ GeV$^2$ for a greater picture of how the descriptions differ at larger values of $Q^2$ and $Q^2_{\text{max}} = 0.20$ GeV$^2$ for a tighter comparison over the values of $Q^2$ that are more relevant to coherent pion production.

A. Dipole Approximation

To analyze the dipole approximation description, various values of $M_A$ were used to generate the $F_A(Q^2)$ curves. These values were selected to range from 1.00 GeV$^2$ to 1.25 GeV$^2$ in increments of 0.05 GeV$^2$. The plots to the different maximum values of $Q^2$ are given in Fig. 3.

To better quantify the differences over both ranges of $Q^2$, a plot of the the dipole approximation with different values for $M_A$ were compared against the dipole approximation with $M_A = 1.00$ GeV according to

$$|\Delta F_A^i(Q^2)| = \frac{|F_A^i(Q^2) - F_{A, M_A=1.00}^i(Q^2)|}{|F_{A, M_A=1.00}^i(Q^2)|},$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)

where $\Delta F_A^i(Q^2)$ is the relative difference for a given from factor description, $F_A^i(Q^2)$, and $F_{A, M_A=1.00}^i(Q^2)$ is the $F_A(Q^2)$ for the dipole approximation with $M_A = 1.00$ GeV, which was chosen arbitrarily. The results are shown in Fig. 4.
B. $z$ Expansion

Beginning the comparisons of the $z$ expansion descriptions with the deuterium data study, the shape of the axial form factor, $F_A^{z,D}(Q^2)$, curves for varying values of $k_{\text{max}}$ were examined. This analysis is shown in Fig. 5.

Similarly to as is done in Ref. [14], it was noted that the $F_A^{z,D}(Q^2)$ curve for $k_{\text{max}}=4$ is essentially the same as for greater values of $k_{\text{max}}$. This was proven through a relative difference plot generated using an expression similar to Eq. 10:

$$|\Delta F_A^z(Q^2)| = \frac{|F_A^z(Q^2) - F_A^{z,D,k_{\text{max}}=4}(Q^2)|}{|F_A^{z,D,k_{\text{max}}=4}(Q^2)|},$$

(11)

where $F_A^z(Q^2)$ is now one of the $F_A^{z,D}(Q^2)$ curves for the deuterium data z expansion except for $k_{\text{max}} = 0$ due to it being an unhelpful description and $k_{\text{max}} = 4$ because $F_A^{z,D,k_{\text{max}}=4}(Q^2)$ is the $F_A(Q^2)$ curve for the deuterium data $z$ expansion with $k_{\text{max}}=4$, which is used as the baseline for the relative difference analysis.
FIG. 6: Relative difference plot for varying values of $k_{\text{max}}$ for the deuterium data $z$ expansion. $k_{\text{max}} = 4$ is the baseline. The curve for $k_{\text{max}} = 0$ has been purposely omitted.

As can be seen from Fig. 6, $F^z_{\text{D}}(Q^2)$ for $k_{\text{max}} = 4$ is an accurate description of the results of the bubble chamber study. Therefore, $F^z_{\text{D}}(Q^2)$ was used exclusively with $k_{\text{max}} = 4$ throughout the rest of this examination for the sake of simplicity.

Moving to the LQCD calculations carried out by Bali et al. [15] and Djukanovic et al. [16], the coefficients are calculated such that it would be improper not to use the entire list calculated by each collaboration, so there is no need to independently determine what $k_{\text{max}}$ should be for these descriptions. Figure 7 shows $F_A(Q^2)$ for these two descriptions. One can see that these descriptions do not converge to $g_A$ at $F_A(Q^2 = 0)$ as is expected and shown in the other descriptions. This is due to the uncertainties intrinsic to the calculations, and the difference in the spectra is likely not a real effect.

C. Direct Comparison

Finally, for $F_A(Q^2)$, selected descriptions from all families were compared at once. In order to get a range of values for the dipole approximation without crowding the plots, only dipole descriptions with $M_A = 1.00, 1.10, 1.20$ GeV were plotted. Once again, these descriptions were all compared over both $Q^2_{\text{max}} = 1.00 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $Q^2_{\text{max}} = 0.20 \text{ GeV}^2$. Figure 8 shows both of these comparisons.

In order to more precisely analyze the differences between the $F_A(Q^2)$ descriptions, a relative difference plot was generated according to Eq. 10, where $F^i_A(Q^2)$ is any selected form factor description, not simply any dipole approximation description as in Sec. IV A. Figure 9 shows these relative differences only to $Q^2_{\text{max}} = 0.20 \text{ GeV}^2$ as it is more easily seen that the descriptions differ appreciably at greater values of $Q^2$.

V. EVENT REWEIGHTING

In order to get an idea of how these changes in $F_A(Q^2)$ would manifest within the detector, it was necessary to compare event variables as recorded by the detector for different descriptions. This was facilitated principally by generating 1,000,000 events using the detector geometry of the DUNE Near Detector in GENIE with $F_A(Q^2)$ given by the dipole approximation with $M_A = 1.00$ GeV. The events from this file were then reweighted according to their $Q^2$ value for the other $F_A(Q^2)$ descriptions to compare the shapes of event distributions. Figure 10 gives three histograms of various reweighted event distributions for event variables.

Furthermore, Fig. 11 shows the relative differences between reweighted number of events in each bin for each $F_A(Q^2)$ for each variable. The method for generating these curves is given as

$$|\Delta N^i_a(\zeta, Q^2)| = \frac{|N^i_a(\zeta, Q^2) - N^{\text{Dip}}_{a, M_A=1.00}(\zeta, Q^2)|}{|N^{\text{Dip}}_{a, M_A=1.00}(\zeta, Q^2)|},$$

where $\Delta N^i_a(\zeta)$ is the relative difference in the reweighted number, $N$, of events in a bin, $a$, for an arbitrary variable, $\zeta$, with an arbitrary form factor description that is...
FIG. 8: Comparisons of $F_A(Q^2)$ for the dipole description with selected $M_A$ values and the $z$ expansion description for the deuterium data [14], LQCD calculations by Bali et al. [15], and LQCD calculations by Djukanovic et al. [16]. $Q^2_{\text{max}} = 1.00$ GeV$^2$ for the top figure and $Q^2_{\text{max}} = 0.20$ GeV$^2$ for the bottom figure.

FIG. 9: Relative difference as given in Eq. 10 between selected $F_A(Q^2)$ descriptions and the $F_A(Q^2)$ curve for the arbitrarily chosen dipole approximation with $M_A = 1.00$ GeV.

FIG. 10: Reweighted histograms for various event variables.

As seen from Fig. 9, the curves of $F_A(Q^2)$ vary only up to about 11% from the dipole approximation with $M_A = 1.00$ GeV. These uncertainties are relatively small, but the more telling indication of the sensitivity of the coherent pion production cross section is the examination of the relative difference curves for the kinematic

VI. ANALYSIS

still dependent on $Q^2$, and $N_{\text{Dip.}}^{\text{Dip.}, M_A=1.00}(\zeta, Q^2)$ represents the same information but specifically for the dipole approximation description with $M_A = 1.00$ GeV$^2$. 

VI. ANALYSIS

As seen from Fig. 9, the curves of $F_A(Q^2)$ vary only up to about 11% from the dipole approximation with $M_A = 1.00$ GeV. These uncertainties are relatively small, but the more telling indication of the sensitivity of the coherent pion production cross section is the examination of the relative difference curves for the kinematic
FIG. 11: Relative differences between the number of reweighted events for various event variables.
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