

Natural Resolution of the Proton Size Puzzle

G. A. MILLER,¹ A. W. THOMAS², J. D. CARROLL², AND J. RAFELSKI³

(Dated: July 16, 2018)

We show that off-mass-shell effects arising from the internal structure of the proton provide a new proton polarization mechanism in the Lamb shift, proportional to the lepton mass to the fourth power. This effect is capable of resolving the current puzzle regarding the difference in the proton radius extracted from muonic compared with electronic hydrogen. These off-mass-shell effects could be probed in several other experiments.

The recent, extremely precise extraction of the proton radius [pohl] from the measured energy difference between the $2P_{3/2}^{F=2}$ and $2S_{1/2}^{F=1}$ states of muonic hydrogen (H) has created considerable interest. Their analysis yields a proton radius that is smaller than the CODATA [codata] value (extracted mainly from electronic H) by about 4% or 5.0 standard deviations. This implies [pohl] that either the Rydberg constant has to be shifted by 4.9 standard deviations or that the QED calculations for hydrogen are insufficient. Since the Rydberg constant is extremely well measured, and the QED calculations seem to be very extensive and highly accurate, the muonic H finding presents a significant puzzle to the entire physics community.

Our analysis is motivated by the fact that muonic hydrogen is far smaller than electronic hydrogen and therefore more sensitive to corrections arising from hadron structure. In particular, we consider the lowest order correction associated with off-shell behaviour at the photon-nucleon vertex, showing that it can very naturally account for the difference reported by Pohl *et al.*. Since at the present state of development of hadronic physics it is not possible to provide a precise value for this correction, our result may be viewed as a phenomenological study of the sensitivity of muonic hydrogen to important aspects of proton structure. It should spur further study of processes which could be sensitive to off-shell changes in proton structure. In alternate language, the explanation which we present may be viewed as a new contribution from proton polarization that is not constrained by dispersion relations but which can be studied in systems other than the hydrogen atom.

We begin with a brief discussion of the relevant phenomenology. Pohl *et al.* show that the energy difference between the $2P_{3/2}^{F=2}$ and $2S_{1/2}^{F=1}$ states, $\Delta\tilde{E}$ is given by

$$\Delta\tilde{E} = 209.9779(49) - 5.2262 r_p^2 + 0.0347 r_p^3 \text{ meV}, \quad (1)$$

where r_p is given in units of fm. Each of the three coefficients is obtained from extensive theoretical work that has typically been confirmed by several groups. Our study of the relevant calculations [eides, friar,

atomcalcs, zemach, grotchynnien] and corresponding efforts to improve those have revealed no variations large enough to significantly affect the above equation [jent, carroll]. Hence, using this equation, we see that the difference between the Pohl and CODATA values of the proton radius would be entirely removed by an increase of the first term on the rhs of Eq. (1) by just 0.15 meV. Finding a new effect of that size and sign would resolve the puzzle provided that the corresponding effect in electronic H was no more than a few parts in a million (the current difference between theory and experiment [eides]). An effect that gives a contribution to $\Delta\tilde{E}$ of the form $\alpha^5 \frac{m^4}{M^3}$ (with m the lepton mass and M the proton mass) could therefore resolve the proton radius puzzle and cause no disagreement in electronic H.

The search to find such an effect has attracted considerable interest. New physics beyond the Standard Model must satisfy a variety of low-energy constraints and so far no explanation of the proton radius puzzle has been found that satisfies these constraints [Barger:2010aj, Jaeckel:2010xx, TuckerSmith:2010ra, jent1, Brax:2010gp]. Attention has been paid to the third term of Eq. (?) [dr], with the result that its current uncertainties are far too small to resolve the proton radius puzzle [Cloet:2010qa, walcher].

We therefore seek an explanation based on the fact that the proton is not an elementary Dirac particle and that many features of its interactions are still unknown. In particular, consider the electromagnetic form factor, which must depend on all of the relevant invariants. For a proton of initial four-momentum p , the most general expression for the electromagnetic form factor must have a term proportional to $p^2 - m^2$. Such terms have been discussed for a very long time in atomic [zemach, grotchynnien] and nuclear physics [tony]-[Ciofi]. They have been of special concern in relation to the difference between free and bound deep inelastic structure functions measured in the EMC effect [emc], nucleon-nucleon scattering and electromagnetic interactions involving nucleons [bincer, Naus:1987kv], notably quasi-elastic scattering [Strauch:2010nm, Paolone:2010qc, Lu:1997mu, Lu:1998tn, Cloet:2009tx].

We proceed by writing the Dirac part of the vertex function for a proton of momentum p to absorb a photon of momentum $q = p' - p$ as:

$$\Gamma^\mu = \gamma_N^\mu F_1(-q^2) \left[1 + \lambda F(-q^2) \left(\frac{p'^2 - M^2}{M^2} + \frac{p^2 - M^2}{M^2} \right) \right], \quad (2)$$

where $F_1(-q^2)$ is the usual Dirac form factor of the proton which is empirically well represented as a dipole $F_1(-q^2) = (1 - q^2/\Lambda^2)^{-2}$, with $\Lambda = 840$ MeV. This gives a good representation of the data for the values of $-q^2 \equiv Q^2 > 0$ of up to about 1 GeV^2 needed here. The second term on the right hand side of Eq. (?) is a natural off-shell extension where the dimensionless parameter λ represents the strength of the effect and $F(-q^2)$ is an off-shell form factor. The subscript N indicates an operator acting on the proton. Operators acting on the electron have no index. The virtuality of the proton is represented by the terms involving the difference between the square of the proton four-momentum and M^2 . The value of λ is constrained by nuclear physics for which the size of the expected effect in nuclear physics (using $(p^2 - M^2)/M^2 \sim 2V/M \approx 0.08$) is about $0.08 \lambda F(-q^2)$. Typical effects at the center of nuclear matter are constrained by a variety of phenomena such as the EMC effect, uncertainties in quasi-elastic electron-nuclear scattering [bobm], and deviations from the Coulomb sum rule [zm]. Such effects are typically constrained to be no larger than 10%. The relevant quantity determining the influence of off-shell effects is the ratio, R

$$R = 0.08 \lambda F(-q^2). \quad (3)$$

Thus existing nuclear physics knowledge prevents the magnitude of λ from being chosen arbitrarily large. Light-front quark-models [Lepage:1982gd] of the nucleon wave function ψ , show that it contains a propagator of the form $D(M^2) \equiv M^2 - \sum_i \frac{\mathbf{k}_{\perp, i}^2 + m_i^2}{x_i}$. The $p^2 - M^2$ term is proportional to $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial M^2} \sim \frac{1}{D(M^2)} \psi$. The average value of the denominator is typically of the order of the nucleon mass and thus the natural value of the parameter λ is of order unity.

We take the off-shell form factor $F(-q^2)$ to vanish at $q^2 = 0$. This means that the charge of the off-shell proton will be the same as the charge of a free proton, and is demanded by current conservation as expressed through the Ward-Takahashi identity [bincer, Naus:1987kv]. Otherwise, it is completely unknown. We assume

$$F(-q^2) = \frac{\frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(\frac{-q^2}{b^2})}{(1 - q^2/\Lambda^2)^\xi}. \quad (4)$$

This form is simple and purely phenomenological. It is clearly not unique. The parameter b is expected to be of the order of the pion mass, because these longest range components of the nucleon are least bound and more susceptible to external perturbations which put the nucleon off its mass shell. At large values of $|q^2|$, F becomes the same as F_1 , if $\xi = 0$. But, in principle, there is no reason why ξ should vanish.

The lowest order term in which the nucleon is sufficiently off-shell in a muonic atom for this correction to produce a significant effect is the two-photon exchange diagram of Fig. 1 and its crossed partner.




FIG. 1. Direct two-photon exchange graph corresponding to the hitherto neglected term. The dashed line denotes the lepton; the solid line, the nucleon; the wavy lines, photons; and the ellipse, the off-shell nucleon.

Feynman rules, using the Lorentz Gauge, give the change in the invariant amplitude caused by using Eq. (?), \mathcal{M}_{Off} as evaluated in the lepton/nucleon rest frame as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\text{Off}} &= e^4 \frac{2\lambda}{M^2} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} F_1^2(-k^2) F(-k^2) \left[\gamma_\mu \frac{(l \cdot \gamma - k \cdot \gamma + m)}{k^2 - 2l \cdot k + i\epsilon} \gamma_\nu + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \gamma_\nu \frac{(l \cdot \gamma + k \cdot \gamma + m)}{k^2 + 2l \cdot k + i\epsilon} \gamma_\mu \right] \left(\frac{1}{k^2 + i\epsilon} \right)^2 \\ &\quad \times \gamma_N^\mu (P \cdot \gamma + k \cdot \gamma + M) \gamma_N^\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the lepton momentum is $l = (m, 0, 0, 0)$ and m its mass, the virtual photon momentum is k and the nucleon momentum $P = (M, 0, 0, 0)$. The denominator of the proton propagator is cancelled by the term involving the virtuality of the intermediate proton. Thus this graph can be thought of as involving a contact interaction and the amplitude in Eq. (?) as a new type of proton polarization correction corresponding to a subtraction term in the dispersion relation for the two-photon exchange diagram that is not constrained by the cross section data [drell].

Evaluation proceeds in the standard way by taking the sum over Dirac indices, performing the integral over k^0 by contour rotation, $k^0 \rightarrow -ik^0$, and integrating over

the angular variables. The matrix element \mathcal{M} is well approximated by a constant in momentum space, for the momenta typical of a muonic atom, so that the corresponding potential $V = i\mathcal{M}$ takes the form $V(\mathbf{r}) = V_0\delta(\mathbf{r})$ in coordinate space. This approach is called the “scattering approximation” [eides]. Then the relevant matrix elements have the form $V_0|\Psi_{2S}(0)|^2$, where Ψ_{2S} is the muonic hydrogen wave function in the 2s-state of relevance to the experiment of Pohl *et al.* This potential gives no contribution to P states. We use $|\Psi_{2S}(0)|^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi a_0^3}$, with $a_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha m_r}$ and m_r the lepton-proton reduced mass.

The result is

$$\langle 2 S | V | 2 S \rangle = \frac{-\alpha^5 m_r^3}{M^2} \frac{2}{\pi} \lambda \frac{8 m M}{\Lambda^2} F_L(m) + \frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha^5 m_r^3}{M^2} \frac{2}{\pi} \lambda \sigma \cdot \sigma_N F_{HFS}(m), \quad (6)$$

$$F_L(m) \equiv \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{x} \frac{1}{(1+x^2)^{4+\xi}} \tan^{-1}(x^2 \frac{\Lambda^2}{b^2}) \frac{\left(\sqrt{\frac{x+\beta}{x}} - 1\right)}{\beta}, \quad (7)$$

$$F_{HFS}(m) \equiv \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty x dx \frac{1}{(1+x^2)^{4+\xi}} \tan^{-1}(x^2 \frac{\Lambda^2}{b^2}) \frac{(-\sqrt{x(x+\beta)} + x + \beta)}{\beta(x+\beta)}, \quad (8)$$

where $\beta \equiv 4m^2/\Lambda^2$. There is a contribution to the Lamb shift which contains a factor of the product of the lepton and nucleon masses in addition to the factor from the wave function, leading to an m^4 dependence. This term will automatically be negligible for electronic hydrogen. There is also a contribution to the hyperfine splitting HFS.

We next seek values of the model parameters b, ξ of Eq. (7). These are chosen so as to reproduce the value of the needed energy shift of 0.15 meV with a value of λ of order unity. Numerical evaluation, using $\xi = 0$ for simplicity, shows that $\lambda = 2$ for $b = 85$ MeV. If ξ is changed substantially from 0 to 2 (using $\tilde{\Lambda} = \Lambda$) the value of λ required to reproduce a 0.15 meV change in the Lamb shift is increased by 5%. If our mechanism increases the muonic Lamb shift by 0.15 meV, the change in the electronic H Lamb shift for the 2S-state is well below 1 kHz, which is significantly below the current uncertainty in both theory and experiment [eides]. We note that the HFS shift caused by our effect, is just 3% of the present correction to the Lamb shift, so we neglect it for muonic H. For electronic H it contributes less than 1 kHz to the HFS, again within current experimental and theoretical limits. Should some other effect account for part of the proton radius puzzle, the value of λ would be reduced. We also caution that other systems in which one might aim to test this effect could show sensitivity to the value of ξ or $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in Eq. (4).

In conclusion, we have shown that a simple off-shell correction to the photon-proton vertex, which arises naturally in quantum field theory and is of natural size and consistent with the constraints of gauge invariance, is capable of resolving the discrepancy between the extraction of the proton charge radius from Lamb shift measurements in muonic and electronic hydrogen. Indeed, off-shell effects were an explicit concern of both Zemach [zemach] and Grotch & Yennie [grotch-yennie]. However, it is only with the remarkable improvement in experimental precision recently achieved that it has become of practical importance. Within nuclear physics there is great interest in the role that the modification of nucleon structure in-medium may play in nuclear structure [Guichon:1995ue, Guichon:2004xg]. We stress that the effect postulated here can be investigated in lepton-nucleus scattering via the binding effects of the nucleon as well as by lepton-proton scattering in arenas where two photon (or γ, Z) effects are relevant. It may also be that the study of other muonic atoms, such as muonic deuterium, may provide an independent constraint on such terms.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the United States Department of Energy, (GAM) grant FG02-97ER41014; (JR) grant DE-FG02-04ER41318; (JDC, in part) contract DE-AC05-06OR23177 (under which Jefferson Science Associates, LLC, operates JeffersonLab), and by the Australian Research Council and the University of Adelaide (AWT, JDC). GAM and JR gratefully acknowledge the support and hospitality of the University of Adelaide while the project was undertaken.

-
- [pohl] R. Pohl *et al.*, Nature **466**, 213 (2010).
[codata] P. J. Mohr, B. N. Taylor, and D. B. Newell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 633 (2008).
[eides] M. I. Eides, H. Grotch and V. A. Shelyuto, Phys. Rept. **342**, 63 (2001).
[friar] J. L. Friar, Annals Phys. **122**, 151 (1979).
[atomcalcs] S. G. Karshenboim, Phys. Rept. **422**, 1 (2005); K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2092 (1996); K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 3593-3598 (1999); E. Borie, Z. Phys. **A278**, 127 (1976) 463; E. Borie, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 032508 (2005); A. P. Martynenko, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022506 (2005); A. P. Martynenko, Phys. At. Nucl. **71**, 125 (2008); K. Pachucki, and U. D. Jentschura, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 113005 (2003); A. Veitia, K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 042501 (2004); A. Antognini *et al.*, AIP Conf. Proc. **796**, 253 (2005); T. Kinoshita, M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett.

- 82, 3240 (1999); V. G. Ivanov, E. Y. Korzinin and S. G. Karshenboim, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 027702 (2009); R. N. Faustov, E. V. Cherednikova and A. P. Martynenko, Nucl. Phys. A **703**, 365 (2002); A. Di Giacomo, Nucl. Phys. B **11**, 411 (1969); G. A. Rinker, Phys. Rev. A **14**, 18 (1976); E. Borie and G. A. Rinker, Phys. Rev. A **18**, 324 (1978); R. Barbieri, M. Caffo, E. Remiddi, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **7S2** (1973) 60-62; H. Suura, E. H. Wichmann, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1930 (1957); E. Petermann, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1931 (1957); E. Borie, Helv. Phys. Acta **48**, 671 (1975); J. L. Friar, J. Martorell and D. W. L. Sprung, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4061 (1999); R. N. Faustov and A. P. Martynenko, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **63**, 845 (2000); A. P. Martynenko and R. N. Faustov, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **64**, 1282 (2001); R. Rosenfelder, Phys. Lett. B **463**, 317 (1999); J. L. Friar, Z. Phys. A **292**, 1 (1979); J. L. Friar, Z. Phys. A **303**, 84 (1981); L. A. Borisoglebsky and E. E. Trofimenko, Phys. Lett. B **81**, 175 (1979); A. Czarnecki, M. Dowling, J. Mondejar and J. H. Piclum, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **205-206**, 271 (2010).
- [**emc**] D. F. Geesaman, K. Saito and A. W. Thomas, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **45**, 337 (1995); M. M. Sargsian *et al.*, J. Phys. G **29**, R1 (2003).
- [**tony**] G. V. Dunne and A. W. Thomas, Nucl. Phys. A **455**, 701 (1986).
- [**wally**] W. Melnitchouk, A. W. Schreiber and A. W. Thomas, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 1183 (1994).
- [**franz**] F. Gross and S. Liuti, Phys. Rev. C **45**, 1374 (1992).
- [**Gross:2008ps**] F. Gross and A. Stadler, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 014005 (2008).
- [**Ciofi**] C. Ciofi degli Atti, L. L. Frankfurt, L. P. Kaptari and M. I. Strikman, Phys. Rev. C **76**, 055206 (2007).
- [**bobm**] R. D. McKeown, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1452 (1986).
- [**zm**] Z. E. Meziani *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 2130 (1984).
- [**Lepage:1982gd**] G. P. Lepage, S. J. Brodsky, T. Huang and P. B. Mackenzie, Invited talk given at Banff Summer Inst. on Particle Physics, Banff, Alberta, Canada, Aug 16-28, (1981).
- [**bincer**] A. M. Bincer, Phys. Rev. **118**, 855 (1960).
- [**Naus:1987kv**] H. W. L. Naus and J. H. Koch, Phys. Rev. C **36**, 2459 (1987); J. W. Bos and J. H. Koch, Nucl. Phys. A **563**, 539 (1993).
- [**zemach**] A. C. Zemach, Phys. Rev. **104**, 1771 (1956).
- [**grotchennie**] H. Grotch and D. R. Yennie, Rev. Mod. Phys. **41**, 350 (1969).
- [**jent**] U. D. Jentschura, arXiv:1011.5275.
- [**carroll**] J. D. Carroll, *et al.* to be published.
- [**Barger:2010aj**] V. Barger, C. W. Chiang, W. Y. Keung and D. Marfatia, arXiv:1011.3519 [hep-ph].
- [**Jaeckel:2010xx**] J. Jaeckel and S. Roy, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 125020 (2010).
- [**TuckerSmith:2010ra**] D. Tucker-Smith and I. Yavin, arXiv:1011.4922 [hep-ph].
- [**Brax:2010gp**] P. Brax and C. Burrage, arXiv:1010.5108 [hep-ph].
- [**jent1**] U. D. Jentschura, arXiv:1011.5453.
- [**dr**] A. De Rújula, Phys. Lett. B **693**, 555 (2010).
- [**Cloet:2010qa**] I. C. Cloet and G. A. Miller, arXiv:1008.4345 [hep-ph], in press Phys. Rev. C.
- [**walcher**] M. O. Distler, J. C. Bernauer and T. Walcher, arXiv:1011.1861 [nucl-th].
- [**Strauch:2010nm**] S. Strauch *et al.* [for the Jefferson Lab Hall A and for the Jefferson Lab Hall A Collaborations], [arXiv:1012.4095 [nucl-ex]].
- [**Paolone:2010qc**] M. Paolone, S. P. Malace, S. Strauch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 072001 (2010).
- [**Lu:1997mu**] D. -H. Lu, A. W. Thomas, K. Tsushima *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **417**, 217-223 (1998).
- [**Lu:1998tn**] D. -H. Lu, K. Tsushima, A. W. Thomas, A. G. Williams, K. Saito, K. Saito, Phys. Rev. C **60**, 068201 (1999); J. R. Smith and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 065205 (2004).
- [**Cloet:2009tx**] I. C. Cloet, G. A. Miller, E. Piasetzky and G. Ron, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 082301 (2009).
- [**drell**] S. D. Drell and J. D. Sullivan, Phys. Lett. **19**, 516 (1965).
- [**Guichon:1995ue**] P. A. M. Guichon, K. Saito, E. N. Rodionov *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **601**, 349-379 (1996); P. G. Blunden and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C **54**, 359 (1996).
- [**Guichon:2004xg**] P. A. M. Guichon, A. W. Thomas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 132502 (2004);