Bounds on compositeness from neutrinoless double β decay

Orlando Panella*
Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Perugia, INFN, Sezione di Perugia, Via A. Pascoli, I-06100 Perugia, Italy and Collège de France, Laboratoire de Physique Corpusculaire, 11 Place Marcelin Berthelot, F-75231 Paris, Cedex 05, France

Yogendra N. Srivastava
Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Perugia, INFN, Sezione di Perugia, Via A. Pascoli, I-06100 Perugia, Italy and Physics Department, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115

(Received 5 January 1995)

Assuming the existence of a heavy Majorana neutral particle arising from a composite model scenario we discuss the constraints imposed by present experimental limits of half-life neutrinoless double β decay ($0\nu\beta\beta$) measurements on the coupling of the heavy composite neutrinos to the gauge bosons. For neutrino masses $M_N = 1$ TeV we obtain a rather weak lower bound on the compositeness scale: $\Lambda \geq 0.3$ TeV.

PACS number(s): 12.60.Rc, 13.15.+g, 14.80.Mz, 23.40.−s

Heavy neutral Majorana particles with masses in the TeV region are predicted in various theoretical models, such as superstring-inspired E_6 grand unification [1] or left-right symmetric models [2]. In addition the possibility of a fourth generation with a heavy neutral lepton that could be of Majorana type is not yet ruled out [3,4].

In this paper we discuss the possibility that a heavy Majorana neutrino might arise from a composite model of the ordinary fermions [5]. Composite models, which describe quarks and leptons as bound states of still more fundamental particles, generally called preons, have been developed as alternatives to overcome some of the theoretical problems of the standard model [6].

Although no completely consistent dynamical composite theory has been found to date, various models have been proposed, and one common (inevitable) prediction of these models is the existence of excited states of the known quarks and leptons, much in the same way as the hydrogen atom has a series of higher energy levels above the ground state. The masses of the excited particles should not be much lower than the compositeness scale Λ, which is expected to be at least of the order of 1 TeV according to experimental constraints. For example the search for four-fermion contact interactions gives $\Lambda(eell) > 0.9$–4.7 TeV depending on the chirality of the coupling and on the lepton flavor [7,8]. We expect therefore the heavy fermion masses to be of the order of a few hundred GeV. The Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF) Collaboration experiment has excluded excited quarks in the mass range 90–540 GeV from $\gamma +$ jet and $W +$ jet final states [9].

Phenomenological implications of heavy fermions have been discussed in the literature [10–12] using weak isospin (I_W) and hypercharge (Y) conservation. Assuming that such states are grouped in SU(2)× U(1) multiplets, since light fermions have $I_W = 0, 1/2$ and electroweak gauge bosons have $I_W = 0, 1$, to lowest order in perturbation theory, only multiplets with $I_W \leq 3/2$ can be excited. Also, since none of the gauge fields carry hypercharge, a given excited multiplet can couple only to a light multiplet with the same Y.

In addition, conservation of the electromagnetic current forces the transition coupling of heavy-to-light fermions to be of magnetic-moment-type with respect to any electroweak gauge bosons [10]. In fact, a γ_μ transition coupling between e and e^* mediated by the $\vec{W}^\mu$ and B^μ gauge fields would result in an electromagnetic current of the type $j^\mu_{\rm em} \approx \bar{\psi}_{e^*}\gamma^\mu\psi_e$ which would not be conserved due to the different masses of excited and ordinary fermions (actually it is expected that $m_{e^*} \gg m_e$).

We will only consider here the excited multiplet with $I_W = 1/2$, $Y = -1$,

$$\mathcal{E} = \begin{pmatrix} N \\ E \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1}$$

which can couple to the light left multiplet

$$\ell_L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1-\gamma_5}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix} \tag{2}$$

through the gauge fields $\vec{W}^\mu$and B^μ, with the additional assumption that N is a neutral Majorana fermion.

In terms of the physical gauge fields $W^\pm_\mu = (1/\sqrt{2})(W^1_\mu \mp i\, W^2_\mu)$ the relevant effective interaction can be expressed as

*Electronic address: panella@cdf.in2p3.fr

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \left(\frac{gf}{\sqrt{2}\Lambda}\right)\left\{\left(\overline{N}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\frac{1-\gamma_5}{2}e\right)\partial_\nu W_\mu^+ + \left(\overline{E}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\frac{1-\gamma_5}{2}\nu\right)\partial_\nu W_\mu^- + \text{H.c.}\right\} + \text{neutral currents}\ , \tag{3}$$

where f is a dimensionless coupling constant, Λ is the compositeness scale, and $\vec{\tau}$ are the Pauli SU(2) matrices, and the rest of the notation is as usual in the standard model. An extension to quarks and other multiplets with a detailed discussion of the spectroscopy of the excited particles can be found in Ref. [13].

Regarding the experimental mass limits on the heavy Majorana neutrinos from pair production, $Z \to N\bar{N}$, we have $M_N > 34.6$ GeV at 95% C.L., which has been deduced from the Z line shape measurements [14], and which is independent of the decay modes. More stringent limits ≈ 90 GeV come from single excited neutrino production, $Z \to N\nu$, through the transition magnetic coupling, but these do depend on assumptions regarding the branching ratio of the decay channel chosen [8,14,15].

In practical calculations of production cross sections and decay rates of excited states, it has been customary [12,16,17] to assume that the dimensionless coupling f in Eq. (3) is of order unity. However if we assume that the excited neutrino is of Majorana type, we have to verify that this choice is compatible with present experimental limits on neutrinoless double β decay ($0\nu\beta\beta$):

$$A(Z) \to A(Z+2) + e^- + e^-\ , \tag{4}$$

a nuclear decay [20] that has attracted much attention both from particle and nuclear physicists because of its potential to expose lepton number violation. More generally, it is expected to give interesting insight into certain gauge theory parameters such as leptonic charged mixing matrix, neutrino masses, etc. The process in Eq. (4), which can only proceed via the exchange of a massive Majorana neutrino, has been experimentally searched for in a number of nuclear systems [18] and has also been extensively studied from the theoretical side [19–21].

We will consider here the decay

$$^{76}\text{Ge} \to {}^{76}\text{Se} + 2e^-\ , \tag{5}$$

for which we have from the Heidelberg-Moscow $\beta\beta$ experiment the recent limit [22] ($T_{1/2}$ is the half-life = ln2 $\times$ lifetime)

$$T_{1/2}\left({}^{76}\text{Ge} \to {}^{76}\text{Se} + 2e^-\right) \geq 5.1 \times 10^{24}\ \text{yr} \quad 90\%\ \text{C.L.} \tag{6}$$

In the following we estimate the constraint imposed by the above measurement on the coupling (f/Λ) of the heavy composite neutrino, as given by Eq. (3). The fact that neutrinoless double β decay measurements might constrain composite models was also discussed in Ref. [5] but within the framework of a particular model and referring to a heavy Majorana neutrino with the usual γ_μ coupling. Models in which $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay proceeds via the exchange of a heavy sterile Majorana neutrino (mass in the GeV scale or higher) have also been recently considered [23].

The transition amplitude of $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay is calculated according to the interaction Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = \frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}}\left\{\frac{f}{\Lambda}\bar{\psi}_e(x)\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1+\gamma_5)\psi_N(x)\partial^\mu W^{\nu(-)}(x) + \cos\theta_C J_\mu^h(x) W^{\mu(-)}(x) + \text{H.c.}\right\}\ , \tag{7}$$

where θ_C is the Cabibbo angle ($\cos\theta_C = 0.974$) and J_μ^h is the hadronic weak charged current,

$$J_\mu^h(x) = \sum_k j_\mu(k)\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{r}_k)\ ,$$
$$j_\mu(k) = \overline{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{r}_k)\gamma_\mu(f_V - f_A\gamma_5)\tau_-(k)\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{r}_k)\ , \tag{8}$$

and where $\mathbf{r}_k$ is the coordinate of the kth nucleon, $\mathcal{N} = \binom{\psi_p}{\psi_n}$, and $\tau_-(k) = (1/2)[\tau_1(k) - i\tau_2(k)]$ is the step down operator for the isotopic spin [$\vec{\tau}(k)$ is the matrix describing the isotopic spin of the kth nucleon]. We emphasize that in Eq. (7) we have a $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ type of coupling as opposed to the γ_μ coupling so far encountered in all $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay calculations.

For simplicity, we carry out our analysis assuming that there are no additional contributions to $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay from light Majorana neutrinos, right handed currents, or other heavy Majorana neutrinos originating from another source.

The transition amplitude is then

$$\begin{aligned} S_{fi} = {} & (\cos\theta_C)^2\left(\frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}}\right)^4\left(\frac{f}{\Lambda}\right)^2\frac{1}{2}\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\,d^4x\,d^4y\,e^{-ik\cdot(x-y)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1-P_{12})\bar{u}(p_1)\sigma_{\mu\lambda}(1+\gamma_5)\frac{\not{k}+M_N}{k^2-M_N^2}(1+\gamma_5)\sigma_{\nu\rho}v(p_2) \\ & \times\left[F(Z+2,\epsilon_1)F(Z+2,\epsilon_2)\right]^{1/2}e^{ip_1\cdot x}e^{ip_2\cdot y}f_A((k-p_1)^2)f_A((k+p_2)^2)(k-p_1)^\lambda(k+p_2)^\rho \\ & \times\frac{\langle f|J_h^\mu(x)\ J_h^\nu(y)|i\rangle}{[(k-p_1)^2-M_W^2][(k+p_2)^2-M_W^2]}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $(1-P_{12})/\sqrt{2}$ is the antisymmetrization operator due to the production of two identical fermions, the functions $F(Z,\epsilon)$ are the well-known Fermi functions [24] that describe the distortion of the electron's plane wave due to the nuclear Coulomb field (ϵ_i are the electron's kinetic energies in units of $m_e c^2$),

$$F(Z,\epsilon) = \chi(Z,\epsilon)\frac{\epsilon+1}{[\epsilon(\epsilon+2)]^{1/2}} , \tag{10}$$
$$\chi(Z,\epsilon) \approx \chi^{\mathrm{RP}}(Z) = \frac{2\pi\alpha Z}{1-e^{-2\pi\alpha Z}} \quad \text{(Rosen-Primakoff approximation)} ,$$

and the nucleon form factor

$$f_A(q^2) = \frac{1}{(1+|\mathbf{q}|^2/m_A^2)^2} , \tag{11}$$

with $m_A = 0.9$ GeV, is introduced to take into account the finite size of the nucleon, which is known to give important effects for the heavy neutrino case.

As is standard in such calculations, we make the following approximations [19,20].

(i) The hadronic matrix element is evaluated within the closure approximation:

$$\langle f|J_h^\mu(x)\ J_h^\nu(y)|i\rangle \approx e^{i(E_f-\langle E_n\rangle)x_0}e^{i(\langle E_n\rangle - E_i)y_0}\langle f|J_h^\mu(\mathbf{x})\ J_h^\nu(\mathbf{y})|i\rangle , \tag{12}$$

where $\langle E_n\rangle$ is an average excitation energy of the intermediate states. This allows one to perform the integrations over k_0, x_0, y_0 in Eq. (9).

(ii) Neglect the external momenta p_1, p_2 in the propagators and use the long wavelength approximation $e^{-i\mathbf{p}_1\cdot\mathbf{x}} = e^{-i\mathbf{p}_2\cdot\mathbf{y}} \approx 1$.

(iii) The average virtual neutrino momentum $\langle|\mathbf{k}|\rangle \approx 1/R_0 = 40$ MeV is much larger than the typical low-lying excitation energies, so that $k_0 = E_f + E_1 - \langle E_n\rangle$ can be neglected relative to $\mathbf{k}$.

(iv) The effect of W and N propagators can be neglected since $M_W \approx 80$ GeV is much greater than $|\mathbf{k}|$ in the region where the integrand is large, and we are interested in heavy neutrino masses $M_N \gg M_W$.

Using the same notation as in Ref. [20] we arrive at

$$S_{fi} = (G_F\cos\theta_C)^2\frac{f^2}{\Lambda^2}\frac{1}{2}2\pi\delta(E_0-E_1-E_2)\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1-P_{12})\bar{u}(p_1)\sigma_{\mu i}\sigma_{\nu j}(1+\gamma_5)v(p_2)\left[F(Z+2,\epsilon_1)F(Z+2,\epsilon_2)\right]^{1/2}$$
$$\times M_N\sum_{kl} I_{ij}\langle f|j^\mu(k)j^\nu(l)|i\rangle , \tag{13}$$

where I_{ij} is an integral over the virtual neutrino momentum ($\mathbf{r}_{kl} = \mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_l\, , r_{kl} = |\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_l|\, , x_{kl} = m_A r_{kl}$),

$$I_{ij} = \frac{1}{M_N^2}\int\frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\,e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_{kl}}\,\frac{(-k_i k_j)}{(1+|\mathbf{k}|^2/m_A^2)^4}$$
$$= \frac{1}{4\pi}\frac{m_A^4}{M_N^2}\frac{1}{r_{kl}}\left\{-\delta_{ij}F_A(x_{kl}) + \frac{(\mathbf{r}_k)_i(\mathbf{r}_l)_j}{r_{kl}^2}F_B(x_{kl})\right\} , \tag{14}$$

with

$$F_A(x) = \frac{1}{48}e^{-x}\,(x^2+x) , \quad F_B(x) = \frac{1}{48}e^{-x}\,x^3 . \tag{15}$$

Since I_{ij} is a symmetric tensor, we can make the replacement $\sigma_{\mu i}\sigma_{\nu j} \to (1/2)\{\sigma_{\mu i},\sigma_{\nu j}\} = \eta_{\mu\nu}\eta_{ij} - \eta_{i\nu}\eta_{i\mu} + i\gamma_5\epsilon_{\mu i\nu j}$. Then, using the nonrelativistic limit of the nuclear current,

$$j_\mu(k) = \begin{cases} f_V\tau_+(k) & \text{if } \mu = 0, \\ -f_A\tau_+(k)(\sigma_k)_i & \text{if } \mu = i \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

($\vec{\sigma}_k$ is the spin matrix of the kth nucleon), we arrive, with straightforward algebra, at

$$S_{fi} = M_{fi}\,2\pi\,\delta(E_0-E_1-E_2) , \quad M_{fi} = (G_F\cos\theta_C)^2\frac{1}{4}\frac{-1}{2\pi}\frac{f_A^2}{r_0A^{1/3}}\,l\,\langle m\rangle , \tag{17}$$

where we have defined

$$
\begin{aligned}
l &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1-P_{12})\bar{u}(p_1)(1+\gamma_5)v(p_2)\left[F(Z+2,\epsilon_1)F(Z+2,\epsilon_2)\right]^{1/2} , \\
\langle m\rangle &= m_e\eta_N\langle f\,|\,\Omega\,|\,i\rangle , \\
\eta_N &= \frac{m_p}{M_N}m_A^2\left(\frac{f}{\Lambda}\right)^2 , \\
\Omega &= \frac{m_A^2}{m_p m_e}\sum_{k\neq l}\tau_+(k)\tau_+(l)\frac{R_0}{r_{kl}}\left[\left(\frac{f_V^2}{f_A^2}-\vec{\sigma}_k\cdot\vec{\sigma}_l\right)\left[F_B(x_{kl})-3F_A(x_{kl})\right]-\vec{\sigma}_k\cdot\vec{\sigma}_l\,F_A(x_{kl})+\frac{\vec{\sigma}_k\cdot\mathbf{r}_{kl}\,\vec{\sigma}_l\cdot\mathbf{r}_{kl}}{r_{kl}^2}F_B(x_{kl})\right] ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}
$$

and $R_0 = r_0 A^{1/3}$ is the nuclear radius ($r_0 = 1.1$ fm).

The new result here is the nuclear operator Ω which is substantially different from those so far encountered in $0\nu\beta\beta$ decays, due to the $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ coupling of the heavy neutrino that we are considering. The decay width is obtained upon integration over the density of final states of the two-electron system,

$$
d\Gamma = \sum_{\text{final spins}} |M_{fi}|^2\, 2\pi\delta(E_0-E_1-E_2)\frac{d^3\mathbf{p}_1}{(2\pi)^3\,2E_1}\frac{d^3\mathbf{p}_2}{(2\pi)^3\,2E_2} , \tag{19}
$$

and the total decay rate Γ can be cast in the form

$$
\Gamma = (G_F\cos\theta_C)^4\frac{(f_A)^4\,m_e^7\,|\eta_N|^2}{(2\pi)^5 r_0^2 A^{2/3}}\,f_{0\nu}(\epsilon_0,Z)\,|\Omega_{fi}|^2 , \tag{20}
$$

$$
f_{0\nu} = \xi_{0\nu} f_{0\nu}^{\mathrm{RP}} , \tag{21}
$$

$$
f_{0\nu}^{\mathrm{RP}} = |\chi^{\mathrm{RP}}(Z+2)|^2\frac{\epsilon_0}{30}(\epsilon_0^4+10\epsilon_0^3+40\epsilon_0^2+60\epsilon_0+30) , \tag{22}
$$

where $\Omega_{fi} = \langle f|\Omega|i\rangle$, ϵ_0 is the kinetic energy of the two electrons in units of $m_e c^2$, and $\xi_{0\nu}$ is a numerical factor that corrects for the Rosen-Primakoff approximation [20] used in deriving the analytical expression of $f_{0\nu}^{\mathrm{RP}}$. For the decay considered in Eq. (5), we have [20] $\xi_{0\nu} = 1.7$ and $\epsilon_0 = 4$. The half-life is finally written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{1/2} &= \frac{K_{0\nu}\,A^{2/3}}{f_{0\nu}\,|\eta_N|^2\,|\Omega_{fi}|^2} , \\
K_{0\nu} &= (\ln 2)\frac{(2\pi)^5}{(G_F\cos\theta_C m_e^2)^4}\frac{(m_e r_0)^2}{m_e f_A^4} = 1.24\times10^{16}\ \mathrm{yr} .
\end{aligned}
\tag{23}
$$

Combining Eq. (23) with the experimental limit given for the decay considered in Eq. (5), we obtain a constraint on the quantity $|f|/(\Lambda^2 M_N)^{1/2}$:

$$
\frac{|f|}{(\Lambda^2 M_N)^{1/2}} < \left(\frac{1}{m_p m_A^2}\right)^{1/2}\left[\frac{K_{0\nu}\,A^{2/3}}{5.1\times10^{24}\ \mathrm{yr}\times f_{0\nu}(Z,\epsilon_0)}\right]^{1/4}\frac{1}{|\Omega_{fi}|^{1/2}} . \tag{24}
$$

Given the heavy neutrino mass M_N and the compositeness scale Λ, we only need to evaluate the nuclear matrix element Ω_{fi} to know the upper bound on the value of $|f|$ imposed by neutrinoless double β decay.

The evaluation of the nuclear matrix elements was in the past regarded as the principal source of uncertainty in $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay calculations, but the recent high-statistics measurement [25] of the allowed $2\nu\beta\beta$ decay, a second-order weak-interaction β decay, has shown that nuclear physics can provide a very good description of these phenomena, giving high reliability to the constraints imposed by $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay on nonstandard model parameters.

Since we simply want to estimate the order of magnitude of the constraint in Eq. (24), we will evaluate the nuclear matrix element only approximatively. First of all the expression of the nuclear operator in Eq. (18) is simplified by making the replacement [26]

$$
\frac{r_{kl}^i r_{kl}^j}{r_{kl}^2} \to \left\langle\frac{r_{kl}^i r_{kl}^j}{r_{kl}^2}\right\rangle \to \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij} . \tag{25}
$$

The operator Ω becomes then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega \approx{}& \frac{m_A^2}{m_p m_e}(m_A R_0)\sum_{k\neq l}\tau_+(k)\tau_+(l)\left(\frac{f_V^2}{f_A^2}-\frac{2}{3}\vec{\sigma}_k\cdot\vec{\sigma}_l\right) \\
&\times F_N(x_{kl}) ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{26}
$$

where $F_N = (1/x)(F_B - 3F_A) = (1/48)e^{-x}(x^2-3x-3)$ with F_B and F_A given in Eq. (15).

TABLE I. Most stringent lower bounds on Λ with $|f| = 1$ and upper bounds on $|f|$ with $\Lambda = 1$ TeV, for different values of the heavy neutrino mass M_N, as can be derived from the $0\nu\beta\beta$ half-life lower limit in Eq. (6), within the approximation discussed in the text.

M_N (TeV)		0.6	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.0
Λ (TeV) >	$[\lvert f\rvert = 1]$	0.38	0.33	0.29	0.27	0.25	0.23	0.22	0.21
$\lvert f\rvert$ <	$[\Lambda = 1\,\text{TeV}]$	2.6	3.0	3.4	3.7	4.0	4.2	4.5	4.7

Since we are interested in deriving the lowest possible upper bound on $|f|$ given by Eq. (24), let us find the maximum absolute value of the nuclear matrix element of the operator Ω in Eq. (26):

$$|\Omega_{fi}| \leq \frac{m_A^2}{m_p m_e}(m_A R_0)|F_N(\bar{x})| \left\{ \frac{f_V^2}{f_A^2}|M_F| + \frac{2}{3}|M_{\rm GT}| \right\} , \tag{27}$$

where $M_F = \langle f| \sum_{k\neq l} \tau_+(k)\tau_+(l)|i\rangle$ and $M_{\rm GT} = \langle f| \sum_{k\neq l} \tau_+(k)\tau_+(l)\vec{\sigma}_k \cdot \vec{\sigma}_l|i\rangle$ are, respectively, the matrix elements of the Fermi and Gamow-Teller operators whose numerical values for the nuclear system under consideration are [19,20] $M_F = 0$ and $M_{\rm GT} = -2.56$. Inspection of the radial function F_N (for $x \geq 0$) shows that its maximum absolute value is attained at $x = 0$. In Eq. (27) we have evaluated F_N at $x = 2.28\,(r_{kl} = 0.5$ fm). This value of r_{kl} corresponds to the typical internuclear distance at which short range nuclear correlations become important [19], so that the region $x \leq 2.28$ does not give contributions to the matrix element of the nuclear operator. We thus find

$$|\Omega_{fi}| \leq 0.6 \times 10^3, \tag{28}$$

which together with Eq. (24) gives

$$\frac{|f|}{\Lambda(M_N)^{1/2}} \leq 3.4 \text{ TeV}^{-3/2}. \tag{29}$$

However, since we have used an upper bound for the nuclear matrix element [Eq. (28)], the above should be taken as the most stringent upper bound one could possibly get for the quantity $|f|/(\Lambda^2 M_N)^{1/2}$ given the half-life measurement quoted in Eq. (6). An exact evaluation of the nuclear matrix element will give less stringent constraints than those that can be derived from Eq. (29).

With this in mind we can use Eq. (29) to give an *order of magnitude estimate* of the lower bound on Λ as a function of M_N (assuming $|f| = 1$). Alternatively, choosing a value for Λ, Eq. (29) gives an "upper bound" on $|f|$ as a function of M_N. We can see that the "lower bound" on the compositeness scale coming from $0\nu\beta\beta$ decays is rather weak: $\Lambda > 0.3$ TeV at $M_N = 1$ TeV. In Table I we summarize our bounds for sample values of the excited Majorana neutrino mass.

In particular, we see that the choice $|f| \approx 1$ is compatible with bounds imposed by experimental limits on neutrinoless double β decay rates. We remark that, as opposed to the case of bounds coming from the direct search of excited particles, our constraints on Λ and $|f|$ *do not depend* on any assumptions regarding the branching ratios for the decays of the heavy particle.

To obtain more stringent bounds, we need to improve on the measurements of $0\nu\beta\beta$ half-life. However, our bounds [cf. Eq. (24)] on ($|f|$ or Λ) depend on the experimental $T_{1/2}$ lower limit only weakly ($\propto T_{1/2}^{\pm 1/4}$) so that to obtain an order of magnitude more stringent bound we need to push higher, by a factor of 10^4, the lower bound on $T_{1/2}$.

We should bear in mind, however, that the simple observation of a few $0\nu\beta\beta$ decay events, while unmistakably proving lepton number violation and the existence of Majorana neutrals, will not be enough to uncover the originating mechanism (including the one discussed here). In order to disentangle the various models, single electron spectra will be needed, which would require high statistics experiments and additional theoretical work.

This work was partially supported by the U.S. Department of Energy and the Italian Institute for Nuclear Physics (Perugia). One of us (O.P.) wishes to thank the Italo-Swiss foundation "Angelo della Riccia" and the University of Perugia (Italy) for financial support. He also would like to thank C. Carimalo for useful discussions and the Laboratoire de Physique Corpusculaire, Collège de France, Paris, where this work was partially completed, for the very kind hospitality. This paper was also partly supported by the EU program "Human Capital and Mobility" under Contract No. CHRX-CT92-0026.

[1] J. L. Hewett and T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rep. **183**, 193 (1989).
[2] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 275 (1974); R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, *ibid.* **11**, 366 (1975); **11**, 2588 (1975); G. Senjanović and R. N. Mohapatra, *ibid.* **12**, 1502 (1975).
[3] C. T. Hill and E. A. Paschos, Phys. Lett. B **241**, 96 (1990); C. T. Hill, M. A. Luty, and E. A. Paschos, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 3011 (1991); G. Jungman and M. A. Luty, Nucl. Phys. **B361**, 24 (1991).
[4] A. Datta, M. Guchait, and A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3194 (1994).
[5] R. Barbieri, R. N. Mohapatra, and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. **105B**, 369 (1981).
[6] H. Harari, Phys. Lett. **86B**, 83 (1979). For further references see, for example, H. Harari, Phys. Rep. **104**, 159

(1984).
[7] ALEPH Collaboration, D. Buskulic *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **59**, 215 (1993).
[8] Particle Data Group, L. Montanet *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 1173 (1994).
[9] CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3004 (1994).
[10] N. Cabibbo, L. Maiani, and Y. Srivastava, Phys. Lett. **139B**, 459 (1984).
[11] A. De Rújula, L. Maiani, and R. Petronzio, Phys. Lett. **140B**, 253 (1984).
[12] U. Baur, I. Hinchliffe, and D. Zeppenfeld, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **2**, 1285 (1987).
[13] G. Pancheri and Y. N. Srivastava, Phys. Lett. **146B**, 87 (1984).
[14] ALEPH Collaboration, D. Decamp *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **216**, 343 (1992).
[15] H1 Collaboration, F. Raupach, in *Proceedings of the International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics*, Marseille, France, 1993, edited by J. Carr and M. Perrottet (Editions Frontières, Gif-Sur-Yvette, France, 1994).
[16] P. Chiappetta and O. Panella, Phys. Lett. B **316**, 368 (1993).
[17] K. Hagiwara, S. Komamiya, and D. Zeppenfeld, Z. Phys. C **29**, 115 (1985).
[18] E. Fiorini, Riv. Nuovo Cimento **2**, 1 (1972); D. Bryman and C. Picciotto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **50**, 11 (1978); Y. Zdesenko, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **11**, 6 (1980); A. Feassler, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **21**, 183 (1988); F. T. Avignone III and R. L. Brodzinski, *ibid.* **21**, 99 (1988).
[19] W. C. Haxton and G. J. Stephenson, Jr., Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **12**, 409 (1984).
[20] J. Vergados, Phys. Rep. **133**, 1 (1986).
[21] A. Staudt, K. Muto, and H. V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus, Europhys. Lett. **13**, 31 (1990); M. Hirish, X. R. Wu, and H. V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus, Z. Phys. A **345**, 163 (1993).
[22] Heidelberg-Moscow Collaboration, A. Balysh *et al.*, in *Proceedings of the XXVII International Conference on High Energy Physics*, Glasgow, Scotland, 1994, edited by P. J. Bussey and I. G. Knowles (IOP, London, 1995), Vol. II, p. 939; Report No. hep-ex/9502007 (unpublished); for previous, slightly lower, bounds see Heidelberg-Moscow Collaboration, A. Piepke, in *Proceedings of the Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics* [15]; A. Balysh *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **283**, 32 (1992); the Heidelberg-Moscow Collaboration has also searched for Majoron-accompained $0\nu\beta\beta$ decays; M. Beck *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2853 (1993).
[23] P. Bambert, C. P. Burgess, and R. N. Mohapatra, Nucl. Phys. **B438**, 3 (1995). The phenomenology of effective operators similar to the one studied here is throughly discussed by C. P. Burgess *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 6115 (1994).
[24] See, for example, H. Primakoff and S. P. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1925 (1969), and references therein.
[25] A. Balysh *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **322**, 176 (1994).
[26] This would be strictly true within the Fermi gas model for which the two particle density, when averaged over spins and isospins, is a spherically symmetric function. See, for example, A. deShalit and H. Feshbach, *Theoretical Nuclear Physics* (Wiley, New York, 1974), Vol. I, Chap. II, pp. 135–140.