

Superluminal Neutrinos and Monopoles

Peng Wang, Houwen Wu and Haitang Yang

*School of Physical Electronics
University of Electronic Science and Technology of China
Chengdu, 610054, China*

pengw@uestc.edu.cn, iverwu@uestc.edu.cn, hyanga@uestc.edu.cn

Abstract

In this letter, we show that superluminal neutrinos announced by OPERA could be explained by the existence of a monopole, which is left behind after the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) phase transition of some scalar fields in the universe. We assume the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole couples to the neutrinos but not photon fields. The monopole introduces a different effective metric to the neutrinos from the one experienced by photons. We find that the superluminal propagation only exists in a very short distance from the monopole, about 10^3 cm in OPERA. No matter how far they travel, neutrinos always arrive earlier than photons by the same amount of time, provided a monopole existing on or close to their trajectories. This conclusion can be tested by future experiments. The result reconciles the contradiction between OPERA and supernova neutrinos. We further exclude cosmic strings as a possible theoretical explanation.

OPERA collaboration [1] announced their observation that muon neutrino undergoes superluminal velocity. The flying time of a beam of ν_μ , traveling from CERN to the Gran Sasso laboratory with a baseline distance around 730km, is 60 ns less than that of photons. The result confirms the earlier data from MINOS [2]. However, the observation contradicts to the supernova neutrinos from SN 1987A. For its fundamental impact on the cornerstones of modern physics, follow-up experiments are certainly demanded. Shortly after the announcement of OPERA, researchers proposed many theoretical explanations, respecting or violating Lorentz invariance [3]. Earlier discussions on superluminal neutrinos can be found in [4].

It is well known that after the big bang, spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) phase transition from the false vacua to the true vacua may not be perfect [5]. It is possible that soliton solutions, also named as topological defects, are left behind as remnants of the false vacua. The existence of topological defects may serve as explanations to the neutrino superluminal propagation. In four dimensional spacetime, there are three kinds of topological defects: domain walls, cosmic strings and monopoles, with dimensionality ranging from two to zero respectively. In a companion paper, we discuss the possible influences of domain walls on the neutrino superluminal propagation [6]. In this letter, we address the consequences caused by monopoles.

To set up, we consider a Higgs triplet φ^a , composed of the adjoint representation of an $SU(2)$ gauge group. In this letter, the real scalars φ^a and gauge fields B^a are assumed to only couple to neutrinos but not photons. With this ansatz, the neutrinos see different metrics from a photon does. This property offers an alternative explanation to the superluminal behavior of the neutrinos. Since

the rest mass of neutrinos is very small, compared to its energy, it is a good approximation to assume the neutrinos are massless. The effective lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2}(D^\mu\varphi)^a(D_\mu\varphi)^a - \frac{1}{8}\lambda(\varphi^a\varphi^a - v^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4}F^{a\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}^a \\ & + i\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\psi - \frac{ig}{M^4}\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\partial_\nu\psi(D^\mu\varphi)^a(D^\nu\varphi)^a \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} (D_\mu\varphi)^a &= \partial_\mu\varphi^a + q\varepsilon^{abc}B_\mu^b\varphi^c \\ F_{\mu\nu}^a &= \partial_\mu B_\nu^a - \partial_\nu B_\mu^a + q\varepsilon^{abc}B_\mu^bB_\nu^c, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the metric on the surface of the earth is approximately set to the Minkovskian. The first line in eqn. (1) is nothing but the Georgi-Glashow model [7]. Two gauge bosons acquire a mass $m_w = qv$ and one remains massless after the symmetry $SU(2)$ spontaneously broken to a $U(1)$ gauge group. In the literature, this $U(1)$ field is usually identified with the electromagnetism $U(1)_{EM}$, since it leads to a charge double the Dirac charge. However, in our model, we make the proposal that it is a new unknown field who does not couple to electromagnetism. Therefore, we call the solitons of eqn. (1) as *monopoles* but not magnetic monopoles. The spinor field ψ stands for neutrinos. The parameter q is the gauge coupling, different from the electric charge. The electromagnetism is absent in the Lagrangian since it does not couple to the other fields. The parameter M denotes the scale where new physics arises. It is reasonable to believe that $M \sim m_w$.

With different nonvanishing winding numbers, there are infinitely many soliton solutions of eqn. (1). In our work, we address the simplest case, the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole [8], with winding number one. The profiles of the monopole are

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^a(x) &= vf(r)x^a/r \\ B_i^a(x) &= a(r)\varepsilon^{aij}x_j/qr^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with $\mathbf{x} = r(\sin\theta\cos\phi, \sin\theta\sin\phi, \cos\theta)$. The Latin and Roman indices denote the three spatial components. The boundary conditions are $f(\infty) = a(\infty) = 1$, $f(0) = a(0) = 0$, determined by the asymptotic limits of the fields. From the Lagrangian (1), one readily reads the effective kinetic term of neutrinos

$$i\left[\eta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{g}{M^4}(D^\mu\varphi)^a(D^\nu\varphi)^a\right]\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\partial_\nu\psi. \quad (4)$$

With the help of $\partial_i(x_a/r) = (r^2\delta_{ai} - x_ax_i)/r^3$ and $\hat{x}_i = x_i/r$, it is straightforward to show

$$(D_i\varphi)^a(D_j\varphi)^a = \frac{v^2}{r^2}\left[(1-a)^2(\delta_{ij} - \hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j)f^2 + r^2f'^2\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j\right]. \quad (5)$$

Therefore the effective metric neutrinos see is

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + \left(\delta_{ij} - \frac{g}{M^4}\frac{v^2}{r^2}\left[(1-a)^2(\delta_{ij} - \hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j)f^2 + r^2f'^2\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j\right]\right)dx^i dx^j, \quad (6)$$

while the photons still live in Minkovski spacetime. Let us consider a neutrino travelling along a straight line from r_i to r_f , the distances to a monopole. The vertical distance of the line to the monopole is R .

The flying time of the neutrino is

$$t_\nu = \frac{1}{m_w} \left(\int_{\rho_0}^{\rho_f} \pm \int_{\rho_0}^{\rho_i} \right) \frac{\rho d\rho}{\sqrt{\rho^2 - \rho_0^2}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\kappa}{\rho^2} \left[(1-a)^2 f^2(\rho) \frac{\rho_0^2}{\rho^2} + f'(\rho)^2 (\rho^2 - \rho_0^2) \right]}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\kappa \equiv \frac{g}{q^2} \left(\frac{m_w}{M} \right)^4, \quad \rho \equiv m_w r, \quad \rho_0 \equiv m_w R. \quad (8)$$

Setting $g \sim q \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ is sensible. Therefore, the dimensionless number $\kappa \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. It is hard to believe that m_w , the mass of the vector bosons, is far smaller than the weak scale $\sim 10^2$ GeV. Then one should note that the dimensionless parameter $\rho = m_w r$ is a very large number even for a small distance, for example, $1 \text{ cm} \sim 10^{14}/\text{GeV}$. Given the boundary conditions of $f(\rho)$ and $a(\rho)$, one can readily see that the travelling time difference $\Delta t = t_c - t_\nu$ between photons and neutrinos is determined by a very short distance from the monopole, denoted as δ .

In general, there are no closed-form solutions of $f(\rho)$ and $a(\rho)$. However, in the limit saturating Bogomolny bound, with $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, a BPS soliton solution is available [12]

$$\begin{aligned} a(\rho) &= 1 - \frac{\rho}{\sinh \rho} \\ f(\rho) &= \coth \rho - \frac{1}{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

As an illustration, plugging this solution into eqn. (7), one finds that Δt is determined by $\rho \sim 10$ ($\delta \sim 10^{-15} \text{ cm}$) distance from the monopole, up to the precision 10^{-6} .

Therefore, to account for the superluminal propagation, we assume there exists one monopole on or very close to the trajectory of the neutrinos. In this scenario, neutrinos from both OPERA and supernova SN 1987A arrive earlier than photons by the same amount of time

$$\Delta t = t_c - t_\nu = \delta - \frac{1}{m_w} \int_0^{m_w \delta} \sqrt{1 - \kappa f'(\rho)^2} d\rho \approx 60 \text{ ns}, \quad (10)$$

with a length $\delta \sim 10^3$ cm on the path of neutrinos, making the real difference on the speed of neutrinos. If our conjecture is correct, experiments with different baseline distances should give the same 60 ns arrival time difference.

There may exist other possibilities. Specifically, more than one monopoles are present on the path of the neutrinos. It sounds reasonable that monopoles are almost evenly distributed in the earth while few can be met by the supernova neutrinos. If this is the case, experiments performed in the outer space won't produce obvious superluminal results and neutrinos on planets always travel faster than light.

Parallel analysis applies to the one dimensional topological defect, cosmic strings with a little work. However, the deficit angle leads to a disaster to nearby objects. Moreover, the lensing caused by cosmic strings has not been detected yet.

In summary, we discussed that a monopole could serve as an explanation to the recent measurement of superluminal neutrinos in OPERA. We found that once a 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole is present on or close to the pathes of the neutrinos, superluminal propagation arises. Moreover, we showed that the travelling time difference between neutrinos and photons, caused by a monopole, is almost fixed no matter how far they travel. From the results of OPERA, the distance really matters is about 10^3

cm. This conclusion explains the contradiction between OPERA and supernova neutrinos. We also excluded cosmic strings as a possible explanation due to the deficit angle catastrophe.

Acknowledgements We are grateful to X. Liu for instructive discussions and inspirations. This work is supported in part by NSFC (Grant No. 11175039 and 11005016) and Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. ZYGX2009J044 and ZYGX2009X008).

References

- [1] T. Adam *et al.* [OPERA Collaboration], [arXiv:1109.4897 [hep-ex]].
- [2] P. Adamson *et al.* [MINOS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. **D76**, 072005 (2007). [arXiv:0706.0437 [hep-ex]].
- [3] A. Kehagias, [arXiv:1109.6312 [hep-ph]]. A. Drago, I. Masina, G. Pagliara, R. Tripiccone, [arXiv:1109.5917 [hep-ph]]. M. Li, T. Wang, [arXiv:1109.5924 [hep-ph]]. C. Pfeifer, M. N. R. Wohlfarth, [arXiv:1109.6005 [gr-qc]]. S. S. Gubser, [arXiv:1109.5687 [hep-th]]. G. F. Giudice, S. Sibiryakov, A. Strumia, [arXiv:1109.5682 [hep-ph]]. J. Alexandre, [arXiv:1109.5629 [hep-ph]]. D. Autiero, P. Migliozzi, A. Russo, [arXiv:1109.5378 [hep-ph]]. F. R. Klinkhamer, [arXiv:1109.5671 [hep-ph]]. J. Ciborowski, J. Rembielinski, [arXiv:1109.5599 [hep-ex]]. G. Dvali, A. Vikman, [arXiv:1109.5685 [hep-ph]]. G. Amelino-Camelia, G. Gubitosi, N. Loret, F. Mercati, G. Rosati, P. Lipari, [arXiv:1109.5172 [hep-ph]]. G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea, L. Panizzi, [arXiv:1109.4980 [hep-ph]]. Z. Lingli, B. -Q. Ma, [arXiv:1109.6097 [hep-ph]]. R. A. Konoplya, arXiv:1109.6215 [hep-th]. R. B. Mann, U. Sarkar, [arXiv:1109.5749 [hep-ph]]. M. A. Anacleto, F. A. Brito, E. Passos, [arXiv:1109.6298 [hep-th]]. L. Iorio, [arXiv:1109.6249 [gr-qc]]. X. -J. Bi, P. -F. Yin, Z. -H. Yu, Q. Yuan, [arXiv:1109.6667 [hep-ph]]. T. Li and D. V. Nanopoulos, arXiv:1110.0451 [hep-ph]. K. Cahill, arXiv:1109.5357. B. Koch, arXiv:1109.5721 [hep-ph]. R. Garattini and G. Mandanici, arXiv:1109.6563 [gr-qc]. V. K. Oikonomou, arXiv:1109.6170 [hep-th]. J. Magueijo, arXiv:1109.6055 [hep-ph]. M. Matone, arXiv:1109.6631 [hep-ph]. J. Franklin, arXiv:1110.0234. F. Tamburini and M. Laveder, arXiv:1109.5445 [hep-ph]. M. Fayngold, arXiv:1109.5743. J. Alexandre, J. Ellis and N. E. Mavromatos, arXiv:1109.6296 [hep-ph]. S. Hannestad and M. S. Sloth, arXiv:1109.6282 [hep-ph]. C. R. Contaldi, arXiv:1109.6160 [hep-ph]. S. Gardner, arXiv:1109.6520 [hep-ph]. A. Nicolaidis, arXiv:1109.6354 [hep-ph]. L. Gonzalez-Mestres, arXiv:1109.6630. E. Ciuffoli, J. Evslin, J. Liu and X. Zhang, arXiv:1109.6641 [hep-ph]. F. R. Klinkhamer and G. E. Volovik, arXiv:1109.6624 [hep-ph]. J. M. Carmona and J. L. Cortes, arXiv:1110.0430 [hep-ph]. W. Winter, arXiv:1110.0424 [hep-ph]. N. D. H. Dass, arXiv:1110.0351 [hep-ph]. R. Cowsik, S. Nussinov and U. Sarkar, arXiv:1110.0241 [hep-ph]. I. Y. Aref'eva and I. V. Volovich, arXiv:1110.0456 [hep-ph]. E. N. Saridakis, arXiv:1110.0697 [gr-qc]. L. Maccione, S. Liberati, D. M. Mattingly, [arXiv:1110.0783 [hep-ph]]. D. Lust, M. Petropoulos, [arXiv:1110.0813 [gr-qc]]. S. I. Vacaru, [arXiv:1110.0675]. S. 'i. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, "Could the dynamical Lorentz symmetry breaking induce the superluminal neutrinos?," [arXiv:1110.0889 [hep-ph]]. I. Oda, H. Taira, [arXiv:1110.0931 [hep-ph]]. D. V. Naumov, V. A. Naumov, [arXiv:1110.0989 [hep-ph]].
- [4] H. Pas, S. Pakvasa, T. J. Weiler, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 095017 (2005). [hep-ph/0504096]. J. Dent, H. Pas, S. Pakvasa, T. J. Weiler, [arXiv:0710.2524 [hep-ph]]. S. Hollenberg, O. Micu, H. Pas, T. J. Weiler, Phys. Rev. **D80**, 093005 (2009). [arXiv:0906.0150 [hep-ph]].
- [5] T. W B. Kibble, *J. Phys. A9, 1387(1976)*.
- [6] P. Wang, H. Wu and H. Yang, arXiv:1109.6930 [hep-ph].
- [7] Howard Georgi and Sheldon Glashow, Unity of all elementary-particle forces, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32(8) Feb 1974, 438-441.
- [8] G. 't Hooft, Nuclear Physics B79, 276 (1974); A.M. Polyakov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. Pis'ma. Red. 20, 430 (1974) [JETP Lett. 20, 194 (1974)].
- [9] N. Panagia, *Memorie della Societa Astronomia Italiana, Vol. 69, p.225*
- [10] D. W. Sciama, *Phys. Rev. Lett. 18, 1065-1067 (1967)*
- [11] M. J. Longo, *Phys. Rev. D 36, 3276 (1987)*.
- [12] M. Srednicki, Cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr. (2007) 641 p.