

# Neutron oscillations for solving neutron lifetime and dark matter puzzles

Wanpeng Tan\*

*Department of Physics and Joint Institute for Nuclear Astrophysics,  
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA*

(Dated: November 29, 2023)

## Abstract

A model of  $n - n'$  (neutron-mirror neutron) oscillations is proposed under the framework of the mirror matter theory with slightly broken mirror symmetry. It resolves the neutron lifetime discrepancy, i.e., the 1% difference in neutron lifetime between measurements from "beam" and "bottle" experiments. In consideration of the early universe evolution, the  $n - n'$  mass difference is determined to be about  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  eV/ $c^2$  with the  $n - n'$  mixing strength of about  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ . The picture of how the mirror-to-ordinary matter density ratio is evolved in the early universe into the observed dark-to-baryon matter density ratio of about 5.4 is presented. Reanalysis of previous data and new experiments that can be carried out under current technology are discussed and recommended to test this proposed model. Other consequences of the model on astrophysics and possible oscillations of other neutral particles are discussed as well.

Free neutrons with a lifetime of about 15 minutes are known to undergo  $\beta$  decay via  $n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$  due to the weak force. There has been much experimental effort over the past decades for measuring the lifetime using two different techniques. The "beam" approach is to measure the neutron flux from a cold neutron beam after it going through a region where the emitted protons are detected [1, 2]. It measures directly the  $\beta$  decay rate as far as other hidden neutron-disappearing processes are on the level of  $10^{-3}$  or below. This approach typically gives a neutron lifetime of about 888 seconds. On the other hand, the "bottle" experiments store ultra-cold neutrons (UCN) confined by the gravitational force in a material or magnetic trap [3–5]. By measuring the neutron loss rate in the trap this method typically presents a neutron lifetime of about 880 seconds. Note that any other unknown loss processes in the trap will contribute to the measured lifetime and make it appear shorter. Another different approach using a magnetic storage ring [6] provides similar results as the "bottle" method. The 1% difference between the results of the two approaches becomes more severe recently with the most precise measurements of  $887.7 \pm 1.2(stat) \pm 1.9(sys)$  s ("beam") [2] and  $877.7 \pm 0.7(stat) + 0.4/-0.2(sys)$  s ("bottle") [3].

Meanwhile, various theoretical studies on resolving the 1% neutron lifetime discrepancy have been carried out. Searching physics beyond the standard model makes the idea of  $n - \bar{n}$  oscillations intriguing. However, an early experiment set a very strict constraint on the oscillation time scale  $\tau_{n\bar{n}} > 0.86 \times 10^8$  s [7] making it unlikely to settle the issue. A recent attempt to consider neutrons that decay to particles in the dark sector showed an interesting decay channel of  $n \rightarrow \chi + \gamma$  with constraints of  $937.900 \text{ MeV} < m_\chi < 938.783 \text{ MeV}$  for the dark particle mass and  $0.782 \text{ MeV} < E_\gamma < 1.664 \text{ MeV}$  for the photon energy [8]. Unfortunately, such a possibility was dismissed shortly by an experiment [9] and a similar channel of  $n \rightarrow \chi + e^+ + e^-$  was excluded as well [10]. By introducing a six-quark coupling in the mirror matter theory for the  $n$  and  $n'$  interaction of  $\delta m \sim 10^{-15}$  eV with a large mass cutoff at  $M \sim 10 \text{ TeV}$ , Berezhiani and Bento proposed a possible  $n - n'$  oscillation mechanism with a time scale of  $\tau \sim 1$  s [11]. Later on, such oscillations were refuted experimentally with a much higher constraint of  $\tau \geq 448$  s [12–15]. Despite all these efforts over the years the neutron lifetime puzzle still eludes explanation. More recent papers that have come to my awareness after the preparation of this work suggest other interesting ideas on either neutron dark decays or  $n - n'$  oscillations [16–18].

In this paper, a new mechanism of  $n - n'$  oscillations will be proposed. The new model

can explain the observed difference of neutron lifetime measurements without harming other known physics. Considering the thermal history of the early universe and big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN), we will show the mass difference of the  $n - n'$  doublet to be about  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  eV/c<sup>2</sup> under the framework of the mirror matter theory with slightly broken mirror symmetry. How the early universe evolved with both sectors forming the observed dark matter to baryon matter ratio  $\Omega_{dark}/\Omega_B = 5.4$  will be demonstrated under this model. Possible experimental tests to confirm or refute this model will be discussed along the way and in the end.

The idea that there may exist mirror particles that compensate the parity violation of ordinary particles in the universe was first conceived by Lee and Young in their seminal paper on parity violation[19]. The idea has been developed into theories of a parallel world of mirror particles that is an exact mirrored copy of our ordinary world and the two worlds can only interact with each other gravitationally [20–24]. Such theories can be contained in the  $E_8 \otimes E_8$  superstring theory.

For simplicity, one can consider a gauge symmetry  $G \otimes G'$  for both sectors of ordinary and mirror particles, where the standard model symmetry  $G = SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$  and the mirror counterpart  $G' = SU(3)'_c \otimes SU(2)'_R \otimes U(1)'_Y$ . The two parallel worlds share nothing but the same gravity. Very importantly, we assume that the mirror symmetry  $P(G \leftrightarrow G')$  is spontaneously broken by the Higgs vacuum, i.e.,  $\langle \phi \rangle \neq \langle \phi' \rangle$ , although very slightly (e.g., on the order of  $10^{-15}$ ). Mass of a fermion particle  $\psi$  will be obtained via the Yukawa term of the Lagrangian coupled to the Higgs field  $\phi$  owing to the broken symmetry,

$$\mathcal{L}_{Yukawa} = -Y^{\alpha\beta} \phi^* \bar{\psi}_\alpha \psi_\beta \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are the mirror indices of 1 and 2 of the two sectors. Note that this mirror mixing is similar to the family mixing for quarks and neutrinos in the standard model and the basis of mass eigenstates is not the same as that of mirror eigenstates. Therefore, like the CKM and PMNS matrices, a unitary mirror mixing operator is defined as follows,

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_m & \sin \theta_m \\ -\sin \theta_m & \cos \theta_m \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

which transforms between the two bases with a mixing angle of  $\theta_m$ .

This broken mirror symmetry then naturally leads to the oscillations of neutral particles due to a mass difference. Similar to the ordinary neutrino oscillation, we can find the

probability of non-relativistic  $n - n'$  oscillations in free space,

$$P_{nn'}(t) = \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{nn'}t\right) \quad (3)$$

where  $\theta$  is the  $n - n'$  mixing angle and  $\sin^2(2\theta)$  denotes the mixing strength,  $t$  is the propagation time, and  $\Delta_{nn'} = m_n - m_{n'}$  is the small mass difference. Note that such oscillations do not affect the stability of nuclei with bound neutrons owing to energy conservation. From now on, natural units ( $\hbar = c = 1$ ) are used for simplicity and quantities of the mirror particles will be marked by  $'$  to distinguish from those of the ordinary particles. For  $t \ll \tau_\beta \approx 888$  s, the neutron  $\beta$  decay factor of  $\exp(-t/\tau_\beta)$  is omitted in Eq.3.

If neutrons travel in a magnetic field  $B$ , Eq. 3 still holds with a slight modification of  $\Delta_{nn'} = m_n - m_{n'} + \mu B$  where  $\mu = |\mu_n| \approx 6 \times 10^{-8}$  eV/T is the absolute neutron magnetic moment. An additional term of  $-\mu'B'$  should also be added if a mirror magnetic field exists at the same time.

The energy of a trapped UCN is typically less than  $10^{-7}$  eV and its mean free flight time  $\tau_f$  is on the order of 0.1 s in a "bottle" experiment setup. Each scattering of UCN (e.g., from the trap walls) will collapse its wave function into a mirror eigenstate with a  $n - n'$  transition probability  $P_{nn'}(\tau_f)$  determined as in Eq. 3. For a unit holding time in the trap, the number of such collisions will be  $1/\tau_f$ . Therefore, the transition rate of  $n - n'$  for the trapped UCN is simply,

$$\lambda_{nn'} = \frac{1}{\tau_f} \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{nn'}\tau_f\right). \quad (4)$$

A more careful treatment of the  $n$  and  $n'$  wave function was carried out in Ref. [25] as the trap walls do not exist for  $n'$ . Nonetheless, the result is the same as Eq. 4.

For the "bottle" experiments, the magnetic field of the UCN trap varied from as low as  $B \approx 2$  nT up to 10 mT (including ambient Earth's magnetic field of about  $50\mu\text{T}$ ) [3, 12–15] corresponding to an energy shift of  $1.2 \times 10^{-16} - 6 \times 10^{-10}$  eV. If the  $n - n'$  mass difference is large enough ( $> 10^{-13}$  eV), i.e.,  $\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{nn'}\tau_f \gg 1$ , then the propagation factor of Eq. 4 will simply be the mean value of  $1/2$ . However, if the  $n - n'$  mass difference is even greater than the energy (about  $10^{-7}$  eV) of the trapped UCN, the propagation factor of Eq. 4 has to have its sine phase modified [25] but its average is still  $1/2$ . So under the assumption of  $\Delta_{nn'} > 10^{-13}$  eV, we can obtain the transition rate of  $n - n'$  for "bottle" experiments,

$$\lambda_{nn'}(\text{bottle}) = \frac{1}{2\tau_f} \sin^2(2\theta) \quad (5)$$

which depends only on the mean free flight time  $\tau_f$  and the mixing strength constant  $\sin^2(2\theta)$  for  $n - n'$  to be determined later.

There was actually strong evidence to support Eq. 5 from an early "bottle" experiment [26]. They developed a novel technique with an adjustable Fomblin-coated UCN storage vessel [27, 28] to determine the lifetime by extrapolating to the ideal condition of zero wall collisions. By varying the size of the vessel, they conducted a number of runs with effectively varied mean free flight time for UCN. Then they fit the data to an equation that is essentially the same as Eq. 5 and obtained the lifetime of  $887.6 \pm 1.1$  s which is almost identical to the best "beam" measurement [2]. The remarkable fit in Fig. 2 of the paper [26] essentially claims a hidden constant just like the  $n - n'$  mixing strength  $\sin^2(2\theta)$ . Unfortunately, the dominating idea for the mythical loss from wall collisions was to blame the imperfect wall surface. And they were not confident of large corrections they had to apply so they changed the measured error bar from  $\pm 1.1$  to  $\pm 3$  s. Nevertheless, the  $n - n'$  mixing strength of about  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  can be inferred from their work and is close to the mean UCN loss per bounce on the Fomblin surface they measured.

As for the most recent "bottle" result [3] with a magnetic trap, neutrons are confined by magnetic fields and gravity and therefore it does not suffer the type of UCN losses from walls as in material trap experiments. However, its measured neutron lifetime is still about 1% lower than the "beam" results. Taking into account the geometry of their trap, it is reasonable to estimate  $\tau_f \sim 0.8$  s in their experiment. Together with the  $n - n'$  mixing strength of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  as discussed above, the lifetime discrepancy is perfectly resolved using Eq. 5. Under the new  $n - n'$  oscillation model, magnetic traps with different sizes or effectively different mean free flight times will give different apparent lifetime values that can only be reconciled by Eq. 5. Future experiments with more of this type of traps will present a very strict test of this  $n - n'$  oscillation model.

Now one can take a look at "beam" experiments in which neutrons don't bounce around until they hit the flux-monitoring detector in the end. Therefore one can consider it like traveling in free space as described in Eq. 3. The flight time of  $t \sim 10^{-3}$  s can be calculated for a flight path of 1 m and energy of 0.0034 eV [1]. "Beam" experiments typically apply high magnetic field of several Teslas to confine and extract emitted protons. This makes the last factor of Eq. 3 averaged to 1/2 as well. Therefore, the  $n - n'$  transition probability is

as follows,

$$P_{nn'}(\text{beam}) = \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\theta) \quad (6)$$

which is on the order of  $10^{-5}$ , i.e., smaller than the best experimental precision by two orders of magnitude and basically not detectable in a "beam" experiment. Therefore,  $n - n'$  oscillations do not affect the beta decay rate or  $\tau_\beta$  measured in "beam" experiments.

Here it is worth pointing out that we don't need the mirror-symmetry framework just to resolve the neutron lifetime discrepancy. The only assumptions for it to work are the mixing mechanism via some spontaneously broken symmetry and the mass difference should be  $> 10^{-13}$  eV. However, the mirror symmetry theory naturally presents a very elegant solution if not the best. In addition, to further constrain the  $n - n'$  mass difference or better yet to nail it down, the mirror-symmetry theory need to be applied to the thermal evolution of the early universe which will be discussed below. As a motivation bonus, much richer physics can be studied under this model, for example, possible oscillations of other neutral particles and its impact on astrophysical environments.

In the first second of the Big Bang after protons and neutrons are formed from quarks, the age of the universe can be parameterized for temperatures between  $10^{12}$  K ( $\sim 100$  MeV) and  $10^{10}$  K ( $\sim 1$  MeV) as [29],

$$t = 3.07 / (\sqrt{g * (T)} T_{10}^2) [\text{sec}] \sim \frac{1}{T_{10}^2} [\text{sec}] \quad (7)$$

where  $T_{10}$  is the temperature in unit of  $10^{10}$  K and  $g * (T)$  is the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom at the given temperature  $T$ , which is about  $10 - 17$  for this temperature range. As pions and muons are quickly annihilated in this temperature range, their contributions here and possible pion-neutron interactions that affect discussions below are omitted for simplicity. See Ref. [17] on the effect of pion-neutron interactions under a different neutron oscillation mechanism.

Once formed at temperature just above  $10^{12}$  K, protons and neutrons are in thermal equilibrium with a 1:1 ratio by interacting with electrons, positrons, and neutrinos. They each consist of half of the baryon content because the Q-value or the mass difference between proton and neutron (1.293 MeV) is negligible at high temperatures. The same is true for the mirror sector except it may have a lower temperature  $T' < T$  (e.g.,  $T' = 1/3T$ ) at the same time as suggested by previous studies [11, 21, 30]. Oscillations of  $n - n'$  then become the dominant source for matter exchange between the two parallel sectors as other neutral

particles are either too short-lived (e.g.,  $\pi^0$ ) or too light (like neutrinos) to contribute, which will be discussed later. Therefore, the baryon contents of the two sectors have stayed the same until this point and are equal if they were the same after the inflation, in other words, the same initial content  $\chi_i = \chi'_i$  is assumed. Afterwards, the two baryon contents will evolve via the interplay of  $n - n'$  oscillations as follows,

$$\frac{d\chi(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{2}P_{n'n}(\tau'_f)\lambda'_{np}(t)\chi'(t) - \frac{1}{2}P_{nn'}(\tau_f)\lambda_{np}(t)\chi(t), \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{d\chi'(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{2}P_{nn'}(\tau_f)\lambda_{np}(t)\chi(t) - \frac{1}{2}P_{n'n}(\tau'_f)\lambda'_{np}(t)\chi'(t) \quad (9)$$

where  $P_{nn'}$  ( $P_{n'n}$ ) is the same as defined in Eq. 3 with  $t = \tau_f$  ( $\tau'_f$ ). The conversion rate  $\lambda_{np}$  between protons and neutrons (smaller  $n - \pi$  contributions are ignored here [17]) essentially defines the mean free flight time  $\tau_f$  as [29],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\tau_f} = \lambda_{np} &= \frac{7\pi}{30}G_F^2|V_{ud}|^2(1 + 3\left(\frac{g_A}{g_V}\right)^2)(kT)^5 \\ &\sim 0.4T_{10}^5[\text{sec}^{-1}] \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $G_F$  is the Fermi constant,  $V_{ud}$  is the CKM matrix element, and  $g_A/g_V$  is the ratio of axial-vector/vector couplings.

Under the condition of the lower mirror temperature ( $T' \lesssim 1/3T$ ), the two equations (8-9) will be decoupled and can be simplified by removing the first term. Therefore, the matter exchange will be in two separate steps. First, most of mirror neutrons, formed earlier than ordinary neutrons, will be converted to neutrons and hence mirror matter to ordinary matter due to  $n - p$  equilibrium. The second step starts when the ordinary temperature gets low enough so that most of ordinary neutrons/matter will go back to the pool of mirror matter in the same way. In the end, a small amount of ordinary matter (neutrons and protons) is left while the mirror matter dominates the universe behaving exactly like the dark matter we have observed today.

First, one can examine the  $n' \rightarrow n$  conversion process. The fraction of leftover mirror matter can be worked out as follows,

$$\frac{\chi'_r}{\chi'_i} = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int P_{n'n}(\tau'_f)\lambda'_{np}(t)dt\right) \quad (11)$$

where  $\chi'_r$  ( $\chi'_i$ ) is the remaining (initial) amount of mirror matter. The integration over time

in Eq. 11 can be simplified by replacing  $t$  with temperature using Eq. 7,

$$\begin{aligned}\int g(T)dT &\equiv \int P_{n'n}\lambda'_{np}dt \\ &= \int 1.6 \times 10^{-5} \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta_{nn'}/[\text{eV}]}{4 \times 10^{-16}(T'_{10})^5}\right)(T'_{10})^2 dT'_{10}\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

where the conversion factor  $g(T)$  is plotted in Fig. 1 assuming the  $n - n'$  mass difference  $\Delta_{nn'} = 2 \times 10^{-6}$  eV and the mixing strength of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$ . Similar equations as above also apply to the second or  $n \rightarrow n'$  conversion step. As seen in Fig. 1, the peak conversion occurs just under  $10^{12}$  K and the distribution is narrow enough to decouple the evolution equations.

For  $\Delta_{nn'} = 2 \times 10^{-6}$  eV, about 17% of mirror matter remains after the first process. Then the reverse conversion ( $n \rightarrow n'$ ) starts following the same equations as Eqs. 11-12 (except for  $n \leftrightarrow n'$ ) when the ordinary matter reaches the same temperature. In the end, a mirror-to-ordinary matter ratio of 5.4 is obtained, which is the same as the ratio of dark matter to baryon matter.

On the other hand, using the observed dark-to-baryon matter ratio as a constraint, one can obtain the following simple relationship between the  $n - n'$  mass difference and its mixing strength,

$$\sin^2(2\theta) = \left(\frac{3 \times 10^{-14} \text{eV}}{\Delta_{nn'}}\right)^{0.6} \quad (13)$$

which could be used to determine a better mass difference once the UCN experiments have better measurements for the mixing strength.

If the  $n - n'$  mixing strength is on the order of  $10^{-5} - 10^{-6}$ , the corresponding single quark mixing strength will be the cube root of that, i.e., about  $10^{-2}$ . The neutral mesons like  $\pi^0$  and  $K^0$ , consequently, will have a mirror mixing strength of about  $10^{-4}$ . The mixing probabilities for neutral mesons are,

$$\begin{aligned}P_{\pi^0\pi^{0'}}(t) &= \sin^2(2\theta_{\pi^0}) \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\pi^0\pi^{0'}}t\right), \\ P_{K^0K^{0'}}(t) &= \sin^2(2\theta_{K^0}) \sin^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta_{K^0K^{0'}}t\right)\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

which hold true even for relativistic particles as far as  $t$  is the proper time in the particle's rest frame. The mirror particles are not detectable in the ordinary world so that Eq. 14 basically defines the branching fractions of invisible decays of the mesons. Since the mass




FIG. 1. The temperature dependence of the  $n \leftrightarrow n'$  conversion factor  $g(T)$  due to  $n - n'$  oscillation is shown. The peak conversion rate occurs right below  $T = 10^{12}$  K shortly after (mirror) baryons are formed in the early universe.

difference stems from the Higgs mixing, it is reasonable to assume that it is scaled to the particle's mass. Therefore,  $\Delta_{\pi^0\pi^{0'}}$  and  $\Delta_{K^0K^{0'}}$  should be similar to that of  $n - n'$ , i.e., about  $10^{-6}$  eV. Considering the  $\pi^0$ 's very short lifetime of  $8.52 \times 10^{-17}$  s, the  $\pi^0 - \pi^{0'}$  transition probability or the branching fraction of its invisible decays should be less than  $10^{-18}$  which is not detectable with today's technology. On the other hand,  $K^0$  has fairly long lifetime ( $9 \times 10^{-11}$  s for  $K_S^0$  and  $5 \times 10^{-8}$  s for  $K_L^0$ ) which makes the propagation factor in Eq. 14 about  $10^{-2}$  for  $K_S^0$  and averaged to  $1/2$  for  $K_L^0$ . Therefore, the branching fraction of  $K^0$  invisible decays is estimated to be about  $10^{-6}$  for  $K_S^0$  and  $10^{-4}$  for  $K_L^0$ , which surprisingly is not constrained experimentally [31]. Such a large fraction should motivate people to start searching for  $K^0 \rightarrow \text{invisible}$  decays at current kaon production facilities.

Similar estimate can be done for  $D^0$  and  $B^0$  mesons and their lifetimes permit an invisible branching fraction of about  $10^{-9} - 10^{-10}$  from the mirror oscillations. Other heavy neutral particles have even shorter lifetimes so that the effect of the oscillations is negligible. As for the light particles, photons have no rest mass and thus can not be mixed. The massive species of neutrinos should take part in the mirror mixing just like the 3-generation mixing in the ordinary sector. However, the effect is very small as  $\Delta_{\nu\nu'}^2 \sim 10^{-17} - 10^{-19}$  eV<sup>2</sup> assuming a neutrino mass of  $0.1 - 0.01$  eV. To observe this oscillation effect for 1 MeV neutrinos, it has to come from stars at least thousands of light years away, possibly from a supernova explosion. Solar neutrinos have to have an energy below 1 eV to experience such oscillations on its way to Earth.

To conclude, the following analysis and experimental studies are highly recommended in order to test the proposed model. Careful reanalysis of past "bottle" experiments should be carried out by taking into account the mean free flight time  $\tau_f$  evaluated or simulated for its own specific setup. Under this model with Eq. 5 for the corrections from  $n - n'$  oscillations, a consistent beta decay lifetime should be obtained and it will also help determine a more accurate  $n - n'$  mixing strength. Magnetic traps with various sizes can provide a much stricter test of this model without worries of the interference from wall surface. Studies of  $K^0 \rightarrow \text{invisible}$  decays should be granted high priority at kaon production facilities. The measured invisible branching fraction will tell us about the  $K^0 - K^{0'}$  mixing strength and possibly verify the mechanism of the spontaneously broken mirror symmetry. If this mirror symmetry theory is confirmed, invisible mirror stars and galaxies should be searched. Such candidates may have already been observed in most of the black hole and neutron star merger events that were detected by gravitational-wave observatories but could not be identified with its electromagnetic counterpart except for the one neutron star merger [32]. Could most of the merger events actually come from the mirror sector of the universe? This is understandable since we are in a dark (mirror) matter dominated universe.

Many of the intriguing features conceived in previous studies of the mirror matter theory [21–23] are kept and work even better under the new model. For example, the  $\Omega_{\text{dark}}/\Omega_B$  ratio could be explained better as discussed above. Another example is the unexpected excess of ultra high energy cosmic rays above the GreisenZatsepinKuzmin (GZK) limit and an elegant explanation using the mirror matter theory was provided except for a caveat of unrealistic requirement on galactic magnetic fields [33]. Under the current model, there is no effect of magnetic fields on the mirror mixing and therefore the same explanation still holds without tarnishment.

The influence of this  $n - n'$  mixing model can also be studied in various other scenarios like BBN, stellar burning processes (in particular, neutron capture processes), neutron star mergers (including all three cases of ordinary-ordinary, mirror-mirror, and mirror-ordinary mergers). Probably the two mirrored yet separated worlds have been and are being connected by the active and fascinating messenger of the  $n - n'$  doublet during the Big Bang and after the formation of stars.

I would like to thank Ani Aprahamian and Michael Wiescher for supporting me in a great research environment at Notre Dame. I also like to thank Jim Cline for pointing out

their work on the effect of pion-neutron interactions under a different neutron oscillation mechanism and I apologize for my ignorance in the initial preparation of this work. This work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant No. PHY-1713857 and the Joint Institute for Nuclear Astrophysics (JINA-CEE, [www.jinaweb.org](http://www.jinaweb.org)), NSF-PFC under grant No. PHY-1430152.

---

\* wtan@nd.edu

- [1] J. S. Nico, M. S. Dewey, D. M. Gilliam, F. E. Wietfeldt, X. Fei, W. M. Snow, G. L. Greene, J. Pauwels, R. Eykens, A. Lamberty, J. V. Gestel, and R. D. Scott, *Phys. Rev. C* **71**, 055502 (2005).
- [2] A. T. Yue, M. S. Dewey, D. M. Gilliam, G. L. Greene, A. B. Laptev, J. S. Nico, W. M. Snow, and F. E. Wietfeldt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 222501 (2013).
- [3] R. W. Pattie, N. B. Callahan, C. Cude-Woods, E. R. Adamek, L. J. Broussard, S. M. Clayton, S. A. Currie, E. B. Dees, X. Ding, E. M. Engel, D. E. Fellers, W. Fox, P. Geltenbort, K. P. Hickerson, M. A. Hoffbauer, A. T. Holley, A. Komives, C.-Y. Liu, S. W. T. MacDonald, M. Makela, C. L. Morris, J. D. Ortiz, J. Ramsey, D. J. Salvat, A. Saunders, S. J. Seestrom, E. I. Sharapov, S. K. Sjue, Z. Tang, J. Vanderwerp, B. Vogelaar, P. L. Walstrom, Z. Wang, W. Wei, H. L. Weaver, J. W. Wexler, T. L. Womack, A. R. Young, and B. A. Zeck, *Science* **360**, 627 (2018).
- [4] A. P. Serebrov, E. A. Kolomensky, A. K. Fomin, I. A. Krasnoshchekova, A. V. Vassiljev, D. M. Prudnikov, I. V. Shoka, A. V. Chechkin, M. E. Chaikovskiy, V. E. Varlamov, S. N. Ivanov, A. N. Pirozhkov, P. Geltenbort, O. Zimmer, T. Jenke, M. Van der Grinten, and M. Tucker, *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 055503 (2018).
- [5] S. Arzumanov, L. Bondarenko, S. Chernyavsky, P. Geltenbort, V. Morozov, V. V. Nesvizhevsky, Y. Panin, and A. Strepetov, *Physics Letters B* **745**, 79 (2015).
- [6] W. Paul, F. Anton, L. Paul, S. Paul, and W. Mampe, *Z. Phys. C - Particles and Fields* **45**, 25 (1989).
- [7] M. Baldo-Ceolin, P. Benetti, T. Bitter, F. Bobisut, E. Calligarich, R. Dolfini, D. Dubbers, P. El-Muzeini, M. Genoni, D. Gibin, A. Gigli Berzolari, K. Gobrecht, A. Guglielmi, J. Last, M. Laveder, W. Lippert, F. Mattioli, F. Mauri, M. Mezzetto, C. Montanari, A. Pi-

- azzoli, G. Puglierin, A. Rappoldi, G. L. Raselli, D. Scannicchio, A. Sconza, M. Vascon, and L. Visentin, *Z. Phys. C - Particles and Fields* **63**, 409 (1994).
- [8] B. Fornal and B. Grinstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 191801 (2018).
- [9] Z. Tang, M. Blatnik, L. J. Broussard, J. H. Choi, S. M. Clayton, C. Cude-Woods, S. Currie, D. E. Fellers, E. M. Fries, P. Geltenbort, F. Gonzalez, K. P. Hickerson, T. M. Ito, C.-Y. Liu, S. W. T. MacDonald, M. Makela, C. L. Morris, C. M. O'Shaughnessy, R. W. Pattie, B. Plaster, D. J. Salvat, A. Saunders, Z. Wang, A. R. Young, and B. A. Zeck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 022505 (2018).
- [10] UCNA Collaboration, X. Sun, E. Adamek, B. Allgeier, M. Blatnik, T. J. Bowles, L. J. Broussard, M. A.-P. Brown, R. Carr, S. Clayton, C. Cude-Woods, S. Currie, E. B. Dees, X. Ding, B. W. Filippone, A. García, P. Geltenbort, S. Hasan, K. P. Hickerson, J. Hoagland, R. Hong, G. E. Hogan, A. T. Holley, T. M. Ito, A. Knecht, C.-Y. Liu, J. Liu, M. Makela, R. Mammei, J. W. Martin, D. Melconian, M. P. Mendenhall, S. D. Moore, C. L. Morris, S. Nepal, N. Nouri, R. W. Pattie, A. Pérez Galván, D. G. Phillips, R. Picker, M. L. Pitt, B. Plaster, J. C. Ramsey, R. Rios, D. J. Salvat, A. Saunders, W. Sondheim, S. Sjue, S. Slutsky, C. Swank, G. Swift, E. Tatar, R. B. Vogelaar, B. VornDick, Z. Wang, W. Wei, J. Wexler, T. Womack, C. Wrede, A. R. Young, and B. A. Zeck, *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 052501 (2018).
- [11] Z. Berezhiani and L. Bento, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 081801 (2006).
- [12] A. P. Serebrov, E. B. Aleksandrov, N. A. Dovator, S. P. Dmitriev, A. K. Fomin, P. Geltenbort, A. G. Kharitonov, I. A. Krasnoschekova, M. S. Lasakov, A. N. Murashkin, G. E. Shmelev, V. E. Varlamov, A. V. Vassiljev, O. M. Zhrebtsov, and O. Zimmer, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment Particle Physics with Slow Neutrons*, **611**, 137 (2009).
- [13] G. Ban, K. Bodek, M. Daum, R. Henneck, S. Heule, M. Kasprzak, N. Khomutov, K. Kirch, S. Kistryn, A. Knecht, P. Knowles, M. Kuźniak, T. Lefort, A. Mtchedlishvili, O. Naviliat-Cuncic, C. Plonka, G. Quéméner, M. Rebetez, D. Rebreyend, S. Roccia, G. Rogel, M. Tur, A. Weis, J. Zejma, and G. Zsigmond, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 161603 (2007).
- [14] I. Altarev, C. A. Baker, G. Ban, K. Bodek, M. Daum, P. Fierlinger, P. Geltenbort, K. Green, M. G. D. van der Grinten, E. Gutmiedl, P. G. Harris, R. Henneck, M. Horras, P. Iaydjiev, S. Ivanov, N. Khomutov, K. Kirch, S. Kistryn, A. Knecht, P. Knowles, A. Kozela, F. Kuchler, M. Kuźniak, T. Lauer, B. Lauss, T. Lefort, A. Mtchedlishvili, O. Naviliat-Cuncic, S. Paul,

- A. Pazgalev, J. M. Pendlebury, G. Petzoldt, E. Pierre, C. Plonka-Spehr, G. Quémener, D. Rebreyend, S. Rocca, G. Rogel, N. Severijns, D. Shiers, Y. Sobolev, R. Stoepler, A. Weis, J. Zejma, J. Zenner, and G. Zsigmond, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 032003 (2009).
- [15] A. P. Serebrov, E. B. Aleksandrov, N. A. Dovator, S. P. Dmitriev, A. K. Fomin, P. Geltenbort, A. G. Kharitonov, I. A. Krasnoschekova, M. S. Lasakov, A. N. Murashkin, G. E. Shmelev, V. E. Varlamov, A. V. Vassiljev, O. M. Zherebtsov, and O. Zimmer, *Physics Letters B* **663**, 181 (2008).
- [16] G. K. Karananas and A. Kassiteridis, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2018**, 036 (2018), arXiv:1805.03656.
- [17] T. Bringmann, J. M. Cline, and J. M. Cornell, ArXiv181008215 *Astro-Ph Physicshep-Ph* (2018), arXiv:1810.08215 [astro-ph, physics:hep-ph].
- [18] I. Goldman, R. N. Mohapatra, and S. Nussinov, ArXiv190107077 *Hep-Ph* (2019), arXiv:1901.07077 [hep-ph].
- [19] T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **104**, 254 (1956).
- [20] I. Y. Kobzarev, L. B. Okun, and I. Y. Pomeranchuk, *Sov.J.Nucl.Phys.* **3**, 837 (1966).
- [21] E. W. Kolb, D. Seckel, and M. S. Turner, *Nature* **314**, 415 (1985).
- [22] R. Foot, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **13**, 2161 (2004).
- [23] Z. Berezhiani, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **19**, 3775 (2004).
- [24] L. B. Okun, *Phys.-Usp.* **50**, 380 (2007).
- [25] B. Kerbikov and O. Lychkovskiy, *Phys. Rev. C* **77**, 065504 (2008).
- [26] W. Mampe, P. Ageron, C. Bates, J. M. Pendlebury, and A. Steyerl, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 593 (1989).
- [27] J. C. Bates, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research* **216**, 535 (1983).
- [28] P. Ageron, W. Mampe, J. C. Bates, and J. M. Pendlebury, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* **249**, 261 (1986).
- [29] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity* (1972).
- [30] H. M. Hodges, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 456 (1993).
- [31] S. N. Gninenko, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 015004 (2015).
- [32] LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 161101 (2017).

[33] Z. Berezhiani and L. Bento, Physics Letters B **635**, 253 (2006).