

KIAS-P 00070
 hep-ph/0011074
 November 6, 2000

Quantum Mechanics of Neutrino Oscillations

Carlo Giunti

INFN, Sez. di Torino, and Dip. di Fisica Teorica, Univ. di Torino, I-10125 Torino, Italy, and
 School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-012, Korea

and

Chung W. Kim

School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-012, Korea, and
 Dept. of Physics & Astronomy, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

Abstract

We present a simple but general treatment of neutrino oscillations in the framework of quantum mechanics using plane waves and intuitive wave packet principles when necessary. We attempt to clarify some confusing statements that have recently appeared in the literature.

The quantum mechanics of neutrino oscillations have been studied in several papers [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11] and reviewed in [12, 13]. Alternative derivations of neutrino oscillations in the framework of quantum field theory have also been presented in [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. In spite of all these studies, the understanding of the theory of neutrino oscillations seems still unsettled, as one can see from controversial claims in the recent literature [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30].

In this article we wish to clarify some of these issues using a simple quantum mechanical treatment of neutrinos as plane waves. A rigorous treatment of neutrino oscillations in the framework of quantum mechanics requires a wave packet formalism [2]. Here we employ some of its principles only when necessary, without technical details (see [3, 9, 12, 13]).

Neutrino oscillations are a consequence of neutrino mixing and the fact that neutrino masses are very small. Neutrino mixing implies that the left-handed components ν_L of the flavor neutrino fields ($\nu = e, \mu, \tau$)¹ are superpositions of the left-handed components ν_{kL} of neutrino fields with definite mass m_k ($k = 1, 2, 3$):

$$\nu_L = \sum_{k=1}^3 U_{kL} \nu_k \quad (\nu = e, \mu, \tau); \quad (1)$$

¹ We consider for simplicity only the three active neutrino flavors whose existence is firmly established (see, for example, Ref. [31]). However, the formalism is valid for any number of neutrinos, including additional sterile neutrinos whose existence is under investigation (see, for example, Refs. [32, 33]).

The flavor of an active neutrino (ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ) is determined by the associated lepton (e, μ, τ) in charged-current weak interactions. Sterile neutrinos do not feel weak interactions, as well as electromagnetic and strong interactions (as active neutrinos); they are sensitive only to gravitational interactions.

where U is a unitary matrix ($UU^\dagger = U^\dagger U = \mathbb{1}$), i.e. such that

$$\sum_k U_{ik} U_{jk}^* = \delta_{ij}; \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_k U_{ik} U_{jk} = \delta_{ij}; \quad (3)$$

A neutrino with definite flavor is described by the state

$$|j\rangle_i = \sum_k U_{kj} |j_k\rangle_i; \quad (4)$$

such that

$$\langle 0 | j_j \rangle_i = \sum_{k,j} U_{kj} U_{ji}^* \langle 0 | j_k \rangle_j / \sum_k U_{kj} U_{ki}^* = \delta_{ij}; \quad (5)$$

where we used $\langle 0 | j_k \rangle_j = \delta_{kj}$. The state describing a flavor antineutrino has complex-conjugated elements of the mixing matrix with respect to the flavor neutrino state in Eq. (4):

$$|j\rangle_{\bar{i}} = \sum_k U_{kj}^* |j_k\rangle_{\bar{i}}; \quad (6)$$

This implies that the oscillations of neutrinos and antineutrinos are different only if the mixing matrix is complex (i.e. only if there is CP violation).

Let us consider ν produced at time t_p and space coordinate² x_p by a weak interaction process with a specific flavor ($\nu = e, \mu, \tau$). This neutrino is described by a state $|j^p\rangle_i$ that is a superposition of neutrino states with definite kinematical properties:

$$|j^p\rangle_i = \sum_k U_{kj} |j_k; p_k\rangle_i; \quad (7)$$

The state $|j_k; p_k\rangle_i$ describes a neutrino with mass m_k and momentum p_k . It is a product of the states $|j_k\rangle_i$ and $|p_k\rangle_i$ belonging to the flavor mass and momentum Hilbert spaces, respectively:

$$|j_k; p_k\rangle_i = |j_k\rangle_i |p_k\rangle_i; \quad (8)$$

In general the momenta of different mass eigenstates can be different, and they are determined by energy-momentum conservation in the production process [34]. For example, in the case of a muon neutrino produced by a pion decay at rest,

$$p_\pi = p_\mu + p_\nu; \quad (9)$$

the momentum of the k^{th} mass eigenstate is

$$p_k^2 = \frac{m^2}{4} - \frac{m^2}{m^2} - \frac{m_k^2}{2} - 1 + \frac{m^2}{m^2} + \frac{m_k^4}{4m^2}; \quad (10)$$

² Since detected neutrinos propagate along a macroscopic distance, we consider only one spatial dimension along the neutrino path.

with the corresponding energy given by

$$E_k^2 = \frac{m^2}{4} \left(1 - \frac{m^2}{m^2} \right)^2 + \frac{m_k^2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{m^2}{m^2} \right) + \frac{m_k^4}{4m^2}; \quad (11)$$

where m and m_k are the masses of the pion and muon, respectively. The mass eigenstate $|j_k; p_k\rangle$ satisfies the energy eigenvalue equation

$$H |j_k; p_k\rangle = E_k |j_k; p_k\rangle; \quad (12)$$

where H is the free neutrino Hamiltonian.

In practice neutrinos with energy smaller than some fraction of MeV are not detectable, either because their energy is below threshold in charged-current processes, or because the cross section in elastic scattering processes, which increases with neutrino energy, is too small. Hence, if all the neutrino masses³ are much smaller than 1 MeV, all the detectable neutrinos are extremely relativistic and it is convenient to use a relativistic approximation for the momentum and energy of the mass eigenstates.

At zeroth order in the relativistic approximation all neutrino masses are considered negligible and all the mass eigenstates have the same energy E , equal to the modulus of their momentum: $p_k = E_k = E$. The value of E is determined by energy-momentum conservation in the production process. For example, from Eq. (10) one can see that in the pion decay process in Eq. (9) we have $E = \frac{m}{2} \left(1 - \frac{m^2}{m^2} \right)^{1/2} \approx 30 \text{ MeV}$. Since the energy E_k and momentum p_k of the k^{th} mass eigenstate are related by the relativistic dispersion relation

$$E_k^2 = p_k^2 + m_k^2; \quad (13)$$

the first order corrections to the equalities $p_k = E_k = E$ depend on the square of the neutrino mass and in general we can write

$$p_k \approx E - \frac{m_k^2}{2E}; \quad (14)$$

where ϵ is a quantity determined by energy-momentum conservation in the production process. For example, from Eq. (10) one can see that in pion decay $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{m^2}{m^2} \right)^{1/2} \approx 0.8$. Using the relativistic approximation of the energy-momentum dispersion relation in Eq. (13),

$$E_k \approx p_k + \frac{m_k^2}{2E}; \quad (15)$$

from Eq. (14) we obtain that the energy E_k of the mass eigenstate neutrino ν_k at first order in the relativistic approximation is given by

$$E_k \approx E + (1 - \epsilon) \frac{m_k^2}{2E}; \quad (16)$$

³ Direct searches of effective neutrino masses in lepton decays gave the upper limits $m_{\mu} < 3 \text{ eV}$, $m_{\tau} < 190 \text{ keV}$, $m_{\nu} < 18.2 \text{ MeV}$ (see Ref. [31]). However, the sum of the masses of light neutrinos is constrained to be smaller than about 24 eV by their contribution to the total energy density of the Universe (see Ref. [31]).

The wave function corresponding to the initial flavor state j^P in Eq. (7) is

$$j^P(x)i = \sum_k U_{kj} h_{j^P} j_k i = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{ip_k(x-x_P)} j_k i; \quad (17)$$

where we have taken into account the initial coordinate x_P of the production process. The time evolution of the wave function $j^P(x)i$ is given by the Schrodinger equation

$$i \frac{d}{dt} j^P(x;t)i = H j^P(x;t)i = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{ip_k(x-x_P)} E_k j_k i; \quad (18)$$

where we have used the energy eigenvalue equation (12). The solution of the evolution equation is

$$j^P(x;t)i = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{ip_k(x-x_P) - iE_k(t-t_P)} j_k i; \quad (19)$$

where t_P is the production time. At a time different from the production time t_P and a coordinate different from the production coordinate x_P , the state $j^P(x;t)i$ is a superposition of flavor states. Indeed, expressing the mass eigenstate $j_k i$ in Eq. (19) in terms of flavor eigenstates,

$$j_k i = \sum_i U_{ki} j_i \quad (20)$$

(this relation is obtained by inverting Eq. (4) using the unitarity relation in Eq. (3)), one obtains

$$j^P(x;t)i = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{ip_k(x-x_P) - iE_k(t-t_P)} \sum_i U_{ki} j_i i; \quad (21)$$

This is a superposition of different flavor states, which reduces to one flavor only at the production point $x = x_P, t = t_P$, where the unitarity relation in Eq. (2) guarantees that $j^P(x = x_P; t = t_P)i = j^P i$.

The term in parenthesis in Eq. (21) is the amplitude of $j^P \rightarrow j$ transitions, which is obtained by projecting $j^P(x = x_D; t = t_D)i$ at the detection point space and time, x_D and t_D , on the flavor state $j i$:

$$A_{j^P \rightarrow j}(L;T) = h_{j^P} j^P(x = x_D; t = t_D)i = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{ip_k L - iE_k T} U_{ki}; \quad (22)$$

where $L = x_D - x_P$ is the source-detector distance and $T = t_D - t_P$ is the neutrino propagation time.

Here it is to be emphasized that the detection process is described only by the flavor state $j i$, with no need to express the detected neutrino state as a superposition of mass eigenstates with different momenta. This is due to the principle of causality, which implies that different mass eigenstates with different momenta created in the production process

determine their own kinematics in the detection process where they are detected. The corresponding different momenta of the particles participating to the detection process do not spoil the coherence of the process if they are within the momentum uncertainty due to the localization of the detection process (through the uncertainty principle).

The probability of $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ transitions is

$$P_{\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau}(L; T) = \mathcal{P}_{\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau}(L; T)^2; \quad (23)$$

leading to

$$P_{\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau}(L; T) = \sum_k \mathcal{P}_{\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau}^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{k>j} U_k U_k^* U_j^* U_j e^{i(p_k - p_j)L - i(E_k - E_j)T}; \quad (24)$$

It is clear that the transition probability at the detector depends only on the neutrino mixing matrix and on the momentum and energy differences of the mass eigenstates, which are due to their mass differences. Invoking now the relativistic approximations in Eqs. (14) and (16), we obtain

$$P_{\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau}(L; T) = \sum_k \mathcal{P}_{\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau}^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{k>j} U_k U_k^* U_j^* U_j \exp \left[i \frac{m_{kj}^2}{2E} L - i \left(1 - \frac{m_{kj}^2}{2E} \right) T \right]; \quad (25)$$

with the mass-squared differences $m_{kj}^2 = m_k^2 - m_j^2$.

Equation (25) gives the oscillation probability as a function of the distance L between a source and a detector and the neutrino travel time T . However, in real experiments, the neutrino travel time is not measured, but the source-detector distance is known. Therefore, the neutrino travel time T must be expressed in terms of the distance L . To accomplish this task it is necessary to go beyond the plane wave approximation employed so far and remind that the propagating mass eigenstate neutrinos must be described by wave packets. Indeed, a plane wave has an infinite space-time extent, whereas neutrino production and detection are localized processes, that are appropriately described by the wave packet formalism. We associate each mass eigenstate, which has well defined kinematical properties, with a wave packet. The spatial width of the neutrino wave-packets is determined by the maximum between the quantum uncertainties of the position and time of the microscopic production process (see Ref. [9]). The wave packets propagate with the group velocity

$$v_k = \frac{p_k}{E_k} \simeq 1 - \frac{m_k^2}{2E^2}; \quad (26)$$

where we have used the relativistic approximations (14) and (16). The different mass eigenstates can interfere if they overlap upon their arrival at the detector or if the coherence time of the detection process is larger than the time separation between the mass eigenstates [5, 8, 9]. In any case, from Eq. (26) one can see that the arrival time at the detector of the mass eigenstate wave packets is equal to the source-detector distance⁴ plus a correction

⁴ We use natural units in which $c = \hbar = 1$.

proportional to $m_k^2 = E^2$. Since the phase in the neutrino oscillation probability in Eq. (25) is already proportional to $m_{kj}^2 = E$, the correction to the relation $T = L$ gives a contribution of higher order, which can be neglected. One may object that since this correction is also proportional to the distance L , it is not negligible when $(m_{kj}^2 L = E)(m_k^2 = E^2) \ll 1$. This is true. However, one must observe that in practice neutrino oscillations are observable only when the phase $(m_{kj}^2 L = E)$ is of order one. This is due to the fact that all neutrino beams have a spread in energy, all detectors have a finite energy resolution and the source-detector distance has a macroscopic uncertainty due to the sizes of the source and detector. When the oscillation phase is much larger than one, the averages over the neutrino energy and the source-detector distance wash out the oscillating term. If all the phases are large and all the oscillating terms are washed out, there remains only a constant transition probability given by the first term in Eq. (25):

$$P_{i \rightarrow i} = \sum_k |U_{ki}|^4 \quad (27)$$

Therefore, the observability of neutrino oscillations guarantees that $(m_{kj}^2 L = E)(m_k^2 = E^2) \ll 1$ and the correction to the relation $T = L$ is negligible.

Another correction to the relation $T = L$ is due to the finite time interval in which the wave packets overlap with the detection process and to the finite coherence time of the detection process. One should average the oscillation probability in Eq. (25) over the resulting total time interval t_D . However, since the time interval t_D is characteristic of a microscopic process, it is always much smaller than the macroscopic propagation time $T \gg L$. If this property were not satisfied, oscillations could not be observed because they would be washed out by the average over time. As mentioned above, since neutrino oscillations are observable only when the phase $(m_{kj}^2 T = E)$ is of order one, the correction $(m_{kj}^2 t_D = E) \ll 1$ is always negligible. In other words, the phase of the oscillations is practically constant in the time interval t_D and the average over such a time interval is equivalent to the approximation $T = L$.

From Eq. (25), the appropriate approximation $T = L$ leads to the transition probability

$$P_{i \rightarrow j}(L) = \sum_k |U_{ki}|^2 |U_{kj}|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{k>j} U_{ki} U_{kj}^* \exp \left(\pm \frac{m_{kj}^2}{2E} L \right); \quad (28)$$

as a function of the source-detector distance L measured in real experiments. This is the standard oscillation formula derived more than 20 years ago [35, 36, 37, 1]. Notice that as a result of the $T = L$ relation, $\hbar$ has magically disappeared, leading to the independence of the neutrino oscillation probability from the specific details of the production process. From Eq. (28) one can see that there is an oscillating term associated with each pair of mass eigenstates $k > j$ and the corresponding oscillation length is

$$L_{kj} = \frac{4E}{m_{kj}^2}; \quad (29)$$

Since the state in Eq. (6) describing a flavor antineutrino has complex-conjugated elements of the mixing matrix with respect to the flavor neutrino state, the probability of

! oscillations is given by Eq. (28) with complex-conjugated elements of the mixing matrix. The oscillation lengths of neutrinos and antineutrinos are equal.

Some comments are in order for the clarification of the derivation of the neutrino oscillation probability in Eq. (28):

- 1) The initial neutrino state in Eq. (7) is a coherent superposition of mass eigenstates. This is possible because neutrino masses are small and the differences between the momenta of different mass eigenstates is smaller than the momentum uncertainty of the production process due to its localization in space. Denoting the spatial interval of the source by x_P , we have the momentum uncertainty $\Delta p_P \sim 1/x_P$ and the two mass eigenstates k, j are emitted coherently if $|p_k - p_j| \leq \Delta p_P$. Using Eq. (14) one gets the condition $|m_{kj}^2| \leq 2E \Delta p_P$. For example, assuming $x_P \sim 1$ cm in the process in Eq. (9) of pion decay at rest, we obtain the coherence condition $|m_{kj}^2| \leq 10^2 \text{ eV}^2$, which is well satisfied by neutrino masses below eV ranges.

If the momentum uncertainty in the production process is too small, different mass eigenstates are emitted incoherently by the source and neutrinos do not oscillate. This happens if the momenta of the particles in the production process are measured with such a high accuracy to the extent that one can determine which neutrino mass eigenstate is produced. In this case $x_P \ll 2E = |m_{kj}^2| L_{kj}^{\text{osc}}$, i.e. the uncertainty in the localization of the source is larger than the oscillation length [2]. It is obvious that in this case it is not possible to measure neutrino oscillations. Analogous considerations apply to the detection process.

- 2) We have assumed that all the mass eigenstates are produced at the same space-time point $(x_P; t_P)$ and detected at the same space-time point $(x_D; t_D)$. Since both the production and detection processes have uncertainties in space and time, different mass eigenstates can be produced and detected coherently at different locations in space and time within the uncertainties, generating interferences responsible for neutrino oscillations. However, one must pay special attention to the coherent character of the production and detection processes. In other words, there is a well-defined phase relation between the wave functions of neutrinos produced (detected) within the spatial and temporal coherence intervals of the production (detection) process.

Let us first consider each mass eigenstate neutrino k produced at a different space-time point $(x_P^k; t_P^k)$, with $|x_P^k - x_P^j| \leq x_P$ and $|t_P^k - t_P^j| \leq t_P$. Since the component of the neutrino field that creates the corresponding mass eigenstate in the production process oscillates in space-time with a phase determined by the energy E_k and momentum p_k , the initial phase difference between the wave function of the k^{th} mass eigenstate neutrino produced at $(x_P^k; t_P^k)$ and that produced at $(x_P; t_P)$ is

$$\phi_P^k = p_k (x_P^k - x_P) - E_k (t_P^k - t_P) : \quad (30)$$

Then, the phase at $(x; t)$ of the wave function of the k^{th} mass eigenstate neutrino produced at x_P^k and time t_P^k is

$$\phi_k(x; t) = \phi_P^k + p_k (x - x_P^k) - E_k (t - t_P^k) = p_k (x - x_P) - E_k (t - t_P); \quad (31)$$

i.e. the same as that of the wave function of the k^{th} mass eigenstate neutrino produced at x_P and time t_P , used in Eq. (19).

Let us consider now each mass eigenstate neutrino k detected at a corresponding space-time point $(x_D^k; t_D^k)$, with $x_D^k = x_D + \delta x_D^k$ and $t_D^k = t_D + \delta t_D^k$. The incoming neutrino wavefunction is

$$|j^P(x_D^k; t_D^k)\rangle = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{ip_k(x_D^k - x_P) - iE_k(t_D^k - t_P)} |j_k\rangle; \quad (32)$$

Since the component of the neutrino field k that destroys the corresponding mass eigenstate in the detection process oscillates in space-time with a phase determined by the energy E_k and momentum p_k , its phase difference between the points $(x_D^k; t_D^k)$ and $(x_D; t_D)$ is

$$\Delta \phi_k = p_k(x_D^k - x_D) - E_k(t_D^k - t_D); \quad (33)$$

This implies that the detected neutrino in a ΔL oscillation experiment is no longer described by a simple flavor state $|j\rangle$ as in Eq. (22), but by the state

$$|j^D(x_D^k; t_D^k)\rangle = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{i\Delta \phi_k} |j_k\rangle; \quad (34)$$

which takes into account the coherence of the process. The amplitude of ΔL transitions turns out to be

$$A_{\Delta L} = \langle j^D(x_D^k; t_D^k) | j^P(x_D^k; t_D^k) \rangle = \sum_k U_{kj} e^{ip_k L - iE_k T} U_{kj}^*; \quad (35)$$

which is equal to the standard amplitude in Eq. (22). This mechanism allows the interference of different mass eigenstates even when the corresponding wave packets do not overlap, but arrive at the detector within the coherence time interval of the detection process [5, 8, 9]. Clearly, in this case the different mass eigenstates are detected at different times, but the coherence of the detection process allows them to interfere.

- 3) In the simple plane wave approach that we have adopted above, there is no indication of a coherence length for neutrino oscillations [38]. The reason for the existence of a coherence length is that each massive neutrino propagates as a wave packet with its own group velocity. The overlap of different wave packets decreases with increasing distance from the source, until eventually they separate. For distances larger than the coherence length, two wave packets arrive at the detector separated by a time interval larger than the coherence time of the detection process. In this case the corresponding mass eigenstates cannot interfere and the oscillations are suppressed. Hence, in general there is a coherence length associated with each pair of mass eigenstates. At distances larger than the largest coherence length one can only measure the averaged constant probability in Eq. (27). This can be calculated using the wave packet formalism in the framework of quantum mechanics [3, 9] or quantum field theory [15, 18]. However, one can estimate the coherence length in the following simple way, as done in Ref. [38]. Using the group velocity formula in

Eq. (26), the separation of the k^{th} and j^{th} mass eigenstate wave packets after traveling a time T corresponding to a distance L is

$$|x_{kj}| = |v_k - v_j|T = \frac{|m_{kj}^2|}{2E}L : \quad (36)$$

The size of the mass eigenstate wave packets is given by the maximum between the spatial and temporal coherence widths of the production process. Denoting by x the maximum between the size of the mass eigenstate wave packets and the spatial and temporal coherence widths of the detection process, the interference is suppressed for $|x_{kj}| \gg x$, leading to the coherence length

$$L_{kj}^{\text{coh}} = \frac{2Ex}{|m_{kj}^2|} : \quad (37)$$

For n massive neutrinos there are $n(n-1)/2$ oscillating terms in the probability in Eq. (28), each one with its oscillation length in Eq. (29) and coherence length in Eq. (37).

Several controversial and often misleading statements and derivations of the neutrino oscillation formula have recently appeared in the literature. Let us comment on some of them :

- A) The traditional derivation of the neutrino oscillation probability [1] is based on the assumption that all the mass eigenstates have a common momentum $p_k = p_j = E$. This is often called "equal momentum" treatment of neutrino oscillations. From Eq. (14) one can see that the equal momentum assumption is equivalent to assuming $\beta = 0$, i.e. this case is simply a particular case of the general kinematical relations in Eqs. (14) and (16). Since the derivation of the neutrino oscillation formula in Eq. (28) does not depend on the value of β , it is clear that the equal momentum assumption is an acceptable one.
- B) It has been argued [24] that neutrinos created by a definite weak-interaction process must have a definite flavor at the production point at all times. From Eq. (19) one can see that this is possible only if all the mass eigenstates have the same energy, $E_k = E_j = E$. Based on this considerations, the authors of Ref. [24] claim that the "equal energy" assumption is the correct one. However, since the production process has uncertainties both in time and space, one could claim as well that neutrinos created by a definite weak-interaction process must have a definite flavor over all the spatial region of the production point at an initial time (or during the coherence time). From Eq. (19) one can see that this is possible only if all the mass eigenstates have the same momentum, $p_k = p_j = E$, justifying the equal momentum assumption. Since energy and momentum satisfy the dispersion relation $E_k^2 = p_k^2 + m_k^2$, different mass eigenstates cannot have simultaneously the same energy and momentum. Hence, it is clear that the equal energy assumption is as arbitrary as the equal momentum assumption, being yet another special case, $\beta = 1$, of the general kinematical relations in Eqs. (14) and (16). Obviously, the equal energy assumption leads to the same oscillation formula in Eq. (28) that we have derived without arbitrary assumptions.

- C) It has been claimed that there is a "factor of two ambiguity" in the oscillation lengths [24, 30]. This ambiguity arises from the observation that the propagation time T in Eq. (24) is not common among the different mass eigenstates, but one should take a different propagation time T_k for each mass eigenstate, given by $T_k = L/v_k$, where v_k is the group velocity in Eq. (26). In this case the phase in the $k \{ j$ interference term is $\phi_{kj} = (p_k - p_j)L = (E_k T_k - E_j T_j)$. In the relativistic approximation $E_k T_k \approx p_k L + m_k^2 L/E$, leading to $\phi_{kj} \approx -m_{kj}^2 L/E$. One can see that the phases are twice as large as the standard ones in Eq. (28), giving oscillation lengths that are a half of the standard ones in Eq. (29). This is the claimed factor of two ambiguity⁵. The confusion in this derivation is that it does not take into account the fact that different mass eigenstates arriving at different times at the detector must be absorbed coherently by the detection process in order to interfere. Hence, there is a phase relation of the detection process that must be taken into account, as discussed in item 2 above. This restores the missing factor of two in the oscillation lengths.
- D) As a variant of the equal momentum and equal energy assumptions, a "equal velocity" assumption has been proposed [29, 11, 30]. Simple kinematics does not allow this possibility [45]. Indeed, $v_k = v_j$ implies that $p_k = E_k = p_j = E_j$. Taking the square of this relation and using the energy-momentum dispersion relation $p_k^2 = E_k^2 - m_k^2$, one finds $m_k = m_j = E_k = E_j$. This equality cannot be true in a real experiment, since $E_k = E_j \neq 1$, whereas $m_k = m_j$ may be extremely small or large.
- E) It has been argued that a wave packet treatment of neutrino oscillations is unnecessary when neutrinos are emitted by a source that is stationary in time [25]. In this argument there is confusion between microscopic and macroscopic stationarity. In practice most neutrino sources (as the sun, or a reactor, or a supernova) can be considered to be stationary sources of neutrinos. However, the microscopic processes that generate neutrinos in these sources cannot be considered stationary, because each microscopic process is able to emit neutrino waves only for a finite interval of time, the coherence time that we have denoted above by t_p . Hence, to understand the physics of neutrino oscillations, a wave packet treatment is necessary. We have seen above that a wave packet description of the propagating mass eigenstates is crucial for the determination of the correct relation between the neutrino propagation time and the source-detector distance. The necessity to establish such a connection is avoided in Ref. [25] by assuming that all mass eigenstates have the same energy. However, we have shown in item 2 above that in general such assumption is not justified (the stationarity argument given in Ref. [25] obviously does not apply to the microscopic production process).
- F) In neutrino oscillation experiments neutrinos are usually produced through charged-current weak processes together with a charged lepton (see, for example, Eq. (9)). It

⁵ A similar ambiguity has been claimed to exist in the case of kaon oscillations in Refs. [39, 40, 41, 42]. The authors of Refs. [43, 44] tried to solve this problem arguing that the interference between the K_L and K_S components should be calculated at the same time and the same space point. However, this argument does not hold because, as discussed in Ref. [8], the coherent character of the detection process for a finite space-time interval allows wave functions at different space-times to interfere (see item 2 above).

is natural to ask if also the charged lepton has some kind of oscillatory behavior. In principle, flavor oscillations of charged leptons would be possible if their masses were very close so as to be produced coherently, and if there were some other means, besides measurement of mass, to distinguish different charged lepton flavors. However, since these two requirements are not satisfied in the real world, there are no flavor oscillations of charged leptons. Notice, in particular, that charged leptons are defined by their mass, which is the only property that distinguishes among charged lepton flavors⁶. In other words, flavor is measured through mass. That is why charged leptons are defined as mass eigenstates.

In Refs. [26, 27, 28] it has been claimed that the probability to detect the charged lepton oscillates in space-time⁷. This claim has been refuted in Ref. [7]. The authors of Ref. [26] presented a proof that the oscillation in space-time of the probability to detect the charged lepton is a consequence of the oscillation in space-time of the probability to detect the neutrino. But it is well known that the probability to detect the neutrino, irrespective of its flavor, does not oscillate in space-time. This property is usually called "conservation of probability" or "unitarity" and is represented mathematically by the general relation $P_{\text{total}} = 1$. Hence, the argument presented in Ref. [26] actually proves that charged leptons do not oscillate!

In conclusion, we have presented a simple but general treatment of neutrino oscillations in a quantum mechanical framework using plane waves and intuitive wave packets arguments when necessary. We have shown that the standard neutrino oscillation formula in Eq. (28) can be derived without arbitrary assumptions as "equal momentum" or "equal energy". We also tried to clarify some confusing statements on the quantum mechanics of neutrino oscillations that have recently appeared in the literature.

Acknowledgments

C.G. would like to thank P. Rotelli for stimulating discussions during the NOW 2000 workshop. C.G. would also like to express his gratitude to the Korea Institute for Advanced Study (KIAS) for warm hospitality.

References

- [1] S.M. Bilenky and B. Pontecorvo, Phys. Rept. 41, 225 (1978).
- [2] B. Kayser, Phys. Rev. D 24, 110 (1981).
- [3] C. Giunti, C.W. Kim, and U.W. Lee, Phys. Rev. D 44, 3635 (1991).
- [4] J. Rich, Phys. Rev. D 48, 4318 (1993).

⁶ In practice all detectors reveal particles through electromagnetic interactions. Charged leptons have all the same electromagnetic interactions. They are distinguished either through kinematics or through their decay products. Both these characteristics depend directly from the charged lepton mass.

⁷ A similar effect, called "lambda oscillations", has been claimed to exist [40, 42] for the Λ^0 's produced together with a neutral kaon, as in the process $\pi^+ + p \rightarrow \Lambda^0 + K^0$. This effect has been refuted in Refs. [43, 46].

- [5] K. Kiers, S. Nussinov, and N. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D 53, 537 (1996), hep-ph/9506271.
- [6] J. E. Campagne, Phys. Lett. B 400, 135 (1997).
- [7] A. D. Dolgov, A. Y. Morozov, L. B. Okun, and M. G. Shchepkin, Nucl. Phys. B 502, 3 (1997), hep-ph/9703241.
- [8] K. Kiers and N. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D 57, 3091 (1998), hep-ph/9710289.
- [9] C. Giunti and C. W. Kim, Phys. Rev. D 58, 017301 (1998), hep-ph/9711363.
- [10] M. Nauenberg, Phys. Lett. B 447, 23 (1999), hep-ph/9812441.
- [11] Y. Takeuchi, Y. Tazaki, S. Y. Tsai, and T. Yamazaki, (2000), hep-ph/0006334.
- [12] C. W. Kim and A. Pevsner, Neutrinos in physics and astrophysics (Harwood Academic Press, Chur, Switzerland, 1993), Contemporary Concepts in Physics, Vol. 8.
- [13] M. Zralek, Acta Phys. Polon. B 29, 3925 (1998), hep-ph/9810543.
- [14] I. Y. Kobzarev, B. V. Martemyanov, L. B. Okun, and M. G. Shchepkin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 35, 708 (1982).
- [15] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, J. A. Lee, and U. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. D 48, 4310 (1993), hep-ph/9305276.
- [16] W. Grimus and P. Stockinger, Phys. Rev. D 54, 3414 (1996), hep-ph/9603430.
- [17] Y. V. Shtanov, Phys. Rev. D 57, 4418 (1998), hep-ph/9706378.
- [18] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, and U. W. Lee, Phys. Lett. B 421, 237 (1998), hep-ph/9709494.
- [19] A. Ioannisian and A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Rev. D 59, 053003 (1999), hep-ph/9809503.
- [20] W. Grimus, P. Stockinger, and S. Mohanty, Phys. Rev. D 59, 013011 (1999), hep-ph/9807442.
- [21] C. Y. Cardall, Phys. Rev. D 61, 073006 (2000), hep-ph/9909332.
- [22] W. Grimus, S. Mohanty, and P. Stockinger, Phys. Rev. D 61, 033001 (2000), hep-ph/9904285.
- [23] W. Grimus, S. Mohanty, and P. Stockinger, (1999), hep-ph/9909341.
- [24] Y. Grossman and H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. D 55, 2760 (1997), hep-ph/9607201.
- [25] L. Stodolsky, Phys. Rev. D 58, 036006 (1998), hep-ph/9802387.
- [26] Y. N. Srivastava, A. Widom and E. Sassaroli, hep-ph/9509261.
- [27] Y. N. Srivastava and A. Widom, hep-ph/9707268.

- [28] Y . Srivastava, A . W idom , and E . Sassaroli, Eur.Phys. J. C 2, 769 (1998).
- [29] Y . Takeuchi, Y . Tazaki, S . Y . T sai, and T . Yam azaki, M od.Phys. Lett. A 14, 2329 (1999), hep-ph/9809558.
- [30] S . D e Leo, G . D ucati and P . R otelli, hep-ph/9906460.
- [31] D . E . G room et al, Eur.Phys. J. C 15, 1 (2000), W W W page: <http://pdg.lbl.gov>.
- [32] S . M . B ilenky, C . G iunti, and W . G rin us, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 43, 1 (1999), hep-ph/9812360.
- [33] S . M . B ilenky and C . G iunti, (1999), hep-ph/9905246, Proc. ot the 8th International W orkshop on Neutrino Telescopes, Venice, Italy, 23{26 Feb 1999, vol. 2, p. 1.
- [34] R . G . W inter, Lett. Nuovo C in . 30, 101 (1981).
- [35] S . E liezer and A . R . Sw iff, Nucl. Phys. B 105, 45 (1976).
- [36] H . Fritzsche and P . M inkowski, Phys. Lett. B 62, 72 (1976).
- [37] S . M . B ilenky and B . Pontecorvo, Nuovo C in . Lett. 17, 569 (1976).
- [38] S . Nussinov, Phys. Lett. B 63, 201 (1976).
- [39] H . J . L ipkin, Phys. Lett. B 348, 604 (1995), hep-ph/9501269.
- [40] Y . N . Srivastava, A . W idom , and E . Sassaroli, Phys. Lett. B 344, 436 (1995).
- [41] Y . Srivastava, A . W idom , and E . Sassaroli, Z . Phys. C 66, 601 (1995).
- [42] A . W idom and Y . N . Srivastava, (1996), hep-ph/9605399.
- [43] J . L owe et al, Phys. Lett. B 384, 288 (1996), hep-ph/9605234.
- [44] B . K ayser, SLAC -PUB -7123 (1997); hep-ph/9702327.
- [45] L . B . O kun and I . S . T sukerm an, M od.Phys. Lett. A 15, 1481 (2000), hep-ph/0007262.
- [46] H . Burkhardt, J . L owe, J . G . J . Stephenson, and T . G oldm an, Phys. Rev. D 59, 054018 (1999), hep-ph/9803365.