## CPT/Lorentz Invariance V iolation and N eutrino O scillation

Paola Arias, J.Gamboa,  $^{y}$  and F.Mendez<sup>z</sup>

Departamento de F sica, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Casilla 307, Santiago 2, Chile

Ashok Das<sup>x</sup>

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627-0171, USA and Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics,

1/AF Bidhannagar, Calcutta 700064, India.

J. Lopez-Sarrion<sup>{</sup>

Departm ent of Physics, City College of CUNY, New York, NY 10031, USA

We analyze the consequences of violation of Lorentz and CPT invariance in the massless neutrino sector by deforming the canonical anti-commutation relations for the elds. We show that, for particular choices of the deformation, oscillation between massless neutrino species takes place when only Lorentz invariance is violated. On the other hand, if both Lorentz and CPT invariances are violated, we show that there is no oscillation between massless neutrino species. Com paring with the existing experimental data on neutrino oscillations, we obtain bounds on the parameter for Lorentz invariance violation.

I. IN TRODUCTION

There has been an increased interest in the possibility that Lorentz and CPT symmetries may be violated at very high energies. For exam ple, recent developm ents in quantum gravity suggest that Lorentz invariance may not be an exact symmetry at high energies [1] and CPT invariance has also been questioned within such contexts [2]. Spontaneous violation of CPT and Lorentz symmetries can arise in string theories [3] and the violation of Lorentz invariance in non-commutative eld theories is wellknown [4]. On the experimental side, the UHE (ultra high energy) cosm ic ray events seen at AGASA [5] and presently under study by AUGER [6] further support the possibility that Lorentz and CPT invariances m ay not hold at such energies. Of course, there already exist very stringent bounds on Lorentz and CPT violation from laboratory experiments in the Kaon and the lepton sectors and any violation of these symmetries has to be compatible with these limits. Nonetheless, it is possible that even a tiny violation of CPT and Lorentz invariance can lead to interesting mechanisms for physicalphenom ena. In a recent paper, for example, we have shown [7] how such a violation can lead to baryogenesis in them all equilibrium (evading one of the criteria of Sakharov). In this note, we analyze the consequences of Lorentz and CPT violation in the neutrino sector. We would like to emphasize that several papers have already

dealt with the e ects of Lorentz [8, 9] and CPT violation in the neutrino sector, particularly in connection with a qualitative discussion of neutrino oscillation in this senario [10] (in another related context see [11]). In this paper, we carry out a quantitative study of such phenom ena within the context of a sim plem odel and derive bounds on such symm etry violating parameters from the existing experim ental results on neutrino oscillation.

N eutrino oscillation is an interesting phenom enon proposed about fly years ago by Pontecorvo (in a di erent context) which is used to explain the de cit of solar and atm ospheric neutrinos in uxes measured on earth [12, 13, 14] (for other recent analyses see [15]). This mechanism which is responsible for the resolution of these puzzles is closely related to the K  $^{0}$ -K  $^{0}$  oscillation [16]. In its simplest form, the probability for oscillation between two species of particles i; j with a mixing angle ij and energy levels E<sub>i</sub>; E<sub>i</sub> in a time intervalt is given by

$$P_{i! j}(t) = \sin^2 (2_{ij}) \sin^2 \frac{E_{ij}t}{2}$$
; (1)

where

$$E_{ij} = E_i \quad E_j:$$
 (2)

If the oscillation is between two neutrino species  $_{i}$ ;  $_{j}$  with small masses m $_{i}$ ; m $_{j}$  respectively, then in the conventional scenario one expands (this assumes Lorentz invariance and c = 1)

$$E_{i} = \frac{q}{p^{2} + m_{i}^{2}} \qquad p + \frac{m_{i}^{2}}{2p} = p + \frac{m_{i}^{2}}{2E_{i}}; \qquad (3)$$

so that we have

$$E_{ij} = E_i \quad E_j \quad \frac{m_i^2 \quad m_j^2}{2E} = \frac{m_{ij}^2}{2E};$$
 (4)

E lectronic address: paola arias@ gm ail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>y</sup>E lectronic address: jgam boa@ lauca.usach.cl

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>z</sup>E lectronic address: fm endez@ lauca.usach.cl

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>x</sup>E lectronic address: das@ pas.rochester.edu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>{</sup> E lectronic address: justinux750 gm ail.com

where we have assumed that for neutrinos of sm allm ass,  $E_i = E_j = E$ . In this case, the probability for oscillation between the two neutrino species in traversing a path length L can be written as (see (1) and (4))

$$P_{i! j}(L) = \sin^{2}(2_{ij}) \sin^{2} - \frac{m_{ij}^{2}L}{4E}$$
$$= \sin^{2}(2_{ij}) \sin^{2} - \frac{127 m_{ij}^{2}L}{E}; (5)$$

where m  $_{ij}^2 = m_i^2 m_j^2$  is taken in (eV)<sup>2</sup>, the neutrino energy E in MeV and the length of path traversed in m' (m eters) (In the last line of the above form ula, we have restored all the nontrivial constants as well as traded the time interval for the path length assuming that the neutrino travels alm ost at the speed of light.)

It follows from eq.(5) that neutrino oscillation does not take place in free space if neutrinos are massless or (when massive) are degenerate in mass. With three families of neutrinos, there can only be two independent combinations of squared mass di erences, say m $^{2}_{12}$ ; m $^{2}_{23}$  which are su cient to nd a solution for the solar neutrino as well as the atm ospheric neutrino puzzles. Within the standard model, this can be achieved with the bounds [17]

m 
$$^{2}_{12}$$
 10  $^{4}$  eV  $^{2}$ ; 10  $^{3}$  eV  $^{2}$  m  $^{2}_{23}$  10  $^{2}$  eV  $^{2}$ : (6)

G iven these, the bound on  $m_{13}^2 = m_{12}^2 + m_{23}^2$  is determined. There is no further freedom within a model with three families of neutrinos.

Several experiments by now have boked for neutrino oscillations. One such experiment, namely, the LSND (Liquid Scintillator Neutrino Detector at Los A lamos) [18] has used muon sources from the decay + + +

. The experim ent looks for neutrino oscillation in the subsequent decay of the muon through  $^+$ !  $e^+$   $_e^+$ . A fler a path length of L = 30m, the experim ent nds the oscillation channel !  $_e$  (with 20M eV E 58 2M eV) with a probability of 0.26%. The experim ent also reports the existence of the oscillation !  $_e$  with the same probability. Furtherm ore, the analysis of the results of this experim ent, following (5), leads to a bound on the di erence of the relevant squared m ass di erence to be

$$m^{2} < 1eV^{2}$$
: (7)

However, the M iniBoone experiement, which was expected to verify the results of LSND, has recently reported their rst result [19] and excludes the mass region in (7). As a result, the simple explanation of the LSND results, based on the two avor neutrino oscillation is nuled out.

All of the above discussion has been within the context of the standard m odel with a massive neutrino where both Lorentz invariance and CPT are assumed to hold. On the other hand, if Lorentz invariance or CPT or both

are violated in the neutrino sector, it has been suggested that neutrino oscillation can take place in free space even for massless neutrinos (in contrast to eq. (5) where Lorentz invariance is assumed). This was pointed out by Colem an and Glashow [20] and developed more extensively by Kostelecky and collaborators [21, 22]. This is particularly clear from eq. (1) where we see that the probability of oscillation really depends on the difference in the energy of the two neutrino species and if  $E_{ij} = E_i$   $E_j \in 0$  even when the masses vanish, the probability of oscillation will be nontrivial. This can happen, for example, if the two neutrino species have different (energy) dispersion relations. This possibility has been discussed extensively in the last few years by various groups [21, 23]. In particular, ref [21] analyzes the structure of the most general Lagrangian with violations of Lorentz invariance and CPT in an attempt to understand the discrepancy between solar and atm ospheric neutrinos and the LSND anom aly [18].

The goal of this note is to analyze the consequences of violations of Lorentz and CPT invariances in the massless neutrino sector from the point of view of a noncom mutative eld theory where such violations are more natural. In such a model, the violation of Lorentz and CPT invariances is implemented through a deformation of the canonical anti-com m utation relations for the neutrino elds. Such a model can be thought of as a subclass of the generalm odel proposed in [21], but since, depending on the deform ation, we have fewer arbitrary param eters, we naturally have more predictive power. The result of our analysis can be sum marized as follows. If there is violation of only Lorentz invariance, then oscillations between massless neutrino species can take place and comparing with the existing experimental data, we can determ ine bounds on the parameter characterizing Lorentz invariance violation. On the other hand, if both Lorentz and CPT invariances are violated, there is no oscillation between massless neutrino species.

### II. THE MODEL AND THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF NEUTRINO OSCILLATION

The model that we will describe below is inspired by the quantum theory of non-commutative elds developed in [24]. The quantum theory of fermionic noncommutative elds (neutrinos) is obtained from the standard fermionic quantum eld theory by deforming the anti-commutation relations while retaining the usual H am iltonian. In order to explain in some detail the construction, let us consider the conventional Lagrangian density for two avors of massless fermions (neutrinos) given by

$$L = i^{i} \quad (0^{i}; \quad (8))$$

where the superscript i = f1;2g runs over the avor quantum number (sum over repeated indices is understood).

The Ham iltonian density has the form

$$H = i \overset{iy}{\sim} \tilde{r} \overset{i}{i}; \qquad (9)$$

where  $\sim = ~^{0} \sim .$  W ith the conventional canonical anticommutation relations for the ferm ion elds, one would obtain the standard relativistic equations for the massless neutrinos using the H am iltonian following from (9). How ever, the non-commutative theory is obtained by deform ing the canonical anti-commutation relations while maintaining the form of the H am iltonian density (9).

We postulate the deformed equal-time anticommutation relations to have the form (with all others vanishing)

$$f^{i}(x); {}^{jy}(y)g = A^{ij} {}^{(3)}(x y);$$
 (10)

where ; ;:::= 1;2;3;4 are spinor indices and  $A^{ij}$  is a constant m atrix. In this paper we consider the following two special choices for the structure of the deform ation m atrix A.

1. A has a nontrivial structure only in the avor space.

2. A depends on both the avor and the spinor indices nontrivially through a constant background vector.

As we will see, the rst choice leads to a violation of Lorentz invariance whereas both Lorentz and CPT invariances are violated with the second choice.

#### 1. Deformation depending only on avor indices

In this case, A is a 2 2 constant m atrix w ith com plex elements in general, which, for simplicity, can be chosen to have the form

$$A^{ij} = \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array};$$
 (11)

so that the com plex param eters can be thought of as the param eters of deform ation. C learly, the deform ed anti-com mutation relations reduce to the conventional ones when the param eters of deform ation vanish.

G iven the deform ed anti-com mutation relations (10) and the H am iltonian density (9), the dynam ical equation takes the form

$$\underline{}^{i} = A^{ij} \sim \tilde{r}^{j}; \qquad (12)$$

which in momentum space takes the form

$$E^{i} = A^{ij} \sim p^{j}$$
: (13)

In order to determ ine the energy eigenvalues for this system , let us consider the unitary matrix D

$$D = \frac{1}{p - \frac{1}{2}} \quad \frac{j j}{j j} \quad \frac{1}{1} ;$$

$$D^{y} = D^{-1} = \frac{1}{p - \frac{1}{2}} \quad \frac{j j}{1} \quad \frac{j j}{1} \quad \vdots \qquad (14)$$

It is straightforward to check that D diagonalizes A and as a result, the energy spectrum for the ferm ions follows to be (c = 1)

$$E^{1} = (1 + j)jpj$$
  

$$E^{2} = (1 j)jpj (15)$$

Here E  $^{1;2}$  are the energies of the two species of the neutrinos considered. W e, therefore, conclude that with this choice of the deform ation, this system exhibits violation of Lorentz invariance, as can be seen from the dispersion relations (15). However, C P T sym metry remains intact in this case which can be easily seen as follow s.

As we have emphasized, our deformation can be thought of as a subclass of the standard model extension (SM E) [2]. Indeed, if we restrict to the part of the Lagrangian in [2] given by

$$L = i^{i} @ ^{i} + i^{i} C^{;ij} @ ^{j};$$
(16)

with the constant background eld c <sup>;ij</sup> diagonal in the space-time indices, then we obtain  $i = i(i^{j} + c^{00;ij})^{jy}$ . This leads to the canonical anti-commutation relations

$$f^{i}(x); {}^{jy}(y)g = ({}^{ij} + c^{00;ij})^{1} (x y);$$
$$= A^{ij} (x y);$$
(17)

which is in agreement with our deformation for the noncommutative elds. In this case, since the background eld is a constant second rank tensor, the extra term

<sup>i</sup>c<sub>ij</sub> @ <sup>j</sup>;

violates Lorentz invariance but not CPT symmetry as was also pointed out in reference [2].

The energy eigenstates corresponding to the eigenvalues (15) can now be determ ined directly through the application of the diagonalizing matrix

$$D \qquad \begin{array}{c} 1 & ~ \sim 1 \\ 2 & = ~ \sim 2 \quad ; \qquad (18)$$

where  $^{-1}$  and  $^{-2}$  are eigenstates with energy values E  $^1$  and E  $^2$  respectively.

The time evolution for the energy eigenstates, is determined to be

$$^{1}$$
 (t) = e  $^{iE_{+}^{1} t+ ip \times \sim 1}$  (0); (19)

$$^{2}$$
 (t) = e<sup>iE  $^{2}_{+}$  t+ ip x  $^{2}$  (0); (20)</sup>

where  $E_{+}^{1;2}$  are the energy eigenvalues determ ined in (15). The diagonal wavefunctions can be seen from (14) and (18) to have the explicit form s

$$^{-1} = \frac{1}{p - \frac{1}{2}} \frac{j j}{1} + {}^{2} ;$$
$$^{-2} = \frac{1}{p - \frac{1}{2}} \frac{j j}{1} + {}^{2}$$
(21)

Thus, we see that if 2 <, then the diagonal wavefunctions can be thought of as resulting from a rotation by =4 in the avor space. This is, in fact, consistent with the hypothesis of large mixing angle (LM A) [26] and, therefore, for simplicity let us choose to be real. In this case, we can parametrize (21) as

$$^{-1} = \cos_{12} ^{1} + \sin_{12} ^{2};$$
 (22)

$$\sim^2 = \sin_{12} + \cos_{12} + \cos_{12}$$
 (23)

with the mixing angle  $_{12}$  = 45 .

Relations (22) and (23) can now be inverted to give

$${}^{1} = \cos_{12} {}^{-1} \sin_{12} {}^{-2};$$
  
$${}^{2} = \sin_{12} {}^{-1} + \cos_{12} {}^{-2}: \qquad (24)$$

Thus, a neutrino initially in the state  $\ ^1$  would evolve in time as

<sup>1</sup> (t) = 
$$\cos_{12} \sim^{1}$$
 (t)  $\sin_{12} \sim^{2}$  (t)  
=  $\cos^{2}_{12} e^{iE_{+}^{1}t} + \sin^{2}_{12} e^{iE_{+}^{2}t} = ^{1}$  (0)  
+  $\frac{1}{2} \sin 2_{12} e^{iE_{+}^{1}t} e^{iE_{+}^{2}t} = ^{2}$  (0)  $e^{ip \times 1}$ 

Therefore, at a later time t, the probability of nding the state  $^2$  in the beam is given by

$$P_{1!_{2}} = \frac{1}{2} \sin 2_{12} e^{iE_{+}^{1}t} e^{iE_{+}^{2}t} e^{ip \times^{2}};$$
  
=  $\sin^{2} (2_{12}) \sin^{2} (j jjp);$  (25)

and since we are considering particles with velocities close to  $c_r$  we can replace

t! L;

where L denotes the path length traversed by the neutrino. Let us note here that in our theory, the velocity of the neutrino can in principle be di erent from c, but any further correction is suppressed by term s of the order O ( $^2$ ) which is extrem ely sm all. Thus, the probability for oscillation (25) becomes

$$P_{1!_{2}} = \sin^{2} (2_{12}) \sin^{2} (j j E L);$$
 (26)

where we have used the fact that for j j 1;E jpj.

There are several things to note from the expression (26). First, the deform ation parameter leads to rotations in the avor space and thereby determ ines the mixing angles. However, di erences from the conventional description of massive neutrinos arise because these deformation parameters also determ ine the nontrivial dispersion relations for the energy eigenvalues and lead to a nontrivial energy di erence even in the absence of masses. Consequently, oscillation takes place even for massless neutrinos. The di erence from the conventional description of neutrino oscillation shows up in (26) in the fact that the energy dependence is linear as opposed to the inverse dependence in (5).

# 2. Vector-dependent deform ations

In order to de ne the m inim alm atrix A which breaks both CPT and Lorentz symmetries and which connects di erent avors {that is A  $^{12}$  6 0 for two avor indices { we need to include a constant background (real) vector  $e^{ij}$ . W ith this, the m inim al A has the form

$$[A]^{ij} = ij + () e^{ij}$$
: (27)

If we assume rotational invariance, we can set the space components of  $e^{ij}$  to zero. The simplest case mixing a-vors would then correspond to choosing  $e_0^{12} = e = e_0^{21}$  and the equations of motion in this case would have the form s

$$\begin{array}{rcl} -\frac{1}{2} &=& \sim \tilde{r} & ^{1} & e \sim \tilde{r} & ^{2}; \\ -\frac{2}{2} &=& \sim \tilde{r} & ^{2} & e \sim \tilde{r} & ^{1}: \end{array}$$
 (28)

These can be diagonalized and lead to the dispersion relations

$$E^{1} = p \frac{1 + e^{2}}{1 + e^{2}} \dot{p} \dot{j}$$

$$E^{2} = p \frac{1 + e^{2}}{1 + e^{2}} \dot{p} \dot{j}; \qquad (29)$$

This is identical to the conventional dispersion relation for massless neutrinos, expect for a scale factor, and shows in particular that massless neutrinos and antineutrinos of di erent species are degenerate in energy. As a consequence, oscillations between massless neutrino species cannot take place (see eq. (2)) if Lorentz and CPT symmetries are simultaneously violated in this model.

Equations (28) can be also obtained from the H am iltonian density  $% \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ 

$$H = i^{iY} \sim \tilde{r}^{i} \quad ie^{ij} \sim \tilde{r}^{j}; \quad (30)$$

with canonicalanti-commutation relations instead of (10). Our deformation can also be understood as a subclass of the standard model extension of [2] as follows. Let us consider the part of the extended model [2] of the form

$$L = i^{i} e^{i} + i^{i} e_{ii} e^{j}; \qquad (31)$$

with ourm inim alchoice for the constant background vector e<sup>ij</sup>. In this case, the derivation of the canonical anticommutation relation leads to the deform ation discussed above up to a eld rescaling. Since the constant background eld is a vector, the extra term in the Lagrangian violates CPT invariance and the Lorentz violation of this term is manifest as well. Thus, the second choice of the deform ation violates both Lorentz and CPT invariances. The CPT violation can also be seen from the analysis of the energy eigenstates. The diagonalized ferm ions involve a combination of left and right handed elds and, as a consequence, do not have well de ned CPT transform ation properties.

# 3. Bounds for (Lorentz invariance violation)

A swe have shown, oscillation between m assless neutrinos can take place in ourm odel if only Lorentz invariance is violated. Therefore, let us use the existing experim ental data on neutrino oscillations to derive bounds on the param eter of Lorentz invariance violation (LIV). We note that our earlier analysis for two neutrino avors can be extended to incorporate more avors easily. For exam ple, to accomm odate three neutrino avors, we need to generalize the deform ation param eter (as well as the m ixing angles) as

where i; j = 1; 2; 3. In this case, the probability for oscillation between neutrino avors can be written as

$$P_{i!j}(L) = \sin^2 (2_{ij}) \sin^2 (j_{ij}EL)$$
: (33)

The same form ula also holds for anti-neutrino oscillations since C P T is not violated in this case.

Therefore, comparing with the conventional analysis of oscillation for massive neutrinos given in (5), we can identify (c = 1)

$$j_{ij} j = \frac{m_{ij}^2}{4E^2}$$
: (34)

W e note here that there are three deform ation parameters  $_{ij}$ ; without any further constraint unlike the constraint on the di erence of the squared masses in the conventional scenario.

Let us next note that from the solar neutrino experiments, we know that this involves oscillations of the a-vors  $1 \cdot 2$  with

$$m_{12}^{2} < 8 \quad 10^{5} \text{ eV}^{2}$$
; E 1M eV: (35)

From (34), this translates into a deform ation parameter

$$j_{12}j < 10^{17}$$
: (36)

The atm ospheric neutrino results, on the other hand, in-volve an oscillation of the type 2 ! 3 with

$$m_{23}^2 < 2.6 \quad 10^3 \text{ eV}^2$$
; E 1G eV: (37)

From (34), we see that this would translate into a deformation parameter

$$j_{23}j < 10^{22}$$
: (38)

F inally, we note that although the simple interpretation of the LSND results has been disproved by the M ini-BooN e experiment, it is nonetheless interesting to recognize that here the oscillations involve avors of the type 1 ! 2 (both in the neutrino as well as the anti-neutrino channels) with

$$m_{12}^2 < 1 eV^2$$
; E 50M eV: (39)

In this case, the analog of (34) for the antineutrinos leads to

$$j_{12}j < 10^{16}$$
: (40)

It is clear now that within this scenario, all the experim ental results can be naturally explained without any particular puzzle. We would like to note here that our analysis for solar neutrinos are not in contradiction with the data from the Kam LAND experiment [27].

In this discussion, we have assumed the neutrinos to be completely massless in which case, the conventional oscillation does not take place. It is possible that the neutrinos have a small mass and that both mechanisms s do contribute to the phenomena of neutrino oscillation. In this case, a careful analysis of the atm ospheric neutrino oscillation results can lead to even a more stringent bound on the parameter  $_{23}$  [11].

#### III. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we have carried out a quantitative analysis of the consequences of CPT and Lorentz invariance violation in the massless neutrino sector. W hile it has already been suggested that in such a case, neutrino oscillation can take place even form assless neutrinos, we have presented a simple model of a theory of noncom mutative ferm ions to study this phenom enon quantitatively. The m odel contains a m inim alnum ber of sym m etry violating param eters that are introduced as deform ation param eters in the equal-tim e anti-com m utation relations for the ferm ion elds. Real values of these deform ation param eters naturally lead to the large mixing angle scenario. W hile the deform ation param eters directly lead to m ixing between di erent neutrino avors, they also lead to nonstandard (energy) dispersion relations (through Lorentz and CPT violation), which leads to oscillations between m assless neutrino species if only Lorentz invariance is violated.

In the case that there is violation of only Lorentz invariance, we have determ ined bounds on the param eters ofdeform ation (param eters characterizing Lorentz invariance violation) from the existing experim entaldata on solar and atm ospheric neutrinos as well as from the LSN D data. The bounds on the deform ation param eters within this m inim alm odel are obtained to have the values

$$j_{23}j < 10^{22}$$
;  $j_{12}j < 10^{17}$  (41)

W e note that bounds for were obtained from the LMA scenario by using =4. For the solar and atm ospheric neutrinos, this is indeed consistent with the experimental determ ination.

On the other hand, if Lorentz and CPT invariances are violated simultaneously, then oscillation between massless neutrinos disappears in our model, although oscillations can take place form assive neutrinos in the standard scenario. This fact could indicate that at very high energy where masses can be neglected, neutrino oscillation

would signal a violation of Lorentz invariance and not of CPT symmetry.

A cknow ledgm ent: This work was supported in part

by US DOE G rant number DE-FG-02-91ER 40685 and by FONDECYT-Chile grants 1050114, 1060079, 3060002 and 2105016.JL-S was supported by a Fulbright Fellowship.

- [L] G. Am elino-Cam elia, J. Ellis, N. Mavromatos, D. V. Nanopoulos and S. Sarkar, Nature, 393, 763 (1998); D. Sudarsky, L. U mutia and H. Vucetich, Phys. Rev. D 68, 024010 (2003); J. Alfaro, H. Morales-Tecotl and L. F. U mutia, Phys Rev. Lett 84, 2318 (2000); ibid, Phys. Rev. D 65, 103502 (2002).
- [2] V. A. Kostelecky and R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D 63, 065008 (2001).
- [3] V.A.Kostelecky and S.Samuel, Phys. Rev. D 39, 683 (1989).
- [4] M. Douglas and N. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. D 39, 977 (2001).
- [5] M. Takeda et al. [AGASA collaboration], Astroparticle Phys. 19, 447 (2003); AGASA hom epage: http://www-akeno.icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/AGASA
- [6] A uger C ollaboration, astro-ph/0606619. Pierre A uger O bservatory hom epage: http://www.auger.org/
- [7] J.M.Carmona, J.L.Cortes, A.Das, J.Gamboa and F. Mendez, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 21, 883 (2006).
- [8] M. Gasperini, Phys. Rev. D 38, 2635; S. L. Glashow, A. Halprin, P. I. Krastev, C. N. Leung and J. Pantaleone, Phys. Rev. D 56, 2433 (1997); R. Foot, C. N. Leung and O. Yasuda, Phys. Lett. B 443, 185 (1998).
- [9] O.Bertolam iand C.S.Carvalho, Phys. Rev. D 61, 103002 (2000)
- [10] S. Colem an and S. L. G lashow, Phys. Lett. B 405, 249 (1997).
- [11] G.L.Fogli, E.Lisi, A.M arrone and G.Scioscia, Phys. Rev.D 60, 053006 (1999);
- [12] B. Pontecorvo, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. (USSR), 34, 247 (1958).
- [13] L.W olfenstein, Phys. Rev. D 17, 2369 (1978).
- [14] S.P.M ikheyev and A.Yu.Sm imov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 42, 913 (1985).
- [15] A.M.Gago et al, Phys. Rev. D 65, 073012 (2002); A.M. Gago et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 4035 (2000); G.L.Fogli et al, Phys. Rev. D 64, 093005 (2001).

- [16] M.Gell-M ann and A.Pais, Phys.Rev. 97, 1387 (1955).
- [17] For a recent review on neutrino data, see for exam ple A . Strum ia and F .V issani , hep-ph/0606054 and references therein .
- [18] LSND collaboration, C. Athanassopoulos et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1774 (2003); LSND collaboration, A. Aguilar et al. Phys. Rev. D 64, 112007 (2001).
- [19] MiniBooN E collaboration homepage wwwboone fnalgov
- [20] S.Colem an and S.L.G lashow, Phys. Rev. D 59, 116008 (1999).
- [21] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes in Phys. Rev. D 69, 016005 (2004), T. Katori, A. V. Kostelecky and R. Taybe, Phys. Rev. D 74, 105009 (2006).
- [22] For a discussion on the CPT theorem see, O.W. G reenberg Phys.Lett. B 567, 179, (2003); Phys.Rev.Lett. 89, 231602, (2002).
- [23] G. Barenboin, L. Borissov, J. D. Lykken and A.Yu Smirnov, JHEP 0210, 001 (2002); J. N. Bahcall, V. Barger and D. Marfatia, Phys. Lett. B 534, 120 (2002); V. Barger, D. Marfatia and K. W hisnant, Phys. Lett. B 576, 303 (2003); R. N. M ohapatra et al, hep-ph/0510213; G. Barenboin and N. M avrom atos, JHEP 0501, 034 (2005); G. Barenboin and J. D. Lykken. Phys. Lett. B 554, 73 (2003)
- [24] JM . Carmona, JL. Cortes, J. Gamboa and F. Mendez Phys. Lett. B 565, 222 (2003); JHEP 0303, 058 (2003).
- [25] M. D ine and A. Kusenko, M od. Phys. Lett. 76, 1 (2004);
   O. Bertolam i, D. Colladay, V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Lett. B 395, 178, (1997).
- [26] S.Fukuda et al (Super-K am iokande Collaboration) Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 5651 (2001); Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 5656 (2001).
- [27] K.Eguchiet al. (Kam LAND Collaboration) Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 021802 (2003).