

PAUL LANGACKER

University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA 19104-6396

ABSTRACT

The implications of the deficit of solar neutrinos are discussed. If all of the experiments are taken literally the relative suppressions render an astrophysical explanation unlikely. Allowing MSW conversions, the data simultaneously determine the temperature of the core of the sun to within five percent. The implications of the atmospheric $\bar{\nu}_e$ ratio are briefly discussed.

1. Solar Neutrinos and Cool Sun Models

The predictions of two recent theoretical studies are shown in Table 1. There is reasonable agreement between them, especially for the gallium experiments. However, the Bahcall-Pinsonneault (PB) [1] calculation predicts a somewhat higher ^8B flux than that of Turk-Chieze (TC) [2]. These are compared with the experimental results [3]-[6] in Table 2. The standard solar model is not in agreement with the data for any reasonable range of the uncertainties [7], and is therefore excluded.

Still possible is some nonstandard solar model (NSSM), which may differ from the SSM by new physics inputs such as weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs), a large core magnetic field, core rotation, etc. Most of these models affect the solar neutrinos by leading to a lower core temperature, i.e., $T_c < 1$, where $T_c = 1 \pm 0.006$ corresponds to the SSM. All reasonable models lead to a larger suppression of the Kamikande rate (which is essentially all ^8B) than that of Homestake (which has in addition a nontrivial component of ^7Be neutrinos), in contrast to the data.

Following Bahcall and Ulrich [8] the temperature dependence is $\phi(^8\text{B}) \propto T_c^{18}$, $\phi(^7\text{Be}) \propto T_c^8$. We assume that the pp flux is reduced by a factor $f(\text{pp})$ chosen so that the total solar luminosity remains constant. The expected counting rates R for each experiment relative to the expectations of the standard solar model are then [9]

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{\text{G}} &= 0.26 \pm 0.04 = (1 \pm 0.033) [0.775 (1 \pm 0.10) T_c^{18} + 0.150 (1 \pm 0.036) T_c^8 + \text{small}] \\
 R_{\text{Kam}} &= 0.50 \pm 0.07 = (1 \pm 0.10) T_c^{18} \\
 R_{\text{Ga}} &= 0.54 \pm 0.11 = (1 \pm 0.04) [0.538 (1 \pm 0.022) f(\text{pp}) \\
 &\quad + 0.271 (1 \pm 0.036) T_c^8 + 0.105 (1 \pm 0.10) T_c^{18} + \text{small}] \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

The overall uncertainties are from the nuclear detection cross-sections, and those which multiply the individual flux components are from the relevant reactions in the sun, correlated from experiment to experiment.

The best fit is for $T_c = 0.92 \pm 0.01$, an enormous deviation from the SSM. Even worse, it is a terrible fit: $\chi^2 = 20.6$ for 2 d.f., which is statistically excluded at the

Theory	SSM (BP)	SSM (TC)
Homestake (CL)	8 ± 1 SNU	6.4 ± 1.3 SNU
Kamionkande gallium	1 ± 0.14 (arb units)	0.77 ± 0.20
	132 ± 7 SNU	125 ± 5 SNU

Table 1: Predictions of Bahcall-Pinsonneault (BP) [1] and Turck-Chieze (TC) [2] for the solar neutrino fluxes. All uncertainties are at one standard deviation.

	Rate	Rate/SSM (BP)	Rate/SSM (TC)
Homestake	2.1 ± 0.3 SNU	0.26 ± 0.04	0.33 ± 0.05
Kam-II (1040 days)		0.47 ± 0.05 ± 0.06	
Kam-III (395 days)		0.56 ± 0.07 ± 0.06	
Kam-II + III (prelim syst.)		0.50 ± 0.07	0.65 ± 0.09
GALLEX	83 ± 19 ± 8 SNU	0.63 ± 0.14	0.67 ± 0.15
SAGE (90 + 91)	58 ⁺¹⁷ ₋₂₄ ± 14 SNU	0.44 ± 0.19	0.47 ± 0.20
GALLEX + SAGE	71 ± 15 SNU	0.54 ± 0.11	0.57 ± 0.12

Table 2: The observed rates, and the rates relative to the calculations of BP and TC.

99.9% c.l. If we accept the experimental values, a cool sun model cannot account for the data [9]. This conclusion is more general than the specific exponents assumed.

2. MSW Conversions

There have been a number of recent studies of the MSW solution [9]–[13]. There are two solutions for oscillations into active neutrinos (or), the non-adiabatic (small mixing angle) and the large-angle. The non-adiabatic solution gives a much better fit [9]. In this region there is more suppression of the intermediate energy ${}^7\text{Be}$ neutrinos, accounting for the larger suppression seen by Homestake. The large-angle fit is much poorer, corresponding to $\chi^2 = 3.8$ for 1 d.f., because there the survival probability varies slowly with neutrino energy. One can also consider the possibility that the ν_e is oscillating into a sterile neutrino. There is no large-angle solution¹ at 90% C.L. There is a non-adiabatic solution but even that yields a relatively poor fit $\chi^2 = 3.6$ for 1 d.f.

It is also interesting to consider MSW oscillations for an arbitrary core temperature T_c , that is for N SSM. One now has three parameters, T_c , $\sin^2 2\theta$, and Δm^2 . There are sufficient constraints to determine all three [9]. There is an expanded non-adiabatic solution with $T_c = 1.02^{+0.03}_{-0.05}$ at 90% C.L. Similarly, there is a large-angle solution with $T_c = 1.04^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$. Thus the core temperature is measured by the solar neutrino experiments,² even allowing for the complication of MSW oscillations. It

¹ The large angle solution for sterile neutrinos is also most likely excluded by nucleosynthesis arguments, while non-adiabatic parameters are allowed.

² Of course, one of the original motivations for the solar neutrino experiments was to probe the core of the sun.

Figure 1: Allowed regions for MSW conversions of $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$ or $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau$, from [9]. The 90% c.l. ($\chi^2 = 4.6$) regions allowed by the Homestake, Kamikande, and gallium experiments and by the combined fit are shown. The astrophysical and nuclear uncertainties are included.

is consistent with the standard solar model prediction $T_c = 1.00057$.

3. Atmospheric Neutrinos

The predicted ν_μ and ν_e produced by the interactions of cosmic rays in the atmosphere are uncertain by around 20%. However, the ratio ν_μ/ν_e is believed to be accurate to 5% [14]. There are additional uncertainties associated with interaction cross-sections, particle identification, etc. The Kamikande and IMB groups have observed a deficit in the ratio of contained muon and electron events

$$\frac{(\nu_\mu/\nu_e)_{\text{data}}}{(\nu_\mu/\nu_e)_{\text{theory}}} = \begin{matrix} 0.65 & 0.08 & 0.06 \\ 0.54 & 0.05 & 0.12 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} ; \\ : \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \text{Kamikande [15]} \\ \text{IMB [16]} \end{matrix} \quad (2)$$

This effect, if real, suggests the possibility of $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$ or possibly $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau$. It probably is not compatible with sterile neutrino oscillations $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_s$, because for the relevant parameter range the extra sterile neutrino would violate the nucleosynthesis bound. The oscillation hypothesis requires a mass range $m^2 \sim (10^{-3} - 1) \text{ eV}^2$, larger than that relevant to the solar neutrinos, and large mixing angles such as $\sin^2 2\theta \sim 0.5$.

4. Implications

The m^2 range suggested by the solar neutrinos is compatible with the gen-

eral range expected in quadratic up-type seesaw models, such as in grand unified theories [9], for which $m_i = m_{u_i}^2/M_N$, where $u_i = u; c; t$ and M_N is the heavy neutrino mass. For $M_N = 10^{11} - 10^{16}$ GeV one obtains the appropriate mass range, for oscillations into ν_μ for $M_N = 10^{16}$ GeV, and into ν_τ for $M_N = 10^{11}$ GeV. However, the simplest models predict equal lepton and quark mixing angles, $V_{\text{lepton}} = V_{\text{CKM}}$, which is not satisfied by the data unless T_c is far from the SSM [9].

The various hints suggest two general scenarios. One could have ν_μ in the sun for $m_\mu = m_\tau = 3 \times 10^3$ eV, with a component of the dark matter ($m_\mu = \text{few eV}$). This pattern is compatible with the mass predictions of GUT-type seesaws. However, in this scenario there is no room for oscillations to account for the atmospheric neutrinos. A separate possibility is that again ν_μ in the sun, with ν_μ oscillations with $m_\mu = (0.1 - 0.6)$ eV for the atmospheric neutrinos. In this case there would be no room for hot dark matter. This second solution requires large leptonic mixings, $\sin^2 2\theta = 0.5$.

1. J. N. Bahcall and M. H. Pinsonneault, IASSNS-AST 92/10.
2. S. Turck-Chieze, S. Cahen, M. Casse, and C. Doom, *Astrophys. J.* 335, 415 (1988). S. Turck-Chieze, *Saclay preprint* 1992/32 (1992).
3. R. Davis, Jr., et al., *Proc. of the 21th Int. Cosmic Ray Conf.*, Vol. 12, ed. R. J. Protheroe (Univ. of Adelaide Press, Adelaide, 1990), p. 143.
4. K. S. Hirata et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 65, 1297, 1301 (1990); 66, 9 (1991). Y. Suzuki, *Int. Sym. on Neutrino Astrophysics*, Takayama, Oct. 1992.
5. P. Anselmann et al., *GX 1-1992*, *Phys. Lett. B* 285, 390 (1992).
6. A. I. Abazov, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 67, 3332 (1991). V. N. Gavlin in *XXVI International Conference on High Energy Physics*, Dallas, August 6 1992.
7. H. A. Bethe and J. N. Bahcall, *Phys. Rev. D* 44, 2962 (1991), IASSNS-AST 92/51.
8. J. N. Bahcall and R. N. Ulrich, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 60, 297 (1988).
9. S. A. Bludman, N. Hata, D. C. Kennedy, and P. G. Langacker, *Pennsylvania preprint* UPR-0516T. S. A. Bludman, D. C. Kennedy, and P. G. Langacker, *Phys. Rev. D* 45, 1810 (1992); *Nucl. Phys. B* 373, 498 (1992).
10. X. Shi and D. N. Schramm, *FERMILAB-PUB-92-322-A*.
11. X. Shi, D. N. Schramm, and J. N. Bahcall, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 69, 717 (1992).
12. J. M. Gelb, W. Kwong and S. P. Rosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 69, 1846 (1992); W. Kwong and S. P. Rosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 68, 748 (1992).
13. P. I. Krastev and S. T. Petcov, *CERN-TH.6539/92*, *Phys. Lett. B* 285, 85 (1992).
14. W. Frati, T. K. Gaisser, A. K. Mann, and T. Stanev, *Pennsylvania UPR-0218E*.
15. K. S. Hirata et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 280, 146 (1992).
16. R. Becker-Szendy et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 46, 3720 (1992).