

The M SW conversion of solar neutrinos and random matter
density perturbations

H. Nunokawa, A. Rossi, and J. W. F. Valle

Instituto de Física Corpuscular - C.S.I.C.
Departament de Física Teòrica, Universitat de València
46100 Burjassot, València, SPAIN

V. B. Semikoz

Institute of Terrestrial Magnetism, the Ionosphere and Radio Wave Propagation of the
Russian Academy of Sciences
Izmiran, Troitsk, Moscow region, 142092 RUSSIA

Abstract

We present a generalization of the resonant neutrino conversion in matter, including a random component in the matter density profile. The study is focused on the effect of such matter perturbations upon both large and small mixing angle M SW solutions to the solar neutrino problem. This is carried out both for the active-active $\nu_e \nu_\mu$; as well as active-sterile $\nu_e \nu_s$ conversion channels. We find that the small mixing M SW solution is much more stable (especially in m^2) than the large mixing solution. Future solar neutrino experiments, such as Borexino, could probe solar matter density noise at the few percent level.

Invited talk presented by A. Rossi at 17th Int. Conf. on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, Helsinki, Finland, 13-20 June 1996. To appear in the Proceedings.

1. The comparison among the present experimental results on the observation of the solar neutrinos strongly points to a deficit of neutrino flux (dubbed the Solar Neutrino Problem (SNP)). The most recent averaged data [1] of the chlorine, gallium¹ and Kamikande experiments are:

$$R_{Cl}^{exp} = (2.55 \pm 0.25) \text{SNU}; R_{Ga}^{exp} = (74 \pm 8) \text{SNU}; R_{K}^{exp} = (0.44 \pm 0.06) R_{K}^{BP95} \quad (1)$$

where R_{K}^{BP95} is the prediction according to the most recent Standard Solar Model (SSM) by Bahcall-Pinsonneault (BP95) [2].

It is now understood that the SNP cannot be explained through astrophysical/nuclear solutions [3, 4]. From the particle physics point of view, however, the resonant neutrino conversion (the Mikheyev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein (MSW) effect) [5] seems to explain successfully the present experimental situation [6, 7, 8, 1].

This talk deals with the stability of the MSW solution with respect to the possible presence of random perturbations in the solar matter density [9].

We remind that in Ref.[10] the effect of periodic matter density perturbations added to a mean matter density upon resonant neutrino conversion was investigated. There are also a number of papers which address similar effects by different approaches [11, 12].

Here we consider the effect of random matter density perturbations $\delta\rho(r)$, characterised by an arbitrary wave number k ,

$$\delta\rho(r) = \int dk \delta\rho(k) \sin kr; \quad (2)$$

Moreover, as in Ref.[12], we assume that the perturbation $\delta\rho(r)$ has Gaussian distribution with the spatial correlation function $\langle \delta\rho(r) \delta\rho(r') \rangle$ defined as

$$\langle \delta\rho(r) \delta\rho(r') \rangle = 2^{-2} \langle \delta\rho^2 \rangle L_0^{-3} \delta^3(r - r'); \quad \langle \delta\rho^2 \rangle = \frac{h^2 \rho^2}{2} \quad (3)$$

The correlation length L_0 obeys the following relation:

$$L_0 \approx \lambda_{free} \lambda_m \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda_{free} \approx 10 \text{ cm}$ is the mean free path of the electrons in the solar medium and λ_m is the neutrino matter wave length. For the sake of discussion, in the following we choose to adjust L_0 as follows:

$$L_0 = 0.1 \lambda_m \quad (5)$$

The SSM in itself cannot account for the existence of density perturbations, since it is based on hydrostatic evolution equations. On the other hand, the present helioseismology observations cannot exclude the existence of few percent level of matter density fluctuations. Therefore, in what follows we assume, on phenomenological grounds, such levels for $\delta\rho$, up to 8%.

Before generalizing the MSW scenario, accounting for the presence in the interior of the sun of such matter density fluctuations, first we give a quick reminder to the main features of the MSW effect.

2. The resonant conversion of neutrinos in a matter background is due to the coherent neutrino scattering on matter constituents [5]. This determines an effective matter potential V for neutrinos. In the rest frame of the unpolarized matter, the potential is given, in the framework of the Standard Model, by

$$V = \frac{G_F}{m_p} Y \quad (6)$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant and Y is a number which depends on the neutrino type and on the chemical content of the medium. More precisely, $Y = Y_e - \frac{1}{2} Y_n$ for the ν_e state, $Y = \frac{1}{2} Y_n$ for

¹For the gallium result we have taken the weighted average of GALLEX $R_{Ga}^{exp} = (77 \pm 5) \text{SNU}$ and SAGE $R_{Ga}^{exp} = (69 \pm 11) \text{SNU}$ data.

and $Y = 0$ for the sterile s state, where $Y_{e,n}$ denotes the electron and neutron number per nucleon. For the matter density, one usually considers the smooth distribution, as given by the SSM [2, 13, 14].

For given mass difference m^2 and neutrino mixing in vacuum, the neutrinos ν_e 's, created in the inner region of the sun, where the distribution is maximal, can be completely converted into ν_y ($y = \mu$ or s), while travelling to the solar surface.

This requires two conditions [5]:

1) - the resonance condition. Neutrinos of given energy E experience the resonance if the energy splitting in the vacuum $m^2 \cos^2 2\theta = 2E$ is compensated by the effective matter potential difference $V_{ey} = V_e - V_y$. It is helpful to define the following dynamical factor A_{ey}

$$A_{ey}(r) = \frac{1}{2} \left[V_{ey}(r) - \frac{m^2}{2E} \cos^2 2\theta \right] \quad (7)$$

which vanishes at the resonance, $A_{ey} = 0$. This condition determines the value

$$r_{res} = \left(\frac{m_p}{2} \cos^2 2\theta - 2G_F \right) (Y_e - Y_y) \frac{m^2}{2E} = 0 \quad \text{which, in turn, implies a resonance layer } r_{res}.$$

2) - The adiabatic condition. At the resonance layer, the neutrino conversion $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_y$ is efficient if the propagation is adiabatic. This can be nicely expressed requiring the neutrino wavelength λ_m to be smaller than r_{res} [5],

$$r_{res} = r_{res}(\lambda_m)_{res} \frac{m^2 \sin^2 2\theta R_0}{4 E \cos^2 2\theta} > 1; \quad R_0 = 0.1R; \quad (8)$$

$$\lambda_m = \frac{2\pi}{A_{ey} + (m^2)^2 \sin^2 2\theta} = (16E^2)^{-1/2}; \quad r_{res} = 2 \tan^2 \theta \lambda_m = dr/dj^1:$$

3. Now we reformulate the neutrino evolution equation accounting for a fluctuation term superimposed to the main profile. The perturbation level $\delta = \dots$ induces a corresponding random component V_{ey} for the matter potential. The evolution for the $\nu_e - \nu_y$ system is governed by

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} H_e & H_{ey} \\ H_{ey} & H_y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_y \end{pmatrix}; \quad (9)$$

where the entries of the Hamiltonian matrix are given by

$$H_e = 2[A_{ey}(t) + \tilde{A}_{ey}(t)]; \quad H_y = 0; \quad H_{ey} = \frac{m^2}{4E} \sin^2 2\theta; \quad \tilde{A}_{ey}(t) = \frac{1}{2} V_{ey}(t); \quad (10)$$

Here the matter potentials read as:

$$V_{e(\mu)}(t) = \frac{p}{m_p} \frac{2G_F}{2} (t) (1 - Y_n); \quad V_{es}(t) = \frac{p}{m_p} \frac{2G_F}{2} (t) (1 - \frac{3}{2} Y_n) \quad (11)$$

for the $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$; and $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_s$ conversions, respectively. (The neutral matter relation $Y_e = 1 - Y_n$ has been used.)

The system (9) has to be rewritten averaging over the random density distribution, taking into account that for the random component we have:

$$\langle \tilde{A}_{ey}^{2n+1} \rangle = 0; \quad \langle \tilde{A}_{ey}(t) \tilde{A}_{ey}(t_1) \rangle = \delta(t - t_1); \quad \langle \tilde{A}_{ey}^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} V_{ey}^2(t) \langle I_{L_0} \rangle; \quad (12)$$

We have obtained (see [9] for more details) the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(t) &= -2H_{ey}I(t) \\ \dot{R}(t) &= 2A_{ey}(t)I(t) - 2(t)R(t) \\ \dot{I}(t) &= 2A_{ey}(t)R(t) - 2(t)I(t) - H_{ey}(2P(t) - 1); \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $P(t) = \text{Re}(\psi_e^2)$, $R(t) = \text{Re}(\psi_e)$ and $I(t) = \text{Im}(\psi_e)$. Now the "dynamics" is governed by one more quantity i.e. the noise parameter ϵ , besides the factor A_{ey} . The quantity ϵ can be given the meaning of energy quantum associated with the matter density perturbation. However, let us note that the MSW resonance condition, i.e. $A_{ey}(t) = 0$ remains unchanged, due to the random nature of the matter perturbations. The comparison between the noise parameter ϵ in Eq. (12) and $A_{ey}(t)$ shows that $\epsilon(t) < A_{ey}(t)$, for $\epsilon < \text{few } \%$, except at the resonance region. As a result, the density perturbation can have its maximum effect just at the resonance. Furthermore, one can find the analogous of condition 2) (see Eq. (8) for the noise to give rise to sizeable effects. Since the noise term gives rise to a damping term in the system (13), it follows that the corresponding noise length scale $l = \epsilon$ be much smaller than the thickness of the resonance layer r . In other words, the following adiabaticity condition

$$\epsilon_r = r \epsilon_{res} > 1; \quad \epsilon_r = r \frac{\epsilon^2}{\tan^2 2\theta} : \quad (14)$$

is also necessary. For the range of parameters we are considering, $\epsilon^2 \approx 10^{-2}$ and $\tan^2 2\theta \approx 10^3 - 10^2$, and due to the r.h.s of (4), there results $\epsilon_r \approx r$. This relation can be rewritten as $\epsilon_{res} < H_{res}$, where H_{res} is the level splitting between the energies of the neutrino mass eigenstates at resonance. This shows that the noise energy quantum is unable to "excite" the system, causing the level crossing (even at the resonance) [10]. In other words, it never violates the MSW adiabaticity condition. From Eq. (14) it follows also that, in the adiabatic regime $\epsilon_r > 1$, the smaller the mixing angle value the larger the effect of the noise. Finally, as already noted above, the MSW non-adiabaticity $\epsilon_r < 1$ is always translated to $\epsilon_r < 1$. As a result, under our assumptions the fluctuations are expected to be ineffective in the non-adiabatic MSW regime.

4. All this preliminary discussion is illustrated in the Fig. 1. For definiteness we take BP95 SSM [2] as reference model. We plot P as a function of $E = m^2$ for different values of the noise parameter ϵ . For comparison, the standard MSW case $\epsilon = 0$ is also shown (lower solid curve). One can see that in both cases of small and large mixing (Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b, respectively), the effect of the matter density noise is to raise the bottom of the pit (see dotted and dashed curves). In other words, the noise weakens the MSW suppression in the adiabatic-resonant regime, whereas its effect is negligible in the non-adiabatic region. The relative increase of the survival probability P is larger for the case of small mixing (Fig. 1a) as already guessed on the basis of Eq. (14). We have also drawn pictorially (solid vertical line) the position, in the P profile, where ^7Be neutrinos fall in for the relevant $m^2 \approx 10^5 \text{ eV}^2$, to visualize that these intermediate energy neutrinos are the ones most likely to be affected by the matter noise.

5. Let us analyse the possible impact of this scenario in the determination of solar neutrino parameters from the experimental data. For that we have performed the standard χ^2 fit in the $(\sin^2 2\theta; m^2)$ parameter space. The results of the fitting are shown in Fig. 2 where the 90% confidence level (C.L.) areas are drawn for different values of ϵ . Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b refer to the cases of $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$; and $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_s$ conversion, respectively. One can observe that the small-mixing region is almost stable, with a slight shift down of m^2 values and a slight shift of $\sin^2 2\theta$ towards larger values. The large mixing area is also pretty stable, exhibiting the tendency to shift to smaller m^2 and $\sin^2 2\theta$. The smaller m^2 values compensate for the weakening of the MSW suppression due to the presence of matter noise, so that a larger portion of the neutrino energy spectrum can be converted. The presence of the matter density noise makes the data fit a little poorer: $\chi^2_{min} = 0.1$ for $\epsilon = 0$, it becomes $\chi^2_{min} = 0.8$ for $\epsilon = 4\%$ and even $\chi^2_{min} = 2$ for $\epsilon = 8\%$ for the $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$; transition.

The same holds in the case of transition into a sterile state (Fig. 2b): $\chi^2_{min} = 1$ for $\epsilon = 0$, it becomes $\chi^2_{min} = 3.6$ for $\epsilon = 4\%$ and $\chi^2_{min} = 9$ for $\epsilon = 8\%$.

In conclusion we have shown that the MSW solution to the SNP exists for any realistic levels of matter density noise ($\epsilon \approx 4\%$). Moreover the MSW solution is essentially stable in mass ($4 \cdot 10^6 \text{ eV}^2 < m^2 < 10^5 \text{ eV}^2$ at 90% C.L.), whereas the mixing appears more sensitive to the level of fluctuations.

6. We can reverse our point of view, wondering whether the solar neutrino experiments can be a tool to get information on the level of matter noise in the sun. In particular, the future Borexino experiment [15], aiming to detect the ^7Be neutrino flux, could be sensitive to the presence of solar matter fluctuations. In the relevant MSW parameter region for the noiseless case, the Borexino signal cannot be definitely predicted (see Fig. 3a). Within the present allowed C.L. regions (dotted line) the expected rate, $Z_{\text{Be}} = R_{\text{Be}}^{\text{pred}} = R_{\text{Be}}^{\text{BP}95}$ (solid lines), is in the range $0.2 - 0.7$.

On the other hand, when the matter density noise is switched on, e.g. $\delta = 4\%$ (see Fig. 3b), the minimal allowed value for Z_{Be} becomes higher, $Z_{\text{Be}} \approx 0.4$. Hence, if the MSW mechanism is responsible for the solar neutrino deficit and Borexino experiment detects a low signal, say $Z_{\text{Be}} < 0.3$ (with good accuracy) this will imply that a 4% level of matter fluctuations in the central region of the sun is unlikely. The same argument can be applied to $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_s$ resonant conversion, whenever future large detectors such as Super-Kamiokande and/or the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (SNO) establish through, e.g. the measurement of the charged to neutral current ratio, that the deficit of solar neutrinos is due to this kind of transition. The expected signal in Borexino is very small $Z_{\text{Be}} \approx 0.02$ for $\delta = 0$ (see Fig. 3c). On the other hand with $\delta = 4\%$, the minimum expected Borexino signal is 10 times higher than in the noiseless case, so that if Borexino detects a rate $Z_{\text{Be}} < 0.1$ (see Fig. 3d) this would again exclude noise levels above 4%.

Let us notice that Super-Kamiokande and SNO experiments, being sensitive only to the higher energy Boron neutrinos, probably do not offer similar possibility to probe such matter fluctuations in the sun.

The previous discussion, which certainly deserves a more accurate analysis involving also the theoretical uncertainties in the ^7Be neutrino flux, shows the close link between neutrino physics and solar physics.

This work has been supported by the grant N.ERBCHBICT-941592 of the Human Capital and Mobility Program.

References

- [1] See A.Yu.Smirnov in this Proceedings for a review.
- [2] J.N.Bahcall and M.H.Pinsonneault, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 67 (1995) 781.
- [3] V.Castellani, et al *Phys. Lett. B* 324 (1994) 245; N.Hata, S.Budman, and P.Langacker, *Phys. Rev. D* 49 (1994) 3622; V.Berezinsky, *Comments on Nuclear and Particle Physics* 21 (1994) 249; J.N.Bahcall, *Phys. Lett. B* 338 (1994) 276.
- [4] V.Berezinsky, G.Fiorentini and M.Lissia, *Phys. Lett. B* 365 (1996) 185.
- [5] S.P.Mikheyev and A.Yu.Smirnov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* 42 (1986) 913; *Sov. Phys. Usp.* 30 (1987) 759; L.Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* 17 (1978) 2369; *ibid.* D 20 (1979) 2634.
- [6] See for a recent analysis e.g. G.L.Fogli, E.Lisi and D.Montanino, *Phys. Rev. D* 54 (1996) 2048.
- [7] P.I.Krastev and A.Yu.Smirnov, *Phys. Lett. B* 338 (1994) 282; V.Berezinsky, G.Fiorentini and M.Lissia, *Phys. Lett. B* 341 (1994) 38.
- [8] E.Calabrese et al., *Phys. Rev. D* 53 (1996) 4211; J.N.Bahcall and P.I.Krastev, *Phys. Rev. D* 53 (1996) 4211.

- [9] H. Nunokawa, A. Rossi, V. Semikoz and J. W. F. Valle, Nucl. Phys. B 472 (1996) 495.
- [10] P. I. Krastev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. B 226 (1989) 341; Mod. Phys. Lett. A 6 (1991) 1001.
- [11] A. Schafer and S. E. Koonin, Phys. Lett. B 185 (1987) 417; R. F. Sawyer, Phys. Rev. D 42 (1990) 3908; A. Abada and S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. B 279 (1992) 153; C. P. Burgess and D. M. M. Chaud, preprint hep-ph/9606295; see also the contribution by C. P. Burgess in this Proceedings.
- [12] F. N. Loreti and A. B. Balantekin, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 4762.
- [13] S. Turck-Chieze et al., Phys. Rep. 230 (1993) 57.
- [14] V. Castellani, S. Degl'Innocenti and G. Fiorentini, Astron. Astrophys. 271 (1993) 601.
- [15] C. Arpesella et al. (Borexino Collaboration), Proposal of BOREXINO (1991).

Fig. 1a




Fig. 1b




Fig. 1: The averaged solar neutrino survival probability P versus $E = m^2$ for small mixing angle, $\sin^2 2\theta = 0.01$, (Fig. 1a) and for large mixing angle, $\sin^2 2\theta = 0.7$, (Fig. 1b). The different curves refer to different values of matter noise level as indicated.

Fig. 2a




Fig. 2b




Fig. 2: The 90% C.L. allowed regions for the $e \rightarrow \mu$ (Fig. 2a) and for the $e \rightarrow \tau$ (Fig. 2b) conversion. The different curves refer to different values of matter noise level as indicated.







Fig. 3: The iso $Z_{Be} = R_{Be}^{pred} = R_{Be}^{BP95}$ contours (lines at curve) in the e scattering Borexino detector (solid lines). The threshold energy for the recoil electron detection is 0.25 MeV. The 90% C.L. regions (dotted line) and the corresponding best fit point are also drawn. Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b refer to the case of $e \rightarrow \nu_e$ conversion and for $\xi = 0$ and $\xi = 4\%$, respectively. Fig. 3c and Fig. 3d refer to the case of $e \rightarrow \nu_s$ conversion and for $\xi = 0$ and $\xi = 4\%$, respectively.