UH-511-885-98 January 1998

# NEUTR IN OS<sup>a</sup>

S.PAKVASA Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Hawaii Honolulu, HI 96822 USA

### 1 Introduction

W e can start with the question: why are neutrino properties especially interesting? Recall that in the minim al standard model there are no right handed neutrinos and furtherm ore lepton number is conserved so neutrinos can have neither D irac nor M a prana m asses. Furtherm ore, with zero m asses, the m ixing angles in the charged weak current are all zero. Any evidence for non-zero m asses or m ixing angles is evidence for physics beyond the standard m odel and hence potentially a powerful tool. Besides, the masses and mixing angles are fundam ental param eters which will have to be explained by the eventual theory of ferm ion m asses. M assless neutrino can be guaranteed by in posing chiral sym m etry. Since chiral sym m etry and just m asslessness are di cult to distinguish at present, one can ask if there are any other fundam ental reasons form to be zero, such as gauge invariance for the photon and graviton m asses. The only other massless particles we know are N am bu-G oldstone particles due to spontaneous breaking of global sym metries. If was such a particle it would obey soft- theorem s analogues of soft theorem s<sup>1</sup>. Hence any amplitude A with as an external particle of m om entum q should satisfy

$$\lim_{q \to 0} A() = 0$$

i.e. A should vanish linearly as q. This additional dependence of am plitudes on the neutrino m om entum, for example, would distort K urie plots for beta decay grossly from linearity. Since no such deviations are observed we can rest assured that neutrino is not a N am bu-G oldstone particle. Hence the neutrino

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Based on lectures delivered at the ICTP Summer School on High Energy Physics and Cosm ology, Trieste, June 16-20, 1997.

is neither a gauge particle nor a N am bu-G oldstone particle and is not required to be m assless.

Once neutrinos have masses, by analogy we expect that the only distinguishing feature between avors is di erent masses and mixings. Hence we would expect  $_{e}$ ; and (or the corresponding mass eigenstates  $_{1}$ ;  $_{2}$  and  $_{3}$ ) to have di erent masses in general.

Let me review brie y the kinds of neutrino masses that can arise. Let  $_{\rm L}$  and  $_{\rm R}$  be two-component chiral (W eyl) elds; with  $_{\rm R}$   $_{\rm L}^{\rm c}$  and  $_{\rm L}$   $_{\rm R}^{\rm c}$  the charge conjugates. Then there are two kinds of M a prana mass term spossible:

$$m_{L L R} + hc: (a) (1)$$
$$m_{R R L} + hc: (b)$$

These violate lepton number by 2 units and the term (2a) violates weak SU (2) and has I = 1 whereas (2b) has I = 0: The D irac mass term transforming as  $I = \frac{1}{2}$  is given by

$$m_{D L R} + hc:$$
 (2)

and conserves lepton number.

In the standard m odel, for example, with particle assignments:

$$e^{e}_{L}$$
  $e_{R}$  (3)

the electron gets a D irac m assm  $_{\rm e}$  (e<sub>L</sub> e<sub>R</sub> + h  $\approx$ ). If there is a  $_{\rm eR}$  and  $_{\rm e}$  also gets a D irac m assm  $_{\rm e}$  ( $_{\rm e_L} e_{\rm R} + {\rm h} \approx$ ) then it is di cult to understand why m  $_{\rm e}$ =m  $_{\rm e}$  is such a sm all number (< 10  $^5$ ): At least so runs an off-quoted sentiment (O ne should bear in m ind that m  $_{\rm e}$ =m  $_{\rm t}$  < 10  $^5$  and is equally hard to understand!) In any case, m  $_{\rm i}$  for all neutrinos are very sm all compared to other ferm ion m asses. How is it possible to get very sm allm asses for neutrinos? Some of the possibilities that have been discussed in the literature are:

i) A rrange the theory so that at tree level and at one loop level m = 0. The rst non-zero contribution arises at two-loop level and hence one expects  $m_e^{-2}m_e^{-w}$  hich gives  $e^{-w}$  mass in eV range! Similarly m and m would be in 100 eV and few K eV range. W hether the neutrinos are D irac or M a jorana particles depends on the detailed m odel.

ii) The See-Saw M echanism <sup>2</sup>: In the general case when both D irac and M a prana m ass term s are present, there is a 2x2 m ass m atrix for every avor.

$$\begin{array}{cccc} m_{\rm L} & m_{\rm D} & {}_{\rm R} \\ {}_{\rm L} & L & m_{\rm D} & m_{\rm R} & {}_{\rm R} \end{array}$$
(4)

This has eigenvalues  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  and the eigenstates  $_1$ ;  $_2$  are M a jorana. The case when  $m_1 = m_2$  is the special one which allows for a conserved lepton number to be de ned and gives a 4 component D irac particle. In the case where  $m_R$  is much larger than the others, e.g.  $m_R >> m_D >> m_L$  the e. values simplify to

$$m_1 = m_D^2 = m_R$$

$$m_2 = m_R$$
(5)

and  $m_1 < < m_D$ . Som can be much smaller than a typical  $m_D$  say  $m_e$ .

In this case, i)  $^{0}{\rm s}$  are M a jorana particles and ii) the mass hierarchy in  $^{0}{\rm s}$  is expected to be

$$m_{e} = m = m m_{e}^{2} = m^{2} = m^{2}$$
 (6)

orm  $\frac{2}{u}$ =m  $\frac{2}{c}$ =m  $\frac{2}{t}$  etc.

Let me rem ind you of som e speci c scenarios for neutrino m asses: (i) N o  $_{\rm R}^0$  s exist. Lepton number is a global symmetry and spontaneously broken via the vacuum expectation value (vev) of an I=1 complex scalar eld<sup>3</sup>. The coupling of the neutral eld so  $^0$ s give the left-handed  $^0$ s a M a prana m ass (m<sub>L</sub>). The massless N am bu-G oldstone eld is the M a pron. The masses m rem ain arbitrary. O ne can also consider the I=1 complex eld as a way of expressing a product of two I =  $\frac{1}{2}$  \standard" H iggs multiplets. (b)  $_{\rm R}$  's exist <sup>4</sup>. This is the case in some unit cation groups, (SO (10), E  $_6$  etc). In one class of m odels m  $_{\rm L}$  = 0 and m  $_{\rm R}$  € 0 and corresponds to the usual see-saw m echanism. In a m ore general case one can envisage m  $_{\rm L}$  € 0;m  $_{\rm R}$  € 0 and the possibility that m  $_1$  and m  $_2$  m ay be close and the m ixing angle m ay be large! Then for three avors there is a 6x6 m ixing m atrix and m ixing with 3 sterile (I= 0) neutrinos.

The current experimental limits on neutrino masses are<sup>5</sup>:

All of these are direct, kinem atic lim its from Laboratory experiments.

W ith non-zero m asses, in general there is m ixing i.e. m ass eigenstates m ay not be identical to weak eigenstates. In the m ost general case the m ixing can be between the three avors  $_{e}$ ; :For simplicity, let us rst consider two avor m ixing between  $_{e}$  and :with the mass eigenstates  $_{1}$  and  $_{2}$  (m  $_{2} > m_{1}$ ). For two avorm ixing (say  $_{e}$  and ). The standard forms for survival probability

and conversion probability are given by

$$P_{ee}(L) = 1 \sin^2 2 \sin^2 \frac{m^2 L}{4E}$$
  
 $P_e(L) = \sin^2 2 \sin^2 \frac{m^2 L}{4E}$ 
(8)

for a neutrino starting out as  $_{e}$ . Here is the mixing angle  $m^{2} = m_{2}^{2}$  $m_{1}^{2}$ ; L = ct and the ultra-relativistic limit E =  $p + \frac{m^{2}}{2p}$  has been taken. A lthough these form ulae<sup>6</sup> are usually derived in plane wave approximation with  $p_{1} = p_{2}$ , it has been shown that a careful wave packet treatment yields the same results. When the argument of the oscillating term  $(\frac{m^{2}L}{4E})$  is too small, no oscillations can be observed. When it is much larger than one then due to the spread of E at the source or nite energy resolution of the detector the oscillating term excitively averages out to 1/2.

There are some obvious conditions to be met for oscillations to take place <sup>7</sup>. As the beam travels, the wave packet spreads and the mass eigenstates separate. If the width x remains greater than the separation then oscillations will occur; but if the separation is greater, then two separate pulses of <sub>1</sub> (mass  $m_1$ ) and <sub>2</sub> (mass  $m_2$ ) register in the detector with intensities  $\cos^2$  and  $\sin^2$  separated by  $t = \frac{m^2}{2E^2}$  (L=c). In principle, the intensities as well as oscillation expressions should relect the slightly dilerent decay widths for dilerent mass eigenstates but this is ofno practical in portance. The same expressions remain valid if the mixing is with a sterile neutrino with no weak interactions. Since the sterile neutrino has no weak interactions, not even neutral current, there is an apparent non-conservation of probability. In general, to describe avor mixing among three avors, a 3x3 analog of K obayashi-M askawa matrix is necessary. To describe the generalm ixing of 3 avors and 3 sterile states a 6x6 unitary matrix is called for. In this case, the 3x3 avor mixing matrix is, of course, not unitary due to leakage to the sterile sector.

In general, there will be CP violation due to phases in the mixing matrix <sup>8</sup>. The deviation of P (!;t) P (!;t) from 0 is a measure of CP violation. P (!;t) and P (!;t) are equal by CPT. Another way to check CP is follow a single probability over a long time (distance) and do a Fourier analysis. If it contains A+B coswt + C sinwt.. then C  $\epsilon$  0 in plies CP violation. If P (!t)  $\frac{4}{3}$  then either CP is violated or there are m ore than three states mixing. Another interesting test can be done using ; beam s from bean dump or K<sub>L</sub> decay. If (e e)=(e+e) or ()=(+) are non-zero, CP is violated. There are also T-violating corrections in avor changing decays such as !eee; !ee etc., of the kind : (P<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub>). An old observation <sup>9</sup> which has become relevant recently is the following: it is possible for neutrinos to be massless and not orthogonal. For example, with three neutrino mixing we have

$$= U_{e1 1} + U_{e2 2} + U_{e3 3}$$

$$= U_{1 1} + U_{2 2} + U_{3 3}$$
(9)

Suppose  $m_1 = m_2 = 0$  but  $m_3$  is non-zero and  $m_3 > Q$  where Q is the energy released in decay or decay producing <sub>e</sub> and beam s. Then <sub>e</sub> and will have zero m asses but will not be orthogonal:

$$<_{e}j > = U_{e3}U_{3} \in 0$$
 (10)

(Scenarios similar to this are realized in combined ts to solar and LSND neutrino anom alies). Incidentally, the  $\backslash_e$ " and <sup>00</sup> " produced in Z decay will not be massless and will be nearly orthogonal! This example illustrates the fact that neutrino avor is not a precise concept and is process dependent.

If a heavier neutrino  $_{\rm H}$  is mixed with  $_{\rm e}$  and with mass in the range KeV to MeV it can show up in the abrupt changes of phase space as the Q-value in a decay process passes m  $_{\rm H}$ . This simple and obvious idea was rst exploited in 1963  $^{10}$ . Typically one expects kinks in energy spectrum in -decay, K e<sub>3</sub>;  $_{\rm e3}$  K  $_3$  etc. So far such searches have yielded null results. Similar searches can also be made in 2-body decays such as ! for  $^0$ s of anom alous momenta.

O scillations of m assless neutrinos arise under two circum stances. O ne is when gravitational couplings of neutrinos are avornon-diagonal. For example,  $_1$  and  $_2$  m ay couple to gravity with di erent strengths:

$$H_{gr} = f_1 G E; + f_2 G E_2$$
 (11)

where is the gravitational potential. Then if  $_{\rm e}$  and ~ are mixtures of  $_1$  and  $_2$  with a mixing angle , oscillations will occur with a avor survival probability given by  $^{11}$ 

$$P = 1 \sin^2 2 \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} f E L$$
 (12)

for a constant potential . If Lorentz invariance is violated with neutrinos being velocity eigenstates corresponding to di erent maximum velocities; then also there are oscillations with P given  $by^{12}$ 

$$P = 1 \sin^2 2 \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} vEL$$
 (13)

In both these cases, the dependence of oscillations is on (EL) to be contrasted to L/E dependence of conventional oscillations.

<u>M atter E ects</u>: In traversing thru m atter, the coherent forward scattering of neutrinos with m atter gives rise to e ective interaction energy which distinguishes  $_{\rm e}$  from other avors. The result is

$$H = \frac{p \overline{2}G_{F}}{2m_{N}} (Y_{e} = 1=2Y_{n})$$
  
for e's and  
$$H = \frac{p \overline{2}G_{F}}{2m_{N}} (1=2Y_{n})$$
  
(14)

for 's and 's. The + sign for 's and -sign for 's, is the density of matter and  $Y_e$  and  $Y_n$  are the number of electron and neutrons respectively per nucleon. There is no such term for sterile neutrinos<sup>13</sup>.

As a result of this, the mixing angles and  $m^2$ 's in matter are dimensional from their vacuum value. The most interesting result is the fact that for a given value of  $m^2$ , mixing angle and neutrino energy, there is always some value of density where the matter angle becomes  $45^0$  i.e. is maxim  $al^{14}$ . This is true no matter how small the vacuum mixing angle is. Furthermore, this enhancement can only occur for either 's or for 's but not for both. Another related result is that (as long as  $Y_e = \frac{1}{2}Y_n > 0$ ) e in matter has higher energy than e and has higher energy than . Hence if there are lepton-number violating couplings to say, a massless M a pron, then decays such  $as^{15}$ 

$$_{e}!_{e} + M$$
 (15)

can occur in matter but not in vacuum . Matter e ects are important for solar neutrinos (if  $m^2$  10 <sup>4</sup> to 10 <sup>7</sup>ev<sup>2</sup>); for upcom ing atmospheric neutrinos and can be for supernova neutrinos.

D ecays: For neutrinos below 1  $\mathrm{M}\xspace$  ecays modes possible are

(1) ! +  
(2) ! + 
$$_{i i}$$
 (16)  
(3) ! + M :

The decay rate for the radiative mode, at one loop level, in the standard model is given by

$$_{1} = \frac{G_{F}^{2} m^{5}}{128^{4}} \frac{9}{16} - \frac{X}{m_{W}} \frac{m_{i}}{m_{W}}^{2} U_{i} U_{i}$$
(17)

assuming m >> m . Cosmological and SN 1987A limits on this mode are of order =BR  $1\theta^{24}$ s. The rate for the 3 mode depends on whether it is one loop induced or whether there is G IM violation at tree level

$${}_{2} (1 \text{ loop}) = \frac{G_{F}^{2} \text{ m}^{5}}{128^{3}} \frac{2}{8^{2}} \frac{\text{m}_{j}^{2}}{\text{m}_{W}^{2}} U_{j} U_{j}^{2}$$

$${}_{2} (\text{tree}) = \frac{{}^{2}GF^{2}}{192^{-3}} \text{ m}^{5}$$
(18)

It is not easy to arrange for this decay rate to be signi cant. The decay rate for M a pron or fam ilon decay mode depends on the unknown Yukawa coupling, g,

M agnetic D ipole M om ent: A M a prana particle cannot have a non-zero m agnetic dipole m om ent. H ence for a non-zero m agnetic dipole m om ent either neutrino is a D irac particle or the dipole m om ent is a transition m om ent between two di erent M a prana states (e.g.  $_{eL}$  and  $_{p}^{c}$ ):

In the standard m odel, the one loop calculation yields<sup>16</sup>

$$r_{\rm p} = \frac{3m_{\rm e}G_{\rm F}}{4^{\rm f}\overline{2}^{\rm 2}} m_{\rm e} B$$
 (19)

which is 3:10  $^{19}$  (m =eV)  $_{\rm B}$  :W ith mixing to a heavy lepton of m $_{\rm L}$  100 GeV and mixing  $_{\rm e}$   $_{\rm L}$  of 0.1, this can be enhanced to 10  $^{14}$   $_{\rm B}$ : The sim plest mod-i cations of standard of model which can yield large magnetic dipole moment for  $_{\rm e}$  are ones with extra scalar elds.

D ouble B eta D ecay: O f particular interest for neutrino properties is the neutrino-less variety:

$$(A;Z)! (A;Z+2)+e+e:$$
 (20)

This can only happen if c and  $m \in 0$  (or e mixes with a massive M a prana particle). The decay rate depends on the m and the nuclearm atrix element<sup>17</sup>.

$$\frac{1}{2:10^{15} \text{yr}} M_{GT} \hat{J} F G_{c}$$
(21)

where  $G_c$  is the Coulumb correction factor,  $F = m^2 = m_e^2 f(_e = m_e)$  and  $M_{GT}$  is the nuclear matrix element.

$$M_{GT} < fm n_{m}^{+} n_{m}^{+} m : nr_{mn}^{1} i >$$
 (22)

This is in the limit of smallm  $\cdot$ . The strongest limits on are for Ge of alm ost 10  $^{24}$  yr.  $^1$ . Using calculated nuclear matrix elements this places a limit on

a M a jorana m ass for  $_{\rm e}$  of m  $_{\rm e}^{\rm M} < 1 \rm eV$ . Eventually the m atrix element can be extracted from 2 double -decay. W ith the next generation it m ay be possible to lower the bound to  $0.2 - 0.3 \rm eV$ .

#### 2 Atm ospheric N eutrinos

The cosm ic ray primaries produce pions which on decays produce <sup>0</sup>s and  $_{e}^{0}$ s by the chain ! , ! e  $_{e}$  : Hence, one expects a  $= _{e}$  ratio of 2:1. As energies increase the <sup>0</sup>s do not have enough time (decay length becomes greater than 15-20 km) and the  $= _{e}$  ratio increases. Also at low energies the ux is almost independent of zenith angle; at high energies due to competition between -decay and -interaction the fam ous \sec ()" e ect takes over. Since the absolute ux predictions are beset with uncertainties of about 20%, it is better to compare predictions of the ratio (which may have only a 5% uncertainty)  $= _{e}$  to data in the form of the fam ous double ratio R = ( $= _{e}$ )<sub>data</sub>=( $= _{e}$ )<sub>m c</sub>.

For the so-called  $\contained$  which for K am iokande and  $\mathbb{M}$  B correspond to visible energies below about 1.5 GeV, the weighted world average (before SuperK am iokande) is  $R = 0.64 \quad 0.06^{18}$ . This includes all the data from MB, Kamiokande, Frejus, Nusex and Soudan. The new SuperK results are completely consistent with this<sup>19</sup>. It may be worthwhile to recall all the doubts and concerns which have been raised about this anom aly (i.e. deviation of R from 1) in the past and their resolution. (i) Since initially the anomaly was only seen in W ater Cerenkov detectors, the question was raised whether the anom aly was specic to water Cerenkov detectors. Since then, it has been seen in a tracking detector i.e. SOUDAN II. (ii) Related to the above was the concern whether e= identi cation and separation was really as good as claim ed by Kamiokande and IMB. The beam tests at KEK established that this was not a problem  $^{20}$ . (iii) The  $_{\rm e}$  and  ${\rm cross-sections}$  at low energies are not well known; how ever e universality should hold apart from known kinem atic e ects. (iv) If more +°s than °s are produced, then even though the ratio of 2/1 is preserved there is an asymmetry in  $e^{=}e^{-1}$  versus = . Since

cross-sections are larger than cross-sections, the double ratio R would become smaller than  $1^{21}$ . However, to explain the observed R, <sup>+°</sup>s would have to dominate over <sup>°</sup>s by 10 to 1, which is extremely unlikely and there is no evidence for such an e ect. (v) Cosmic ray muons passing thru near (but outside) the detector could create neutrals (especially neutrons) which enter the tank unobserved and then create <sup>0°</sup>s faking \e" like events<sup>22</sup>. A gain this e ect reduces R. However, K am iokande plotted their events versus distance from wall and did not nd any evidence for more \e" events near the walls

<sup>23</sup>. (vi) Finally, the measurement of ux at heights of 10-15 km to tag the parent particles as suggested by Perkins was performed by the MASS collaboration<sup>24</sup>. This should help decrease the uncertainty in the expected ( $=_{\rm e}$ ) ux ratio even further. It seems that the anomaly is real and does not have any m undane explanation.

We now turn to an explanation in terms of neutrino oscillations<sup>25</sup>. Deviation of  $R_{obs}=R_{MC}$  from 1 is fairly uniform over zenith angle and is most pronounced in the charged lepton energy range 200-700 MeV which corresponds to neutrino energies from 300 MeV to 1.2 GeV. If we are to interpret this de cit of  $_{e}$ 's (and/or excess of  $_{e}$ 's) as being due to neutrino oscillations, the relevant parameters are determined rather easily. The typical height of production, h, is about 15-20 km above ground and for a zenith angle the distance traveled by the neutrino before reaching the detector is

L () = R 
$$(1 + h=R)^2 \sin^2 \cos$$
 (23)

where R is the radius of the earth. A llowing for angular smearing due to the scattering and nite angular resolution one nds that neutrino path lengths vary between 30 and 6500 km, and hence L=E can vary between 25 km/G eV and 20,000 km/G eV. Since the data (pre-SuperK) did not show any L (i.e.) or E dependence one was led to infer that the oscillations had already set in at E 1 G eV and L 30 km and hence  $m^2$  could not be m uch sm aller than 10  ${}^2\text{eV}{}^2$ . As for the mixing angle , if P denotes the average oscillation probability i.e. P =  $\sin^2 2 < \sin^2 m^2 L = 4E > \frac{1}{2}\sin^2 2$ ; then R = 1 P in case of oscillations and for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ oscillations

$$R = \frac{1}{1 + (1 = r - 1)P}$$
(24)

where r = N ( ) in absence of oscillations and most ux calculations yield r 0.45. Since R is nearly 0.6, large m ixing angles of order  $30^{0}$  to  $45^{0}$  are called for, e m ixing needing som ewhat smaller one. Detailed to by K am iokande and IM B, bear these expectations out although som ewhat bigger range of parameters  $m^{2}$  up to  $4:10^{-3} \text{eV}^{2}$  and m ixing angles up to  $20^{0}$ ) are allow ed.

If the atm ospheric neutrino anom aly is indeed due to neutrino oscillations as seem sm ore and m ore likely; one would like to establish just what the nature of oscillations is. There have been several proposals recently. One is to de ne an up-down asymmetry for  ${}^{0}$ s as well as  $e^{0}$ s as follow s<sup>26</sup>:

$$A = (N^{d} N^{u}) = (N^{d} + N^{u})$$
(25)

where = e or , d and u stand for downcom ing ( $_{z}$  = 0 to =2) and upcom ing ( $_{z}$  = =2 to ) respectively. A is a function of E . The comparison of A (E ) to data can distinguish various scenarios for -oscillations rather easily  $^{26}$ . This asymmetry has the advantage that absolute ux cancels out and that statistics can be large. It can be calculated numerically or analytically with some simple assumptions. One can plot A<sub>e</sub> versus A for a variety of scenarios: (i) (or sterile) mixing, (ii) <sub>e</sub> mixing, (iii) three neutrino mixing (iv) massless mixing etc.

The general features of the asymmetry plot are easy to understand. For (or  $_{st}$ ) case, A increases with energy, and A  $_{e}$  rem ains 0; for m ixing, Ae and A have opposite signs; the three neutrino cases interpolate between the above two; for the massless case the energy dependence is opposite and the asymmetries decrease as E is increased; when both and <sub>e</sub> mix with sterile  $^{0}$ s, both A and A<sub>e</sub> are positive etc. With enough statistics, it should be relatively straightforward to determ ine which is the correct one. P relim inary indications point to as the culprit. There is also another suggestion<sup>27</sup> which can in principle distinguish from st m ixing. If one considers the total neutral current event rate divided by the total charged current event rate; the ratio is essentially the n.c. cross section divided by the st oscillations the ratio rem ains unchanged since c.c. cross section. W ith st has neither n.c. nor c.c. interactions and the num erator and denom inator change equally ( e case is even simpler: nothing changes); how ever, in case the denom inator decreases and the ratio is expected to increase 1:5, (here  $r = N_{0}^{0} = N^{0}$ by  $\frac{1+r}{p+r}$ 1=2 and P = 1=2 =survival probability). Of course, it is di cult to isolate neutral current events; but it is <sup>0</sup>N and N ! ' N events and the K am iokande proposed to select N! data seem to favor over e<sup>27</sup>. <sub>st</sub> or

The new data from SuperK am iokande seem<sup>19</sup> to rule out all non-oscillation explanations, prefer a value for  $m^2$  near 5:10  $^3$  eV  $^2$  with large mixing and also prefer over  $_{e}$ .  $_{e}$  mixing is also excluded as a result of the new CHOOZ data<sup>28</sup>.

If we scale L and E each by the same amount, say 100, we should again see large e ects. Hence, upcoming thrugoing <sup>0</sup>s which correspond to E 100 GeV on the average, with path lengths of L > 2000 km should be depleted. There are data from KolarGold Fields, Baksan, Kamiokande, IM B, MACRO, SOUDAN and now SuperK. It is dicult to test the event rate for depletion since there are no  $_{e}^{0}$ s to take ux ratios and the absolute ux predictions have 30% uncertainties. However, there should be distortions of the zenith angle distribution and there seems to be some evidence for this.

#### 3 Solar N eutrinos

Since the work of von W eizsacker<sup>29</sup>, Bethe<sup>30</sup> and C ritch eld in the 30's and 40's, we believe that the energy of the sun is generated by conversion of hydrogen to helium. The basic reaction is

$$4p! {}^{4}He_{2} + 2e^{+} + 2_{e}$$
 (26)

with a release of 25 M eV. M ost of the energy goes into producing photons which eventually emerge as sunlight and the two neutrinos share about 2 M eV. From the fact that the energy density in sunlight at earth's surface is 1400Jm  $^{2}$ sec  $^{1}$ , it is easy to estimate that the neutrino ux at the earth is about  $10^{11}$  cm  $^{2}$ sec  $^{1}$ . These neutrinos, unlike the light, come directly from the center of the sun, and probe the interior in a unique way. The actual energy spectrum and ux of the neutrinos depend on the interm ediate steps in the reaction above as show in the Table 1 from the book by Bahcall<sup>31</sup>.

The rst and pioneering solar neutrino detector is the one build by D avis and his collaborators. It is a tank containing 100 000 cubic feet of CC  $l_4$  in Hom estate gold m ine in South D akota. The aim is to look for the reaction  $e + {}^{37}$ Cl!  $e + {}^{37}$ Ar. The Argon-37 decays with a half-life of 37 days.

The tank is ushed every month with helium which ushes out the Argon and then one looks for the radioactivity of  $^{37}$ Ar: The number of Argon atom s is extrem ely sm all, the total number detected in over twenty years of running (1970-1997) is of the order of a few hundred. The average counting rate is alm ost 1/4th of the expected rate in the standard solar model (SSM).

A nother detector is the K am iokande in a zinc m ine in K am ioka, Japan. It consists of about 1000 tons of water surrounded by phototubes to detect C erenkov light em itted by charged particles. The reaction being studied is  $_{\rm e}$  + e !  $_{\rm e}$  + e where the nal electron em its C erenkov light and should be in the same direction as the initial  $_{\rm e}$  and hence point away from there sun. D ue to high background at low energies, only electrons above 7.5 M eV can be detected. In data collected over 9 years (1987–1996), the observed rate is about 40% of the rate expected in SSM . Since 1990, two G allium detectors (G allex at G ran-Sasso and SAGE in Russia), have been taking data as well. They are sensitive to low energy p p neutrinos via the low threshold reaction  $_{\rm e}$  + <sup>71</sup> G a ! e + <sup>71</sup> G e. The m ethod is chem ical and sim ilar to the D avis experiment. The <sup>71</sup>G e decays back to <sup>71</sup>G a by e-capture w ith a half-life of 11 days and the <sup>71</sup>G a is extracted chem ically. G allium . The current observed rate is about 50% of the SSM expectation.

The data from four solar neutrino detectors (Homestake, Kamiokande, SAGE and Gallex) have been discussed extensively  $^{32}$ . The SuperK data are

Table 1: The pp chain in the Sun. The average number of pp neutrinos produced per term ination in the Sun is 1.85. For all other neutrino sources, the average number of neutrinos produced per term ination is equal to (the term ination percentage/100).

R eaction	N um ber	Term ination	<sub>e</sub> energy
		(%)	(MeV)
p+p! <sup>2</sup> H+e <sup>+</sup> + <sub>e</sub>	1a	100	0.420
or			
р+е +р! <sup>2</sup> Н+ <sub>е</sub>	1 b (pep)	0.4	1.442
<sup>2</sup> H + e ! <sup>3</sup> H e+	2	100	
<sup>3</sup> He+ <sup>3</sup> He! + 2p	3	85	
or			
<sup>3</sup> He+ <sup>4</sup> He! <sup>7</sup> Be+	4	15	
<sup>7</sup> Be+e ! <sup>7</sup> Li+ <sub>e</sub>	5	15	(90%) 0.861
			(10%) 0.383
<sup>7</sup> Li+p! 2	6	15	
or			
<sup>7</sup> Be+p! <sup>8</sup> B+	7	0.02	
<sup>8</sup> B! <sup>8</sup> Be+e <sup>+</sup> + <sub>e</sub>	8	0.02	< 15
<sup>8</sup> Be ! 2	9	0.02	
or			
$^{3}\text{H}e+p!^{4}\text{H}e+e^{+}+e^{-}$	10 (hep)	0.00002	18.77

consistent with those from K am iokande but increase the statistics by an order of m agnitude in one year<sup>18;19</sup>. To analyze these data one m akes the following assumptions: (i) the sun is powered m ainly by the pp cycle, (ii) the sun is in a steady state, (iii) neutrino m assess are zero and (iv) the decay spectra have the standard Ferm i shapes. Then it is relatively straightforward to show using these data with the solar luminosity that the neutrinos from <sup>7</sup>B e are absent or at least two experiments are wrong <sup>33</sup>. <sup>7</sup>B e is necessary to produce <sup>8</sup>B and the decay of <sup>8</sup>B has been observed; and the rate for <sup>7</sup>B e + e ! + Li is orders of m agnitude greater than <sup>7</sup>B e + ! <sup>8</sup>B + p and hence it is alm ost im possible to nd a \conventional" explanation for this lack of <sup>7</sup>B e neutrinos. The simplest explanation is neutrino oscillations.

A ssum ing that neutrino oscillations are responsible for the solar neutrino anom aly; there are several distinct possibilities. There are several di erent regions in  $m^2 \sin^2 2$  plane that are viable: (i) \Just-so" with  $m^2 10^{10} \text{eV}^2$ and sin<sup>2</sup> 2  $1^{34}$ , (ii) MSW smallangle with m<sup>2</sup> 10 <sup>5</sup>eV<sup>2</sup> and sin<sup>2</sup>2 10<sup>2</sup> and (iii) MSW large angle with m<sup>2</sup> 10<sup>7</sup> eV<sup>2</sup> (or m<sup>2</sup>  $10^{5} eV^{2}$ ) and  $\sin^2 2$ 1. The just-so'' is characterized by strong distortion of <sup>8</sup>B spectrum and large real-time variation of ux, especially for the <sup>7</sup>Be line; M SW sm all angle also predicts distortion of the  ${}^{8}B$  spectrum and a very sm all  ${}^{7}Be$ ux and M SW large angle predicts day-night variations. These predictions (especially spectrum distortion) will be tested in the SuperK as well as SNO detectors. In particular SNO, in addition to the spectrum, will be able to measure N C = C C ratio thus acting as a ux m onitor and reducing the dependence on solarm odels.

The only way to directly con m the absence of <sup>7</sup>B e neutrinos is by trying to detect them with a detector with a threshold low enough in energy. One such detector under construction is Borexino, which I describe below <sup>35</sup>.

Borexino is a liquid scintilator detector with a ducial volume of 300T; with energy threshold for 0.25M eV, energy resolution of 45 K eV and spatial resolution of 20cm at 0.5 M eV. The PM T pulse shape can distinguish between  $^{0}$ s and  $^{0}$ s. T in e correlation between adjacent events of upto 0.3 nsec is possible. W ith these features, it is possible to reduce backgrounds to a low enough level to be able to extract a signal from  $^{7}$ B e  $^{0}_{e}$ s via e scattering. Radioactive in purities such as  $^{238}$ U,  $^{232}$ Th and  $^{14}$ C have to be lower than 10  $^{15}$ ;10  $^{16}$ g=g and 10  $^{18}$  ( $^{14}$ C = $^{12}$ C) respectively. In the test tank CTF (C ounting Test Facility) containing 6T of LS, data were taken in 1995–96 and these reductions of background were achieved. A s of last sum m er, funds for the construction of full Borexino have been approved in Italy (INFN), G erm any (DFG) and the U S. (NSF); and construction should begin soon. The Borexino collaboration includes institutions from Italy, G erm any, Hungary, Russia and

_			
Expt.	${ m E}_{ m th}$	R ate/SSM	
H om estake	0.8 M eV	0:28	0:03
K am iokande	7.5 M eV	0:42	0:06
Gallex	0.2 M eV	0:52	0:12
SAGE	0.2 M eV	0:53	0:17

Table 2: Sum m ary of current data on solar neutrinos

the U.S.

W ith a FV of 300T, the events rate from <sup>7</sup>Be <sup>0</sup>s is about 50 per day with SSM, and if <sup>0</sup><sub>e</sub>s convert completely to ( = = ) then the rate is reduced by a factor <sup>e</sup><sub>e</sub> = <sup>ee</sup> 0.2 to about 10 per day, which is still detectable. Since the events in a liquid scintilator have no directionality, one has to rely on the time variation due to the 1=r<sup>2</sup> e ect to verify the solar origin of the events. If the solution of the solar neutrinos is due to \just so" oscillations with m<sup>2</sup> 10 <sup>10</sup> eV<sup>2</sup>, then the event rate from <sup>7</sup>Be <sup>0</sup>s shows dram atic variations with periods of m on thes.

B orexino has excellent capability to detect low energy  $_{e}^{0}s$  by the Reines-C ow an technique:  $_{e}+p$  !  $e^{+}+n$ ; n+p ! d+ with 0.2 m sec separating the  $e^{+}$  and . This leads to possible detection of terrestial and solar  $_{e}^{0}s$ . The terrestial  $_{e}^{0}s$  can come from nearby reactors and from  $^{238}U$  and  $^{232}Th$  underground. The G eo-therm al  $_{e}^{0}s$  have a di erent spectrum and are relatively easy to distinguish above reactor backgrounds. Thus one can begin to distinguish am ongst various geophysical m odels for the U=Th distribution in the crust and m antle. Solar  $_{e}^{0}s$  can arise via conversion of  $_{e}$  to inside the sun when  $_{e}$  passes thru a m agnetic eld region in the sun (for a M a jorana m agnetic m om ent) and then !  $_{e}$  by the large m ixing enroute to the earth  $^{36}$ .

Am ong the detectors under construction is SNO  $^{37}$  (Solar Neutrino Observatory) at Sudbury, Canada. This is a Kiloton D $_2$ O Cerenkov detector sensitive to the reactions.

$$^{2}_{e1}$$
D!epp;  $^{2}_{1}$ D!pnande!e (27)

i.e. CC (charged current), NC (neutral current) and e scattering, respectively with energy threshold for electron energies about 5 M eV. SNO can detect spectrum distortion quite clearly and can alo con m depletion of  ${}^0_e$ s by comparing NC to CC rates. SNO is expected to begin taking data within a year.

LSND and 3 Neutrino Mixing: We have not discussed the LSND experiment in detail. The LSND detector at Los A lam os used the neutrinos from !; !  $e_e$  to bok for !  $e_e$  (and !  $e_e$ ) conversion. They reported a positive result<sup>38</sup> with m<sup>2</sup> (0.5 to 2)eV<sup>2</sup> and sin<sup>2</sup> 2 (1 2)10<sup>3</sup>. The KARMEN detector <sup>39</sup> will be able to con m this result within a few m onths. If these results hold up, one needs four neutrino states to account for all the neutrino anom alies and hence at least one light sterile state.

## 4 Supernova Neutrinos

In February 23, 1987, a supernova explosion was seen in the Large M agellanic C bud. Neutrino signals were observed in the K am jokande and the IM B detectors. Before discussing the observed signal, let m e brie y recapitulate what would be expected on general grounds.

The general picture of a type-II supernova goes like this<sup>40</sup>. A red giant star ofm assgreater than 10 solarm asses reaches a stage when the core in plodes and neutronization occurs i.e., e<sup>0</sup>s and p's combine to form n's and e's: e + p! n + e. Density can increase from  $10^{11}$  to  $10^{14}$  g=cm<sup>3</sup>. The energy released is about 1% of the rest energy released and the process takes place in about 10<sup>3</sup> sec. Subsequently the therm all neutrinos and antineutrinos (of all kinds) are em itted via e<sup>+</sup> e ! i i. These have Ferm i-D irac energy distribution with tem peratures of about 5 M eV for e; e and 10 M eV for ; . The num ber of and are about equal, but the num ber of and are about 1/2 of the num ber of e. The tim e interval over which the neutrino em ission lasts is expected to be about 10 seconds or so. The total energy em itted in neutrinos is about 10% of rest energy which corresponds to (2 to 4)  $10^{53}$  ergs.

In water C erenkov detectors such as  $\mathbb{M}$  B and K am iokande, the reactions possible are (i)  $_{e}p ! ne^{+}$  and (ii)  $_{e} ! _{e}$  and most events would be from  $_{e}p$  reaction since in H  $_{2}O$ , the event rate ratio for ( $_{e}p$ )=( $_{e}$ ) goes as E =M eV and at 10 M eV (which is the expected m ean energy of the neutrinos) is just 10. The  $_{e}p$  events should show no directional preference since the cross-section is nearly isotropic whereas the  $_{e}$  events should be forw ard peaked.

The neutrino events seen by K am iokande and IM B are in rem arkable agreement with these general expectations<sup>41</sup>. The total number of events seen over about 10 second interval was 19, the energies ranged between 7 and 30 M eV with a mean of about 15 M eV. The total energy in 's was about 3  $10^{52}$  ergs which translates into 3  $10^{53}$  ergs in total em itted energy in neutrinos. The angular distribution is nearly at as expected with a slight forward preference and one event is perhaps better interpreted as a  $_{\rm e}$  event. A t to Ferm i (or M axwell) distribution suggests a tem perature for  $_{\rm e}$  in the range 3.5 to 5 M eV. There was also detection of a few events<sup>42</sup> by the LSD detector in M ont B ianc and by a sim ilar detector in Baksan, but there are questions about how to

interpret these events and we shall ignore them . I will now list the neutrino properties that can be constrained tightly and uniquely by these few events.

(1)  $_{\rm e}$  lifetime: Since the expected number of  $_{\rm e}$ 's arrived form LMC, they lived at least as long as the ight-time. The ight path is about 52 kiloparsec which corresponds to a ight-time (at speed of light) of 5  $10^{12}$  sec. Hence the laboratory life-time for 10 MeV  $_{\rm e}$ 's is greater than 5  $10^{12}$  sec. The limit in the rest-frame is (m =10 M eV) 5  $10^{12}$  sec. If  $_{\rm e}$  is not a mass eigenstate but there is a mixing, then at least one (the low est) eigenstate should have (a) large component of  $_{\rm e}$  and (b) live longer than 5  $10^{12}$  sec.

(2)  $_{\rm e}$  photonic decay: In observations by a satellite during the 10 sec period of the SN 1987A neutrino burst, no gam m a rays of energies in the range (1 to 10 M eV) were seen <sup>43</sup>. Since the num ber density of  $_{\rm e}$ 's due to SN 1987a was about 10<sup>10</sup> per cm<sup>2</sup>, one can plate a lim it of 10<sup>22</sup> sec on  $_{\rm e}$ =B R, where B R is the branching ratio of  $_{\rm e}$  to decay into photons. This lim it is valid for m < 200 eV even for and

(3)  $_{e}$  m ass: From the data we know that largest spread in arrivaltimes is t 10 sec and the largest energy spread is between 10 and 30 MeV. If two neutrino arrivaltime di erence is t<sub>21</sub>, this can come from two sources: for a non zero m ass of  $_{e}$ , the energy di erence gives velocity di erence giving an arrivaltime di erence and there m ay be a departure time di erence t<sub>21</sub>; i.e.:

$$t_{21} = \frac{R_{LMC}}{c} \frac{1}{2} (m c^2)^2 (E_2^2 E_1^2) + t_2$$
(28)

If we assume that  $t_{21} > t_{21}$ , then

m c<sup>2</sup> 
$$\frac{2c t_{21}}{R_{LM C}} \frac{E_2^2 E_1^2}{E_2^2 E_1^2}$$
 <sup>1=2</sup> (29)

which for  $E_1; E_2 = 10; 30 \text{ MeV}$  and  $t_{21} = 10 \text{ sec}$ , gives a limit of about 20 eV. M ore sophisticated analysis can not do much better.

(4) M ass of and : If and have D irac m asses, then the neutral current scattering on nuclei changes chirality and can create non-interacting sterile right handed 's at a rate proportional to  $m^2$ . If  $m^2$  is too large, this happens in a short time scale and  $_R$ 's would escape carrying away too m uch energy. From such considerations, one can put an upper bound on ; m asses of order 100 K eV or so <sup>44</sup>. This is m uch better than the laboratory bounds m entioned earlier.

(5) E lectric charge of  $_{\rm e}$ : If  $_{\rm e}^{0}$ s had an electric charge of Q, they would be de ected in the galactic magnetic elds according to their energies leading to dispersion in arrival times. The fractional deviation from a straight line path

s=s, can be shown to be 1/24 (s  ${}^2=R^2$ ) where R is the radius of the path and is given by E/cQB where E is the neutrino energy, and B is the magnetic eld. The dispersion in arrival times is then t t (s=s), where t is the ight time of  $5 \cdot 10^{12}$  sec. For an observed dispersion time of 10 sec, one can nd a limit on Q, the neutrino charge given by  ${}^{45}$ 

Q 
$$(t=t)^{p} 24 \text{ [E i=0:3s B]}^{p} \text{ fE =2 E g}$$
 (30)

where hE i in GeV is about 15 10<sup>3</sup>; s is 1:5  $10^{21}$  m, B is 10<sup>10</sup> in tesla, E =2 E is about 1 and the bound on Q is about 10<sup>14</sup> je j. The laboratory bounds on Q are stronger but depend on charge conservation and charge additivity, whereas this measures charge dynam ically.

(6) N eutrino speed: A coording to the earliest optical observation, the time di erence between the arrival of neutrino and photons from SN 1987A is less than a few hours or  $2 10^4$  sec. Hence

$$t = t \quad t < 2 \quad 10^4 sec$$
 (31)

So if neutrino speed is  $\boldsymbol{v}$  , then

$$j1 = c \neq t = 5 \ 10^9$$
 (32)

and hence = c to within a few parts in a billion <sup>46</sup>.

(7) Neutrino F lavor: If the number of light ( 1 M eV) neutrino avors were N, then the lum inosity in  $\sim_e$ 's would be reduced by 3/N from expected. But the observed lum inosity was just what was expected, hence if we allow for a factor of 2 uncertainty, then N should be less than 6. This lim it has been superseded by the LEP results on Z<sup>0</sup> which put N = 3 very accurately.

(8) Equivalence Principle for  $_{\rm e}$ : If  $_{\rm e}$  feels the gravitational interaction due to our galaxy, then their time delay should be.

$$t = M (1 + ) ln (2R = b)$$
 (33)

where M is the mass of M ilky W ay and b is the distance of solar system from the center; should be one in general relativity. The time delay for photon is given by a similar form ula with instead of : is known that

$$t = t \qquad t < 2 \qquad 10^4 sec \qquad (34)$$

and M (in appropriate units!)  $3 \ 10^5 \text{sec}; R = b \ 4; t \ 3 \text{ m onths, and}$ hence

$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 () = (t = t) 2 10<sup>4</sup> sec/5 m on ths 10<sup>-3</sup> (35)

Hence = to within 1 part in  $1000^{47}$ .

(8) Equivalence Principle for  $_{\rm e}$  and  $_{\rm e}$ : In addition, if one interprets the one events as being due to  $_{\rm e}$  e scattering, then since the time interval is about 1 sec, one can test particle-antiparticle equivalence between  $_{\rm e}$  and  $\sim_{\rm e}^{48}$ 

$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 ( \_\_\_) < 10<sup>-6</sup> (36)

(9) New Forces on  $e^{0}s$ : The above result can also be used to place bounds on new forces (long range) coupling to neutrinos<sup>48</sup>. The potential energy between neutrino and the galactic matter is given by

$$E(r) = \frac{2GEm_2}{r} - \frac{q_1q_2}{r} + \frac{mS_1S_2}{r}$$
 (37)

where m<sub>2</sub> is galactic mass, m<sub>y</sub> the neutrino mass;  $q_i$  are the neutrino and galactic charges for a vector force-eld, S<sub>i</sub> are for a scalar force-eld and the upper (lower) sign refers to neutrinos (anti-neutrinos). Then a bound on the vector force can be obtained from

t t = 
$$(m = E)^2 (2q Q E) [R = (R^2 + p^2)]$$
  
 $p = \frac{p}{R^2 + b^2} = bg ] 1sec$  (38)

For example, if vector eld couples to a combination of B and L i.e. G =  $g(L + B)^{1} C_{5}$ , then one nds that  $g^{2}(+12) < 2 = 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^{2}$  for m 15 eV. If coupling to neutrino and to other matter is di erent, then

$$g^2$$
 ( + ) < 2 10  $^{3}GeV^{2}$  (39)

and for the dimensionless coupling f de ned by

$$g = f^{D}G; f^{2}(+) < 2 10^{35}$$
 (40)

For the scalar force, which contributes only to the time delay between 's and 's, one nds  $f_s^2$ ; ( + ) < 10<sup>34</sup>. If neutrinos from the dark matter in the

galaxy, the bounds are stronger:  $f^2 = 2 < 3 = 10^{-43}$  and  $f_s^2 = 2 < 10 = 32$ .

(10) Secret Interactions of  $_{e}^{0}$ s: A ny new interactions of  $_{e}$ 's with majorons or self interactions cannot be too strong, otherwise the number arriving would have been a ected. This is because 's can scatter o's in the 3 K neutrino background radiation. The limits on coupling constants obtained this way are typically of the order of 10<sup>349</sup>.

(11) M ixing Angles of Neutrino: Generally no information on the mixing angles or mass di erence of 's can be obtained from the supernova data. But

if one event is assumed to be  $_{\rm e}$ e scattering, then the matter e ects in the supernova place strong constraints on  ${\rm m}^2$ ;  $\sin^2$  (2) that are allowed, in order that  $_{\rm e}$  ux be not depleted. When superim posed on the MSW solution for the solar neutrinos, it disfavors the large angle solution <sup>50</sup>.

(12) Neutrino M agnetic M om ent: Before the core cooled to T 5 M eV, it had a T 50--100 M eV. If had a m agnetic m om ent, when e<sup>t</sup> e ! <sub>R R</sub> by the m agnetic interaction and the <sub>R</sub> would escape (whereas <sub>L</sub> of this energy is trapped by its small m ean free path). This would create two problem s: one that no neutrinos of this energy were observed (<sub>R</sub> ! <sub>L</sub> in the galactic m agnetic elds) and the other is that so m uch energy would be lost that there would be little left in the low energy <sub>L</sub>'s. If this argument were valid <sup>51</sup>, one would obtain bounds on m agnetic dipole m om ent of 10 <sup>12</sup> <sub>Bohr</sub>. How ever, if the neutrino is a M a jorana particle or if the <sub>R</sub> 's have new interactions, this argum ent breaks down since <sub>R</sub> would then be trapped. So strictly speaking, there is no lim it on the neutrino m agnetic m om ent from SN 1987a.

For a paltry 19 events, this is a trem endous am ount of inform ation on neutrinos. We hope that the next observed supernova would be inside M ilky W ay at a distance under 10 kiloparsec. Then the neutrino events seen would be in the order of several hundred. C an this happen in the next twenty years or so? Supernova watch is continuing.

### 5 Early Universe

The cosm ic m icrowave background radiation should be accompanied by neutrinos which decoupled at very early times<sup>52</sup>. The present temperature of neutrino T is related to the photon temperature T by

$$T = (4=11)^{1=3} T$$
 (41)

which gives T = 1.9 K for T = 0.7 K. The physical reason for the dimension of the factor  $(4=11)^{1=3}$  is the raising of photon temperature after decoupling due to  $e^+e^-$  annihilation which dumps energy in photons. A ssum ing a Ferm i-D irac distribution a temperature of 1.9 K yields for the neutrino density

$$n = 115 \text{ per cc} \tag{42}$$

for each avor. Hence the energy density in neutrinos is

$$= \int_{i}^{X} 115 \, (m_{i}c^{2}) \, per cc \qquad (43)$$

For this to be less than the critical density  $_{c} = 10^{4}h^{2}$  eV =cc, the sum of all neutrino m asses m ust satisfy (for h 0.4 to 1).

This is the well-known result  $^{53}$  due to Cowsik, M cLeland, and Zeldovich.

These results raise two questions. One is the fact that if neutrino m asses add up to 10-30 eV (or if one neutrino, say has such a m ass) then neutrinos can provide the bulk of the energy density of the universe and a sizable fraction of the dark m atter (30 to 100%) in the form of hot dark m atter. How can this be tested experimentally? The other is, whether these cosm ic background neutrinos them selves be detected experimentally?

For the detection of relic 's many suggestions have been made over the years. None of them is in the danger of being in plem ented in the near future. Som e early proposal were based using coherent surface e ects and detect a net force, on a large area due to the earth's motion in space. This turned out to be too sm all for detection after it was shown that the e ect is proportional to  $G_{\pi}^{2}$ rather than  $G_F$ . A nother elegant idea <sup>54</sup> is to use a possible asvm m etrv to create an electric parity violating force on polarised electrons and look for the spin rotation with propagation. At very low temperatures with all externalm agnetic elds quenched, this may becom e feasible som e day. A nother suggestion<sup>55</sup> is to use very distant sources of very high energy 's and look for Z-absorption dips in their spectrum due to the process  $+_{CBR}$  !  $Z^{0}$ . Perhaps the most promising and practical proposal is the one due to Zeldovich et  $al^{56}$ . They propose using the volume e ect by employing a loosely led container (about half-lled) with spheres of size 0() when is the wavelength of the CBR 's and keeping the interstitial distance d less than . The acceleration experienced by the container is

for neutrino m ass in the eV range. Here K  $_{\rm L}$  = (A Z) for and (3Z A) for e.C an such objects be constructed and such sm allaccelerations be measured?

If one neutrino, say has a m ass in the range 5 to 30 eV it can provide 30 to 100% of energy density needed to guarantee a of 0(1). If such a m ixes with by an amount > 10<sup>4</sup> ongoing and future experiments at CERN and Ferm ilab such as CHORUS, NOMAD and COSMOS should be able to con m that. These are appearance experiments in which if ! + N ! + x takes place, they can be detected. The sensitivity is to probe  $m^2$  1 to 1000 eV<sup>2</sup> and sin<sup>2</sup> 2 up to 10<sup>4</sup>.

Conclusion and Summary

W e expect great progress in this eld in the next 4 or 5 years and hope for eventual unam biguous evidence for physics beyond the standard m odel from neutrino properties.

The neutrinoless double beta decay limits should be pushed to at least as low as 0.1 eV. The new solar neutrino experiments with rates of several thousand events per year should con m (or deny) the anomaly and measure  $m^2$  and mixing angles. Long baseline experiments (as well as Superkam iokande) should settle the question of  $m^2$  near 10  $^2\text{eV}^2$  with large mixing for either e or . Short baseline experiments at CERN and Ferm ilab should check oscillations with large  $m^2$  and  $\sin^2 2$  upto 10  $^3$  10  $^4$  and thus indirectly the identity of H ot D ark M atter. If we are fortunate we m ay have a G alactic Supernova and we m ay be about to witness the early days of an emerging new eld: high energy neutrino astronomy. These are exciting times.

### A cknow ledgm ent

I thank A lexei Sm innov, Antonio M asiero and G oran Senjanovic for the invitation to lecture in Trieste, for a most stimulating atmosphere in the school and outstanding hospitality. This work was supported in part by USDOE. under G rant # DE-FG-03-94ER 40833.

# References

- 1. B.deW it and D Z.Freedman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 827 (1975).
- 2. T.Yanagida, Proc. of W orkshop on Uni ed Theory and Baryon Number of the Universe, ed. by O.Sawada and A.Sugamoto, KEK (1979); M. GelM ann, P.Ramond and R.Slanksky, Supergravity, ed. by P.von Nienvenhuizen and D.Z.Freedman, N.Holland (1979).
- 3. G.B.Gehminiand M.Roncadelli, Phys. Lett. 99B, 411 (1981).
- 4. Y. Chicasige, R.N. Mohapatra and R. Peccei, Phys. Lett. 98B, 265 (1981).
- Talks by I. Nikolic and by V M. Lobashov, Int. W orkhop on W eak Interactions and Neutrinos, Capri, June 1997 (Elsevier), to be published; K. Assam agan et al. Phys. Rev. D 53, 6065 (1996).
- 6. B.Kayser, Phys. Rev. D 24, 110 (1981).
- 7. C.W.K in and A.Pevsner, Neutrinos in Physics and A strophysics, Harwood (1994).

- N.Cabibbo, Phys. Lett. 72B, 333 (1978); L.W olfenstein, Phys. Rev. D 18, 958 (1978).
- 9. B.W. Lee, S.Pakvasa and H. Sugawara, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 937 (1977); S.B. Treim an, F.W ilczek and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. D 16, 152 (1977).
- 10. M. Nakagawa et al, Proc. Theor. Physics 30, 258 (1963).
- 11. M .G asperini, Phys. Rev. D 38, 2635 (1988); A .H alprin and C .N .Leung, Phys. Rev. Lett. D 67, 1833 (1991).
- 12. S.Colem an and S.L.G lashow, Phys. Lett. B 405, 249 (1997).
- 13. L.W olfenstein, Phys. Rev. D 17, 2369 (1978).
- 14. S.P.M ikheyev and A.Y.Sm imov, Nuov. Cim. C9, 17 (1986).
- 15. V. Berezhiani and M. I. Vysotsky, Phys. Lett. 199B, 281 (1987).
- 16. K. Fujikawa and R. Shrock, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 963 (1980).
- 17. W C. Haxton and G. Stephenson, Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys. 12, 408 (1989).
- M .Nakahata, Proceedings of PPPP Sym posium, Seoul, Nov. 1997, W orld Scientic (to be published).
- Y. Totsuka, Proceedings of the Lepton Photon Symposium, Hamburg, July 1997 (to be published).
- 20. S.K asuga et al, Phys. Lett. B 374, 238 (1996).
- 21. L.Volkova, Phys. Lett. B 316, 178 (1993).
- 22.0.G.Ryazhkaya, JFTP Lett. 61, 237 (1995).
- 23. Y.Fukuda et al, Phys. Lett. B 388, 397 (1996).
- 24. R. Bellottiet al, Phys. Rev. D 53, 35 (1996).
- 25. J.G. Learned, S.Pakvasa and T.J.W eiler, Phys. Lett. B 207, 79 (1988);
   V.Barger and K.W hisnant, Phys. Lett. 209B, 360 (1988); K.Hidaka et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 1537 (1988).
- 26. J.Flanagan, J.G. Learned and S.Pakvasa, hep-ph/9709438, Phys. Rev. D in press.
- 27. F.Vissani and A.Sminov, hep-ph/9710565.
- 28. The CHOOZ collaboration, M. A pollonio et al., hep-ex/9711002.
- 29. C.F.Von W eizacker, Zeit, fur Physik 39, 663 (1938).
- 30. H.A.Bethe, Phys. Rev. 55, 434 (1939).
- 31. J.N. Bahcall, \Neutrino A strophysics," Cambridge, (1989).
- 32. See talks by the Hom eskate, K am iokande, Sage and G allex C ollaborations in: Proceedingss XVII International Conference on Neutrino Physics and A strophysics, Helsinki F inland (13-19 June 1996), eds. J. M aalam pi and M. Roos (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1997), to be published.
- 33. N. Hata and P. Langacker, Phys. Rev. D 56, 6107 (1997); J. N. Bahcall, hep-ph/9711358; V. Castellani et al. hep-ph/9606180; S. Parke, Phys.

Rev. Lett. 74, 839 (1995); K.V.L.Samma, hep-ph/9408277.

- 34. S.L. G lashow anddd L.M. K rauss, Phys. Lett. 190B, 199 (1987); V. Barger, R.J.N. Phillips and K.W hisnant, Phys. Rev. D 234, 528 (1981).
- 35. C. Arpesella et al. The Borexino Proposal Vol. 1 and 2 ed. G. Bellini and R. S. Raghavan (Univ. of Milan) 1991; G. Alimonti et al. (Nucl. Instruments & Methods, in press).
- 36. R.S.Raghavan et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 635 (1998).
- 37. A.B.M cD onald, Proc. The N ineth Lake Louise W inter Inst., ed. A. A stbury et al, W orld Scienti c, 1994, p. 1.
- 38. The LSND collaboration, C. Athanassapoulos et al, Phys. Rev. C 54, 2685 (1996) and nucl-ex/9709006.
- 39. The KARMEN Collaboration, K. Eitelet al. Proc. of the 32nd Rencontre de Moriond, Electroweak Interaction and Unied Theories, Les Arcs, March 1997 (to be published), hep-ex/9706023.
- 40. G.G.Ra eltt, Stars as Laboratories for Fundam ental Physics; University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1996).
- 41. K. Hirata et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 1490 (1987); R. Bionta et al. ibid. 58, 1494 (1987).
- 42. E.N.A lexeyev et al. JETP Lett. 45, 589 (1987).
- 43. L.O berauer and F. von Feilitzsch, Phys. Lett. B 200, 580 (1988).
- 44. R.G andhiand A.Burrows, Phys. Lett. B246, 149 (1990).
- 45. R. Barbiellini and G. Cocconi, Nature, 329, 21 (1987).
- 46. L. Stodolsky, Phys. Lett. 201B, 353 (1988).
- 47. M. Longo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 173 (1988); L.K rauss and S.Trem aine, ibid, 60, 176 (1988).
- 48. S. Pakvasa, W A. Simmons and T J. Weiler, Phys. Rev. D 39, 1761 (1989), J. Losecco, Phys. Rev. D 38, 3313 (1988).
- 49. R.Kolb and M. Tumer, Phys. Rev. D 30, 2895 (1987).
- 50. J.A rafine et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 1564 (1987).
- 51. R. Barbieri and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 27 (1988).
- 52. R.Kolb and M. Tumer, The Early Universe, Addision-Wesley California (1990).
- 53. R.Cowsik and J.M cLeland, Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 669 (1972); S.G erstein and Ya.B.Zeldovich, JETP Lett. 4, 174 (1966).
- 54. L. Stodolsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 110 (1975).
- 55. T.J.W eiler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 234 (1984).
- 56. V.F. Shvartzm an et al. JETP Lett. 36, 224 (1983).