UH-511-884-98 January 1998

SOM E PHENOM ENOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF NEUTRINO PHYSICS^a

SAND IP PAKVASA Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Hawaii Honolulu, HI 96822 USA

I concentrate on two topics. One is techniques to distinguish amongst various oscillation scenarios from atm ospheric neutrino data; and the other is the Borexino solar neutrino detector and its capabilities.

The current high level of interest in neutrino properties is well justi ed. Neutrino properties (such as masses, mixings, magnetic moments etc.) are of interest for a variety of reasons: (i) in their own right as fundam ental parameters and (ii) as harbingers of new physics beyond the standard model (if e.g. $m_i \notin 0$; $_i \notin 0$ etc.).

I will not review here the kinem atic limits on masses but concentrate on the current evidence for mixing and oscillations. First we summarize some salient features of neutrino oscillations. For two avor mixing (say $_{\rm e}$ and

), the standard form s for survival probability and conversion probability are given by

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

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 lim it E_{i} $p + \frac{m_{1}^{2}}{2p}$ has been taken. A lthough these formulae 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 formulae¹. 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

^a Invited talk at the Paci c Particle Physics Phenom enology W orkshop, APCTP, Seoul, K orea, N ov. 1997.

the spread of E at the source or nite energy resolution of the detector, the oscillating term e ectively averages out to 1/2.

There are some obvious conditions to be met for oscillations to take place. 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 than two separate pulses of $_1$ (m ass m₁) and $_2$ (m ass m₂) register in the detector with intensities cos² and sin² separated by t = (m²=2E²) (L=c). In principle, the intensities as well as oscillation expressions should relate the slightly dilerent decay widths for different mass eigenstates but this is of no practical importance¹. The same expressions remain valid if the mixing is with a sterile neutrino with no weak interactions. With 3 avors mixing, the mixing matrix can have a phase (a la K obayashi and M askawa) and the oscillations have a CP non-conserving term leading to

$$P (L) \notin P (L); P (L) \notin P (L)$$
 (2)

etc. Som e possibilities for observing CP violating e ects in Long Baseline experiments were discussed here² by Dr. Koike and by Dr. Sato. An old observation which has become relevant recently is the following: it is possible for neutrinos to be massless but not be orthogonal³. For example, with three neutrino mixing we have

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

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

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 e and beam s. Then e and will have zero m asses but will not be orthogonal:

$$<_{e}j > = U_{e3}U_{3} \in 0$$
 (4)

(Scenarios similar to this are realized in combined ts⁴, to solar and LSND neutrino anom alies). Incidentally, the $_e$ " and $\$ " 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.

1 Atm ospheric N eutrinos

The cosm ic ray primaries produce pions which on decays produce 0 s and ${}^{0}_{e}$ s by the chain ! , ! e ${}_{e}$: Hence, one expects a ${}^{e}_{e}$ ratio of 2:1. As energies increase the 0 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 famous \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 $R = (=_{e})_{data} = (=_{e})_{mc}$.

For the so-called \contained" events which for K am iokande and IM B correspond to visible energies below about 1.5 G eV, the weighted world average (before SuperK am iokande) is $R = 0.64 - 0.06^{5}$. This includes all the data from IM B, K am iokande, Frejis, Nusex and Soudan. As we heard from D r. Nakahata, the new SuperK results are completely consistent with this⁵. It m ay 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 anom aly was only seen in W ater C erenkov detectors, the question was raised whether the anom aly was speci c to water C erenkov 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 K am iokande and IM B. The beam tests at KEK established that this was not a problem ⁶. (iii) The e and cross-sections at low energies are not well known; how ever e

universality should hold apart from known kinematic e ects. (iv) If more $\frac{1}{2}$'s than $\frac{1}{2}$'s are produced, then even though the ratio of 2/1 is preserved there is an asymmetry in $e^{-1}e^{-1}$ eversus = -1. Since cross-sections are larger than

cross-sections, the double ratio R would become smaller than 1^7 . However, to explain the observed R, ^{+°s} s would have to dominate over ^{°s} s by 10 to 1, which is extremely unlikely and there is no evidence for such an e ect. (v) C osm ic ray muons passing thru near (but outside) the detector could create neutrals (especially neutrons) which enter the tank unobserved and then create

 $^{0^{\circ}}$ s faking \e" like events⁸. A gain this e ect reduces R. How ever, K am iokande plotted their events versus distance from wall and did not nd any evidence for more \e" events near the walls⁹. (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 10 . 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 mundance explanation. The new data from SuperK that we just hear about extends the anomaly to higher energies than before and shows a clear zenith angle dependence as well. This rules out most explanations o ered except for the ones based on neutrino oscillations.

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 follows:

$$A = (N^{d} N^{u}) = (N^{d} + N^{u})$$
(5)

where $= e \circ r$, d and u stand for downcoming ($_{z} = 0$ 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 11. This asymmetry has the advantage that absolute ux cancels out and that statistics can be large. It can be calculated num erically or analytically with some simple assumptions. One can plot A_e versus A for a variety of scenarios: (i) (or sterile) m ixing, (ii) e mixing, (iii) three neutrino m ixing (iv) m assless m ixing etc. O scillations of m assless neutrinos can occur in models of avor violating couplings to gravity and Lorentz invariance violation ¹². However, in both these cases the dependence of oscillations on the distance is very di erent from the conventional oscillation: $\frac{m^2 L}{4E}$ is replaced by $\frac{1}{2}$ f EL or by $\frac{1}{2}$ vEL. Here f = 2 = 26 $_1$) is the sm all num ber param eterizing the avor violating coupling to gravity, the gravitational potential and $v = v_2 v_1$ is the difference between the two maximum speeds of the velocity eigenstates when Lorentz invariance is violated. The general features of the asym m etry plot are easy to understand. For (or $_{st}$) case, A increases with energy, and A_e remains 0; for e m ixing, A_e 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 e mix with sterile

⁰s, both A and A_e are positive etc. With enough statistics, it should be relatively straightforward to determ ine which is the correct one. As we heard, as the culprit. There is also another prelim inary indications point to suggestion which can in principle distinguish from st mixing. 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 c.c. cross section.W ith st oscillations the ratio rem ains unchanged since 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 by $\frac{1+r}{P+r}$ 1:5, (here $r = N_{a}^{0} = N^{0}$ 1=2 and P = 1=2 =survivalprobability). Of course, it is di cult to isolate neutral current events; but it is proposed to select N ! 0 N and N ! ' N events and the K am iokande

_{st} or

over

data seem to favor

_¹³.

If we scale L and E each by the sam e am ount, say 100, we should again see large e ects. Hence, upcoming thrugoing ⁰s which correspond to E 100 G eV on the average, with path lengths of L > 2000 km should be depleted. There are data from K olar G old Fields, B aksan, K am iokande, IM B, M A C R O, SO UDAN and now SuperK. It is di cult to test the event rate for depletion since there are no $_{e}^{0}$ s to take ux ratios and the absolute ux predictions have 20% uncertainties. However, there should be distortions of the zenith angle distribution and there seem s to be som e evidence for this¹⁴.

2 Solar N eutrinos

The data from four solar neutrino detectors (H on estake, K am iokande, SAGE and G allex) have been discussed extensively ¹⁵. The SuperK data are consistent with those from K am iokande but increase the statistics by an order of m agnitude in one year⁵. 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 asses 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 lum inosity that the neutrinos from ⁷B e are absent or at least two experiments are wrong¹⁶. ⁷B e is necessary to produce ⁸B and the decay of ⁸B has been observed; and the rate for ⁷B e + e ! + Li is orders of magnitude greater than ⁷B e + ! ⁸B + p and hence it is alm ost im possible to nd a \conventional" explanation for this lack of ⁷B e neutrinos. The sim plest 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 m² sin²2 plane that are viable: (i) \Just-so" with m² 10¹⁰ eV² and sin²2 1¹⁶, (ii) M SW sm all angle with m² 10⁵ eV² and sin²2 10² and (iii) M SW large angle with m² 10⁷ eV² (or m² 10⁵ eV²) and sin²2 1¹⁷. The \just-so" is characterized by strong distortion of ⁸B spectrum and large real-time variation of tux, especially for the ⁷Be line; M SW sm all 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 monitor and reducing the dependence on solar models.

The only way to directly con m the absence of ⁷B e neutrinos is by trying to detect them with a detector with a threshold low enough in energy. One such detector under construction is B orexino, which I describe below ¹⁸.

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. With these features, it is possible to reduce backgrounds to a low enough level to be able to extract a signal from ⁷B e $_{e}^{0}$ 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 mer, funds for the construction of full B orexino have been approved in Italy (INFN), G erm any (DFG) and the U S. (NSF); and construction should begin soon. The B orexino collaboration includes institutions from Italy, G erm any, H ungary, R ussia and the U S.

W ith a FV of 300T, the events rate from ⁷B e ⁰s is about 50 per day with SSM, and if $_{e}^{0}s$ convert completely to (= =) then the rate is reduced by a factor $_{e} = _{ee}$ 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 $1=r^{2}$ e ect to verify the solar origin of the events. If the solution of the solar neutrinos is due to \just so" oscillations with m² 10 ¹⁰ eV², then the event rate from ⁷B e ⁰s shows dram atic variations with periods of m onths.

Borexino has excellent capability to detect low energy ${}_{e}^{0}s$ by the Reines-C owan technique: ${}_{e}+p$! ${}_{e}^{+}+n$; n+p ! ${}_{e}^{+}$ 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 models 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 19 .

3 Three Neutrino Mixing.

In addition to the atm ospheric and solar neutrino anom alies, there is also the LSND observations (as we heard from Dr. K in)²⁰ which require $_{\rm e}$ m ixing with m² 0(1)eV² and sin² 2 (0)(10³). W ith the atm ospheric anom aly requiring m ixing with a m² 5:10 3 eV² and solar neutrinos a m² in the range 10⁵ 10 7 eV² (or 10 10 eV²) for $_{\rm e}$ m ixing; it is clear that one needs 4

neutrino states to m ix in order to account for the three separate $m^{2^{\circ}}s$. There have been two proposals to account for the three e ects with just three avors. One was by A dker and P akvasa²¹ which uses the same $m^2 = 5:10^{-3}$ with large e m ixing to account for both solar and atm ospheric neutrinos; and a sm all m ixing with $(m^2 = 1eV^2)$ to account for the LSND. The other, by C ardall and Fuller²² em ploys a m^2 of $0:3eV^2$ to account for both atm ospheric and LSND with solar neutrinos driven by either MSW $(m^2 = 10^{-5}eV^2 \text{ or })$ just so" $(m^2 = 10^{-10}eV^2)$. At the moment, both of these are disfavored: by the CHOOZ results²³ which saw no e oscillations at a m^2 of $5:10^{-3}eV^2$. It thus seem s inescapable that the three anom alies together require four light neutrino states; and thus at least one sterile neutrino.

4 Conclusion

The only conclusion I can draw is that we have seen possible evidence for neutrino oscillations and within the next 3-4 years, data (from SuperK am iokande, SNO, Borexino; the Long, Short and Interm ediate Baseline E xperim ents, CHOOZ and Palos Verde; LSND and K arm en); will tell us more precisely the param eters of the neutrino m ass m atrix.

A cknow ledgm ents

I thank M anuelD rees and K aonu H agiw ara for the organization, the APCTP and the SeoulNationalUniversity for the hospitality and J.Flanagan, J.G. Learned, and R.S.Raghavan for discussions.

This research was supported in part by the US D epartm ent of Energy G rant No. DE-FG-03-94ER 40833.

References

- 1. C W .K im and A.Pevsner, Neutrinos in Physics and Astrophysics, Harwood, 1994 and references therein.
- 2. M. Koike (These Proceedings), J. Sato (These Proceedings).
- 3. 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).
- 4. K.S.Babu, J.Pati, and F.W ilczek, Phys. Lett. B 359, 351 (1997).
- 5. M. Nakahata (These Proceedings).
- 6. S.K asuga et al, Phys. Lett. B 374, 238 (1996).
- 7. L.Volkova, Phys. Lett. B 316, 178 (1993).
- 8.0.G.Ryazhzkaya, JETP Lett. 61, 237 (1995).

- 9. Kam iokande Collaboration, Y. Fukuda et al., Phys. Lett. B 388, 397 (1996).
- 10. R. Bellottiet al, Phys. Rev. D 53, 35 (1996).
- 11. J.Flanagan, J.G. Learned and S.Pakvasa, (Phys. Rev. D., in press), hep-ph/9709438.
- 12.S.L.G lashow et al, Phys. Rev. D 56, 2433 (1997).
- 13. F.V issani and A.Sm imov, hep-ph/9710565.
- 14. J.G. Learned (private communication).
- 15. Proceedings of Neutrino96; June 1996, Helsinki, ed. J.M alaam piand M. Roos (W orld Scientic) to be published.
- 16. N.Hata and P.Langacker, Phys. Rev. D 56, 6107 (1997), and references therein.
- 17. J.N. Bahcall, Lectures at SLAC Summer Institute on Particle Physics, Aug. 1997 (to be published); hep-ph/9711358.
- 18. C. A presella et al., The Borexino ProposalVol. 1 and 2., ed. G. Bellini and R.S. Raghavan (Univ. of M ilan) 1991; Ultralow backgrounds in a large volum e underground detector; G. A lim onti et al. (Nucl. Inst. and M ethods, in press).
- 19. R S.Raghavan et al. Phys. Rev. D 44, 3786 (1991); R S.Raghavan et al. BellLab Report (to be published).
- 20. H J.K im (these proceedings).
- 21. A.Acker and S.Pakvasa, Phys. Lett. B 397, 209 (1997).
- 22. C.Cardalland G.Fuller, Phys. Rev. D 53, 4421 (1996).
- 23. The CHOOZ Collaboration, M. Apollonio et al., hep-ex/9711002.