Astro 596/496 NPA Lecture 29 April 10, 2019

Announcements:

1

- Problem Set 5 due Friday
- Office hours after class today

Event Horizon Telescope has imaged M87 black hole!

- shadow detected, and asymmetric ring
- direct confirmation of black hole event horizon
- \bullet asymmetry \rightarrow doppler boost of accretion disk \rightarrow spin direction
- $M = (6.5 \pm 0.2_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.7_{\text{sys}}) \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ agrees with stellar dynamics
- Illinois a key player! Prof. Charles Gammie led simulation effort with grad students Ben Ryan, George Wong, Ben Prather
- Gammie Astronomy Colloquium: April 30 arrive early!
- party like it's 1999! this doesn't happen every day!

Last Time: The Case of the Missing Neutrinos

more on neutrino physics: neutral vs charged current interactions *Q: what's that? differences? similarities?*

solar neutrino problems Q: what are they? what do they suggest? why was SNO crucial?

solar neutrino solution: new neutrino physics *Q: what's the basic idea?*

Neutral vs Charged Current



that is: W couples ν_e and e, ν_μ and μ , etc.

Neutrino Oscillations in Vacuum: The Quantum Neutrino

If neutrinos have nonzero mass

• family status $(e, \mu, \tau$ "flavor"), and

• mass

4

can be **distinct**!

 ν family \rightarrow lepton number conservation in Weak interactions formally, νs couple to Weak interaction as

flavor eigenstates

flavor basis vectors $|\nu_{\alpha}\rangle$, $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$

free (vacuum) neutrino \rightarrow propagates as mass eigenstate

mass basis vectors $|j\rangle$, j = 1, 2, 3

Neutrino Oscillations: Spin-1/2 Analogy

consider a *beam of electrons*, with spin s = 1/2: 2 states

create with *spin up* $s_z = +1/2$ wavefunction $|\text{init}\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle$

propagate through magnetic field in x axis spin rotated an angle θ with respect to z

observe with detector aligned in zmeasure wavefunction $|obs\rangle$ spin-up and spin-down components i.e., $\langle \uparrow |obs\rangle$ and $\langle \downarrow |obs\rangle$ infer probability $P(\theta) = P(\uparrow_{init}, \uparrow_{obs})_{\theta} = \|\langle \uparrow |obs\rangle\|^2$ of observing in spin-up state

С

Q: what is $P(\theta = 0)$? $P(\theta = \pi)$? $P(\theta = \pi/2)$? $P(\theta)$? *Q*: what's going on physically when P < 1?

Spin-1/2 Analogy

for 2-state system like spin- $\frac{1}{2}$: two eigenstates

in z basis: $s_z = \pm 1/2$ eigentstates are

$$|\uparrow\rangle = \psi_{\uparrow} = \begin{pmatrix} 1\\0 \end{pmatrix} , |\downarrow\rangle = \psi_{\downarrow} = \begin{pmatrix} 0\\1 \end{pmatrix}$$
 (1)

in this basis, the x-axis $s_x = \pm 1/2$ eigent states are

$$| \rightarrow \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad , \quad |\leftarrow\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$

but these also form a perfectly valid basis

n lesson: eigenstates of one basis are linear combo of other basis

Basis Transformation: Flavor/Weak \leftrightarrow Mass/Vacuum

neutrino mass eigenstate \neq flavor eigenstate

either basis a valid description of ν state

physical situation selects most natural choice:

- ν production/detection: Weak interaction \rightarrow flavor basis
- ν propagation in vacuum \rightarrow mass basis

Q: what does this mean for solar neutrinos?

Neutrino Flavor Change

Key idea:

- neutrinos *born* in Weak interactions
 - \rightarrow *created* as *Weak* eigenstates
- *propagate* as *vacuum* eigenstates
- then *detected* in *Weak* interactions

Evolution of wavefunction during propagation *changes probability* of remaining a ν_e state

If mass eigenstates have definite p and thus $E_j = \sqrt{p^2 + m_j^2}$ (as in vacuum), then Schrödinger:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt}|\nu_{\text{mass}}\rangle_j = H_{\text{vacuum}}|\nu_{\text{mass}}\rangle_j = E_j|\nu_{\text{mass}}\rangle_j$$
 (2)

and so

 ∞

$$|\nu_{\text{mass}}(t)\rangle_j = e^{-iE_jt/\hbar} |\nu_{\text{mass}}(0)\rangle_j$$
 (3)

Two flavors: allow 2 flavors (*e* and *x*) to mix write $|f\rangle = U_{\text{Vac}}|m\rangle$, where

$$U_{\mathsf{V}} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_{\mathsf{V}} & \sin \theta_{\mathsf{V}} \\ -\sin \theta_{\mathsf{V}} & \cos \theta_{\mathsf{V}} \end{pmatrix}$$
(4)

with vacuum mixing angle $heta_V \in (0,\pi/4)$ (" u_e mostly u_1 ")

$$|\nu_e(t)\rangle = e^{-iE_1t/\hbar}\cos\theta_V|1\rangle + e^{-iE_2t/\hbar}\sin\theta_V|2\rangle$$
(5)

where E_1 , E_2 have same momentum p

Solar neutrinos start (t = 0) as pure ν_e QM **amplitude** at t to *remain* ν_e :

$$\langle \nu_e(0) | \nu_e(t) \rangle = e^{-iE_1 t/\hbar} \cos \theta_V^2 + e^{-iE_2 t/\hbar} \sin \theta_V^2 \tag{6}$$

 \Rightarrow probability to remain ν_e :

$$|\langle \nu_e(0)|\nu_e(t)\rangle|^2 = 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_V \sin^2 \left[1/2 \ \frac{(E_2 - E_1)t}{\hbar}\right]$$

9

Since
$$m(\nu_i) \ll p$$
, $E_j = \sqrt{p^2 + m_j^2} \simeq p + m_j^2/2p$, and
 $E_2 - E_1 \simeq \frac{m_2^2 - m_1^2}{2E} = \frac{\pm \Delta m^2}{2E}$
(7)
 $\Delta m^2 = |m_2^2 - m_1^2| > 0$
 $E = \text{avg energy.}$

In time t go distance
$$L \simeq ct$$

$$P(\nu_e^{\text{birth}} \rightarrow \nu_e^{\text{detect}}) = |\langle \nu_e(0) | \nu_e(t) \rangle|^2$$

$$= 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_V \sin^2 \left(\pi \frac{L}{L_V}\right) \qquad (8)$$

$$= 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_V \sin^2 \left[1.27 \frac{\Delta m^2 (\text{eV}^2) L(\text{km})}{E(\text{GeV})}\right]$$

5 where $L_V = 4\pi \hbar E / \Delta m^2$ "vacuum oscillation length"

$$P(\nu_e^{\text{birth}} \rightarrow \nu_e^{\text{detect}}) = |\langle \nu_e(0) | \nu_e(t) \rangle|^2 = 1 - \frac{\sin^2 2\theta_V}{\sin^2 \left(\frac{\pi L}{L_V}\right)}$$

Minimum mass sensitivity: $\pi L/L_V = \pi/2$ If $L_V \ll 1$ AU: wash out differences among species If $L_V \simeq 1$ AU: solve solar ν problem!

$$\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-12} \text{ eV}^2 \left(\frac{E}{10 \text{ MeV}}\right) \tag{9}$$

solves solar ν problem, but dubious

Q: why?

 \Rightarrow "just-so" solution

also note: if Δm^2 larger, $L_V \ll 1 A U$

$$\Rightarrow |\langle \nu_e(0) | \nu_e(t) \rangle|^2 \simeq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 2\theta \ge \frac{1}{2}$$
(10)

11

but we need suppression > 50%! can't do this with vacuum oscillations!

Neutrino Oscillations in Matter MSW = Mikheyev, Smirnov, Wolfenstein

 ν s pass thru matter twice (in Sun, in Earth) all ν types can have NC interactions but ν_e have extra CC interactions ($\nu e \rightarrow \nu e$) selectively modifies ν_e flux

 $\nu_e \text{ potential in matter: } V_e(r) = \sqrt{2} G_F n_e(r)$ put $\langle \nu_e(0) | \nu_e(t) \rangle = c_e(t)$, similar $c_x(t)$ Schrödinger equation + algebra:

 $i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} c_e \\ c_x \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{4E} \begin{pmatrix} -\Delta m^2 \cos 2\theta_V + 2\sqrt{2} G_F n_e E \\ \Delta m^2 \sin 2\theta_V \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta m^2 \sin 2\theta_V \\ \Delta m^2 \cos 2\theta_V - 2\sqrt{2} G_F n_e E \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_e \\ c_x \end{pmatrix}$ $Q: \text{ evolution as } n_e \to \infty? \quad n_e \to 0?$ Q: condition for maximal mixing? $Q: \text{ so how will } \nu \text{ states evolve when propagating from solar core}?$

maximal mixing ("resonance") when diagonal elements zero: $\rightarrow 2\sqrt{2} EG_{F}n_{e} = \Delta m^{2} \cos 2\theta_{V}$: density-dependent!

$$m_u n_e^{\text{crit}} = \frac{m_u \Delta m^2 \cos 2\theta_V}{2\sqrt{2}G_F E}$$
$$= 66 \text{ g cm}^{-2} \cos 2\theta_V \left(\frac{E}{10 \text{ MeV}}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Delta m^2}{10^{-4} \text{ eV}^2}\right)$$

Can happen in Sun! No fine tuning needed!

- start as ν_e , in dense region where $n_e > n_e^{\text{crit}}$ neutrinos leave, seeing a dropping electron density
- reach $n_e = n_e^{\text{crit}} \rightarrow change to \nu_x$
- continue to Earth works for range of Δm^2 Q: how?
- $\stackrel{i}{\omega}$ But note energy dependence:

Q: what energies, ν populations, experience MSW?

Solar Neutrino Solutions

Using all solar ν data, most favored solution:

Implications

14

• "large mixing angle" (LMA)

Q: what angle gives maximal vacuum mixing? ...hint:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_{\mathsf{V}} & \sin\theta_{\mathsf{V}} \\ -\sin\theta_{\mathsf{V}} & \cos\theta_{\mathsf{V}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

• $\Delta m^2 = |m_2^2 - m_1^2|$ does *not* give either m_1 or m_2 but does set *minimum* mass for either: $m_{\nu,\min} = \sqrt{\Delta m^2} = 8 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}$

Q: how to test this solution in the lab?

Laboratory test: KamLAND

(Kamiokande Liquid Scintillator Anti-Neutrino Detector) sources: anti-neutrinos from Japanese nuke reactors

• $E_{\nu} = 2.6 - 8 \text{ MeV}$

<mark>1</mark>5

- \bullet avg distance $R\sim 180~{\rm km}$
- \rightarrow if LMA, disappearance probability is

$$P_{\rm dis} = \sin^2 2\theta_{\rm V} \, \sin^2 \left(2\pi \frac{R}{350 \,\rm km} \right) \tag{11}$$

Kamland observes flux reduction: $P_{dis} = 0.66$ E_{ν} spectrum $\rightarrow \Delta m^2 = 7.9^{+0.6}_{-0.5} \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ \rightarrow confirms oscillations in general, and LMA in particular! www: KamLAND plots

Solar Neutrino Problem Solved!

Q: remaining questions? experiments?

Next Step: Precision Neutrino Astronomy

- measure monoenergetic ⁷Be neutrinos now detected in real-time! flux consistent with MSW LMA www: Borexino
- measure pp flux to $\sim 1\% \Rightarrow$ better θ_V www: Stanford Lab

New questions:

What are ν masses?

oscillations only measure splittings Δm^2

 \rightarrow know masses are *different* and *nonzero*

but don't even know hierarchy: is $m_1 < m_2$ or the reverse?

16

Is ν_i identical to $\bar{\nu}_i$?

yes: "Majorana" neutrinos no: "Dirac" neutrinos, right-hand ν exist can test with "neutrinoless double beta decay" (rare nuclear decays, only go if Majorana)

Do neutrinos violate CP?

if so: maybe important in baryogenesis...

"leptogenesis" scenario: generate net *lepton* number, then translate this to net baryon number



Three-Flavor Mixing

Full neutrino description has three flavor states and thus three mass states

(P)MNS=Pontecorvo, Maki, Nakagawa, Sakata matrix

$$|\nu_{\text{flavor}}\rangle_{i\in e,\mu,\tau} = \sum_{j=1,2,3} U_{ij} |\nu_{\text{mass}}\rangle_j$$
 (12)

$$|\nu_{\text{mass}}\rangle_{i\in 1,2,3} = \sum_{j=e,\mu,\tau} U_{ij}^{\dagger} |\nu_{\text{flavor}}\rangle_j$$
 (13)

U is time-indep, unitary: $U^{-1}=U^{\dagger};\;U^{\dagger}U=UU^{\dagger}=1$

19