

# Searching for Pseudo-Dirac neutrinos from Astrophysical sources in IceCube data

Khushboo Dixit,<sup>1,\*</sup> Luis Salvador Miranda,<sup>2,†</sup> and Soebur Razzaque<sup>1,3,4,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Centre for Astro-Particle Physics (CAPP) and Department of Physics,  
University of Johannesburg, PO Box 524, Auckland Park 2006, South Africa*

<sup>2</sup>*Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo (USP)  
Av. Trabalhador São Carlense 400, São Carlos, São Paulo, Brazil*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*National Institute for Theoretical and Computational Sciences (NITheCS), Private Bag X1, Matieland, South Africa*

(Dated: June 24, 2024)

We analyze IceCube public data from its IC86 configuration, namely PSTRacks event selection, to search for pseudo-Dirac signatures in high-energy neutrinos from astrophysical sources. Neutrino flux from astrophysical sources is reduced in the pseudo-Dirac scenario due to conversion of active-to-sterile neutrinos as compared to the neutrino oscillation scenario of only three active neutrinos over astrophysical distances. We fit IceCube data using astrophysical flux models for three point-like sources in both scenarios and constrain the active-sterile mass-square-difference in the absence of any evidence for pseudo-Dirac scenario. We find that a common mass-squared-difference  $\delta m^2$  for all three flavors can be constrained as  $\delta m^2 \lesssim 2.2 \times 10^{-19} \text{ eV}^2$  for the source NGC 1068,  $\delta m^2 \lesssim 1.2 \times 10^{-20} \text{ eV}^2$  for the source TXS 0506+056, and  $\delta m^2 \lesssim 1.5 \times 10^{-21} \text{ eV}^2$  for the source PKS 1424+240 at 90% C.L. A stacking analysis gives a constraint on  $\delta m^2 \lesssim 1.5 \times 10^{-21} \text{ eV}^2$  at 90% CL which is dominated by the constraint obtained from PKS 1424+240.

## I. Introduction

The observation of high-energy neutrinos by IceCube from the direction of the gamma-ray blazar TXS 0506+056 in coincident with a flaring event [1] provided the first hint of astrophysical origin of high-energy neutrinos. This hint was further strengthened by the detection of a neutrino flare from the direction of TXS 0506+056 prior to the flare detected in electromagnetic wavebands in coincident with a neutrino event [2]. More recently, IceCube has established NGC 1068, an active galactic nuclei (AGN), to be a persistent source of high-energy neutrinos [3]. In fact it was pointed out early on [4] that NGC 1068 is in correlation with an ultrahigh cosmic-ray event detected by the Pierre Auger Observatory and a very high-energy neutrino event detected by IceCube. Further time-integrated analysis of 10-year data, from 2008 to 2018, by IceCube Collaboration where it released its search results with aggregated neutrino emission observation from a list of 110 gamma-ray sources during this period [5]. This excess of neutrino events is cognate mainly to four sources: NGC 1068, TXS 0506+056, PKS 1424+240, and GB6 J1542+6129, where the results show inconsistency with the background-only hypothesis in the Northern Hemisphere at the  $3.3\sigma$  level.

The observations of such persistent high energy astrophysical neutrino sources can act as natural neutrino beams and provide an opportunity to explore the presence of new physics effects in the neutrino sector. The flavor oscillation probabilities get averaged out over its frequency terms driven by the atmospheric and solar

mass-squared differences associated to the mass eigenstates of active neutrinos propagating over astrophysical distances. However, the advantage of observing possible effects of comparatively tiny mass-squared differences induced by some new physics effects can be observed in the neutrino fluxes from astrophysical sources. One such possibility is the pseudo-Dirac nature of neutrinos. In this scenario, neutrinos still exhibit the characteristics of a Dirac particle, while having tiny Majorana mass as well. This is also known as the soft lepton number violating case as the small Majorana mass induces very small but nonzero lepton-number violation. It makes this scenario interesting to explore as it can shed some light on the nature of neutrino mass. The details of the quasi-Majorana mass scheme have been delineated with details in [6–12].

The pseudo-Dirac scenario speculates the existence of extra sterile mass eigenstates along with the active ones. However, due to the small Majorana masses, there is a minor splitting between the active and sterile states, which is negligible in general but can be observed efficiently if the travel distance of neutrinos is significantly large and/or neutrinos have very small energy. So far, the constraints on the active-sterile mass splitting have been obtained as  $\lesssim 10^{-4} \text{ eV}^2$  from atmospheric [13],  $\lesssim 10^{-11} \text{ eV}^2$  from solar [14, 15] and  $\lesssim 10^{-20} \text{ eV}^2$  from supernovae neutrinos [16, 17]. Moreover, some weaker constraints are also available from the LHC data [18].

A favorable situation to probe pseudo-Dirac neutrinos can be provided by astrophysical neutrinos where neutrinos travel the distance up to 100s to 1000s of Mpc. In some previous works, constraint on the tiny mass splitting driving the active-sterile neutrino oscillations has been obtained in case of high energy astrophysical neutrinos such as, using the IceCube data regarding the NGC 1068 source [19]. At the same time, a more detailed analysis was done in terms of the sensitivity of the IceCube

\* kdixit@uj.ac.za

† smiranda@ifsc.usp.br

‡ srazzaque@uj.ac.za

data from PKS 1424+240 and TXS 0506+056 sources along with NGC 1068 for this scenario in Ref. [20].

In this work, we use the IceCube public data from its IC86 configuration, which is named as PSTRacks event selection and put constraint on the active-sterile mass squared difference from individual sources: NGC 1068, PKS 1424+240 and TXS 0506+056. Also, we perform a stacking analysis and provide the constraint on the same parameters. We have generalized this analysis by keeping the spectral index for the source flux and source event counts as free parameters while fitting data both in the standard oscillation scenario and in the pseudo-Dirac case. Also, we provide our results for different energy ranges considered for the neutrino data. In Sec. II, we discuss the phenomena of pseudo-Dirac neutrino oscillations and provide the expressions for survival and transition probabilities.

In Sec. III A we discuss the details of IceCube PSTRack data selection and source properties in Sec. III B, followed by the astrophysical neutrino fluxes observed on the earth in Section. III C. Then we provide the statistical methodology for data analysis used to obtain the constraints on active-sterile mass splitting in Sec. IV. Finally, we present our results in Sec. V, and discuss our results and conclude in Sec. VI.

## II. Pseudo-Dirac scenario

The phenomena of neutrino oscillations indicate that neutrinos are not massless. Since then it has induced immense interest to find out the mechanism to produce neutrino masses. One way to explain neutrino masses is to extend the Standard Model (SM) to include three additional sterile neutrinos where at least two of them have

nonzero Majorana masses. In this scenario, the mass matrix takes the form as follows

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_L & M_D^T \\ M_D & M_R^* \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where  $M_D$ ,  $M_L$  and  $M_R$  are the Dirac, the left-handed Majorana and right-handed Majorana mass terms, respectively, in terms of  $3 \times 3$  matrices for three generations. The Dirac masses are consequences of the so-called Yukawa couplings, while on the other hand, the nonzero Majorana masses induce lepton number violation. An intermediate case of soft Lepton number violation is also possible with a very small value of Majorana mass term compared to the Dirac mass, *i.e.*,  $M_{L,R} \ll M_D$ . In this case, the given mass matrix can be diagonalized using a  $6 \times 6$  block-diagonal unitary matrix that consists of the traditional PMNS matrix and a  $3 \times 3$  mixing matrix associated with the right-handed (sterile) neutrinos. This scenario is known as pseudo-Dirac or quasi-Dirac neutrinos [10, 12]. The mixing between active-sterile pairs associated to each flavor is almost maximum due to very small Majorana mass terms. Hence, each neutrino flavor state becomes the superposition of active and sterile states as given below

$$\nu_{\alpha L} = U_{\alpha j} \frac{(\nu_j^+ + i\nu_j^-)}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\nu_j^\pm$  are mass eigenstates associated with the flavor states with corresponding masses  $m_{j,\pm}^2 = m_j^2 \pm \delta m_j^2$ , where  $\delta m_j^2$  is the mass-squared difference between the active states with mass  $m_{ja}$  and the sterile states with mass  $m_{js}$ . In the case of zero  $\delta m_j^2$ ,  $m_j^2$  represent masses associated with the active mass eigenstates. The mixing matrix for such active-sterile mixing for three flavor oscillation scenario can be expressed as [10]

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} U_{\text{PMNS}} & 0 \\ 0 & U_{\text{R}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\phi_1} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\phi_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\phi_2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\phi_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\phi_3} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\phi_3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

and the Hamiltonian in mass basis is given as

$$M = \text{diag}(m_{1a}, m_{2a}, m_{3a}, m_{1s}, m_{2s}, m_{3s}).$$

In Eq. (3),  $U_{\text{R}}$  is the  $3 \times 3$  unitary matrix driving mixing between the sterile states. Interestingly, the active flavor transition probabilities do not depend on the elements of  $U_{\text{R}}$ .

The survival and transition probabilities of active flavors propagating over astrophysical distances in the

pseudo-Dirac scenario take the forms as following [10, 21]

$$P_{\alpha\alpha} = \sum_{i=1,2,3} |U_{\alpha i}|^4 \cos^2 \left( \frac{\delta m_i^2 L}{4E_\nu} \right),$$

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i=1,2,3} |U_{\alpha i}|^2 |U_{\beta i}|^2 \cos^2 \left( \frac{\delta m_i^2 L}{4E_\nu} \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$ . Note that  $P_{\alpha\alpha}$  and  $P_{\alpha\beta}$  reduce to




FIG. 1: Variation of oscillation probabilities for the three active neutrinos in the pseudo-Dirac scenario with respect to the  $\delta m_i^2$  for  $E_\nu = 1$  TeV, in the context of NGC 1068 (upper), PKS 1424+240 (middle) and TXS 0506+056 (lower). We considered here  $\delta m_1^2 = \delta m_2^2 = \delta m_3^2 = \delta m^2$ . Different curves represent different survival and transition probabilities. The corresponding SM probabilities are shown as the black lines, e.g.,  $P_{ee}^{\text{SM}}$  is shown as the black solid line.

the SM case for  $\delta m_i^2 = 0$ . Note also that in the special case when  $\delta m_1^2 = \delta m_2^2 = \delta m_3^2 = \delta m^2$ , the transition probabilities for pseudo-Dirac neutrinos in Eq. (4) take the form

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = P_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{SM}} \cos^2 \left( \frac{\delta m^2 L}{4E} \right), \quad (5)$$

where  $P_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{SM}} = \sum_{i=1,2,3} |U_{\alpha i}|^2 |U_{\beta i}|^2$  represent the flavor transition probabilities for the standard case of Dirac




FIG. 2: Oscillation probabilities for the three active neutrinos in the pseudo-Dirac scenario with respect to the neutrino energy  $E_\nu$  for NGC 1068 (upper), PKS 1424+240 (middle) and TXS 0506+056 (lower) for different  $\delta m^2$  values.

neutrinos which is averaged over astrophysical distances. The probabilities in Eq. (4) are plotted with respect to the mass squared difference  $\delta m_i^2 \equiv \delta m^2$ , are shown in Fig. 1 for the distance of the sources NGC 1068 (left), PKS 1424+240 (middle) and TXS 0506+056 (right). Here, sensitivity to the smallest values of  $\delta m^2$  can be seen for PKS 1424+240 that can be attributed to the longest distance observed of this source among all three mentioned sources here. Moreover, the variation of these flavor transition probabilities can also be seen in Fig. 2 for different sources and corresponding  $\delta m^2$  values of different orders of magnitudes. It can be seen that the effects

of these tiny  $\delta m_i^2$  values are significant at lower neutrino energy ranges.

### III. Astrophysical neutrino data and sources

#### A. IceCube PSTRacks data

The IceCube Collaboration in 2018 released a public data set of neutrino track events from its 40-string configuration (IC40) starting from 2008 throughout the full 86-string configuration (IC86). This event selection is called PSTRacks v3 and it provides an invaluable opportunity to implement correlation studies with the Galactic and extragalactic sources, due to a very good angular resolution of the data [22, 23]. The public data set contains one-year of data for each of the configurations IC40, IC59 and IC79 and seven years of data of the IC86 configuration. The data release also includes files of binned instrument response functions and effective areas.

In order to perform a consistent analysis we decided to use the track neutrino events from the IC86 configuration only. Northern and Southern hemispheres are split at  $-5$  degrees in declination, and for values larger than 81 degrees studies are not reliable. Therefore we limit this study to the declination range  $[-5^\circ, 81^\circ]$ , containing a total of 601,163 muon neutrino or track events collected over seven years in the IC86 configuration.

#### B. Astrophysical neutrino sources

In its analysis of ten years data, the IceCube Collaboration has found four significant point sources in the sky [5]. These neutrino sources are aligned with known astrophysical objects as listed in Table I below. The coordinates of the sources were obtained from the NED<sup>1</sup>. There are two possible redshift values for PKS 1424+240,  $z = 0.16$  [24] and 0.604 [25, 26]. There is no consensus on the redshift of GB6 J1542+6129. Based on the spectroscopy of gamma-ray BL lac sample, its redshift is in the range of 0.34-1.76 [27, 28]. As a result, we have ignored this source in our analysis. We calculate the comoving distance for  $H_0 = 69.6 \text{ km sec}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ ,  $\Omega_M = 0.286$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.714$  using Ref. [29].

#### C. Source neutrino flux

In our analysis we consider pion-decay scenario, which are produced via  $pp$  and/or  $p\gamma$  interactions, for neutrino

production:  $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu \rightarrow e^+ \nu_e \bar{\nu}_\mu \nu_\mu$  for the initial neutrino fluxes. The ratio of  $\nu_\mu$  to  $\nu_e$  fluxes and of  $\nu_\mu$  to  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  fluxes can be estimated using the decay properties of  $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$  and  $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu_e \bar{\nu}_\mu \nu_\mu$ , as well as on the spectrum of the primary protons [30, 31]. For a primary proton spectrum  $dN/dE \propto E^{-p}$ , the initial neutrino fluxes also follow power laws and are approximately,

$$\Phi_{\nu_\mu}^0 \approx \Phi_{\bar{\nu}_\mu}^0 \approx \Phi_{\nu_e}^0 = \Phi^0 \left( \frac{E_\nu}{\text{TeV}} \right)^{-\gamma}, \quad (6)$$

where we have assumed simple power-law fluxes. These ratios remains approximately the same in case of no significant energy losses by pions and muons before decaying [32]. Hence, we use the source flux of  $\nu_\mu$  or  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  as

$$\Phi_{\nu_\mu}^{\text{src}} = x P_{ee} \Phi_{\nu_e}^0 + (1-x) P_{e\mu} \phi_{\nu_\mu}^0, \quad (7)$$

after neutrino propagation through space and Earth, where  $x = 1/3$ .

### IV. Data analysis

We calculate the number of neutrino events both from the astrophysical point sources and from the backgrounds in this section and perform statistical analysis to constrain the model parameters, including the mass-squared-difference  $\delta m_i^2$  between the active and sterile neutrinos in the pseudo-Dirac scenario of neutrinos.

#### A. Signal and background events

We calculate the number of signal  $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$  events from an astrophysical source in an energy bin  $E_k - E_{k+1}$  over the detector lifetime  $T$ , using the source flux in Eqs. (6) and (7) as

$$n_{s,k} = T \int d\Omega \int_{E_k}^{E_{k+1}} dE_\nu A_\nu^{\text{eff}}(E_\nu, \Omega) \times \left[ \phi_{\nu_\mu}^{\text{src}}(E_\nu; \delta m^2, \phi^0, \gamma) + \phi_{\bar{\nu}_\mu}^{\text{src}}(E_\nu; \delta m^2, \phi^0, \gamma) \right] \quad (8)$$

where  $A_\nu^{\text{eff}}$  is the neutrino effective area of the detector. We calculate the background events from the atmospheric and from a diffuse astrophysical flux as,

$$n_{b,k} = T \int d\Omega \int_{E_k}^{E_{k+1}} dE_\nu A_\nu^{\text{eff}}(E_\nu, \Omega) \times \left[ \phi_{\nu_\mu}^{\text{atm}}(E_\nu, \Omega) + \phi_{\nu_\mu}^{\text{ast}}(E_\nu, \Omega) \right] + \text{antineutrino events.} \quad (9)$$

We use the conventional atmospheric neutrino fluxes from the Honda et al. model [33] and the prompt atmospheric neutrino flux component from the Enberg &

<sup>1</sup> The NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED) is funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and operated by the California Institute of Technology.

TABLE I: List of highest-significance point sources in 2008-2018 IceCube data release [5] along with their positions in the sky and distance.

Name	RA (Deg)	Dec (Deg)	Redshift	Distance (Mpc)
NGC 1068	40.669629	-0.013281	0.00379	16.3
TXS 0506+056	77.358185	5.693148	0.3365	1450.43
PKS 1424+240	216.751632	23.8	0.16 (0.604)	689.65 (2603.45)
GB6 J1542+6129	235.737265	61.498707	0.34-1.76	1465.52-4896.5

Reno model [34]. For the diffuse astrophysical neutrino background, we use a power-law of the form

$$\phi_{\nu\mu}^{\text{ast}} = \phi_{\text{ast}} \left( \frac{E_\nu}{100 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{-\gamma_{\text{ast}}}, \quad (10)$$

with  $\phi_{\text{ast}} = 1.44 \times 10^{-18} \text{ GeV}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1}$  and  $\gamma_{\text{ast}} = 2.28$  from [35] kept fixed. We use an energy resolution given by  $\log_{10}(\Delta E/E) = 0.1$  and angular resolution given by the neutrino angular errors given in the PSTRacks data. We considered in this work different ranges of energy to perform the analysis. The results presented here are for 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV energy range. We also provide the results for 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV range in the Appendix. The results from both these energy-ranges are also summarized in Table II.

## B. Likelihood analysis

Following Braun et al. [36] we use a likelihood method to analyze the PSTRacks data for point sources. We calculate the probability density  $P_j(E_j|\phi^{\text{src}})$  for a neutrino with energy  $E_j$  from an astrophysical point source with flux  $\phi^{\text{src}}$  as

$$P(E_j|\phi^{\text{src}}) = \frac{\sum_k M(E_j, E_k^*) n_{s,k}}{\sum_k n_{s,k}}. \quad (11)$$

Here  $n_{s,k}$  is the signal event number calculated using Eq. (8) for the energy interval  $E_k \leq E_\nu \leq E_{k+1}$ , and  $M(E_j, E_k^*)$  is an energy migration matrix to obtain a muon with energy  $E_k \leq E_\mu \leq E_{k+1}$  represented by  $E_k^*$ , from a neutrino with energy  $E_j$ , provided by the IceCube Collaboration as part of the instrument response function [22, 23]. Finally, after introducing Eq. (11) with a Gaussian spatial probability density profile, we can write a source probability density for the  $j$ -th neutrino event as

$$\mathcal{S}_j(\vec{x}_j, \vec{x}_s, E_j, \phi^{\text{src}}) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma_j^2} e^{-\frac{|\vec{x}_j - \vec{x}_s|^2}{2\sigma_j^2}} P(E_j|\phi^{\text{src}}). \quad (12)$$

Here  $\vec{x}_s$  is a unit vector to the direction of the point source, while  $\vec{x}_j$  is that of the  $j$ -th neutrino arrival direction. These unit vectors can be written in terms of Right Ascension ( $\varphi$ ) and Declination ( $\delta$ ) as

$$\vec{x} = (\sin \delta \cos \varphi, \sin \delta \sin \varphi, \cos \delta)^t.$$

The term  $\sigma_j$  in Eq. (12) is the angular error associated with the  $j$ -th neutrino event.

Similarly, we calculate the background probability density for the  $j$ -th  $\nu$  event as

$$\mathcal{B}_j = \frac{P(E_j|\phi^{\text{atm}} + \phi^{\text{ast}})}{\Delta\Omega_s}, \quad (13)$$

where we assume that the background events are uniformly distributed within a solid angle  $\Delta\Omega_s$  around the source direction  $\vec{x}_s$  in the sky. The solid angle is a square of side  $12^\circ$  centered at a particular source. We calculate  $P(E_j|\phi^{\text{atm}} + \phi^{\text{ast}})$  in the same way as equation (11) but by replacing the source flux with the background fluxes to calculate the background events  $n_{b,k}$ . Finally, for a total of  $N$  neutrino events within  $\Delta\Omega_s$ , we compute a likelihood function as

$$\mathcal{L}(\vec{x}_s; \theta) = \prod_{j=1}^N \left[ \frac{n_s}{N} \mathcal{S}_j + \left( 1 - \frac{n_s}{N} \right) \mathcal{B}_j \right], \quad (14)$$

where  $\theta = \{n_s, \gamma, \delta m^2\}$  is the set of free parameters that we vary to maximize  $\log \mathcal{L}$ . Note that, for the parameter set  $\theta = \{n_s, \gamma, \delta m^2 = 0\}$ , the pseudo-Dirac scenario is converted to the conventional 3- $\nu$  oscillation scenario. We define a test statistic based on the likelihood ratio test as

$$\text{TS} = -2 \left[ \log \mathcal{L}(\vec{x}_s; 0) - \log \mathcal{L}(\vec{x}_s; \hat{\theta}) \right], \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(\vec{x}_s; 0)$  correspond to the null hypothesis of no signal event, i.e.,  $n_s = 0$  and  $\hat{\theta}$  corresponds to the set of parameters for which  $\log \mathcal{L}(\vec{x}_s; \theta)$  is the maximum. To distinguish between the SM and pseudo-Dirac scenarios and to constrain  $\delta m^2$  we use the difference between the  $TS$  values for the two cases as

$$\Delta \text{TS} = \text{TS}^{\text{SM}} - \text{TS}^{\text{pD}}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\text{TS}^{\text{SM}}$  correspond to  $\delta m^2 = 0$ .  $\Delta \text{TS}$  is expected to be distributed as a  $\chi^2$  with one degree of freedom.

## V. Results

In this section, we discuss our results based on the approach defined for the statistical analysis in the previous section. In Fig. 3, the TS defined in Eq. (15) is scanned over the parameters  $n_s$  and  $\gamma$  and subtracted from the TS for the best-fit values  $\hat{n}_s$  and  $\hat{\gamma}$ , and is projected in the  $(\gamma - n_s)$ -plane both in the case of standard (upper




FIG. 3: Contour plots of the TS scanned over the parameter  $n_s$  and  $\gamma$  and subtracted from the maximum TS obtained for their best fit values  $\hat{n}_s$  and  $\hat{\gamma}$ , have been projected in the  $\gamma$ - $n_s$  plane for both  $\delta m^2 = 0$  (SM) and for a nonzero  $\delta m^2$  value for the first three sources in Table I. The best fit point in each case is represented with ‘x’ and the allowed regions with 68% and 95% C.L. are shown as solid and dashed curves, respectively. The energy-range for IceCube is considered to be 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV.

panels) and pseudo-Dirac neutrinos (lower panels) in the context of three sources with the best fit points (black ‘x’) and the corresponding 68% and 95% significance regions. It can be seen that the presence of non-zero  $\delta m^2$  parameter significantly affects the best fit values of the spectral index as well as the number of events. In general the number of signal events  $n_s$  decreases in the pseudo-Dirac scenario as active neutrinos are converted into sterile neutrinos. In the standard scenario, the best fit parameter values are  $\hat{n}_s \approx 72, 43$  and  $22$ ; and  $\hat{\gamma} \approx 3.1, 3.7$  and  $2.4$ , respectively for NGC 1068, PKS 1424+240 and TXS 0506+056. These values are shifted to  $\hat{n}_s \approx 62, 27$  and  $11$ ; and  $\hat{\gamma} \approx 2.9, 2.9, 1.85$  for the same order of sources in the pseudo-Dirac scenario for the particular  $\delta m^2$  values chosen here. We can notice here that the spectral index shifts to lower values, *i.e.*, the spectrum gets harder for non-zero value of  $\delta m^2$ . This can be attributed to the fact that in the pseudo-Dirac scenario, fast oscillations at lower energies are averaged out to a lower value compared to the standard oscillations. This results in a change in the flux reaching the earth, see e.g., Fig. 1 in Ref. [19], which is in general lower in normalization and harder in index compared to the standard case. The event distribution changes are discussed in more details later on and relevant plots are shown in the appendix.

In the left panel of Fig. 4, variation of the number of events is shown as a function of  $\delta m^2$  for the three sources considered. The solid blue, red and green curves exhibit the best-fit values for NGC 1068, PKS 1424+240 and TXS 0506+056 with corresponding  $1\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$  regions in

darker and lighter shades, respectively, of gray color.

To constrain the  $\delta m^2$  parameter, we obtained Fig. 4 right panel using  $\Delta TS$  defined in Eq. (16). The blue (dotted), red (dashed) and green (dot-dashed) curves represent the case of NGC 1068, PKS 1424+240 and TXS 0506+056, respectively. The black curve represents the stacking analysis combining the data from all these three sources. The 90%, 95% and 99% C.L. are shown as solid, dashed and dot-dashed curves, respectively, in gray color. For PKS 1424+240, there are two possible redshift values,  $z = 0.604$  and  $z = 0.16$ . Hence, we incorporated the analysis for this source for both the redshifts. The results are shown in red dashed (for  $z = 0.604$ ) and red dotted (for  $z = 0.16$ ) curves, we call these analysis-I and analysis-II, respectively. Moreover, the stacking analysis is also shown as black solid (analysis-I) and black dotted (analysis-II) curves for given two values of the redshift for PKS 1424+240. During this analysis we also kept the number of signal events  $n_s$  and spectral index  $\gamma$  as free parameter. The constraints we have obtained on  $\delta m^2$  for different sources and from stacking analyses are reported in Table II for both the 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV and 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV energy ranges. Since, different sources are sensitive to distinct ranges of magnitude of  $\delta m^2$ , the dominance of PKS 1424+240 can be seen in the stacking analysis which provides the tightest constraint on the pseudo-Dirac parameter among all three sources. Note, however, that these constraints apply only in limited  $\delta m^2$  range as there is no difference between the standard and pseudo-Dirac scenarios below certain  $\delta m^2$  values [19, 20].




FIG. 4: The results of the statistical analysis are presented in this figure. In the left panel, the number of events with respect to  $\delta m^2$  are shown for all three sources. The best fit curve is given as solid blue (NGC 1068), red (PKS 1424+240) and green (TXS 0506+056), along with their  $1\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$  regions in dark and light gray shades, respectively. In the right panel, the curves representing  $\Delta TS$  vs.  $\delta m^2$  are shown. We have provided the constraints on  $\delta m^2$  parameter at 90%, 95% and 99% C.L. from different sources individually with blue-dotted (NGC 1068), red-dotted (PKS 1424+240 I), red-dashed (PKS 1424+240 II) and green-dot-dashed (TXS 0506+056) curves. Results from the stacking analysis are represented as black-dotted (includes PKS 1424+240 I) and black-solid (includes PKS 1424+240 II) curves, for the two redshift values of PKS 1424+240. For this analysis we considered the neutrino energy range as 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV.

These values can be roughly estimated from the probabilities such as those plotted in Fig. 1 for different energies and are listed in Table II.

In Fig. 5 and 6, given in the appendix, event distribution is provided for all three sources for SM scenario ( $\delta m^2 = 0$ , black-solid line) and for pseudo-Dirac scenario with two different non-zero values of  $\delta m^2$  corresponding to 90% and 95% C.L. as red-dashed and blue-dotted curves, respectively. There is a change in the event distribution for  $\delta m^2 \neq 0$ , as the oscillation in the pseudo-Dirac scenario change the flux reaching the earth. This change affect both the normalization and spectral shape, in general making the index harder as discussed previously. As a result, the event distribution changes, resulting in fewer events at lower energies and more events at higher energies compared to the standard oscillation scenario.

The results discussed so far are regarding the 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV range considered for IceCube data, while we have also performed the same analysis for 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV range. The results are summarized in Table II, also the event distribution for both energy ranges are given in the appendix. Contour plots as well as the  $\Delta TS$  vs.  $\delta m^2$  and  $n_s$  (number of events) vs.  $\delta m^2$  for 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV are also provided in the appendix as Fig. 7 and Fig. 8, respectively.

## VI. Discussion and Conclusions

In this work, we have searched for pseudo-Dirac neutrinos from the most significant three astrophysical point sources in the PStTrack events coming from the IC86 configuration of IceCube. We have fitted these data in the direction of the high energy neutrino sources NGC 1068, PKS 1424+240 and TXS 0506+056 in the standard

three-neutrino oscillation scenario and found good agreement with IceCube Collaboration's published results for NGC 1068 [3]. In the standard case, our results, especially values for the best-fit index  $\hat{\gamma}$ , agree with those found in Ref. [20] for all three sources. We found that our likelihood fits do not improve for any of the three sources in the pseudo-Dirac scenario. Hence, we opted for constraining the active-sterile mass splitting  $\delta m^2$ , which we have assumed equal for all three neutrino generations.

Given varied distances, each source is sensitive above a particular value of  $\delta m^2$ , below which no constraint can be imposed as there is no difference between the standard and pseudo-Dirac scenarios. These values are reported in Table II and are in general agreement with the sensitivity limits mentioned in Ref. [20]. Therefore, our constraints on  $\delta m^2$  apply above these values and are reported in Table II at 90% C.L. In the case of NGC 1068, we have found that  $\delta m^2 \lesssim 2.2 \times 10^{-19} \text{ eV}^2$  ( $1.0 \times 10^{-19} \text{ eV}^2$ ) at 90% C.L. for our analysis in the 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV (0.1 TeV - 1 PeV) energy range. This constraint is stronger than the one obtained in Ref. [19], which kept the power-law index of the source flux fixed. Furthermore, only  $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$  source flux and the corresponding survival probability  $P_{\mu\mu}$  was used in that analysis. Whereas, we have considered physically motivated pion-decay fluxes of  $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$  and  $\nu_e + \bar{\nu}_e$  with corresponding probabilities  $P_{\mu\mu}$  and  $P_{e\mu}$ . The most stringent constraint we found is for PKS 1424+240 where  $\delta m^2 \lesssim 1.5 \times 10^{-21} \text{ eV}^2$  ( $6.0 \times 10^{-21} \text{ eV}^2$ ) at 90% C.L. for  $z = 0.64$  (0.16) and for our analysis in the 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV energy range. The constraint is more stringent if considering 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV energy range. Finally, we found that the constraint on  $\delta m^2$  from stacking analysis is dominated by PKS 1424+240 thus resulting in similar constraints as obtained for this source.

In conclusion, the sensitivity to pseudo-Dirac scenario

TABLE II: Results of the analysis performed for all three sources, as well as for the stacking analysis are given in terms of constraints of  $\delta m^2$  with 90% CL and  $\gamma$  with  $1\sigma$  error.

Name	0.5 TeV - 1 PeV			0.1 TeV - 1 PeV		
	$\delta m^2$ (eV <sup>2</sup> ) sensitivity limit	$\delta m^2$ (eV <sup>2</sup> ) 90% CL	$\hat{\gamma}_{SM}$ ( $\pm 1\sigma$ )	$\delta m^2$ (eV <sup>2</sup> ) sensitivity limit	$\delta m^2$ (eV <sup>2</sup> ) 90% CL	$\hat{\gamma}_{SM}$ ( $\pm 1\sigma$ )
NGC 1068	$9 \times 10^{-20}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-19}$	$3.1^{+0.4}_{-0.2}$	$2 \times 10^{-20}$	$1 \times 10^{-19}$	$2.9^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$
TXS 0506+056	$9 \times 10^{-22}$	$1.2 \times 10^{-20}$	$2.4^{+0.2}_{-0.4}$	$2 \times 10^{-22}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-20}$	$2.3^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$
PKS 1424+240 (I)	$5 \times 10^{-22}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-21}$	$3.7^{+1.6}_{-0.7}$	$1 \times 10^{-22}$	$5 \times 10^{-22}$	$3.2^{+0.6}_{-0.4}$
PKS 1424+240 (II)	$2 \times 10^{-21}$	$6 \times 10^{-21}$	$3.7^{+1.6}_{-0.7}$	$4 \times 10^{-22}$	$3 \times 10^{-21}$	$3.2^{+0.6}_{-0.4}$
Stacking (I)	$5 \times 10^{-22}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-21}$	—	$1 \times 10^{-22}$	$5 \times 10^{-22}$	—
Stacking (II)	$2 \times 10^{-21}$	$5 \times 10^{-21}$	—	$4 \times 10^{-22}$	$2.5 \times 10^{-21}$	—

for astrophysical sources arises because of a change in the spectral features of the neutrino flux arriving at the earth compared to the standard oscillation. We have not found these signatures of active-sterile neutrino oscillations in the pseudo-Dirac scenario from our analysis of public data release by IceCube. We have independently found constraints on the active-sterile mass-squared-difference  $\delta m^2 \lesssim (1.5 - 5.0) \times 10^{-21} \text{ eV}^2$  at 90% C.L. from a stacking analysis of three astrophysical neutrino sources. This constraint depends on the energy range for analysis, however. Identification of more sources in future may improve this bound further.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Carlos A. Argüelles and P. S. Bhupal Dev for useful discussion. This work was partially supported by grants from the National Research Foundation (NRF), South Africa, through the National Institute of Theoretical and Computational Sciences (NITheCS) and from the University of Johannesburg Research Council.

- 
- [1] M.G. Aartsen, et al., *Science* **361**(6398), eaat1378 (2018). doi:10.1126/science.aat1378
- [2] M.G. Aartsen, et al., *Science* **361**(6398), 147 (2018). doi:10.1126/science.aat2890
- [3] R. Abbasi, et al., *Science* **378**(6619), 538 (2022). doi:10.1126/science.abg3395
- [4] R. Moharana, S. Razzaque, *JCAP* **08**, 014 (2015). doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2015/08/014
- [5] R. Abbasi, et al., *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **920**(2), L45 (2021). doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac2c7b
- [6] L. Wolfenstein, *Nucl. Phys. B* **186**, 147 (1981). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90096-1
- [7] S.T. Petcov, *Phys. Lett. B* **110**, 245 (1982). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(82)91246-1
- [8] S.M. Bilenky, S.T. Petcov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **59**, 671 (1987). doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.59.671. [Erratum: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 61, 169 (1989), Erratum: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 60, 575–575 (1988)]
- [9] A.S. Jshipura, S.D. Rindani, *Phys. Lett. B* **494**, 114 (2000). doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(00)01148-5
- [10] M. Kobayashi, C.S. Lim, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 013003 (2001). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.013003
- [11] A. de Gouvea, W.C. Huang, J. Jenkins, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 073007 (2009). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.073007. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.80.073007>
- [12] G. Anamiati, R.M. Fonseca, M. Hirsch, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 095008 (2018). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.095008. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.095008>
- [13] J.F. Beacom, N.F. Bell, D. Hooper, J.G. Learned, S. Pakvasa, T.J. Weiler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 011101 (2004). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.011101
- [14] A. de Gouvea, W.C. Huang, J. Jenkins, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 073007 (2009). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.073007
- [15] S. Ansarifard, Y. Farzan, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**(7), 075029 (2023). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.075029
- [16] A. De Gouvêa, I. Martínez-Soler, Y.F. Perez-Gonzalez, M. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 123012 (2020). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.123012
- [17] I. Martínez-Soler, Y.F. Perez-Gonzalez, M. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**(9), 095019 (2022). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.095019
- [18] A. Das, P.S. Bhupal Dev, N. Okada, *Phys. Lett. B* **735**, 364 (2014). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.06.058
- [19] T. Rink, M. Sen, *Phys. Lett. B* **851**, 138558 (2024). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2024.138558
- [20] K. Carloni, I. Martínez-Soler, C.A. Argüelles, K.S. Babu, P.S.B. Dev, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L051702 (2024). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.L051702
- [21] A. Esmaili and Y. Farzan, *JCAP* **12** (2012), 014 doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2012/12/014 [arXiv:1208.6012 [hep-ph]].
- [22] R. Abbasi, et al., (2021). doi:10.21234/CPKQ-K003
- [23] M.G. Aartsen, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**(5), 051103 (2020). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.051103
- [24] J. Aleksic, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **729**, 115 (2011). doi:10.1088/0004-637X/729/2/115
- [25] A. Furniss, D.A. Williams, C. Danforth, M. Fumagalli, J.X. Prochaska, J. Primack, C.M. Urry, J. Stocke, A.V.

- Filippenko, W. Neely, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **768**, L31 (2013). doi:10.1088/2041-8205/768/2/L31
- [26] S. Paiano, M. Landoni, R. Falomo, A. Treves, R. Scarpa, C. Righi, *Astrophys. J.* **837**(2), 144 (2017). doi:10.3847/1538-4357/837/2/144
- [27] M.S. Shaw, R.W. Romani, G. Cotter, S.E. Healey, P.F. Michelson, A.C.S. Readhead, J.L. Richards, W. Max-Moerbeck, O.G. King, W.J. Potter, *Astrophys. J.* **764**, 135 (2013). doi:10.1088/0004-637X/764/2/135
- [28] P. Padovani, B. Boccardi, R. Falomo, P. Giommi, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **511**(4), 4697 (2022). doi:10.1093/mnras/stac376
- [29] E.L. Wright, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **118**, 1711 (2006). doi:10.1086/510102
- [30] P. Lipari, *Astropart. Phys.* **1**, 195 (1993). doi:10.1016/0927-6505(93)90022-6
- [31] S. Razzaque, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**(10), 103003 (2013). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.103003
- [32] J.P. Rachen, P. Meszaros, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 123005 (1998). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.58.123005
- [33] M. Honda, M. Sajjad Athar, T. Kajita, K. Kasahara, S. Midorikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**(2), 023004 (2015). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.023004
- [34] R. Enberg, M.H. Reno, I. Sarcevic, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 043005 (2008). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.043005
- [35] J. Stettner, *PoS ICRC2019*, 1017 (2020). doi:10.22323/1.358.1017
- [36] J. Braun, J. Dumm, F. De Palma, C. Finley, A. Karle, T. Montaruli, *Astropart. Phys.* **29**, 299 (2008). doi:10.1016/j.astropartphys.2008.02.007

## A. Appendix

Here, the event distribution plots for two energy ranges of 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV and 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV are provided. Also, the contour plots, showing the TS values in the  $(\gamma - n_s)$ -plane just as in Fig. 3 are given. The results in terms of number of events Vs.  $\delta m^2$  and  $\Delta TS$  Vs.  $\delta m^2$  are also presented for 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV energy range.




FIG. 5: These event distributions are generated for the energy-range 0.5 TeV - 1 PeV for all the sources. The  $\hat{\gamma}$  obtained for these fits are 3.0 (3.0) for NGC 1068, 2.0 (1.8) for TXS 0506+056, 3.3 (3.1) for PKS 1424+240 (I) and PKS 1424+240 (II) with 90% (95%) CL. The  $\gamma_{SM}$  corresponding to the SM scenario are provided in Table II.




FIG. 6: Same as Fig. 5 for 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV energy range. The  $\hat{\gamma}$  obtained are 2.8 (2.6) for NGC 1068, 2.0 (1.8) for TXS 0506+056, 3.0 (2.7) for PKS 1424+240 (I) and 2.9 (2.8) for PKS 1424+240 (II) with 90% (95%) CL.




FIG. 7: 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV: Same as Fig. 3.




FIG. 8: 0.1 TeV - 1 PeV: Same as Fig. 4