

# Neutrino Decay as an Explanation of Atmospheric Neutrino Observations

<sup>1,4</sup>V. Barger, <sup>2</sup>J. G. Learned, <sup>2</sup>S. Pakvasa, and <sup>3</sup>T. J. Weiler

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA,*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA,*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL 60510, USA*

We show that the observed zenith angle dependence of the atmospheric neutrinos can be accounted for by neutrino decay. Furthermore, it is possible to account for all neutrino anomalies with just three flavors.

## I. NEUTRINO DECAY PHENOMENOLOGY

According to the analysis by the Super-Kamiokande (SK) Collaboration [1] of their atmospheric neutrino data, the  $L/E$  dependence of the  $\nu_\mu$  data is well accounted for by  $\nu_\mu$  oscillation into  $\nu_\tau$  (or a sterile neutrino  $\nu_{st}$ ) with a mixing angle  $\sin^2 2\theta \gtrsim 0.8$  and a  $\delta m^2$  in the range  $3 \times 10^{-4} - 8 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ . The  $\nu_\mu$  survival probability in vacuum is given by

$$P_{\mu\mu} = 1 - \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2(\delta m^2 L/4E). \quad (1)$$

According to the data and in this simple two flavor mixing hypothesis, the  $\nu_e$  channel is unaffected and hence the survival probability  $P_{ee} = 1$ . The interpretation of the atmospheric neutrino data in terms of oscillations is an old and venerable proposal [2].

It is obviously an important question to ask whether  $\nu_\mu$  oscillation is the only possible explanation for the observed  $L/E$  dependence. Several other interpretations have been offered [3]. In this Letter we raise another possibility - neutrino decay.

We begin by noting that decay implies a non-zero mass difference between two neutrino states and thus, in general, mixing as well. For definiteness, let us assume the existence of just three light neutrinos, and label as  $\nu_1$ ,  $\nu_2$ , and  $\nu_3$  that mass eigenstate with the largest admixture in the flavor state  $\nu_e$ ,  $\nu_\mu$ , and  $\nu_\tau$ , respectively. We further assume the dominant component of  $\nu_\mu$ , i.e.  $\nu_2$ , to be the only unstable state, with a rest-frame lifetime  $\tau_0$ . There are strong limits coming from the nonobservation of  $\pi$  and  $K$  decay to anomalous final states containing  $e^\pm$ 's on the participation of  $\nu_e$  in non-SM vertices [4]. Consequently,  $\nu_e$  must nearly decouple from the unstable  $\nu_2$  and its decay partner  $\nu_3$ , and we are led to  $\nu_e \approx \nu_1$ , and

$$\nu_\mu \approx \cos \theta \nu_2 + \sin \theta \nu_3, \quad (2)$$

with  $m_2 > m_3$ . From Eq. (2) with an unstable  $\nu_2$ , the  $\nu_\mu$  survival probability is

$$P_{\mu\mu} = \sin^4 \theta + \cos^4 \theta \exp(-\alpha L/E) + 2 \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta \exp(-\alpha L/2E) \cos(\delta m^2 L/2E), \quad (3)$$

where  $\delta m^2 = m_2^2 - m_3^2$  and  $\alpha = m_2/\tau_0$ .

If, as we argue later,  $\delta m^2 > 0.1 \text{ eV}^2$ , then  $\cos(\delta m^2 L/2E)$  effectively averages to zero for atmospheric neutrinos and  $P_{\mu\mu}$  becomes

$$P_{\mu\mu} = \sin^4 \theta + \cos^4 \theta \exp(-\alpha L/E). \quad (4)$$




FIG. 1. The Super-Kamiokande data/expectations as a function of  $L/E$ , for electron events (upper) and muon events (lower). Our model normalized to the electron flux total is shown by the lines, indicating an acceptable fit for decaying muon neutrinos.

We find that it is possible to choose  $\theta$  and  $\alpha$  to provide a good fit to the Super-K  $L/E$  distributions of  $\nu_\mu$  events and  $\nu_\mu/\nu_e$  event ratio. The fit to the  $L/E$  distribution of the  $\nu_\mu$  events is shown in Figure 1, where smearing over  $L$  and  $E$  is included. The best fit values of the two parameters are  $\cos^2 \theta \sim 0.97$  (i.e.  $\theta \sim 10^\circ$ ) and  $\alpha \sim 1 \text{ GeV}/D_E$ , where  $D_E = 12,800 \text{ km}$  is the diameter of the Earth. This best-fit  $\alpha$  value corresponds to a rest-frame  $\nu_2$  lifetime of

$$\tau_0 = m_2/\alpha \sim \frac{m_2}{(1 \text{ eV})} \times 10^{-10} \text{ s} . \quad (5)$$

Such a lifetime and decay length are not in conflict with current limits on non-radiative modes [7]. Previous limits on  $\nu_\mu$  decay lengths from accelerators are only of the order of a few km.

## II. NON-RADIATIVE NEUTRINO-DECAY MODELS

The simplest possibility for fast invisible neutrino decay is to choose  $\nu_2$  and  $\nu_3$  to be Dirac states, with a decay interaction between the right-handed  $SU(2)$ -singlet states given by [5]

$$\mathcal{L}_I = g_{23} \overline{\nu_{3R}^c} \nu_{2R} \chi + \text{h.c.} , \quad (6)$$

where  $\chi$  is a complex scalar field with lepton number  $-2$ ,  $I_W = 0$ , and hypercharge zero.  $\chi$  is not a Nambu-Goldstone boson. The scalar field should be light compared to the neutrino masses.

The quantum numbers of  $\chi$  make it difficult to test its existence in laboratory experiments. Processes such as  $\mu \rightarrow e + X$  are forbidden. Furthermore, neutrino decay is not helicity-suppressed but the interactions of its decay products are: all new processes involving neutrinos are suppressed by the chirality factor  $(m_\nu/E_\nu)^2$ .

A decay model for Majorana neutrinos can also be constructed. The effective decay interaction is

$$\mathcal{L}_I = g_{23} \overline{\nu_{3L}^c} \nu_{2L} J + \text{h.c.} , \quad (7)$$

where  $J$  is a Majoron field [10], which has to be dominantly singlet with only a small triplet admixture, in order to satisfy the constraints from the invisible decay width of  $Z$ . A full model needs further embellishment to generate the above coupling at tree level and generate the desired neutrino masses and mixings. The model described by Acker et al. [11] can be easily adapted to our purpose here.

With the interaction of Eq. (6) or Eq. (7), the rest-frame lifetime of  $\nu_2$  is given by

$$\tau_0 = \frac{16\pi}{g_{23}^2} \frac{m_2^3}{\delta m^2 (m_2 + m_3)^2} , \quad (8)$$

and hence

$$g_{23}^2 \delta m^2 = 16\pi\alpha (1 + m_3/m_2)^{-2} , \quad (9)$$

leading to, for  $0 < m_3/m_2 < 1$ ,

$$g_{23}^2 \delta m^2 \sim (2 - 7) \times 10^{-4} \text{ eV}^2 . \quad (10)$$

From studying  $K$  decays, in particular the modes  $K \rightarrow \mu + \text{neutrals}$ , a bound on the coupling  $g_{23}$  can be derived which is [6]

$$g_{23}^2 < 2.4 \times 10^{-4} , \quad (11)$$

thus leading to a bound on  $\delta m^2$  in the present model of

$$\delta m_{23}^2 \gtrsim 0.73 \text{ eV}^2 . \quad (12)$$

This result justifies the above approximation of large  $\delta m^2$ .

In both the Dirac neutrino and the Majorana neutrino decay models, the small mass scale for the scalar fields seems to require fine-tuning. This is unavoidable, though unappealing. The Dirac and Majorana models are testably different in that in the Dirac-neutrino model the decay is into essentially undetectable final states, whereas the Majorana-neutrino model posits decay of  $\nu_\mu$ 's and  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ 's into  $\bar{\nu}_\tau$ 's and  $\nu_\tau$ 's respectively, which are observable in principle. Furthermore, with the Majorana-neutrino model, lepton number is broken and neutrinoless double-beta decay is allowed; with the Dirac-neutrino model, lepton number is unbroken and neutrinoless double-beta decay is not allowed.

If the decay of the  $\nu_2$  is into a new(sterile) neutrino with which it does not mix, then the  $\delta m^2$  appearing in the oscillation is not restricted by the constraint of Eq. (12) and can be very small. Then the cosine term in Eq. (3) is essentially unity and the survival probability is given by

$$P_{\mu\mu} = [\sin^2 \theta + \cos^2 \theta \exp(-\alpha L/2E)]^2 . \quad (13)$$

In this case, even better fits to the Super-K data can be obtained. However, we do not pursue this class of models further at this time.

## III. INCLUSION OF ALL NEUTRINO ANOMALIES

It is easy to incorporate the solar and LSND neutrino anomalies into the present discussion. The decay of  $\nu_2$  with  $\delta m_{23}^2 \gtrsim 0.73 \text{ eV}^2$  explains the atmospheric data, but also allows  $\delta m_{23}^2$  to accommodate the LSND result. We are free to choose the remaining  $\delta m^2$  to accommodate the solar anomaly. As mentioned earlier,  $U_{e3}$  must be rather small; and hence the solution to the solar  $\nu_e$  depletion is necessarily small-angle mixing enhanced by the MSW effect. To this end, we set  $\delta m_{sun}^2 \equiv \delta m_{31}^2 \sim 0.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$  to complement the  $\delta m_{23}^2$  of Eq. (12).

### Atmospheric $\nu$ 's

With these  $\delta m_{ij}^2$ , the  $\nu_\mu$  survival probability is given by Eq. (4) with  $\cos^2 \theta \equiv |U_{\mu 2}|^2 \sim 0.97$  and  $\sin^2 \theta = 1 - |U_{\mu 2}|^2$ , and the earlier two-flavor discussion and fit remain intact. The survival probability for  $\nu_e$ 's is

$$P_{ee} = (1 - |U_{e2}|^2)^2 + |U_{e2}|^2 e^{-\alpha L/E} + 2|U_{e2}|^2 (1 - |U_{e2}|^2) \cos(\delta m_{32}^2 L/2E) e^{-\alpha L/2E} . \quad (14)$$

If  $U_{e2} \ll 1$ , then  $P_{ee} \approx 1$ , as observed.

### Solar $\nu$ 's

For solar  $L/E$  values, the  $\nu_2$ 's have decayed away and the  $\nu_e$  survival probability is given by

$$P_{ee} = (1 - |U_{e2}|^2)^2 - 4|U_{e1}|^2|U_{e3}|^2 \sin^2 \left( \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right). \quad (15)$$

By choosing  $4|U_{e1}|^2|U_{e3}|^2 \approx 5.5 \times 10^{-3}$ , with  $m_3 > m_1$ , one can reproduce the small-angle MSW solution for solar neutrinos [8]. Furthermore, the resulting value of  $|U_{e3}|^2 \sim 1.4 \times 10^{-3}$  easily satisfies the upper bound on the  $\nu_e$  coupling which is  $g_e^2 = g_{23}^2(|U_{e3}|^2 + |U_{e2}|^2) < 3 \times 10^{-5}$  [4].

### LSND

At the  $L/E$  value relevant to the LSND experiment, the  $\nu_\mu$ - $\nu_e$  conversion probability is given by

$$P_{\mu e} = 4|U_{\mu 2}|^2|U_{e2}|^2 \sin^2 \left( \frac{\delta m_{32}^2 L}{4E} \right). \quad (16)$$

With  $\delta m_{23}^2 \sim \mathcal{O}(1 \text{ eV})^2$  and  $|U_{\mu 2}|^2 \sim 1$ , choosing  $|U_{e2}|^2 \sim 10^{-3}$  allows this  $P_{\mu e}$  to account for the LSND observations [9].

### Summary of Mass and Mixing

To summarize, the three-neutrino mixing matrix with the approximate form

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 0.999 & 0.02 & -0.04 \\ -0.05 & 0.985 & 0.17 \\ \epsilon & -0.17 & 0.985 \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

and mass differences given by

$$\delta m_{21}^2 \approx \delta m_{23}^2 \gtrsim 0.73 \text{ eV}^2, \text{ and } \delta m_{13}^2 \sim 0.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2, \quad (18)$$

along with an unstable  $\nu_2$  satisfying the lifetime constraint of Eq. (5), explain all three neutrino anomalies without violating any known data. The very small entry,  $\epsilon$  in Eq. (17), is fixed by unitarity of the mixing matrix.

### Big Bang Nucleosynthesis

A neutrino with lifetime as short as the one discussed here decays before the primordial neutrinos decouple (about 2 MeV). Then the decay products would also achieve thermal equilibrium, increasing the effective number of neutrino species  $N_\nu$  to nearly 5, and would be in conflict with the bound on light degrees of freedom which is generally considered to be about 3.5 [12] or even lower [13]. Given all the uncertainties, more cautious and conservative estimates [14] lead to upper bounds on  $N_\nu$  in the range of 4 to 5. Furthermore, the bound is modified if there is lepton number asymmetry present [15]. Hence, although this may be a potential problem, we do not regard it as fatal.

### Supernova Emission

The decay of  $\nu_\mu$  at the fast rate envisaged here will certainly modify supernova dynamics, since the decay will occur inside the core. In the Dirac case, the sterile decay products will carry away energy on a very short time scale and this probably conflicts with the observed period of a few seconds of the SN1987A neutrino burst. In the Majorana case, the decay products are not sterile and this problem does not arise, and the effects on dynamics should be much milder. It is not clear what is “the precise range of parameters that can be ruled out or ruled in by the SN1987A signal” [16].

### Cosmic $\nu$ Fluxes

In neutrinos coming from distant sources, such as Supernovae, AGN's, and GRB's, the  $\nu_\mu$  ( $\approx \nu_2$ )'s have decayed away and only  $\nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e, \nu_\tau$  and  $\bar{\nu}_\tau$  will arrive at the Earth. Existing neutrino telescopes, as well as those under construction, will not observe the tiny component ( $\sim \sin^4 \theta \sim 10^{-3}$ ) of surviving  $\nu_\mu$ 's (apart from atmospheric ones).

### Future Tests

There are several opportunities to test the neutrino decay hypothesis decisively. One is that the Super-Kamiokande collaboration, with sufficient data, can distinguish between the two  $L/E$  distributions: the oscillatory one as given in Eq. (1) and the decaying one as given in Eq. (4). A second is that in the upcoming  $\mu$ 's in Super-K (which come from  $\nu_\mu$ 's of average energy around 100 GeV) the decay should have very little effect due to the long lab-frame lifetime of the  $\nu_2$  and the zenith angle distribution of events should be undistorted. For the same reason, partially contained  $\mu$ 's should show some up-down asymmetry but less pronounced than for the fully-contained events.

A third opportunity exists with future long-baseline experiments [17]. Expectations are quite different with the neutrino decay interpretation of Super-K results, compared to the oscillation interpretation. In the  $\nu_\mu$  decay scenario the typical  $\nu_\mu$  survival probability is 94%, the  $\nu_\mu$ - $\nu_\tau$  conversion probability is about 6%, and the  $\nu_\mu$ - $\nu_e$  conversion probability about 0.2%. (There is, in the Majorana model, a further small  $\nu_\tau$  flux from the decay products; however their energies are much lower than the parent  $\nu_\mu$ 's due to the backward-peaked nature of the decay.)

### Conclusion

We have presented a neutrino decay scenario capable of explaining the atmospheric neutrino data. Furthermore, it enables us to explain all neutrino anomalies with just three neutrino flavors. The scenario violates no available data, and is economical in that only a single physics parameter ( $\alpha = m_2/\tau_0$ ) is added beyond those of the usual oscillation phenomenology. The decay possibility can be checked in future Super-K data as well as in forthcoming long-baseline experiments and neutrino telescopes.

### Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Graciela Gelmini, Jim Pantaleone and participants of the Trieste Relic Neutrino Workshop (September 16-19, 1998) for clarifying and stimulating discussions. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy and in part by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation.

---

- [1] Y. Fukuda et al., the Super-Kamiokande Collaboration, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1562 (1998).
- [2] V. Barger and K. Whisnant, *Phys. Lett.* **209B**, 365 (1988); J.G. Learned, S. Pakvasa, and T.J. Weiler, *ibid.* **207B**, 79 (1988); K. Hidaka, M. Honda, and S. Midorikawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1537 (1988).
- [3] E. Ma and P. Roy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4637 (1998); Y. Grossman and M. P. Worah, hep-ph/9807511; G. Brooijmans, hep-ph/9808498; M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia et al., hep-ph/9809531.
- [4] D. L. Britton et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D49**, 28 (1994).
- [5] A. Acker, S. Pakvasa, and J. Pantaleone, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, R1 (1992).
- [6] V. Barger, W.-Y. Keung, and S. Pakvasa, *Phys. Rev.* **D25**, 907 (1982).
- [7] Particle Data Group, C. Caso et al., *Eur. Phys. J.* **C3**, 1 (1998).
- [8] J.N. Bahcall, P. Krastev, and A. Smirnov, hep-ph/9807216; N. Hata and P. Langacker, *Phys. Rev.* **D56**, 6107 (1997).
- [9] C. Athanassopoulos et al. (LSND Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1774 (1998); *ibid.* **77**, 3082 (1996); *Phys. Rev.* **C54**, 2685 (1996).
- [10] G. Gelmini and M. Roncadelli, *Phys. Lett.* **B99**, 411 (1981); Y. Chicashige, R. N. Mohapatra and R. Peccei, *Phys. Lett.* **B98**, 1980.
- [11] A. Acker, A. Joshipura, and S. Pakvasa, *Phys. Lett.* **B285**, 371 (1992); G. Gelmini and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Lett.* **B142**, 181 (1984); K. Choi and A. Santamaria, *Phys. Lett.* **B267**, 504 (1991); A. S. Joshipura, PRL Report-PRL-TH-91/6; A. S. Joshipura and S. Rindani, *Phys. Rev.* **D46**, 3000 (1992).
- [12] T. P. Walker et al., *Ap. J.* **376**, 71 (1991).
- [13] G. Steigman, astro-ph/9803055.
- [14] S. Sarkar, hep-ph/9710273; P.J. Kernan and S. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev.* **D54**, R3681 (1996); C.J. Copi, D.N. Schramm, and M.S. Turner, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 3389 (1997); B.D. Fields et al., *New Astron.* **1**, 77 (1996); K.A. Olive and D. Thomas, *Astropart. Phys.* **7**, 27 (1997).
- [15] N. F. Bell, R. R. Volkas and Y. Y. W. Wong, hep-ph/9809363 and references therein.
- [16] G. G. Raffelt, *Stars as Laboratories for Fundamental Physics*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, (1996) p. 564.
- [17] For World Wide Web links to these long-baseline and other proposed neutrino oscillation experiments, see the Neutrino Oscillation industry web page at