Solar Neutrinos II: New Physics

- Helioseismology
- Matter-enhanced neutrino oscillations
- SNO and Super-Kamiokande

Wick Haxton, UC Berkeley and LBL

SSI 2010, August 2-10

Cl/Ga/Kamioka measured the three major solar ν fluxes and found they were difficult to reconcile with the SSM



• Under the assumption that the experiments were measuring EC line sources and continuous β -decay sources with allowed shapes

$$\phi(pp) \sim 9.9\phi^{\text{SSM}}(pp)$$
$$\phi(^{7}\text{Be}) \sim 0$$
$$\phi(^{8}\text{B}) \sim 0.43\phi^{\text{SSM}}(^{8}\text{B})$$

• Steady-state models where the fluxes are largely controlled by the average temperature of the core cannot produce this pattern



so the pattern is contradictory

In parallel, a second precise probe of the solar interior was being developed: helioseismology, the measurement and analysis of Doppler shifts of photospheric absorption lines. Amplitudes \sim 30m and velocities \sim 0.1m/s.



Turbulence within Sun's convective zone acts as a random driver of sound waves propagating through the gas

Specific frequencies are enhanced as standing waves -- normal modes whose frequencies depend on solar physics

n=14 l=20 m=16 p-mode (acoustic)

How does this probe the SSM? For a spherical star

$$p(r), \ \rho(r), \ T(r), \ s(r), \ \phi_{\text{gravity}}(r), \ \epsilon_{\text{nuclear energy}}(r)$$

Introduce adiabatic indices describing power-law behavior of p,T with ρ

$$\Gamma_1 \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \log \rho}\right)_s \qquad \Gamma_3 - 1 \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \log T}{\partial \log \rho}\right)_s$$

Define a total derivative

$$\frac{D}{Dt} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \vec{v} \cdot \vec{\nabla}$$

Write down the equations for

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{motion:} & \rho \frac{D \vec{v}}{D t} = - \vec{\nabla} p - \rho \vec{\nabla} \phi & \text{continuity:} & \frac{D \rho}{D t} + \rho \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v} = 0 \\ \text{gravitational potential:} & \vec{\nabla}^2 \phi = 4 \pi G \rho \\ \text{energy conservation:} & \frac{1}{p} \frac{D p}{D t} - \Gamma_1 \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{D \rho}{D t} = \frac{\Gamma_3 - 1}{p} (\rho \epsilon - \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{F}) \\ \text{(internal energy corrected for any work done due to volume change)} \\ \text{where } \vec{F} \text{ is the energy flux.} & \text{Static interior solution} \Rightarrow \text{SSM} \end{array}$$

Now look for a variation around the SSM solution

 $\rho(\vec{r},t) = \rho_0(r) + \rho'(\vec{r},t)$ where displacements are small, $\delta(\vec{r})$, $v = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\delta(\vec{r})$

• Plug into the stellar evolution equations (see Balantekin, WH nucl-th9903038)

♦ try normal mode solution $\rho'(\vec{r},t) \sim \rho'(r)Y_{lm}(\theta,\phi)e^{-i\omega t}$

 \diamondsuit introduce the adiabatic sound speed c, $p=\frac{1}{\Gamma_{\rm 1}}\rho c^2$

 \diamondsuit and the field $~\Psi(r)=c^2\sqrt{\rho}~\vec{\nabla}\cdot\delta\vec{r}$

and one finds that the equations reduce to a Schroedinger-like form

$$\frac{d^2\Psi(r)}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{c^2} \left[\omega^2 - \omega_{co}^2 - \frac{l(l+1)c^2}{r^2} \left(1 - \frac{N^2}{\omega^2} \right) \right] \Psi(r) \sim 0$$

$$\omega^2_{\text{eff}} > 0 \text{ propagating} \qquad \omega^2_{\text{eff}} < 0 \text{ damped}$$
an eigenvalue problem, governed by two frequencies
the bouyancy frequency
$$N(r) = \sqrt{\frac{Gm(r)}{r} \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma_1} \frac{d\log p}{dr} - \frac{d\log \rho}{dr} \right)}$$
vanishes in the convective zone, ~constant in radiative zone
acoustic cutoff frequency
$$\omega_{co} = \frac{c}{2H} \sqrt{1 - 2\frac{dH}{dr}} \text{ where } H^{-1} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{d\rho}{dr}$$
propagating modes are those where one does not "see" a
change in the density over a wavelength
p-modes: surface modes, $N = 0$, $\omega > \omega_{co}$, $\omega > \frac{l(l+1)c^2}{r^2}$

different modes propagate to different depths depending on I

the turning-point defined by

$$\frac{\omega^2 - \omega_{\rm co}^2}{l(l+1)} = \frac{c(r)^2}{r^2}$$

so large-l acoustic modes (p-modes) less penetrating



similar arguments for the gravity modes, those that propagate in the radiative zone, controlled by the bouyancy frequency ($\omega < N$ guarantees propagation at sufficiently small r): difficult to see, because the surface is in the forbidden region

sound speed c(r) derived from mode inversion, compared to SSM



Bahcall: agreement at 0.2% over 80% of Sun a more severe test than the Vs

The neutrino flux discrepancy -- the fact it was not compatible with any adjustment of T in steady-state solar models --combined with the SSM success in helioseismology made a "new-physics" solution more credible

Another development that changed viewpoints was a theoretical step, the recognition that solar matter could enhance v oscillations

Vacuum flavor oscillations: mass and weak eigenstates



Noncoincident bases \Rightarrow oscillations down stream:

 $|v_e\rangle = \cos \theta |\nu_L\rangle + \sin \theta |\nu_H\rangle$ $|v_{\mu}\rangle = -\sin \theta |\nu_L\rangle + \cos \theta |\nu_H\rangle$

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu_e^k \rangle &= |\nu^k (x = 0, t = 0) \rangle \quad E^2 = k^2 + m_i^2 \\ |\nu^k (x \sim ct, t) \rangle &= e^{ikx} \left[e^{-iE_L t} \cos \theta |\nu_L \rangle + e^{-iE_H t} \sin \theta |\nu_H \rangle \right] \\ < \nu_\mu |\nu^k (t) \rangle |^2 &= \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \left(\frac{\delta m^2}{4E} t \right), \quad \delta m^2 = m_H^2 - m_L^2 \end{aligned}$$

 v_{μ} appearance downstream \Leftrightarrow vacuum oscillations (some cheating here: wave packets) Can slightly generalize this

 $|\nu(0)\rangle \rightarrow a_e(0)|\nu_e\rangle + a_\mu(0)|\nu_\mu\rangle$

yielding

$$i\frac{d}{dx}\left(\begin{array}{c}a_e(x)\\a_\mu(x)\end{array}\right) = \frac{1}{4E}\left(\begin{array}{cc}-\delta m^2\cos 2\theta & \delta m^2\sin 2\theta\\\delta m^2\sin 2\theta & \delta m^2\cos 2\theta\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}a_e(x)\\a_\mu(x)\end{array}\right)$$
vacuum m_v² matrix

solar matter generates a flavor asymmetry



- modifies forward scattering amplitude
- explicitly dependent on solar electron density
- makes the electron neutrino heavier at high density

 $m_{\nu_e}^2 = 4E\sqrt{2}G_F \ \rho_e(x)$

inserting this into mass matrix generates the 2-flavor MSW equation

$$i\frac{d}{dx}\left(\begin{array}{c}a_{e}(x)\\a_{\mu}(x)\end{array}\right) = \frac{1}{4E}\left(\begin{array}{c}-\delta m^{2}\cos 2\theta + 4E\sqrt{2}G_{F}\rho_{e}(x)&\delta m^{2}\sin 2\theta\\\delta m^{2}\sin 2\theta&\delta m^{2}\cos 2\theta\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}a_{e}(x)\\a_{\mu}(x)\end{array}\right)$$
or equivalently
$$i\frac{d}{dx}\left(\begin{array}{c}a_{e}(x)\\a_{\mu}(x)\end{array}\right) = \frac{1}{4E}\left(\begin{array}{c}-\delta m^{2}\cos 2\theta + 2E\sqrt{2}G_{F}\rho_{e}(x)&\delta m^{2}\sin 2\theta\\\delta m^{2}\sin 2\theta&-2E\sqrt{2}G_{F}\rho_{e}(x)+\delta m^{2}\cos 2\theta\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}a_{e}(x)\\a_{\mu}(x)\end{array}\right)$$

the m_v^2 matrix's diagonal elements vanish at a critical density

$$\rho_c: \quad \delta m^2 \cos 2\theta \equiv 2E\sqrt{2}G_F \rho_c$$

Alternately this in terms of local mass eigenstates

$$|\nu(x)\rangle = a_H(x)|\nu_H(x)\rangle + a_L(x)|\nu_L(x)\rangle$$
$$i\frac{d}{dx}\begin{pmatrix}a_H(x)\\a_L(x)\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{4E}\begin{bmatrix}m_H^2(x) & i\alpha(x)\\-i\alpha(x) & m_L^2(x)\end{bmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}a_H(x)\\a_L(x)\end{pmatrix}$$

observe:

- mass splittings small at ρc: avoided level crossing
- $\nu_H(x) \sim \nu_e$ at high density
- if vacuum θ small, $\nu_H(0) \sim \nu_\mu$ in vacuum

thus there is a local mixing angle $\theta(x)$ that rotates from $\sim \pi/2 \rightarrow \theta_v$ as $\rho_e(x)$ goes from $\infty \rightarrow 0$



- it must be that $\alpha(x) \sim \frac{d
 ho}{dx}$
- if derivative gentle (change in density small over one local oscillation length) we can ignore: matrix then diagonal, easy to integrate

$$\Rightarrow P^{adiabatic}_{\nu_e} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\cos 2\theta_v \cos 2\theta_i \to 0 \text{ if } \theta_v \sim 0, \theta_i \sim \pi/2$$

- most adiabatic behavior is near the crossing point: small splitting \Rightarrow large local oscillation length \Rightarrow can "see" density gradient
- derivative at ρ_c governs nonadiabatic behavior (Landau Zener)

$$P_{\nu_e}^{LZ} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\cos 2\theta_v \cos 2\theta_i (1 - 2P_{hop})$$

so
$$\rightarrow 1$$
 if $\theta_v \sim 0, \theta_i \sim \pi/2, P_{hop} \sim 1$



$$P_{hop}^{linear} = e^{-\pi\gamma_c/2} \qquad \gamma_c = \frac{\sin^2 2\theta}{\cos 2\theta} \frac{\delta m^2}{2E} \frac{1}{\left|\frac{1}{\rho_c} \frac{d\rho}{dx}\right|}$$

 $\Upsilon_c >> I \Leftrightarrow$ adiabatic, so strong flavor conversion

 $\Upsilon_c << I \Leftrightarrow$ nonadiabatic, little flavor conversion

so two conditions for strong flavor conversion: sufficient density to create a level crossing adiabatic crossing of that critical density

MSW mechanism is about passing through a level crossing



Mathematica HW problem

a) vacuum oscillations θ =15° R from -20 to +20 R in units of $\frac{4E\cos 2\theta}{\delta m^2 \sin^2 2\theta}$

b) matter oscillations

add
$$\rho_e(R) \propto 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan aR$$

normalize so that crossing occurs at R = 0

note $\rho_e(R) \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$

So ν_e is produced as a heavy eigenstate, then propagates toward the vacuum, where it is the light eigenstate







Small angle solution





distinctive energy-dependent suppression



Neutrino oscillations had been one of the early suggestions for solving the solar neutrino puzzle (Pontecorvo) -but the apparent need for nearly complete mixing of three neutrino species to produce the needed factorof-three reduction in the CI counting rate seemed a stretch. The known quark mixing angles are small.

The MSW mechanism provided a means for suppressing the flux even if the mixing angle were small;

and the energy-dependent reductions that the data seemed to demand.



By the mid-1980s planning was underway for two next-generation experiments to resolve the solar neutrino puzzle, Super-Kamiokande and SNO

Saturday, July 31, 2010



SK increase in fiducial volume (from 0.68 to 22 ktons) provided the potential to see spectrum distortions or day-night matter effects -- reconstructed from spectrum of scattered electrons in $\nu_e(\nu_x) + e \rightarrow \nu'_e(\nu'_x) + e'$



SKI (1996 \rightarrow), SKII (2002 \rightarrow), SKIII (2006 \rightarrow), SKIV (2008 \rightarrow) $\phi(^{8}B) = [2.38 \pm 0.05(\text{stat})^{+0.16}_{-0.15}(\text{sys})] \cdot 10^{6} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ SKII $\delta(\text{day/night}) = -6.3 \pm 4.2(\text{stat}) \pm 3.7(\text{sys})\%$





Ratio of SKII observed to SSM energy spectrum. Purple: $I\sigma$ level of energy-correlated systematic errors.

Low-energy turnup predicted is potentially a 10% effect, detectable with proper attention to energycorrelated systematic errors, and with a reduced threshold

Phase	Energy response	Energy threshold
SK-I	6p.e./MeV	5.0MeV
SK-II	3p.e./MeV	7.0MeV
SK-III	6p.e./MeV	5.0MeV →4.5MeV
SK-IV	6p.e./MeV	4.0MeV

H.Sekiya, Jul 30th 2008, Philadelphia, ICHEP2008 ⁵

Sudbury Neutrino Observatory

- Suggested by Herb Chen in mid-1980s: replacement of the ordinary water in a Cerenkov detector with heavy water
- Provides three complementary detection channels

reaction detected 1) $\nu_x + e \rightarrow \nu'_x + e'$ scattered electron 2) $\nu_e + D \rightarrow p + p + e'$ produced electron 3) $\nu_x + D \rightarrow p + n + \nu'_x$ produced neutron

- I) isolated from the forward-peaking of the scattering: energy shared among outgoing leptons -- sensitive to $\nu_e s$, reduced sensitive to $\nu_{\mu,\tau} s$
- 2) detected by the scattered electron, hard spectrum with $E_e \sim E_{\nu} 1.44 \text{ MeV}$, as GT strength concentrated near threshold; angular distribution $1 1/3 \cos \theta$; only sensitive to $\nu_e s$

3) detected by capture of the produce neutron: total cross section measured; sensitive equal to νs of any flavor

- Detection of electrons weakly correlated with direction, and especial of neutrons, placed exception requirements on background reduction
 - cavity at exceptional depth of 2 kilometers to reduce muons
 - construction under cleanroom conditions: tiny quantities of dust in 12-story cavity would have produced neutrons above the expected solar rate, 8/day
- Experiment proceeded in three phases, depending on the neutral current detection scheme
 - ♦ capture on deuterium d(n, γ) producing a 6.25 MeV γ ♦ capture on 2 tons of dissolved salt:
 - $^{35}\mathrm{Cl}(n,\gamma)$ 8.6 MeV energy release Phase II \diamond capture in ³He proportional counters Phase III
- Recent low-energy re-analysis of Phases I and II, reaching to electron kinetic energies of 3.5 MeV

Figure 2: Flux of ⁸B solar neutrinos is divided into ν_{μ}/ν_{τ} and ν_{e} flavors by the SNO analysis. The diagonal bands show the total ⁸B flux as predicted by the SSM (dashed lines) and that measured with the NC reaction in SNO (solid band). The widths of these bands represent the $\pm 1\sigma$ errors. The bands intersect in a single region for $\phi(\nu_{e})$ and $\phi(\nu_{\mu}/\nu_{\tau})$, indicating that the combined flux results are consistent with neutrino flavor transformation assuming no distortion in the ⁸B neutrino energy spectrum.

- SNO thus definitively resolved the solar neutrino problem
- The detector is dismantled, making space for SNO+, but the analysis continues. The best-fit combined-analysis two-flavor parameters are

$$\delta m_{12}^2 = 7.59^{+0.20}_{-0.21} \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$$

$$\theta_{12} = 34.06^{+1.16}_{-0.84} \text{ degrees}$$

• The SSM was found to be consistent with the measurements

$$\phi(^{8}B) = \left(5.046^{+0.169}_{-0.152}(\text{stat})^{+0.107}_{-0.123}(\text{syst})\right) \times 10^{6} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$$

BPS08(OP; GS) $5.95 \times 10^{6} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$
BPS08(OP; AGS) $4.72 \times 10^{6} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$

``I was called right after the[SNO] announcement was made by someone from the New York Times and asked how I felt. Without thinking I said `I feel like dancing I'm so happy.' ... It was like a person who had been sentenced for some heinous crime, and then a DNA test is made and it's found that he isn't guilty. That's exactly the way I felt." JNB