Invisible decays of ultra-high energy neutrinos
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The source of ultra high energy cosmic rays remains a mystery. In gamma-ray burst (GRB) models such as the fireball model cosmic-ray acceleration should be accompanied by neutrinos produced in the decay of charged pions created in interactions between the high-energy protons and γ-rays 1. Recently the Ice-Cube collaboration reported an upper limit on the flux of energetic neutrinos associated with GRBs almost four times below this prediction 2. Here we speculate on the plausibility of the decay hypothesis as a possible explanation for the mismatch between observation and expectation. The most attractive possibility involves invisible decays, which have been considered theoretically since long time ago 3–7. These arise in models with spontaneous violation of ungauged lepton number 3, 8. A natural scenario to test neutrino stability are astrophysical objects 9–12. In particular, limits on Majoron couplings from solar and supernova neutrinos have been obtained in Refs. 13 (for non astrophysical constraints for example from 0νββ searches, see 14–17). Moreover, recent results from Pierre Auger Observatory (PAO) 18, ANTARES 19 and IceCube 20 have put strong constraints on the neutrino flux coming from distant ultra high energy (UHE) neutrinos. Some mechanisms to explain a possible deficit in the observed neutrino flux have been suggested 21, 22 and the neutrino decay hypothesis has been recently revisited 23 and an estimate of the relevant GRB neutrino lifetime ranges been given in 24.

Here we explore the phenomenological plausibility and theoretical consistency of the decay hypothesis within a class of low-scale SU(3)c ⊗ SU(2)L ⊗ U(1)Y seesaw schemes with spontaneous family-dependent lepton number violation. We show that the required neutrino decay lifetime range hinted by the non observation of UHE muon neutrinos is theoretically achievable for the majoron-emitting neutrino decays and, moreover, consistent with all existing phenomenological constraints.

The decay rate νi → νj + J in the rest frame of νi is

\[ \Gamma(\nu_i \rightarrow \nu_j + J) = \frac{g_{ij}^2}{16\pi} \frac{(m_i + m_j)^2}{m_i^2} \left( m_i^2 - m_j^2 \right) \]

where νi and νj are active neutrinos and J is a massless or very light majoron. Taking mJ = 0, we can estimate the decay length for a relativistic neutrino as given by

\[ L = c\tau = c \frac{E_i}{m_i \Gamma} \simeq 1 \times 10^9 \left( g_{ij}^{-2} \right) \left( \frac{E_i}{100 \text{TeV}} \right) \left( \frac{1 \text{eV}}{m_i} \right)^2 \text{m} \]

For typical AGN distances we obtain the required values of g_{ij} for a given neutrino mass m_i which would cause decay before reaching the detector. In Fig. 1 we took AGN distances from 3.6 Mpc (the distance to Centaurus A) up to 100 Mpc. In the bottom panel of same Fig. 1 we have plotted the corresponding result for GRBs, at typical distances of 10 - 10^3 Mpc. The vertical lines correspond to the relevant region for m_2 and m_3 for the case m_1 = 0. As we will discuss below, putting into a theory...
context, such couplings are relatively large. In order to
have an estimate of the neutrino flux reduction resulting
from neutrino decay we note that, since coherence is lost,
the final flux of a given neutrino flavour will be

$$\phi_{\nu_\alpha}(E) = \sum_{iB} \phi_{\nu_{B,i}}^{\text{source}}(E) |U_{\beta i}|^2 |U_{\alpha i}|^2 e^{-L/\tau_i(E)},$$

(3)

where $\phi$’s are neutrino fluxes at production and detection, $L$ the travel distance, $\tau_i$ the neutrino lifetime in
the laboratory frame and $U_{\alpha i}$ the elements of the lepton
mixing matrix [25]. Typical neutrino energies lie in the
range of $10^5$ TeV and $10^2$ TeV for AGNs and GRBs
respectively. Note that, in the limit that $L \gg \tau_i$ where
only the stable state survives Eq. (3) becomes

$$\phi_{\nu_\alpha}(E) = \sum_{i(\text{stable})/B} \phi_{\nu_{B,i}}^{\text{source}}(E) |U_{\beta i}|^2 |U_{\alpha i}|^2.$$  

(4)

Here we take a normal hierarchy neutrino mass spectrum,
the disappearance of all states except the lightest (in this
case $\nu_1$) is allowed. The final flux of $\nu_e$, $\nu_\mu$ and $\nu_\tau$
can be computed from Eq. (4) and will depend on the three
mixing angles and the Dirac CP phase $\delta$. In particular,
we can calculate the suppression of the muon neutrino

$$R_{\bar{\nu}_{e},\bar{\nu}_{\mu}} = \left( \frac{\cos \theta_{12} \cos \theta_{13} + \sin \theta_{12} \cos \theta_{23} - \sin \theta_{13} \sin \theta_{23} \cos \theta_{12} e^{i \delta}}{-\sin \theta_{12} \cos \theta_{23} - \sin \theta_{13} \sin \theta_{23} \cos \theta_{12} e^{i \delta}} \right)^2,$$

(5)

where $\theta_{12}$, $\theta_{23}$ and $\theta_{13}$ are the neutrino mixing angles
determined in neutrino oscillation experiments. Fig. 2
show the expected values for this ratio when the neutrino
mixing angles lie within the 1$\sigma$ bands from their current
global best fit values [26–28], for which $R_{\bar{\nu}_{e},\bar{\nu}_{\mu}} \approx 8$. One
can also see, Fig. 3 that by allowing these parameters
to vary up to their three sigma ranges, $R_{\bar{\nu}_{e},\bar{\nu}_{\mu}}$ can be as
large as 25 or as low as 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Fit</th>
<th>1st octant</th>
<th>2nd octant</th>
<th>At 3$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forero, et. al</td>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>2-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwetz, et. al</td>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>2-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fogli, et. al</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: $R_{\bar{\nu}_{e},\bar{\nu}_{\mu}}$ for current neutrino oscillation fits.

FIG. 2: $R_{\bar{\nu}_{e},\bar{\nu}_{\mu}}$ versus the CP phase $\delta$ for neutrino mixing
angles at 1$\sigma$, with $\theta_{23}$ in the 1st octant (left panel) and 2nd
count (right panel) [26].

Very similar results are found for global fit of Ref. [27].

We now turn to the issue of theoretical consistency of
the decay hypothesis. In most SU(3)$_c \otimes$ SU(2)$_L \otimes$ U(1)$_Y$
seesaw models with spontaneous lepton number violation
when one diagonalizes the neutrino mass matrix one also diagonalizes, to first approximation, the coupling of the resulting Nambu-Goldstone boson to the mass eigenstate neutrinos \([3]\). The exact form of the light-neutrino majoron couplings can be determined explicitly by perturbative diagonalization of the seesaw mass matrix, or by using a more general approach using only the symmetry properties. The result is \([3]\)

\[
g_{ij} = -\frac{m_i}{v_1} \delta_{ij} + \left[ \frac{m_i}{v_1} \left( V_i^T D^* M'^{-1} M^{-1} D^T V_i \right) \right] S_{ij} + \ldots
\]

(6)

where the subscript \(S\) denotes symmetrization, \(D\) and \(M\) are the Dirac and Majorana mass terms in, say, the type-I seesaw and \(V_i\) is the light neutrino diagonalization matrix. One sees that the majoron couples proportionally to the light neutrino mass, hence diagonal to first approximation. The off-diagonal part of the \(g_{ij}\) is inversely proportional to three powers of lepton number violation scale \(v_1 \equiv \langle \sigma \rangle\), since \(M \propto v_1\). This is tiny, the only hope being to use a seesaw scheme that allows for a very low lepton number violation scale, such as the inverse seesaw \([29]\). The particle content is the same as that of the Standard Model (SM) except for the addition of a pair of two component gauge singlet leptons, \(\nu_i^c\) and \(S_i\), within each of the three generations, labeled by \(i\). The isodoublet neutrinos \(\nu_i\) and the fermion singlets \(S_i\) have the same lepton number, opposite with respect to that of the three singlets \(\nu_i^c\) associated to the “right-handed” neutrinos. In the \(\nu, \nu^c, S\) basis the \(9 \times 9\) neutral lepton mass matrix \(M_\nu\) has the form:

\[
M_\nu = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & m_D & 0 \\
m_D & 0 & M^T \\
0 & M & \mu
\end{bmatrix},
\]

(7)

where \(m_D \propto \langle \Phi \rangle\) is the standard Dirac term coming from the SM Higgs vev and \(M\) is a bare mass term. The term \(\mu \propto \langle \sigma \rangle\), the vacuum expectation value of \(\sigma\) responsible for spontaneous low-scale lepton number violation as proposed in \([7]\). This gives rise to a majoron \(J\),

\[
J = \sqrt{2} \text{ Im} \sigma.
\]

(8)

As a result of diagonalization one obtains an effective light neutrino mass matrix. Note that lepton number symmetry is recovered as \(\mu \to 0\), making the three light neutrinos strictly massless. The majoron couplings of the light mass eigenstate neutrinos are determined again as a sum of two pieces as in Eq. (6). Detailed calculation shows that its off-diagonal part behaves as \(P' \sim \mu^2 D^2 M^{-4}\). Even if the \(M\) can be significantly lower than that of the standard high-scale type-I seesaw it is clear that this is way too small in order to produce neutrino decay within the relevant astrophysical scales.

The only way out is to induce a mismatch between the neutrino mass basis and the coupling basis. This can be achieved by making lepton number a family-dependent symmetry \([3, 6]\). The model is by no means unique, here we give an example based on \(SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \otimes U(1)_H\) assigned as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(L_L)</th>
<th>(L_R)</th>
<th>(\nu_R)</th>
<th>(\nu_R)</th>
<th>(h)</th>
<th>(S_1)</th>
<th>(S_2)</th>
<th>(S_3)</th>
<th>(\sigma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2 -2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Model field content and transformation properties

The \(SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \otimes U(1)_H\) invariant Lagrangian would be

\[
\mathcal{L}_\nu = Y_m D_{ij} \hat{L}_i \nu_R h + M_{ij} \nu_R S_j + Y_{M_{ij}} \nu_R S_j \sigma + Y_{\nu_{ij}} S_i S_j + \mu_{ij} S_i S_j \sigma,
\]

where the relevant sub-matrices are

\[
m_D = \begin{bmatrix}
m_a & m_d & 0 \\
m_c & m_d & 0 \\
0 & 0 & m_e
\end{bmatrix}, \quad M = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & M_1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & M_2
\end{bmatrix}, \quad M_\sigma = \begin{bmatrix}
M_3 & M_4 & 0 \\
M_5 & M_6 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & M_7
\end{bmatrix} \quad (10)
\]

\[
\mu = \begin{bmatrix}
M_8 & M_9 & 0 \\
M_{10} & M_{11} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \mu_\sigma = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & M_{12} \\
0 & 0 & M_{13} \\
M_{14} & M_{15} & 0
\end{bmatrix} \quad (11)
\]

One can check explicitly that the first term in Eq. (6) is already non-diagonal and, for sufficiently low values of the \(U(1)_H\) breaking scale can induce a decay sufficiently fast as to suppress the flux of \(\phi_{\nu_i}\) to account for the non observation of \(\nu_\mu\) by Ice Cube.

Finally we comment on a possible indirect test of the neutrino decay hypothesis through the observation of majoron-emitting \(J0\nu\beta\beta\) decay. Indeed if the majoron
FIG. 4: Correlating $R_{\nu_e\nu_{\mu}}$ to majoron-emitting $J_0\nu\beta\beta$ coupling ($g_{ee}$).

exists and its coupling to the electron neutrino is not expected to significantly differ from the one required to explain the muon neutrino deficit in IceCube through the neutrino decay hypothesis. This correlation is depicted in Fig. 4. The figure corresponds to fixing the neutrino mixing angles at their best fit values with the Dirac mass entry at $m_D \sim 10$ GeV, $M \sim 1$ TeV, $\mu \sim 1$ KeV and $\mu_\sigma \sim 1$ KeV where the $\sim$ sign takes into account order one differences among the various flavour components of each block. The solid (red) curve corresponds to the second octant of the atmospheric mixing angle $\theta_{23}$ while the solid (blue) corresponds to the first octant, varying the CP phase from 0 to $2\pi$. One sees that large values of the $R$ ratio are preferred by the second octant. In conclusion one sees that the decay hypothesis invoked to account for the IceCube results may be tested in the upcoming searches for the $J_0\nu\beta\beta$ decay.
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