Collective effects in oscillations of supernova neutrinos

Amol Dighe

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research
Mumbai, India

NuTheme 2010
CERN, Geneva, Sept 21, 2010

Propagation through matter of varying density



Inside the SN: *flavor conversion*

Collective effects and MSW matter effects

Between the SN and Earth: *no flavor conversion*

Mass eigenstates travel independently

Inside the Earth: *flavor oscillations*

MSW matter effects (*if detector is shadowed by the Earth*)

Nonlinear effects due to $\nu - \nu$ coherent interactions

- Large neutrino density $\Rightarrow$ substantial ν–ν potential

$$H = H_{vac} + H_{MSW} + H_{\nu\nu}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{vac}(\vec{p}) &= M^2/(2p) \\ H_{MSW} &= \sqrt{2} G_F n_{e^-} \, diag(1,0,0) \\ H_{\nu\nu}(\vec{p}) &= \sqrt{2} G_F \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} (1 - \cos\theta_{pq}) \big(\rho(\vec{q}) - \bar{\rho}(\vec{q})\big) \end{aligned}$$

- $d\rho/dt = i[H(\rho), \rho] \quad \Rightarrow \quad$ Nonlinear effects !



Multi-angle vs. single-angle approximation



H.Duan, G.M.Fuller, J.Carlson

Y.-Z. Qian, PRD74, 105014 (2006)

- Multi-angle effects only smear the spectra to some extent

  G.L.Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, A. Mirizzi, JCAP 0712, 010 (2007)

- "Multi-angle decoherence" during collective oscillations suppressed by ν–$\bar{\nu}$ asymmetry

  A.Esteban-Pretel, S.Pastor, R.Tomas, G.Raffelt, G.Sigl, PRD76, 125018 (2007)

- If matter density is extremely high, multi-angle decoherence possible.

  A.Esteban-Pretel, A.Mirizzi, S.Pastor, R.Tomas, G.G. Raffelt,

  P.D.Serpico, G. Sigl, PRD78, 085012 (2008)

Single-angle approximation $\Rightarrow$

“Collective” effects: qualitatively new phenomena

Synchronized oscillations:

ν and $\bar{\nu}$ of all energies oscillate with the same frequency

S. Pastor, G. Raffelt and D. Semikoz, PRD65, 053011 (2002)

Bipolar/pendular oscillations:

Coherent $\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e \leftrightarrow \nu_x\bar{\nu}_x$ oscillations even for extremely small θ_{13}

S. Hannestad, G. Raffelt, G. Sigl, Y. Wong, PRD74, 105010 (2006)

Spectral split/swap:

ν_e and ν_y ($\bar{\nu}_e$ and $\bar{\nu}_y$) spectra interchange completely, only within certain energy ranges.

G.Raffelt, A.Smirnov, PRD76, 081301 (2007), PRD76, 125008 (2007)

B. Dasgupta, AD, G.Raffelt, A.Smirnov, PRL103,051105 (2009)

Spectral split/swap

cooling-phase Garching fluxes



B. Dasgupta, AD, G.Raffelt, A.Smirnov, arXiv:0904.3542 [hep-ph], PRL

Changing paradigm of SN neutrino oscillations

Neutrino-electron forward scattering: MSW effects (1999 –)

- Flavour conversions mainly in MSW resonance regions : ($\rho \sim 10^{3-4}$ g/cc, 1–10 g/cc)
- Sensitivity to $\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-5}$ and mass hierarchy

Neutrino-neutrino forward scattering: Collective effects (2006 –)

- Significant flavour conversions near the neutrinosphere : ($\rho \sim 10^{6-10}$ g/cc)
- Synchronized osc $\rightarrow$ bipolar osc $\rightarrow$ spectral split
- Single spectral split: In IH,
  $\bar{\nu}_e$ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ spectra swap completely
  ν_e and ν_μ spectra swap for $E > E_c$
- Sensitivity even to $\sin^2\theta_{13} \sim 10^{-10}$

Changing paradigm of SN neutrino oscillations

Multiple spectral splits (2009 –)

- "Single spectral split" valid only when $L_{\nu_e} \approx L_{\bar{\nu}_e} \gtrsim L_{\nu_\mu}$
- In general, both $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_y$ and $\bar{\nu}_e \leftrightarrow \bar{\nu}_y$ swaps take place, in sharply separated energy regions

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_x \\ \nu_y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_{23} & \sin\theta_{23} \\ -\sin\theta_{23} & \cos\theta_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{pmatrix}$$

- Three flavour effects: even $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_x$ and $\bar{\nu}_e \leftrightarrow \bar{\nu}_x$ swaps take place, in sharply separated energy regions
- The swapped / unswapped energy regions depend on primary fluxes and mass hierarchy

Primary neutrino fluxes: a lot of model dependence

Livermore 1998 Garching 2003



solid: $\bar{\nu}_e$, dotted: $\bar{\nu}_x$

Totani et al., 1998, Raffelt et al., 2003

Recent model preditions for fluxes

Basel 2009



Garching 2009



Fischer et al, 2009; Hüdepohl et al, 2009

- Average energies slightly smaller
- $\sim$ 20% differences in average energies and fluxes (especially during the accretion phase; more for neutrinos)

Typical features of the spectra



- Average energies:
  $\langle E_0(\nu_e)\rangle \approx 10\text{–}12$ MeV
  $\langle E_0(\bar{\nu}_e)\rangle \approx 13\text{–}16$ MeV
  $\langle E_0(\nu_x)\rangle \approx 15\text{–}25$ MeV
- Energy hierarchy:
  $\langle E_0(\nu_e)\rangle < \langle E_0(\bar{\nu}_e)\rangle < \langle E_0(\nu_x)\rangle = \langle E_0(\nu_y)\rangle$
- Luminosities:
  $L_{\nu_e} \approx L_{\bar{\nu}_e}$
  $L_{\nu_x} \approx (0.5 - 2.0)\, L_{\nu_e}$

Number and position of splits: is there a pattern ?

Split patterns with $\langle E_{\nu_\mu} \rangle$ and L_{ν_μ}:



No swap, $e \leftrightarrow y$ swap, $e \leftrightarrow x$ swap

S. Choubey, B. Dasgupta, AD, A. Mirizzi, arXiv:1008.0308 [hep-ph]

- $\langle E_{\nu_e} \rangle = 12$ MeV, $\langle E_{\bar{\nu}_e} \rangle = 15$ MeV
- $L_{\nu_e} = L_{\bar{\nu}_e}$
- For lower $\langle E_{\nu_e} \rangle$, scale $\langle E_{\nu_\mu} \rangle$ appropriately
- Two "phases":
  phase A ($F_{\nu_e} \gtrsim F_{\nu_x}$) and phase C ($F_{\nu_e} \lesssim F_{\nu_x}$)

Sequential dominance of phenomena (Fe-core SN)



- $\mu \equiv \sqrt{2} G_F (N_\nu + N_{\bar{\nu}})$
- $\lambda \equiv \sqrt{2} G_F N_e$

- $r \lesssim 200$ km: collective effects dominate
- $r \gtrsim 200$ km: standard MSW matter effects dominate

G.L.Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, A. Mirizzi, JCAP 0712, 010 (2007)

MSW Resonances inside a SN

Normal mass ordering



Inverted mass ordering



AD, A.Smirnov, PRD62, 033007 (2000)

H resonance: $(\Delta m^2_{\rm atm}, \theta_{13})$, $\rho \sim 10^3$–10^4 g/cc

- In $\nu(\bar{\nu})$ for normal (inverted) hierarchy
- Adiabatic (non-adiabatic) for $\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3} (\lesssim 10^{-5})$

L resonance: $(\Delta m^2_{\odot}, \theta_{\odot})$, $\rho \sim 10$–100 g/cc

- Always adiabatic, always in ν

Fluxes arriving at the Earth

$$F_{\nu_e} = p\, F^0_{\nu_e} + (1-p)\, F^0_{\nu_x}\,, \qquad F_{\bar{\nu}_e} = \bar{p}\, F^0_{\bar{\nu}_e} + (1-\bar{p})\, F^0_{\nu_x}$$

p at low, intermediate, high energies

		Phase A ($L_{\nu_e} \gtrsim L_{\nu_x}$)			Phase C ($L_{\nu_e} \gtrsim L_{\nu_x}$)		
NH	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$	0	0	0	0	0	s^2
	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \lesssim 10^{-5}$	s^2	s^2	s^2	s^2	s^2	0
IH	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$	s^2	0	0	s^2	0	c^2 (s^2)
	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \lesssim 10^{-5}$	s^2	0	0	s^2	0	c^2 (s^2)

$\bar{p}$ at low, intermediate, high energies

		Phase A ($L_{\nu_e} \gtrsim L_{\nu_x}$)			Phase C ($L_{\nu_e} \gtrsim L_{\nu_x}$)		
NH	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$	c^2	c^2	c^2	c^2	c^2	0
	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \lesssim 10^{-5}$	c^2	c^2	c^2	c^2	c^2	0
IH	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$	0	c^2	c^2	0	c^2 [0]	s^2 (0)
	$\sin^2\theta_{13} \lesssim 10^{-5}$	c^2	0	0	c^2	0 [c^2]	s^2 (c^2)

$s^2 \equiv \sin^2\theta_{12}, c^2 \equiv \cos^2\theta_{12}$ (C_3, C_4), $[C_2, C_4]$

Signal expected from a galactic SN (10 kpc)

Water Cherenkov detector: (events at SK)

- $\bar{\nu}_e p \to n e^+$: $\approx 7000 - 12000$

$$\Delta_{\rm WC}/{\rm MeV} = 0.47\sqrt{E_e/{\rm MeV}}$$

- $\nu e^- \to \nu e^-$: $\approx 200 - 300$
- $\nu_e + {}^{16}O \to X + e^-$: ≈ 150–800

Carbon-based scintillation detector:

- $\bar{\nu}_e p \to n e^+$ (~ 300 per kt)

$$\Delta_{\rm SC}/{\rm MeV} = 0.075\sqrt{E_e/{\rm MeV}}$$

- $\nu + {}^{12}C \to \nu + X + \gamma$ (15.11 MeV)

Liquid Argon detector:

- $\nu_e + {}^{40}Ar \to {}^{40}K^* + e^-$ (~ 300 per kt)

$$\Delta_{\rm LAr}/{\rm MeV} = 0.11\sqrt{E_e/{\rm MeV}} + 0.02\, E_e/{\rm MeV}$$

Earth matter effects

- If F_{ν_1} and F_{ν_2} reach the earth,

$$F^D_{\nu_e}(L) - F^D_{\nu_e}(0) = (F_{\nu_2} - F_{\nu_1}) \times \sin 2\theta^{\oplus}_{12} \sin(2\theta^{\oplus}_{12} - 2\theta_{12}) \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m^2_{\oplus} L}{4E}\right)$$

(Sign changes for antineutrinos)

- Nonzero Earth matter effects require
  - Neutrinos: $p \neq 0$
  - Antineutrinos: $\bar{p} \neq 0$
- Can distinguish scenarios depending on Earth effects in different energy regimes
- A more efficient way of detecting split positions

Spectra at detectors with Earth effects: phase A



- Spectral splits not visible
- Earth effects possibly visible in neutrinos

Spectra at detectors with Earth effects: phase C



- Spectral split may be visible as “shoulders”
- Earth effects possibly visible, more prominent in ν_e

Earth effects: oscillations at a single detector

Fourier power spectrum: $G_N(k) = \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{events} e^{iky} \right|^2$

$(y \equiv 25\ MeV/E)$

- Peak positions model independent, at known frequencies



AD, M. Kachelrieß, G. Raffelt,

R. Tomàs, JCAP 0401:004 (2004)

Comparison between two detectors

- Ratio of luminosities at IceCube and a megaton water Cherenkov, as a function of time

AD, M. Keil, G. Raffelt, JCAP 0306:005 (2003)

- Comparing spectra at two 400 kt water Cherenkovs



S. Choubey et al., arXiv:1008.0308 [hep-ph]

Robust experimental signature

- Earth effects can distinguish hierarchies even for $\theta_{13} \lesssim 10^{-10}$

Shock wave and adiabaticity breaking

When shock wave passes through a resonance region (density ρ_H or ρ_L):



- adiabatic resonances may become momentarily non-adiabatic
- Sharp changes in the final spectra even if the primary spectra change smoothly

R. C. Schirato, G. M. Fuller, astro-ph/0205390

G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, D. Montanino and A. Mirizzi, PRD 68, 033005 (2003)

J.P.Kneller, G.C.Mclaughlin, J.Brockman, PRD77, 045023 (2008)

Shock signals at a megaton water Cherenkov

- Time-dependent dip/peak features in $N_{\nu_e,\bar{\nu}_e}(E)$, $\langle E_{\nu_e,\bar{\nu}_e} \rangle$, $\langle E^2_{\nu_e,\bar{\nu}_e} \rangle$, etc.
- Times at which dips/peaks appear in $N_{\bar{\nu}_e}(E)$ are the times at which the shock waves enter the densities

$$\rho(E) = \frac{m_N \Delta m^2_{atm}}{2\sqrt{2} G_F Y_e E}$$

- $\Rightarrow$ Tracking of shock wave while it is still inside the mantle

R.Tomas, M.Kachelriess, G.Raffelt, AD, H.T.Janka and L.Scheck, JCAP **0409**, 015 (2004)

Identifying mixing scenario

- Shock wave present in ν_e only for NH $\oplus \sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-5}$
- Shock wave present in $\bar{\nu}_e$ only for IH $\oplus \sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-5}$

Shock signals at a megaton water Cherenkov

- Time-dependent dip/peak features in $N_{\nu_e,\bar{\nu}_e}(E)$, $\langle E_{\nu_e,\bar{\nu}_e} \rangle$, $\langle E^2_{\nu_e,\bar{\nu}_e} \rangle$, etc.
- Times at which dips/peaks appear in $N_{\bar{\nu}_e}(E)$ are the times at which the shock waves enter the densities

$$\rho(E) = \frac{m_N \Delta m^2_{atm}}{2\sqrt{2} G_F Y_e E}$$

- $\Rightarrow$ Tracking of shock wave while it is still inside the mantle

R.Tomas, M.Kachelriess, G.Raffelt, AD, H.T.Janka and L.Scheck, JCAP **0409**, 015 (2004)

Identifying mixing scenario

- Shock wave present in ν_e only for NH $\oplus \sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-5}$
- Shock wave present in $\bar{\nu}_e$ only for IH $\oplus \sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-5}$

Vanishing neutronization (ν_e) burst



M. Kachelriess, R. Tomas, R. Buras,

H. T. Janka, A. Marek and M. Rampp

PRD **71**, 063003 (2005)

- Time resolution of the detector crucial for separating ν_e burst from the accretion phase signal

Burst signal vanishes for NH $\oplus \sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$

Stepwise spectral split in O-Ne-Mg supernovae



Neutronization burst

- MSW resonances deep inside collective regions

H. Duan, G. M. Fuller, J. Carlson, Y.Z.Qian, PRL100, 021101 (2008)

C. Lunardini, B. Mueller, H. T. Janka, arXiv:0712.3000

- "MSW-prepared" spectral splits: two for IH, one for NH

H.Duan, G.Fuller, Y.Z.Qian, PRD77, 085016 (2008)

- Positions of splits fixed by initial spectra

B.Dasgupta, AD, A. Mirizzi, G.G.Raffelt, PRD77, 1130007 (2008)

- ν_e suppression more at low energy: Ar detector crucial
- Identification of O-Ne-Mg supernova ??

Inverse SN neutrino problem

Multiple independent signals

	Earth Matter Effects				Shock effects		ν_e burst vanishing
	ν_e		$\bar{\nu}_e$		ν_e	$\bar{\nu}_e$	
	Peak	Tail	Peak	Tail			
NH, $\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$							
Phase A	X	X	$\surd$	$\surd$	$\surd$	X	$\surd$
Phase C	X	$\surd$	$\surd$	X	$\surd$	X	$\surd$
NH, $\sin^2\theta_{13} \lesssim 10^{-5}$							
Phase A	$\surd$	$\surd$	$\surd$	$\surd$	X	X	X
Phase C	$\surd$	X	$\surd$	X	X	X	X
IH, $\sin^2\theta_{13} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$							
Phase A	X	X	$\surd$	$\surd$	X	$\surd$	X
Phase C	X	$\surd$	$\surd$	$\surd$	X	$\surd$	X
IH, $\sin^2\theta_{13} \lesssim 10^{-5}$							
Phase A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Phase C	X	$\surd$	X	$\surd$	X	X	X

Smoking gun signals and caveats

Earth matter effects

- Hierarchy identification even for extremely small θ_{13} values
- If primary fluxes are similar, identifying Earth effects is hard
- Multi-angle effects still to be understood (should not affect in accretion phase)
- Better results with ν_e spectrum $\Rightarrow$ Ar detector crucial

S.Choubey et al., 2010

Shock wave effects

- Presence / absence independent of collective effects
- Turbulent convections behind the shock wave: gradual depolarization effects

A. Friedland et al., 2006; J. Kneller et al, 2008, 2010,

Neutronization burst signal

- Robust, but needs Ar detector with good time resolution

Some open questions

Better analytical understanding of collective effects

- Development of “pendular oscillations”
- Prediction of positions and widths of spectral swaps
- Multi-angle decoherence effects ??
- Effects of turbulence ??

Effect of ν oscillations on SN astrophysics

- Shock wave dynamics
- R-process nucleosynthesis

So what ?

If we gain some information on θ_{13} or mass ordering:
How will it affect our long baseline experiments ?
Will it help us design experiments more optimally ?

Extra Slides

Trapped neutrinos before the collapse

- Neutrinos trapped inside “neutrinospheres” around $\rho \sim 10^{10}$g/cc
- Free-streaming when $\rho \lesssim 10^{10}$g/cc



$\nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e$



$\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu, \nu_\tau, \bar{\nu}_\tau$

Core collapse, shock wave, and explosion

Gravitational core collapse $\Rightarrow$ Shock Wave





Neutronization burst: ν_e emitted for $\sim$ 10 ms

Cooling through neutrino emission: $\sim 10^{58}$ neutrinos

$\nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e, \nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu, \nu_\tau, \bar{\nu}_\tau$ Duration: About 10 sec

Emission of 99% of the SN collapse energy in neutrinos

¿¿¿ Explosion ???

2-ν flavors : Formalism

- Expand all matrices in terms of Pauli matrices as

$$X = \frac{I}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1,2,3} \mathrm{X}_i \, \sigma_i$$

- The following vectors result from the matrices

$$\rho_{\mathrm{p}} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{P}_{\omega}$$

$$H_{\mathrm{p}}^{0} \Leftrightarrow \omega \, \mathbf{B}$$

$$V \Leftrightarrow \sqrt{2} G_F N_e \, \mathbf{L} \equiv \lambda \, \mathbf{L}$$

$$H_{\mathrm{p}}^{\nu\nu} \Leftrightarrow \sqrt{2} G_F (n + \bar{n}) \int d\omega \, f(\omega) \, \mathbf{P}_{\omega} \, \mathrm{sgn}(\omega) \equiv \mu \, \mathbf{D}$$

- EOM resembles spin precession

$$\frac{d}{dr} \mathbf{P}_{\omega} = (h\omega \, \mathbf{B} + \lambda \, \mathbf{L} + \mu \, \mathbf{D}) \times \mathbf{P}_{\omega} \equiv \mathbf{H}_{\omega} \times \mathbf{P}_{\omega}$$

Mass ordering, spectral crossings, swaps, and splits



- Neutrinos:
  $\omega \equiv 1/E$
- Antineutrinos:
  $\omega \equiv -1/E$
- Spectrum
  $g(|\omega|) = F_{\nu_e}(\omega) - F_{\nu_x}(\omega)$
  $g(-|\omega|) = F_{\bar{\nu}_x}(\omega) - F_{\bar{\nu}_e}(\omega)$
- Swap
  $S(\omega) = \frac{g(\omega)_{final}}{g(\omega)_{initial}}$

Swap $S(\omega) = -1 \Rightarrow$

- Inverted Hierarchy: positive crossing
- Normal Hierarchy: negative crossing
- Nearby swaps may overlap to reduce number of splits

B. Dasgupta, AD, G.Raffelt, A.Smirnov, arXiv:0904.3542 [hep-ph], PRL