

Perturbation Theory of Neutrino Oscillation with Nonstandard Neutrino Interactions

Takashi Kikuchi,^{*} Hisakazu Minakata,[†] and Shoichi Uchinami[‡]

*Department of Physics, Tokyo Metropolitan University
1-1 Minami-Osawa, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-0397, Japan*

(Dated: September 19, 2008)

Abstract

We discuss various physics aspects of neutrino oscillation with non-standard interactions (NSI). We formulate a perturbative framework by taking $\Delta m_{21}^2/\Delta m_{31}^2$, s_{13} , and the NSI elements $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$) as small expansion parameters of the same order ϵ . Within the ϵ perturbation theory we obtain the S matrix elements and the neutrino oscillation probability formula to second order (third order in ν_e related channels) in ϵ . The formula allows us to estimate size of the contribution of any particular NSI element $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ to the oscillation probability in arbitrary channels, and gives a global bird-eye view of the neutrino oscillation phenomena with NSI. Based on the second-order formula we discuss how all the conventional lepton mixing as well as NSI parameters can be determined. Our results shows that while θ_{13} , δ , and the NSI elements in ν_e sector can in principle be determined, complete measurement of the NSI parameters in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector is not possible by the rate only analysis. We observe that the phenomenon of parameter degeneracy prevails in a new form which involves both the SI and the NSI parameters. An analysis based on the matter perturbation theory is given to have a first grasp of the nature of the degeneracy. The general properties of neutrino oscillation with and without NSI are illuminated by the phase reduction and the matter hesitation theorems.

PACS numbers: 14.60.Pq, 14.60.Lm, 13.15.+g

^{*}Electronic address: t-kiku@phys.metro-u.ac.jp

[†]Electronic address: minakata@phys.metro-u.ac.jp

[‡]Electronic address: uchinami@phys.metro-u.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutrino masses and lepton flavor mixing [1] discovered by the atmospheric [2], the solar [3], and the reactor neutrino [4] experiments constitute still the unique evidence for physics beyond the Standard Model. A possible next step would be a discovery of neutrino interactions outside the standard electroweak theory. Based on expectation of new physics at TeV scale such non-standard interactions (NSI) with matter possessed by neutrinos are proposed and extensively discussed [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. The experimental constraints on NSI are summarized in [11].

Recognition of structure of neutrino masses and lepton flavor mixing, at least up to now, relies on neutrino flavor transformation [1, 5, 12, 13], which we generically refer as neutrino oscillation in this paper. Quite naturally, there have been numerous theoretical analyses to understand the structure of the phenomena. In the context of long-baseline neutrino experiments, an exact expression of the oscillation probability is derived under the constant matter density approximation [14]. To understand physics of neutrino oscillation, however, it is often more illuminating to have suitable approximation schemes. In the latter category, various perturbative formulations of three-flavor neutrino oscillation have been developed and proven to be quite useful in particular in the context of long-baseline accelerator and reactor experiments. They include one-mass scale dominance approximation in vacuum [15], short-distance expansion in matter [16], matter perturbation theory [17, 18], and perturbation theory with the small expansion parameters $\Delta m_{21}^2/\Delta m_{31}^2$ and θ_{13} [19] (that are taken as of order ϵ) which we call the ϵ perturbation theory in this paper. See, for example, [20, 21, 22, 23] for subsequent development of perturbation theory of neutrino oscillation.

When the effects of NSI are included, however, theoretical analysis of the system of neutrino flavor transformation does not appear to achieve the same level of completeness as that only with standard interactions (SI). Perturbative formulas of the oscillation probabilities with NSI have been derived under various assumptions [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. Even some exact formulas are known [30]. However, one cannot answer the questions such as: How large is the effects of $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}$ in the oscillation probability $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$? (See below for definition of NSI elements $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$.) How large is the effects of ϵ_{ee} in the oscillation probability $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$? Which set of measurement is sufficient to determine all the NSI elements? References of neutrino oscillation and the sensitivity analyses with NSI are too numerous to quote here and may be found in bibliographies in the existing literatures, for example, in [29, 30, 31].

It is the purpose of this paper to fill the gap between understanding of neutrino oscillations with and without NSI. We try to do it by formulating the similar ϵ perturbation theory as in [19] but with including effects of NSI by assuming that NSI elements are of order $\sim \epsilon$. We derive the perturbative formula of the oscillation probability similar to the one in [19], which we call, respectively, the NSI and the SI second-order formulas in this paper. The approximate formula will allow us to have a bird-eye view of the neutrino oscillations with NSI, and will enable us to answer the above questions.

The other limitation that is present in some foregoing analyses, which we want to overcome, is the assumption of single (or, a few) $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ dominance. Upon identification or getting hint for possible NSI interactions it will become possible to express $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ in propagation as a function of couplings involved in the higher dimensional operators. When this situation occurs it is likely that all (or at least most of) the NSI elements $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ exist in the Hamilto-

nian with comparable magnitudes. Therefore, the theoretical machinery we prepare for the analysis must include all the NSI elements at the same time.¹

More about necessity and usefulness of the S matrix and the NSI second-order formula of all oscillation channels and with all NSI elements included; If we are to include the effects of NSI in production and detection processes it is necessary to sum up all the oscillation channels that can contribute. Hence, the formulas of all channels are necessary. We are able to discuss, for the first time, a strategy for simultaneous complete determination of the SI and NSI parameters. Through the discussion we indicate that, as in the system without NSI, the parameter degeneracy [32, 33, 34] exist in systems with NSI, but in a new form which involve both the SI and the NSI parameters. In a previous paper it was uncovered that the so called θ_{13} -NSI confusion [25, 26] can be resolved by a two-detector setting in neutrino factory experiments [30]. Keeping the terms with the solar Δm_{21}^2 is shown to be crucial for resolving the confusion, and hence a full second-order formula is useful. In fact, the NSI second-order formula is surprisingly simple in its form, keeping the form of the original SI one with generalized variables, and the structure is even more transparent than those with first-order approximation of NSI.

Finally, we should mention about what will not be achieved in this paper even within the context of theoretical analysis. First of all, our perturbative formulation relies on the particular assumption on relative magnitudes of SI and NSI parameters, and we cannot say many for cases in which our assumptions are not valid. We discuss the effects of NSI while neutrinos propagate in matter, and its effects in production and detection of neutrinos are ignored. While uncovering a new type of parameter parameter degeneracy in systems with NSI we are unable to fully analyze its structure. Yet, an analysis based on matter perturbation theory is given, indicating the new feature mentioned above. Therefore, this paper must be regarded as merely the first step toward complete treatment of neutrino oscillation with NSI.

II. PHYSICS SUMMARY

Because this paper has been developed into a long one, unfortunately, we think it convenient for readers, in particular experimentalists, to summarize the physics outputs of the perturbative treatment of neutrino oscillation with NSI. We highly recommend the readers to read this section first.

A. Some new results in the standard three flavor mixing

Though this paper aims at uncovering structure of neutrino oscillation with NSI, we have observed a few new features of neutrino oscillation without NSI. One of them is a theorem called “matter hesitation” shown in Sec. VC which states that the matter effect comes in into the oscillation probability only at the second order in the small expansion parameter

¹ The similar comments also apply to the procedure by which the current constraints on NSI is derived, for example in [11]. Namely, the constraints are derived under the assumption of presence of a particular NSI element in each time. Notice, however, that this point was carefully mentioned with caution by the authors of [11] themselves.

ϵ in all the channels of neutrino oscillation. It is a highly nontrivial feature because we treat the matter effect as of order unity. The theorem explains why it is so difficult to have a sufficiently large matter effect, e.g., to resolve the mass hierarchy, in many long-baseline neutrino oscillation experiments. It also has implications to neutrino oscillation with NSI as will be mentioned below.

B. Guide for experimentalists; importance of various NSI elements in each channel

Experimentalists who want to hunt NSI in neutrino propagation may ask the following questions:

- We want to uncover the effect of $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ (or $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$). What is the neutrino oscillation channel do you recommend to use for this purpose?
- We plan to detect the effect of $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$. Which set of measurement do we need to prepare?
- We seek a complete determination of all the SI and the NSI parameters. What would be the global strategy to adopt?

With the oscillation probability formulas given in Sec. VI we will try to answer these questions. Though we can offer only a partial answer to the last question above we can certainly give the answer to the first two questions within the framework of perturbation theory we formulate. In Table I the relative importance of the effects of each element $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ of NSI are tabulated as order of a small parameter ϵ that they first appear in each oscillation channel. We presume $\epsilon \sim 10^{-2}$. Thus, our answer to the above questions based on the assumption that only the terms up to second order in ϵ are relevant would be (in order):

- The neutrino oscillation channels in which only $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ come in and the other elements do not are the ν_e related ones, $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e$, $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$, and $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau$. Obviously, the latter two appearance channels would be more interesting. One can in principle determine them simultaneously with θ_{13} and δ by rate only analysis.
- Do measurement at the $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu$ channel to determine $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$. Adding $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ channel does not help. Effects of the NSI element are relatively large because they are first order in ϵ , but the spectrum information is crucial to utilize this feature and to separate its effects from those of $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$. If an extreme precision is required you might want to supplement the measurement by the ν_μ and ν_τ appearance measurement above.
- We will show that, in fact, there is a difficulty in complete determination of all the NSI and SI parameters by the rate only analysis. The trouble occurs in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector. Even though we are allowed to assume perfect measurement of all the channels including the one with ν_τ beam (which, of course, would not be practical), one of the three unknowns, $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ and $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$ including its phase, cannot be determined if we rely on the rate only analysis. See Sec. VII for more detail. Clearly, the spectrum information is the key to the potential of being able to determine all the SI and the NSI parameters, which should be taken into account in considering future facilities which search for NSI.

TABLE I: Presented are the order in ϵ at which the matter effect and each type of $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$) start to come in into the expression of the oscillation probability in ϵ perturbation theory. Here, ϵ is assumed to be $\sim 10^{-2}$. The first and the second columns are for the matter effect, as signaled by the appearance of Wolfenstein’s coefficient a [5], in system without and with NSI, respectively. To second order in ϵ the sensitivity to $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ is through the form $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$, and hence no sensitivity to the individual ε ’s. Generally, the diagonal ε ’s appear in a form of difference in the oscillation probabilities because an over-all phase is an unobservable. The order of ϵ indicated in parentheses implies the one for the maximal θ_{23} in which cancellation takes place in the leading order. See the text for the definition of ϵ perturbation theory and for more details.

| Channel | matter effect (SI) | matter effect (NSI) | ϵ_{ee} | $\epsilon_{e\mu}$ | $\epsilon_{e\tau}$ | $\epsilon_{\mu\tau}$ | $\epsilon_{\mu\mu}$ | $\epsilon_{\tau\tau}$ |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^3 |
| $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^3 |
| $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^3 |
| $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ | ϵ^2 | ϵ^1 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^1 | $\epsilon^1(\epsilon^2)$ | $\epsilon^1(\epsilon^2)$ |
| $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ | ϵ^2 | ϵ^1 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^1 | $\epsilon^1(\epsilon^2)$ | $\epsilon^1(\epsilon^2)$ |
| $P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ | ϵ^2 | ϵ^1 | ϵ^3 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^2 | ϵ^1 | $\epsilon^1(\epsilon^2)$ | $\epsilon^1(\epsilon^2)$ |

With regard to the second point above, some remarks are in order; Usually, disappearance channels are disadvantageous in looking for a small effect such as θ_{13} , because one has to make the statistical error smaller than the effect one wants to detect. In this respect, the NSI search in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector is promising because it is the first order effect in ϵ . In fact, rather high sensitivities for determining $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$ and $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ observed in atmospheric [35] and future accelerator [36] neutrino analyses are benefited by this feature.

We must warn the readers that experimental observable will be affected by NSI effects in production and detection of neutrinos. Therefore, our comments in this subsection assumes that they are well under control and shown to be smaller than the NSI effects in propagation by near detector measurement with an extreme precision. It should be also emphasized that some of our comments rely on the second-order perturbative formula of the oscillation probability.

C. Some interesting or peculiar features of neutrino oscillation with NSI

We list here some interesting features of neutrino oscillation with NSI which will be fully discussed in the following sections in this paper. Some of them are either unexpected, or might be showed up in previous analyses but without particular attention. A few points in them requires further investigation for full understanding.

- One of the most significant feature in Table. 1 is that ε_{ee} appears only at third order in ϵ in all oscillation channels. It will be shown in Sec. VD that this feature can be explained as a consequence of the matter hesitation theorem mentioned earlier.
- It is interesting to observe from Table I that NSI act as “catalyst” of the matter effect. Namely, the matter effect as signaled by the appearance of Wolfenstein’s coefficient a in the oscillation probability, shows up in first (second) order in ϵ in system with

(without) NSI. It occurs in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector, and is easily understood as a consequence of “tree level” transition by the NSI element. In the $\nu_e - \nu_\mu$ and the $\nu_e - \nu_\tau$ sectors there is no catalyzing effect by NSI because the leading order terms in the oscillation probabilities are of order ϵ^2 .

- The results in the last column in Table I indicates that sensitivity to $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ will depend upon if θ_{23} is maximal or not. This feature is clearly seen, e.g., in [36]. Analysis to resolve the θ_{23} octant degeneracy similar to the one proposed for cases without NSI [37, 38, 39, 40, 41], would be required for correct estimation of the sensitivity to NSI.
- Our analysis for determination of the SI and the NSI parameters indicates that the sign- Δm^2 and the θ_{23} octant degeneracies [33, 34] exist also in system with NSI. The intrinsic one is also likely to exist. An important new feature is that the NSI parameters must be involved into these degeneracies in tight connection to SI parameters. See Secs. VII and VIII for more details.

III. INTRODUCING THE EFFECTS OF NSI IN NEUTRINO PRODUCTION, PROPAGATION AND DETECTION PROCESSES

We consider NSI involving neutrinos of the type

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{NSI}} = -2\sqrt{2}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{fP}G_F(\bar{\nu}_\alpha\gamma_\mu P_L\nu_\beta)(\bar{f}\gamma^\mu P f), \quad (1)$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, and f stands for the index running over fermion species in the earth, $f = e, u, d$, where P stands for a projection operator and is either $P_L \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma_5)$ or $P_R \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5)$. The current constraints on ε parameters are summarized in [11].

Upon introduction of the NSI as in (1) it affects neutrino production, detection as well as propagation in matter [9, 24, 26, 27]. Therefore, we have to analyze the following “grand transition amplitude” from a parent Π particles (which needs not to be pions) to the particular detection particle N (which needs not be nucleons):²

$$T(E_\Pi, E_N) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \int dE_{\nu\alpha} D(E_\Pi, E_{\nu\alpha}) S(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; E_{\nu\alpha}) R(E_{\nu\beta}, E_N) \quad (2)$$

where the sum over α and β must be taken only if they are amenable to be produced by the decay, or to undergo the reaction. Here, we have assumed the particular decay process to produce neutrinos as $\Pi \rightarrow \nu_\alpha + X_\alpha$ with decay amplitude $D(E_\Pi, E_{\nu\alpha})$ with the energies E_Π and $E_{\nu\alpha}$ of parent and daughter particles, and the particular reaction $\nu_\beta + P_{TG} \rightarrow N_\beta + Y_\beta$ with reaction amplitude $R(E_{\nu\beta}, E_N)$ which produce N_β particle with energy E_N . Here, X_α and Y_β are meant to be some inclusive collections of particles and P_{TG} denotes the target particle. $S(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta)$ denotes the neutrino oscillation amplitude of the channel $\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta$. The observable quantity is of course $|T(E_\Pi, E_N)|^2$.

² One can talk about momentum reconstructed detected neutrinos instead of detected positrons, for example, but the reconstruction process must involve the effects of NSI. The expression in (2) is just to symbolically indicate this point.

We assume that the coupling constant $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ possessed by NSI is small, $\sim \left(\frac{M_W}{M_{NP}}\right)^2$ where M_{NP} is a new physics scale, so that we can organize perturbative treatment of the effects of NSI. $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ can be as small as 10^{-2} (10^{-4}) for $M_{NP} = 1(10)$ TeV, and is even smaller if higher dimension operators (higher than six) are required. We assume that all the $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ have similar order of magnitudes and denote the small number collectively as ϵ . Under these assumptions we expect that the decay and the detection functions, and the oscillation probabilities can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} D(E_{\text{II}}, E_{\nu\alpha}) &= D^{(0)} + D^{(1)}\epsilon + D^{(2)}\epsilon^2 + \dots \\ S(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; E_{\nu\alpha}) &= S^{(0)}(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta) + S^{(1)}(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta)\epsilon + S^{(2)}(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta)\epsilon^2 + \dots \\ R(E_{\nu\alpha}, E_N) &= R^{(0)} + R^{(1)}\epsilon + R^{(2)}\epsilon^2 + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where we have suppressed the kinematical dependences in quantities in the right-hand-side of (3). The first terms in (3) are the one without NSI. Now, because of the smallness of $\epsilon \sim 10^{-2}$ (or smaller) we take the attitude that keeping terms up to second order in ϵ must be good enough to discuss the effects of NSI and eventually to estimate the sensitivity to NSI.³

Unfortunately, even with the perturbative treatment this is a highly complicated system to analyze its full structure. It is possible that the types of NSI that contribute to production and detection processes are more numerous than the ones in the propagation process [29]. If this occurs the effects of NSI into production and detection processes could be qualitatively different from those in propagation. Therefore, the effects of NSI come into the decay and the reaction amplitudes generally in a model-dependent fashion, so that the flavor (α, β) dependence of NSI effects are also model-dependent. Also they do so in an energy dependent way so that integration over neutrino energy in (2) is required for the full analysis. For an explicit example of how NSI enter into the decay and the reaction amplitudes as well as to the neutrino propagation in matter in concrete models, see for example the ‘‘unitarity violation’’ approach developed in [42].

In this paper, therefore, we confine ourselves to analysis of the structure of neutrino propagation with NSI, namely the terms with no effects of NSI in the decay and the reaction amplitudes in (2). This is a particularly simple system (relatively speaking with the full one) in the sense that no unitarity violation comes in because it deals with propagation of three light neutrinos. Furthermore, it has no explicit model dependence once the effects of NSI is parametrized in the familiar way. See the Hamiltonian in (5). We should emphasize that limitation of our scope to the problem of neutrino propagation, in fact, allows us to dig out structure of neutrino oscillation with NSI in a transparent manner. Therefore, we think it a meaningful first step.

Our analysis can become the whole story provided that extremely stringent bounds on NSI effects in decay as well as detection reactions are placed by front detector measurement in future experiments. Otherwise, it covers only a leading (zeroth) order terms in NSI effect in decay and detection. When the first order corrections to them are taken into account what is needed is to compute the oscillation amplitude up to first order in ϵ to obtain the

³ As far as the appearance channels $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$ and $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ are concerned the oscillation amplitudes start from first order in ϵ , as we will see below. Therefore, only the first order corrections to D and R are relevant for the observable to order ϵ^2 .

observable to order ϵ^2 . We present, for future use, the results of S matrix elements in Appendix A, not only the expression of the oscillation probabilities.

IV. GENERAL PROPERTIES OF NEUTRINO OSCILLATION WITH AND WITHOUT NSI

Now, we analyze the structure and the properties of neutrino propagation in matter with NSI. We, however, sometimes go back to the system without NSI whenever it is illuminating. The results obtained in this section are exact, that is, they are valid without recourse to perturbation theory we will formulate in the next section. To discuss effects of NSI on neutrino propagation it is customary to introduce the ε parameters, which are defined as $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \sum_{f,P} \frac{n_f}{n_e} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{fP}$, where n_f (n_e) denotes the f -type fermion (electron) number density along the neutrino trajectory in the earth. Then, the neutrino evolution equation can be written in flavor basis as

$$i \frac{d}{dx} \nu_\alpha = H_{\alpha\beta} \nu_\beta \quad (\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau). \quad (4)$$

In the standard three-flavor neutrinos, including NSI as interactions, Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2E} \left\{ U \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta m_{21}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Delta m_{31}^2 \end{bmatrix} U^\dagger + a(x) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + a(x) \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{ee} & |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| e^{i\phi_{e\mu}} & |\varepsilon_{e\tau}| e^{i\phi_{e\tau}} \\ |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| e^{-i\phi_{e\mu}} & \varepsilon_{\mu\mu} & |\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}| e^{i\phi_{\mu\tau}} \\ |\varepsilon_{e\tau}| e^{-i\phi_{e\tau}} & |\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}| e^{-i\phi_{\mu\tau}} & \varepsilon_{\tau\tau} \end{bmatrix} \right\} \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta m_{ji}^2 \equiv m_j^2 - m_i^2$, and $a(x) \equiv 2\sqrt{2}G_F N_e(x)E$ is the coefficient which is related to the index of refraction of neutrinos in medium of electron number density $N_e(x)$ [5], where G_F is the Fermi constant and E is the neutrino energy. The first two terms in (5) are the Standard Model interactions, whereas the last term denotes the non-standard neutrino interactions with matter. U denotes the flavor mixing matrix, the Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (MNS) matrix [1] in the lepton sector. In its standard form [43] it reads

$$U = U_{23}U_{13}U_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13}e^{i\delta} & 0 & c_{13} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where δ stands for the leptonic Kobayashi-Maskawa (KM) phase [44].

In this and the next sections (Secs. IV and V) in which general properties and a perturbative formulation of neutrino oscillation, respectively, are discussed the matter density profile can be taken as an arbitrary form. Whereas in deriving the perturbative formulas for the oscillation probabilities in Sec. VI, we use the constant matter density approximation to simplify the calculation. Unlike the case of the MSW solar neutrino solutions [13] in which the matter density variation is the key to the problem, the constant density approximation to $N_e(x)$ in long-baseline experiments should serve as a reasonable first approximation.

The S matrix describes possible flavor changes after traversing a distance L ,

$$\nu_\alpha(L) = S_{\alpha\beta}\nu_\beta(0), \quad (7)$$

and the oscillation probability is given by

$$P(\nu_\beta \rightarrow \nu_\alpha; L) = |S_{\alpha\beta}|^2. \quad (8)$$

When the neutrino evolution is governed by the Schrödinger equation (4), S matrix is given as

$$S = T \exp \left[-i \int_0^L dx H(x) \right] \quad (9)$$

where T symbol indicates the “time ordering” (in fact “space ordering” here). The right-hand-side of (4) may be written as e^{-iHL} for the case of constant matter density. For notational convenience, we denote the S matrix elements as

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{ee} & S_{e\mu} & S_{e\tau} \\ S_{\mu e} & S_{\mu\mu} & S_{\mu\tau} \\ S_{\tau e} & S_{\tau\mu} & S_{\tau\tau} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

The primary purpose of this paper is to discuss the properties of neutrino oscillation in the standard three flavor system with NSI. Interestingly enough, it requires better understanding the neutrino oscillation without NSI. Therefore, we recollect the properties of neutrino oscillation without NSI whenever necessary, and treat both systems simultaneously or go back and forth between them to make our discussion transparent. By this way the properties of the neutrino oscillations can be better illuminated.

A. Relations between neutrino oscillation amplitudes without NSI

If NSI, the third term in (5), is absent the matter term (the second term in (5)) has a symmetry; It is invariant under U_{23} rotation which act on $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ subspace. Due to this symmetry the Hamiltonian can be rewritten as

$$H = U_{23} \tilde{H} U_{23}^\dagger, \quad (11)$$

and hence the S matrix can be written as

$$S(L) = U_{23} \tilde{S}(L) U_{23}^\dagger \quad (12)$$

as noticed in [22] where $\tilde{S}(L) = T \exp \left[-i \int_0^L dx \tilde{H}(x) \right]$. The point here is that \tilde{H} and $\tilde{S}(L)$ do *not* contain θ_{23} .

If we denote $\tilde{S}(L)$ matrix elements in a form analogous to the one in (10) S matrix can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{S}_{ee} & c_{23}\tilde{S}_{e\mu} + s_{23}\tilde{S}_{e\tau} & -s_{23}\tilde{S}_{e\mu} + c_{23}\tilde{S}_{e\tau} \\ c_{23}\tilde{S}_{\mu e} + s_{23}\tilde{S}_{\tau e} & c_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\mu\mu} + s_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\tau\tau} + c_{23}s_{23}(\tilde{S}_{\mu\tau} + \tilde{S}_{\tau\mu}) & c_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\tau\mu} + c_{23}s_{23}(\tilde{S}_{\tau\tau} - \tilde{S}_{\mu\mu}) \\ -s_{23}\tilde{S}_{\mu e} + c_{23}\tilde{S}_{\tau e} & c_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\tau\mu} - s_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\mu\tau} + c_{23}s_{23}(\tilde{S}_{\tau\tau} - \tilde{S}_{\mu\mu}) & s_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\mu\mu} + c_{23}^2\tilde{S}_{\tau\tau} - c_{23}s_{23}(\tilde{S}_{\mu\tau} + \tilde{S}_{\tau\mu}) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

It should be noticed that $S_{ee} = \tilde{S}_{ee}$ is independent of θ_{23} . Therefore, the S matrix elements obey relationships [22]

$$\begin{aligned} S_{e\tau} &= S_{e\mu}(c_{23} \rightarrow -s_{23}, s_{23} \rightarrow c_{23}), \\ S_{\tau\tau} &= S_{\mu\mu}(c_{23} \rightarrow -s_{23}, s_{23} \rightarrow c_{23}), \\ S_{\tau\mu} &= -S_{\mu\tau}(c_{23} \rightarrow -s_{23}, s_{23} \rightarrow c_{23}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

B. Relations between neutrino oscillation amplitudes with NSI

The secret behind the relations between $S_{e\mu}$ and $S_{e\tau}$ and the others in (14) is that \tilde{H} is independent of θ_{23} , or in other words, the invariance of \tilde{H} under the transformation $c_{23} \rightarrow -s_{23}, s_{23} \rightarrow c_{23}$. When NSI is introduced there exists the following additional term in \tilde{H} :

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}^{\text{NSI}} &= U_{23}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{ee} & \varepsilon_{e\mu} & \varepsilon_{e\tau} \\ \varepsilon_{e\mu}^* & \varepsilon_{\mu\mu} & \varepsilon_{\mu\tau} \\ \varepsilon_{e\tau}^* & \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* & \varepsilon_{\tau\tau} \end{bmatrix} U_{23} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{ee} & c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} & s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \\ c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^* & c_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} + s_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\tau\tau} - c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau} + \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) & c_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* + c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) \\ s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^* & c_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* - s_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\mu\tau} + c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) & s_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} + c_{23}^2\varepsilon_{\tau\tau} + c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau} + \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Because \tilde{H}^{NSI} in (15) *does* depend on θ_{23} , the S matrix relations as given in (14) do not hold. However, if we consider the extended transformation

$$\begin{aligned} c_{23} &\rightarrow -s_{23}, & s_{23} &\rightarrow c_{23}, \\ \varepsilon_{e\mu} &\rightarrow \varepsilon_{e\tau}, & \varepsilon_{e\tau} &\rightarrow -\varepsilon_{e\mu}, \\ \varepsilon_{\mu\mu} &\rightarrow \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}, & \varepsilon_{\tau\tau} &\rightarrow \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \\ \varepsilon_{\mu\tau} &\rightarrow -\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^*, & \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* &\rightarrow -\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

it is easy to show that \tilde{H}^{NSI} is invariant under the transformation (16). It means that the S matrix relations (14) hold even with NSI provided that we extend the transformation to the ones in (16). It not only implies the existence of useful relations between the S matrix elements, but also serves as a powerful tool for consistency check of perturbative computation. We will see in Sec. A that the computed results of the S matrix elements, and hence the oscillation probabilities, do satisfy (14) with the extended transformation (16).

As we will see in Sec. VIB, the invariance under the extended transformation (16) entails a remarkable feature that the terms which depend on ε 's in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector in the oscillation probabilities $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$, $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$, and $P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ are all equal except for the sign.

C. Phase reduction theorem

Now, we present a general theorem on reduction of number of CP violating phases in system with NSI, which we call ‘‘phase reduction theorem’’ for short. By looking into the results of perturbative computation [27] it was observed that when the solar Δm_{21}^2 is

switched off the oscillation probabilities with NSI depends on phases which come from NSI elements and δ in a particular manner, e.g., $|\varepsilon|e^{i(\delta+\phi)}$. It was conjectured on physics ground that the property must hold in the exact expressions of the oscillation probabilities [30]; With vanishing Δm_{21}^2 the system becomes effectively two flavor and hence the observable CP violating phase must be unique.

Here, we give a general proof of this property which is, in fact, very easy to do. We first notice a simple relation which holds in the absence of Δm_{21}^2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &\equiv \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\delta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} H \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\delta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \Delta \begin{bmatrix} s_{13}^2 & c_{13}s_{13}s_{23} & c_{13}s_{13}c_{23} \\ c_{13}s_{13}s_{23} & c_{13}^2s_{23}^2 & c_{13}^2c_{23}s_{23} \\ c_{13}s_{13}c_{23} & c_{13}^2c_{23}s_{23} & c_{13}^2c_{23}^2 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{a}{2E} \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \varepsilon_{ee} & |\varepsilon_{e\mu}|e^{i\chi} & |\varepsilon_{e\tau}|e^{i\omega} \\ |\varepsilon_{e\mu}|e^{-i\chi} & \varepsilon_{\mu\mu} & |\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}|e^{i\phi_{\mu\tau}} \\ |\varepsilon_{e\tau}|e^{-i\omega} & |\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}|e^{-i\phi_{\mu\tau}} & \varepsilon_{\tau\tau} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{2E}$, $\chi \equiv \delta + \phi_{e\mu}$, and $\omega \equiv \delta + \phi_{e\tau}$. Then, if we use a new basis $\hat{\nu}_\alpha \equiv [\text{diag}(e^{i\delta}, 1, 1)]_{\alpha\beta}\nu_\beta$, the evolution equation reads

$$i \frac{d}{dx} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\nu}_e \\ \hat{\nu}_\mu \\ \hat{\nu}_\tau \end{bmatrix} = \hat{H} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\nu}_e \\ \hat{\nu}_\mu \\ \hat{\nu}_\tau \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

It is obvious from (18) that the system depends on only three phases $\chi = \delta + \phi_{e\mu}$, $\omega = \delta + \phi_{e\tau}$ and $\phi_{\mu\tau}$ out of four. This particular combination of phases is, of course, depends upon the specific parametrization of the MNS matrix. The phase factor attached to the transformation matrix in (17) does not affect to the oscillation probability because it is an over-all phase. This completes a general proof that number of CP violating phases is reduced by one when the solar Δm_{21}^2 is switched off. We emphasize that this property has implication to the real world where $\Delta m_{21}^2 \neq 0$. For example, the phenomenon of phase reduction occurs at the magic baseline, $\frac{aL}{4E} = \pi$, in the perturbative formula to be obtained in Sec. VI even though $\Delta m_{21}^2 \neq 0$.

V. PERTURBATION THEORY OF NEUTRINO OSCILLATION

A. ϵ Perturbation theory

To formulate perturbation theory one has to specify the expansion parameters. We take the following dimensionless parameters as small expansion parameters and assume that they are of the same order:

$$\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sim s_{13} \sim \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} \sim \epsilon \quad (\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau). \quad (19)$$

Whereas, we treat $\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2}$ as of order unity.⁴ We collectively denote order of magnitude of the expansion parameters as ϵ , and hence we call the perturbative framework the ϵ

⁴ We do not take $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - s_{23}$ as an expansion parameter because a rather large range is currently allowed and the situation will not be changed even with the next generation experiments [23].

perturbation theory. In the absence of NSI our formulas of oscillation probabilities, of course, reduces to the Cervera *et al.* formula [19], which we call the SI second-order formula in this paper. Correspondingly, we call our second-order probability formula “NSI second-order formula”. It appears that in the standard case this perturbative framework accommodates the situation of relatively large θ_{13} within the Chooz bound [45], and applicable to wide variety of experimental settings.

Another approach would be to just expand in terms of $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ which is assumed to be small without any correlation with other SI mixing parameters. If NSI elements are extremely small, much smaller than the SI expansion parameters, such first-order formulas of NSI would be sufficient. It would be the case of NSI search in the next generation experiments as discussed e.g., in [29].

On the contrary, it often occurs in deriving constraints on various NSI parameters that the bounds on the diagonal ε 's, ε_{ee} , $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$, and $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$, are sometimes milder than the ones on the off-diagonal ε 's by an order of magnitude. If it is the case, we may need to keep the higher order of the diagonal ε 's in ϵ -perturbation theory, to e.g. ϵ^4 , in probabilities to analyze such situations. We try not to enter into this problem in our present treatment.

B. Formulating perturbative framework

We follow the standard perturbative formulation to calculate the S matrix and the neutrino oscillation probabilities [17]. Yet, we present a simplified treatment which is suitable for higher order calculations. For convenience, we start by treating the system without NSI in this section. We use the tilde-basis $\tilde{\nu} = U_{23}^\dagger \nu$ with Hamiltonian \tilde{H} defined in (11). The tilde-Hamiltonian is decomposed as $\tilde{H} = \tilde{H}_0 + \tilde{H}_1$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_0(x) &= \Delta \begin{bmatrix} r_A(x) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \tilde{H}_1 &= \Delta \begin{bmatrix} s_{13}^2 & 0 & c_{13}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ c_{13}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & 0 & -s_{13}^2 \end{bmatrix} + \Delta r_\Delta \begin{bmatrix} s_{12}^2 c_{13}^2 & c_{12}s_{12}c_{13} & -s_{12}^2 c_{13}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ c_{12}s_{12}c_{13} & c_{12}^2 & -c_{12}s_{12}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}^2 c_{13}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{12}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{12}^2 s_{13}^2 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{2E}$, $r_\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2}$, $r_A(x) \equiv \frac{a(x)}{\Delta m_{31}^2}$. To calculate $\tilde{S}(L)$ we define $\Omega(x)$ as

$$\Omega(x) = e^{i \int_0^x dx' \tilde{H}_0(x')} \tilde{S}(x). \quad (22)$$

$\Omega(x)$ obeys the evolution equation

$$i \frac{d}{dx} \Omega(x) = H_1 \Omega(x) \quad (23)$$

where

$$H_1(x) \equiv e^{i \int_0^x dx' \tilde{H}_0(x')} \tilde{H}_1 e^{-i \int_0^x dx' \tilde{H}_0(x')} \quad (24)$$

Then, $\Omega(x)$ can be computed perturbatively as

$$\Omega(x) = 1 + (-i) \int_0^x dx' H_1(x') + (-i)^2 \int_0^x dx' H_1(x') \int_0^{x'} dx'' H_1(x'') + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3). \quad (25)$$

where the “space-ordered” form in (25) is essential because of the highly nontrivial spatial dependence in H_1 . Collecting the formulas the S matrix can be written as

$$S(L) = U_{23} e^{-i\tilde{H}_0 L} \Omega(L) U_{23}^\dagger \quad (26)$$

Therefore, essentially we are left with perturbative computation of $\Omega(x)$ with use of (27) to calculate the S matrix.⁵

C. Matter hesitation theorem

To demonstrate the usefulness of perturbation theory, we derive in this subsection a “matter hesitation theorem” within the framework without NSI. It states that the matter effect dependent terms in the neutrino oscillation probabilities $P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta)$ ($\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$) are absent to first order in ϵ within the perturbative framework we work in this paper; It hesitates to come in before computation goes to second order in ϵ . The theorem explains why it is so difficult to detect the matter effect in many accelerator experiments.

We seek construction of an “interaction representation” with $\hat{\nu}$ basis, corresponding Ω in (22), as $\tilde{\nu} = e^{-i \int_0^x dx' \tilde{H}_0(x')} \hat{\nu}$. The “hat basis” obeys the Schrödinger equation $i \frac{d}{dx} \hat{\nu} = H_1 \hat{\nu}$ with H_1 defined in (24). To first order in ϵ it takes the form

$$H_1(x) = \Delta \begin{bmatrix} s_{12}^2 r_\Delta & c_{12} s_{12} r_\Delta e^{i\Delta \int_0^x dx' r_A(x')} & s_{13} e^{-i\delta} e^{-i\Delta \int_0^x dx' [1-r_A(x')]} \\ c_{12} s_{12} r_\Delta e^{-i\Delta \int_0^x dx' r_A(x')} & c_{12}^2 r_\Delta & 0 \\ c_{13} s_{13} e^{i\delta} e^{i\Delta \int_0^x dx' [1-r_A(x')]} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (27)$$

The hat basis Hamiltonian has a peculiar feature that there is no matter density dependence in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector as well as in the ee element. It is nothing but this feature of the Hamiltonian in (27) that the matter effect is absent, to first order in ϵ , in the oscillation probabilities in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector and in the disappearance one in the ee sector. To confirm this understanding we calculate the S matrix in the tilde basis

$$\tilde{S}(L) = e^{-i \int_0^L dx' \tilde{H}_0(x')} \left[1 - i \int_0^L dx' H_1(x') \right]. \quad (28)$$

⁵ Since \tilde{H}_1 in (21) contains order ϵ^2 terms in addition to order ϵ terms the formal expression in (25) includes terms higher than $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ which are meant to be ignored. The same statement applies to the computation to be carried out in Appendix A.

If we denote the elements of $\tilde{S}(L)$ analogously as in (10) they are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{S}(L)_{ee} &= (1 - is_{12}^2 r_\Delta \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta \int_0^L dx' r_A(x)} \\
\tilde{S}(L)_{e\mu} &= -ic_{12}s_{12}r_\Delta \Delta e^{-i\Delta \int_0^L dx' r_A(x)} \int_0^L dx e^{i\Delta \int_0^x dx' r_A(x')} \\
\tilde{S}(L)_{e\tau} &= -is_{13}e^{-i\delta} \Delta e^{-i\Delta \int_0^L dx' r_A(x)} \int_0^L dx e^{-i\Delta \int_0^x dx' [1-r_A(x')]} \\
\tilde{S}(L)_{\mu e} &= -ic_{12}s_{12}r_\Delta \Delta \int_0^L dx e^{-i\Delta \int_0^x dx' r_A(x')} \\
\tilde{S}(L)_{\mu\mu} &= 1 - ic_{12}^2 r_\Delta \Delta L \\
\tilde{S}(L)_{\mu\tau} &= \tilde{S}(L)_{\tau\mu} = 0 \\
\tilde{S}(L)_{\tau e} &= -is_{13}e^{i\delta} \Delta e^{-i\Delta L} \int_0^L dx e^{i\Delta \int_0^x dx' [1-r_A(x')]} \\
\tilde{S}(L)_{\tau\tau} &= e^{-i\Delta L}
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Finally, the S matrix is obtained as $S(L) = U_{23}\tilde{S}(L)U_{23}^\dagger$. Notice, however, that the rotation by U_{23} does not mix the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector to the $\nu_e - \nu_\alpha$ ($\alpha = \mu, \tau$) sector. Therefore, the structure of the $\tilde{S}(L)$ matrix is enough to prove the matter hesitation theorem. The results in (29) indicate that the S matrix elements to first order in ϵ perturbation theory are of first and zeroth orders in ϵ , respectively, in the $\nu_e - \nu_\alpha$ and the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sectors. The latter guarantees that the oscillation probabilities $P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta)$ ($\alpha, \beta = \mu, \tau$) in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector do not depend on matter density to first order in ϵ . Whereas the former proves that the oscillation probabilities themselves in the $\nu_e - \nu_\alpha$ sector, including the matter effects, are of second-order in ϵ . This completes the derivation of the matter hesitation theorem, the property that matter effects comes in into the oscillation probability only at second order in ϵ . Notice that it holds with generic forms of matter profile.

We stress that the absence of the matter effect in the oscillation probability to first order in ϵ is highly nontrivial. Since the matter effect coefficient $r_A = \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2}$ is zeroth order in ϵ it can affect the S matrix in all orders in ϵ . Probably, the most surprising thing is that while S_{ee} does have matter effect even in zeroth order in ϵ this dependence disappears in the the survival probability $|S_{ee}|^2$ because the matter dependence comes in via a phase factor, as can be seen in the first line in (29). After we carry out perturbative calculation of the oscillation probability we will show that this property can be understood by unitarity. (See Sec. VIC.)

D. Implication of matter hesitation theorem to neutrino oscillation with NSI

There is a clear implication of the matter hesitation theorem to the system with NSI; The terms with the NSI element ε_{ee} must appear in the oscillation probability only at third-order in ϵ or higher. It is due to the special nature of ε_{ee} that can be introduced as a renormalization factor of the matter effect coefficient a , $a \rightarrow a(1 + \varepsilon_{ee})$. Since the terms with a are already of order ϵ^2 , the terms with ε_{ee} must be at least of order ϵ^3 .

The reader should be puzzled by the above statement. One may argue quite naturally that there must exist a term with first order in ε_{ee} in the survival probability $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$.

In fact, such a term does exist in the relevant S matrix element as one can see in (A6):

$$S_{ee} = e^{-ir_A \Delta L} \left\{ 1 - i(s_{12}^2 r_\Delta + \varepsilon_{ee} r_A) \Delta L \right\} \quad (30)$$

Resolution of the puzzle, therefore, is that the first order term of ε_{ee} cannot appear in the oscillation probability because it is purely imaginary. However, to confirm the cancellation of second order term we must go beyond the present treatment by keeping the order ϵ^2 terms in the S matrix. It will be presented in the next section.

Another interesting question is whether the matter hesitation theorem can be generalized into the systems with NSI. We will show by explicit computation that the answer is yes and no in the oscillation probabilities in the ν_e -related and the $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ sectors, respectively. In the latter the first order terms in ϵ in the S matrix which involve $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$, which enter into the S matrix in a similar way as in (30), breaks the theorem. See the next section.

VI. NSI SECOND-ORDER PROBABILITY FORMULAS

Now, we derive the formulas of oscillation probabilities with NSI which is valid to second order in ϵ . The procedure is to compute the S matrix using the framework of ϵ perturbation theory developed in Sec. V. Then, the oscillation probabilities can be obtained with (8). We use constant electron number density approximation in matter in this and the subsequent sections. For details of the calculation and the results of the S matrix elements, see Appendix A. For clarity, we prefer to display explicitly everything of the expressions of the oscillation probabilities in this section. For structural analysis of the oscillation probabilities e.g., for analysis of parameter determination, we use more abstract notations. See Sec. VII. The results of third-order calculation which are necessary to complete Table I are presented in Appendix B.

A. Electron neutrino sector

We start from the sector which involve ν_e because the features of the oscillation probabilities with NSI are markedly different from those in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector. To second order in ϵ , the oscillation probabilities in the ν_e related sector do not contain any NSI elements in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector, $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$ etc. It should not come as a surprise because in the ν_μ and ν_τ appearance channel the leading term of the S matrix is already of order ϵ , and it can contain only the ν_e related NSI elements, $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$. Therefore, there is no room for ε 's in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector in the appearance probabilities. We will see in the next subsection that this simple fact leads to a great simplification of the oscillation probabilities in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector.

The oscillation probabilities in $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e$, $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$, and $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ channels are given as follows:

$$P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e) = 1 - 4 \left| c_{12} s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23} \varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23} \varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} - 4 \left| s_{13} e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23} \varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23} \varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L, \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = & 4c_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} \\
& + 4s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& + 8c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re} \left[(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau})(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^*) \right] \\
& \quad \times \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& + 8c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Im} \left[(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau})(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^*) \right] \\
& \quad \times \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L, \quad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau) = & 4s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} \\
& + 4c_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& - 8c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re} \left[(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau})(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^*) \right] \\
& \quad \times \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& - 8c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Im} \left[(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau})(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^*) \right] \\
& \quad \times \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L. \quad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

Of course, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ can be obtained from $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ by the extended transformation (16). We note that the relative simplicity of the expression of the appearance oscillation probabilities compared to those in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector given in the next subsection can be traced back to the fact that the S matrix elements start with terms of order ϵ . Therefore, we do not need ϵ^2 terms in the S matrix to obtain the NSI second-order probability formulas. Several other remarks can be made immediately in seeing the expressions of the oscillation probabilities with NSI. But, we shall postpone them to the next section because they can be made in a more transparent manner after seeing the formulas in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector.

The readers may ask a question; Why the form of $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ so simple even with NSI? A simple answer is that complicated phase dependent terms in $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ cancel when added to obtain $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ via unitarity; $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e) = 1 - [P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) + P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)]$.

B. $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector

In the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector, the oscillation probabilities with and without NSI have several characteristic differences from those in the ν_e sector. First of all, they contain zeroth order

term in ϵ , and hence, NSI second-order formula requires full order ϵ^2 terms in the S matrix. Looking at the expressions of S matrix elements in Appendix A, which are already long, it is natural to expect far more complicated expressions of probabilities in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector. Nevertheless, there is a remarkable way of organizing terms in the oscillation probabilities in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector to greatly simplify their expressions.

We note that the results of perturbative computation of the oscillation probabilities the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector can be written to second order in ϵ as

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; \epsilon_{e\mu}, \epsilon_{e\tau}, \epsilon_{\mu\mu}, \epsilon_{\mu\tau}, \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) &= P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; 2 \text{ flavor in vacuum}) \\ &+ P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; \epsilon_{e\mu}, \epsilon_{e\tau}) \\ &+ P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; \epsilon_{\mu\mu}, \epsilon_{\mu\tau}, \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where α and β denote one of μ and τ . The first term in (34) has a form that it appears in the two flavor oscillation in vacuum:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; 2 \text{ flavor in vacuum}) &= P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau; 2 \text{ flavor in vacuum}) \\ &= 1 - 4c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \\ P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau; 2 \text{ flavor in vacuum}) &= 4c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The second term in (34) is given, respectively, in $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu$, $\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ channels as

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \epsilon_{e\mu}, \epsilon_{e\tau}) &= -4c_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} \\ &- 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\ &+ 8c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\ &- 4s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\ &- 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\ &+ 8c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \cos \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\ &+ 8c_{23}s_{23} \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \\ &\times \left[c_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} + s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L - s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} - (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau}) &= -4s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} \\
&- 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
&+ 8c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
&- 4c_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
&- 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
&+ 8c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \cos \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
&- 8c_{23}s_{23} \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \\
&\quad \times \left(s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} + c_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L - c_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Notice that $P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau})$ can be obtained from $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau})$ by the extended transformation (16). Finally, the second term in the oscillation probability in the $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ channel is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau}) &= 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
&- 8c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
&+ 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
&- 8c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \cos \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
&+ 8c_{23}s_{23}(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} - \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \right) \\
&+ 8c_{23}s_{23} \text{Im} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Surprisingly, the third term in (34) in the $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu$, $\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau$, and $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ channels are

given by the single equation

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) \\
&= P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) = -P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) \\
&= 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left\{ c_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) - 2c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau} + \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) + s_{13}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right\} \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
&- 8c_{23}s_{23}(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \operatorname{Re} \left[c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* - c_{12}s_{12}s_{13} e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right] \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \\
&- c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left\{ c_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) - 2c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau} + \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) \right\}^2 \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right)^2 \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
&+ 4c_{23}s_{23}(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \left\{ c_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) - 2c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau} + \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) \right\} \\
&\quad \times \operatorname{Re} \left[c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right] \left[\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \\
&- 4c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left| c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right|^2 \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\
&- 4(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)^2 \left| c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \\
&+ 16c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\operatorname{Re} \left[c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2 \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right] \right)^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}. \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

To second order in ϵ the sensitivity to $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ is through the form $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$, and hence no sensitivity to the individual ε 's. Generally, the diagonal ε 's appear in a form of difference in the oscillation probabilities as one can observe in the third-order formula given in Appendix B. It must be the case because the over-all phase is an unobservable.

C. Use of unitarity relation in understanding simplicity of the NSI second-order formulas

Here is a explanation why such regularities exist in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector to allow great simplification of the oscillation probabilities. In particular, the relation between the probabilities of different channels in (34), as embodied in the first line of (39), might look mysterious. But, it is very simple to understand it. By unitarity it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu) + P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau) &= 1 - P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e), \\
P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau) + P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\mu) &= 1 - P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_e). \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ and $P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_e)$ do not contain $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$, $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$, and $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$ to second order in ϵ . Noticing that the terms related to ε 's in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector are T-invariant, the relations $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) = -P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) = -P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau})$ must hold. The last equality also follows from the relationship between S matrix elements due to the extended transformation (16).

The unitarity relation is useful also in understanding the matter hesitation theorem discussed in Sec. V C. For its most nontrivial case of $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$, the relevant unitarity relation

is

$$1 - P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e) = P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) + P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau) \quad (41)$$

Since $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ are at least of order ϵ^2 the matter dependent term in $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$, which is involved in the left-hand-side in (41), has to be second order, or higher, in ϵ . It should be noticed that this argument is valid not only in systems with SI only but also in the one with NSI, the matter hesitation theorem for $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ in the presence of NSI. Also notice that the same argument does not go through for $1 - P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ because $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ can contain the terms lower than ϵ^2 , thereby allowing the catalysis of matter effect by NSI, as mentioned in Sec. II C.

VII. PARAMETER DETERMINATION IN NEUTRINO OSCILLATION WITH NSI

Thanks to the NSI second-order probability formulas derived in the previous section, we can now address the question of how simultaneous measurement of the SI and the NSI parameters can be carried out. However, we must first warn the readers that our discussions in this section are based solely on the NSI second-order formulas, and hence its validity may be limited. Nonetheless, we believe that ignoring the ϵ^3 effects is quite safe because we anticipate $\epsilon \sim 10^{-2}$ in our perturbative framework.

A. SI-NSI confusion

One of the most distinctive features of the oscillation probability formulas in Sec. VI is that the NSI parameters $\varepsilon_{e\alpha}$ ($\alpha = \mu, \tau$) appears in the particular combination with the SI parameters as

$$\Theta_\pm \equiv s_{13} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + (s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau})e^{i\delta} = \pm s_{13} \frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|e^{i\hat{\phi}_{e\tau}} \quad (42)$$

$$\Xi \equiv \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau} \right) e^{i\delta} = \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{i\delta} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|e^{i\hat{\phi}_{e\mu}} \right) \quad (43)$$

where $\hat{\phi}_{e\alpha} \equiv \delta + \tilde{\phi}_{e\alpha}$ ($\alpha = \mu, \tau$). At the second equality in the right-hand-side of (42), we have introduced a new notation $\Delta m_{31}^2 = \pm \delta m_{31}^2$ where \pm sign indicates the sign of Δm_{31}^2 , the mass hierarchy, and $\delta m_{31}^2 \equiv |\Delta m_{31}^2| > 0$. It should be mentioned that the feature is true not only in the ν_e related sector, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$, but also in all the oscillation probabilities in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector as well as in $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$, as can be seen in Sec. VI. Of course, it has root in the form of the perturbed Hamiltonian in (15). In fact, an intuitive understanding of the feature in (42) and (43) is that $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}$ play the role of the mixing angles which govern 1-2 and 1-3 transitions, respectively, as anticipated from the first-order Hamiltonian in the tilde basis in (15).

What that means in the context of parameter determination? It means that, in general, determination of SI mixing parameters, θ_{13} and δ , has severe confusion with determination of NSI parameters $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$, and vice versa. However, it should be noticed that it does *not* mean something like ‘‘No Go’’ theorem. Namely, there is a way to circumvent this problem. It is

a complete determination of the SI and the NSI parameters, the possibility we address later in this section.

Nonetheless, we should note the following: If one assumes that such complete determination is somehow not feasible experimentally, our result may be interpreted as an analytic proof of the “NSI-SI confusion theorem”.⁶ It is a powerful statement because it not only reveals the existence of confusion but also illuminates which SI parameters are confused with which NSI parameters via which manner.

In fact, the characteristic feature in (42) and (43), namely, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}$ only couples to the solar scale oscillation and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}$ the atmospheric one, would affect the resolution of the θ_{13} -NSI and the two-phase confusions. Coupling between the solar and the atmospheric degrees of freedom bridged by a NSI element is the key to the resolution of the θ_{13} -NSI confusion by the two-detector method [30]. Therefore, the resolution mechanism might be affected by the simultaneous presence of two ε 's, which “decouples” the solar and the atmospheric degrees of freedom. This point requires careful investigation.

B. Strategy for parameter determination

To gain a hint of how we can proceed let us look at Table. I. We first note that it is not possible to detect the effects of ε_{ee} because it is of third order in all channels, and hence we have to omit it from our subsequent discussions. It is also well known and is obvious from the probability formulas in Sec. VI that $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ come in through the form $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ and therefore only their difference is measurable.

Next, we observe that the order of ϵ at which their effect shows up is different between the ν_e related NSI, $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$, and the ones in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector. The former two appears at second order in ϵ in all channels. Whereas the latter appears at first order (for $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ second order if θ_{23} is maximal) in ϵ in channels in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector, and at third order in channels involving ν_e . The important point is therefore that one can explore the effects of $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ in ν_e related channels while ignoring $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$, $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$, and $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$. It is a good news because the appearance channels, assuming excellent detection capability of ν_μ and ν_τ , have great potential of detecting the effects of NSI [30]. Once $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ are measured one can proceed to determine the rest of the NSI elements $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$, $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$, and $\varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ using the oscillation probabilities in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector.⁷

The actual ways how the six SI and NSI parameters can be determined may depend on whether one can enjoy prior knowledges of θ_{13} and δ at the time of measurement. If θ_{13} is large enough such that the SI parameters can be measured by the next generation reactor [46] and the accelerator experiments [47, 48], and conventional muon neutrino superbeam [49] experiments are powerful enough to measure δ , it may be thinkable that the both parameters are already known though with limited accuracies. Then, one might argue that the discussion of parameter determination would become much less complicated in this case.

We argue that this is not quite correct. As we have seen in the previous subsection

⁶ We note that a different type of the confusion theorem was derived in [26] which involves θ_{13} and NSI parameters in production and in propagation processes that obey a special relationship.

⁷ If θ_{23} is deviated significantly from the maximal so that $\cos 2\theta_{23} \gg \epsilon$, then the terms with $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ can have sizes of order ϵ . In this case, it may be possible to detect the effects of $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$ and measure (or constrain) it even without having a priori knowledges of $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$.

the NSI parameters come in into the oscillation probability in certain combinations with the SI parameters. Hence, determination of the former with size of $\varepsilon_{\alpha,\beta} \sim 10^{-2}$ requires simultaneous determination of the latter with *accuracy* of similar order. Therefore, prior determination of θ_{13} and δ , unless extremely precise ones, would not alter the necessity of simultaneous determination of SI and NSI parameters. Thus, we think it necessary to go through the discussions of parameter determination simply assuming no prior knowledges of θ_{13} and δ , as we will attempt in the next subsection. However, we note that knowing the neutrino mass hierarchy would greatly help by decreasing the ambiguities which arise from the degeneracy.

C. Complete measurement of the SI and the NSI parameters; θ_{13} , δ , $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$

Now, we start to formulate a recipe for complete determination of the SI and the NSI parameters. To make equations simpler we use the simplified notations introduced in (42) and (43), and their antineutrino versions

$$\bar{\Theta}_{\pm} \equiv -s_{13} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + (s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^*)e^{-i\delta} = \mp s_{13} \frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|e^{-i\hat{\phi}_{e\tau}}, \quad (44)$$

$$\bar{\Xi} \equiv \left(-c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\varepsilon_{e\mu}^* - s_{23}\varepsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) e^{-i\delta} = \left(-c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{-i\delta} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|e^{-i\hat{\phi}_{e\mu}} \right). \quad (45)$$

Note that $a > 0$.

Based on consideration in the previous subsection, we concentrate on $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ and their CP and T conjugates. By looking into the expressions of oscillation probabilities in (32) and (33) (and other related ones which will be given below) one notices that the observable quantities are of the forms

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Theta_{\pm}|^2, |\Xi|^2, \text{Re} [\Xi\Theta_{\pm}^*], \text{Im} [\Xi\Theta_{\pm}^*] \text{ in neutrino sector, and} \\ &|\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}|^2, |\bar{\Xi}|^2, \text{Re} [\bar{\Xi}\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}^*], \text{Im} [\bar{\Xi}\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}^*] \text{ in antineutrino sector.} \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Notice that informations of these quantities do *not* determine the two complex quantities Θ_{\pm} and Ξ (in neutrino channel) completely, because the obtained quantities are invariant under the simultaneous arbitrary phase transformation $\Theta_{\pm} \rightarrow \Theta_{\pm}e^{i\alpha}$ and $\Xi \rightarrow \Xi e^{i\alpha}$. The similar statement holds also in the antineutrino channel. Or, in other word, if we parametrize the relevant quantities as

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\pm} &= |\Theta_{\pm}|e^{i\theta_{\pm}}, & \Xi &= |\Xi|e^{i\xi}. \\ \bar{\Theta}_{\pm} &= |\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}|e^{i\bar{\theta}_{\pm}}, & \bar{\Xi} &= |\bar{\Xi}|e^{i\bar{\xi}}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

what are actually measurable are: $|\Theta_{\pm}|$, $|\Xi|$, $|\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}|$, $|\bar{\Xi}|$, $\theta_{\pm} - \xi$, and $\bar{\theta}_{\pm} - \bar{\xi}$. There are altogether six quantities.

Suppose now that somehow we were able to determine all these quantities. We discuss in the following subsections how it can be done. Here, we show how they determine the SI and the NSI parameters, s_{13} , δ , $|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|$, $|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|$, $\phi_{e\mu}$, and $\phi_{e\tau}$. It may be sufficient, assuming that the inversion is possible, to express the observable in terms of the physical parameters. We

start with the neutrino sector:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Theta_{\pm}|^2 &= s_{13}^2 \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right)^2 + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|^2 \pm 2s_{13}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}| \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right) \cos \hat{\phi}_{e\tau} \\
|\Xi|^2 &= \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 + 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \cos(\delta - \hat{\phi}_{e\mu})
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

For phase difference we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Theta_{\pm}^* \Xi}{\Theta_{\pm} \Xi^*} &= e^{2i(\xi - \theta_{\pm})} = \frac{1}{|\Theta_{\pm}|^2 |\Xi|^2} \\
&\times \left[s_{13}^2 \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right)^2 \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 e^{2i\delta} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 e^{2i\hat{\phi}_{e\mu}} + 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{i(\delta + \hat{\phi}_{e\mu})} \right\} \right. \\
&+ |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|^2 \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 e^{2i(\delta - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 e^{2i(\hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} + 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{i(\delta + \hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - 2\hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} \right\} \\
&\left. \pm 2s_{13}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}| \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right) \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 e^{i(2\delta - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 e^{i(2\hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} + 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{i(\delta + \hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} \right\} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

By taking the real and the imaginary parts of (49) one can obtain $\cos 2(\xi - \theta_{\pm})$ and $\sin 2(\xi - \theta_{\pm})$, respectively.

For antineutrinos we obtain similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}|^2 &= s_{13}^2 \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right)^2 + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|^2 \mp 2s_{13}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}| \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right) \cos \hat{\phi}_{e\tau} \\
|\bar{\Xi}|^2 &= \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 - 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \cos(\delta - \hat{\phi}_{e\mu})
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Similarly, only their difference $\bar{\theta}_{\pm} - \bar{\xi}$ is the observable.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}^* \bar{\Xi}}{\bar{\Theta}_{\pm} \bar{\Xi}^*} &= e^{2i(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_{\pm})} = \frac{1}{|\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}|^2 |\bar{\Xi}|^2} \\
&\times \left[s_{13}^2 \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right)^2 \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 e^{-2i\delta} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 e^{-2i\hat{\phi}_{e\mu}} - 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{-i(\delta + \hat{\phi}_{e\mu})} \right\} \right. \\
&+ |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|^2 \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 e^{-2i(\delta - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 e^{-2i(\hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} - 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{-i(\delta + \hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - 2\hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} \right\} \\
&\mp 2s_{13}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}| \left(\frac{\delta m_{31}^2}{a} \right) \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right)^2 e^{-i(2\delta - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 e^{-i(2\hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - 2c_{12}s_{12}|\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}| \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} e^{-i(\delta + \hat{\phi}_{e\mu} - \hat{\phi}_{e\tau})} \right\} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Having the six equations altogether with given six observable, $|\Theta_{\pm}|$, $|\bar{\Theta}_{\pm}|$, $|\Xi|$, $|\bar{\Xi}|$, $\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_{\pm}$, and $\xi - \theta_{\pm}$, they can be solved for the six unknowns, s_{13} , δ , two complex numbers $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}$, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}$. Given the latter two numbers one can determine the original $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$. Therefore, the rest of the problem in simultaneous determination of the SI and the NSI parameters is how to measure the above six observable.

D. Measurement with a mono-energetic neutrino beam

In this subsection, we discuss a way of determining the SI-NSI combined parameters in (46) by assuming a set of measurement at an energy E , aiming at their complete determination. In this discussion we aim at illuminating some features characteristic to the neutrino oscillation with NSI. With the six unknowns we have to prepare neutrino oscillation measurement of six different channels.⁸ To simplify the discussion we just assume that the measurement will give us the six probabilities. We note that our discussion may be extended to the rate only analysis as will be mentioned at the end of this subsection.

Suppose that one measures the following six probabilities at a neutrino energy E , $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$, $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) = \text{T}[P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)]$, $P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu) = \text{CP}[P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)]$, $P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\tau) = \text{CP}[P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)]$, $P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) = \text{T}[P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu)]$. Notice that we have intentionally avoided to use the channels which require ν_τ beam which, if not impossible, would be very difficult to prepare.

To represent the oscillation probability in a compact way we define

$$\begin{aligned} X_\pm &\equiv \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2 \mp a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 \mp a}{4E} L, \\ Y_\pm &\equiv \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2 \mp a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 \mp a}{4E} L, \\ Z &\equiv \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E}. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

For anti-neutrinos we have flipped sign of a , and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_\pm &= X_\mp, \\ \bar{Y}_\pm &= Y_\mp. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Z is obviously invariant under the sign change of a , $\bar{Z} = Z$.

With these simplified notations the oscillation probabilities $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$

⁸ It was proposed that such a monochromatic neutrino beam can be prepared for ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ beams [50, 51].

and their anti-neutrino counterparts can be written as⁹

$$P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = 4s_{23}^2 X_\pm |\Theta_\pm|^2 + 4c_{23}^2 Z |\Xi|^2 + 8c_{23}s_{23} Y_\pm |\Xi| |\Theta_\pm| \cos(\xi - \theta_\pm - \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}) \quad (54)$$

$$P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau) = 4c_{23}^2 X_\pm |\Theta_\pm|^2 + 4s_{23}^2 Z |\Xi|^2 - 8c_{23}s_{23} Y_\pm |\Xi| |\Theta_\pm| \cos(\xi - \theta_\pm - \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}) \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) &= T[P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)] \\ &= 4s_{23}^2 X_\pm |\Theta_\pm|^2 + 4c_{23}^2 Z |\Xi|^2 + 8c_{23}s_{23} Y_\pm |\Xi| |\Theta_\pm| \cos(\xi - \theta_\pm + \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}) \quad (56) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu) &= \text{CP}[P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)] \\ &= 4s_{23}^2 X_\mp |\bar{\Theta}_\pm|^2 + 4c_{23}^2 Z |\bar{\Xi}|^2 + 8c_{23}s_{23} Y_\mp |\bar{\Xi}| |\bar{\Theta}_\pm| \cos(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_\pm - \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}) \quad (57) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\tau) &= \text{CP}[P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)] \\ &= 4c_{23}^2 X_\mp |\bar{\Theta}_\pm|^2 + 4s_{23}^2 Z |\bar{\Xi}|^2 - 8c_{23}s_{23} Y_\mp |\bar{\Xi}| |\bar{\Theta}_\pm| \cos(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_\pm - \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}) \quad (58) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) &= \text{T}[P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu)] = \text{TCP}[P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)] \\ &= 4s_{23}^2 X_\mp |\bar{\Theta}_\pm|^2 + 4c_{23}^2 Z |\bar{\Xi}|^2 + 8c_{23}s_{23} Y_\mp |\bar{\Xi}| |\bar{\Theta}_\pm| \cos(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_\pm + \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}) \quad (59) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the upper and the lower signs in the above equations are for the normal and the inverted hierarchies, respectively. We note, in passing, that because of the relation $Y_\pm = \sqrt{X_\pm Z}$ which is easily recognized by (52) it is evident that the oscillation probabilities can be written in a form of absolute square.¹⁰ For example, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ takes the form

$$P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = 4 \left| s_{23} \sqrt{X_\pm} |\Theta_\pm| + c_{23} \sqrt{Z} |\Xi| \exp \left[i \left(\xi - \theta_\pm - \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right) \right] \right|^2. \quad (60)$$

At the magic baseline, $\frac{qL}{4\pi} = \pi$, the second term vanishes because $Z = 0$, leaving a very simple expression of the oscillation probability, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = 4s_{23}^2 X_\pm |\Theta_\pm|^2$.

From (54), (55), and (56), it is easy to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) + P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) &= 8s_{23}^2 X_\pm |\Theta_\pm|^2 + 8c_{23}^2 Z |\Xi|^2 \\ &\quad + 16c_{23}s_{23} Y_\pm |\Xi| |\Theta_\pm| \cos(\xi - \theta_\pm) \cos \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \quad (61) \end{aligned}$$

$$P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) - P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) = 16c_{23}s_{23} Y_\pm |\Xi| |\Theta_\pm| \sin(\xi - \theta_\pm) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \quad (62)$$

$$P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) + P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau) = 4X_\pm |\Theta_\pm|^2 + 4Z |\Xi|^2 \quad (63)$$

⁹ By writing the NSI second order formula in this way, we observe the remarkable similarity with the conventional SI second order formula [19]. The only difference is the use of generalized atmospheric and the solar variables defined in (42) and (43), and the resultant new phase degrees of freedom.

¹⁰ We thank Stephen Parke for calling our attention to this point.

Similarly, for the antineutrino channels, we obtain from (57), (58), and (59),

$$P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu) + P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) = 8s_{23}^2 X_\mp |\bar{\Theta}_\pm|^2 + 8c_{23}^2 Z |\bar{\Xi}|^2 + 16c_{23}s_{23} Y_\mp |\bar{\Xi}| |\bar{\Theta}_\pm| \cos(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_\pm) \cos \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \quad (64)$$

$$P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu) - P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) = 16c_{23}s_{23} Y_\mp |\bar{\Xi}| |\bar{\Theta}_\pm| \sin(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_\pm) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \quad (65)$$

$$P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu) + P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\tau) = 4X_\mp |\bar{\Theta}_\mp|^2 + 4Z |\bar{\Xi}|^2 \quad (66)$$

It is easy to solve these equations to obtain $|\Theta_\pm|$, $|\Xi|$, and $(\xi - \theta_\pm)$ (for neutrinos), and $|\bar{\Theta}_\pm|$, $|\bar{\Xi}|$, and $(\bar{\xi} - \bar{\theta}_\pm)$ (for antineutrinos).

It may be obvious that the above analysis can be converted to the rate only analysis by replacing the probabilities $P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta)$ by energy integrated number of events with fluxes and cross sections $\int dE F_\alpha \sigma_{\nu N} P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta)$, and the similar integrated quantities of X_\pm etc.

E. Determining the NSI parameters in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector

We now discuss determination of the NSI parameters in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector. Without ν_τ beam the only available channels are ν_μ disappearance and $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ channels and their antineutrino counter part. However, as we saw in Sec. VIB, the terms with $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu}$ and $\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}$ in the oscillation probabilities $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ and $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ are exactly the same to ϵ^2 ; $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) = P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau})$ in (39). Therefore, adding (experimentally highly nontrivial) $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ channel will produce no new information. Even worse, even if we bravely assume that τ neutrino beam is available and add the information of $P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ the same statement holds because $P(\nu_\tau \rightarrow \nu_\tau; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) = P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau})$ as shown in (39). Therefore, all the informations on NSI parameters would be obtained by measurement of $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$. Though they may not be sufficient let us see explicitly how far one can go.

The oscillation probability $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ derived in Sec. VI can be written as

$$P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau}, \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) = P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau}) + \mathcal{D}_\pm^{(0)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + \mathcal{R}_\pm^{(0)} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) + \mathcal{D}^{(1)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + \mathcal{R}^{(1)} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) + \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau})^2 + \mathcal{W}^{(0)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) + \mathcal{Q}^{(0)} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau})^2 + \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \text{Im}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau})^2 \quad (67)$$

where the coefficients are defined as

$$\mathcal{D}_\pm^{(0)} \equiv \pm 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \left[\left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 4 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \quad (68)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_\pm^{(0)} \equiv \mp 8c_{23}s_{23} \left[c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)^2 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \quad (69)$$

$$\mathcal{D}^{(1)} \equiv -2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) c_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \left[\left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right)^2 \cos \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 2 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} + 4 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \quad (70)$$

$$\mathcal{R}^{(1)} \equiv 4c_{23}s_{23}c_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \left[2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right)^2 \cos \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \right. \\ \left. + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)^2 \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 2 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right\} \right] \quad (71)$$

$$\mathcal{S}^{(0)} \equiv -c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left[(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)^2 \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right)^2 \cos \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 4(1 - 5c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2) \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \right. \\ \left. + 4(3 - 16c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2) \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \quad (72)$$

$$\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \equiv 4c_{23}s_{23}(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \left[2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right)^2 \cos \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \right. \\ \left. + (1 - 10c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2) \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} - 4(1 - 8c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2) \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \quad (73)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(0)} \equiv -4 \left[4c_{23}^4 s_{23}^4 \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right)^2 \cos \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} + 5c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)^2 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \right. \\ \left. + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)^2 (1 - 16c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2) \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \quad (74)$$

$$\mathcal{I}^{(0)} \equiv -4 \left[c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{2E} \right) \sin \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)^2 \left(\frac{a}{\delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right] \quad (75)$$

For antineutrinos we have the similar probability formulas as

$$P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau}, \varepsilon_{\mu\mu}, \varepsilon_{\mu\tau}, \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) = P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu; \varepsilon_{e\mu}, \varepsilon_{e\tau}) \\ + \mathcal{D}_{\mp}^{(0)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + \mathcal{R}_{\mp}^{(0)} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) - \mathcal{D}^{(1)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) - \mathcal{R}^{(1)} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) \\ + \mathcal{S}^{(0)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau})^2 + \mathcal{W}^{(0)}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) + \mathcal{Q}^{(0)} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau})^2 + \mathcal{I}^{(0)} \text{Im}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau})^2, \quad (76)$$

where we have used the relationship between the neutrino and the antineutrino coefficients $\bar{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}(a \rightarrow -a)$.

We have obtained two equations for the three unknowns, $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$, $\text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau})$, and $\text{Im}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau})$. Clearly we need one more equation to determine the three unknowns. Unfortunately, it does not appear to be available, as we have argued above. Thus, we have to conclude that a complete determination of the NSI elements in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector is not possible by measurement at a monochromatic beam or the rate only analysis.

F. How to circumvent the difficulty; Necessity of spectrum analysis

Doing measurement at six different channels is *not* the unique way of carrying out complete determination of the six parameters. Even in the case where only the “golden channel”, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ and $P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu)$, is available one can in principle determine $|\Theta_\pm|^2$, $|\Xi|^2$, $\text{Re}(\Xi\Theta_\pm^*)$, $\text{Im}(\Xi\Theta_\pm^*)$, and their antineutrino counterparts. Since the energy and baseline dependences of the coefficients of these quantities in the oscillation probabilities in (54) and (57) are different with each other one can, in principle, determine the above quantities by spectrum analysis. In the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector all the NSI elements cannot be determined by the rate only analysis. Therefore, the necessity of the spectrum information is mandatory in this sector.

It appears that one of the most promising ways to carry this out is the two-detector method, which has been proposed in the context of measuring leptonic CP violation [52]. It has been successfully applied to the Tokai-to-Kamioka-Korea (T2KK) two-detector complex which receives neutrino beam from J-PARC [41, 53]. For a global overview of T2KK, see [54]. In the context of neutrino parameter determination in neutrino factory with NSI as well as SI, this method was examined in detail in [30]. The feature of the results obtained in this reference, in particular, the fact that the setting can determine simultaneously θ_{13} , δ , and $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ (for example) strongly indicates that the method of spectrum analysis successfully works to resolve the individual coefficients of various terms. Other possibility would be the one called the “on axis wide-band beam approach” which was proposed in a concrete form in the project description for Brookhaven National Laboratory [55]. Precise estimation of the potential in doing spectrum analysis, however, depends upon which kind of detector is chosen and the actual performance of the detector. Clearly, the task is beyond the scope of this paper.

G. Parameter degeneracy

The parameter degeneracy is the problem of multiple solutions in determination of lepton mixing parameters [32, 33, 34]. It is known to be a notorious problem for their precision measurement. See [56, 57] for a global overview of the degeneracy.

Clearly, the phenomenon has an extension to the system with NSI. It is obvious from the set of equations we derived in Secs. VII C and VII D that the sign- Δm_{31}^2 degeneracy exists because the equations obeyed by the parameters take different form for different mass hierarchies for a given set of observable. In the case of $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector discussed in Sec. VII E, the number of equation is not enough, but the same statement may apply assuming that just the missing information is provided by e.g., spectrum analysis. The similar argument can go through also for the θ_{23} octant degeneracy. By exchanging c_{23} by s_{23} , the first and the second octant solutions, we obtain different set of equation with the same observable. It is very likely that the intrinsic-type degeneracy also exists, as one can see in the bi-probability diagram [33] given in Fig. 2 of [30]. See [57, 58] for understanding the intrinsic and the sign- Δm_{31}^2 degeneracies in the pictorial way, The point is that even if one obtains a sufficient numbers of independent set of equations of observable, which is shown to be possible in ν_e sector in Sec. VII D, the equations do not allow the unique solutions for the SI and the NSI parameters. Most probably, it takes a generalized form which involves both the SI and the NSI parameters, as indicated by the analysis based on matter perturbation theory in the next section. An example of such new solution with NSI parameter in the context of

the solar neutrino solution is presented in [59]. Though the parameter degeneracy is an interesting problem to examine, illuminating the whole structure of the degeneracy is far beyond the scope of this paper.

VIII. MATTER PERTURBATION THEORY WITH NSI

As a first step toward understanding the degeneracy we examine neutrino oscillation with NSI by matter perturbation theory following the treatment in [41]. It is known [33] that structure of parameter degeneracy is particularly transparent in the region where the matter effect can be treated as a perturbation, as explicitly verified in the analyses in [41, 53]. See [60] for further explanation of this point.

For simplicity, we restrict our discussion to ν_e related appearance measurement in this section. In concordance to these works we consider ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ appearance measurement with conventional muon neutrino beam and its antiparticles.

A. Structure of the oscillation probability with NSI in matter perturbation theory

If we restrict ourselves into the first order in a , the matter effect coefficient, the only terms that survive are the ones up to first order in $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$ or $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$. This must be obvious due to the matter hesitation theorem given in Sec. V C. The oscillation probability in $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ channel is given to first order in matter perturbation theory as

$$P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\tau}, \varepsilon_{e\mu}) = P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon = 0)_{AKS} + P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\tau})_{NSI} + P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\mu})_{NSI}, \quad (77)$$

where the leading term is the Arafune-Koike-Sato (AKS) formula without NSI [17]¹¹

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon = 0)_{AKS} &= \sin^2 2\theta_{13} s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \Delta_{31} + c_{23}^2 \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \left(\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right)^2 \Delta_{31}^2 \\ &+ 4J_r \left(\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right) \Delta_{31} [\cos \delta \sin 2\Delta_{31} - 2 \sin \delta \sin^2 \Delta_{31}] \\ &+ 2 \sin^2 2\theta_{13} s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \left[\frac{1}{\Delta_{31}} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

In (78), $\Delta_{31} \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E}$, $a \equiv 2\sqrt{2}G_F N_e E$ as before. J_r ($\equiv c_{12}s_{12}c_{13}^2 s_{13}c_{23}s_{23}$) denotes the reduced Jarlskog factor.

The first order matter correction which include the first order NSI effects in ε 's can be obtained by taking the first order term in a as

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\tau})_{NSI} &= 8 \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \\ &\times \left[c_{23} s_{23}^2 s_{13} \left\{ |\varepsilon_{e\tau}| \cos(\delta + \phi_{e\tau}) \left(\frac{\sin^2 \Delta_{31}}{\Delta_{31}} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) + |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \sin(\delta + \phi_{e\tau}) \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right\} \right. \\ &\left. - c_{12} s_{12} c_{23}^2 s_{23} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \left\{ |\varepsilon_{e\tau}| \cos \phi_{e\tau} \left(\Delta_{31} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) - |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \sin \phi_{e\tau} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

¹¹ We got rid of a higher order ϵ^3 term which was kept in our previous references, e.g., [33, 41, 53].

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\mu})_{NSI} &= -8 \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \\
&\times \left[s_{23}s_{13} \left\{ |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \cos(\delta + \phi_{e\mu}) \left(s_{23}^2 \frac{\sin^2 \Delta_{31}}{\Delta_{31}} - \frac{c_{23}^2}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) + c_{23}^2 |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \sin(\delta + \phi_{e\mu}) \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right\} \right. \\
&\left. - c_{12}s_{12}c_{23} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \left\{ |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \cos \phi_{e\mu} \left(c_{23}^2 \Delta_{31} + \frac{s_{23}^2}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) + s_{23}^2 |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \sin \phi_{e\mu} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right\} \right]. \quad (80)
\end{aligned}$$

The antineutrino probability $P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e; \varepsilon_{e\tau}, \varepsilon_{e\mu})$ can be obtained by making the replacement in (77); $a \rightarrow -a$, $\delta \rightarrow 2\pi - \delta$. $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^*$. Notice that both of the CP violating leptonic KM phase δ and $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$ due to NSI elements changes sign when we discuss the time reversal process $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$, as opposed to $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$ in the previous sections.

For the oscillation probabilities in the $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector we only deal with the one in ν_μ disappearance channel (which may be easiest to measure) to first order in ϵ :

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \text{1st order in } \epsilon) &= 1 - 4c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \Delta_{31} + 4c_{12}^2 c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right) \Delta_{31} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \\
&+ 2c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left[(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) - 4c_{23}s_{23} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) \right] \frac{aL}{2E} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \\
&- 8c_{23}s_{23}(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \left[c_{23}s_{23}(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) + (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) \right] \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \sin^2 \Delta_{31}. \quad (81)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that (81) is already in the form of first-order formula in matter perturbation theory.

B. Sign- Δm^2 and θ_{23} octant degeneracies prevail in the presence of NSI

In this subsection, we discuss the fate of the sign- Δm^2 and the θ_{23} octant degeneracies in the presence of NSI. In the conventional cases without NSI, they are known as notorious ones among the three types of degeneracies because they are hard to resolve and the former can confuse CP violation with CP conservation. The sign- Δm^2 degeneracy was uncovered in systems without NSI by noticing that the oscillation probability $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ in vacuum is invariant under the transformation $\Delta m_{31}^2 \rightarrow -\Delta m_{31}^2$, $\delta \rightarrow \pi - \delta$ without changing θ_{13} [33]. It maps a positive Δm_{31}^2 solution to the negative one, and vice versa. The presence of the symmetry as well as the fact that it is broken by the first order matter terms can be seen in (78).

Now, we observe that the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy prevails in the presence of NSI. That is, the NSI induced terms in the probability (79) and (80), though they are ‘‘matter terms’’, are invariant under the extended transformation

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta m_{31}^2 &\rightarrow -\Delta m_{31}^2, \\
\delta &\rightarrow \pi - \delta, \\
\phi_{e\alpha} &\rightarrow 2\pi - \phi_{e\alpha}. \quad (82)
\end{aligned}$$

while keeping θ_{13} and $|\varepsilon_{e\alpha}|$ fixed, where $\alpha = \mu, \tau$.¹² The symmetry is broken only by the

¹² Under the transformation (82), the trigonometric factors in (80) and (79) transform as follows: $\cos(\delta + \phi_{e\alpha}) \rightarrow -\cos(\delta + \phi_{e\alpha})$, $\sin(\delta + \phi_{e\alpha}) \rightarrow +\sin(\delta + \phi_{e\alpha})$, $\cos \phi_{e\alpha} \rightarrow +\cos \phi_{e\alpha}$, and $\sin \phi_{e\alpha} \rightarrow -\sin \phi_{e\alpha}$.

matter term in (78) which is independent of NSI; The symmetry is broken by the matter effect which has exactly the same magnitude in systems with and without NSI. Therefore, to first order in matter perturbation theory, the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy exists in systems with NSI to the same extent as it does in the system without NSI. Given the robustness of the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy in the conventional case we suspect that the degeneracy in systems with NSI has the similar robustness.

Similarly, one can easily show that the θ_{23} octant degeneracy survives the presence of NSI. It can be readily observed that $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu; \text{1st order in } \epsilon)$ in (81) is invariant under the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} c_{23} &\rightarrow s_{23}, \\ s_{23} &\rightarrow c_{23}, \\ (\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) &\rightarrow -(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}). \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

It means that the θ_{23} octant degeneracy prevails in the presence of NSI, and actually in an extended form which involves NSI parameter $\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}$. Since this NSI parameter decouples from $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ to second-order in ϵ , the presence of the θ_{23} octant degeneracy remains intact when NSI is included though values of the degenerate solutions themselves are affected by the presence of $\varepsilon_{e\alpha}$.

It is interesting to note that both of the two degeneracies discussed in this subsection have common features. Their presence can be discussed based on (approximate) invariance under some discrete transformations, and with NSI the transformations are extended to the ones which involve NSI parameters. Most probably, our treatment here is the first one to signal the existence of the degenerate solutions which involves both the SI (θ_{13} and δ) and the NSI parameters.

C. Decoupling between the degeneracies in the presence of NSI

In [41] the property called ‘‘decoupling between degeneracies’’ are shown to exist for experimental settings with baseline shorter than ~ 1000 km which may allow treatment based on matter perturbation theory. See also [38] and [61] for preliminary discussions. The property of decoupling between degeneracies A and B guarantees that when one tries to resolve the degeneracy A one can forget about the presence of the degeneracy B, and vice versa. Existence of NSI terms, in general, influences the discussion of decoupling. It is the purpose of this and the next subsections to fully discuss the fate of the decoupling in the presence of NSI. Since it is one of the most significant characteristic features of the degeneracies in matter perturbative regime, we believe it worth to present a complete treatment.

1. Definition of decoupling between degeneracies

To define the property decoupling between degeneracies A and B, we define, following [41], the probability difference

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P^{ab}(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta) &\equiv P\left(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; (\Delta m_{31}^2)^{(a)}, \theta_{23}^{(a)}, \theta_{13}^{(a)}, \delta^{(a)}, \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(a)}\right) \\ &\quad - P\left(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta; (\Delta m_{31}^2)^{(b)}, \theta_{23}^{(b)}, \theta_{13}^{(b)}, \delta^{(b)}, \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(b)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

where the superscripts a and b label the degenerate solutions. Suppose that we are discussing the degeneracy A. The decoupling between the degeneracies A and B holds if ΔP^{ab} defined in (84) for the degeneracy A is invariant under the replacement of the mixing parameters corresponding to the degeneracy B, and vice versa.

2. Matter-perturbative treatment of the degenerate solutions

We follow [41] to define the degenerate solutions in a perturbative manner.¹³ Throughout the discussion in this section we assume that deviation of θ_{23} from the maximal angle $\pi/4$ is small. A disappearance measurement, $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu$, determines s_{23}^2 to first order in s_{13}^2 as $(s_{23}^2)^{(1)} = (s_{23}^2)^{(0)}(1 + s_{13}^2)$, where $(s_{23}^2)^{(0)}$ is the solution obtained by ignoring s_{13}^2 . It is given by $(s_{23}^2)^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{23}} \right]$. In leading order the relationship between the first and the second octant solutions of θ_{23} is given by $s_{23}^{1st} = c_{23}^{2nd}$.

A ν_e appearance measurement determines the combination $s_{23}^2 \sin^2 2\theta_{13}$. The first and the second octant solutions of θ_{23} is also related to leading order by $s_{23}^{1st} s_{13}^{1st} = s_{23}^{2nd} s_{13}^{2nd}$. In an environment where the vacuum oscillation approximation applies the solutions corresponding to the intrinsic degeneracy are given in Appendix C as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{13}^{(2)} &= \sqrt{(\theta_{13}^{(1)})^2 + 2 \left(\frac{Y_c}{X} \right) \theta_{13}^{(1)} \cos \delta_1 + \left(\frac{Y_c}{X} \right)^2} \\ \sin \delta_2 &= \frac{\theta_{13}^{(1)}}{\theta_{13}^{(2)}} \sin \delta_1 \\ \cos \delta_2 &= \mp \frac{1}{\theta_{13}^{(2)}} \left(\theta_{13}^{(1)} \cos \delta_1 + \frac{Y_c}{X} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

where

$$\frac{Y_c}{X} \equiv \sin 2\theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31}. \quad (86)$$

and the superscripts (1) and (2) label the solutions due to the intrinsic degeneracy. The sign \mp for $\cos \delta_2$ are for $Y_c = \pm |Y_c|$, and $\theta_{13}^{(2)}$ in the solution of δ is meant to be the $\theta_{13}^{(2)}$ solution given in the first line in (85).

As we saw in the previous section, an extended form of the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy is given under the same approximation (mod. 2π) as

$$\theta_{13}^{\text{norm}} = \theta_{13}^{\text{inv}}, \quad (\Delta m_{31}^2)^{\text{norm}} = -(\Delta m_{31}^2)^{\text{inv}}, \quad \delta^{\text{norm}} = \pi - \delta^{\text{inv}}, \quad (\phi_{\alpha\beta})^{\text{norm}} = -(\phi_{\alpha\beta})^{\text{inv}}, \quad (87)$$

¹³ More precise meaning of the term ‘‘perturbative’’ is as follows: Since the disappearance probability by which θ_{23} is determined is of order unity we disregard quantities of order ϵ or higher. They include the matter effect, θ_{13} , and NSI. Similarly, ν_e appearance probability is of order ϵ^2 the relationship between the two degenerate solution inevitably contains a small quantity, which is θ_{13} in this case. But, all the quantities of higher order are neglected. If the near-far two detectors are involved, like in the case of T2KK [41, 53], the degenerate solutions are essentially defined by the near detector. In this case, the second detector is meant to give raise to perturbation effect to lift the degeneracy. For more concrete example of this feature, see [41].

where the superscripts “norm” and “inv” label the solutions with the positive and the negative sign of Δm_{31}^2 , and $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$ denotes the phase of $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$. The validity of these approximate relationships in the actual experimental setup in the T2K II measurement is explicitly verified in [41, 53]. It should be noticed that even if sizable matter effect is present the relation (87) holds in a good approximation if the energy is tuned to the one corresponding to the vacuum oscillation maximum, or more precisely, the shrunk ellipse limit [62].

D. Decoupling between the sign- Δm^2 and the θ_{23} octant degeneracies

Let us start by treating the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy. For this purpose, we calculate $\Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ as defined in (84). Thanks to the extended symmetry (82) obeyed by the appearance probability, it is given by the same result obtained without NSI in [41]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \\ &= \sin^2 2\theta_{13}^{\text{norm}} (s_{23}^{\text{norm}})^2 \left(\frac{aL}{E} \right) \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta_{31})^{\text{norm}}} \sin^2(\Delta_{31})^{\text{norm}} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2(\Delta_{31})^{\text{norm}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where the superscripts “norm” and “inv” can be exchanged if one want to start from the inverted hierarchy. Therefore, breaking the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy requires the matter effect but not more than that required in resolving it in systems without NSI; NSI does not contribute resolution of the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy but it does not add more difficulties.

By following the same discussion as in [41], we observe that $\Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}$ is invariant under the transformation $\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \leftrightarrow \theta_{23}^{\text{2nd}}$ and $\theta_{13}^{\text{1st}} \leftrightarrow \theta_{13}^{\text{2nd}}$, because $\Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}$ depends upon θ_{13} and θ_{23} only through the combination $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} s_{23}^2$ within our approximation. Therefore, resolution of the sign- Δm_{31}^2 can be done in the presence of the θ_{23} octant degeneracy.

What is the influence of the ν_μ disappearance channel in the discussion of decoupling? Using the first-order formula in (81), $\Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu) &= 8c_{12}^2 c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{4E} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \\ &+ 4c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \left[(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)(\varepsilon_{\mu\mu} - \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}) - 4c_{23} s_{23} \text{Re}(\varepsilon_{\mu\tau}) \right] \frac{aL}{2E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E}. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

It is manifestly invariant under that the transformation in (83), and hence the sign- Δm_{31}^2 degeneracy decouples from the θ_{23} octant degeneracy. Presence of the $\Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ in first order in ϵ indicates that the ν_μ disappearance channel would play a role in lifting the sign- Δm_{31}^2 degeneracy if the measurement is done off the vacuum oscillation maximum.

Now, we discuss the inverse problem, namely, whether the θ_{23} octant degeneracy can be resolved in the presence of the sign- Δm_{31}^2 . By noting that $J_r^{\text{1st}} - J_r^{\text{2nd}} = \cos 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} J_r^{\text{1st}}$ in leading order in $\cos 2\theta_{23}$, the difference between probabilities with the first and the second octant solutions can be given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \\ &= \cos 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \Delta_{21} \left[\sin^2 2\theta_{12} \Delta_{21} + 4J_r^{\text{1st}} (\cos \delta \sin 2\Delta_{31} - 2 \sin \delta \sin^2 \Delta_{31}) \right] \\ &+ \Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\tau})_{NSI} + \Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\mu})_{NSI}, \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\tau})_{NSI} &= -2\sqrt{2}c_{12}s_{12} \cos 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \sin 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \left(\frac{aL}{4E}\right) \left(\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2}\right) \\ &\times \left[|\varepsilon_{e\tau}| \cos \phi_{e\tau} \left(\Delta_{31} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) - |\varepsilon_{e\tau}| \sin \phi_{e\tau} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\mu})_{NSI} &= 8 \cos 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \left(\frac{aL}{4E}\right) \\ &\times \left[s_{23}^{\text{1st}} s_{13} \left\{ |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \cos(\delta + \phi_{e\mu}) \left(\frac{\sin^2 \Delta_{31}}{\Delta_{31}} + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) - |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \sin(\delta + \phi_{e\mu}) \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right\} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{c_{12}s_{12}}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2}\right) \left\{ |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \cos \phi_{e\mu} \left(3\Delta_{31} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) - |\varepsilon_{e\mu}| \sin \phi_{e\mu} \sin 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

The first term of $\Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}}$ in (90), being composed only of the vacuum oscillation terms, is obviously invariant under the replacement *normal* \leftrightarrow *inverted* solutions. The remarkable feature of (91) and (92) is that they are also invariant under the replacement relation between different hierarchy solutions given in (82) which is extended to include NSI phases. The disappearance channel does not play a role in the present discussion under the approximation taken in deriving (81), because then $\Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ vanishes. Therefore, even in the presence of NSI, the resolution of the θ_{23} octant degeneracy can be carried out without worrying about the presence of the sign- Δm_{31}^2 degeneracy. The sign- Δm^2 and the θ_{23} octant degeneracies decouple with each other even in the presence of NSI in matter perturbative regime.

E. Non-Decoupling of Intrinsic degeneracy

Now we discuss the intrinsic degeneracy for which the situation is somewhat different. First of all, this is a degeneracy which is somewhat different in nature. Unlike the case of the sign- Δm_{31}^2 degeneracy, It is often true that this degeneracy is fragile to the spectrum analysis; In many cases it can be resolved by including informations of energy dependence in the reconstructed events. An example for this is the T2KK setting which receives an intense neutrino beam from J-PARC [41, 53]. It means that there is no intrinsic degeneracy from the beginning in the analysis with spectrum informations. Nonetheless, anticipating possible circumstances in which spectrum informations are not available, and for completeness, we discuss below if resolving the intrinsic degeneracy decouple to lifting the other two degeneracies. We disregard the ν_μ disappearance channel in this subsection because it does not appear to play a major role in resolving the intrinsic degeneracy. The discussions in this subsection are also meant to partly correct and append the ones given in Sec. III in [41].

1. Non-Decoupling of Intrinsic degeneracy without NSI

Let us first discuss the problem of decoupling with intrinsic degeneracy without NSI. In our perturbative approach $\Delta P^{12}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ arises only from the first order matter term

in (78) because the degenerate solutions in vacuum, by definition, gives the same vacuum oscillation probabilities. It reads

$$\Delta P^{12}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) = -4 \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \Delta\theta^2 \left(\frac{1}{\Delta_{31}} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right). \quad (93)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\theta^2 &\equiv (\theta_{13}^{(1)})^2 - (\theta_{13}^{(2)})^2 \\ &= -\sin 2\theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31} \left(2\theta_{13}^{(1)} \cos \delta^{(1)} + \sin 2\theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Based on the result of ΔP^{12} in (93) we discuss possible decoupling of the sign- Δm^2 and the octant θ_{23} degeneracies from the intrinsic one.

We start from the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy. It can be readily seen that ΔP^{12} is odd under interchange of the normal and the inverted hierarchy solutions as dictated in (87). It means that $\Delta P^{12}(\text{normal}) - \Delta P^{12}(\text{inverted}) = 2\Delta P^{12}$. Clearly, the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy do not decouple from the intrinsic one.

Now we turn to the octant θ_{23} degeneracy. From (93), $\Delta P^{12}(\text{1st}) - \Delta P^{12}(\text{2nd})$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P^{12}(\text{1st}) - \Delta P^{12}(\text{2nd}) &= 8 \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \sin 2\theta_{12} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta_{31}} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) \\ &\times \cos 2\theta_{23} \left[\theta_{13}^{(1)} \cos \delta^{(1)} \frac{1 + c_{23}s_{23}}{c_{23}^2 s_{23} (c_{23} + s_{23})} + \frac{2}{\sin^2 2\theta_{23}} \sin 2\theta_{12} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where θ_{13} and s_{23} etc. in (95) are meant to be the ones in the first octant. It is small in the sense that it is proportional to $\cos 2\theta_{23}$ which vanishes in the limit of maximal θ_{23} . But, this is the factor of kinematical origin which inevitably exists because the measure for breaking of the octant degeneracy has to vanish at $\theta_{23} = \pi/4$. Therefore, we conclude that there is no dynamical decoupling of the θ_{23} octant degeneracy from the intrinsic one.

Now, we discuss the inverse problem, namely, whether the sign- Δm^2 and the θ_{23} octant degeneracies can be resolved independently of the intrinsic degeneracy. The measure for resolving the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy is given in (88)

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta P^{\text{norm inv}(1)} - \Delta P^{\text{norm inv}(2)} \\ &= 4\Delta\theta^2 s_{23}^2 \left(\frac{aL}{E} \right) \left[\frac{1}{\Delta_{31}} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right] \Big|_{\text{norm}}^{(1)} \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where all the quantities in (96) is to be evaluated by using the normal hierarchy and intrinsic first solution. Clearly, the intrinsic degeneracy does not decouple from the sign- Δm^2 one.

How about the θ_{23} octant degeneracy? The appropriate measure for the question is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}(1)} - \Delta P^{\text{1st 2nd}(2)} = \cos 2\theta_{23}^{\text{1st}} \Delta_{21} \\ &\times \frac{1}{\theta_{13}^{(2)}} \left[\left\{ 4J_r^{\text{1st}} \left(\theta_{13}^{(1)} + \theta_{13}^{(2)} \right) \cos \delta^{(1)} + \frac{Y_c}{X} \right\} \sin 2\Delta_{31} - 2 \frac{\sin \delta^{(1)}}{\theta_{13}^{(1)} + \theta_{13}^{(2)}} \Delta\theta^2 \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where $\theta_{13}^{(2)}$ implies to insert the expression in (85). Again there is no sign of the decoupling.

Nonetheless, there are some cases in which the decoupling with the intrinsic degeneracy still holds in a good approximation. For example, $\Delta P^{12}(\text{1st}) - \Delta P^{12}(\text{2nd})$ in (95) and $\Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}(1) - \Delta P^{\text{norm inv}}$ in (96) may be small numerically. It is the case at relatively short baseline $L \lesssim 1000$ km where it is further suppressed by $\frac{aL}{4E}$. The ΔP differences between the two θ_{23} octant solutions are always suppressed by $\cos 2\theta_{23}$, and hence they may be small at θ_{23} very close to the maximal.

It is significant to observe that at the vacuum oscillation maxima, $\Delta_{31} = (2n + 1)\frac{\pi}{2}$, the decoupling is realized in all pairs of degeneracies. Therefore, if the experimental set up is near the vacuum oscillation maxima the decoupling with the intrinsic degeneracy perfectly holds. The identical two detector setting in T2KK [41, 53], whose intermediate (far) detector is near the first (second) oscillation maximum provides a good example for such ‘‘accidental decoupling’’.

2. Decoupling and non-decoupling of Intrinsic degeneracy with NSI

We concisely describe what happens in the decoupling between the intrinsic and the other two degeneracies when NSI is introduced. We explicitly discuss below the case with $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ because the equations are slightly simpler, but we have verified that the same conclusion holds for the case with $\varepsilon_{e\mu}$, and hence in the full system.

$\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ type NSI gives rise to contribution to the difference of the probabilities with the first and the second solutions of intrinsic degeneracy of the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P^{12}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \varepsilon_{e\tau}) &= 8 \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) |\varepsilon_{e\tau}| c_{23}^2 s_{23}^2 \\ &\times \left(2\theta_{13}^{(1)} \cos \delta^{(1)} + \frac{Y_c}{X} \right) \left[\cos \phi_{e\tau} \left(\frac{\sin^2 \Delta_{31}}{\Delta_{31}} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) + \sin \phi_{e\tau} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

where use has been made the relation (C7). Notice that the terms proportional to the solar Δm_{21}^2 do not contribute, and $\sin \delta$ terms cancel out owing to the relation (C6).

We observe that $\Delta P^{12}(\varepsilon_{e\tau})$ are invariant under interchange between the normal and the inverted hierarchies, (87). Therefore, NSI induced oscillation probability, by itself, fulfills the decoupling condition with the sign- Δm^2 degeneracy.

The situation is different in relationship with the θ_{23} octant degeneracy. With $\varepsilon_{e\tau}$ one can derive the similar expression as (95):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P^{12}(\varepsilon_{e\tau}; \text{1st}) - \Delta P^{12}(\varepsilon_{e\tau}; \text{2nd}) &= 4\sqrt{2} \cos 2\theta_{23} \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) |\varepsilon_{e\tau}| \sin 2\theta_{12} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31} \\ &\times \left[\cos \phi_{e\tau} \left(\frac{\sin^2 \Delta_{31}}{\Delta_{31}} - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\Delta_{31} \right) + \sin \phi_{e\tau} \sin^2 \Delta_{31} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

Though the intrinsic degeneracy does not decouple with the θ_{23} octant degeneracy, the suppression factor $\cos 2\theta_{23} \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) |\varepsilon_{e\tau}|$ may be very small if baseline is relatively short and θ_{23} is near maximal, assuming the likely possibility that $|\varepsilon_{e\tau}|$ is small. Again, the decoupling holds at the vacuum oscillation maxima.

General conclusion in the last two subsections is that although the decoupling between the sign- Δm_{31}^2 and the θ_{23} octant degeneracies holds, but there is no decoupling between the intrinsic degeneracy and the other two types of degeneracies. The conclusion applies to the cases with and without NSI.

IX. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we have discussed various aspects of neutrino oscillation with NSI, the exactly hold properties as well as the properties best illuminated by a perturbative method. The former category includes the relation between the S matrix elements and the probabilities that arises due to an invariance of the Hamiltonian under the transformation which involves θ_{23} and the NSI elements $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$). It allows us to connect the probabilities of various flavor conversion channels. The relation is powerful enough to strongly constrain the way how various NSI elements $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ enter into the oscillation probabilities. It also includes the phase reduction theorem which guarantees reduction of number of CP violating phases when the solar Δm_{21}^2 is switched off.

By taking the following three quantities, $\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2}$, s_{13} , and the NSI elements $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$, as small expansion parameters (which are collectively denoted as ϵ) we have formulated a perturbative framework which we have dubbed as the “ ϵ perturbation theory”. Within this framework we have calculated the S matrix elements to order ϵ^2 and derived the NSI second-order formula of the oscillation probability in all channels. It allows us to estimate size of the contribution of the particular NSI element $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$) to the particular oscillation probability $P(\nu_\kappa \rightarrow \nu_\omega)$ ($\kappa, \omega = e, \mu, \tau$), as tabulated in Table I. To complete the table we have also calculated the oscillation probability in the ν_e related channels to third order in ϵ , which is given in Appendix B. We hope that the table serves as a “handbook” for hunting NSI effects in neutrino propagation, and we have successfully given global overview of neutrino oscillation with NSI.

Thanks to the NSI second-order formula we have discussed, for the first time, the way how the SI and the NSI parameters can be determined. We found that simultaneous measurement of all the relevant NSI and SI parameters is extremely demanding. While all the NSI elements in ν_e related sector can be determined, in principle, together with θ_{13} and δ , it requires $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu$, $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$, $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau$, and their CP conjugate channels if we do it by rate only measurement. However, we have proven to the accuracy of second order in ϵ that, if we restrict to the rate only analysis, all the NSI elements in $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ sector cannot be determined even if we prepare ν_τ beam. In the course of treatment of parameter determination, we have observed that the phenomenon of parameter degeneracy prevails in the system with NSI. Notably, it exists in an extended form of involving not only the SI but also the NSI parameters.

Clearly, the right strategy is to pursue the appropriate experimental setup which enables us the spectrum analysis to determine several coefficients at the same time. The capability of spectrum analysis with good resolution would be a mandatory requirement for future facilities which aim at searching for effects of NSI at least as one of their objectives. To our knowledge, the leading candidate for such setup is the two-detector setup at $L \simeq 3000$ km and $L \simeq 7000$ km in neutrino factory with use of the golden channel [19], which are proven to be powerful in resolving the conventional parameter degeneracy [32, 63]. In a previous paper, we have shown that the setting is also powerful in resolving the θ_{13} -NSI (and probably the two-phase) confusion [30]. It must be stressed, however, that we still do not know if the setting is sufficiently powerful in determining all the SI and the NSI parameters.

We note that some of our discussions address the case of standard three-flavor oscillation without NSI. We have proven a property called the matter hesitation theorem, which states that the matter effect comes into the oscillation probability only at the second order in ϵ . The theorem allows us to understand why it is so difficult to detect the matter effect in

various long-baseline experiments, and explains why ε_{ee} is absent from the NSI second order formula. Though what the theorem says should be known in the community as the results of perturbative calculation, it appears to us that it did not receive enough attention so far. We have also shown that the theorem is not valid in the presence of NSI; NSI acts as a catalyst of the matter effect.

As the last topics we discussed the matter perturbation theory of neutrino oscillation with NSI to have a first grasp of the nature of the parameter degeneracy. We have uncovered that the sign- Δm_{31}^2 and the θ_{23} octant degeneracies are robust, and the analysis indicates the way how the NSI parameters are involved into the new form of degeneracy. The decoupling between degeneracies, a salient feature in the matter perturbative regime, is also revisited and the treatment is extended to the system with NSI.

Of course, a number of cautions have to be made to correctly interpret our results; Many of our statements are based on the NSI second order formula which is reliable only if the assumption we made in formulating our perturbative treatment is correct. We do not deal with effects of NSI in production and detection of neutrinos. The program of complete determination of the NSI parameters mentioned above must cooperate with search for NSI in production and detection processes.

We have argued that even if θ_{13} is large enough so that not only θ_{13} but also δ are determined by the reactor and/or the upgraded superbeam experiments prior NSI search, extremely high precision apparatus (such as neutrino factory) are required anyway for simultaneous measurement of the NSI and the SI parameters with the required accuracy.¹⁴ That is, if the presumed order of magnitude of NSI $\sim (M_W/M_{NP})^2 \lesssim 10^{-2}$ is true, the expected accuracy of prior measurement of the SI parameters would not be enough to treat them as known inputs in the NSI parameter determination. Given the fact that the NSI and the SI parameters appear in the oscillation probability in a tightly coupled way, the precision required for the SI parameters must be the one similar to the size of NSI's. Therefore, the search for NSI with that size is feasible only when apparatus for such high precision experiments is constructed, indicating inevitable intimate connection between precision measurement of the SI parameters and the NSI search.

APPENDIX A: PERTURBATIVE COMPUTATION OF S MATRIX FOR NEUTRINO OSCILLATION WITH NSI

We describe here some details of the perturbative calculation of S matrix elements of neutrino oscillation.

1. Double-tilde basis

For ease of computation we use slightly different basis, the double-tilde basis, with Hamiltonian

$$H = U_{23}U_{13}\tilde{H}U_{13}^\dagger U_{23}^\dagger \quad (\text{A1})$$

¹⁴ Note, however, that prior knowledge of the mass hierarchy helps in many ways.

and the corresponding S matrix

$$S(L) = U_{23}U_{13}\tilde{\tilde{S}}(L)U_{13}^\dagger U_{23}^\dagger \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\tilde{\tilde{S}}(L) = T \exp \left[-i \int_0^L dx \tilde{\tilde{H}}(x) \right]$. The zeroth order and the perturbed part of the reduced Hamiltonian $\tilde{\tilde{H}}$ are given by

$$\tilde{\tilde{H}}_0 = \Delta \begin{bmatrix} r_A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tilde{H}}_1 = \Delta & \left\{ r_\Delta \begin{bmatrix} s_{12}^2 & c_{12}s_{12} & 0 \\ c_{12}s_{12} & c_{12}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + r_A \begin{bmatrix} -s_{13}^2 & 0 & c_{13}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ c_{13}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & 0 & s_{13}^2 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \\ & + \Delta r_A U_{13}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{ee} & \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{e\mu} & \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{e\tau} \\ \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{e\mu}^* & \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{\mu\mu} & \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{\mu\tau} \\ \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{e\tau}^* & \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{\mu\tau}^* & \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{\tau\tau} \end{bmatrix} U_{13} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{2E}$, $r_\Delta \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2}$, $r_A \equiv \frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2}$. To simplify the expressions of the S matrix elements we use the NSI elements in the tilde basis, $\tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{\alpha\beta} = (U_{23}^\dagger)_{\alpha\gamma} \tilde{\epsilon}_{\gamma\delta} (U_{23})_{\delta\beta}$, in (27). Notice that $\tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}$'s are invariant under the extended transformation (16).

By defining H_1 for the double-tilde basis in an analogous manner as in (24), the S matrix can be obtained by (A2) with the $\tilde{\tilde{S}}$ matrix in the double-tilde basis

$$\tilde{\tilde{S}}(L) = e^{-i\tilde{\tilde{H}}_0 L} \left[1 + (-i) \int_0^L dx' H_1(x') + (-i)^2 \int_0^L dx' H_1(x') \int_0^{x'} dx'' H_1(x'') \right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \quad (\text{A5})$$

2. S matrix elements up to second order

Now, it is straightforward to compute the S matrix elements for neutrino oscillations with NSI. Omitting calculations we just present the results of the S matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ee} = & \left\{ 1 - i\Delta L (s_{12}^2 r_\Delta + r_A \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{ee}) \right\} e^{-ir_A \Delta L} \\ & + s_{13}^2 (ir_A \Delta L) e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - s_{13}^2 \frac{1+r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\ & - 2s_{13} \text{Re}(\tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{e\tau} e^{i\delta}) r_A \left[i\Delta L e^{-ir_A \Delta L} + \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\ & - (s_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{ee})^2 \frac{(r_A \Delta L)^2}{2} e^{-ir_A \Delta L} \\ & - |c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{e\mu}|^2 \left\{ (ir_A \Delta L) e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - (1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \right\} \\ & + |s_{13} e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\tilde{\epsilon}}_{e\tau}|^2 \left(\frac{r_A^2}{1-r_A} \right) \left[i\Delta L e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{e\mu} = & -c_{23} \left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} \right) (1 - e^{-ir_A\Delta L}) - s_{23} (s_{13}e^{-i\delta} + r_A\tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau}) \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& - c_{23}s_{13}\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}^* e^{-i\delta} \left\{ (1 - e^{-ir_A\Delta L}) + r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right\} \\
& + s_{23}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} (\tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau}) \frac{r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& + s_{23}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} (i\Delta L) \left\{ (s_{12}^2 r_\Delta + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} r_A) e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} r_A e^{-i\Delta L} \right\} \\
& + c_{23} \left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} \right) \left[ir_A\Delta L \left\{ \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu} \right) - \left(s_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} \right) e^{-ir_A\Delta L} \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \left((c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu} \right) (1 - e^{-ir_A\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + s_{23} (s_{13}e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau}) \left(\frac{r_A^2}{1-r_A} \right) \left[i\Delta L \left\{ \left(s_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} \right) e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} e^{-i\Delta L} \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{1}{1-r_A} \left(s_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} \right) (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + \left\{ c_{23}\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}^* (s_{13}e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau}) + s_{23}\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau} \left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} \right) \right\} \\
& \times r_A \left[(1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \tag{A7}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{e\tau} = & s_{23} \left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} \right) (1 - e^{-ir_A\Delta L}) - c_{23} (s_{13}e^{-i\delta} + r_A\tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau}) \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& + s_{23}s_{13}\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}^* e^{-i\delta} \left\{ (1 - e^{-ir_A\Delta L}) + r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right\} \\
& + c_{23}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} (\tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau}) \frac{r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& + c_{23}s_{13}e^{-i\delta} (i\Delta L) \left\{ (s_{12}^2 r_\Delta + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} r_A) e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} r_A e^{-i\Delta L} \right\} \\
& + s_{23} \left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} \right) \left[ir_A\Delta L \left\{ - \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu} \right) + \left(s_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} \right) e^{-ir_A\Delta L} \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left((c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu} \right) (1 - e^{-ir_A\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + c_{23} (s_{13}e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau}) \left(\frac{r_A^2}{1-r_A} \right) \left[i\Delta L \left\{ \left(s_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} \right) e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} e^{-i\Delta L} \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{1}{1-r_A} \left(s_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{ee} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} \right) (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + \left\{ -s_{23}\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}^* (s_{13}e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau}) + c_{23}\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau} \left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} \right) \right\} \\
& \times r_A \left[(1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A\Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \tag{A8}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\mu\mu} = & c_{23}^2 \left\{ 1 - i(c_{12}^2 r_\Delta + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu} r_A) \Delta L \right\} + s_{23}^2 (1 - i\tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} r_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} \\
& - 2c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}) r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& - s_{23}^2 s_{13}^2 \left[(ir_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} - \frac{1+r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + 2s_{23}^2 s_{13} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau} e^{i\delta}) \left[(ir_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} + \frac{r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + 2c_{23}s_{23}s_{13} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} e^{i\delta}) r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& + 2c_{23}s_{23}s_{13} \left\{ c_{12}s_{12} \cos \delta \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} e^{i\delta}) \right\} (1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \\
& - \left[c_{23}^2 (c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu})^2 + s_{23}^2 \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau}^2 e^{-i\Delta L} \right] \frac{(r_A \Delta L)^2}{2} \\
& + c_{23}^2 \left[\left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu} \right|^2 \left\{ (ir_A \Delta L) - (1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \right\} - |\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}|^2 r_A^2 (1 - i\Delta L - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& - s_{23}^2 \left[\left| s_{13} e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{r_A^2}{1-r_A} \right) \left\{ i\Delta L e^{-i\Delta L} - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + |\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}|^2 r_A^2 \left\{ i\Delta L e^{-i\Delta L} - (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right\} \right] \\
& + 2c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\tau}) r_A^2 \left[i\Delta L \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} e^{-i\Delta L} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{\mu\mu} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{\tau\tau} \right) (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + 2c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\mu}^* \right) (s_{13} e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{e\tau}) \right\} \\
& \times r_A \left[(1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \tag{A9}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\tau\tau} = & s_{23}^2 \left\{ 1 - i(c_{12}^2 r_\Delta + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu} r_A) \Delta L \right\} + c_{23}^2 (1 - i\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau} r_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} \\
& + 2c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}) r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& - c_{23}^2 s_{13}^2 \left[(ir_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} - \frac{1+r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + 2c_{23}^2 s_{13} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau} e^{i\delta}) \left[(ir_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} + \frac{r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& - 2c_{23}s_{23}s_{13} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} e^{i\delta}) r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& - 2c_{23}s_{23}s_{13} \left\{ c_{12}s_{12} \cos \delta \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} e^{i\delta}) \right\} (1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \\
& - \left[s_{23}^2 (c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu})^2 + c_{23}^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau}^2 e^{-i\Delta L} \right] \frac{(r_A \Delta L)^2}{2} \\
& + s_{23}^2 \left[\left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} \right|^2 \left\{ (ir_A \Delta L) - (1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \right\} - |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}|^2 r_A^2 (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& - c_{23}^2 \left[\left| s_{13} e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{r_A^2}{1-r_A} \right) \left\{ i\Delta L e^{-i\Delta L} - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}|^2 r_A^2 \left\{ i\Delta L e^{-i\Delta L} - (1 - i\Delta L - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right\} \right] \\
& - 2c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}) r_A^2 \left[i\Delta L \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau} e^{-i\Delta L} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau} \right) (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& - 2c_{23}s_{23} \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}^* \right) (s_{13} e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}) \right\} \\
& \times r_A \left[(1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \tag{A10}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\mu\tau} = & -c_{23}s_{23} \left\{ 1 - i(c_{12}^2 r_\Delta + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu} r_A) \Delta L \right\} + c_{23}s_{23} (1 - i\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau} r_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} \\
& - \left\{ (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \text{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}) - i \text{Im}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}) \right\} r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& - c_{23}s_{23}s_{13}^2 \left[(ir_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} - \frac{1+r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + 2c_{23}s_{23}s_{13} \text{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau} e^{i\delta}) \left[(ir_A \Delta L) e^{-i\Delta L} + \frac{r_A}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + s_{13} \left\{ (c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \text{Re}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} e^{i\delta}) + i \text{Im}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} e^{i\delta}) \right\} r_A (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \\
& + s_{13} \left[(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \text{Re} \left\{ e^{i\delta} \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} \right) \right\} - i \text{Im} \left\{ e^{i\delta} \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} \right) \right\} \right] (1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \\
& + r_A^2 (c_{23}^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}^*) \left[i\Delta L \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau} e^{-i\Delta L} \right) \right. \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - \left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau} \right) (1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + \left[c_{23}^2 \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}^* \right) (s_{13} e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}) - s_{23}^2 \left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu} \right) (s_{13} e^{i\delta} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}^*) \right] \\
& \times r_A \left[(1 - e^{-i\Delta L}) - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& + c_{23}s_{23} \left[\left(c_{12}^2 \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\mu} \right)^2 - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\tau\tau}^2 e^{-i\Delta L} \right] \frac{(r_A \Delta L)^2}{2} \\
& - c_{23}s_{23} |s_{13} e^{-i\delta} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\tau}|^2 \left(\frac{r_A^2}{1-r_A} \right) \left[i\Delta L e^{-i\Delta L} - \frac{1}{1-r_A} (e^{-ir_A \Delta L} - e^{-i\Delta L}) \right] \\
& - c_{23}s_{23} |c_{12}s_{12} \frac{r_\Delta}{r_A} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{e\mu}|^2 \left\{ ir_A \Delta L - (1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \right\} \\
& - c_{23}s_{23} |\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mu\tau}|^2 r_A^2 \left\{ i\Delta L (1 + e^{-i\Delta L}) - 2(1 - e^{-ir_A \Delta L}) \right\} \tag{A11}
\end{aligned}$$

The other S matrix elements are given by either the T-conjugate relations

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\mu e}(\delta, \phi_{\alpha\beta}) &= S_{e\mu}(-\delta, -\phi_{\alpha\beta}), \\
S_{\tau e}(\delta, \phi_{\alpha\beta}) &= S_{e\tau}(-\delta, -\phi_{\alpha\beta}), \\
S_{\tau\mu}(\delta, \phi_{\alpha\beta}) &= S_{\mu\tau}(-\delta, -\phi_{\alpha\beta}), \tag{A12}
\end{aligned}$$

or by the CP-conjugate relations for antineutrino channels

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{S}_{e\mu}(\delta, \phi_{\alpha\beta}, a) &= S_{e\mu}(-\delta, -\phi_{\alpha\beta}, -a), \\
\bar{S}_{e\tau}(\delta, \phi_{\alpha\beta}, a) &= S_{e\tau}(-\delta, -\phi_{\alpha\beta}, -a), \\
\bar{S}_{\mu\tau}(\delta, \phi_{\alpha\beta}, a) &= S_{\mu\tau}(-\delta, -\phi_{\alpha\beta}, -a). \tag{A13}
\end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX B: NSI THIRD-ORDER FORMULA

We present here the formula for oscillation probability with NSI to third-order in ϵ . We restrict ourselves to the ν_e related channel because they are necessary to complete Table I. Moreover, we only present $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ here because from which $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ can be obtained by the extended transformation (16). Then, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ can be readily calculated by using the unitarity relation. The third-order probability formula was rarely discussed but an exception only with SI can be found in [22].

The NSI third-order formula for $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu) = & 4c_{23}^2 \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} \\
& + 4s_{23}^2 \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& + 8c_{23}s_{23} \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& + 8c_{23}s_{23} \text{Im} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& + 4s_{23}^2 \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + c_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) + c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) - s_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \\
& \quad \times \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \left\{ \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{2E} L - 2 \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \right\} \\
& + 4c_{23}^2 \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + s_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) - c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) + (c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \\
& \quad \times \left| c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \left\{ 2 \sin^2 \frac{aL}{4E} - \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{2E} \right\} \\
& + 8s_{23}^2 \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right) \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \\
& \quad \times \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L - \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right) \cos \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

(equation continues to the next page)

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 8c_{23}^2 \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right. \\
& \quad \times \left(c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right) \left. \right] \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \\
& \quad \times \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L - \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \right\} \\
& + 8(c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2) \text{Im} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right. \\
& \quad \times \left(c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right) \left. \right] \left(\frac{a^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2(\Delta m_{31}^2 - a)} \right) \\
& \quad \times \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& + 4c_{23}s_{23} \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
& \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \left\{ \left((c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) + 2c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) - c_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \right. \\
& + \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + s_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) - c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) + (c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{2E} \\
& - \left. \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + c_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) + c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) - s_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{2E} L \right\} \\
& - 4c_{23}s_{23} \text{Im} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
& \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \left(\frac{aL}{4E} \right) \left\{ \left((c_{23}^2 - s_{23}^2)(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) + 2c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) - c_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{2E} \right. \\
& + \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + s_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) - c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) + (c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \cos \frac{aL}{2E} \\
& - \left. \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + c_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) + c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) - s_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{2E} L \right\} \\
& - 8c_{23}s_{23} \text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
& \times \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + c_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) + c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) - s_{12}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + s_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) - c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) + (c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \right\} \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L
\end{aligned}$$

(equation further continues to the next page)

$$\begin{aligned}
& - 8c_{23}s_{23}\text{Im} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) \left(s_{13}e^{i\delta}\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu}^* + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}^* \right) \right] \\
& \quad \times \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + c_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) + c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) - s_{12}^2\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \left((\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{ee}) + s_{23}^2(\epsilon_{\tau\tau} - \epsilon_{\mu\mu}) - c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\tau} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^*) + (c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2)\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right) \right\} \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& + 8c_{23}s_{23} \left| c_{12}s_{12}\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \text{Re} \left[c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L - \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \right\} \\
& + 8c_{23}s_{23} \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta}\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \text{Re} \left[c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& \quad \times \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L - \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} \right) \cos \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \right\} \\
& + 8c_{23}s_{23} \left\{ \left| s_{13}e^{-i\delta}\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{a} + s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 - \left| c_{12}s_{12}\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right|^2 \right\} \\
& \quad \times \text{Im} \left[c_{23}s_{23}(\epsilon_{\mu\mu} - \epsilon_{\tau\tau}) + c_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau} - s_{23}^2\epsilon_{\mu\tau}^* \right] \left(\frac{a^2}{\Delta m_{31}^2(\Delta m_{31}^2 - a)} \right) \\
& \quad \times \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& - 8c_{23}s_{23}\text{Re} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) s_{12}^2 s_{13} e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \cos \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& - 8c_{23}s_{23}\text{Im} \left[\left(c_{12}s_{12}\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} - s_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau} \right) s_{12}^2 s_{13} e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right) \sin \frac{aL}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L \\
& - 8s_{23}^2 \text{Re} \left[s_{12}^2 s_{13}^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 \Delta m_{31}^2}{a^2} + (s_{23}\epsilon_{e\mu} + c_{23}\epsilon_{e\tau}) s_{12}^2 s_{13} e^{i\delta} \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{a} \right] \\
& \quad \times \left(\frac{a}{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 - a}{4E} L. \quad (\text{B1})
\end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX C: INTRINSIC DEGENERACY IN VACUUM

We re-examine the intrinsic degeneracy, starting from the simplest problem with the oscillation probability in vacuum. For simplicity, we focus on the channel $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$. We use a simplified notation $s_{13} \equiv s$ below. The neutrino and anti-neutrino oscillation probabilities in vacuum are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) &= X s^2 + (Y_c \cos \delta - Y_s \sin \delta) s + P_\odot \\ P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) &= X s^2 + (Y_c \cos \delta + Y_s \sin \delta) s + P_\odot \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

where X, Y 's, etc. are defined with simplified symbol $\Delta_{ji} \equiv \frac{\Delta m_{ji}^2 L}{4E}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} X &\equiv 4s_{23}^2 \sin^2 \Delta_{31}, \\ Y_c &\equiv \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \sin 2\Delta_{31}, \\ Y_s &\equiv 2 \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \sin^2 \Delta_{31}, \\ P_\odot &\equiv \sin^2 2\theta_{12} c_{23}^2 \Delta_{21}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

Let us denote two set of intrinsic degenerate solutions as (s_1, δ_1) and (s_2, δ_2) . They satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} P - P_\odot &= X s_1^2 + (Y_c \cos \delta_1 - Y_s \sin \delta_1) s_1 \\ P - P_\odot &= X s_2^2 + (Y_c \cos \delta_2 - Y_s \sin \delta_2) s_2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P} - P_\odot &= X s_1^2 + (Y_c \cos \delta_1 + Y_s \sin \delta_1) s_1 \\ \bar{P} - P_\odot &= X s_2^2 + (Y_c \cos \delta_2 + Y_s \sin \delta_2) s_2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

By subtracting two equations in (C3) and (C4) respectively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X(s_1^2 - s_2^2) + Y_c(s_1 \cos \delta_1 - s_2 \cos \delta_2) - Y_s(s_1 \sin \delta_1 - s_2 \sin \delta_2) &= 0, \\ X(s_1^2 - s_2^2) + Y_c(s_1 \cos \delta_1 - s_2 \cos \delta_2) + Y_s(s_1 \sin \delta_1 - s_2 \sin \delta_2) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C5})$$

They further simplifies to

$$s_1 \sin \delta_1 - s_2 \sin \delta_2 = 0, \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$X(s_1^2 - s_2^2) + Y_c(s_1 \cos \delta_1 - s_2 \cos \delta_2) = 0. \quad (\text{C7})$$

Equation (C6) can be solved as

$$s_2 \cos \delta_2 = \pm \sqrt{s_2^2 - s_1^2 \sin^2 \delta_1} \quad (\text{C8})$$

which can be inserted to (C7) to yield the (formally quartic but actually) quadratic equation for s_2 . Now, the issue here is to choose the correct sign in (C8). One can show that by using (C7) if $Y_c > 0$ ($Y_c < 0$), minus (plus) sign has to be chosen.

These equations can be easily solved for (s_2, δ_2) for given values of (s_1, δ_1) as inputs:

$$\begin{aligned} s_2 &= \sqrt{s_1^2 + 2 \left(\frac{Y_c}{X} \right) s_1 \cos \delta_1 + \left(\frac{Y_c}{X} \right)^2} \\ \sin \delta_2 &= \frac{s_1}{s_2} \sin \delta_1 \\ \cos \delta_2 &= \mp \frac{1}{s_2} \left(s_1 \cos \delta_1 + \frac{Y_c}{X} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C9})$$

where the sign \mp for $\cos \delta_2$ are for $Y_c = \pm|Y_c|$, and s_2 in the solution of δ is meant to be the s_2 solution given in the first line in (C9). By using

$$\frac{Y_c}{X} = \sin 2\theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31} \quad (\text{C10})$$

s_2 can be written as

$$s_2 = \sqrt{s_1^2 + 2 \sin 2\theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31} s_1 \cos \delta_1 + (\sin 2\theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31})^2} \quad (\text{C11})$$

Similarly, $\cos \delta$ is given as

$$\cos \delta_2 = \mp \frac{1}{s_2} (s_1 \cos \delta_1 + \sin 2\theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23} \Delta_{21} \cot \Delta_{31}) \quad (\text{C12})$$

By further expanding (C9) by $\frac{Y_c}{X}$, assuming it small, the Burguet-Castell *et al.* solution [32, 57] is reproduced;

$$s_2 \simeq s_1 + \frac{Y_c}{X} \cos \delta_1 \quad (\text{C13})$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Two of the authors (H.M. and S.U.) thank Hiroshi Numokawa and Renata Zukanovich Funchal for useful discussions and for sharing various knowledges of neutrino oscillation with NSI through fruitful collaborations. They are grateful to Belen Gavela and Andrea Donini for illuminating discussions and for hospitality at Departamento de Física Teórica and Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, where this work was completed. Their visits were supported by the JSPS-CSIC (Japan-Spain) Bilateral Joint Projects. H.M. thanks Stephen Parke for critical discussions on systems with NSI, and Theoretical Physics Department of Fermilab for hospitality in the summer 2008. This work was supported in part by KAKENHI, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. 19340062, and Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows No. 209677, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

-
- [1] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28**, 870 (1962).
 - [2] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **335**, 237 (1994); Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ex/9807003]. Y. Ashie *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 101801 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0404034]; Phys. Rev. D **71**, 112005 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0501064].
 - [3] B. T. Cleveland *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **496**, 505 (1998); J. N. Abdurashitov *et al.* [SAGE Collaboration], J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **95**, 181 (2002) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **122**, 211 (2002)] [arXiv:astro-ph/0204245]; W. Hampel *et al.* [GALLEX Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **447**, 127 (1999); M. Altmann *et al.* [GNO Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **616**, 174 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0504037]; J. Hosaka *et al.* [Super-Kamkiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **73**, 112001 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ex/0508053]; B. Aharmim *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. C **72**, 055502 (2005) [arXiv:nucl-ex/0502021]; Phys. Rev. C **75**, 045502 (2007). C. Arpesella *et al.* [Borexino Collaboration], arXiv:0805.3843 [astro-ph]; G. Bellini *et al.*, arXiv:0808.2868 [astro-ph].

- [4] K. Eguchi *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021802 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ex/0212021]. T. Araki *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 081801 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0406035]. S. Abe *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 221803 (2008) [arXiv:0801.4589 [hep-ex]].
- [5] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 2369 (1978).
- [6] J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. B **199** (1987) 432.
- [7] M. M. Guzzo, A. Masiero and S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 154 (1991).
- [8] E. Roulet, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 935 (1991).
- [9] Y. Grossman, Phys. Lett. B **359**, 141 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9507344].
- [10] Z. Berezhiani and A. Rossi, Phys. Lett. B **535**, 207 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0111137].
- [11] S. Davidson, C. Pena-Garay, N. Rius and A. Santamaria, JHEP **0303**, 011 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0302093].
- [12] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP **26**, 984 (1968) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **53**, 1717 (1967)].
- [13] S. P. Mikheev and A. Y. Smirnov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **42**, 913 (1985) [Yad. Fiz. **42**, 1441 (1985)]; Nuovo Cim. C **9**, 17 (1986).
- [14] K. Kimura, A. Takamura and H. Yokomakura, Phys. Lett. B **537**, 86 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0203099]; Phys. Rev. D **66**, 073005 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0205295].
- [15] H. Minakata, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6630 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9503417]. Phys. Lett. B **356**, 61 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9504222]. S. M. Bilenky, A. Bottino, C. Giunti and C. W. Kim, Phys. Lett. B **356**, 273 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9504405]. K. S. Babu, J. C. Pati and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B **359**, 351 (1995) [Erratum-ibid. B **364**, 251 (1995)] [arXiv:hep-ph/9505334]. G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi and G. Scioscia, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5334 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9506350].
- [16] E. K. Akhmedov, Phys. Lett. B **503**, 133 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0011136]. O. Yasuda, Phys. Lett. B **516**, 111 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0106232].
- [17] J. Arafune, M. Koike and J. Sato, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 3093 [Erratum-ibid. D **60** (1997) 119905], [arXiv:hep-ph/9703351].
- [18] H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 4403 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9705208].
- [19] A. Cervera, A. Donini, M. B. Gavela, J. J. Gomez Cadenas, P. Hernandez, O. Mena and S. Rigolin, Nucl. Phys. B **579**, 17 (2000) [Erratum-ibid. B **593**, 731 (2001)] [arXiv:hep-ph/0002108].
- [20] O. Yasuda, Acta Phys. Polon. B **30**, 3089 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9910428].
- [21] M. Freund, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 053003 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0103300].
- [22] E. K. Akhmedov, R. Johansson, M. Lindner, T. Ohlsson and T. Schwetz, JHEP **0404**, 078 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0402175].
- [23] H. Minakata, M. Sonoyama and H. Sugiyama, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 113012 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0406073].
- [24] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, Y. Grossman, A. Gusso and Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 096006 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0105159].
- [25] P. Huber, T. Schwetz and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 101804 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0111224].
- [26] P. Huber, T. Schwetz and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 013006 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0202048].
- [27] T. Ota, J. Sato and N. a. Yamashita, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 093015 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0112329].
- [28] O. Yasuda, arXiv:0704.1531 [hep-ph].
- [29] J. Kopp, M. Lindner, T. Ota and J. Sato, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 013007 (2008) [arXiv:0708.0152 [hep-ph]].

- [30] N. Cipriano Ribeiro, H. Minakata, H. Nunokawa, S. Uchinami and R. Zukanovich Funchal, *JHEP* **0712**, 002 (2007) [arXiv:0709.1980 [hep-ph]].
- [31] H. Minakata, arXiv:0805.2435 [hep-ph].
- [32] J. Burguet-Castell, M. B. Gavela, J. J. Gomez-Cadenas, P. Hernandez and O. Mena, *Nucl. Phys. B* **608**, 301 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0103258].
- [33] H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, *JHEP* **0110**, 001 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0108085].
- [34] G. L. Fogli and E. Lisi, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 3667 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9604415].
- [35] N. Fornengo, M. Maltoni, R. T. Bayo and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 013010 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0108043].
- [36] N. Cipriano Ribeiro, H. Nunokawa, T. Kajita, S. Nakayama, P. Ko, and H. Minakata, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 073007 (2008) [arXiv:0712.4314 [hep-ph]].
- [37] H. Minakata, H. Sugiyama, O. Yasuda, K. Inoue and F. Suekane, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 033017 (2003) [Erratum-ibid. *D* **70**, 059901 (2004)] [arXiv:hep-ph/0211111].
- [38] K. Hiraide, H. Minakata, T. Nakaya, H. Nunokawa, H. Sugiyama, W. J. C. Teves and R. Zukanovich Funchal, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 093008 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0601258].
- [39] K. B. McConnel and M. H. Shaevitz, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **21**, 3825 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ex/0409028].
- [40] O. L. G. Peres and A. Y. Smirnov, *Phys. Lett. B* **456**, 204 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9902312]. *Nucl. Phys. B* **680**, 479 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0309312]. M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni and A. Y. Smirnov, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 093005 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0408170]. T. Kajita, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **155**, 155 (2006). S. Choubey and P. Roy, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 013006 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0509197].
- [41] T. Kajita, H. Minakata, S. Nakayama and H. Nunokawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 013006 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0609286].
- [42] S. Antusch, C. Biggio, E. Fernandez-Martinez, M. B. Gavela and J. Lopez-Pavon, *JHEP* **0610**, 084 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0607020].
- [43] W. M. Yao *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *J. Phys. G* **33**, 1 (2006).
- [44] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49**, 652 (1973).
- [45] M. Apollonio *et al.* [CHOOZ Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **27**, 331 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ex/0301017]; *Phys. Lett. B* **466**, 415 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ex/9907037]. See also, The Palo Verde Collaboration, F. Boehm *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 112001 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ex/0107009]. For a bound from accelerator experiment, see M. H. Ahn *et al.* [K2K Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 051801 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0402017].
- [46] F. Ardellier *et al.* [Double Chooz Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0606025; X. Guo *et al.* [Daya Bay Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0701029; K. K. Joo [RENO Collaboration], *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **168**, 125 (2007). K. Anderson *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ex/0402041.
- [47] Y. Itow *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ex/0106019.
For an updated version, see: <http://neutrino.kek.jp/jhfnu/loi/loi.v2.030528.pdf>
- [48] D. Ayres *et al.* [Nova Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0503053.
- [49] H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, *Phys. Lett.* **B495** (2000) 369; [arXiv:hep-ph/0004114]; J. Sato, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* **A472** (2001) 434 [arXiv:hep-ph/0008056]; B. Richter, arXiv:hep-ph/0008222.
- [50] J. Sato, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 131804 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0503144].
- [51] J. Bernabeu, J. Burguet-Castell, C. Espinoza and M. Lindroos, *JHEP* **0512**, 014 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0505054].
- [52] H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, *Phys. Lett. B* **413**, 369 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9706281].

- [53] M. Ishitsuka, T. Kajita, H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 033003 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0504026].
- [54] *Far Detector in Korea for the J-PARC Neutrino Beam*, Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on a Far Detector in Korea for the J-PARC Neutrino Beam, Tokyo, Japan, September 30-October 1, 2007, edited by T. Kajita and S.-B. Kim (Universal Academy Press, Tokyo, 2008): <http://www-rcn.icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/workshop/T2KK07/proceedings/>
- [55] D. Beavis *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ex/0205040; M. V. Diwan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 012002 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0303081].
- [56] V. Barger, D. Marfatia and K. Whisnant, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 073023 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0112119].
- [57] H. Minakata, H. Nunokawa and S. J. Parke, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 093012 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0208163].
- [58] H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **110**, 404 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0111131].
- [59] A. Friedland, C. Lunardini and C. Pena-Garay, Phys. Lett. B **594**, 347 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0402266];
- [60] H. Minakata, *In the Proceedings of International Conference on Heavy Quarks and Leptons (HQL 06), Munich, Germany, 16-20 Oct 2006, pp 036* [arXiv:hep-ph/0701070].
- [61] H. Minakata, Phys. Scripta **T127**, 73 (2006).
- [62] T. Kajita, H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, Phys. Lett. B **528**, 245 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0112345].
- [63] P. Huber and W. Winter, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 037301 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0301257].