

# Massless Neutrino Oscillations via Quantum Tunneling

Hai-Long Zhao

Jiuquan satellite launch center, Jiuquan, 732750, China

**Abstract:** In the present theory, the masses of neutrinos are required in order to realize oscillations. By analogy with the oscillation of quantum two-state system, we assume that neutrino oscillations may be regarded as quantum tunneling process. The difference of the quantum numbers between two particles may build a barrier. Thus neutrinos with vanishing mass will oscillate. The hypothesis can also be applied to the lepton flavor violation and quark mixing as well as the oscillation of neutral kaons. We point out that quark mixing is the consequence of quark oscillations via barrier tunneling in hadrons as bound states, while neutrinos oscillate as free particles. We expect that the recent experimental results on anomalous magnetic moment of the muon and the breaking of lepton universality in beauty-quark decays will be explained with flavor-changing via barrier tunneling instead of introducing new interactions and particles.

**Keywords:** Neutrino oscillations; Quantum two-state system; Quantum tunneling; Quark mixing; Lepton flavor violation

## 1 Introduction

The experiments with solar, atmospheric and reactor neutrinos have provided compelling evidences for the existence of neutrino oscillations [1–11]. According to the present theory, neutrino oscillations are due to non-vanishing neutrino masses. Neutrino oscillations include oscillations in matter and in vacuum, and the Seesaw mechanism has been proposed to explain why the neutrino masses are so small [12, 13]. The oscillation length can be derived by the present theory [14]. But some of the assumptions, such as equal-energy or equal-momentum in the production process of neutrino, are controversial. This has led to the wave packet description of neutrinos by some authors [15–25]. Although the plane wave description of neutrinos is imperfect, it is still the foundation of the theoretical analysis of neutrino oscillations. So we mainly discuss the method of plane wave approximation. It should be noted that there exist issues whether for the plane wave or the wave packet description, which will be discussed in the subsequent section.

In order to realize neutrino oscillation within the framework of Standard Model, we assume that neutrino oscillations are similar to the oscillation of quantum two-state system, then neutrino oscillations do not need non-vanishing mass.

## 2 The present theory of neutrino oscillations

As a plane wave, neutrino can oscillate via four assumptions: equal-energy, equal-momentum, energy-momentum conservation and equal-velocity. For a review of these assumptions one may see [24, 25]. We mainly discuss the former two assumptions, which can be found in [14]. For the latter two assumptions, one may see [24, 25] and the references therein.

For convenience we work in the natural units, where  $\hbar = c = 1$ . For simplicity, we leave the tauon neutrino  $\nu_\tau$  out of the following and assume that only the electron neutrino  $\nu_e$  and muon neutrino  $\nu_\mu$  mix with each other. As  $\nu_e$  and  $\nu_\mu$  are not the energy eigenstates, we denote the eigenstates of

---

Email: zhlyzj@126.com

the Hamiltonian with  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , respectively, and for which we make the following ansatz

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_e \\ v_\mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

The inversion of Eq. (1) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_e \\ v_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

First we assume that an electron neutrino  $v_e$  is produced with definite momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  at point  $\mathbf{x}$  and at time  $t=0$ . In the energy representation it holds that, for the evolution of the state

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ v_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-iE_1 t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-iE_2 t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1(0) \\ v_2(0) \end{pmatrix} e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}}, \quad (3)$$

where  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are the energy eigenvalues of  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , respectively, and we have

$$E_1 = \sqrt{p^2 + m_1^2}, \quad E_2 = \sqrt{p^2 + m_2^2}, \quad (4)$$

where  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are the masses of the eigenstates  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , respectively. With the help of above equations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} v_e(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ v_\mu(\mathbf{x}, t) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-iE_1 t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-iE_2 t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_e(0) \\ v_\mu(0) \end{pmatrix} e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2 \theta e^{-iE_1 t} + \sin^2 \theta e^{-iE_2 t} & \sin \theta \cos \theta (e^{-iE_2 t} - e^{-iE_1 t}) \\ \sin \theta \cos \theta (e^{-iE_2 t} - e^{-iE_1 t}) & \cos^2 \theta e^{-iE_1 t} + \sin^2 \theta e^{-iE_2 t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_e(0) \\ v_\mu(0) \end{pmatrix} e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

According to the assumption that purely neutrinos of the electronic type are emitted at the source, we have  $v_e(0)=1$  and  $v_\mu(0)=0$ . Then the probability of finding a muon neutrino  $v_\mu$  at time  $t$  is

$$|v_\mu(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 = |\sin \theta \cos \theta (e^{-iE_2 t} - e^{-iE_1 t})|^2 = \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2 \frac{(E_2 - E_1)t}{2}. \quad (6)$$

In the case of  $m_1 = m_2 = 0$ , we have  $E_1 = E_2$ . Then the probability of finding  $v_\mu$  at any time  $t$  is zero. We then suppose that neutrinos are produced with a definite energy  $E$ , and make the ansatz

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ v_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{ip_1 x} v_1(0) \\ e^{ip_2 x} v_2(0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where  $p_1 = \sqrt{E^2 - m_1^2}$ ,  $p_2 = \sqrt{E^2 - m_2^2}$ . And again set  $v_e(0)=1$  and  $v_\mu(0)=0$  for  $x=0$ . It results that

$$|v_\mu(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 = \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2 \frac{(p_2 - p_1)x}{2}. \quad (8)$$

If  $m_1 = m_2 = 0$ , we have  $p_1 = p_2$ , Eq. (8) will be zero. Then neutrino cannot oscillate.

Besides the assumptions of equal-momentum and equal-energy, there are also assumptions of energy-momentum conservation and equal-velocity. Although the four assumptions lead to the same result in the relativistic limit, no one gives arguments for their correctness. A first look at the four assumptions shows that they are incompatible. For example, if the neutrinos with different masses had the same energy they could not have the same momentum and vice versa. The assumption of

energy–momentum conservation seems to be the most satisfying one, while the equal–velocity assumption is the most unlikely one. An explanation in [26] was proposed to account for why equal–velocity assumption can be ruled out. Assuming the two mass eigenstates have a same velocity, we immediately arrive at  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \sqrt{1-u^2}$ , then we get  $E_1/E_2 = m_1/m_2$ . This equality cannot hold because  $E_1/E_2 \approx 1$ , while  $m_1/m_2$  may be extremely small or extremely large.

Since the plane wave description of neutrino is unsatisfactory, it's natural to describe it with wave packet. The detailed discussion may refer to [15–25]. But a problem remains for the two descriptions, that is, since the equal–velocity assumption is not correct, different neutrinos will travel with a different velocity. Then after a long distance of flight (e.g. the neutrinos reaching the earth from supernovas), the neutrino mixing will become incoherent and neutrinos will cease to oscillate. The difficulty will be swept away with massless neutrino oscillations model in the following.

The above analysis of two–flavor neutrino mixing can be easily extended to the instance of three–flavor mixing, which is described with PMNS matrix [27].

### 3 Neutrino oscillations via barrier tunneling

#### 3.1 Oscillation of quantum two-state system

There is a two-state system in quantum physics, which has two quantum states with a symmetric structure. The system oscillates between the two quantum states. The following discussion may refer to [28]. Taking ammonia molecule as an example. There are two possible positions for the nitrogen atom, which may be on one side of the plane or on the other, as shown in Fig. 1. We denote the two quantum states by  $|C_1\rangle$  and  $|C_2\rangle$ , respectively.




Fig. 1 Two symmetric configurations of ammonia molecule.

In Fig. 1, the nitrogen atom must penetrate a barrier when flipping to the other side. Even if its energy is not high enough to traverse the barrier from the classical point of view, there is a certain probability for the nitrogen atom to tunnel through the barrier. So we suppose the Schrödinger equation for the flipping of the nitrogen atom to be

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} C_1 \\ C_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} E_0 & -A \\ -A & E_0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C_1 \\ C_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

It's not difficult to solve this differential equation. The detailed calculations may refer to [28]. We only give the result here. Suppose the system is in state  $|C_1\rangle$  at  $t=0$ , i.e.,  $C_1(0)=1$ ,  $C_2(0)=0$ . Then the probabilities that the system is in states  $|C_1\rangle$  and  $|C_2\rangle$  are respectively

$$\begin{cases} |C_1(t)|^2 = \cos^2 At \\ |C_2(t)|^2 = \sin^2 At \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

### 3.2 Neutrino oscillations via barrier tunneling

We see that Eqs. (6) and (10) are actually the same in the case of  $\theta = \pi/4$  and  $A = (E_2 - E_1)/2$ . So if we wish to let neutrinos oscillate with vanishing mass, we may simply think that neutrino oscillations are the consequence of barrier tunneling. In this case, even if  $m_1 = m_2 = 0$ , we still have  $E_1 \neq E_2$ , where  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are the eigenvalues of the energy of the system, and  $E_1 = E_0 - A$  is the energy of the ground state.

We have pointed out that the four assumptions on the energy and momentum of neutrinos are incompatible with each other. This difficulty disappears in our theory. Although neutrinos have vanishing mass, their energy eigenvalues are different due to the existence of barriers, and we have  $E_1 \neq E_2 \neq E_3$ . On the other hand, neutrinos travel at the velocity of  $c$ , they will always remain coherent mixing whether as plane wave or wave packet.

Massless neutrinos can also oscillate in matter, where the oscillations may change due to the interactions between neutrinos and the matter, and an alternative discussion may see [29]. In medium, the energies of neutrinos contain the potentials of neutrinos in addition to kinetic energies. This implies that the  $E_0$  in Eq. (9) may be different. The difference of potentials for different neutrinos will influence the oscillations probability. There are also other massless neutrino oscillations theories. But they all need some additional assumptions. For example, residual symmetry in [30], open system in [31] and modified Dirac equations in [32], are respectively introduced in order to keep neutrinos massless. By contrast, our model is based on the present theory, and it is natural to extend the oscillation of quantum two-state system to neutrino oscillations.

### 3.3 Formation mechanism of barrier

We have adopted the hypothesis of barrier tunneling to explain the neutrino oscillations, then the next question is: How are the barriers between neutrinos formed? Let's first see some tunneling phenomena. In the case of scanning tunneling microscope, electrons tunnel through air from one metal to another metal, the barrier is the air between the two metals. In the Josephson junction, the barrier is the insulator sandwiched between the superconductors. In the photon tunneling experiment, the barrier is the air between the two prisms [33, 34]. These tunneling phenomena are quantum effects, and they can be explained with quantum mechanics without introducing new interaction. The only requirement for quantum tunneling is the conservations of energy and momentum of the particles before and after tunneling.

Now let's see the electron transitions outside the nucleus between different orbitals, which may also be regarded as a quantum tunneling phenomenon. The barrier here is not a tangible substance, but the difference of quantum numbers  $(n, l, m)$  of the electron in different orbitals. Due to the different energies of the electron in different orbitals, the electron must emit or absorb a photon during the transition process. For barrier between neutrinos, the difference of the quantum number is due to the flavor-changing. The barriers ensure that the neutrino is in a pure state of flavor rather than in the

superposition state at any time, so that we can distinguish among three generations (flavors) of neutrinos.

What if there are no barriers among neutrinos? In this case, neutrino cannot maintain the independence of flavor, it will become a simple mixture of three flavors. Its property will be different from any flavor of neutrinos. To illustrate this point, we take the polarization of light as an example. The linear polarization can be considered as the superposition of the left-handed and right-handed circular polarizations. There is no barrier between the two eigenstates. Thus the property of the linearly polarized light is different from that of the circularly polarized light. We see that the existence of the barrier among neutrinos not only is the theoretical requirement but also has physical significance.

Let's consider another question: Why should neutrinos oscillate? We know that there are three generations of quarks in nature, and their masses are different. So are the three generations (flavors) of charged leptons. Heavier quarks and charged leptons will decay into lighter ones. That is, flavor-changing exists between them. But for the three generations (flavors) of neutrinos with equal zero mass, how to realize flavor-changing? So neutrinos must oscillate, which is the consequence of their vanishing masses.

## 4 Oscillations of other particles

The neutrino oscillations can be arguably extended to other particles. If the two particles have different masses before and after the transition, the tunneling will turn out to be a decay process. Let's see some examples.

### 4.1 Radiative decay of charged leptons

Unlike neutrinos, charged leptons are massive. Due to the conservations of energy and momentum, massive leptons can not oscillate freely, which may be seen from the following equations:

$$\frac{m_1 u_1}{\sqrt{1-u_1^2/c^2}} = \frac{m_2 u_2}{\sqrt{1-u_2^2/c^2}}, \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{m_1 c^2}{\sqrt{1-u_1^2/c^2}} = \frac{m_2 c^2}{\sqrt{1-u_2^2/c^2}}. \quad (12)$$

It follows from the two equations that  $u_1 = u_2$ . Substituting it into Eq. (11), we find  $m_1 = m_2$ . Thus a free muon can not merely convert into an electron, it must emit a neutral particle during the tunneling process. That is, the following process will occur

$$\mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \gamma. \quad (13)$$

This process is quantum tunneling process and does not rely on intermediate particle. It is similar to the electron transitions between different orbitals. Here the barrier is established upon flavor violation. Due to the large mass difference between electron and muon, the decay probability is very small. On the other hand, the decay will be greatly suppressed by weak interaction, since the following process is easier to occur:

$$\mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_e. \quad (14)$$

The radiative decay of the muon has not been observed in experiments thus far. Many new physics beyond Standard Model can accommodate lepton flavor violation, for a review one may see [35]. By contrast, barrier tunneling is the simplest interaction model for lepton flavor violation within the framework of Standard Model.

If the radiative decay of the muon is verified by future experiments, it will help to explain the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon. The latest measurement indicates a 4.2 standard deviations between experiment and theory [36]. There is an intimate correlation between radiative decay of the muon and its anomalous magnetic moment. According to the research in [37], the radiative decay of the muon is expected to occur with a branching ratio of the same order as the present experimental limit, so it can account for the discrepancy between experiment and theory. Compared with other models, such as Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model, Left-Right symmetric model, B – L model, etc (see [35]), barrier tunneling gives a natural explanation to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon without introducing new interactions and particles.

## 4.2 Quark mixing and decay

We have discussed neutrino oscillations via barrier tunneling. One may wonder whether quarks can oscillate in this way. We think that quark mixing is actually quark oscillation. By convention, the up-type quarks ( $u$ ,  $c$ ,  $t$ ) are chosen to be pure states. The mixing of three generations of down-type quarks ( $d$ ,  $s$ ,  $b$ ) is represented by CKM matrix. For simplicity, we only consider the mixing between  $d$  and  $s$  quarks which can be described by Cabibbo angle  $\theta_c$  [14]. Both  $d$  and  $s$  quarks are massive, so they cannot transform into each other without emitting or absorbing other particles, just like the radiative decay of muon. But free quarks do not exist, they can only exist in hadrons as bound states. In this case, the energy of the quark includes not only kinetic energy but also potential energy (just like the instance of neutrino oscillations in matter). The potential between  $d$  and  $u$  quarks is proportional to  $\cos\theta_c$ , while the potential between  $s$  and  $u$  quarks is proportional to  $\sin\theta_c$ . Thus, even though  $d$  and  $s$  quarks have different masses, their bound state energies may be equal, and they can oscillate freely in hadrons.

In the case that the quarks are not in the bound state, e.g., protons are hit at the collider, the decay of heavy quark into light quark via barrier tunneling will occur, just like the radiative decay of charged leptons. In the recent experimental test of lepton universality in beauty-quark decays [38], the ratio of branching fractions for  $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ + \mu^+ + \mu^-$  and  $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ + e^+ + e^-$  decays is measured to be 0.846. The breaking of lepton universality reaches a significance of 3.1 standard deviations. In the decay process, a  $\bar{b}$  quark decays into a  $\bar{s}$  quark via weak interaction, and two charged leptons are emitted. If the direct transition of  $\bar{b}$  quark to  $\bar{s}$  quark via barrier tunneling is taken into account, we expect that the discrepancy will disappear.

## 4.3 Oscillation of neutral kaons

Let's see the oscillation of neutral kaons.  $K^0$  ( $d\bar{s}$ ) and  $\bar{K}^0$  ( $\bar{d}s$ ) constitute a quantum two-state system. They will oscillate via barrier tunneling. Another easier oscillation manner is realized by the weak interaction [14]. This process can be described as follows. The  $d$  quark in the  $K^0$  meson

captures a virtual  $\bar{u}$  quark in the vacuum and turns into a  $W^-$  particle, which then transforms into  $s$  and  $\bar{u}$  quarks. In the meanwhile, the  $\bar{s}$  quark in the meson  $K^0$  meson captures a virtual  $u$  quark in the vacuum and turns into a  $W^+$  particle, which then transforms into  $\bar{d}$  and  $u$  quarks. The  $u$  and  $\bar{u}$  quarks annihilate into the vacuum, and only  $\bar{d}s$  is left. Thus, a  $K^0$  meson will transform into a  $\bar{K}^0$  meson, as described in the following.

$$K^0 \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} d + \bar{u} \rightarrow W^- \rightarrow s + \bar{u} \\ \bar{s} + u \rightarrow W^+ \rightarrow \bar{d} + u \end{array} \right\} \rightarrow \bar{K}^0. \quad (15)$$

It is convenient to define the CP eigenstates [39]

$$|K_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|K^0\rangle + |\bar{K}^0\rangle), \quad |K_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|K^0\rangle - |\bar{K}^0\rangle), \quad (16)$$

with  $|K_1\rangle = +CP|K_1\rangle$  and  $|K_2\rangle = -CP|K_2\rangle$ . We see that  $|K_1\rangle$  and  $|K_2\rangle$  constitute a quantum two-state system and the difference of CP quantum number will build a barrier between them. Thus the system will oscillate between  $|K_1\rangle$  and  $|K_2\rangle$ . However,  $|K_1\rangle$  and  $|K_2\rangle$  are not the eigenstates of energy. What we can observe in experiments are their energy eigenstates  $|K_S^0\rangle$  and  $|K_L^0\rangle$  with a small energy difference of  $\Delta mc^2 = 0.529 \times 10^{10} \text{ h/s}$  [40]. As  $|K_L^0\rangle$  is heavier,  $|K_S^0\rangle$  is the ground state of energy.

An interesting question is whether  $|K_L^0\rangle$  will decay into  $|K_S^0\rangle$ , since  $|K_L^0\rangle$  is the excited state of the system. If this is true, a photon with a wavelength of 0.356m will be emitted. As the wavelength is very large, it will be difficult to observe the photon.

## 5 Conclusion

Neutrino oscillations with vanishing mass lead to a simple version of Standard Model, and we have already had an appropriate equation to describe the behavior of neutrinos, i.e., Weyl equation. Barrier tunneling provides a simple explanation for neutrino oscillations, and the difficulties with the plane wave and wave packet descriptions do not exist. Barrier tunneling can be naturally applied to quarks, charged leptons and mesons. We expect that the recent experimental results of anomalous magnetic moment of the muon and the breaking of lepton universality in beauty-quark decays will be explained with the barrier tunneling hypothesis.

## References

- [1] Y. Fukuda et al., [Super-Kamiokande Collab.], Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 1562-1567.
- [2] Q. R. Ahmad et al., [SNO Collab.], Measurement of the rate of  $\nu_e + d \rightarrow p + p + e^-$  interactions Produced by  $^8\text{B}$  solar neutrinos at the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 071301.
- [3] Q. R. Ahmad et al., [SNO Collab.], Direct evidence for neutrino flavor transformation from neutral-current interactions in the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 011301.
- [4] W. Hampel et al., [GALLEX Collab.], GALLEX solar neutrino observations: Results for GALLEX IV, Phys. Lett. B **447** (1999) 127-133.

- [5] M. Altmann et al., [GNO Collab.], Complete results for five years of GNO solar neutrino observations, *Phys. Lett. B* **616** (2005) 174-190.
- [6] K. Eguchi et al., [KamLAND Collab.], First results from KamLAND: Evidence for reactor antineutrino disappearance, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003) 021802.
- [7] M. H. Ahn et al., [K2K Collab.], Measurement of neutrino oscillation by the K2K experiment, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 072003.
- [8] D. G. Michael et al., [MINOS Collab.], Observation of muon neutrino disappearance with the MINOS detectors and the NuMI neutrino beam, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 191801.
- [9] P. Adamson et al., [MINOS Collab.], Measurement of neutrino oscillations with the MINOS detectors in the NuMI beam, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 131802.
- [10] F. P. An et al., [Daya Bay Collab.], Observation of electron-antineutrino disappearance at Daya bay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 171803.
- [11] J. K. Ahn et al., [RENO Collab.], Observation of reactor electron antineutrinos disappearance in the RENO experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 191802.
- [12] T. Yanagida, Horizontal symmetry and masses of neutrinos, *Prog.Theor. Phys.* **64** (1980) 1103-1105.
- [13] M. Lindner, T. Ohlsson and G. Seidl, Seesaw mechanisms for Dirac and Majorana neutrino masses, *Phys. Lett. D* **65** (2002) 053014.
- [14] G. Greiner and B. Müller, Gauge theory of weak interactions. 3rd. ed., Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [15] S. Nussinov, Solar neutrinos and neutrino mixing, *Phys. Lett. B* **63** (1976) 201-203.
- [16] B. Kayser, On the quantum mechanics of neutrino oscillation, *Phys. Rev. D* **24** (1981) 110-116.
- [17] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim and U. W. Lee, When do neutrinos really oscillate?: Quantum mechanics of neutrino oscillations, *Phys. Rev. D* **44** (1991) 3635-3640.
- [18] C. Giunti and C. W. Kim, Fundamentals of neutrino physics and astrophysics, Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [19] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, J. A. Lee and U. W. Lee, On the treatment of neutrino oscillations without resort to weak eigenstates, *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 4310-4317.
- [20] K. Kiers and N. Weiss, Neutrino oscillations in a model with a source and detector, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 3091-3105.
- [21] C. Y. Cardall, Coherence of neutrino flavor mixing in quantum field theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **61** (2000) 073006.
- [22] M. Beuthe, Towards a unique formula for neutrino oscillations in vacuum, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 013003.
- [23] E. Kh. Akhmedov and A. Yu. Smirnov, Paradoxes of neutrino oscillations, *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **72** (2009) 1363-1381.
- [24] M. Beuthe, Oscillations of neutrinos and mesons in quantum field theory, *Phys. Rept.* **375** (2003) 105-218.
- [25] D. Kruppke, On Theories of neutrino oscillations: A Summary and characterisation of the problematic aspects, Diploma Thesis, 2007.
- [26] L. B. Okun and I. S. Tsukerman, Comment on equal velocity assumption for neutrino oscillations, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **15** (2000) 1481-1482.



- [27] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, J. Salvado and T. Schwetz, Global fit to three neutrino mixing: Critical look at present precision, *JHEP* **1212** (2012) 123.
- [28] R. P. Feynman, *The Feynman lectures on physics*, Vol, 3rd, ed., Addison Wesley Longman, 1970.
- [29] I. Bhattacharyya, Can massless neutrinos oscillate in presence of matter? *Fund. J. Math. Phys.* **3** (2013) 23-31.
- [30] A. S. Joshipura and K. M. Patel, Horizontal symmetries of leptons with a massless neutrino, *Phys. Lett. B* **727** (2013), 480-487.
- [31] F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Massless neutrino oscillations, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 085015.
- [32] S. I. Kruglov, Equations for massless and massive spin-1/2 particles with varying speed and neutrino in matter, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **29** (2014) 1450031.
- [33] J. J. Carey, J. Zawadzka, D. A. Jaroszynski and K. Wynne, Noncausal time response in frustrated total internal reflection? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84** (2000) 1431-1434.
- [34] Ph. Balcou and L. Dutriaux, Dual optical tunneling times in frustrated total internal reflection, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** (1997) 851-854.
- [35] M. Lindner, M. Platscher and F. S. Queiroz, A call for new physics: The muon anomalous magnetic moment and lepton flavor violation, *Phys. Rep.* **731** (2018) 1-82.
- [36] B. Abi et al., Measurement of the Positive Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment to 0.46 ppm, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (2021), 141801.
- [37] X. Calmet, H. Fritzsch and D. Holtmannspötter, Anomalous magnetic moment of the muon and radiative lepton decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 037701.
- [38] R. Aaij et al., [LHCb Collab.], Test of lepton universality in beauty-quark decays, arXiv:2103.11769, 2013.
- [39] H. Burkhardt, et al, [CERN-Dortmund-Edinburgh-Mainz-Orsay-Pisa-Siegen Collab.], First evidence for direct CP violation, *Phys. Lett. B* **206** (1988) 169-176.
- [40] K. A. Olive et al., [Particle Data Group], *Chin. Phys. C* **38** (2014) 090001.