

# Bremsstrahlung from the Cosmic Neutrino Background

Konstantin Asteriadis,<sup>1,\*</sup> Alejandro Quiroga Triviño,<sup>2,†</sup> and Martin Spinrath<sup>2,3,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*High Energy Theory Group, Physics Department,  
Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 30013, Taiwan*

<sup>3</sup>*Center for Theory and Computation, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, 30013, Taiwan*

In this paper we discuss a detection method for the Cosmic Neutrino Background using bremsstrahlung from a neutrino scattering process which has no kinematic threshold, does not rely on a resonance and would in principle allow to measure the velocity distribution of the relic neutrinos. As a concrete example we calculate the rate for solar neutrinos scattering from a relic neutrino emitting a photon. We also provide the energy and angular distributions of the emitted photons.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The direct observation of the Cosmic Neutrino Background (CNB) in a laboratory remains one of the great challenges of experimental particle cosmology. Given the tiny cross sections and energies of CNB neutrinos it was even called an “apparently impossible experiment” [1]. Some recent proposals include detecting the tiny force induced by the CNB “wind” using current gravitational wave detector technology [2, 3], resonant scattering against ultra-high energetic cosmic neutrinos [4], cosmic birefringence induced by the CNB [5] and the absorption of CNB neutrinos on tritium [6, 7]. The last is probably the most promising proposal at this time, see, e.g. Refs [8–11] for more comprehensive reviews.

Currently proposed methods to detect the CNB often only work above kinematic thresholds, at specific resonances or rely on non-standard cosmologies. Here we study the feasibility of a method that has no such restrictions. We consider scattering between the two largest natural neutrino fluxes on earth: solar neutrinos and CNB neutrinos. Since the scattered neutrinos would still be hard to detect, we consider an additional bremsstrahlung photon in the final state that is comparatively easy to detect and that can be produced at any energy.

In the Standard Model of particle physics (SM) including Dirac neutrino masses neutrinos couple to photons via loop induced magnetic dipole moments. The neutrino magnetic moment is tiny and so is the cross section for the considered process. For Majorana neutrinos, however, the magnetic moment is exactly zero. In this case, the scattering cross section is still non-zero if one considers transition magnetic moments, see, e.g. Ref. [12], and we

expect the cross sections to be similar to the (simpler) Dirac case.

Measuring this process would be more conceivable if the neutrino magnetic moment would be substantially enhanced by some new physics. We, therefore, consider an enhanced neutrino magnetic moment, slightly below the current upper bound, but still orders of magnitude larger than in the SM.

## II. BREMSSTRAHLUNG FROM NEUTRINO-NEUTRINO SCATTERING

We study the processes

$$\nu_{\odot} + \bar{\nu}_{\text{CNB}} \rightarrow \nu + \bar{\nu} + \gamma \quad (1)$$

at leading order, neglecting the exchanged momentum with respect to the  $Z$ -boson mass in the propagators. Here  $\nu_{\odot}$  is a solar neutrino and  $\nu_{\text{CNB}}$  and  $\bar{\nu}_{\text{CNB}}$  are relic neutrinos and anti-neutrinos, respectively. In the SM and standard cosmology the CNB is expected to consist of neutrinos and anti-neutrinos to equal parts and we assume them to be left-helical today, cf. Ref. [13]. The solar neutrinos are assumed to be purely left-chiral and for the sake of simplicity we will neglect any flavor effects. That means we treat solar and CNB neutrinos to consist of only one flavor. We consider massive Dirac neutrinos with a mass set to 0.05 eV that is compatible with current limits. Hence, the CNB neutrinos are non-relativistic and we can neglect their velocity in our calculation. Interestingly though, non-vanishing CNB velocities would lead to corrections to our result which would, in principle, allow to measure their velocity distribution.

In our setup, the photons couple to the neutrinos via an effective magnetic dipole moment with the effective Lagrangian [14]


$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = -i M_{\nu} \bar{\nu} \sigma_{\alpha\beta} q^{\alpha} \nu A^{\beta}, \quad (2)$$

\* kasteriad@bnl.gov

† alejandro.quiroga@gapp.nthu.edu.tw

‡ spinrath@phys.nthu.edu.tw

where  $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$  is the anti-symmetric combination of  $\gamma$ -matrices,  $q^\alpha$  is the momentum carried away by the photon field  $A^\beta$ , and  $M_\nu$  is the magnetic moment of the neutrino. The coupling then reads



$$\nu \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ p_2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ p_1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ q \end{array} \gamma \hat{=} -\frac{i}{2}(\gamma_\beta \not{q} - \not{q} \gamma_\beta) M_\nu. \quad (3)$$

In the SM the coupling Eq. (3) occurs for Dirac neutrinos via loops with an effective coupling constant of  $M_\nu^{\text{SM}} \lesssim 3.8 \times 10^{-19} \mu_B$  [14]. Here we assume it to be additionally enhanced by some new physics. The parameter  $M_\nu$  is experimentally constrained to be  $M_\nu < 0.28 \times 10^{-10} \mu_B$  at 90% CL [15]. Accordingly, we write  $M_\nu = f_M \times 10^{-11} \mu_B$  for some  $f_M \lesssim 1$ . Note that, for Majorana neutrinos  $f_M = 0$ , but considering multiple flavours and transition magnetic moments instead would also imply the existence of the considered process with expected results similar to the case of Dirac neutrinos.

Neutrinos can also have other electromagnetic moments. For instance, they could have a tiny electric charge. However, the current upper bound is so low that these contributions should be orders of magnitude smaller (even considering possible enhancements close to infrared singularities). For this reason, and for simplicity, we will neglect such complications here.

For this set of assumptions, the relation between the cross sections for CNB neutrinos  $\sigma(\nu\nu)$  and CNB anti-neutrinos  $\sigma(\nu\bar{\nu})$  and the photon production rate  $R$  reads

$$R = 3 n_{\text{CNB}} \int \frac{d\Phi_\odot}{dE_\nu} (\sigma(\nu\nu) + \sigma(\nu\bar{\nu})) dE_\nu, \quad (4)$$

where the local CNB density  $n_{\text{CNB}} = f_n \times 56/\text{cm}^3$ . The factor  $f_n$  parametrizes potential overdensities which are nevertheless not expected to be very large, see, e.g. Ref. [16]. The factor three is from summing over the three flavors of the CNB. Finally,  $d\Phi_\odot/dE_\nu$  are the solar neutrino fluxes.

In our calculations we consider an observed volume of  $1 \text{ km}^3$ , at an earth-like distance from the sun, isolated from the surroundings (it will still contain CNB photons) and want to see how many photons are produced in this volume within a year and how their energies and angles are distributed. Numerical tables for the solar neutrino fluxes are taken from Ref. [17]. The final state phase space integration is performed numerically and getting the desired distributions is straightforward.

### III. RESULTS

In Fig. 1 we show the energy distribution of the emitted bremsstrahlung photons, separating the different components of the solar neutrino flux. It follows from this




FIG. 1. Energy distributions of the emitted bremsstrahlung photons. Here we have set  $f_M = f_n = 1$  and we separate the different components of the solar neutrino flux.




FIG. 2. Angular distribution of the emitted bremsstrahlung photons. The angle is chosen such that  $\theta_\gamma = 0$  points away from the sun which is treated as a point source. Here we have set  $f_M = f_n = 1$ .

figure that they can be clearly distinguished from each other in many cases. This is quite a unique feature which could potentially be used to separate the bremsstrahlung photons of this process from other potential backgrounds. We also see that the higher energies of the  $^8\text{B}$  and the hep neutrinos, implying larger cross sections, cannot compensate for the much larger flux of the pp neutrinos. We checked numerically that in the relevant energy range the cross section grows quadratically with the incoming neutrino energy to a good approximation. This increase is much weaker than the flux decrease for the high energy solar neutrinos. For that reason we also do not consider other naturally occurring neutrino fluxes such as atmospheric neutrinos which are much smaller than the solar flux [17].

In Fig. 2 we show the angular distribution with respect to the direction towards the center of the sun, assuming the incoming neutrino momenta to be parallel. As expected the distribution is very much peaked at  $\theta_\gamma = 0$  which is due to the “fixed target” nature of our setup and the

very large energies of the incoming neutrinos compared to the target neutrino mass. This is another feature which could, in principle, be used to distinguish a signal from potential background photons. The width of the angular distribution is similar to the deviations that would be induced by the neutrino production zones in the sun which have a similar angular diameter in the sky [18]. Therefore, a fully realistic treatment would widen the distribution somewhat but there would still be a very strong directional dependence.

Nevertheless, what becomes apparent from both figures is that the expected rates are extremely small. In fact, the total expected rate is about  $1.9 \times 10^{-45}$  bremsstrahlung photons per year and  $\text{km}^3$  of target volume assuming no neutrino overdensities and a neutrino magnetic dipole moment slightly below the current bound, to be precise  $f_M = f_n = 1$ . That makes a discovery of the CNB in this way rather unlikely as one would need a neutrino beam with significantly higher energies, flux and/or observed volume to get a reasonable rate.

The dependence of the rate on the model parameter  $f_M$  and  $f_n$  is only quadratic and linear, respectively. Increasing the rate by orders of magnitude would also require increasing these parameters by orders of magnitudes which is not expected neither from experiments nor simulations.

What might be more promising to improve the rate is to increase the neutrino flux. Given that the biggest neutrino flux on earth are the CNB neutrinos themselves, self-scattering of CNB neutrinos may be an option. Such a process with similar kinematics to the process studied above would be a massless neutrino flavour scattering from a massive one. We can provide a rough estimate for this case. The flux would be roughly a factor 25 larger than the solar neutrino flux. On the other hand the cross section would drop by a factor  $m_\nu^2/E_\odot^2 \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-15}$  where we used for the neutrino mass  $m_\nu = 0.05$  eV and for the solar neutrino energy  $E_\odot \approx 10^6$  eV. This estimate is only an upper bound because the neutrino mass is used as the energy scale of the CNB self-scattering process instead of the much smaller kinetic energy. We conclude from the above numbers that this process would be even more rare compared to the one involving solar neutrinos. This said, this little thought experiment shows how the rates for other sources can be estimated as long as the center of mass energy is below the  $Z$ -boson mass and no other new physics scenarios are considered.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we presented a way to search for neutrinos from the very early universe, the Cosmic Neutrino Background. From our results it is once again clear why this is such a big challenge. We computed the cross section for bremsstrahlung photons produced in the scattering of solar neutrinos on the CNB and, although we chose a magnetic dipole moment which is strongly enhanced compared to the SM and just slightly below the current experimental bound, the obtained cross section is still tiny and somewhat discouraging.

Nevertheless, we want to emphasize the principle advantages of our proposal: Our method has no kinematic thresholds and is not related to any resonance. Both computed neutrino energy and angular distributions show clear features from the considered process that could be used to distinguish bremsstrahlung photons from potential background. Furthermore, the velocity distribution of the relic neutrinos would lead to corrections to the photon spectra, which therefore could be measured, at least in theory. These are important benefits compared to other proposals.

We also showed how the bremsstrahlung photon rate for other energetic neutrino sources can be easily estimated assuming a similar set of assumptions. Other neutrino beams or sources, non-standard cosmology, additional new physics contributions, a larger target volume and a combination thereof could lead to a rate closer to being measurable. We leave the study of these cases for further investigations.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research of KA is supported by the United States Department of Energy under Grant Contract DE-SC0012704. AQT and MS are supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) of Taiwan under grant number MOST 110-2112-M-007-018 and MOST 111-2112-M-007-036.

- 
- [1] A. C. Melissinos, in *Conference on Probing Luminous and Dark Matter: Adrian Fest* (1999) pp. 262–285.  
 [2] V. Domcke and M. Spinrath, *JCAP* **06**, 055 (2017), arXiv:1703.08629 [astro-ph.CO].  
 [3] J. D. Shergold, *JCAP* **11**, 052 (2021), arXiv:2109.07482 [hep-ph].  
 [4] V. Brdar, P. S. B. Dev, R. Plestid, and A. Soni, (2022),

- arXiv:2207.02860 [hep-ph].  
 [5] R. Mohammadi, J. Khodagholizadeh, M. Sadegh, and A. Vahedi, (2021), arXiv:2109.00152 [hep-ph].  
 [6] E. Baracchini *et al.* (PTOLEMY), (2018), arXiv:1808.01892 [physics.ins-det].  
 [7] S. Betts *et al.*, in *Community Summer Study 2013: Snowmass on the Mississippi* (2013) arXiv:1307.4738 [astro-

- ph.IM].
- [8] G. B. Gelmini, *Phys. Scripta T* **121**, 131 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0412305.
  - [9] A. Ringwald, *Nucl. Phys. A* **827**, 501C (2009), arXiv:0901.1529 [astro-ph.CO].
  - [10] P. Vogel, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1666**, 140003 (2015).
  - [11] M. Bauer and J. D. Shergold, (2022), arXiv:2207.12413 [hep-ph].
  - [12] M. Czakon, J. Gluza, and M. Zralek, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 013010 (1999).
  - [13] A. J. Long, C. Lunardini, and E. Sabancilar, *JCAP* **08**, 038 (2014), arXiv:1405.7654 [hep-ph].
  - [14] C. Giunti and A. Studenikin, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**, 531 (2015), arXiv:1403.6344 [hep-ph].
  - [15] P. A. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *PTEP* **2020**, 083C01 (2020).
  - [16] A. Ringwald and Y. Y. Y. Wong, *JCAP* **12**, 005 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0408241.
  - [17] E. Vitagliano, I. Tamborra, and G. Raffelt, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 45006 (2020), arXiv:1910.11878 [astro-ph.HE].
  - [18] G.-L. Lin, T. T. L. Nguyen, M. Spinrath, T. D. H. Van, and T.-C. Wang, (2022), arXiv:2201.06733 [hep-ph].