

Testing the Origins of Neutrino Mass with Supernova Neutrino Time Delay

Shao-Feng Ge,^{1,2,*} Chui-Fan Kong,^{1,2,†} and Alexei Y. Smirnov^{3,‡}

¹*Tsung-Dao Lee Institute & School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China*

²*Key Laboratory for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology (MOE)*

*& Shanghai Key Laboratory for Particle Physics and Cosmology,
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China*

³*Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany*

The origin of neutrino masses remains unknown. Both the vacuum mass and the dark mass generated by the neutrino interactions with DM particles or fields can fit the current oscillation data. The dark mass squared is proportional to the DM number density and therefore varies on the galactic scale with much larger values around the Galactic Center. This affects the group velocity and the arrival time delay of core-collapse supernovae neutrinos. This time delay, especially for the ν_e neutronization peak with a sharp time structure, can be used to distinguish the vacuum and dark neutrino masses. For illustration, we explore the potential of DUNE which is sensitive to ν_e . Our simulations show that DUNE can distinguish the two neutrino mass origins at more than 5 σ C.L., depending on the observed local value of neutrino mass, the neutrino mass ordering, the DM density profile, and the SN location.

Introduction – Numerous data from atmospheric, reactor, and accelerator neutrino experiments provided robust evidences for neutrino oscillation [1–4]. The MSW (Mikheyev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein) effect [5, 6], was established as the solution to the solar neutrino problem [7, 8]. The observed energy dependence of these effects is consistent with non-zero neutrino masses m_i and the terms $\Delta m_{ij}^2/2E_\nu$ ($\Delta m_{ij}^2 \equiv m_i^2 - m_j^2$) in the Hamiltonian of flavor evolution for ultra-relativistic neutrinos.

Still, the origin of neutrino oscillations and the nature of neutrino masses are not fully established. Indeed, oscillations are sensitive to the neutrino masses squared that do not change chirality and therefore do not probe the masses directly. The term $A/2E_\nu$, where A is a constant, of any origin in the Hamiltonian of evolution, can reproduce the observed oscillation data. In fact, neutrino forward scattering on background particles, e.g. on light dark matter such as the fuzzy/wavy DM, generates a potential with $A/2E_\nu$ dependence [9–12] and A can be interpreted as the effective mass squared. For brevity, we will call this effective mass the dark mass, $A = m_{\text{dark}}^2$, to emphasize its origin.

A number of models can realize such a possibility [9–12] which differ by properties of DM particles and mediators of interactions. The dark masses squared are proportional to the number density of DM particles $n_{\text{DM}}(x)$ [9], and in general are functions of the neutrino energy E_ν and time [12, 13]:

$$m_{\text{dark}}^2 = n_{\text{DM}}(\mathbf{x}, t)g(t)f(E_\nu). \quad (1)$$

The functions $g(t)$ and $f(E_\nu)$ depend on specific models and for simplicity we assume $g(t) = 1$.

According to Eq. (1), the value of dark mass varies with space-time coordinates. To explain experimental data, the DM density and consequently the dark masses should be almost constants in the Solar System. However, they vary significantly on the galactic scales. In this paper,

we propose to use the galactic supernova (SN) neutrinos to probe the space-time dependence and therefore the nature of neutrino masses. Specifically, we suggest searching for the excessive time delay and spread of the ν_e neutronization peak that has a sharp time structure.

Time Delay due to the Dark Neutrino Mass – The idea of measuring the neutrino masses via the arrival time delay of SN neutrinos was put forward long time ago by Zatsepin [14]. The time delay due to the vacuum mass with respect to massless particles, $\Delta t_{\text{vac}} = (m_{\text{vac}}/E_\nu)^2(D/2)$, after traveling distance D is

$$\Delta t_{\text{vac}} \approx 5.14 \text{ ms} \left(\frac{m_{\text{vac}}}{\text{eV}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{10 \text{ MeV}}{E_\nu} \right)^2 \frac{D}{10 \text{ kpc}}. \quad (2)$$

Analyzing the observed neutrino events associated with SN1987A, an upper bound $m_\nu < 5.8 \text{ eV}$ (95% C.L.) was established [15, 16]. The sensitivity can be improved down to the sub-eV level with future galactic SN neutrino observations [17–24].

The value of dark mass in Eq. (1) changes on the way from a star to the Earth. Since the DM number density increases substantially towards the Galactic Center, the SN neutrinos with varying dark mass may have much larger delay than in the case of vacuum mass. The dispersion relation for neutrinos with dark mass only can be written as $E_\nu = p_\nu + V$, where p_ν is the neutrino momentum and $V \equiv m_{\text{dark}}^2/2p_\nu$ is the effective potential. Consequently, the group velocity $v \equiv dE_\nu/dp_\nu$ differs from the speed of light by

$$1 - v(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{m_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}, p_\nu)}{2p_\nu^2} - \frac{1}{2p_\nu} \frac{dm_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}, p_\nu)}{dp_\nu}. \quad (3)$$

Here the first term is similar to that for vacuum mass while the second one arises from the possible energy dependence of the dark mass. Experimentally, the energy dependence of oscillation parameters has not been found

for $E_\nu \gtrsim 1$ MeV relevant for SN neutrinos and therefore the last term in Eq. (3) can be small.

The time delay due to the dark mass is given by the integral over the neutrino trajectory from a SN at coordinate \mathbf{x}_* to the Sun \mathbf{x}_\odot ($|\mathbf{x}_* - \mathbf{x}_\odot| \equiv D$): $\Delta t_{\text{dark}} \equiv \int_{\mathbf{x}_*}^{\mathbf{x}_\odot} [1/v(\mathbf{x}) - 1] |d\mathbf{x}| \approx \int_{\mathbf{x}_*}^{\mathbf{x}_\odot} [1 - v(\mathbf{x})] |d\mathbf{x}|$.

We take for illustration the model [12] in which the DM is a light boson ϕ with mass m_ϕ and number density n_ϕ . The interaction of neutrinos with DM arises from the coupling $\lambda \bar{\chi} \nu \phi + h.c.$, where λ is the coupling constant, and χ is the light fermionic mediator with mass m_χ . Since DM particles are non-relativistic, the DM energy density equals $\rho_\phi \approx m_\phi n_\phi$, so that the dark mass in Eq. (1) can be written as [9, 12]

$$m_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\lambda^2 n_\phi(\mathbf{x})}{m_\phi} f(E_\nu) = \frac{\lambda^2 \rho_\phi(\mathbf{x})}{m_\phi^2} f(E_\nu), \quad (4)$$

where $f(E_\nu) \equiv y(y - \epsilon)/(y^2 - 1)$, $y \equiv E_\nu/E_R \approx p_\nu/p_R$. Here $E_R \equiv m_\chi^2/2m_\phi$ is the resonance energy and ϵ is the DM charge asymmetry [12]. For $p_\nu \gg p_R$, $f \approx 1$. Let us introduce the dark mass inside the Solar System $m_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}_\odot) \equiv \lambda^2 \rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)/m_\phi^2$ which can be measured in the Earth-based neutrino experiments. Then from Eq. (4) and Eq. (3) we find

$$1 - v(\mathbf{x}) \approx \frac{\lambda^2}{2E_\nu^2 m_\phi^2} \rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}) f_2 \approx \frac{m_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}_\odot)}{2E_\nu^2} \frac{\rho_\phi(\mathbf{x})}{\rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)} f_2, \quad (5)$$

with $f_2 \equiv y^2(y^2 - 2\epsilon y + 1)/(y^2 - 1)^2$, and $f_2 \approx 1$ for $p_\nu \gg p_R$. Consequently, the time delay equals

$$\Delta t_{\text{dark}} = \frac{m_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}_\odot) D}{2E_\nu^2} \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x}_*}^{\mathbf{x}_\odot} \rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}) |d\mathbf{x}|}{D \rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)} \equiv \Delta t_\odot \frac{\bar{\rho}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_*)}{\rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)}, \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta t_\odot \equiv m_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}_\odot) D / 2E_\nu^2$ is the time delay due to the local dark mass $m_{\text{dark}}^2(\mathbf{x}_\odot)$. Here $\rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)$ is the local DM energy density in the Solar System and $\bar{\rho}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_*) \equiv \int_{\mathbf{x}_*}^{\mathbf{x}_\odot} \rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}) |d\mathbf{x}| / D$ is the average DM energy density along the neutrino trajectory.

In general, the value of local dark mass $m_{\text{dark}}(\mathbf{x}_\odot)$ can differ from the value in the case of vacuum mass m_{vac} . Due to the energy dependence of m_{dark} described by $f(E_\nu)$ and in particular the decrease of m_{dark} with energy below the resonance [12], the mass m_{dark} at $\mathcal{O}(10)$ MeV energies is not restricted by KATRIN experiment [25] and the cosmological bound [26] where the neutrino energies are much lower. Therefore, $m_{\text{dark}}(\mathbf{x}_\odot)$ can be much larger than the allowed vacuum mass m_{vac} and the time delay Δt_{dark} can be enhanced. Interestingly, the SN1987A neutrino data prefer a non-zero neutrino mass $m_\nu \sim 3.5$ eV, although not statistically significant [16].

According to Eq. (6), the time delay depends on the local dark neutrino mass and the DM density profile. In our study we adopt the standard NFW profile [27, 28], $\rho_\phi(r) \equiv 0.3371 / [(r/r_s)(1 + r/r_s)^2] \text{ GeV/cm}^3$, where r is the distance from the Galactic Center (GC) and $r_s =$




FIG. 1. The lines of constant ratio $\bar{\rho}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_*)/\rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)$ (numbers at the lines) with the Sun being at the origin in the polar coordinate system on the galactic plane. The polar angle of the Galactic Center (labeled by a black dot) is chosen to be 90° .

20 kpc is the galactic scale radius. The constant in the numerator is fixed by the DM local density, $\rho_\phi(r_\odot) = 0.43 \text{ GeV/cm}^3$ with $r_\odot = 8 \text{ kpc}$ [29]. Even for the fuzzy DM with tiny mass, the NFW profile is a good approximation [30]. Notice, however, that the DM density profile depends on models, see [31, 32]. For instance, taking $D = 7 \text{ kpc}$ along the direction towards the Galactic Center we find that the ratio $\bar{\rho}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_*)/\rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)$ equals 3.5, 3.3, and 4.3 for the NFW profile, the isothermal profile [33, 34], and the Einasto profile [35, 36], respectively.

Fig. 1 shows the values of $\bar{\rho}_\phi(\mathbf{x}_*)/\rho_\phi(\mathbf{x}_\odot)$ on the galactic plane. At the polar angle $\theta \sim 30^\circ$ (red line), the ratio is 1, which means that the vacuum and dark masses produce the same delay if the values of vacuum and local dark masses are equal. The smallest relative time delay, characterized by the ratio ~ 0.4 , is along the direction opposite to the Galactic Center, $\theta \sim -90^\circ$, where the nearby relative time delay varies mildly. On the contrary, the relative time delay is large and varies strongly around the Galactic Center due to drastic changes of DM density. The ratio diverges for neutrinos passing through the center due to the cusp [37, 38]. To avoid this divergence, we set the ratio at $\theta = 90^\circ$ to be the same as the one at $\theta = 89^\circ$ throughout this paper. For $\theta \sim 89^\circ$ and $D \sim 9 - 11 \text{ kpc}$, the ratio is around 11.

SN Neutrino Flux and Delayed Event Distribution at DUNE – A core-collapse supernova produces neutrinos with $\mathcal{O}(10 \text{ MeV})$ energy. Lasting $\mathcal{O}(10 \text{ s})$, the neutrino emission has three distinct phases [39, 40]: (i) the neutronization burst, (ii) the accretion phase, and (iii) the cooling phase. A ν_e flux with a sharp peak in the time is radiated during the first phase which lasts $\sim 25 \text{ ms}$, while neutrinos and anti-neutrinos of all flavors are emitted in the other two phases. Characteristics of the neutronization burst which is the main source of the mass sensitivity, are rather generic and weakly depend on properties of a collapsing star such as the progenitor

mass, electron capture rate, as well as the equation of state [41, 42].

We adopt the following parametrization of neutrino fluxes at production introduced by the Garching group [43–46]:

$$\Phi_{\nu_\beta}^0(t_e, E_\nu) = \frac{L_{\nu_\beta}(t_e)}{\langle E_{\nu_\beta}(t_e) \rangle} \varphi_{\nu_\beta}(t_e, E_\nu), \quad (7)$$

where t_e is the neutrino emission time defined as the time after the shock wave bounce, $L_{\nu_\beta}(t_e)$ is the ν_β luminosity, and $\langle E_{\nu_\beta}(t_e) \rangle$ is the average energy of ν_β neutrinos. In Eq. (7) $\varphi_{\nu_\beta}(t_e, E_\nu)$ is the ν_β energy spectrum [22]:

$$\varphi_{\nu_\beta}(t_e, E_\nu) \equiv \xi_\beta(t_e) \left(\frac{E_\nu}{\langle E_{\nu_\beta}(t_e) \rangle} \right)^{\alpha_\beta(t_e)} e^{-\frac{(\alpha_\beta(t_e)+1)E_\nu}{\langle E_{\nu_\beta}(t_e) \rangle}}, \quad (8)$$

with $\alpha_\beta(t_e)$ being the pinching parameter and $\xi_\beta(t_e)$ the normalization factor determined by the condition $\int_0^\infty \varphi_{\nu_\beta}(t_e, E_\nu) dE_\nu = 1$. The time dependence of parameters $\langle E_{\nu_\beta}(t_e) \rangle$, $L_{\nu_\beta}(t_e)$, and $\alpha_\beta(t_e)$ is taken from the Garching Core-Collapse Modeling Group result [44].

After being produced, neutrinos undergo adiabatic flavor conversions (the MSW effect) during the propagation inside the star [47]. Then at the star surface, the total ν_e flux emerges as a mixture of initially produced fluxes of different flavors $\Phi_{\nu_\beta}^0(t_e, E_\nu)$:

$$\Phi_{\nu_e}(t_e, E_\nu) = p \Phi_{\nu_e}^0(t_e, E_\nu) + (1-p) \Phi_{\nu_x}^0(t_e, E_\nu), \quad (9)$$

where $\Phi_{\nu_x}^0 \equiv \Phi_{\nu_\mu}^0 = \Phi_{\nu_\tau}^0$. Here p is the ν_e survival probability which equals $p = \sin^2 \theta_{13}$ for the normal mass ordering (NO) and $p = \cos^2 \theta_{13} \sin^2 \theta_{12} \approx \sin^2 \theta_{12}$ for inverted ordering (IO) [47]. We neglect the collective neutrino oscillations which are not efficient due to the large flavor asymmetries during the neutronization phase [46]. Also we neglect oscillations inside the Earth which have negligible impact on the neutrino mass sensitivity [22].

In DUNE [48], the SN neutrinos can be detected via the charged-current (CC) interaction of ν_e with Argon nuclei [49], $\nu_e + {}^{40}\text{Ar} \rightarrow e^- + {}^{40}\text{K}^*$. The neutrino detection time t_d is related to its emission time t_e via, $t_d = t_e + D/c + \Delta t$, where D/c is the traveling time from SN to a detector for massless particles and Δt is the time delay due to the non-zero vacuum or dark neutrino mass. Since D/c is a common term for all neutrinos, it can be dropped out, so that $t_d = t_e + \Delta t$. Given the ν_e flux at star surface in Eq. (9), one obtains the event rate at DUNE [22],

$$R(t_d, m_\nu, E_\nu) = \frac{\Phi_{\nu_e}[t_d - \Delta t, E_\nu]}{4\pi D^2} A \sigma_{\nu_e}(E_\nu) \epsilon(E_\nu), \quad (10)$$

where $m_\nu = m_{\text{vac}}$ or m_{dark} enters the rate via $\Delta t = \Delta t_{\text{vac}}(E_\nu, m_{\text{vac}})$ or $\Delta t_{\text{dark}}(E_\nu, m_{\text{dark}})$ as given by Eq. (2) or Eq. (6). Here $A = 6.03 \times 10^{32}$ is the number of Argon nuclei in the DUNE far detector with 40 kt fiducial mass, the ν_e - ${}^{40}\text{Ar}$ CC cross section $\sigma_{\nu_e}(E_\nu)$ is taken from




FIG. 2. The time distributions of the detected ν_e events integrated over energy for different values of vacuum and dark neutrino masses.

the MARLEY result [50, 51], and the detection efficiency $\epsilon(E_\nu)$ with 5 MeV energy threshold is from [49].

Let us consider the time delay information only that is given by the integral of rate in Eq. (10) over the neutrino energy $R(t_d, m_\nu) \equiv \int dE_\nu R(t_d, m_\nu, E_\nu)$. Fig. 2 shows the binned time distributions of events for SN at $D = 11$ kpc and $\theta = 89^\circ$, IO, and different values of vacuum and dark masses. As the neutrino mass increases, the distributions are shifted to larger t_d and become wider with flatter front slopes. The difference in the distributions for $m_\nu = 0$ eV, $m_{\text{vac}} = 0.2$ eV, and $m_{\text{dark}} = 0.2$ eV is small and therefore hard to be resolved. For $m_{\text{dark}} \gtrsim 0.5$ eV the peak shifts more than 5 ms which can be detected in the experiment.

We assume perfect time resolution since the expected DUNE time resolution is better than $1 \mu\text{s}$ [49] which is much smaller than the neutronization burst duration ~ 25 ms. On the other hand, the energy E is further smeared by the Gaussian function $G(E_\nu, E_d)$ with a 10% fractional energy resolution [49] and E_d being the detected energy. Then the smeared event rate equals

$$R_{\text{sme}}(t_d, m_\nu, E_d) \equiv \int R(t_d, m_\nu, E_\nu) G(E_\nu, E_d) dE_\nu, \quad (11)$$

where $R(t_d, m_\nu, E_\nu)$ is defined in Eq. (10).

Sensitivity of DUNE to Mass Origins – We consider scenarios determined by the neutrino mass ordering (MO), the true value of the vacuum mass $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{true}}$, and the SN coordinates (D, θ) : (MO, $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{true}}$, D, θ). For each scenario we generate a large (a few hundreds) number DUNE datasets $\text{DS}_k(\text{MO}, m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{true}}, D, \theta)$ with k indicating the dataset number. For each dataset DS_k , using the rate $R_{\text{sme}}(t_d, m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{true}}, E_d)$ in Eq. (11) with the true vacuum mass as the target distribution we randomly generate N_k pseudo events. Due to the existence of statistical uncertainties for a real measurement, N_k varies between different datasets according to the Gaussian distribution with




FIG. 3. Contours of constant confidence levels (numbers at the lines) on the $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}-t_{\text{off}}$ plane.

the mean $N \equiv \int R_{\text{sme}}(t_{\text{d}}, m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{true}}, E_{\text{d}}) dt_{\text{d}} dE_{\text{d}}$ and standard deviation \sqrt{N} . We take $t_{\text{d}} \in [0, 9]$ s and $E_{\text{d}} \in [5, \infty]$ MeV for the time and energy intervals, respectively. The i -th pseudo event ($i = 1, \dots, N_k$) is characterized by its detection time as well as energy ($t_{\text{d},i}^k, E_{\text{d},i}^k$) and sorted in the time-ascending order.

We then fit the generated pseudo events with two fitting parameters: (i) the neutrino mass m_{ν}^{fit} , vacuum mass $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{fit}}$ or dark mass $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}$ which enters the rate via the time delay $\Delta t_i^{\text{fit},k}$, and (ii) the offset time t_{off} [52]. The time t_{off} , being a nuisance parameter, accounts for the fact that the first detected event $t_{\text{d},1}^k$ does not necessarily happen at the arrival time t_0 of the first SN neutrino due to the quantum nature of measurement: $t_{\text{off}}^k \equiv t_{\text{d},1}^k - t_0$. Therefore, the fitting time for the i -th detected event in the k -th dataset equals $t_{\text{d},i}^{\text{fit},k} \equiv t_{\text{d},i}^k - t_{\text{d},1}^k + t_{\text{off}}^k$.

We adopt the unbinned likelihood to evaluate the experimental sensitivities. The likelihood \mathcal{L}_i^k for the i -th event in dataset k , is given by its smeared detection rate function in Eq. (11) with fitting mass $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{fit}}$ or $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}$ and offset time t_{off}^k . Then, the total unbinned likelihood \mathcal{L} for the k -th dataset is a product [22, 52],

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{tot}}^k(m_{\nu}^{\text{fit}}, t_{\text{off}}^k) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^N R_{\text{sme}}(t_{\text{d},i}^{\text{fit},k}, m_{\nu}^{\text{fit}}, E_{\text{d},i}^k). \quad (12)$$

We first estimate the DUNE sensitivity to the dark mass m_{dark} and the offset time t_{off} . Since t_{off}^k varies among datasets, we consider one dataset for illustration. We take MO = IO, $m_{\nu}^{\text{true}} = 0$ eV, $D = 11$ kpc, and $\theta = 89^\circ$ to generate events. Since the mass differences are negligible compared to the accessible mass range, we assume the degenerate mass spectrum $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}} \approx m_{1,2,3}$. We then compute the total likelihood in Eq. (12) and consequently, $\chi_k^2 \equiv -2 \log \mathcal{L}_{\text{tot}}^k$. To quantify the sensitivity to $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}$ and t_{off} , we compute the difference $\Delta \chi_k^2 \equiv \chi_k^2(m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}, t_{\text{off}}) - \chi_{k,\text{min}}^2$, where $\chi_{k,\text{min}}^2$ is the global minimum of χ_k^2 in the $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}-t_{\text{off}}$ space. Fig. 3 with the

contours of constant confidence levels shows that the DUNE experiment is sensitive to t_{off} at the millisecond level and to $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}$ below $0.2 - 0.3$ eV. The best-fit values equal $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}} \sim 0$ eV as expected, and $t_{\text{off}} \sim 1$ ms. The contours show a positive correlation between $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}$ and t_{off} , since these two parameters enter the likelihood function Eq. (12) in combination $-\Delta t^{\text{fit}} + t_{\text{off}} = -(m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}/E)^2 D/2 + t_{\text{off}}$, which is constant at $m \sim \sqrt{t_{\text{off}}}$.

Next, we study the DUNE capability to distinguish the dark mass from the vacuum mass for different SN locations. Pseudo events are generated for both mass orderings and $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{true}} = 0.2$ eV, which equals the KATRIN projected upper bound [25] and is marginally allowed by Cosmology [26]. We use the intervals of distances $D \in [5, 15]$ kpc and polar angles $\theta \in [-90^\circ, 90^\circ]$. Recall that the dark mass can be much larger than the allowed vacuum mass. To test such a possibility, we take the fitting vacuum mass $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{fit}} = 0.2$ eV as well as the dark mass $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}(\mathbf{x}_{\odot}) = 0.2$ eV or 0.8 eV to compute the likelihood function in Eq. (12) and hence $\overline{\chi^2}(m_{\nu}^{\text{fit}})$ obtained by first marginalizing the nuisance parameter t_{off}^k and then averaged over datasets. The difference of χ^2 is computed between the fitting dark and vacuum masses:

$$\Delta \chi^2 \equiv \overline{\chi^2}(m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}, D, \theta) - \overline{\chi^2}(m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{fit}}, D). \quad (13)$$

Fig. 4 shows the values of $\sqrt{\Delta \chi^2}$ at different SN locations on the galactic plane. The most sensitive part appears for SN in the direction of the Galactic Center. In the case of $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{fit}} = 0.2$ eV and $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}} = 0.2$ eV (panels 1 and 2), the effects of two types of masses can be distinguished at $\sim 2(< 1)\sigma$ C.L. for IO (NO). In the case of $m_{\text{vac}}^{\text{fit}} = 0.2$ eV and $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}} = 0.8$ eV (panels 3 and 4), the sensitivity for SN in the direction of the Galactic Center can reach $\sim 5\sigma$ C.L. for both NO and IO. The sensitivity in the case of NO is lower than in the case of IO since the ν_e neutronization flux is highly suppressed by the MSW conversion as shown in Eq. (9).

Conclusion – The time delay effect of SN neutrinos opens up a unique possibility to test the neutrino mass origins. Being constant, the vacuum masses lead to small time delay for galactic SN. In contrast, the dark mass effects can be strongly enhanced due to the increase of the DM number density and therefore the value of mass towards the Galactic Center. Therefore, observation of substantial delay effects would testify to the existence of the dark neutrino masses. Detecting SN neutrinos crossing the central regions of Galaxy allows to distinguish $m_{\text{vac}} = 0.2$ eV and $m_{\text{dark}} \gtrsim 0.8$ eV for both mass orderings at $\sim 5\sigma$ C.L.. Better tests will be possible if two SN bursts from different locations are observed. Further increase of sensitivity can be done by decreasing the detection energy threshold and analyzing events from different energy regions separately.

Acknowledgements – CFK and AYS would like to thank the organizers of MAYORANA School & Workshop held in July 2023, where this project was initiated.




FIG. 4. The difference $\sqrt{\Delta\chi^2}$ as a function of SN location on the galactic plane for different values of dark mass $m_{\text{dark}}^{\text{fit}}$ and mass orderings. The central parts close to the Earth, $D < 5$ kpc, with small effect of dark mass variation are not shown.

SFG and CFK are supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (12375101, 12090060 and 12090064) and the SJTU Double First Class start-up fund (WF220442604). SFG is also an affiliate member of Kavli IPMU, University of Tokyo.

* gesf@sjtu.edu.cn

† kongcf@sjtu.edu.cn

‡ smirnov@mpi-hd.mpg.de

- [1] B. Pontecorvo, “Mesonium and anti-mesonium,” *Sov. Phys. JETP* **6**, 429 (1957).
- [2] B. Pontecorvo, “Neutrino Experiments and the Problem of Conservation of Leptonic Charge,” *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **53**, 1717-1725 (1967).
- [3] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, “Remarks on the unified model of elementary particles,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **28**, 870-880 (1962).
- [4] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia and M. Yokoyam, “Neutrino Masses, Mixing, and Oscillations”, (Chapter 14) of R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [5] L. Wolfenstein, “Neutrino Oscillations in Matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **17**, 2369-2374 (1978).
- [6] S. P. Mikheyev and A. Y. Smirnov, “Resonance Amplification of Oscillations in Matter and Spectroscopy of Solar Neutrinos,” *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **42**, 913-917 (1985); S. P. Mikheev and A. Y. Smirnov, “Resonant amplification of neutrino oscillations in matter and solar neutrino spectroscopy,” *Nuovo Cim. C* **9**, 17-26 (1986).
- [7] A. Y. Smirnov, “Solar neutrinos: Oscillations or No-oscillations?,” [arXiv:1609.02386 [hep-ph]].
- [8] M. Maltoni and A. Y. Smirnov, “Solar neutrinos and neutrino physics,” *Eur. Phys. J. A* **52**, no.4, 87 (2016) [arXiv:1507.05287 [hep-ph]].
- [9] S. F. Ge and H. Murayama, “Apparent CPT Violation in Neutrino Oscillation from Dark Non-Standard Interactions,” [arXiv:1904.02518 [hep-ph]]; S. F. Ge, “The Leptonic CP Measurement and New Physics Alternatives,” *PoS NuFact2019*, 108 (2020) (slides); S. F. Ge, “New Physics with Scalar and Dark Non-Standard Interactions in Neutrino Oscillation,” *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **1468**, no.1, 012125 (2020).
- [10] K. Y. Choi, E. J. Chun and J. Kim, “Neutrino Oscillations in Dark Matter,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **30**, 100606 (2020) [arXiv:1909.10478 [hep-ph]].
- [11] K. Y. Choi, E. J. Chun and J. Kim, “Dispersion of neutrinos in a medium,” [arXiv:2012.09474 [hep-ph]].
- [12] M. Sen and A. Y. Smirnov, “Refractive neutrino masses, ultralight dark matter and cosmology,” *JCAP* **01**, 040 (2024) [arXiv:2306.15718 [hep-ph]].
- [13] A. Berlin, “Neutrino Oscillations as a Probe of Light Scalar Dark Matter,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, no.23, 231801 (2016) [arXiv:1608.01307 [hep-ph]].
- [14] G. T. Zatsepin, “On the possibility of determining the upper limit of the neutrino mass by means of the flight time,” *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **8**, 333-334 (1968).
- [15] T. J. Loredo and D. Q. Lamb, “Bayesian analysis of neutrinos observed from supernova SN-1987A,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 063002 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0107260 [astro-ph]].
- [16] G. Pagliaroli, F. Rossi-Torres and F. Vissani, “Neutrino mass bound in the standard scenario for supernova electronic antineutrino emission,” *Astropart. Phys.* **33**, 287-291 (2010) [arXiv:1002.3349 [hep-ph]].
- [17] E. Nardi and J. I. Zuluaga, “Exploring the sub-eV neutrino mass range with supernova neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103002 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0306384 [astro-ph]].
- [18] E. Nardi and J. I. Zuluaga, “Constraints on neutrino masses from a galactic supernova neutrino signal at present and future detectors,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **731**, 140-163 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0412104 [hep-ph]].
- [19] J. S. Lu, J. Cao, Y. F. Li and S. Zhou, “Constraining Absolute Neutrino Masses via Detection of Galactic Supernova Neutrinos at JUNO,” *JCAP* **05**, 044 (2015) [arXiv:1412.7418 [hep-ph]].
- [20] K. Abe *et al.* [Hyper-Kamiokande], “Hyper-Kamiokande Design Report,” [arXiv:1805.04163 [physics.ins-det]].
- [21] R. S. L. Hansen, M. Lindner and O. Scholer, “Timing the neutrino signal of a Galactic supernova,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.12, 123018 (2020) [arXiv:1904.11461 [hep-ph]].
- [22] F. Pompa, F. Capozzi, O. Mena and M. Sorel, “Absolute ν Mass Measurement with the DUNE Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, no.12, 121802 (2022) [arXiv:2203.00024 [hep-ph]].
- [23] F. Pompa and O. Mena, “How long do neutrinos live and how much do they weigh?,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, no.2, 134 (2024) [arXiv:2310.05474 [hep-ph]].
- [24] G. Parker and M. Wurm, “Absolutely Scintillating: constraining ν mass with black hole-forming supernovae,” [arXiv:2311.10682 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [25] M. Aker *et al.* [KATRIN], “Direct neutrino-mass measurement with sub-electronvolt sensitivity,” *Nature Phys.* **18**, no.2, 160-166 (2022) [arXiv:2105.08533 [hep-ex]].
- [26] J. Lesgourgues and L. Verde, “Neutrinos in Cosmology”, (Chapter 26) of R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle

- Data Group], “*Review of Particle Physics*,” *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [27] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk and S. D. M. White, “*The Structure of cold dark matter halos*,” *Astrophys. J.* **462**, 563-575 (1996) [arXiv:astro-ph/9508025 [astro-ph]].
- [28] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk and S. D. M. White, “*A Universal density profile from hierarchical clustering*,” *Astrophys. J.* **490**, 493-508 (1997) [arXiv:astro-ph/9611107 [astro-ph]].
- [29] P. Salucci, F. Nesti, G. Gentile and C. F. Martins, “*The dark matter density at the Sun’s location*,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **523**, A83 (2010) [arXiv:1003.3101 [astro-ph.GA]].
- [30] E. G. M. Ferreira, “*Ultra-light dark matter*,” *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **29**, no.1, 7 (2021) [arXiv:2005.03254 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [31] E. Charles *et al.* [Fermi-LAT], “*Sensitivity Projections for Dark Matter Searches with the Fermi Large Area Telescope*,” *Phys. Rept.* **636**, 1-46 (2016) [arXiv:1605.02016 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [32] B. L. Young, “*A survey of dark matter and related topics in cosmology*,” *Front. Phys. (Beijing)* **12**, no.2, 121201 (2017) [erratum: *Front. Phys. (Beijing)* **12**, no.2, 121202 (2017)].
- [33] J. N. Bahcall and R. M. Soneira, “*The Universe at faint magnetitudes. 2. Models for the predicted star counts*,” *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **44**, 73-110 (1980).
- [34] K. G. Begeman, A. H. Broeils and R. H. Sanders, “*Extended rotation curves of spiral galaxies: Dark haloes and modified dynamics*,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **249**, 523 (1991).
- [35] A. W. Graham, D. Merritt, B. Moore, J. Diemand and B. Terzic, “*Empirical models for Dark Matter Halos. I. Nonparametric Construction of Density Profiles and Comparison with Parametric Models*,” *Astron. J.* **132**, 2685-2700 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0509417 [astro-ph]].
- [36] J. F. Navarro, A. Ludlow, V. Springel, J. Wang, M. Vogelsberger, S. D. M. White, A. Jenkins, C. S. Frenk and A. Helmi, “*The Diversity and Similarity of Cold Dark Matter Halos*,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **402**, 21 (2010) [arXiv:0810.1522 [astro-ph]].
- [37] B. Moore, “*Evidence against dissipationless dark matter from observations of galaxy haloes*,” *Nature* **370**, 629 (1994).
- [38] R. A. Flores and J. R. Primack, “*Observational and theoretical constraints on singular dark matter halos*,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **427**, L1-4 (1994) [arXiv:astro-ph/9402004 [astro-ph]].
- [39] K. Kotake, K. Sato and K. Takahashi, “*Explosion mechanism, neutrino burst, and gravitational wave in core-collapse supernovae*,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **69**, 971-1144 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0509456 [astro-ph]].
- [40] K. Scholberg, “*Supernova Neutrino Detection*,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **62**, 81-103 (2012) [arXiv:1205.6003 [astro-ph.IM]].
- [41] M. Kachelriess, R. Tomas, R. Buras, H. T. Janka, A. Marek and M. Rampp, “*Exploiting the neutronization burst of a galactic supernova*,” *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 063003 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0412082 [astro-ph]].
- [42] J. Wallace, A. Burrows and J. C. Dolence, “*Detecting the Supernova Breakout Burst in Terrestrial Neutrino Detectors*,” *Astrophys. J.* **817**, no.2, 182 (2016) [arXiv:1510.01338 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [43] M. T. Keil, G. G. Raffelt and H. T. Janka, “*Monte Carlo study of supernova neutrino spectra formation*,” *Astrophys. J.* **590**, 971-991 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0208035 [astro-ph]].
- [44] L. Hudepohl, B. Muller, H. T. Janka, A. Marek and G. G. Raffelt, “*Neutrino Signal of Electron-Capture Supernovae from Core Collapse to Cooling*,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 251101 (2010) [erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 249901 (2010)] [arXiv:0912.0260 [astro-ph.SR]].
- [45] I. Tamborra, B. Muller, L. Hudepohl, H. T. Janka and G. Raffelt, “*High-resolution supernova neutrino spectra represented by a simple fit*,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 125031 (2012) [arXiv:1211.3920 [astro-ph.SR]].
- [46] A. Mirizzi, I. Tamborra, H. T. Janka, N. Saviano, K. Scholberg, R. Bollig, L. Hudepohl and S. Chakraborty, “*Supernova Neutrinos: Production, Oscillations and Detection*,” *Riv. Nuovo Cim.* **39**, no.1-2, 1-112 (2016) [arXiv:1508.00785 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [47] A. S. Dighe and A. Y. Smirnov, “*Identifying the neutrino mass spectrum from the neutrino burst from a supernova*,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 033007 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9907423 [hep-ph]].
- [48] R. Acciarri *et al.* [DUNE], “*Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility (LBNF) and Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE): Conceptual Design Report, Volume 2: The Physics Program for DUNE at LBNF*,” [arXiv:1512.06148 [physics.ins-det]].
- [49] B. Abi *et al.* [DUNE], “*Supernova neutrino burst detection with the Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment*,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, no.5, 423 (2021) [arXiv:2008.06647 [hep-ex]].
- [50] S. Gardiner, “*Nuclear de-excitations in low-energy charged-current ν_e scattering on ^{40}Ar* ,” *Phys. Rev. C* **103**, no.4, 044604 (2021) [arXiv:2010.02393 [nucl-th]].
- [51] S. Gardiner, “*Simulating low-energy neutrino interactions with MARLEY*,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **269**, 108123 (2021) [arXiv:2101.11867 [nucl-th]].
- [52] G. Pagliaroli, F. Vissani, M. L. Costantini and A. Ianni, “*Improved analysis of SN1987A antineutrino events*,” *Astropart. Phys.* **31**, 163-176 (2009) [arXiv:0810.0466 [astro-ph]].