





Diffuse Neutrino Background from Magnetorotational Stellar Core Collapses

Pablo Martínez-Miravé ^{1,*} Irene Tamborra ^{1,†} Miguel Ángel Aloy ^{2,3,‡} and Martin Obergaulinger ^{2,§}

¹*Niels Bohr International Academy and DARK, Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Blegdamsvej 17, 2100, Copenhagen, Denmark*

²*Departament d'Astronomia i Astrofísica, Universitat de València, Dr. Moliner, 50, 46100, Burjassot, Spain*

³*Observatori Astronòmic, Universitat de València, 46980, Paterna, Spain*

A statistically significant detection of the diffuse supernova neutrino background (DSNB) is around the corner. To this purpose, we assess the contribution to the DSNB of magnetorotational collapses of massive stars, relying on a suite of state-of-the-art three-dimensional neutrino-magnetohydrodynamic simulations. We find that neutrinos from magnetorotational core collapses boost the high-energy tail of the DSNB spectrum, similar to what is expected from neutrino-driven black hole-forming collapses. The latest data from the Super-Kamiokande Collaboration can already exclude that more than 13% of all collapsing massive stars undergo magnetorotational collapses under optimistic assumptions. A DSNB detection at 3σ could take place up to 4 yr earlier at Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium or JUNO if the fraction of magnetorotational collapses should be larger than 10%. Fascinatingly, if the fraction of magnetorotational stellar collapses should be larger than 7%, Hyper-Kamiokande could measure such a fraction at 3σ after 20 yr of DSNB data taking. The combination of DSNB and electromagnetic data has the potential to resolve the degenerate contributions from magnetorotational and neutrino-driven black hole forming collapses, providing crucial insight on the properties of the population of collapsing massive stars.

I. INTRODUCTION

On average, every second, a core-collapse supernova (CCSN) explodes somewhere in the Universe releasing $\sim 10^{53}$ erg in the form of neutrinos and antineutrinos of all flavors. The cumulative flux of neutrinos emitted from all CCSNe in the Universe over cosmological distances is the Diffuse Supernova Neutrino Background (DSNB) [1–7]. The DSNB is expected to be the dominant contribution to the overall diffuse emission of neutrinos from known sources between 10 and 25 MeV [8].

To date, the theoretical modeling of the DSNB is hampered by our incomplete understanding of the CCSN rate [9] and the initial mass function [10], the rate of collapses forming a black hole (BH) [11, 12], flavor conversion in the supernova (SN) core [13], the metallicity evolution of galaxies [14, 15], binary stellar interactions [16], as well as the neutron star properties [17]; we refer the interested reader to Ref. [17] for an overview of the relevant uncertainties. Moreover, Type Ia SNe [18], population III supermassive stars [19–21], and accretion flows [22, 23] can also contribute to the diffuse neutrino emission in the same energy region.

The DSNB is the key observational target of the Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium project [24, 25]. While the DSNB signal has not been detected with high confidence yet, the first results from the Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium project are extremely encouraging [24–27].

So far, most DSNB searches have focused on the detection of electron antineutrinos via inverse beta decay (i.e., $\bar{\nu}_e + p \rightarrow e^+ + n$). Whereas this approach remains the most promising one [24, 26–28], a measurement of the DSNB in all flavors, and for neutrino and antineutrinos, is desirable. In this regard, the liquid Argon neutrino telescope DUNE should improve existing limits on ν_e [29, 30]; detectors based on the neutrino-nucleus coher-

ent elastic scattering, such as DARWIN and RES-NOVA, could probe the non-electron flavors [31–33].

In this paper, we investigate the contribution to the diffuse neutrino emission from magnetorotational core collapses of massive stars, leading to protomagnetars and spinars.¹ Magnetorotational core collapses are considered to be the progenitors of superluminous SNe and certain gamma-ray bursts [39, 40]. To this purpose, we model the neutrino emission from the (transiently stable) protomagnetars relying on three-dimensional neutrino-magnetohydrodynamic simulations of the same models studied in 2D in Ref. [40]. Since the rate of protomagnetars and spinars is unknown, we keep it as a free parameter and investigate whether the neutrino emission from magnetorotational core collapses could lead to a DSNB contribution which is degenerate with respect to the uncertainties in the CCSN rate and fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses.

Our work is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the suite of models adopted to compute the DSNB. Section III presents our fiducial DSNB model from CCSNe and neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses as well as explore the contribution from protomagnetars and spinars. Section IV presents a comparison between our theoretical prediction and the model-independent limits on the $\bar{\nu}_e$ flux from Super-Kamiokande [27]. A large

¹ Note that we distinguish between magnetorotational core collapses leading to the formation of a protomagnetar or a spinar (if the central compact object is a BH). The term “spinar” was first introduced in Ref. [34] in the context of active galactic nuclei, but it is now commonly adopted to refer to a fast rotating magnetized relativistic object, in quasi-equilibrium due to the balance between the centrifugal and gravitational forces, which undergoes a two-stage collapse, first to a protoneutron star and, subsequently, to form a BH [35–38].

fraction of magnetorotational core collapses would enhance the near-future prospects for detecting the DSNB at Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium and JUNO, as shown in Sec. V. There, we also explore the sensitivity of Hyper-Kamiokande loaded with Gadolinium to measure the fraction of protomagnetars and spinars contributing to the DSNB. Section VI highlights the relevance of combining the DSNB data with electromagnetic observations to overcome the astrophysical uncertainties currently plaguing the DSNB. Finally, we conclude in Sec. VII.

II. NEUTRINO DRIVEN AND MAGNETOROTATIONAL CORE COLLAPSES: NEUTRINO EMISSION PROPERTIES

In this section, we introduce the neutrino emission properties for successful neutrino-driven CCSNe and neutrino-driven BH-forming models, as well as the protomagnetar and spinar models adopted to reproduce the population of collapsing massive stars.

A. Core-collapse supernova and black hole forming collapse models

In order to model the DSNB contribution from neutrino-driven core collapses, we follow Ref. [29] and rely on spherically symmetric (1D) hydrodynamical simulations without muons [6, 41]. We consider a model with a mass of $11.2M_{\odot}$ as representative of the neutrino-driven CCSN population with mass below $15M_{\odot}$. For the remaining neutrino-driven CCSN population, we use a model with mass of $27M_{\odot}$ and a neutrino-driven BH-forming model with a mass of $40M_{\odot}$ (model s4027b2, characterized by a short accretion phase, with the neutrino emission lasting for 0.57 s after bounce before prompt BH formation). All models employ the Lattimer and Swesty equation of state, with a nuclear incompressibility modulus of $K = 220$ MeV [42].

Figure 1 displays the temporal evolution of the neutrino emission properties (for ν_e , $\bar{\nu}_e$, and ν_x , where the latter denotes ν_{μ} , $\bar{\nu}_{\mu}$, ν_{τ} , and $\bar{\nu}_{\tau}$) for the neutrino-driven collapse models introduced above. One can see that the duration of the neutrino signal is shorter for the neutrino-driven BH-forming model, with neutrino luminosity slightly larger than the one of the neutrino-driven CCSN models.

B. Protomagnetar and spinar models

In order to model the neutrino emission from protomagnetars we rely on 3D simulations combining special relativistic magnetohydrodynamics and a spectral two-moment (M1) neutrino transport [40, 43]. The simulations use the SFHo hadronic equation of state [44] and

include the most relevant neutrino-matter reactions (absorption, emission, and scattering by nucleons and nuclei, scattering off electrons and positrons, electron-positron pair annihilation and nucleonic bremsstrahlung). The models are the 3D equivalent of the 2D ones presented in Ref. [40]. We call protomagnetar a post-collapsed core that develops magnetar magnetic field strengths $\gtrsim \mathcal{O}(10^{15})$ G and has an associated magnetar phenomenology as described in, e.g., Refs. [45, 46]; if the collapse into a BH occurs a few seconds after core bounce, we refer to our models as spinars. Note that we do not consider the contribution to the neutrino background from the resulting BH accretion disk, which was investigated in Ref. [22].

We rely on seven models with mass at the zero age main sequence time: $M_{\text{ZAMS}} = 5 M_{\odot}$, $8 M_{\odot}$, $13 M_{\odot}$, $17 M_{\odot}$, $20 M_{\odot}$, $26 M_{\odot}$, and $30 M_{\odot}$, obtained from the progenitors presented in Ref. [39]. These models consider enhanced rotational mixing, leading to chemically homogeneous evolution. While a detailed description of the dynamics and explosion properties of these 3D models will be presented elsewhere, here we provide a brief summary.

All cores produce delayed explosions at times between ~ 0.3 and ~ 1.3 s after bounce. Shock revival is powered by a combination of neutrino heating and magnetorotational stresses, with a higher contribution of the latter leading to explosions with energies above $E_{\text{exp}} \gtrsim 10^{51}$ erg. Unlike the 2D models presented in Ref. [40], only the 3D models with the larger masses ($M_{\text{ZAMS}} \gtrsim 26M_{\odot}$; models A26 and A30 in the nomenclature of that reference) have clear signs of BH formation, leading to spinars. The formation of the BH does not happen promptly after core bounce, but, at least, after 1.5 s. This is the case of model A26, for example. For more massive models, more than 2.5 s are needed for the protomagnetars to collapse. A common feature of these high-mass models is that the protoneutron star mass grows (due to non-spherical accretion) above the limit set by the equation of state relatively soon after bounce. High-mass progenitors thus form protomagnetars for a relatively short period of time, and then they may turn into BH-forming events or even collapsars at later times, as anticipated in Refs. [47, 48]. Lower mass progenitors (including models A05, A08, A13, A17, and A20) do not display signatures of BH formation; the protoneutron star mass remains below the maximum mass set by the equation of state throughout the computed evolution (for some models, such as A17, the evolution lasts for more than 3.5 s after bounce). These lower mass progenitor models are more likely to form standard protomagnetars that survive the SN explosion. It is noteworthy that the progenitor stars modeled in Ref. [39] were predicted to produce either superluminous SNe (if $M_{\text{ZAMS}} \lesssim 13M_{\odot}$), protomagnetar-driven SNe ($M_{\text{ZAMS}} = 17M_{\odot}$, $20M_{\odot}$), or collapsars ($M_{\text{ZAMS}} \gtrsim 26M_{\odot}$). However, the limited simulated time for our 3D models does not allow to distinguish whether the protomagnetar models lead to superlu-




FIG. 1. Temporal evolution of the neutrino emission properties for one representative protomagnetar model with mass of $17 M_{\odot}$ (1D equivalent neutrino emission properties of model A17, black lines), the spinar model with mass $26 M_{\odot}$ (1D equivalent neutrino emission properties of model of model A26, gray lines), two 1D neutrino-driven CCSNe models with mass of $11.2 M_{\odot}$ and $27 M_{\odot}$ (red and orange lines, respectively), and a 1D neutrino-driven BH-forming collapse with $40 M_{\odot}$ (model s4027b2 characterized by a short accretion phase before prompt BH formation, green lines). The upper and lower panels display the luminosity and mean energy, for ν_e , $\bar{\nu}_e$, and ν_x , respectively. The protomagnetar and spinar models exhibit larger average energies for the non-electron flavors due to neutrino decoupling occurring at higher densities than for the neutrino-driven CCSN models.

minous SNe or protomagnetar-driven explosions, so far. Nevertheless, the distribution of specific angular momentum in spinars (see, e.g., Fig. 2 of Ref. [40]) suggests promising prospects for the formation of an accretion disc, and hence, the potential for a collapsar scenario.

The M1 neutrino transport evolves the spectral energy and momentum densities, $J(\vec{r}, E)$ and $\vec{H}(\vec{r}, E)$, of ν_e , $\bar{\nu}_e$, and ν_x as functions of position (\vec{r}) and particle energy (E). As the momentum density is equal to the energy flux of the neutrinos, we can extract the luminosity directly from its radial component by integrating it at an extraction radius, fixed at $r_{\text{ext}} = 500$ km, over the solid angle: $L_{\nu}(E) = \int_{\Omega} d\Omega r_{\text{ext}}^2 J^r(r_{\text{ext}}, E)$. The number density of the neutrinos and its flux can be obtained by dividing the spectral energy and momentum density by the particle energy, $\{N(\vec{x}, E), \vec{F}_N(\vec{x}, E)\} = 1/E \{J(\vec{x}, E), \vec{H}(\vec{x}, E)\}$. We then compute the neutrino mean energies via an integration over the energy spec-

trum: $\langle \varepsilon_{\nu} \rangle = \langle \int dE J(\vec{x}, E) \rangle_{\Omega, r_{\text{ext}}} / \langle \int dE N(\vec{x}, E) \rangle_{\Omega, r_{\text{ext}}}$, where $\langle \dots \rangle_{\Omega, r_{\text{ext}}}$ indicates an average over the solid angle at the extraction radius.

Figure 1 shows the angle-averaged (1D equivalent) neutrino emission properties for the representative protomagnetar model with mass $M = 17 M_{\odot}$ (model A17; note that the sudden termination of the neutrino signal at about 4 s corresponds to the end of the simulation time for this model and not to BH formation) and the spinar model with mass $26 M_{\odot}$ (model A26; the signal terminates about 1.5 s after core bounce due to BH formation). These models have neutrino luminosity $L_{\nu} \gtrsim 10^{52}$ erg s $^{-1}$ for all flavors, with the typical neutrino emission lasting for several seconds. The neutrino mean energies for the different flavors exhibit a characteristic hierarchy: $\langle \varepsilon_{\nu_e} \rangle < \langle \varepsilon_{\bar{\nu}_e} \rangle < \langle \varepsilon_{\nu_x} \rangle$. The large mean energy of the non-electron flavor neutrinos (which exceeds 20 MeV for a significant part of the emission) is due to the compact protoneutron star, that facilitates

the neutrino decoupling at densities higher than in the neutrino-driven CCSN models. The small offset (of a few MeV) in the heavy-neutrino mean energies is produced by the development of steep density and temperature gradients at the typical densities where the transition region from diffusion to free streaming is located. As a result, the flux factors (i.e., the ratio of flux-to-neutrino energy) grow over a narrow radial range. The region where ν_x 's decouple from matter and the other neutrino flavors coincides with a sharp drop of the gas temperature, such that even a small radial difference has an impact on the mean energies of the non-electron neutrino flavors. The detailed treatment of the pair processes may have also some (small) impact on the computed heavy-neutrino mean energy.

III. DIFFUSE NEUTRINO BACKGROUND

In this section, after outlining the approach employed to model the DSNB, we compute the contribution of neutrino-driven CCSN explosions, neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses, protomagnetars, and spinars to the diffuse neutrino emission.

A. Contribution to the diffuse neutrino background from neutrino-driven core-collapse supernovae and black hole-forming collapses

The diffuse neutrino background from neutrino-driven CCSNe and neutrino-driven BH forming collapses is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\text{CCSN}}(E) = & c \int_{8M_{\odot}}^{125M_{\odot}} dM \\ & \times \int_{z=0}^{z_{\text{max}}} dz \frac{\mathcal{R}(z, M)}{H(z)} F_{\nu}(M, E(1+z)), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where c denotes the speed of light, z is the redshift with $z_{\text{max}} = 5$ (see below), $\mathcal{R}(z, M)$ is the CCSN rate, $F_{\nu}(M, E(1+z))$ is the time-integrated neutrino energy spectrum of a CCSN of mass M , and the factor $1/H(z)$ accounts for the expansion history of the Universe.

Neutrino energetics. The time-integrated neutrino energy spectrum, $F_{\nu}(M, E)$, is computed as

$$F_{\nu}(M, E) = \int dt L_{\nu}(E, t) \frac{\phi_{\nu}^0(E, t)}{\langle \varepsilon_{\nu}(t) \rangle}, \quad (2)$$

where we integrate over the duration of neutrino emission the product of the luminosity ($L_{\nu}(E, t)$), the spectral energy distribution ($\phi_{\nu}^0(E, t)$ parametrized following Refs. [49, 50]), and the neutrino mean energy ($\langle \varepsilon_{\nu}(t) \rangle$).

The top panel of Fig. 2 shows the $\bar{\nu}_e$ DSNB spectrum computed following Eq. 1 and assuming that all collapsing massive stars behave as the $11.2 M_{\odot}$, or $27 M_{\odot}$ CCSN

models, or the $40 M_{\odot}$ neutrino-driven BH-forming model (i.e., we compute the DSNB assuming that each of these models would be representative of the whole core collapse population in order to highlight the differences in the neutrino emission). One can see that, because of the energetic and long-lasting emission from protomagnetars (cf. $17 M_{\odot}$ model), their flux is the largest with the high-energy tail as soft as that of BH-forming CCSNe. Similarly, the luminous neutrino emission from spinars results in the second largest flux (after protomagnetars, cf. $26 M_{\odot}$ model) with a soft high-energy tail comparable to the one of protomagnetars.

Core-collapse supernova rate. The bulk of the DSNB mainly comes from neutrinos emitted from core collapses at $z \lesssim z_{\text{max}}$ [51]. For these redshifts, the expansion rate of the Universe is well described by $H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_{\Lambda} + \Omega_m(1+z)^3}$, with the local expansion rate being $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ [52], the dark-energy density $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.7$, and the matter density $\Omega_m = 0.3$ [53].

We parametrize the CCSN rate in terms of the initial mass function (IMF) and the star formation history $\dot{\rho}_{*}(z)$:

$$\mathcal{R}(z, M) = \frac{\text{IMF}(M)}{\int_{0.1M_{\odot}}^{125M_{\odot}} dM M \times \text{IMF}(M)} \dot{\rho}_{*}(z), \quad (3)$$

for collapsing stars with mass $\gtrsim 8M_{\odot}$. For what concerns the star formation history, we adopt the following piecewise parametrization [54]:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{*}(z) = \dot{\rho}_0 & \left[(1+z)^{\alpha\eta} \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\frac{1+z}{B} \right)^{\beta\eta} + \left(\frac{1+z}{C} \right)^{\gamma\eta} \right]^{1/\eta}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with $\eta = -10$. The constants B and C are given by

$$B = (1+z_1)^{1-\alpha/\beta}, \quad (5)$$

$$C = (1+z_1)^{(\beta-\alpha)/\gamma} (1+z_2)^{1-\beta/\gamma}. \quad (6)$$

Given our poor knowledge of the CCSN rate, which constitutes the largest uncertainty plaguing the DSNB [13, 54], we consider a range of values for $\dot{\rho}_0$, α , β , and γ as summarized in Table I, and we set $z_1 = 1$ and $z_2 = 4$. The analytical fits of $\dot{\rho}_{*}(z)$ depend on the assumed initial mass function [54]. We consider for the latter the Salpeter initial mass function [55]: $\text{IMF} \propto (M/M_{\odot})^{-2.35}$. Employing non-universal initial mass functions would affect the CCSN rate (i.e., $\dot{\rho}_0$) with a negligible impact on the DSNB [10, 56].

Fraction of neutrino-driven black hole-forming collapses. Another unknown in the DSNB modeling is the fraction of non-rotating (or mildly-rotating) massive stars collapsing into BHs. To take this into account, we allow for the fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses ($f_{\nu\text{BH}}$) to vary, following Ref. [29], and restrict the range to $f_{\nu\text{BH}} < 0.47$. This choice is motivated by the




FIG. 2. *Top panel:* Electron-antineutrino DSNB flux (Eq. 1) as a function of the observed neutrino energy, assuming that the $11.2 M_{\odot}$ or the $27 M_{\odot}$, the $40 M_{\odot}$ model (dashed, dotted, and dashed-dotted gray lines), the protomagnetar model with mass of $17 M_{\odot}$ (dashed orange line), or the spinar model with mass of $26 M_{\odot}$ (dashed green line) are representative of the population of collapsing massive stars, respectively. Flavor conversion at the source is neglected. *Bottom panel:* Same as top panel, but now taking into account different CCSN and magnetorotational models according to the initial mass function (cf. Fig. 3) and for different values of the fraction of magnetorotational collapses (f_{MR} , colored lines). The dark gray band shows the fiducial DSNB model and the light gray one takes into account complete flavor conversion at the source.

findings of Ref. [17], which considers a suite of parameterized 1D neutrino-driven engines for single-star and helium-star progenitors (i.e., $0.178 < f_{\nu\text{BH}} < 0.417$).

Neutrino flavor conversion. The DSNB is expected to be affected by neutrino flavor conversions [13]. However, due to the large uncertainties in the modeling of neutrino quantum kinetics in the core of SNe [6, 57, 58], we

TABLE I. Numerical values of the parameters in the upper, fiducial, and lower analytical fits of the star formation rate from Ref. [54], assuming the Salpeter initial mass function [55].

Ranges	$\dot{\rho}_0$	α	β	γ
Upper	0.0213	3.6	-0.1	-2.5
Fiducial	0.0178	3.4	-0.3	-3.5
Lower	0.0142	3.2	-0.5	-4.5

rely on a conservative approach and consider two extreme cases: (i) no flavor conversion, or (ii) full flavor conversion (i.e., ν_e or $\bar{\nu}_e$ emerge from the source as ν_x or $\bar{\nu}_x$, swapping completely their flavor). We stress that none of these assumptions is realistic, yet they should serve as guidance to assess the impact of flavor conversion uncertainties. Conversely, flavor conversion of neutrinos en route to Earth is not subject to large uncertainties [59]. To model this, we consider the best-fit values of the neutrino mixing parameters for normal mass ordering from Ref. [60].

The dark gray band in the bottom panel of Fig. 2 represents the $\bar{\nu}_e$ component of our “fiducial” DSNB flux model, obtained for $0 < f_{\nu\text{BH}} < 0.47$, $0.0142 < \dot{\rho}_0 < 0.0213$, $3.2 < \alpha < 3.6$, $-0.5 < \beta < -0.1$, and $-4.5 < \gamma < -2.5$, as well as no flavor conversion. The light gray band of Fig. 2 instead corresponds to the case of full flavor conversion. We assume the values for the fiducial parametrization of the CCSN rate (cf. Table I) and $f_{\nu\text{BH}} = 0.3$, which is an average value according to Ref. [17]. In order to make this plot, we consider each of the core collapse models from our suite as representative of the population for a certain mass range (cf. the top panel of Fig. 3). The slope of the tail of the spectrum becomes less steep as the fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses increases, since the emission from this source class is more energetic.

B. Contribution to the diffuse neutrino background from protomagnetars and spinars

Assuming that our protomagnetar model A17 or our spinar model A26 are representative of the population of massive stellar collapses, the top panel of Fig. 2 shows the corresponding $\bar{\nu}_e$ fluxes.² One can see that the $\bar{\nu}_e$ spectra from protomagnetars and spinars exhibit an energy tail with slope comparable to the one of the neutrino-driven BH-forming collapse model, but peaking at $E \simeq 10$ MeV in the source frame.

² We have verified that the neutrino spectral energy distributions of our suite of magnetorotational collapse models follow the parametrization of Refs. [49, 50].

When taking into account the contribution of protomagnetars and spinars, the total diffuse neutrino emission is

$$\Phi_{\text{diffuse}} = (1 - f_{\text{MR}})\Phi_{\nu\text{CCSN}} + f_{\text{MR}}\Phi_{\text{MR}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Phi_{\nu\text{CCSN}}$ is the diffuse flux from neutrino-driven CCSNe and neutrino-driven BH forming collapses (Eq. 1), while Φ_{MR} represents the contribution from protomagnetars and spinars, and f_{MR} is the fraction of magnetorotational collapses assumed to be constant over redshift.

For the initial mass function of magnetorotational stellar core collapses, we adopt the Salpeter one, but extending from $5M_{\odot}$ to $125M_{\odot}$. The lower minimum mass that we consider for magnetorotational collapses ($5M_{\odot}$) is motivated by the fact that the chemically homogeneous evolution of the models under consideration results in larger carbon-oxygen cores compared to those in non-rotating, standard core-collapse progenitors. These cores provide conditions conducive to the development of subsequent nuclear burning stages, even below the non-rotating threshold of approximately $8M_{\odot}$. Consequently, chemically homogeneous models in the mass range $[5M_{\odot}, 8M_{\odot}]$ may also undergo core collapse instead of evolving into carbon-oxygen white dwarfs. The lower panel in Fig. 3 illustrates how the magnetorotational models introduced in Sec. II are employed to model the magnetorotational core collapse population, where for each band in the initial mass function we have considered the correspondent protomagnetar or spinar model.

We have also considered two extreme initial mass functions, $\text{IMF}_{\text{MR},1} \propto (M/M_{\odot})^{-2.7}$ and $\text{IMF}_{\text{MR},2} \propto (M/M_{\odot})^{-1}$, following Refs. [61] and [62], respectively. We find that the DSNB is negligibly affected by the choice of the IMF, in agreement with the findings of Ref. [10]; we, thus, only report our findings for the Salpeter mass function.

The diffuse neutrino emission from protomagnetars and spinars is obtained analogously to Eq. 1. It is worth noticing that the prefactor f_{MR} in Eq. 7 accounts for the different normalization in the initial mass function of CCSNe and the one of magnetars resulting from the different lower mass limit ($8M_{\odot}$ or $5M_{\odot}$) adopted for each of the two cases. In addition, in the computation of the contribution of neutrinos from magnetorotational collapses to the DSNB, the uncertainties in the star formation history and flavor conversion are taken into account as described in Sec. III A.

The lower panel of Fig. 2 shows the contribution of different fractions of magnetorotational collapses to the DSNB, one can see that the tail of the latter increases with the fraction of protomagnetars and spinars. It is worth noticing that the magnetorotational collapse models predict an emission of non-electron flavor neutrinos and antineutrinos with larger mean energies than the electron-flavor ones. Hence, uncertainties due to flavor conversion in the source can potentially affect the spectral shape of the related diffuse neutrino emission even




FIG. 3. *Top panel:* Initial mass function for neutrino-driven CCSNe and BH forming collapses as a function of the ZAMS progenitor mass. *Bottom panel:* Same as the top panel, but for the magnetorotational core collapses. The neutrino-driven core collapse and the protomagnetar/spinar populations extend up to $125M_{\odot}$, although not explicitly shown in the plots. The vertical dashed lines highlight the ZAMS mass of the models in our suite. The color bands correspond to the range of masses for which we consider each model of our suite as representative. In parenthesis, we indicate if the remnant compact object is a neutron star (NS) or a BH, following Refs. [6, 41] and the 3D models for the magnetorotational collapses adopted in this work (note that this setup fixes the fraction of spinars to $f_{\text{BH-MR}} \simeq 0.11$).

more than in CCSNe.

Figure 4 displays our $\bar{\nu}_e$ DSNB spectrum for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$ and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.03$. These fractions of magnetorotational collapses are chosen as representative. In fact, Ref. [63] finds that the fraction of fast rotating Be stars (CBe stars) is $(32.8 \pm 3.4)\%$ for stars with mass above $15\text{--}16M_{\odot}$, and $(4.4 \pm 0.9)\%$ for stars with mass between




FIG. 4. Electron-antineutrino DSNB for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.03$ (green) and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$ (orange), including the contribution from neutrino-driven CCSNe and BH forming collapses and in the absence of flavor conversion. The gray band corresponds to the fiducial DSNB prediction (i.e., for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$, uncertainties on the star formation history as from Table I, and $f_{\nu\text{BH}} < 0.47$). The solid gray line corresponds to the fiducial cosmic rate (cf. Table I) and $f_{\nu\text{BH}} = 0.3$. The error bars represent the model-independent upper limits from Super-Kamiokande on a flux of $\bar{\nu}_e$'s of astrophysical origin [27]. The neutrino emission from magnetorotational collapses enhances the high-energy tail of the DSNB spectrum, boosting its detection prospects.

$\sim 2\text{--}16M_{\odot}$. Since an initially fast rotating star is necessary for the formation of a protomagnetar, the fraction of fast-rotating CBe stars could be considered as an upper bound on the fraction of massive stars expected to form protomagnetars. Following Ref. [63], we find that the IMF weighted average fraction of fast rotating stars in the $[5M_{\odot}, 26M_{\odot}]$ mass range (where $26M_{\odot}$ defines the minimum mass beyond which BH formation is expected in our 3D models) is 7.6%, which we approximate to $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$. The green and orange bands mostly overlap with the gray one, although one can clearly see that the contribution of magnetorotational collapses to the DSNB enhances the high-energy tail of the spectrum. This effect is more visible as f_{MR} increases (cf. the bottom panel of Fig. 2).

IV. CONSTRAINING THE FRACTION OF MAGNETOROTATIONAL COLLAPSES WITH THE SUPER-KAMIOKANDE-GD DATA

Several neutrino telescopes carry out DSNB searches, including KamLAND [64], Borexino [65], SNO [66] and Super-Kamiokande [25, 67]. Recently, the Super-Kamiokande Collaboration reported their most stringent limits on a model-independent $\bar{\nu}_e$ flux of astrophysical

origin using data from the phases VI and VII, with different levels of Gadolinium doping [27]. We compare such limits to the DSNB flux expected at Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium computed as

$$\bar{\Phi}(E_i, E_f) = \frac{\int_{E_i}^{E_f} \sigma_{\text{IBD}}(E) \Phi_{\text{diffuse}}(E) dE}{\int_{E_i}^{E_f} \sigma_{\text{IBD}}(E) dE}, \quad (8)$$

where σ_{IBD} is the cross-section for inverse beta decay [68, 69]. For the sake of simplicity, we assume an energy-independent detection efficiency and perfect energy resolution [70].

The large number of reactor antineutrinos below 10 MeV and the atmospheric background above ~ 30 MeV constrain the neutrino detection window for the DSNB [4, 5]. The model-independent results reported by the Super-Kamiokande Collaboration account for these backgrounds and assume an energy-independent flux per energy bin. As a consequence, when comparing with our theoretical predictions, we unfold the energy-dependence of the detection cross section—see Eq. (8).

Figure 5 compares the limits reported by the Super-Kamiokande Collaboration with our DSNB forecast. We consider the fiducial DSNB model ($f_{\text{MR}} = 0$, gray band), the DSNB computed for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.03$ (top panel, dark green bands) and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$ (bottom panel, dark orange bands) and also scenarios with full flavor conversion at the source (see Sec. III, light green and light orange bands, respectively). In all cases, our forecast for the DSNB signal falls below the current Super-Kamiokande limits. However, if $f_{\text{MR}} \gtrsim 0.13$ and full flavor conversion would take place for the highest local star formation rate, the Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium upper limits would already be incompatible with the DSNB model. Note that, in order to allow for a direct quantitative comparison of our model to the data, the energy binning used in Fig. 5 is analogous to the one adopted by the Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium Collaboration [27].

V. DETECTION PROSPECTS AND FUTURE SENSITIVITY

In this section, we discuss the impact of a non-zero fraction of magnetorotational core collapses in the near-future DSNB detection prospects at Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium [71] and JUNO [72]. We also forecast the sensitivity of Hyper-Kamiokande-Gadolinium [73, 74] and DUNE [75] to the fraction of magnetorotational collapses. The detector characteristics that we consider for these four neutrino telescopes are summarized in Table II. This table also includes the number of signal events for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$ and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0$ as well as the number of background events.




FIG. 5. Electron-antineutrino DSNB flux binned in energy for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.03$ (top panel) and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$ (bottom panel). The gray bands correspond to the fiducial DSNB model (i.e., obtained considering uncertainties on the star formation history as from Table I), $f_{\nu\text{BH}} < 0.47$, and no flavor conversion at the source. The dark shaded colored bands correspond to the DSNB obtained for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.03$ and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$. Light shaded bands are obtained for full flavor conversion at the source. The black dots and lines represent the $\bar{\nu}_e$ model-independent limits obtained by the Super-Kamiokande Collaboration [27]. Current Super-Kamiokande data do not allow to constrain $f_{\text{MR}} \lesssim 0.1$.

A. Near term detection prospects

The increase in Gadolinium doping in Super-Kamiokande is expected to result in a larger event statistics also for what concerns the DSNB [76, 77]. To illustrate the short-term potential of Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium, we investigate the exposure that one would need to detect the DSNB and infer the fraction of mag-




FIG. 6. Fraction of magnetorotational collapses needed to reject the background-only hypothesis for $S/\sqrt{S+B} = 3$ (cf. main text for details) as a function of the exposure for Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium (top panel) and JUNO (bottom panel). The shaded regions correspond to different sets of parameters for the star formation history (Table I), considering no flavor conversion (darker shades) or full flavor conversion at the source (lighter shades). Under the assumption of full flavor conversion and for a 10–20% fraction of magnetorotational core collapses, the detection of the DSNB could occur 2–4 yr earlier than for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0$.

netorotational collapses.

The expected number of signal events for a neutrino observatory is

$$S = N_t \tau \xi \int \sigma_{\text{IBD}}(E) \Phi_{\text{diffuse}}(E) dE, \quad (9)$$

where N_t is the number of targets for a given detector volume, τ is the exposure time, and ξ is the energy-independent detection efficiency. The integral over the neutrino energy is carried out for the energy window of interest (see Table II)

For a fiducial volume of 22.5 kT, 65% detection efficiency, and the backgrounds reported for the Super-Kamiokande-VI and Super-Kamiokande-VII runs [27], we compute the ratio between the signal events (S) and the Poissonian statistical fluctuations of the total number of events, i.e. signal plus background (B). For our baseline analysis, the fraction of magnetorotational collapses is the only free parameter for a fixed star formation history (i.e., for a given set of values $\dot{\rho}_0$, α , β and γ ; see Table I)—whereas the CCSN rate (Eq. 4) and the fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses ($f_{\nu\text{BH}} = 0.3$) are assumed to be known.

In the absence of systematic uncertainties, $S/\sqrt{S+B} = 3$ corresponds to reject the background-only hypothesis with a significance of 3σ . Precisely, the top panel of Fig. 6 shows the region where $S/\sqrt{S+B} = 3$, in the plane spanned by the exposure and the fraction of magnetorotational collapses. The light-shaded band in the top panel of Fig. 6 corresponds to the case of full flavor conversion at the source. Similarly, JUNO is expected to start taking data in late 2024 [78]. With a fiducial volume of 17 kT, detection efficiency of 80%, and backgrounds as described in Ref. [79], its DSNB detection prospects are comparable to the ones from Super-Kamiokande doped with Gadolinium, as visible from the bottom panel of Fig. 6. For both Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium and JUNO, a non-zero f_{MR} would result in a positive signal at neutrino observatories within less than a decade of data taking. In particular, a non-zero fraction of magnetorotational collapses could result in the DSNB detection within the next 6–8 yr or earlier.

We stress that the evolution of the sensitivity of Super-Kamiokande depends on the Gadolinium-enrichment phases and other experimental aspects such as background rejection and neutron tagging [24, 26, 28]. Changes in the experimental setup in JUNO may also modify the results presented above quantitatively.

Importantly, the combination of data from different neutrino observatories—affected by different systematics and backgrounds—could further advance the detection of the DSNB and hint at the existence of a population of magnetorotational collapses contributing to the DSNB. For instance, combining Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium and JUNO would result in an increase of the statistical significance of an eventual DSNB detection, as evident from the expected number of events summarized in Table II.

B. Long term detection prospects

A better assessment on the contribution from proto-magnetars and spinars to the DSNB is expected from the upcoming water Cherenkov neutrino telescope Hyper-Kamiokande [73]. We consider an experimental configuration with two tanks of 187 kT each and detection efficiency of 67%, resulting from adding $\sim 0.1\%$ of GdCl_3 to water (cf. Table II for a summary on the expected number of events). Among the different backgrounds expected in Hyper-Kamiokande, neutral-current atmospheric background events are particularly relevant [80, 81], and the possibility of reducing them to negligible level is under investigation [82].

Figure 7 shows the sensitivity to the fraction of magnetorotational collapses as a function of the exposure for the DSNB model of Sec. III, with and without neutral current atmospheric backgrounds. This corresponds to the sensitivity to distinguish the DSNB prediction for a non-zero fraction of magnetorotational collapses from a




FIG. 7. Hyper-Kamiokande sensitivity at 3σ to the fraction of magnetorotational core collapses (f_{MR}) as a function of the exposure. The solid line corresponds to negligible neutral-current backgrounds induced by atmospheric neutrinos. The dashed line considers the fiducial backgrounds from Ref. [83]. The dark shaded band represents the impact of the uncertainties on the CCSN rate and the fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses. After 20 yr exposure, Hyper-Kamiokande-Gadolinium will be sensitive to $f_{\text{MR}} \gtrsim 7\%$.

DSNB signal with $f_{\text{MR}} = 0$, i.e. we consider a ratio:

$$\frac{S(f_{\text{MR}}) - S(f_{\text{MR}} = 0)}{\sqrt{S(f_{\text{MR}} = 0) + B}} = 3. \quad (10)$$

One can see that a fraction of magnetorotational collapses smaller than 7% could be measured at 3σ after 20 yr of data taking, assuming that the fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses is known and the neutral current atmospheric background is efficiently tagged.

The upcoming liquid Argon neutrino experiment DUNE [75], being sensitive to the ν_e component, could also add positively to this picture, although with smaller statistics (cf. Table II). We estimate that a ratio $S/\sqrt{S+B} = 3$ (i.e. to reject the background-only hypothesis at 3σ level) could only be achieved in 10 yr at this detector, if $f_{\text{MR}} \gtrsim 0.27$ —assuming 100% detection efficiency and the backgrounds from Ref. [83]. The difference between the mean energies of electron and non-electron flavor neutrinos is larger than the one for antineutrinos. This could potentially disentangle some of the existing uncertainties in the picture, especially for what concerns the flavor conversion physics and the fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses [29].

TABLE II. Fiducial volume, detection efficiency (ξ), and optimal energy window for JUNO [79], Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium (Super-K-Gd) [27], DUNE [75], and Hyper-Kamiokande-Gadolinium (Hyper-K-Gd) [73]. We also indicate the energy-integrated number of DSNB events for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0$ and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$, and the number of background events per 100 kT and year.

Experiment	Fiducial volume [kt]	Detection efficiency	Energy window [MeV]	DSNB events ($f_{\text{MR}} = 0$) [(100 kT yr) $^{-1}$]	DSNB events ($f_{\text{MR}} = 0.1$) [(100 kT yr) $^{-1}$]	Background events [(100 kT yr) $^{-1}$]
JUNO	17	0.7	9.4–31.4	11.0	14.3	3.2
Super-K-Gd	22.5	0.65	9.4–31.4	16.9	21.9	26.1
DUNE	40	1	19.0–31.0	1.3	1.8	0.6
Hyper-K-Gd	374	0.67	9.4–31.4	17.5	22.6	18.0 (10.5 ^a)

^a This value corresponds to the scenario in which neutral current backgrounds induced by atmospheric neutrinos are negligible.

VI. COMPLEMENTARY ELECTROMAGNETIC CONSTRAINTS

Assuming magnetorotational core collapses are distributed following the star formation rate, their fraction and the one of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses are degenerate in the DSNB signal. In both cases, the larger the population, the higher would be the high-energy tail of the DSNB spectrum. To illustrate this, we assume that the true fractions of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses and magnetorotational collapses are $f_{\nu\text{BH}} = 0.3$ and $f_{\text{MR}} = 0$ and compute the expected number of DSNB events after 20 yr of data taking at Hyper-Kamiokande-Gadolinium, in the absence of flavor conversion. Figure 8 shows the region of the parameter space (i.e. values of f_{MR} and $f_{\nu\text{BH}}$) compatible with our hypothesis. To guide the eye, we also display the allowed fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses from the numerical simulations of Ref. [17] as a green-shaded contour. Note that limits on BH formation could also be inferred from searches with the Large Binocular Telescope on disappearing luminous stars [84]; we select from Ref. [84] the constraints obtained assuming only one failed SN: $f_{\nu\text{BH}} = 0.16^{+0.23}_{-0.12}$, as not all of the luminous stars in their sample may be neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses. These limits are displayed in Fig. 8 (shaded blue region).

While we have focused on neutrinos, combining DSNB and electromagnetic data could help to break the degeneracy in the fraction of magnetorotational collapses plaguing the DSNB data. The Palomar Transient Facility has measured the total rate of observed SNe—both CCSN and stripped-envelope SNe—to be [85]:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Palomar, total}}^{\text{obs}} = 9.10^{+1.56}_{-1.27} \times 10^{-5} \text{yr}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-3}, \quad (11)$$

for $H_0 = 70 \text{ km}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ and at an average redshift of $\langle z \rangle = 0.028$. The fraction of BH-forming collapses as well as the one of protomagnetars and spinars could be inferred relying on the Palomar data, as shown in Fig. 8.

The Palomar Transient Facility has also determined

the local rate of stripped-envelope SNe to be [85]:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Palomar, SESN}}^{\text{obs}} = 2.41^{+0.81}_{-0.64} \times 10^{-5} \text{yr}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-3}. \quad (12)$$

One can then constrain the fraction of magnetorotational collapses by requiring that the observable rate of protomagnetars and spinars predicted in this work is smaller than the rate of stripped SNe observed by the Palomar Transient Facility. This would provide an upper limit, since it would rely on the assumption that all stripped SNe are linked to our suite of magnetorotational collapses, i.e., $f_{\text{MR}} < \mathcal{R}_{\text{Palomar, SESN}}^{\text{obs}} / \mathcal{R}_{\text{Palomar, total}}^{\text{obs}} \sim 0.26$.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

As the detection of the DSNB approaches, it is timely to address whether the diffuse neutrino emission from magnetorotational core collapses, leading to the formation of protomagnetars or spinars, could contribute to the DSNB. We rely on a suite of seven 3D special relativistic neutrino-magnetohydrodynamic simulations with different ZAMS mass, inspired by the 2D equivalent models presented in Ref. [40], to investigate the related neutrino properties and the associated contribution to the DSNB. Our models predict large neutrino luminosities $\gtrsim 10^{52} \text{ ergs}^{-1}$ for several seconds and large mean energies for non-electron neutrinos and antineutrinos ($\langle \varepsilon_{\nu_x} \rangle \gtrsim 20 \text{ MeV}$). Such neutrino properties suggest that magnetorotational core collapses could provide a non-negligible contribution to the high-energy DSNB tail (above 5 MeV).

We show that current data from Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium are compatible with a fraction of magnetorotational collapses smaller than $\sim 13\%$ (assumed to be constant as a function of the redshift, for the sake of simplicity) after accounting for uncertainties in the CCSN rate, the fraction of neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses, and flavor conversion physics at the source. Due to the enhancement of the high-energy tail of the DSNB spectrum, a non-zero fraction of magnetorotational collapses could also lead to an earlier detection of




FIG. 8. Present and future constraints from neutrino (DSNB) electromagnetic data and numerical simulations on the fraction of magnetorotational collapses (f_{MR}) and neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses ($f_{\nu\text{BH}}$). The red-shaded region corresponds to the projected sensitivity of Hyper-Kamiokande-Gadolinium after 20 yr of data, taking into account the uncertainties on the CCSN rate. To guide the eye, the black dot marks our fiducial DSNB model. The orange band represents the observed rate of successful explosions constrained by the Palomar facility [85]. The green-shaded region displays the interval of $f_{\nu\text{BH}}$ extracted from simulations of the CCSN population [17]. Additional constraints from the search for disappearing luminous stars from the Large Binocular Telescope [84] are shown in blue. The vertical dashed line corresponds to the upper limits on the observed rate of stripped-envelope SNe (SESNe) at the Palomar transient facility [85]. The neutrino and electromagnetic data and numerical simulations can potentially provide complementary constraints on f_{MR} and $f_{\nu\text{BH}}$.

the $\bar{\nu}_e$ component of the DSNB flux. In particular, in the near future, Super-Kamiokande-Gadolinium and JUNO could reject the background-only hypothesis with an exposure of 6–8 yr for fractions of magnetorotational collapses above 10–20%, i.e. 2–4 yr earlier than for $f_{\text{MR}} = 0$.

Given its larger size, the upcoming Hyper-Kamiokande-Gadolinium neutrino telescope could measure a fraction of magnetorotational collapses larger than 7% at 3σ after 20 yr of data-taking, if meanwhile we can infer the fraction of (neutrino-driven) BH-forming collapses and pin down the uncertainties on the CCSN rate through electromagnetic observations. This measurement would further benefit from improved background reduction and detection efficiency.

The observational signatures of magnetorotational collapses in the DSNB signal are entangled with the ones linked to neutrino-driven BH-forming collapses. However, complementary electromagnetic probes, e.g., searches for disappearing luminous stars [84, 86, 87], could help to break such degeneracies. Moreover, previous work [39, 40] suggests that a subset of our suite of magnetorotational models could harbor progenitors of long gamma-ray bursts (LGRBs). Assuming that the magnetorotational progenitors with ZAMS mass $M \gtrsim 15M_{\odot}$ lead to GRB jets [39] and that magnetorotational core collapses are the only sources of LGRBs, one could compare the rate of LGRBs with our findings to break the DSNB degeneracies. Similarly, the connection be-

tween these magnetorotational collapses and superluminous SNe [39] could also be explored. Such multi-messenger approach would greatly benefit from reduced uncertainties on the star formation history [88] as well as progress in stellar evolution models [89–92], and our understanding of angular momentum transport in massive stars [93–96].

With this work, we set a roadmap for an improved comprehension of the sources that can contribute to the DSNB, particularly protomagnetars and spinars. While existing data are still plagued by astrophysical uncertainties, the combination of upcoming neutrino and electromagnetic measurements will be crucial to learn more about the properties of the population of magnetorotational collapses in our Universe.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In Copenhagen, this project has received support from the Villum Foundation (Project No. 13164), the Danmarks Frie Forskningsfond (Project No. 8049-00038B), the Carlsberg Foundation (CF18-0183) and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through Sonderforschungsbereich SFB 1258 “Neutrinos and Dark Matter in Astro- and Particle Physics” (NDM). Part of this work was performed at Aspen Center for Physics, which is supported by National Science Foundation

grant PHY-2210452. In Valencia, this work was supported from the grant PID2021-127495NB-I00, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the European Union under “NextGenerationEU” as well as “ESF: Investing in your future”, the Astrophysics and High Energy Physics program of the Generalitat Valenciana ASFAE/2022/026 funded by MCIN and the European Union “NextGenerationEU” (PRTR-C17.I1), and the Prometeo excellence program grant CIPROM/2022/13 funded by the Generalitat Valenciana. MO acknowledges support from the Spanish Ministry of Science

via the Ramón y Cajal programme (RYC2018-024938-I). The Tycho supercomputer hosted at the SCIENCE HPC Center at the University of Copenhagen and computing time granted via the Red Española de Supercomputación (grants AECT-2022-3-0016, AECT-2023-1-0009, AECT-2023-3-0019, AECT-2024-1-0013) at the supercomputers MareNostrum-4 and MareNostrum-5 of the Barcelona Supercomputing Centre as well as on the hosts Tirant (grants AECT-2022-1-0003, AECT-2023-1-0001) and Lluïsvives of the Servei d’Informàtica of the Universitat de València were used for supporting the numerical simulations presented in this work.

* pablo.mirave@nbi.ku.dk

† tamborra@nbi.ku.dk

‡ miguel.a.aloy@uv.es

§ martin.obergaulinger@uv.es

- [1] G. S. Bisnovatyi-Kogan and Z. F. Seidov, SUPERNOVAE, NEUTRINO REST MASS, AND THE MIDDLE ENERGY NEUTRINO BACKGROUND IN THE UNIVERSE, in *11th Texas Symposium on Relativistic Astrophysics* (1982).
- [2] L. M. Krauss, S. L. Glashow, and D. N. Schramm, Antineutrinos Astronomy and Geophysics, *Nature* **310**, 191 (1984).
- [3] G. V. Domogatskii, The Isotropic Electron Antineutrino Flux - a Clue to the Rate of Stellar Gravitational Collapse in the Universe, *Soviet Astronomy* **28**, 30 (1984).
- [4] J. F. Beacom, The Diffuse Supernova Neutrino Background, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **60**, 439 (2010), arXiv:1004.3311 [astro-ph.HE].
- [5] C. Lunardini, Diffuse supernova neutrinos at underground laboratories, *Astropart. Phys.* **79**, 49 (2016), arXiv:1007.3252 [astro-ph.CO].
- [6] 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**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1508.00785 [astro-ph.HE].
- [7] S. Ando, N. Ekanger, S. Horiuchi, and Y. Koshio, Diffuse neutrino background from past core collapse supernovae, *Proceedings of the Japan Academy, Series B* **99**, 460 (2023), arXiv:2306.16076 [astro-ph.HE].
- [8] E. Vitagliano, I. Tamborra, and G. G. Raffelt, Grand Unified Neutrino Spectrum at Earth: Sources and Spectral Components, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 45006 (2020), arXiv:1910.11878 [astro-ph.HE].
- [9] N. Ekanger, S. Horiuchi, H. Nagakura, and S. Reitz, Diffuse supernova neutrino background with up-to-date star formation rate measurements and long-term multidimensional supernova simulations, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 023024 (2024), arXiv:2310.15254 [astro-ph.HE].
- [10] J. J. Ziegler, T. D. P. Edwards, A. M. Suliga, I. Tamborra, S. Horiuchi, S. Ando, and K. Freese, Non-universal stellar initial mass functions: large uncertainties in star formation rates at $z \approx 2-4$ and other astrophysical probes, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **517**, 2471 (2022), arXiv:2205.07845 [astro-ph.GA].
- [11] C. Lunardini, Diffuse neutrino flux from failed supernovae, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 231101 (2009), arXiv:0901.0568 [astro-ph.SR].
- [12] K. Nakazato, R. Akaho, Y. Ashida, and T. Tsujimoto, Impacts of Black-Hole-Forming Supernova Explosions on the Diffuse Neutrino Background, (2024), arXiv:2406.13276 [astro-ph.HE].
- [13] C. Lunardini and I. Tamborra, Diffuse supernova neutrinos: oscillation effects, stellar cooling and progenitor mass dependence, *JCAP* **07**, 012, arXiv:1205.6292 [astro-ph.SR].
- [14] K. Nakazato, E. Mochida, Y. Niino, and H. Suzuki, Spectrum of the Supernova Relic Neutrino Background and Metallicity Evolution of Galaxies, *Astrophys. J.* **804**, 75 (2015), arXiv:1503.01236 [astro-ph.HE].
- [15] Y. Ashida, K. Nakazato, and T. Tsujimoto, Diffuse Neutrino Flux Based on the Rates of Core-collapse Supernovae and Black Hole Formation Deduced from a Novel Galactic Chemical Evolution Model, *Astrophys. J.* **953**, 151 (2023), arXiv:2305.13543 [astro-ph.HE].
- [16] S. Horiuchi, T. Kinugawa, T. Takiwaki, K. Takahashi, and K. Kotake, Impact of binary interactions on the diffuse supernova neutrino background, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 043003 (2021), arXiv:2012.08524 [astro-ph.HE].
- [17] D. Kresse, T. Ertl, and H.-T. Janka, Stellar Collapse Diversity and the Diffuse Supernova Neutrino Background, *Astrophys. J.* **909**, 169 (2021), arXiv:2010.04728 [astro-ph.HE].
- [18] S. Anandagoda, D. H. Hartmann, C. L. Fryer, M. Ajello, A. Desai, A. L. Hungerford, and L.-S. The, Cosmic Supernova Neutrino and Gamma-Ray Backgrounds in the MeV Regime, *Astrophys. J.* **950**, 29 (2023).
- [19] K. Nakazato, K. Sumiyoshi, and S. Yamada, Gravitational collapse and neutrino emission of population III massive stars, *Astrophys. J.* **645**, 519 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0509868.
- [20] Y. Suwa, T. Takiwaki, K. Kotake, and K. Sato, Impact of Rotation on Neutrino Emission and Relic Neutrino Background from Population III Stars, *Astrophys. J.* **690**, 913 (2009), arXiv:0806.1072 [astro-ph].
- [21] C. Nagele, H. Umeda, K. Takahashi, T. Yoshida, and K. Sumiyoshi, Neutrino emission from the collapse of $\sim 104 M_{\odot}$ Population III supermassive stars, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **508**, 828 (2021), arXiv:2107.01761 [astro-ph.HE].
- [22] T. S. H. Schilbach, O. L. Caballero, and G. C. McLaughlin, Black Hole Accretion Disk Diffuse Neu-

- trino Background, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 043008 (2019), arXiv:1808.03627 [astro-ph.HE].
- [23] Y.-F. Wei, T. Liu, and C.-Y. Song, Contribution of Neutrino-dominated Accretion Flows to the Cosmic MeV Neutrino Background, *Astrophys. J.* **966**, 101 (2024), arXiv:2403.16856 [astro-ph.HE].
- [24] K. Abe *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande), First gadolinium loading to Super-Kamiokande, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **1027**, 166248 (2022), arXiv:2109.00360 [physics.ins-det].
- [25] M. Harada *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande), Search for Astrophysical Electron Antineutrinos in Super-Kamiokande with 0.01% Gadolinium-loaded Water, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951**, L27 (2023), arXiv:2305.05135 [astro-ph.HE].
- [26] K. Abe *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande), Second gadolinium loading to Super-Kamiokande, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **1065**, 169480 (2024), arXiv:2403.07796 [physics.ins-det].
- [27] M. Harada, Talk “Review of Diffuse supernova Neutrino Background” at the XXXI International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics (Neutrino 2024), Milano (Italy), June 16-22, 2024.
- [28] J. F. Beacom and M. R. Vagins, GADZOOKS! Antineutrino spectroscopy with large water Cherenkov detectors, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 171101 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0309300.
- [29] K. Møller, A. M. Suliga, I. Tamborra, and P. B. Denton, Measuring the supernova unknowns at the next-generation neutrino telescopes through the diffuse neutrino background, *JCAP* **05**, 066, arXiv:1804.03157 [astro-ph.HE].
- [30] B. Abi *et al.* (DUNE), Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE), Far Detector Technical Design Report, Volume I Introduction to DUNE, *JINST* **15** (08), T08008, arXiv:2002.02967 [physics.ins-det].
- [31] A. M. Suliga, J. F. Beacom, and I. Tamborra, Towards probing the diffuse supernova neutrino background in all flavors, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 043008 (2022), arXiv:2112.09168 [astro-ph.HE].
- [32] R. F. Lang, C. McCabe, S. Reichard, M. Selvi, and I. Tamborra, Supernova neutrino physics with xenon dark matter detectors: A timely perspective, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 103009 (2016), arXiv:1606.09243 [astro-ph.HE].
- [33] L. Pattavina, N. Ferreiro Iachellini, and I. Tamborra, Neutrino observatory based on archaeological lead, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 063001 (2020), arXiv:2004.06936 [astro-ph.HE].
- [34] P. Morrison and A. Cavaliere, Spinars - A Progress Report, in *Study Week on Nuclei of Galaxies*, edited by D. J. K. O’Connell (1971) p. 485.
- [35] G. V. Lipunova, E. S. Gorbovskoy, A. I. Bogomazov, and V. M. Lipunov, Population synthesis of gamma-ray bursts with precursor activity and the spinar paradigm, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **397**, 1695 (2009), arXiv:0903.3169 [astro-ph.HE].
- [36] V. M. Lipunov, Detection of magnetomultipole radiation from neutron stars, *Astroph. J.* **127**, L1 (1983).
- [37] V. M. Lipunov, *Astrophysics of neutron stars* (New York: Springer, 1987).
- [38] G. V. Lipunova and V. M. Lipunov, Formation of a gravitationally bound object after binary neutron star merging and GRB phenomena, *Astroph. J.* **329**, L29 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9704057 [astro-ph].
- [39] D. R. Aguilera-Dena, N. Langer, T. J. Moriya, and A. Schootemeijer, Related progenitor models for long-duration gamma ray bursts and Type Ic superluminous supernovae, *Astrophys. J.* **858**, 115 (2018), arXiv:1804.07317 [astro-ph.SR].
- [40] M. Obergaulinger and M. Á. Aloy, Magnetorotational core collapse of possible gamma-ray burst progenitors - IV. A wider range of progenitors, *Mon. Not. Astron. Soc.* **512**, 2489 (2022), arXiv:2108.13864 [astro-ph.HE].
- [41] Garching core-collapse supernova archive.
- [42] J. M. Lattimer and F. D. Swesty, A Generalized equation of state for hot, dense matter, *Nucl. Phys. A* **535**, 331 (1991).
- [43] M. Obergaulinger and M. Á. Aloy, Magnetorotational core collapse of possible GRB progenitors. III. Three-dimensional models, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **503**, 4942 (2021), arXiv:2008.07205 [astro-ph.HE].
- [44] A. W. Steiner, M. Hempel, and T. Fischer, Core-collapse supernova equations of state based on neutron star observations, *Astrophys. J.* **774**, 17 (2013), arXiv:1207.2184 [astro-ph.SR].
- [45] B. D. Metzger, D. Giannios, T. A. Thompson, N. Bucciantini, and E. Quataert, The protomagnetar model for gamma-ray bursts, *Mon. Not. Astron. Soc.* **413**, 2031 (2011), arXiv:1012.0001 [astro-ph.HE].
- [46] B. D. Metzger, P. Beniamini, and D. Giannios, Effects of fallback accretion on protomagnetar outflows in gamma-ray bursts and superluminous supernovae, *Astrophys. J.* **857**, 95 (2018), arXiv:1802.07750 [astro-ph.HE].
- [47] M. Obergaulinger and M. Á. Aloy, Protomagnetar and black hole formation in high-mass stars, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **469**, L43 (2017), arXiv:1703.09893 [astro-ph.SR].
- [48] M.-Á. Aloy and M. Obergaulinger, Magnetorotational core collapse of possible GRB progenitors - II. Formation of protomagnetars and collapsars, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **500**, 4365 (2020), arXiv:2008.03779 [astro-ph.HE].
- [49] M. T. Keil, G. G. Raffelt, and H.-T. Janka, Monte Carlo study of supernova neutrino spectra formation, *Astrophys. J.* **590**, 971 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0208035.
- [50] I. Tamborra, B. Mueller, L. Huedepohl, H.-T. Janka, and G. G. Raffelt, High-resolution supernova neutrino spectra represented by a simple fit, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 125031 (2012), arXiv:1211.3920 [astro-ph.SR].
- [51] S. Ando and K. Sato, Relic neutrino background from cosmological supernovae, *New J. Phys.* **6**, 170 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0410061.
- [52] E. Abdalla *et al.*, Cosmology intertwined: A review of the particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology associated with the cosmological tensions and anomalies, *JHEAP* **34**, 49 (2022), arXiv:2203.06142 [astro-ph.CO].
- [53] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO].
- [54] S. Horiuchi, J. F. Beacom, and E. Dwek, The Diffuse Supernova Neutrino Background is detectable in Super-Kamiokande, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 083013 (2009), arXiv:0812.3157 [astro-ph].
- [55] E. E. Salpeter, The Luminosity function and stellar evolution, *Astrophys. J.* **121**, 161 (1955).
- [56] A. M. Hopkins and J. F. Beacom, On the normalisation of the cosmic star formation history, *Astrophys. J.* **651**, 142 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0601463.

- [57] I. Tamborra and S. Shalgar, New Developments in Flavor Evolution of a Dense Neutrino Gas, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **71**, 165 (2021), arXiv:2011.01948 [astro-ph.HE].
- [58] S. Richers and M. Sen, Fast Flavor Transformations, in *Handbook of Nuclear Physics*, edited by I. Tanihata, H. Toki, and T. Kajino (2022) pp. 1–17, arXiv:2207.03561 [astro-ph.HE].
- [59] 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.
- [60] P. F. de Salas, D. V. Forero, S. Gariazzo, P. Martínez-Miravé, O. Mena, C. A. Ternes, M. Tórtola, and J. W. F. Valle, 2020 global reassessment of the neutrino oscillation picture, *JHEP* **02**, 071, arXiv:2006.11237 [hep-ph].
- [61] G. Chabrier, P. Henebelle, and S. Charlot, Variations of the stellar initial mass function in the progenitors of massive early-type galaxies and in extreme starburst environments, *The Astrophysical Journal* **796**, 75 (2014).
- [62] Y. Sibony, B. Liu, C. Simmonds, G. Meynet, and V. Bromm, Impact of Population III homogeneous stellar evolution on early cosmic reionisation, *Astroph. J.* **666**, A199 (2022), arXiv:2205.15125 [astro-ph.SR].
- [63] F. Navarete, P. Ticiani dos Santos, A. C. Carciofi, and A. L. Figueiredo, On the Origin of Fast-rotating Stars. I. Photometric Calibration and Results of AO-assisted BVRI+H α Imaging of NGC 330 with SAMI/SOAR, *Astrophys. J.* **970**, 113 (2024), arXiv:2405.12429 [astro-ph.GA].
- [64] S. Abe *et al.* (KamLAND), Limits on Astrophysical Antineutrinos with the KamLAND Experiment, *Astrophys. J.* **925**, 14 (2022), arXiv:2108.08527 [astro-ph.HE].
- [65] M. Agostini *et al.* (Borexino), Search for low-energy neutrinos from astrophysical sources with Borexino, *Astropart. Phys.* **125**, 102509 (2021), arXiv:1909.02422 [hep-ex].
- [66] B. Aharmim *et al.* (SNO), Electron antineutrino search at the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 093014 (2004), arXiv:hep-ex/0407029.
- [67] K. Abe *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande), Search for solar electron anti-neutrinos due to spin-flavor precession in the Sun with Super-Kamiokande-IV, *Astropart. Phys.* **139**, 102702 (2022), arXiv:2012.03807 [hep-ex].
- [68] A. Strumia and F. Vissani, Precise quasielastic neutrino/nucleon cross-section, *Phys. Lett. B* **564**, 42 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0302055.
- [69] G. Ricciardi, N. Vignaroli, and F. Vissani, An accurate evaluation of electron (anti-)neutrino scattering on nucleons, *JHEP* **08**, 212, arXiv:2206.05567 [hep-ph].
- [70] E. Akhmedov and P. Martínez-Miravé, Solar $\bar{\nu}_e$ flux: revisiting bounds on neutrino magnetic moments and solar magnetic field, *JHEP* **10**, 144, arXiv:2207.04516 [hep-ph].
- [71] C. Simpson (Super-Kamiokande), Physics Potential of Super-K Gd, PoS **ICHEP2018**, 008 (2019).
- [72] A. Abusleme *et al.* (JUNO), JUNO physics and detector, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **123**, 103927 (2022), arXiv:2104.02565 [hep-ex].
- [73] K. Abe *et al.* (Hyper-Kamiokande), Hyper-Kamiokande Design Report, (2018), arXiv:1805.04163 [physics.ins-det].
- [74] K. Abe *et al.* (Hyper-Kamiokande), Physics potentials with the second Hyper-Kamiokande detector in Korea, *PTEP* **2018**, 063C01 (2018), arXiv:1611.06118 [hep-ex].
- [75] B. Abi *et al.* (DUNE), Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE), Far Detector Technical Design Report, Volume II: DUNE Physics, (2020), arXiv:2002.03005 [hep-ex].
- [76] L. Marti *et al.*, Evaluation of gadolinium’s action on water Cherenkov detector systems with EGADS, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **959**, 163549 (2020), arXiv:1908.11532 [physics.ins-det].
- [77] Y.-F. Li, M. Vagins, and M. Wurm, Prospects for the Detection of the Diffuse Supernova Neutrino Background with the Experiments SK-Gd and JUNO, *Universe* **8**, 181 (2022), arXiv:2201.12920 [astro-ph.HE].
- [78] M. R. Stock (JUNO), Status and Prospects of the JUNO Experiment, in *17th International Workshop on Tau Lepton Physics* (2024) arXiv:2405.07321 [physics.ins-det].
- [79] A. Abusleme *et al.* (JUNO), Prospects for detecting the diffuse supernova neutrino background with JUNO, *JCAP* **10**, 033, arXiv:2205.08830 [hep-ex].
- [80] H. Kunxian, *Measurement of the Neutrino-Oxygen Neutral Current Quasi-elastic Interaction Cross-section by Observing Nuclear De-excitation γ -rays in the T2K Experiment*, Ph.D. thesis, Kyoto U. (2016).
- [81] Y. Ashida, *Measurement of Neutrino and Antineutrino Neutral-Current Quasielastic-like Interactions and Applications to Supernova Relic Neutrino Searches*, Ph.D. thesis, Kyoto U. (2020).
- [82] D. Maksimović, M. Nieslony, and M. Wurm, CNNs for enhanced background discrimination in DSNB searches in large-scale water-Gd detectors, *JCAP* **11** (11), 051, arXiv:2104.13426 [physics.ins-det].
- [83] P. Martínez-Miravé, I. Tamborra, and M. Tórtola, The Sun and core-collapse supernovae are leading probes of the neutrino lifetime, *JCAP* **05**, 002, arXiv:2402.00116 [astro-ph.HE].
- [84] J. M. M. Neustadt, C. S. Kochanek, K. Z. Stanek, C. Basinger, T. Jayasinghe, C. T. Garling, S. M. Adams, and J. Gerke, The search for failed supernovae with the Large Binocular Telescope: a new candidate and the failed SN fraction with 11 yr of data, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **508**, 516 (2021), arXiv:2104.03318 [astro-ph.SR].
- [85] C. Frohmaier *et al.*, From core collapse to superluminous: The rates of massive stellar explosions from the Palomar Transient Factory, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **500**, 5142 (2020), arXiv:2010.15270 [astro-ph.HE].
- [86] J. R. Gerke, C. S. Kochanek, and K. Z. Stanek, The search for failed supernovae with the Large Binocular Telescope: first candidates, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **450**, 3289 (2015), arXiv:1411.1761 [astro-ph.SR].
- [87] S. M. Adams, C. S. Kochanek, J. R. Gerke, and K. Z. Stanek, The search for failed supernovae with the Large Binocular Telescope: constraints from 7 yr of data, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **469**, 1445 (2017), arXiv:1610.02402 [astro-ph.SR].
- [88] A. Lien, B. D. Fields, and J. F. Beacom, Synoptic Sky Surveys and the Diffuse Supernova Neutrino Background: Removing Astrophysical Uncertainties and Revealing Invisible Supernovae, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 083001 (2010), arXiv:1001.3678 [astro-ph.CO].
- [89] B. Paxton, J. Schwab, E. B. Bauer, L. Bildsten, S. Blinnikov, P. Duffell, R. Farmer, J. A. Goldberg, P. Marchant, E. Sorokina, A. Thoul, R. H. D. Townsend, and F. X. Timmes, Modules for Experiments in Stellar Astrophysics (MESA): Convective Boundaries, Element Diffusion, and Massive Star Explosions, *Astrophysical*

- Journal, Supplement **234**, 34 (2018), arXiv:1710.08424 [astro-ph.SR].
- [90] S. Ekström, C. Georgy, P. Eggenberger, G. Meynet, N. Mowlavi, A. Wyttenbach, A. Granada, T. Decressin, R. Hirschi, U. Frischknecht, C. Charbonnel, and A. Maeder, Grids of stellar models with rotation. I. Models from 0.8 to 120 M_{\odot} at solar metallicity ($Z = 0.014$), *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **537**, A146 (2012), arXiv:1110.5049 [astro-ph.SR].
- [91] A. Heger, C. L. Fryer, S. E. Woosley, N. Langer, and D. H. Hartmann, How Massive Single Stars End Their Life, *Astrophysical Journal* **591**, 288 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0212469 [astro-ph].
- [92] A. Griffiths, M.-Á. Aloy, R. Hirschi, M. Reichert, M. Obergaulinger, E. E. Whitehead, S. Martinet, S. Ekström, and G. Meynet, Evolving massive stars to core collapse with GENEC: Extension of equation of state, opacities and effective nuclear network, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2408.03368 (2024), arXiv:2408.03368 [astro-ph.SR].
- [93] B. Müller, Supernova Simulations, (2024), arXiv:2403.18952 [astro-ph.HE].
- [94] A. Griffiths, P. Eggenberger, G. Meynet, F. Moyano, and M. Á. Aloy, The magneto-rotational instability in massive stars, *Astroph. J.* **665**, A147 (2022), arXiv:2204.00016 [astro-ph.SR].
- [95] L. Ma and J. Fuller, Angular momentum transport in massive stars and natal neutron star rotation rates, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **488**, 4338 (2019), arXiv:1907.03713 [astro-ph.SR].
- [96] A. Heger, S. E. Woosley, and H. C. Spruit, Presupernova evolution of differentially rotating massive stars including magnetic fields, *Astrophys. J.* **626**, 350 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0409422.