

The Meaning of Coherence in Weak Decay Processes: ‘Neutrino Oscillations’ Reconsidered

J.H.Field

*Département de Physique Nucléaire et Corpusculaire, Université de Genève
24, quai Ernest-Ansermet CH-1211Genève 4.
E-mail: john.field@cern.ch*

Abstract

A Feynman path integral analysis of a two-neutrino-flavour electron appearance experiment following pion decay at rest recovers the standard oscillation phase, revealing an important contribution from the decay amplitude of the pion as well as an error in previous similar calculations by the present author. In the calculation, path amplitudes for different neutrino mass eigenstates add coherently, but no putative ‘neutrino flavour eigenstates’ are invoked. It is shown that the coherent production of the latter states is incompatible with the measured values of $\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu)/\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu)$ and the PMNS matrix elements. Application of the path integral approach to other two-path quantum interference experiments is compared with that to neutrino oscillations, and other treatments of the latter in the literature are discussed.

PACS 03.65.Bz, 14.60.Pq, 14.60.Lm, 13.20.Cz

Keywords ; Quantum Mechanics, Neutrino Oscillations.

In the Standard Electroweak Model (SEM), the coupling of a charged lepton, ℓ_i , of generation i and a neutrino mass eigenstate ν_j , of generation j to the W-boson is proportional to ij th component of the leptonic charged current:

$$J_\mu(CC)^{lept} = \sum_{i,j} \bar{\psi}_{\ell_i} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) U_{ij} \psi_{\nu_j} \quad (1)$$

where U_{ij} is the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) [1, 2] charged lepton flavour/ neutrino mass mixing matrix. Table 1 shows an early estimate [3] of the elements of this matrix from experimental measurements of atmospheric and solar neutrino oscillations. The non-diagonal nature of this matrix gives evidence for strong violation of generation number (or lepton flavour) by $J_\mu(CC)^{lept}$. Conservation of generation number corresponds to a diagonal PMNS matrix with $\nu_1 = \nu_e$, $\nu_2 = \nu_\mu$ and $\nu_3 = \nu_\tau$. This is the conventional massless neutrino scenario. With massive neutrinos and a non-diagonal PMNS matrix the leptonic charged current (1) contains only the mass eigenstates ν_j of mass m_j so that in this case the ‘flavour eigenstates’: ‘ ν_e ’, ‘ ν_μ ’ and ‘ ν_τ ’ do not exist. That is, they do not appear in the amplitude for any physical process of the SEM.

An analysis of two-flavour neutrino oscillations, following pion decay at rest, within Feynman’s path integral formulation of quantum mechanics, is now presented. In this case, without loss of generality, the PMNS matrix elements are assumed to be real numbers. A close comparison with another two-path experiment, the Young double slit, in

j	1 (ν_1)	2 (ν_2)	3 (ν_3)
i			
1 (e)	0.79 ± 0.12	0.57 ± 0.16	0.1 ± 0.1
2 (μ)	-0.45 ± 0.25	0.49 ± 0.28	0.69 ± 0.18
3 (τ)	0.34 ± 0.29	-0.60 ± 0.23	0.67 ± 0.18

Table 1: Values of the MNS lepton flavour/neutrino mass mixing matrix U_{ij} as derived from solar and atmospheric neutrino oscillation data [3].

physical optics, will be made. This comparison will reveal an incorrect physical postulate in previous treatments [4, 5, 6] of neutrino oscillations by the present author. Following the sequential factorisation law [6] for constructing path amplitudes, each such amplitude in a two-flavour neutrino oscillation experiment or a two path experiment in photonic physical optics, will be the product of the following amplitudes:

- (i) The amplitude to produce the source particle.
- (ii) The decay amplitude of the source particle into a final state containing a neutrino mass eigenstate or a photon
- (iii) The space-time propagator of the neutrino or the photon.
- (iv) The amplitude of the process by which the neutrino or photon is detected.

The superposition principle for path amplitudes [7, 6] requires that if, and only if, the path amplitudes have the same initial and final states they must be added coherently, i.e. the amplitudes, not the modulus squared of the amplitudes, must be summed. This coherence condition is completely different to the hypothesis to be discussed below, that is the basis of ‘standard’ neutrino oscillation phenomenology that a ‘neutrino flavour eigenstate’ that is a superposition of neutrino mass eigenstates, is produced at some fixed time. The production amplitude in (i) is common to both path amplitudes and therefore contributes only an overall multiplicative factor to the oscillation probability or interference pattern. For the neutrino oscillation experiment, the initial state of the path amplitudes is that of the pion at the instant of its creation. The amplitude in (ii) is a function of the time interval, t_P , after the source particle is created, at which the decay occurs [8, 6]:

$$\langle f|i \rangle_{t_P} = \exp \left[-i \frac{(E_i - E_f)t_P}{\hbar} \right] \langle f|i \rangle_0 \quad (2)$$

where $\langle f|i \rangle_0$ and $\langle f|i \rangle_{t_P}$ are the transition amplitudes at time zero and t_P respectively. The suffix ‘P’ stands for ‘Production’ (of the neutrino or photon). In the formula (2) it is assumed that the lifetime of the source particle is much greater than the difference between the times-of-flight of the neutrinos or photons in the two paths. The source particle is produced at time zero in both path amplitudes. In the physical optics application of (2) E_i and E_f are the energies of atomic states and $E_i - E_f = E_\gamma$ where E_γ is the photon energy. The conceptual error in [4, 5, 6] and earlier versions of the present paper [10] was to replace the amplitude (ii) by the space-time propagator of the source particle. Since the same laws of physics should apply for both neutrino oscillations and physical optics this corresponds, in the latter case, to replacing E_γ by $M_i c^2$ where M_i is the mass of

the unstable source atom! The ‘photon wavelength’ governing interference effects would then be smaller by the factor $E_\gamma/(M_i c^2)$ as compared with the value in the classical wave theory of light [6] — evidently at variance with experiment.

Since the space-time propagator of a free particle has the phase: $(rp - Et)/\hbar$ [6], and for a photon $c = r/t = E/p$, the propagator phase vanishes [9] so that the path amplitude phase resides entirely in (ii) and is given by (2) with $E_i - E_f = E_\gamma$. For the case of neutrino oscillations (2) holds with $E_i - E_f = E_{\nu_j} \equiv E_j$, whereas the phase of the neutrino propagator is [4, 6]: $-m_j c^2 \tau_F / \hbar$ where τ_F is the time-of-flight of the neutrino in its rest frame.

The final state of both path amplitudes is that of the detection process described by the amplitude (iv).

Consider now production of the neutrino mass eigenstates ν_1 or ν_2 in the two-body decay at rest of a positively charged pion: $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_1$ or $\mu^+ \nu_2$. A ‘neutrino oscillation’ effect is manifested by detection of a neutrino via the processes: $(\nu_1, \nu_2)n \rightarrow e^- p$ at a fixed distance, L , from the source. In units with $\hbar = c = 1$ the path amplitude for the mass eigenstate ν_j is, up to a overall multiplicative constant [4, 6]:

$$A_{e\mu\pi}^j(t_P^j) = U_{ej} \langle e^- | \nu \rangle \exp \left[-i \frac{m_j^2 L}{p_j} \right] \exp \{ -i E_j t_P^j \} U_{\mu j} \langle \nu \mu^+ | \pi^+ \rangle \quad (3)$$

where the ‘reduced’ decay and scattering amplitudes $\langle \nu \mu^+ | \pi^+ \rangle$ and $\langle e^- | \nu \rangle$ are defined according to the relations:

$$\langle \nu_j \mu^+ | \pi^+ \rangle_0 \equiv U_{\mu j} \langle \nu \mu^+ | \pi^+ \rangle, \quad \langle e^- | \nu_j \rangle \equiv U_{ej} \langle e^- | \nu \rangle. \quad (4)$$

The amplitudes (ii)-(iv) are written as factors from right to left on the right side of (3). Extracting the the modulus and phase of the path amplitude in (3):

$$A_{e\mu\pi}^j(t_P^j) = U_{ej} U_{\mu j} |\langle e^- | \nu \rangle| |\langle \nu \mu^+ | \pi^+ \rangle| e^{i(\phi_j + \phi_0)} \equiv A_{e\mu\pi}^{0j} e^{i(\phi_j + \phi_0)} \quad (5)$$

where ϕ_0 is a possible flavour-independent phase associated with the amplitudes $\langle \nu \mu^+ | \pi^+ \rangle$ and $\langle e^- | \nu \rangle$ and

$$\phi_j = - \left(\frac{m_j^2 L}{p_j} + E_j t_P^j \right). \quad (6)$$

Quantum mechanical superposition of the path amplitudes [7, 6] gives, for the probability to detect an electron:

$$P_{e\mu\pi} = |A_{e\mu\pi}^1 + A_{e\mu\pi}^2|^2 = (A_{e\mu\pi}^{01})^2 + (A_{e\mu\pi}^{02})^2 + 2A_{e\mu\pi}^{01} A_{e\mu\pi}^{02} \cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2). \quad (7)$$

Introducing the neutrino production time difference: $2\Delta t_P$ and the mean neutrino production time \bar{t}_P :

$$\Delta t_P \equiv \frac{t_P^1 - t_P^2}{2}, \quad \bar{t}_P \equiv \frac{t_P^1 + t_P^2}{2} \quad (8)$$

enables the phase difference between the two path amplitudes to be written, using (6), as:

$$\Delta\phi_{12} \equiv \phi_1 - \phi_2 = \left(\frac{m_2^2}{p_2} - \frac{m_1^2}{p_1} \right) L - (E_1 + E_2)\Delta t_P + (E_2 - E_1)\bar{t}_P. \quad (9)$$

If t_f^1, t_f^2 are the times-of-flight of ν_1 and ν_2 between production and detection at the common time t_D then

$$t_D = t_P^1 + t_f^1 = t_P^2 + t_f^2 \quad (10)$$

so that

$$t_P^1 - t_P^2 = 2\Delta t_P = t_f^2 - t_f^1 \quad (11)$$

and since

$$t_f^j = \frac{L}{v_j} = \frac{E_j L}{p_j} \quad j = 1, 2 \quad (12)$$

it follows that

$$\Delta t_P = \frac{L}{2} \left(\frac{E_2}{p_2} - \frac{E_1}{p_1} \right). \quad (13)$$

Exact relativistic two-body kinematics of the decay process $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu_j$ gives:

$$E_j = \frac{m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2}{2m_\pi} + \frac{m_j^2}{2m_\pi} \equiv E_\nu + \frac{m_j^2}{2m_\pi} \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (14)$$

$$E_2 - E_1 = \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{2m_\pi}, \quad \Delta m_{21}^2 \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2. \quad (15)$$

Since

$$p_j = E_j - \frac{m_j^2}{2E_\nu} + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4) \quad (16)$$

(13) gives

$$\Delta t_P = \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{4E_\nu^2} + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4) \quad (17)$$

Combining (13)-(17) and (9) gives:

$$\Delta\phi_{12} = \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{2E_\nu} \left[L + \frac{E_\nu c\bar{t}_P}{E_\pi} \right] + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4) \quad (18)$$

where both terms in the square bracket are of dimension [L]. Inserting the values of the PMNS matrix elements in terms of the two-flavour mixing angle θ_{12} :

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_{e1} & U_{e2} \\ U_{\mu 1} & U_{\mu 2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_{12} & \sin\theta_{12} \\ -\sin\theta_{12} & \cos\theta_{12} \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

in (7) gives

$$P_{e\mu\pi} = (A_{e\mu\pi}^0)^2 \cos^2\theta_{12} \sin^2\theta_{12} (1 - \cos\Delta\phi_{12}) \quad (20)$$

where

$$A_{e\mu\pi}^0 \equiv |\langle e^- | \nu \rangle| |\langle \nu \mu^+ | \pi^+ \rangle|. \quad (21)$$

The maximum electron production rate occurs for $\Delta\phi_{12} \simeq \pi$, which, inserting the measured value [11] of $\Delta m_{21}^2 = 7.58 \times 10^{-5} \text{ (eV)}^2$ as well as $E_\nu = 29.8 \text{ MeV}$ requires that $L + E_\nu c\bar{t}_P / E_\pi = 490 \text{ km}$. Since $c\bar{t}_P \simeq c\tau_\pi = 7.8 \text{ m}$, the term in (18) containing the mean production time \bar{t}_P may be neglected for experimentally interesting values of $\Delta\phi_{12}$. Eq. (20) may then be written as:

$$P_{e\mu\pi} = (A_{e\mu\pi}^0)^2 \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{4E_\nu}. \quad (22)$$

Thus, contrary to assertions in previous papers [4, 5, 6] by the present author, correct application of the Feynman path integral formulation reproduces the standard formula $\Delta\phi_{12} = \Delta m_{21}^2 L / (2E_\nu)$ for the ‘vacuum oscillation’ phase difference.

The above calculation shows that there are two distinct contributions to the phase difference $\Delta\phi_{12}$ at leading order in the neutrino masses. The first, originating in the neutrino propagator, is the L -dependent term in (9) that gives the contribution:

$$\Delta\phi_{12}^\nu \equiv \left(\frac{m_2^2}{p_2} - \frac{m_1^2}{p_1} \right) L = \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{E_\nu} + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4). \quad (23)$$

The second, originating in the decay amplitude of the source pion is the Δt_P dependent term in (9):

$$\Delta\phi_{12}^\pi \equiv -(E_1 + E_2)\Delta t_P = -\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{2E_\nu} + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4). \quad (24)$$

The phase $\Delta\phi_{12}^\nu$ above, associated with neutrino propagation, was correctly given [4] in the seminal paper of Gribov and Pontecorvo [12] on neutrino oscillations.

How the factor two difference between $\Delta\phi_{12}^\nu$ and $\Delta\phi_{12}$ is obtained in the conventional ‘plane wave’ derivation of the latter phase difference, without any consideration of the contribution from the source particle decay amplitude, will now be explained [4]. A typical such derivation is to be found in the review article of Kayser in the 2008 ‘Review of Particle Properties’ [13]. There the interference phase difference is asserted to be:

$$\Delta\tilde{\phi}_{12}^\nu = (p_1 - p_2)L - (E_1 - E_2)t \quad (25)$$

which implies that the phases associated with the propagation of the eigenstates ν_1, ν_2 are:

$$\tilde{\phi}_1^\nu = p_1 L - E_1 t, \quad (26)$$

$$\tilde{\phi}_2^\nu = p_2 L - E_2 t. \quad (27)$$

In the case of pion decay at rest, discussed above, the path length is the same for both mass eigenstates. However, if the times-of-flight are also the same, as assumed in (26) and (27), then the velocities of the two eigenstates must be the same, which is physically impossible if the neutrinos have different masses. Allowing for different neutrino masses and times-of-flight requires that (26) and (27) are replaced by:

$$\phi_1^\nu = p_1 L - E_1 t_1 \quad (28)$$

$$\phi_2^\nu = p_2 L - E_2 t_2 \quad (29)$$

and (25) by

$$\Delta\phi_{12}^\nu = (p_1 - p_2)L - E_1 t_1 + E_2 t_2 \quad (30)$$

Retaining only the leading $\mathcal{O}(m_j^2)$ terms in (25) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\tilde{\phi}_{12}^\nu &= (p_1 - p_2)L - (E_1 - E_2)t \\ &= (p_1 - E_1 - p_2 + E_2)L + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4) \\ &= \left(-\frac{m_1^2}{2E_\nu} + \frac{m_2^2}{2E_\nu} \right) L + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4) \\ &= \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{2E_\nu} + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

while the same approximation in (30) gives [4]:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\phi_{12}^\nu &= \left[p_1 - \frac{E_1}{v_1} - p_2 + \frac{E_2}{v_2} \right] L = \left[-\frac{m_1^2}{p_1} + \frac{m_2^2}{p_2} \right] L \\ &= \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{E_\nu} + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4)\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

where the relations $L = vt$, $v = p/E$ and $m^2 = E^2 - p^2$ have been used. Writing (30) as

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\phi_{12}^\nu &= (p_1 - p_2)L + (E_1 + E_2)\Delta t - (E_1 - E_2)\bar{t} \\ &= (E_1 - E_2)L + \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{2E_\nu} + (E_1 + E_2)\Delta t - (E_1 - E_2)L + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4) \\ &= \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{2E_\nu} + (E_1 + E_2)\Delta t + \mathcal{O}(m_j^4)\end{aligned}\quad (33)$$

where $\Delta t \equiv (t_2 - t_1)/2$, $\bar{t} \equiv (t_2 + t_1)/2$, and comparing with (32) shows that the Δt -dependent term in (33), that is neglected in (25), gives a contribution equal to that of the first term. This is the explanation of the factor two difference between the neutrino propagator phase difference (32), correctly found by Gribov and Pontecorvo and the standard phase difference of (31). Omitting the Δt -dependent term of (33) has, fortuitously, the same effect as including the contribution of the pion decay amplitude of Eq. (24) in the Feynman path integral calculation.

The reason that the same flight time is assigned to both mass eigenstates in the calculation of Ref. [13] is the hypothesis that what is actually created in the pion decay process is a putative ‘neutrino flavour eigenstate’ with wavefunction ψ_{ν_μ} that is a linear superposition of the wavefunctions of the mass eigenstates:

$$\psi_{\nu_\mu} \equiv U_{\mu 1}\psi_{\nu_1} + U_{\mu 2}\psi_{\nu_2} + U_{\mu 3}\psi_{\nu_3}.\quad (34)$$

That is, the invariant amplitudes for the decays $\pi^+ \rightarrow \bar{\ell}\nu_\ell$, $\bar{\ell} = \mu^+, e^+, \tau^+$ are written as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}} = \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}} f_\pi m_\pi V_{ud} \bar{\psi}_{\bar{\ell}} (1 - \gamma_5) \psi_{\nu_\ell}, \quad \ell = \mu, e, \tau.\quad (35)$$

where V_{ij} is the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) [14] quark-flavour mixing matrix and G is the Fermi constant. On the assumption that all neutrino masses are much smaller than the pion mass, the amplitude in (35) may be written in terms of the corresponding ‘reduced amplitude’ $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0$ for a massless neutrino ν_0 :

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}} = \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0 [U_{\ell 1} + U_{\ell 2} + U_{\ell 3}], \quad \ell = \mu, e, \tau\quad (36)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0 = \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}} f_\pi m_\pi V_{ud} \bar{\psi}_{\bar{\ell}} (1 - \gamma_5) \psi_{\nu_0}.\quad (37)$$

Using (19), the amplitudes for decay μ^+ , e^+ are, from (36) [13]:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mu}} = \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0 [(\cos \theta_{12} - \sin \theta_{12}) \cos \theta_{23} + \sin \theta_{23}],\quad (38)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{e}} = \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0 (\cos \theta_{12} + \sin \theta_{12}).\quad (39)$$

where $\theta_{13} = 0$ has been assumed. It then follows that:

$$R_{e/\mu} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+\nu_e)}{\Gamma(\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu)} = \left(\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}\right)^2 \left[\frac{m_\pi^2 - m_e^2}{m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2}\right]^2 \left(\frac{\cos\theta_{12} + \sin\theta_{12}}{(\cos\theta_{12} - \sin\theta_{12})\cos\theta_{23} + \sin\theta_{23}}\right)^2. \quad (40)$$

Allowing for radiative corrections [15, 16] the world average experimental value $R_{e/\mu} = (1.230 \pm 0.004) \times 10^{-4}$ [17] leads to a constraint on the elements of the PMNS matrix:

$$\left(\frac{\cos\theta_{12} + \sin\theta_{12}}{(\cos\theta_{12} - \sin\theta_{12})\cos\theta_{23} + \sin\theta_{23}}\right)^2 = 0.9976 \pm 0.0032 \quad (41)$$

The measured values [18] $\sin\theta_{12} = 0.558 + 0.016 - 0.014$ and $\sin\theta_{23} = 0.648 + 0.059 - 0.024$ give the value 2.62 for the LHS of Eq. (41). It is clear, from these considerations, that the hypothesis that a coherent ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’ is produced in pion decay is experimentally excluded, with an enormous statistical significance, by the experimental measurements of $R_{e/\mu}$ and the PMNS matrix elements.

Giunti has claimed [19] that the argument just presented is flawed and that coherent ‘flavour eigenstates’ of massive neutrinos are produced in weak decay processes. To substantiate this claim it is suggested to define a ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’ not according to Eq. (34) above but by instead writing the pion decay amplitude as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^G = \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}\nu_1} U_{\ell 1} + \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}\nu_2} U_{\ell 2} + \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}\nu_3} U_{\ell 3} \quad (42)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}\nu_j}$ is the invariant amplitude to decay into the mass eigenstate ν_j :

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}\nu_j} = \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}} f_\pi m_\pi V_{ud} \bar{\psi}_{\bar{\ell}} (1 - \gamma_5) U_{\ell j} \psi_{\nu_j} \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0 U_{\ell j} \quad j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (43)$$

and where in the last member the kinematical effects of non-vanishing neutrino masses have been neglected. Combining (42) and (43) gives

$$\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^G = \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0 [|U_{\ell 1}|^2 + |U_{\ell 2}|^2 + |U_{\ell 3}|^2] = \mathcal{M}_{\bar{\ell}}^0 \quad (44)$$

where the unitarity of the PMNS matrix in the two-flavour sector has been invoked. Since the PMNS elements do not appear in Eq. (44), the prediction given by this equation for $R_{e/\mu}$ is the same as the text book massless neutrino result, which is in excellent agreement with experiment and provides no information on the values of the PMNS elements. However, since the amplitude (44) has no dependence on the values of these elements, so that, unlike the correct SEM amplitude (43), the neutrino mass eigenstates are absent, it does not predict neutrino oscillations following pion decay! This is experimentally excluded by the observation of 2-3 flavour oscillations in both atmospheric neutrinos [20] and the K2K [21] experiment. Actually, the ansatz of Eq. (42) which seems to have been constructed precisely to avoid the constraint provided by Eq. (40), is in contradiction with the correct SEM expression, (43), for the pion decay amplitude, which is linear, not quadratic, in the PMNS elements, and does contain the wavefunction of the mass eigenstate ν_j —a necessary consequence of the structure (1) of the leptonic charged current in the SEM.

The correct calculation of the pion decay rate assumes independent production of the *physically distinct* mass eigenstates ν_1 and ν_2 . Fundamentally, this is because the pion

decay process reflects different decay branching ratios of a (virtual) W-boson: $W \rightarrow \bar{\ell}\nu_1$, $W \rightarrow \bar{\ell}\nu_2$, which may be compared, for example, to those in the quark sector, described by the CKM matrix V_{ij} : $W \rightarrow u\bar{d}$, $W \rightarrow u\bar{s}$, corresponding to distinct ‘Cabbibo allowed’ and ‘Cabbibo suppressed’ transitions respectively. An analogue, in the quark sector, of the ‘lepton flavour neutrino eigenstate’ of (34) would be:

$$\psi_{dc} = V_{cd}\psi_d + V_{cs}\psi_s + V_{cb}\psi_b \quad (45)$$

which is a ‘charm flavour eigenstate of d-type quarks’ comparable to the ‘muon flavour eigenstate of neutrinos’ (34). The latter state has no more relevance for leptonic W-boson decays than (45) has to hadronic ones.

In the calculation of the pion decay width, the contributions of the different mass eigenstates given by the SEM amplitudes of Eq. (43) must be added *incoherently*:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+\nu) &\propto |\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mu}\nu_1}|^2 + |\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mu}\nu_2}|^2 + |\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mu}\nu_3}|^2 \\ &\simeq |\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mu}}^0|^2(|U_{\mu 1}|^2 + |U_{\mu 2}|^2 + |U_{\mu 3}|^2) = |\mathcal{M}_{\bar{\mu}}^0|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

This is in accordance with the quantum mechanical superposition principle [7, 6]. Since, unlike in the case of the final state in neutrino oscillation experiments, the neutrino mass eigenstates are distinct, the contributions of the corresponding decay amplitudes do not interfere. All dependence on the values of the PMNS element vanishes in (46) due to the unitarity constraint. Clearly, since decays into the different neutrino mass eigenstates are physically independent processes there is no reason to assume, as in Eq. (25), that the decays occur at the same time in the interfering path amplitudes. Indeed, it is essential, if the laws of space time geometry (i.e. the relation $L = vt_f$) are to be respected, that they occur at *different times* in these amplitudes when the ‘neutrino oscillation’ phenomenon occurs.

Although the incoherent nature of the production of the different neutrino mass eigenstates, as exemplified in Eq. (46) above, was pointed out more than thirty years ago by Shrock [22, 23], and the unphysical nature of coherent states of neutrinos of different mass was also discussed in the literature [24] the production of a coherent ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’ at a fixed time remains the basic assumption, in the literature, for the calculation of the phase of neutrino oscillations [13]. The assumption that all mass eigenstates are produced at the same time implicitly assumes equal velocities, since there is evidently a unique detection event at some well defined point in space-time. Still, in the derivation of the phase, the neutrino velocities, as defined by the kinematical relation: $v = p/E$ are assumed to be different. Thus contradictory hypotheses are made in space-time and in momentum space.

Examination of Eq. (20) shows that the mechanism that governs the value of $P_{e\mu\pi}$ is interference between the path amplitudes for different neutrino flavours. A small value of $P_{e\mu\pi}$ is not necessarily an indication of an approximate conservation of lepton flavour, but may be due to strong destructive interference between the different path amplitudes, independently of the values of the PMNS matrix elements.

The term $-\cos \Delta\phi_{12}$ in Eq. (20) originates in the interference of the path amplitudes corresponding to ν_1 and ν_2 . For small values of L , e^- production is suppressed by the almost complete destructive interference of these amplitudes, independently of the value of θ_{12} i.e. of the degree of non-conservation of lepton number. The destructive nature

of the interference is due to the minus sign multiplying $\sin \theta_{12}$ in the second row of the matrix on the RHS of Eq. (19). This, in turn, is a consequence of the unitarity of the PMNS matrix.

Indeed, nowhere in the description of the ‘ ν_e appearance’ experiment, described by Eq. (20) do ‘lepton flavour eigenstates’ occur, although such an experiment is typically referred to [13] as ‘ $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ flavour oscillation’. In fact, only the mass eigenstates ν_1, ν_2 appear in the amplitudes of the physical processes which interfere. It is the interference of these amplitudes in the production of the detection event that constitutes the phenomenon of ‘neutrino oscillations’; no temporal oscillations of ‘lepton flavour’ actually occur. Within each path amplitude the neutrino is in a definite mass eigenstate. The so-called ‘oscillation’ phenomenon is an attribute of the detection process where interference occurs between the different path amplitudes, each corresponding to a definite neutrino mass eigenstate, in the production of a charged lepton of definite flavour. Still the terms ‘ ν_e ’, ‘ ν_μ ’ and ‘ ν_τ ’ may still have a certain utility as mnemonics, even though they do not represent physical neutrino states for massive neutrinos. For example, it makes sense to refer to solar neutrinos, in a loose way, as a ‘ ν_e beam ’ since the different physical components are all created together with an electron. Similarly, atmospheric neutrinos are predominantly ‘ ν_μ ’, i.e., born together with a muon.

The different ingredients —the amplitudes (i)-(iv) above— that contribute to the path amplitudes in Feynman’s formulation of quantum mechanics, have all been experimentally verified in various two-path quantum interference experiments apart from neutrino oscillations. There is no reason to suppose that the laws of physics governing the latter should be any different than in neutrino oscillations.

The existence of the contribution (ii) —the decay amplitude of the unstable source particle— with time intervals t_f calculated according to exact space time geometry: $t_f = s/v$ where s is the path length and v the free-particle velocity, is verified by:

- All diffraction and interference experiments in photonic optics [9, 6]. In this case the entire interference phase originates in the decay amplitude, (ii), of the source, since, as shown above, the space-time propagator of the photon does not change the phase of the path amplitude.
- The quantum beat experiment [27, 5]. This experiment measures directly the phase variation of the decay amplitude given by Eq. (2) for excited atoms. A beam of atoms is excited into different states by interaction with a thin foil (Coulomb excitation) or a laser beam. A decay photon detected downstream may originate from different excited states. Interference of the corresponding path amplitudes gives a cosine term in the photon detection rate as a function of the distance d from the excitation foil with a phase:

$$\phi_{\text{beat}} = \frac{(E_\alpha^* - E_\beta^*)d}{\bar{v}_{\text{atom}}} \quad (47)$$

where E_α^* and E_β^* are the energies of two excited states and \bar{v}_{atom} is the average velocity of the atomic beam. This experiment is a direct test of the correctness of Eq. (2).

The contribution of the propagator of a massive particle, (iii), is demonstrated by

- The Young double slit experiment using electrons. In this case there is no coherent electron source. The detailed space-time analysis [6] shows that the interference

effect requires finite-width momentum wave packets, the observed interference wavelength corresponding to equal production times and different velocities in the two interfering path amplitudes. The interference phase thus originates entirely from the electron propagator in contrast to the double slit experiment with photons where only the source particle decay amplitude contributes. In both cases the Feynman path integral analysis predicts purely spatial classical wave theories with well defined momentum-dependent wavelengths, in the case that the lifetime of any coherent source is much greater than the difference between the times-of-flight in the two paths [6].

The combined effect, in the same experiment, of the amplitudes (ii) and (iii) is demonstrated by

- The photodetachment microscope [5, 28, 29, 30]. Here a coherent source of electrons of fixed energy is provided by a negative ion beam irradiated by a laser. The detached electron moves in a constant external electric field before detection. Just two classical trajectories link the point of emission to any point on a plane detector oriented perpendicularly to the electric field direction. Quantum interference effects are observed between the path amplitudes corresponding to the two trajectories. A good pedagogical description can be found in Ref. [30] where the appropriate path integral formula^a :

$$\psi(\vec{r}, t_f) = \int_{-\infty}^{t_f} \exp[-i\frac{\epsilon t_i}{\hbar}] \exp[i\frac{S_{cl}(\vec{r}, t_i, t_f)}{\hbar}] dt_i$$

is given.

In this formula ϵ is the energy of the detached electron and S_{cl} the classical action corresponding to an electron trajectory. Note particularly the time integral on the RHS of the equation. The first exponential function is the propagator of the coherent source (analogous to that of a coherent neutrino source) the second represents the propagator of the electron in the electric field. In practice it is well approximated by the contributions of the two classical trajectories mentioned above, corresponding to values of t_i with a fixed separation. These are the analogues of the propagators of different neutrino mass eigenstates. A typical value of the difference in t_i between the two trajectories, quoted in Ref. [30] is 160 psec for a time-of-flight of 117 nsec.

The laws of physics must be the same in all of the above ‘two path’ quantum mechanical experiments and in any neutrino oscillation experiment. In particular, the contribution of the source amplitude (ii) is essential for the derivation of the standard oscillation phase of Eq. (22) that has hitherto been obtained in a manner that does not respect Feynman’s formulation of the laws of quantum mechanics [7, 6], but that, fortuitously, obtains the same result as the calculation, presented above, that does.

In 2004 Giunti stated [32] four assumptions on which the ‘standard’ quantum mechanical treatment of neutrino oscillations is based. In conclusion, these assumptions are recalled and critically discussed in the light of the work presented above and that in Refs. [4, 5]. The assumptions are^b:

^aA similar formula was proposed for the neutrino oscillation problem by Pažma and Vanko [31]. The corresponding oscillation phase was not, however, derived.

^bGiunti’s notation for states is replaced by that of the present paper.

- (A1) Neutrinos are ultrarelativistic particles.
- (A2) Neutrinos produced or detected in charged-current weak interaction processes are described by the flavour states:

$$\psi_{\nu_\alpha} \equiv U_{\alpha 1}\psi_{\nu_1} + U_{\alpha 2}\psi_{\nu_2} + U_{\alpha 3}\psi_{\nu_3}. \quad (\text{G1}).$$

where $U_{\alpha k}$ is the unitary mixing matrix $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ and ψ_{ν_j} , ($j = 1, 2, 3$) is the state of a neutrino with mass m_j

- (A3) The propagation time T is equal to the source-detector distance L .
- (A4) The massive neutrino states ψ_{ν_j} in Eq. (G1) have the same momentum $p_j = p \simeq E$ (“equal momentum assumption”), and different energies:

$$E_j = \sqrt{p^2 + m_j^2} \simeq E + m_j^2/(2E)$$

where E is the neutrino energy neglecting mass effects and the approximations are valid for ultrarelativistic neutrinos.

The assumption (A1) is certainly a valid one given the experimental limits on the neutrino masses. In the path integral derivation the assumption (A2) is false and, if the SEM is correct, it is excluded by experimental measurements of $\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu)/\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu)$ and the PMNS matrix elements. The assumption (A3) implies that all neutrino mass eigenstates have the same velocity, c . This is physically impossible if relativistic kinematics correctly describes the decay processes and the mass eigenstates are non-degenerate. The existence of neutrino oscillations shows that the neutrinos are indeed non-degenerate. In his discussion of assumption (A3) Giunti invokes the presence of *ad hoc* Gaussian spatial wavepackets [26] following the suggestion of Kayser [25] in an attempt to evade the constraints of space-time geometry and relativistic kinematics that require the assumption (A3) to be false. A detailed critical discussion of wavepackets, both physical and modelled in a *ad hoc* manner may be found in Refs. [4, 5]. as well as in a debate [33, 34, 35, 36, 37] on the arXiv preprint server some seven years ago. The only physically-motivated wavepacket in pion decay is the momentum wavepacket that reflects the off-shell nature (finite-width distribution) of the mass of the decay muon. The associated damping effect on neutrino oscillations, calculated in Ref. [5], is found to be completely negligible. As shown in Section 2 of Ref. [4] modifying exact relativistic decay kinematics, as in assumption (A4) gives only $O(m_j^4)$ corrections to the oscillation phase. This holds whether equal momenta or equal energies are assumed. However, as demonstrated above, the equal velocity assumption (A3) changes the oscillation phase associated with neutrino propagation by a factor of two as compared to the value given by applying space-time geometry and exact relativistic kinematics. It is shown in Refs. [4, 5] that this conclusion is unchanged by the introduction of *ad hoc* Gaussian spatial wavepackets.

The assumptions (A2) and (A3) are correlated; if a ‘neutrino flavour eigenstate’ is produced at some fixed time then since the detection event also occurs at a unique time both neutrinos must have the same velocity. In (A3) it is further assumed that this common velocity is c . A necessary consequence of (A2) or (A3) is that no possible contribution to the interference phase from the decay amplitude (ii) of the source particle can occur. The application of the path integral method to other physical problems, summarised above, shows clearly the importance of the amplitude (ii) in all interference

experiments in physical optics of photons (but not for electrons [6]), quantum beats and the photodetachment microscope. The laws of quantum mechanics [7, 6] are not expected to change when they are applied to the description of neutrino oscillations, in the case that Giunti's assumption (A2) is false (as required by experiment), and neutrinos of different mass are created at different times in different interfering path amplitudes with the same initial and final states. This is a direct consequence of the generality of the superposition principle in Feynman's formulation of quantum mechanics [7, 6].

References

- [1] B.Pontecorvo,Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **53** 1717 (1967) [Sov. Phys. JETP **26** 984 (1968)]
- [2] Z.Maki, M.Nakagawa and S.Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28** 870 (1962)
- [3] M.C.Gonzalez-Garcia and Y.Nir, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75** 345 (2003)
- [4] J.H.Field, Eur. Phys. J. **C30** 305 (2003)
- [5] J.H.Field, Eur. Phys. J. **C37** 359 (2004)
- [6] J.H.Field, Ann. Phys. (NY) **321** 627 (2006)
- [7] R.P.Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **20** 367 (1948)
- [8] P.A.M.Dirac, The Principles of Quantum Mechanics, 4th Edition. (OUP, London 1958) Section 28, Eq. (20).
- [9] R.P.Feynman, QED, The Strange Theory of Light and Matter, (Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1985) Chapter 3 p.103.
- [10] J.H.Field, The Meaning of Coherence in Weak Decay Processes: ‘Neutrino Oscillations’ Reconsidered, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0503034v2>, Cited 21 Feb 2006
- [11] K.Eguchi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** 021802 (2003)
- [12] V.Gribov and B.Pontecorvo, Phys. Lett. **B28** 493 (1969)
- [13] B.Kayser, ‘Neutrino mass mixing and flavour change’ in Review of Particle Properties, Phys. Lett. **B667** 163(2008)
- [14] N.Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10** 531 (1963)
M.Kobayashi and T.Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49** 652 (1973).
- [15] W.Marciano and A.Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **36** 1425 (1976)
- [16] T.Goldman and W.Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D15** 709 (1977)
- [17] Review of Particle Properties, H.Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D66** 010001 (2002).
- [18] G.L.Fogli *et al.*, Evidence of $\theta_{13} > 0$ from global neutrino data analysis, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.6028>
- [19] C.Giunti, Coherence in Neutrino Oscillations, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0302045>
- [20] T.Kajita and Y.Totsuka, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73** 85 (2001)
- [21] M.H.Ahn *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** 041801 (2003)
- [22] R.E.Shrock, Phys. Lett. **B96** 159 (1980)
- [23] R.E.Shrock, Phys. Rev. **D24** 1232 (1981); **D24** 1275 (1981)
- [24] C.Giunti, C.W.Kim and U.W.Lee, Phys. Rev. **D45** 2414 (1992)
- [25] B.Kayser, Phys. Rev. **D24** 110 (1981)
- [26] C.Giunti, C.W.Kim and U.W.Lee, Phys. Rev. **D44** 3635 (1991)
- [27] H.G.Berry and J.L.Subtil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27** 1103 (1971)
- [28] C.Blondel, C.Delsart and F.Dulieu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 3755 (1996)
- [29] C.Bracher *et al.*, Am J. Phys. **66** 38 (1998)

- [30] C.Blondel, S.Berge and C.Delsart, Am J. Phys. **69** 810 (2001)
- [31] V.Pažma and J.Vanko, Alternative Theory of Neutrino Oscillations, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0311090>
- [32] C.Giunti, Theory of Neutrino Oscillations, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0409230>.
- [33] L.B.Okun *et al* A remark on the "Theory of neutrino oscillations", <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0312151>
- [34] C.Giunti, Reply to 'A remark on the "Theory of neutrino oscillations"', <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0312180>
- [35] J.H.Field, A comment on the paper 'Coherence in Neutrino Oscillations' by C.Giunti. Either lepton flavour eigenstates or neutrino oscillations do not exist, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0303241>
- [36] J.H.Field, On some erroneous comments on the literature of neutrino oscillations in the website 'Neutrino Unbound' of C.Giunti, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0306300>
- [37] J.H.Field, Remarks on: 'Theory of Neutrino Oscillations' (hep-ph/0311241) by C.Giunti, the comments by L.B.Okun et al in hep-ph/0312151, and Giunti's reply in hep-ph/0312180'. <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0401051>