

On flavor violation for massive and mixed neutrinos

M. Blasone ^a, A. Capolupo ^a, C.R. Ji^b and G. Vitiello ^a

^aDipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Salerno and Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Gruppo Collegato di Salerno, 84100 Salerno, Italy,

^bDepartment of Physics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8202, USA

We discuss flavor charges and states for interacting mixed neutrinos in QFT. We show that the Pontecorvo states are not eigenstates of the flavor charges. This implies that their use in describing the flavor neutrinos produces a violation of lepton charge conservation in the production/detection vertices. The flavor states defined as eigenstates of the flavor charges give the correct representation of mixed neutrinos in charged current weak interaction processes.

In this report we analyze the definition of the flavor charges in the canonical formalism for interacting (Dirac) neutrinos with mixing. On this basis, we study the flavor states for mixed neutrinos in the QFT formalism [1]-[7] and in the Pontecorvo formalism [8]-[11]. We show that Pontecorvo mixed states are not eigenstates of the neutrino flavor charges and we estimate how much the leptonic charge is violated on these states.

A realistic description of flavor neutrinos starts by taking into account the (charged current) weak interaction processes in which they are created, together with their charged lepton counterparts. In the Standard Model, flavor is strictly conserved in the production and detection vertices of such interactions. The flavor violations are due only to loop corrections and are thus expected to be extremely small [12]. Therefore, we define the flavor neutrino states as eigenstates of flavor charges. This is obtained in a QFT treatment where the flavor charges are defined in the usual way from the symmetry properties of the neutrino Lagrangian.

Here we consider the decay process $W^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e$ and we study the case where the neutrino mixing is present. We consider for simplicity the case of two generations. After spontaneous symmetry breaking, the relevant terms of the Lagrangian density for charged current weak inter-

action are $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_{int}$, where the free lepton Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_0

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 = & (\bar{\nu}_e, \bar{\nu}_\mu) (i\gamma_\mu \partial^\mu - M_\nu) \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \end{pmatrix} \\ & + (\bar{e}, \bar{\mu}) (i\gamma_\mu \partial^\mu - M_l) \begin{pmatrix} e \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

includes the neutrino non-diagonal mass matrix M_ν and the mass matrix of charged leptons M_l :

$$M_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} m_{\nu_e} & m_{\nu_{e\mu}} \\ m_{\nu_{e\mu}} & m_{\nu_\mu} \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_l = \begin{pmatrix} m_e & 0 \\ 0 & m_\mu \end{pmatrix}.$$

\mathcal{L}_{int} is the interaction Lagrangian given by [13]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{int} = & \frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}} \left[W_\mu^+(x) \bar{\nu}_e(x) \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5) e(x) \right. \\ & \left. + W_\mu^+(x) \bar{\nu}_\mu(x) \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5) \mu(x) + h.c. \right]. \end{aligned}$$

\mathcal{L} is invariant under the global phase transformations:

$$e(x) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} e(x), \quad \nu_e(x) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \nu_e(x), \quad (2)$$

together with

$$\mu(x) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \mu(x), \quad \nu_\mu(x) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \nu_\mu(x). \quad (3)$$

These are generated by the charges $Q_e(t)$, $Q_{\nu_e}(t)$, $Q_\mu(t)$ and $Q_{\nu_\mu}(t)$ respectively, where

$$Q_{\nu_e}(t) = \int d^3\mathbf{x} \nu_e^\dagger(x) \nu_e(x), \quad (4)$$

$$Q_{\nu_\mu}(t) = \int d^3\mathbf{x} \nu_\mu^\dagger(x) \nu_\mu(x). \quad (5)$$

Similar expressions hold for Q_e , Q_μ . The invariance of the Lagrangian is then expressed by $[Q_i^{tot}, \mathcal{L}(x)] = 0$, which guarantees the conservation of total lepton number. Here, Q_i^{tot} is the total Noether (flavor) charge:

$$Q_i^{tot} = Q_{\nu_e}(t) + Q_{\nu_\mu}(t) + Q_e(t) + Q_\mu(t) \quad (6)$$

Note that the presence of the mixed neutrino mass term, i.e. the non-diagonal mass matrix M_ν , prevents the invariance of the Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_0 under the separate phase transformations (2) and (3). Consequently, Q_{ν_e} and Q_{ν_μ} are time dependent. However, family lepton numbers are still good quantum numbers if the neutrino production/detection vertex can be localized within a region much smaller than the region where flavor oscillations take place. This is what happens in practice, since typically the spatial extension of the neutrino source/detector is much smaller than the neutrino oscillation length.

We now proceed to define the flavor states as eigenstates of the flavor charges Q_{ν_e} and Q_{ν_μ} . Till now, our considerations have been essentially classical. In order to define the eigenstates of the above charges, we quantize the fields with definite masses as usual. Then, the normal ordered charge operators for free neutrinos ν_1, ν_2 are

$$\begin{aligned} :Q_{\nu_i}: &\equiv \int d^3\mathbf{x} : \nu_i^\dagger(x) \nu_i(x) : \\ &= \sum_r \int d^3\mathbf{k} \left(\alpha_{\mathbf{k},i}^{r\dagger} \alpha_{\mathbf{k},i}^r - \beta_{-\mathbf{k},i}^{r\dagger} \beta_{-\mathbf{k},i}^r \right), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $i = 1, 2$ and $:\dots:$ denotes normal ordering with respect to the vacuum $|0\rangle_{1,2}$. The neutrino states with definite masses defined as

$$|\nu_{\mathbf{k},i}^r\rangle = \alpha_{\mathbf{k},i}^{r\dagger} |0\rangle_{1,2}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (8)$$

are then eigenstates of Q_{ν_1} and Q_{ν_2} , which can be identified with the lepton charges of neutrinos in the absence of mixing.

The situation is more delicate when the mixing is present. In such a case, the flavor neutrino states have to be defined as the eigenstates of the flavor charges $Q_{\nu_\sigma}(t)$ (at a given time). The relation between the flavor charges in the presence of mixing and those in the absence of mixing is

given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\nu_e}(t) &= \cos^2 \theta Q_{\nu_1} + \sin^2 \theta Q_{\nu_2} \\ &+ \sin \theta \cos \theta \int d^3\mathbf{x} \left[\nu_1^\dagger(x) \nu_2(x) + \nu_2^\dagger(x) \nu_1(x) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and similarly for $Q_{\nu_\mu}(t)$. Notice that the presence of the last term in Eq.(9) forbids the construction of eigenstates of the $Q_{\nu_\sigma}(t)$, $\sigma = e, \mu$, in the Hilbert space for free fields $\mathcal{H}_{1,2}$.

The normal ordered flavor charge operators for mixed neutrinos are then written as

$$\begin{aligned} :Q_{\nu_\sigma}(t) : &\equiv \int d^3\mathbf{x} : \nu_\sigma^\dagger(x) \nu_\sigma(x) : \\ &= \sum_r \int d^3\mathbf{k} \left(\alpha_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^{r\dagger}(t) \alpha_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^r(t) - \beta_{-\mathbf{k},\sigma}^{r\dagger}(t) \beta_{-\mathbf{k},\sigma}^r(t) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\sigma = e, \mu$, and $:\dots:$ denotes normal ordering with respect to the flavor vacuum $|0\rangle_{e,\mu}$, the vacuum for the Hilbert spaces of interacting fields $\mathcal{H}_{e,\mu}$. At finite volume it is given by: $|0(t)\rangle_{e,\mu} = G_\theta^{-1}(t) |0\rangle_{1,2}$, where $G_\theta(t)$ is the mixing generator. Indeed, the mixing transformations can be written as $\nu_\sigma^\alpha(x) = G_\theta^{-1}(t) \nu_i^\alpha(x) G_\theta(t)$, where $(\sigma, i) = (e, 1), (\mu, 2)$. In a similar way, flavor annihilators, relative to the fields $\nu_\sigma(x)$ at each time are expressed as: $\alpha_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^r(t) = G_\theta^{-1}(t) \alpha_{\mathbf{k},i}^r(t) G_\theta(t)$, $\beta_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^r(t) = G_\theta^{-1}(t) \beta_{\mathbf{k},i}^r(t) G_\theta(t)$, where $\alpha_{\mathbf{k},i}^r$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k},i}^r$, $i = 1, 2$, $r = 1, 2$ are the annihilation operators for $|0\rangle_{1,2}$.

Eq.(10) shows that the flavor charges are diagonal in the flavor annihilation/creation operators. Note that $:Q_{\nu_\sigma}(t) := G_\theta^{-1}(t) :Q_{\nu_j} : G_\theta(t)$, with $(\sigma, j) = (e, 1), (\mu, 2)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} :Q_{\nu} : &= :Q_{\nu_e}(t) : + :Q_{\nu_\mu}(t) : \\ &= :Q_{\nu_1} : + :Q_{\nu_2} : = :Q_{\nu} : . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The flavor states are defined as eigenstates of the flavor charges Q_{ν_σ} at a reference time $t = 0$:

$$|\nu_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^r\rangle \equiv \alpha_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^{r\dagger}(0) |0(0)\rangle_{e,\mu}, \quad \sigma = e, \mu. \quad (12)$$

Let us turn now to the Pontecorvo states [8]-[11]

$$|\nu_{\mathbf{k},e}^r\rangle_P = \cos \theta |\nu_{\mathbf{k},1}^r\rangle + \sin \theta |\nu_{\mathbf{k},2}^r\rangle, \quad (13)$$

$$|\nu_{\mathbf{k},\mu}^r\rangle_P = -\sin \theta |\nu_{\mathbf{k},1}^r\rangle + \cos \theta |\nu_{\mathbf{k},2}^r\rangle. \quad (14)$$

They are clearly *not* eigenstates of the flavor charges [7] as can be seen from Eqs.(9) and (10). In order to estimate how much the lepton charge is violated in the usual quantum mechanical states, we consider the expectation values of the flavor charges on the Pontecorvo states. We obtain, for the electron neutrino charge,

$${}_P\langle\nu_{\mathbf{k},e}^r|::Q_{\nu_e}(0)::|\nu_{\mathbf{k},e}^r\rangle_P = \cos^4\theta + \sin^4\theta + 2|U_{\mathbf{k}}|\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta + \sum_r \int d^3\mathbf{k}, \quad (15)$$

where $|U_{\mathbf{k}}| \equiv u_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r\dagger}u_{\mathbf{k},2}^r = v_{-\mathbf{k},1}^{r\dagger}v_{-\mathbf{k},2}^r$ and

$${}_{1,2}\langle 0|::Q_{\nu_e}(0)::|0\rangle_{1,2} = \sum_r \int d^3\mathbf{k}. \quad (16)$$

The infinities in Eqs.(15) and (16) may be removed by considering the expectation values of $:Q_{\nu_\sigma}(t):$, i.e. the normal ordered flavor charges with respect to the mass vacuum $|0\rangle_{1,2}$. Then,

$${}_{1,2}\langle 0|:Q_{\nu_e}(0):|0\rangle_{1,2} = 0. \quad (17)$$

However, [7]

$${}_P\langle\nu_{\mathbf{k},e}^r|:Q_{\nu_e}(0):|\nu_{\mathbf{k},e}^r\rangle_P = \cos^4\theta + \sin^4\theta + 2|U_{\mathbf{k}}|\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta < 1, \quad (18)$$

$${}_P\langle\nu_{\mathbf{k},e}^r|:Q_{\nu_\mu}(0):|\nu_{\mathbf{k},e}^r\rangle_P = 2\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta \times (1 - |U_{\mathbf{k}}|) > 0, \quad (19)$$

for any $\theta \neq 0$, $m_1 \neq m_2$, $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$.

In conclusion, the correct flavor states describing the neutrino oscillations must be those defined in Eq.(12).

We also note that similar results about flavor violation for massive neutrinos have been recently discussed in Ref.[14], although from a different point of view.

REFERENCES

1. M. Blasone and G. Vitiello, *Annals Phys.* **244**, 283 (1995); M. Blasone, P. A. Henning and G. Vitiello, *Phys. Lett. B* **451** 140 (1999),
2. M. Blasone, A. Capolupo, O. Romei and G. Vitiello, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 125015 (2001); A. Capolupo, C. R. Ji, Y. Mishchenko and G. Vitiello, *Phys. Lett. B* **594**, 135 (2004).
3. C. R. Ji and Y. Mishchenko, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 076004 (2001); *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 096015 (2002); *Annals Phys.* **315**, 488 (2005).
4. M. Blasone, A. Capolupo and G. Vitiello, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 025033 (2002).
5. A. Capolupo, Ph.D. Thesis [hep-th/0408228].
6. A. Capolupo, S. Capozziello and G. Vitiello, *Phys. Lett. A* **363**, 53 (2007); hep-th/0809.0085; *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* (2008) in press, hep-th/0705.0319; M. Blasone, A. Capolupo, S. Capozziello, S. Carloni and G. Vitiello, *Phys. Lett. A* **323**, 182 (2004); M. Blasone, A. Capolupo, S. Capozziello and G. Vitiello, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **588**, 272 (2008).
7. M. Blasone, A. Capolupo, F. Terranova and G. Vitiello, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 013003 (2005); M. Blasone, A. Capolupo and G. Vitiello, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **36**, 3245 (2005).
8. B. Pontecorvo, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **6**, 429 (1957) [*Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **33**, 549].
9. V. N. Gribov and B. Pontecorvo, *Phys. Lett. B* **28**, 493 (1969).
10. R. N. Mohapatra and P. B. Pal, World Sci. Lect. Notes Phys. **41**, 1 (1991); J.N. Bahcall, "Neutrino Astrophysics", Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, (1989).
11. M. Beuthe, *Phys. Rept.* **375** 105 (2003).
12. J. A. Casas and A. Ibarra, *Nucl. Phys. B* **618**, 171 (2001).
13. Eidelman S et al., (Particle Data Group) *Phys. Lett. B* **592**, 1 (2004).
14. C. C. Nishi, hep-ph/0810.2812.