

Distinguishing between Dirac and Majorana neutrinos using temporal correlations

Bhavya Soni^{§ a}, Sheeba Shafaq^{¶ b} and Poonam Mehta^{⋈ c}

[§] *Indian Institute of Technology, Jodhpur, Jodhpur 342037, India*

[¶] *508-Rose Enclave, Shivpora-B, Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir 190004, India*

[⋈] *School of Physical Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 110067, India*

Abstract

In the context of two flavour neutrino oscillations, it is understood that the 2×2 mixing matrix is parameterized by one angle and a Majorana phase. However, this phase does not impact the oscillation probabilities in vacuum or in matter with constant density. Interestingly, the Majorana phase becomes relevant when we describe neutrino oscillations along with neutrino decay. This is due to the fact that effective Hamiltonian has Hermitian and anti-Hermitian components which cannot be simultaneously diagonalized (resulting in decay eigenstates being different from the mass eigenstates). We consider the \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian describing two flavour neutrino case and study the violation of Leggett-Garg Inequalities (LGI) in this context for the first time. We demonstrate that temporal correlations in the form of LGI allow us to probe whether neutrinos are Dirac or Majorana. We elucidate the role played by the mixing and decay parameters on the extent of violation of LGI. We emphasize that for optimized choice of parameters, the difference in K_4 (K_3) for Dirac and Majorana case is $\sim 15\%$ ($\sim 10\%$).

^aEmail: soni.16@iitj.ac.in

^bEmail: sheebakhawaja7@gmail.com

^cEmail: pm@jnu.ac.in

1 Introduction

In a classic paper, Bender and Boettcher [1] (see also [2]) invoked a very insightful idea of \mathcal{PT} symmetry in non-Hermitian Hamiltonians and suggested that \mathcal{PT} symmetry led to the real and positive spectra, thereby replacing the condition of self-adjointness to ensure real eigenvalues. Their work has triggered a lot of work across diverse fields spanning optics to nuclear and particle physics. Using the simplest example of a two-level quantum system, the intricacies of the \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonians have been extensively studied in different contexts [3, 4] leading to useful insights.

It is well-known that the two flavor neutrino system is equivalent to a two state quantum system in the ultra-relativistic limit (for equal and fixed momenta of two neutrinos) [5]. The consequences of \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian in the context of two flavour neutrino oscillations have been widely investigated in the recent times. Ohlsson [6] developed an approach to extend the ordinary two flavour neutrino oscillation formalism in matter for the case non-Hermitian \mathcal{PT} symmetric effective Hamiltonian. Ohlsson and Zhou [7] calculated the transition probabilities for flavour eigenstates for two flavour neutrinos and discussed some implications of the \mathcal{PT} broken phase. Later the authors [8] developed the density matrix formalism for \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian open quantum systems in the presence of Lindblad decoherence. Chattopadhyay et al. [9] showed that the Hermitian and anti-Hermitian components of the effective two flavour Hamiltonian cannot be simultaneously diagonalized thereby resulting in decay eigenstates being different from the mass eigenstates. For two flavour neutrino oscillations, it is generally understood that the 2×2 mixing matrix is parameterized by one angle and a Majorana phase however this phase does not impact the oscillation probabilities in vacuum or in matter with constant density [5, 10, 11]. Following [9], Dixit et al. [12] showed that the Majorana phase in the mixing matrix can appear at the level of detection probabilities if proper treatment is carried out for the case of neutrino oscillations along with decay. Naumov et al. [13] considered non-Hermitian Hamiltonian for three neutrino case and obtained a relation between the neutrino oscillation parameters in vacuum and their counterparts in matter. The analytic treatment of neutrino oscillations and decay was carried out for the three flavour case in [14].

Quantum mechanics has been extremely successful however some concerns are raised while discussing the applicability of quantum mechanics to the macroscopic world. In 1935, Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (EPR) [15] questioned if the quantum mechanical description of the world is indeed complete. Later, in 1964, using the idea of local realism and spatially separated systems, Bell [16] introduced the famous Bell's inequalities which could allow for a distinction between classical and quantum correlations for such a system. Violation of Bell's inequality has been experimentally tested in different branches of physics. In turn, these tests allow us to examine the compatibility of local hidden variable theories with quantum mechanics. In a profound development, Leggett and Garg [17] (see [18] for a review) introduced the Leggett-Garg inequalities (LGI), which involve performing measurements on a single system at different points in time. This approach offers a distinct possibility to test the applicability of quantum mechanics as we go from microscopic to macroscopic world. Violation of LGI for non-Hermitian \mathcal{PT} -symmetric dynamics (via a sequence of dichotomic projective measurements which are carried out at different time intervals) has been studied in [19, 20].

Unlike their photonic counterparts, neutrinos exhibit quantum coherence over astronomical length scales. This makes neutrinos unique probes of foundational issues related to quantum mechanics and in particular, LGI. Violation of LGI was studied in the context of oscillations of neutral kaons and neutrinos [21,22]. The three flavour analysis was carried out assuming the stationarity condition [23] and relaxing it [24]. Certain other forms of LGI in subatomic systems have been studied in [25]. In fact, two neutrino experiments have demonstrated violation of LGI in their data at high level of significance. The Main Injector Neutrino Oscillation Search (MINOS) experiment was the first to report $\sim 6\sigma$ violation of LGI over a macroscopic length scale of 735 km [26]. Even though Bell's tests (or its temporal analogue) have been performed in different contexts, the MINOS experiment provided the longest ever distance over which such a test had been carried out. In the Daya Bay reactor experiment, $\sim 6\sigma$ violation of LGI was reported in the data [27]. Note that these tests were performed assuming two neutrino states only.

Neutrino oscillations in two and three flavours can be described in terms of qubits and qutrits used in quantum information theory [5, 11, 28] and entanglement in neutrino oscillations has been studied in [29–31]. Quantum studies of neutrinos have been implemented on IBMQ processors [32]. No signaling in time has also been studied in the context of neutrino oscillations [33]. There are some other measures to examine coherence in neutrino oscillations such as contextuality [34], l_1 norm of coherence [35], entropic uncertainty relations [36], quantum spread complexity [37] and quantum mismatch [38]. Tools of quantum resource theory [39, 40] have also been used to quantify the quantumness of neutrino oscillations. Impact of new physics such as non-standard interactions [35, 41–43] and damping effects [44, 45] on quantum correlations in neutrino oscillations have also been studied.

That neutrinos, being electrically neutral, could possibly be of Majorana type was proposed in 1937 [46] (see [47, 48] for a review). Majorana's insightful idea has triggered extensive theoretical and experimental work. The smoking gun signal could come from the so-called neutrinoless double β -decay process which violates lepton number by two units and is proportional to the Majorana mass of the neutrino. Several laboratories around the world host experiments to detect neutrinoless double β -decay, with no success so far [49].

In the present work, we investigate the violation of LGI in the context of non-Hermitian \mathcal{PT} symmetric two flavour neutrino system. We demonstrate that we can probe the nature of neutrinos (*i.e.*, Dirac or Majorana character) via the extent of violation of LGI. As far as leptonic mixing is concerned, there is only one Majorana phase [10, 47] in the two flavour scenario. For three (or more) flavours, we can have one (or more) Dirac-type phases and two (or more) Majorana phases¹. We elucidate the role played by the mixing and decay parameters on the extent of violation of LGI. For certain favourable choice of parameters and examining the dependence on the Majorana phase, we show that we can discriminate between Dirac and Majorana case.

This article is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we describe the framework of \mathcal{PT} -symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian in the context of two flavour neutrino oscillations. In Sec. 3, we present our results on LGI violation. Finally, we conclude in Sec. 4.

¹For N generations of leptons, there are $(N - 1)(N - 2)/2$ Dirac phases and $(N - 1)$ Majorana phases.

2 Framework

2.1 Two flavour neutrino oscillations with Hermitian Hamiltonian

A general 2×2 unitary mixing matrix can be expressed as [10]

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta e^{i\omega_1} & \sin \theta e^{i(\omega_1 + \phi)} \\ -\sin \theta e^{i(\omega_2 - \phi)} & \cos \theta e^{i\omega_2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

We note that U is parameterized by one angle and three phases. It is possible to rephase the two Dirac charged-lepton fields (without affecting the kinetic and mass Lagrangians as well as Lagrangians of other interactions to which charged leptons take part) and eliminate two of these phases. However, it is not possible to rephase the Majorana field as Majorana mass term is not invariant under rephasing of the field. Thus, one of the phases remains physical and is referred to as the ‘‘Majorana phase’’ [46] (see also [50–52]).

Now to address the question of observability of the Majorana phase, let us rephase the charged-lepton fields as ² $e_L(x) \rightarrow e^{i\omega_1} e_L(x)$ and $\mu_L(x) \rightarrow e^{i(\omega_2 - \phi)} \mu_L(x)$.

This leads to the following form of the mixing matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta e^{i\phi} \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix} = R(\theta)D(\phi), \quad (2)$$

where the Majorana phase ϕ has been factorized as a diagonal matrix $D(\phi) = \text{diag}(1, e^{i\phi})$ on the right side of the mixing matrix. While there were some claims that Majorana phase may be observable in neutrino oscillation experiments (with an initial beam described by superposition of flavors [53]), it is clear that the Majorana phase can not appear at the level of oscillation probabilities in the context of two flavour neutrino oscillations [10].

We can qualify this statement further for a generalized situation. It is known that neutrino mixing and neutrino decay can be described by non-Hermitian quantum dynamics. In this scenario, it is possible to visualize the effects of the Majorana phase at the level of detection probabilities. The main reason is as follows. The mass eigenstates and decay eigenstates are not the same [9] and therefore if the decay term in the Hamiltonian has off-diagonal entries, we can get a unique opportunity to see the effect of Majorana phase through detection probabilities of neutrinos [12].

2.2 Two flavour neutrino oscillations with decay and PT symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonians

A general non-Hermitian Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} can be expressed as $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_+ + \mathcal{H}_-$ with $\mathcal{H}_\pm = (\mathcal{H} \pm \mathcal{H}^\dagger)/2$ with \mathcal{H}_+ being Hermitian and \mathcal{H}_- being anti-Hermitian, respectively. For decay, \mathcal{H} is usually written on the Weisskopf-Wigner form [54],

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{M} - i\Gamma/2, \quad (3)$$

²This choice is not unique and we refer the reader to [10] for details.

where the Hermitian matrices \mathcal{M} and $\Gamma/2$ have the form

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma/2 = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & \frac{1}{2}\eta e^{i\xi} \\ \frac{1}{2}\eta e^{-i\xi} & b_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where a_i, b_i, η and ξ are real with $a_2 - a_1 = \Delta m^2/2E$. Note that $\Delta m^2 = m_2^2 - m_1^2$ denotes the mass-squared difference between the two states and E is the energy of the neutrinos. Since Γ is positive semidefinite, it follows that $b_i \geq 0$ and $\eta^2 \leq 4b_1b_2$. We consider $b_1 = b_2 = b$ to make second matrix \mathcal{PT} symmetric. We assume $\eta \ll |a_2 - a_1|$ for sake of simplicity. If Γ is diagonal (*i.e.*, $\eta = 0$), the decay eigenbasis is the same as the mass eigenbasis and the Majorana phase ϕ disappears from neutrino evolution equations. But, if Γ is non-diagonal (*i.e.*, $\eta \neq 0$) the mass eigenstates are not the same as decay eigenstates (*i.e.*, σ_z and Γ do not commute). As a consequence, Majorana phase appears at the level of oscillation probabilities as shown in [12]. We would like to remark that a complex non-Hermitian Hamiltonian can also be realised when absorption effects play a role giving rise to complex indices of refraction [55].

The Hamiltonian can be expressed as [12]

$$\mathcal{H} = \left[\frac{(a_1 + a_2)}{2} \sigma_0 - \frac{(a_2 - a_1)}{2} \sigma_z - \frac{i}{2} \left((b_1 + b_2) \sigma_0 + \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\Gamma} \right) \right], \quad (5)$$

where $\vec{\Gamma} = [\eta \cos \xi, -\eta \sin \xi, -(b_2 - b_1)]$. This clearly shows that $[\mathcal{H}, \Gamma] \neq 0$.

The oscillation probabilities for the case of neutrino oscillation and decay are

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e\mu} &= e^{-2bt} [P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}} + 2\eta \sin(\xi - \phi) \mathcal{B}], \\ P_{\mu e} &= e^{-2bt} [P_{\mu e}^{\text{vac}} - 2\eta \sin(\xi - \phi) \mathcal{B}], \\ P_{ee} &= e^{-2bt} [P_{ee}^{\text{vac}} - \eta \cos(\xi - \phi) \mathcal{A}], \\ P_{\mu\mu} &= e^{-2bt} [P_{\mu\mu}^{\text{vac}} + \eta \cos(\xi - \phi) \mathcal{A}]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where, \mathcal{A} are \mathcal{B} given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \frac{\sin(2\theta) \sin[(a_2 - a_1)t]}{(a_2 - a_1)}, \\ \mathcal{B} &= \frac{\sin(2\theta) \sin^2 \left[\frac{1}{2}(a_2 - a_1)t \right]}{(a_2 - a_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The vacuum probability expressions are

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mu e}^{\text{vac}} &= \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m^2 L}{4E} \right) \equiv P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}, \\ P_{ee}^{\text{vac}} &= 1 - P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}} \equiv P_{\mu\mu}^{\text{vac}}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where, L is the distance traveled by neutrinos. For antineutrinos, $\xi \rightarrow -\xi$ and $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ in Eq. 6. For standard oscillations and in absence of decay, $P_{\mu e}^{\text{vac}} = P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}$ and $P_{ee}^{\text{vac}} = P_{\mu\mu}^{\text{vac}}$.




Figure 1: Oscillation probability (Eq. 6) is plotted as a function of energy for a fixed baseline of $L = 1300$ km. The different panels correspond to (a) \mathcal{CP} violation due to ϕ (top left), (b) \mathcal{CP} violation due to decay, ξ (top right), (c) \mathcal{T} violation (bottom left) and (d) survival probabilities for the different flavours (bottom right). Note that $\Delta m^2 = 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, $\theta = 45^\circ$, $b = 10^{-4} \text{ eV}^2$, $\eta = 10^{-4} \text{ eV}^2$, $\xi = \pi/5$, $\phi = \pi/4$.

This implies that \mathcal{CP} , \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{CPT} are conserved in vacuum. However, in presence of decay, this no longer holds. Eq. 6 implies that both \mathcal{CP} is violated ($P_{\bar{e}\mu} \neq P_{e\mu}$) and \mathcal{T} is violated ($P_{\mu e} \neq P_{e\mu}$) but \mathcal{CPT} is conserved *i.e.*, $P_{\bar{\mu}\bar{e}} = P_{e\mu}$, $P_{\bar{e}\bar{e}} = P_{ee}$, $P_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\mu}} = P_{\mu\mu}$. There are two ways in which \mathcal{CP} and \mathcal{T} could be violated in presence of decay (with off-diagonal decay terms, $\eta \neq 0$):

- (a) $\phi \neq 0$ and $\xi = 0$ (Majorana phase induced),
- (b) $\xi \neq 0$ and $\phi = 0$ (decay induced).

We note that the presence of off-diagonal term in the decay matrix plays a crucial role in revealing the dependence of the Majorana phase ϕ at the level of probabilities. By setting the off-diagonal terms in the decay matrix to zero, *i.e.*, $\eta = 0$ in Eq. 6, we recover the Dirac case (*i.e.*, \mathcal{CP} and \mathcal{T} are conserved) as described in [44].

In Fig. 1, we plot the probability as a function of energy for a fixed baseline of 1300 km. This baseline corresponds to an upcoming long baseline experiment based on Liquid Argon Time Projection Chamber (LArTPC) detector technology such as Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE) [56]. The top panel depicts the probability for the \mathcal{CP} conjugate

channels for contribution coming from off-diagonal decay term (right) or due to Majorana nature of neutrinos (left). For comparison, the vacuum probability is also shown. The bottom panel shows the probability for \mathcal{T} conjugate channels on the left and electron neutrino and muon neutrino survival probabilities on the right. It is evident from Fig. 1 that \mathcal{CP} (and \mathcal{T}) could be violated either due to the off-diagonal term in the decay matrix or due to the Majorana phase. Further, the survival probabilities are flavour-dependent and not the same, as is expected from Eq. 6.

2.3 Leggett-Garg Inequalities and two flavour neutrino system

Our intuition about the macroscopic world can be cast in terms of two principles which form the basis of LGI [17] (for a review, see [18])

- (a) Macroscopic realism (MR) which implies that the measurement process reveals a well-defined pre-existing value.
- (b) Non-invasive measurability (NIM) which states that we can measure this value without disturbing the system.

These two assumptions are respected in the classical world. But, quantum mechanics is based on superposition principle and collapse of wave function under measurement which implies that these assumptions do not hold.

The problem of two flavour neutrino oscillations can be mapped onto a two-level quantum system in the ultra-relativistic approximation [5]. Once this mapping is clear, we can use our understanding of a general two-level quantum system which has been widely studied in the context of LGI. For such a quantum system, the correlators are given by the symmetrized combination [18, 57]

$$C_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{\hat{Q}_i, \hat{Q}_j\} \rangle, \quad (9)$$

where Q_i represents a dichotomic observable (*i.e.*, takes values $+1$ or -1) defined over the Hilbert space of a given two-level quantum system. For the simplest of LGI, three sets of runs are carried out experimentally to measure the two-time correlation function C_{ij} . We can parameterize the qubit operators as $\hat{Q}_i = \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ where $\vec{\sigma}$ is the vector of Pauli matrices, \vec{a}_i is a unit vector. Using the identity, $(\vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma})(\vec{a}_j \cdot \vec{\sigma}) = \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{a}_j + i(\vec{a}_i \times \vec{a}_j) \cdot \vec{\sigma}$, and the fact that the vectors \vec{a}_i all lie in a plane, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \{\hat{Q}_i, \hat{Q}_j\} \rangle = \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{a}_j. \quad (10)$$

For the n^{th} order LGI parameter, we can write

$$K_n = \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} C_{m,m+1} - C_{1,n}. \quad (11)$$

We can express this K_n as

$$\begin{aligned} K_n &= \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \vec{a}_m \cdot \vec{a}_{m+1} - \vec{a}_1 \cdot \vec{a}_n \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \cos \theta_m - \left(\cos \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \theta_m \right), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where θ_m is the angle between \vec{a}_m and \vec{a}_{m+1} and the angle between any pair of \vec{a}_i and \vec{a}_j are equal i.e., $\theta_{ij} \equiv \theta_m$. We can write generalised version of LGI as follows

$$\begin{aligned} -n \leq K_n \leq n-2 & \quad n \geq 3, \text{ odd} \\ -(n-2) \leq K_n \leq n-2 & \quad n \geq 4, \text{ even} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

For a qubit, we can maximise K_n by setting all angles, $\theta_m = \pi/n$ and obtain

$$K_n^{max} = n \cos \frac{\pi}{n}. \quad (14)$$

It follows that

$$K_3^{max} = \frac{3}{2} \quad ; \quad K_4^{max} = 2\sqrt{2} \quad ; \quad K_5^{max} = \frac{5}{4}(1 + \sqrt{5}) \quad ; \quad K_6^{max} = 3\sqrt{3}. \quad (15)$$

These correspond to the Luder's bound or temporal Tsirelson bound [58–60]. C_{ij} can be expressed in terms of joint probabilities [18]

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{\hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j = \pm 1} \hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j \mathbb{P}_{\hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j}(t_i, t_j), \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j}(t_i, t_j)$ is the joint probability of obtaining the results \hat{Q}_i and \hat{Q}_j from successive measurements at times t_i and t_j respectively. Considering a muon neutrino $|\nu_\mu\rangle$ on which measurements are made at times t_i , the two flavour case, the C_{12} [21] can be written as

$$C_{12} = \mathbb{P}_{\nu_e \nu_e}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{P}_{\nu_e \nu_\mu}(t_1, t_2) - \mathbb{P}_{\nu_\mu \nu_e}(t_1, t_2) + \mathbb{P}_{\nu_\mu \nu_\mu}(t_1, t_2), \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\alpha \nu_\beta}(t_1, t_2) = P_{\mu\alpha}(t_1)P_{\alpha\beta}(\Delta t)$ is the joint probability of obtaining neutrino in state $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ at time t_1 and in state $|\nu_\beta\rangle$ at time t_2 . This approach has been extended to three-flavour neutrino oscillation in Ref. [22].

The correlation function for the standard two flavour neutrino oscillations is (for details, see [26, 41, 44])

$$C_{ij} = 1 - 2 \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \psi_{ij}, \quad (18)$$

where θ is the mixing angle in vacuum and ψ_{ij} is given by

$$\psi_{ij} = \frac{\Delta m^2}{4E}(t_j - t_i). \quad (19)$$




Figure 2: K_3 and K_4 plotted as a function of ΔL for standard two flavour neutrino oscillations. The shaded regions represent quantum regime. Here, $\Delta m^2 = 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, $\theta = 45^\circ$ and $E = 50 \text{ MeV}$.

Assuming equal time intervals, *i.e.*, $t_{m+1} - t_m = \tau$ (which corresponds to the stationarity condition), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 K_3 &= 1 - 2 \sin^2 2\theta \left[2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m^2 \tau}{4E} - \sin^2 \frac{2\Delta m^2 \tau}{4E} \right], \\
 K_4 &= 2 - 2 \sin^2 2\theta \left[3 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m^2 \tau}{4E} - \sin^2 \frac{3\Delta m^2 \tau}{4E} \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

In the ultra-relativistic limit, we can replace τ by $\Delta L = L_i - L_j$, where L_i and L_j are the fixed distances from the neutrino source where the measurements occur.

In Fig. 2, We depict K_3 and K_4 as a function of ΔL for standard two flavour neutrino oscillations. It can be noted that K_3 and K_4 (see Eq. 20) exceed their respective classical bounds (Eq. 13) however they respect the maximum upper bounds (Eq. 15). Next, we will study the impact of neutrino decay on two flavour neutrino oscillations and its implications for LGI.

3 Non-Hermitian neutrino Hamiltonian and implications for LGI - role of the Majorana phase

Using the prescription to compute LGI parameter (Eq. 17) for the case of \mathcal{PT} symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonian given by Eq. 6, we get the following

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_{12} &= e^{-2b(L+\Delta L)} \left[1 + x [\mathcal{A}(L) + \mathcal{A}(\Delta L)] - 2x [\mathcal{A}(L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(\Delta L) + \mathcal{A}(\Delta L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(L)] \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \mp 2y[\mathcal{B}(L) - \mathcal{B}(\Delta L)] - 2P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(\Delta L) \right], \\
 C_{23} &= e^{-2b(L+2\Delta L)} \left[1 + x[\mathcal{A}(\Delta L) + \mathcal{A}(L + \Delta L)] - 2x[\mathcal{A}(\Delta L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(L + \Delta L) \right.
 \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: K_3 plotted as function of ΔL for the case of Dirac and Majorana neutrinos. K_3 depends on neutrinos or anti-neutrinos for the Majorana case (Eq. 21). The left and right plots are for two different ranges of ΔL to show the effects clearly. In the inset (shown in the right panel), K_3 is plotted as function of ΔL near the location of the peak at around $\Delta L = 100$ km. The parameter values are taken to be the same as those given in the caption of Fig. 1.




Figure 4: Same as Fig. 3 but for K_4 .

$$\begin{aligned}
& +\mathcal{A}(L + \Delta L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(\Delta L)] \mp 2y[\mathcal{B}(L + \Delta L) - \mathcal{B}(\Delta L)] - 2P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(\Delta L) \Big], \\
C_{34} &= e^{-2b(L+3\Delta L)} \left[1 + x[\mathcal{A}(\Delta L) + \mathcal{A}(L + 2\Delta L)] - 2x[\mathcal{A}(\Delta L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(L + 2\Delta L) \right. \\
& \left. + \mathcal{A}(L + 2\Delta L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(\Delta L)] \mp 2y[\mathcal{B}(L + 2\Delta L) - \mathcal{B}(\Delta L)] - 2P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(\Delta L) \right], \\
C_{13} &= e^{-2b(L+2\Delta L)} \left[1 + x[\mathcal{A}(2\Delta L) + \mathcal{A}(L)] - 2x[\mathcal{A}(2\Delta L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(L) + \mathcal{A}(L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(2\Delta L)] \right. \\
& \left. \mp 2y[\mathcal{B}(L) - \mathcal{B}(2\Delta L)] - 2P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(2\Delta L) \right], \\
C_{14} &= e^{-2b(L+3\Delta L)} \left[1 + x[\mathcal{A}(3\Delta L) + \mathcal{A}(L)] - 2x[\mathcal{A}(3\Delta L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(L) + \mathcal{A}(L)P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(3\Delta L)] \right.
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 5: Parameter dependence on K_4 is shown as a function of ΔL . Here, ΔL varies between 0 – 500 km and $E = 50$ MeV. The parameter values are taken to be the same as those given in the caption of Fig. 1.

$$\mp 2y[\mathcal{B}(L) - \mathcal{B}(3\Delta L)] - 2P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}(3\Delta L)]. \quad (21)$$

Here, $x = \eta \cos(\xi - \phi)$, $y = \eta \sin(\xi - \phi)$, values of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are given by Eq. 7 and value of $P_{e\mu}^{\text{vac}}$ is given in Eq. 8. In the above equations, the upper sign ($-$) is for neutrinos and lower sign ($+$) is for anti-neutrinos. Since η is very small, we neglect terms of $\mathcal{O}(\eta^2)$ to make our expressions more compact [12]. The corresponding expressions for K_3 and K_4 can be computed using the prescription given in Eq. 11. In order to obtain the corresponding expression for Dirac neutrinos, we put $\eta = 0$ in Eq. 21. We note that we recover the expressions for K_3 and K_4 given in Ref. [44] in this case.

In Fig. 3, K_3 plotted as function of ΔL for the case of Dirac and Majorana neutrinos. As can be seen, K_3 depends on neutrinos or anti-neutrinos for the Majorana case (Eq. 21). The left and right plots are for two different ranges of ΔL (the right plot is a zoomed in version




Figure 6: The dependence of K_4 on ΔL (left) and E (right) is depicted in this figure. The parameter values are taken to be the same as those given in the caption of Fig. 1.

of the left plot) to demonstrate the effects clearly. In the inset (shown in the right panel), K_3 is plotted as function of ΔL near the location of the peak at around $\Delta L = 100$ km.

Fig. 4 depicts the behaviour of the LGI parameter K_4 plotted as function of ΔL . The dependence of K_4 on different parameters is shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. In Fig. 5, K_4 is plotted as function of ΔL for different values of decay parameters (b , η , ξ), Majorana Phase (ϕ) and the mixing angle (θ). In Fig. 6, K_4 is plotted as a function of energy for different values of ΔL (left) and ΔL for different values of E (right). From Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, we can deduce the following parameters that maximize K_4 . These are: $\theta = 45^\circ$, $b = 10^{-22}$ GeV², $\eta = 10^{-22}$ GeV², $\xi = \pi/5$, $\phi = \pi/4$ and $E = 50$ MeV.

In order to quantify the distinction between Dirac and Majorana case, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K_n &= K_n^{\nu,M} - K_n^{\nu,D}, \\ \Delta \bar{K}_n &= K_n^{\nu,M} - \bar{K}_n^{\nu,D},\end{aligned}\tag{22}$$

where $K_n^{\nu,M}$ ($\bar{K}_n^{\nu,M}$) corresponds to Majorana neutrino case (Majorana anti-neutrino case) and $K_n^{\nu,D}$ corresponds to the Dirac case. We plot ΔK_3 and ΔK_4 as a function of ΔL (left panel) and the Majorana phase ϕ (right panel) in Fig 7. The dependence on the Majorana phase ϕ is guided by oscillatory terms involving $(\xi - \phi)$ and in general, we do not expect symmetric behaviour about $\phi = 0$.

Interestingly, we find that $|\Delta K_3| \sim 10\%$ and $|\Delta K_4| \sim 15\%$ thereby implying that K_4 allows for a better distinction between Dirac and Majorana cases for favourable choice of parameters. This particular trend is generally true for anti-neutrinos as well. To understand why this is the case, we plot individual contributions of ΔC_{ij} s in Fig. 8. It can be seen that (i) there is a large contribution coming from C_{23} which appears in K_4 with a plus sign, and (ii) the contribution of C_{13} is larger than C_{14} . As both appear with a minus sign in K_3 and K_4 respectively, it naturally makes K_3 smaller than K_4 . These two effects collectively give ΔK_4 an advantage over ΔK_3 when it is used for distinguishing Dirac and Majorana cases.




Figure 7: ΔK_3 and ΔK_4 plotted as function of ΔL (left) and ϕ (right). The parameter values are taken to be the same as those given in the caption of Fig. 1 and we have taken $\Delta L = 100$ km in the right panel.

4 Conclusion

Study of temporal correlations in the form of LGI has attracted significant attention in recent times both in the context of two and three flavour neutrino oscillations [21–27, 41–43]. It should be noted that while different dichotomic observables have been employed in these studies, the dynamics was restricted to be Hermitian in these studies.

It is believed that Majorana phase appearing in the two flavour neutrino mixing matrix can not have any effect on the neutrino oscillation probabilities [10]. It should be noted that this holds as long as the dynamics is Hermitian. However, if we replace the condition of self-adjointness by enforcing \mathcal{PT} symmetry, then the above claim does not hold. One possible way to realize non-Hermitian \mathcal{PT} symmetric Hamiltonian is to incorporate neutrino decay along with neutrino oscillation. In order that the Majorana phase appears in two flavour oscillation probability, it is essential that off-diagonal terms in the decay matrix are non-zero [12]. For the scenario of neutrino oscillation and decay in vacuum (with off-diagonal terms in the decay matrix), we explore the violation LGI and show that it is possible to discriminate between Dirac and Majorana neutrinos. If the decay matrix is diagonal as considered in [44], the Majorana phase ceases to play a role at the level of probability, as expected.

Presently, we do not know if neutrinos are Dirac or Majorana particles [46] and in future




Figure 8: ΔC_{ij} plotted as function of ΔL (left) and Majorana phase, ϕ (right). Similar pattern of ΔC_{ij} is seen for anti-neutrinos.

neutrinoless double β -decay process is expected to provide conclusive evidence. Moreover, exploring effects of CP violation due to Majorana phase is quite challenging [61]. Complementing the results of neutrinoless double β -decay experiments, several interesting proposals have emerged that could potentially allow us to probe the nature of neutrinos as well as CP violating effects due to Majorana phases using cosmological probes [62] or ideas of geometric phases and quantum decoherence [63–66]. Richter et al. [45] considered quantum decoherence in the density matrix formalism along with matter effects and proposed that LGI could be used as a probe of the nature of neutrinos i.e., whether they are of Dirac-type or Majorana-type. The claim was based on the assumption that matter effects played a role and the off-diagonal terms in the decoherence matrix were non-zero. Recently, King et al [67] have used the spectrum of gravitational waves to probe the nature of neutrinos.

With the goal of probing the nature of neutrinos, in the present work, we consider a scenario in which we exploit the non-Hermiticity of the Hamiltonian (by invoking decay with neutrino oscillations) and show that even in vacuum, with non-zero off-diagonal terms in the decay matrix, it is possible to distinguish Dirac and Majorana cases by studying the extent of violation of LGI. We quantify this in terms of ΔK_3 and ΔK_4 (Eq. 22) and find that $|\Delta K_3| \sim 10\%$ and $|\Delta K_4| \sim 15\%$ which means that K_4 allows for a better discrimination between Dirac and Majorana case for favourable choice of parameters.

Acknowledgements

BS would like to thank PM for the warm hospitality during her visits to JNU, New Delhi. BS acknowledges Sabila Parveen for discussions and help with Gnuplot software. PM would like to thank Dibya Chattopadhyay and Amol Dighe for discussions. The work of PM is partially supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No 690575 and 674896.

References

- [1] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, “Real spectra in nonHermitian Hamiltonians having PT symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 80, pp. 5243–5246, 1998.
- [2] C. M. Bender, “Making sense of non-Hermitian Hamiltonians,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, vol. 70, p. 947, 2007.
- [3] C. M. Bender, M. V. Berry, and A. Mandilara, “Generalized PT symmetry and real spectra,” *J. Phys. A*, vol. 35, p. L467, 2002.
- [4] M. Berry, “Physics of nonhermitian degeneracies,” *Czechoslovak Journal of Physics*, vol. 54, pp. 1039–1047, 2004.
- [5] P. Mehta, “Topological phase in two flavor neutrino oscillations,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 79, p. 096013, 2009.
- [6] T. Ohlsson, “Non-Hermitian neutrino oscillations in matter with PT symmetric Hamiltonians,” *EPL*, vol. 113, no. 6, p. 61001, 2016.
- [7] T. Ohlsson and S. Zhou, “Transition Probabilities in the Two-Level Quantum System with PT-Symmetric Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians,” *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 61, no. 5, p. 052104, 2020.
- [8] T. Ohlsson and S. Zhou, “Density Matrix Formalism for PT-Symmetric Non-Hermitian Hamiltonians with the Lindblad Equation,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 103, no. 2, p. 022218, 2021.
- [9] D. S. Chattopadhyay, K. Chakraborty, A. Dighe, S. Goswami, and S. M. Lakshmi, “Neutrino Propagation When Mass Eigenstates and Decay Eigenstates Mismatch,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 129, no. 1, p. 011802, 2022.
- [10] C. Giunti, “No Effect of Majorana Phases in Neutrino Oscillations,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 686, pp. 41–43, 2010.
- [11] P. Mehta, “Geometric imprint of CP violation in two flavor neutrino oscillations,” 7 2009.
- [12] K. Dixit, A. K. Pradhan, and S. U. Sankar, “CP violation due to a Majorana phase in two flavor neutrino oscillations with decays,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 107, no. 1, p. 013002, 2023.
- [13] D. V. Naumov, V. A. Naumov, and D. S. Shkirmanov, “Rephasing Invariant for Three-Neutrino Oscillations Governed by a Non-Hermitian Hamiltonian,” *Symmetry*, vol. 12, no. 8, p. 1285, 2020.
- [14] D. S. Chattopadhyay, K. Chakraborty, A. Dighe, and S. Goswami, “Analytic treatment of 3-flavor neutrino oscillation and decay in matter,” *JHEP*, vol. 01, p. 051, 2023.
- [15] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, “Can quantum mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 47, pp. 777–780, 1935.
- [16] J. S. Bell, “On the Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 38, pp. 447–452, 1966.
- [17] A. J. Leggett and A. Garg, “Quantum mechanics versus macroscopic realism: Is the flux there when nobody looks?,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 54, pp. 857–860, 1985.
- [18] C. Emary, N. Lambert, and F. Nori, “Leggett–garg inequalities,” *Reports on Progress in Physics*, vol. 77, no. 1, p. 016001, 2013.
- [19] H. S. Karthik, A. Shenoy Hejamadi, and A. R. U. Devi, “Leggett-Garg inequalities and temporal correlations for a qubit under PT -symmetric dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 103, no. 3, p. 032420, 2021.
- [20] A. V. Varma, I. Mohanty, and S. Das, “Temporal correlation beyond quantum bounds in non-hermitian pt-symmetric dynamics of a two level system,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 54, no. 11, p. 115301, 2021.
- [21] D. Gangopadhyay, D. Home, and A. S. Roy, “Probing the Leggett-Garg Inequality for Oscillating Neutral Kaons and Neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 88, no. 2, p. 022115, 2013.

- [22] D. Gangopadhyay and A. S. Roy, “Three-flavoured neutrino oscillations and the Leggett–Garg inequality,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 77, no. 4, p. 260, 2017.
- [23] J. Naikoo, A. K. Alok, S. Banerjee, S. Uma Sankar, G. Guarnieri, C. Schultze, and B. C. Hiesmayr, “A quantum information theoretic quantity sensitive to the neutrino mass-hierarchy,” *Nucl. Phys. B*, vol. 951, p. 114872, 2020.
- [24] J. Naikoo, A. Kumar Alok, S. Banerjee, and S. Uma Sankar, “Leggett-Garg inequality in the context of three flavour neutrino oscillation,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 99, no. 9, p. 095001, 2019.
- [25] J. Naikoo, S. Kumari, S. Banerjee, and A. K. Pan, “Probing inequivalent forms of Leggett–Garg inequality in subatomic systems,” *J. Phys. G*, vol. 47, no. 9, p. 095004, 2020.
- [26] J. A. Formaggio, D. I. Kaiser, M. M. Murskyj, and T. E. Weiss, “Violation of the Leggett-Garg Inequality in Neutrino Oscillations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 117, no. 5, p. 050402, 2016.
- [27] Q. Fu and X. Chen, “Testing violation of the Leggett–Garg-type inequality in neutrino oscillations of the Daya Bay experiment,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 77, no. 11, p. 775, 2017.
- [28] A. K. Jha, A. Chatla, and B. A. Bambah, “Neutrinos as Qubits and Qutrits,” 3 2022.
- [29] A. Kumar Jha, S. Mukherjee, and B. A. Bambah, “Tri-Partite entanglement in Neutrino Oscillations,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*, vol. 36, no. 09, p. 2150056, 2021.
- [30] P. Siwach, A. M. Suliga, and A. B. Balantekin, “Entanglement in three-flavor collective neutrino oscillations,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 107, no. 2, p. 023019, 2023.
- [31] M. M. Etefaghi and Z. A. Ravari, “Quantum coherence and entanglement in neutral-current neutrino oscillation in matter,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 83, no. 5, p. 417, 2023.
- [32] A. K. Jha and A. Chatla, “Quantum studies of neutrinos on IBMQ processors,” *Eur. Phys. J. ST*, vol. 231, no. 2, pp. 141–149, 2022.
- [33] M. Blasone, F. Illuminati, L. Petruzzello, K. Simonov, and L. Smaldone, “No-signaling-in-time as a condition for macrorealism: the case of neutrino oscillations,” 11 2022.
- [34] M. Richter-Laskowska, M. Łobejko, and J. Dajka, “Quantum contextuality of a single neutrino under interactions with matter,” *New J. Phys.*, vol. 20, no. 6, p. 063040, 2018.
- [35] K. Dixit and A. Kumar Alok, “New physics effects on quantum coherence in neutrino oscillations,” *Eur. Phys. J. Plus*, vol. 136, no. 3, p. 334, 2021.
- [36] D. Wang, F. Ming, X.-K. Song, L. Ye, and J.-L. Chen, “Entropic uncertainty relation in neutrino oscillations,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 80, no. 8, p. 800, 2020.
- [37] K. Dixit, S. S. Haque, and S. Razaque, “Quantum Spread Complexity in Neutrino Oscillations,” 5 2023.
- [38] D. S. Chattopadhyay and A. Dighe, “Quantum mismatch: a powerful measure of ”quantumness” in neutrino oscillations,” 4 2023.
- [39] X.-K. Song, Y. Huang, J. Ling, and M.-H. Yung, “Quantifying Quantum Coherence in Experimentally-Observed Neutrino Oscillations,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 98, no. 5, p. 050302, 2018.
- [40] F. Ming, X.-K. Song, J. Ling, L. Ye, and D. Wang, “Quantification of quantumness in neutrino oscillations,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 80, no. 3, p. 275, 2020.
- [41] S. Shafaq and P. Mehta, “Enhanced violation of Leggett–Garg inequality in three flavour neutrino oscillations via non-standard interactions,” *J. Phys. G*, vol. 48, no. 8, p. 085002, 2021.
- [42] T. Sarkar and K. Dixit, “Effects of nonstandard interaction on temporal and spatial correlations in neutrino oscillations,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 81, no. 1, p. 88, 2021.
- [43] B. Yadav, T. Sarkar, K. Dixit, and A. K. Alok, “Can NSI affect non-local correlations in neutrino oscillations?,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 82, p. 446, 2022.

- [44] S. Shafaq, T. Kushwaha, and P. Mehta, “Investigating Leggett-Garg inequality in neutrino oscillations – role of decoherence and decay,” 12 2021.
- [45] M. Richter, B. Dzierwit, and J. Dajka, “Leggett-Garg K_3 quantity discriminates between Dirac and Majorana neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 96, no. 7, p. 076008, 2017.
- [46] E. Majorana, *A Symmetric Theory of Electrons and Positrons*, pp. 113–128. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [47] P. B. Pal, “Dirac, Majorana and Weyl fermions,” *Am. J. Phys.*, vol. 79, pp. 485–498, 2011.
- [48] S. M. Bilenky, “Neutrinos: Majorana or Dirac?,” *Universe*, vol. 6, no. 9, p. 134, 2020.
- [49] M. J. Dolinski, A. W. P. Poon, and W. Rodejohann, “Neutrinoless Double-Beta Decay: Status and Prospects,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, vol. 69, pp. 219–251, 2019.
- [50] S. M. Bilenky, J. Hosek, and S. T. Petcov, “On Oscillations of Neutrinos with Dirac and Majorana Masses,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 94, pp. 495–498, 1980.
- [51] M. Doi, T. Kotani, H. Nishiura, K. Okuda, and E. Takasugi, “CP Violation in Majorana Neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 102, pp. 323–326, 1981.
- [52] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino Oscillation Thought Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 23, p. 1666, 1981.
- [53] R. Adhikari and P. B. Pal, “Neutrino oscillation with flavor non-eigenstates and CP-violating Majorana phases,” 12 2009.
- [54] R. A. Bertlmann, W. Grimus, and B. C. Hiesmayr, “An Open-quantum-system formulation of particle decay,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 73, p. 054101, 2006.
- [55] V. A. Naumov, “High-energy neutrino oscillations in absorbing matter,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 529, pp. 199–211, 2002.
- [56] B. Abi *et al.*, “Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE), Far Detector Technical Design Report, Volume II: DUNE Physics,” 2 2020.
- [57] T. Fritz, “Quantum correlations in the temporal clausner–horne–shimony–holt (chsh) scenario,” *New Journal of Physics*, vol. 12, p. 083055, aug 2010.
- [58] B. S. Cirelson, “QUANTUM GENERALIZATIONS OF BELL’S INEQUALITY,” *Lett. Math. Phys.*, vol. 4, pp. 93–100, 1980.
- [59] C. Budroni, T. Moroder, M. Kleinmann, and O. Gühne, “Bounding temporal quantum correlations.,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 111 2, p. 020403, 2013.
- [60] C. Budroni and C. Emary, “Temporal quantum correlations and leggett-garg inequalities in multilevel systems,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 113, no. 5, p. 050401, 2014.
- [61] A. de Gouvea, B. Kayser, and R. N. Mohapatra, “Manifest CP Violation from Majorana Phases,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 67, p. 053004, 2003.
- [62] B. Hernandez-Molinero, R. Jimenez, and C. Pena-Garay, “Distinguishing Dirac vs. Majorana neutrinos: a cosmological probe,” *JCAP*, vol. 08, no. 08, p. 038, 2022.
- [63] J. Dajka, J. Syska, and J. Luczka, “Geometric phase of neutrino propagating through dissipative matter,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 83, p. 097302, 2011.
- [64] A. Capolupo, S. M. Giampaolo, and G. Lambiase, “Decoherence in neutrino oscillations, neutrino nature and CPT violation,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 792, pp. 298–303, 2019.
- [65] L. Buoninfante, A. Capolupo, S. M. Giampaolo, and G. Lambiase, “Revealing neutrino nature and CPT violation with decoherence effects,” *Eur. Phys. J. C*, vol. 80, no. 11, p. 1009, 2020.
- [66] A. Capolupo, S. M. Giampaolo, G. Lambiase, and A. Quaranta, “Discerning the Nature of Neutrinos: Decoherence and Geometric Phases,” *Universe*, vol. 6, no. 11, p. 207, 2020.
- [67] S. F. King, D. Marfatia, and M. H. Rahat, “Towards distinguishing Dirac from Majorana neutrino mass with gravitational waves,” 6 2023.