

Possible explanation of not observing ultra-high energy cosmic neutrinos

J. Rembieliński, J. Ciborowski

October 5, 2023

Abstract

Assuming that neutrinos are spacelike (tachyonic) fermions, we calculate width for the kinematically allowed, lepton number conserving, three-body decay $\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \nu_\beta \bar{\nu}_\beta$ in the Standard Model. Decays of tachyonic neutrinos over cosmological distances can lead to a reduction of the neutrino flux in the high-energy end of the spectrum. We estimate upper limits on the spacelike neutrino mass based on the PeV-energy cosmological neutrino events observed in the IceCube experiment. These limits are close to those deduced from the measurements of m_ν^2 in the tritium-decay experiment KATRIN.

Keywords: neutrino astronomy, cosmic neutrinos, extragalactic sources, tachyonic neutrinos, neutrino decays

1 Introduction

In the past decade a significant effort has been spent on the study of high energy astrophysical neutrinos, customarily classified as high-energy (HE) in the range from TeV to 100 PeV and ultra-high energy (UHE) above 100 PeV. It is widely accepted that such neutrinos, produced in distant sources, can travel to Earth undisturbed by the magnetic fields or matter on the way across the Universe, carrying information about the conditions ruling in the cosmic accelerators. The IceCube Collaboration [1] discovered high energy extragalactic neutrinos in 2013 [2] whose energy spectrum, $E^2 dN/dE$, was found similar to that of the γ -rays [3]. The measured neutrino flux was initially observed isotropic (diffuse) until the discovery of point-like sources: the blazars TXS 0506+156 [4], PKS B1424-418 [5], PKS 1502+106 [6] and the nearby active galaxy NGC 1068 (Messier 77) [7, 8]. PeV-energy neutrinos have been observed over time [9], including two most energetic – a Glashow resonance candidate ($\bar{\nu}_e e^- \rightarrow W^-$) [10] as well as just announced 13 ± 5 PeV muon neutrino event [11].

On the other hand cosmic rays, generated in cosmic accelerators, have been observed on Earth with energies up to about 50 EeV [12, 13, 14]. This limit corresponds to the cut-off value for protons

interacting with photons of the cosmic microwave background radiation [15, 16] but can also be explained as a consequence of a maximal energy reachable in cosmic sources. Since UHE neutrinos are expected to carry 3 ÷ 5 % of the primary hadron energy, they should be observed on Earth with energies even up to a few EeV [17, 18, 19, 20]. However this is not the case so the question of not observing UHE neutrinos is still open. Lorentz symmetry violation has been considered in this context [21, 22, 23], involving a kinematical high-energy cutoff, possibly leading to non-observation of neutrinos beyond a certain energy. According to another concept, UHE primary and secondary charged particles, spiraling in a magnetic field in the source, are subject to a significant radiative energy loss prior to eventually decaying into neutrinos. Also sensitivity of the present detectors to neutrinos in the UHE range can be insufficient.

In the present paper we adopt a hypothesis that neutrinos are spacelike (thus superluminal) fermions and consider kinematically allowed neutrino decays to explain the reduction of the neutrino flux in the high energy end of the spectrum. A tachyonic particle is characterised by a spacelike energy-momentum dispersion relation, $E^2 - \mathbf{k}^2 = -\kappa^2$, where κ denotes the tachyonic mass, in contrast to the inertial mass, m , satisfying the relation $E^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 = m^2$ for massive particles. We derive the neutrino decay width within the framework of a slightly modified Standard Model in the neutrino sector and translate it into the decay probability in the expanding Universe. We determine upper limits on the tachyonic neutrino mass, κ , from the observation on Earth of the highest energy cosmological neutrino events and find these results very close to the independent measurement of m_ν^2 in the tritium decay experiment KATRIN. In the following the term "neutrino" implicitly refers to the "spacelike neutrino" unless stated otherwise.

2 Why spacelike neutrinos

Neutrinos have been associated with superluminality since decades. The initial underlying justification consisted in repeated occurrences of negative or consistent with negative central values for the electron antineutrino mass squared, observed in numerous tritium decay experiments, to quote only the most recent: $m^2 = -0.6 \pm 2.2(\text{stat.}) \pm 2.1(\text{syst.})$ [24] (Mainz Collaboration, 2005) and $m^2 = -0.67 \pm 2.53(\text{tot.})$ [25] (Troitsk Collaboration, 2011). These results were superseded by those obtained in the presently running experiment KATRIN which achieved an unprecedented accuracy. Their first measurement again yielded a negative central value of the mass squared, $m_\nu^2 = -1.0_{-1.1}^{+0.9} \text{ eV}^2$ [26] (2019), while the following measurement period ended with a positive central value, $m_\nu^2 = 0.26 \pm 0.34 \text{ eV}^2$ [27] (2022), however consistent with being negative within even less than 1σ . In contrast to any other elementary object, letting aside the common prejudice, one must accept that according to the present evidence, the four-momentum of the neutrino may as well be spacelike. Admitting the above requires providing an adequate theoretical description of spacelike neutrinos at the quantum field theory level.

Early attempts to describe tachyonic neutrinos within the standard (Einsteinian) relativity were unsuccessful at any level and did not lead to a solution of the essential problems within this frame-

work, like causality violation, negative energies or vacuum instability. It was shown already half a century ago that the standard relativistic quantum field theory is inapplicable for describing spacelike particles [28],[29]. The first proposition of a Dirac-like equation for spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ spacelike neutrinos is due to Chodos et al. [30], although his formalism was not unitary. However a turning point in these studies came about when it was realised that spacelike particles can be causally described using a special procedure of clock synchronisation [31]. This modification affects uniquely the superluminal sector, leaving the subluminal sector unchanged since different clock synchronisation schemes lead to equivalent results in the latter case. This particular procedure implies existence of a preferred frame of reference which plays a role only for the superluminal sector. It does not overrule the validity of the relativity principle and the Lorentz symmetry in the subluminal sector as well as respects the Lorentz covariance of the entire theory. This seemingly minor modification allows to construct a Lorentz-covariant quantum field-theoretical model of a relativistic helicity $-\frac{1}{2}$ tachyonic fermion [31] and avoid known fundamental difficulties related to spacelike particles. In a recent paper we formulated a consistent quantum field theory of the spacelike neutrino with both $\pm\frac{1}{2}$ helicity components, within the formalism based on the existence of a preferred frame, affecting the neutrino sector only [32]. A further motivation to consider neutrinos as spacelike particles is of a theoretical nature. One thread stems from the fact that, according to our new results the two-helicity neutrino state for $E \approx \kappa$ reduces to one-helicity state for $E \gg \kappa$, as observed in nature; another one is that the property of the neutrino known for decades – separate C and P violation – would follow from the fact of their spacelike nature [32]. The notion of the preferred frame has scored numerous references in the context of the quantum theory. A natural candidate to consider is the Cosmic Neutrino Background (CNB) frame, an artefact of the electroweak phase transition [33], defined as a local reference frame in which the CNB is isotropic. According to cosmological predictions, the CNB frame should practically coincide with cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation frame in which the microwave background radiation is isotropic.

Although all relevant details can be found in the cited papers [31, 32], we point here to two most serious difficulties of the standard tachyonic theory – vacuum instability and the causality problem, which are frequently passed over in numerous publications. These problems disappear in our approach due to the assumption of existence of the preferred frame, identified with the CNB frame. Let us denote the four-velocity of the CNB frame as seen by an observer by u^μ , where $u^2 = 1$, and the four-momentum of a free particle by k^μ . Then $q = u^\mu k_\mu$ is a Lorentz invariant so

$$q > 0 \tag{1}$$

is an invariant spectral condition, irrespective of the dispersion relation of the considered particle (timelike, lightlike or spacelike). In all three cases, for observers in the preferred frame, $u^0 = 1$, $\mathbf{u} = 0$ and $k^\mu = (E, \mathbf{k})$, by means of this condition, the energy of a particle is positive. In the two former cases, it is positive for observers in all inertial frames because the upper (physical) parts of the two-sheet energy-momentum hyperboloid or the energy-momentum cone transform into themselves under the action of the Lorentz group. In the spacelike case, the one-sheet four-momentum hyperboloid is as well divided by the Lorentz invariant condition $q > 0$ into the upper (physical) and the lower (unphysical) parts. This condition fixes a lower bound of energy in any inertial frame, necessary

to avoid vacuum instability and causality violation as well as to carry out a proper quantisation procedure of spacelike fields [32]. Vacuum instability stems from the fact of the appearance of negative energies without a lower bound and a possibility of a spontaneous creation from the vacuum of tachyon-antitachyon pairs with opposite four-momenta, k^μ and $-k^\mu$, explicitly satisfying energy-momentum conservation. In the approach with the preferred frame, the respective invariants are uk and $-uk$, so both the tachyon and antitachyon in a given pair cannot simultaneously satisfy (1). Therefore, the condition $q > 0$ rules out the possibility of vacuum instability. We note that this condition is analogous to choosing the upper energy-momentum hyperboloid (or cone) as the physical one for massive (or massless) particles, respectively. Now, as regards causality, identification of the preferred frame with the CNB frame allows to interpret the cosmic time, measured by a physical clock moving along the Hubble flow, as the absolute time determining causality relations between events.

For more contributions to the tachyonic neutrino hypothesis one is referred to abundant literature [34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. In the following we use $c = 1$ but we preserve \hbar for clarity.

3 Decays of spacelike neutrinos

3.1 Decay width

A unique property of the tachyonic neutrino is its decay into the neutrino of the same flavour and an additional state, $\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\alpha + X$ – a process which is kinematically allowed under the conservation of four-momentum and respecting the spacelike energy-momentum dispersion relations while it is forbidden for massive neutrinos. The two dominant channels are the three-body decay $\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \nu_\beta \bar{\nu}_\beta$ and the radiative decay $\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \gamma$, where the indices α, β run over three flavours, e, μ, τ . These processes have already been preliminarily analysed, albeit in a different context [35]. Also the following decay channel, $\nu \rightarrow \nu e^+ e^-$, has been considered in literature, however we do not deal with this process as it is forbidden in our approach due to violating the spectral condition (1) (see below).

Below we present calculations of the amplitudes and the widths for the three-body decay, depicted in Fig. 1, within the full framework of the aforementioned quantum field theory of spacelike neutrinos [32]. We do not deal with the radiative process since its width is many orders of magnitude smaller, compared to that for the three-body channel.

The width for the process shown in Fig. 1 can be calculated from the formula [32]

$$d\Gamma = \frac{G_F^2 |M|^2 d\Phi}{(2\pi)^5 k^0 \sqrt{|\mathbf{k}|}}, \quad (2)$$

where $d\Phi = \theta(up)\theta(ul)\theta(ur)\delta^4(k-p-l-r)\delta(p^2+\kappa^2)\delta(l^2+\mu^2)\delta(r^2+\mu^2)d^4p d^4l d^4r$ is the phase-space element. The matrix element squared, $|M|^2$, has the following general form




Figure 1: Feynmann diagram of the tachyonic neutrino/antineutrino three-body decay. The neutrino momenta and tachyonic masses that appear in Eq. 3 are indicated in brackets.

$$\begin{aligned}
|M|^2 = & \frac{64}{\sqrt{(uk)^2 + \kappa^2} \sqrt{(up)^2 + \kappa^2} \sqrt{(ul)^2 + \mu^2} \sqrt{(ur)^2 + \mu^2}} \\
& \left(\kappa^4 \mu^4 + \kappa^4 \left[\mu^2 \left((ul)^2 + (ur)^2 \right) + (ul)^2 (ur)^2 \right] + \mu^4 \left[\kappa^2 \left((up)^2 + (uk)^2 \right) + (up)^2 (uk)^2 \right] \right. \\
& + \kappa^2 \mu^2 \left[(kr) \left((uk)(ur) - (up)(ul) \right) + (up)^2 (ur)^2 + (uk)^2 (ul)^2 \right] \\
& \left. + (kr) \left((uk)(ul) - (up)(ur) \right) \left(\kappa^2 (ul)(ur) - \mu^2 (uk)(up) \right) - (uk)(up)(ur)(ul)(kr)^2 \right), \quad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

where u , as above, denotes the four-velocity of the preferred frame (CNB) and the scalar products are of the form $uk = u^\lambda k_\lambda$ etc. Since below we calculate the width for the decay in the preferred frame (CNB), we put $u = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, for which $uk = k^0 = E$. In view of the complexity of these calculations, the width Γ cannot be easily derived as a closed form expression. Instead, we have developed a simple effective formula on the basis of dimensional and numerical analysis, accurate to the 8-th decimal in the energy range under study (TeV-PeV)

$$\Gamma(E, \kappa, \mu) = f n_f G_F^2 (\kappa^4 + 4\mu^4) E, \quad (4)$$

where $f = \frac{5}{18(2\pi)^3}$ and $n_f = 3$ accounts for the three neutrino flavours in the final state of the $\nu\bar{\nu}$ pair (cf. Fig. 1). Understandably, the powers of the masses and energy, integers to a very high precision, add up to five. We note the strong dependence of the width on the neutrino masses as well as the dominating weight of the mass μ . The numerical calculations require a very high working precision to obtain a numerically stable result.

Given the mass differences squared measured in oscillation experiments, one can derive the masses of the heavier mass states as a function of the mass of the lowest mass state, m_1 : $m_2(m_1) = \sqrt{\Delta m_{21}^2 + m_1^2}$ and $m_3(m_1) = \sqrt{\Delta m_{21}^2 + \Delta m_{32}^2 + m_1^2}$, where $\Delta m_{21}^2 = 7.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ and $\Delta m_{32}^2 =$

$2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ [40] (using the conventional labeling of the neutrino masses). It has been shown that the oscillation pattern of tachyonic neutrinos is the same as that of the massive ones [41], i.e., the above formulae relating the mass states are applicable for tachyonic neutrinos too when the conventional masses, m_i , are replaced by the tachyonic masses, κ_i . If the mass of the lowest neutrino state is of the order of a fraction of an eV, the above differences of mass squares can be neglected and the same given mass, κ , can be assigned to all three flavours, implying also $\kappa \approx \mu$. This is true in particular for the value derived from the latest measurement of KATRIN, $m_\nu^2 = 0.26 \pm 0.34 \text{ eV}^2$ [27], from which one can determine the lower limit, $m_\nu^2 > -0.3 \text{ eV}^2$, at a 90% c.l. and the corresponding upper limit on the tachyonic neutrino mass, $\kappa < 0.55 \text{ eV}$, below referred to as the KATRIN limit. In the special relativity framework the mean lifetime for the decay of a given tachyonic neutrino can be obtained from the well known relation $\tau = \hbar/\Gamma$, valid in the CNB frame of reference, where the width for the decay has already been accounted for three possible final states. Simply put, the mean lifetime calculated this way would describe the neutrino moving through a static Universe, with the conventional understanding of time and distance. Obviously, in view of cosmologic distances between neutrino sources and the detector on Earth, it is indispensable to insert the decay width (4) into the environment of the expanding Universe, in particular consider the decay according to the flow of the cosmic time, which requires a description involving the neutrino energy at the source of emission as well as the redshift of the source.

Lastly, the following remarks regarding the process $\nu \rightarrow \nu e^+ e^-$ are in order. Cohen and Glashow admitted that this decay was forbidden within the standard Einsteinian relativity [39]. In order to demonstrate that it is also forbidden within the preferred frame framework, it is sufficient to consider this decay in the center-of-mass frame of the $e^+ e^-$ pair and apply the spectral condition (1).

3.2 Survival probability in the expanding Universe

Since we consider decays of spacelike neutrinos, we elaborate on this nonstandard case in cosmology in detail (we note in passing that the first attempt of describing tachyon kinematics in cosmology is owed to Narlikar and Sudarshan [43]). According to the commonly used Λ CDM model [44], the geometry of our Universe is described by the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) spacetime [45]. Since our Universe is flat at a large scale, we put the curvature parameter $k = 0$ and the corresponding FLRW line element takes the form

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a(t)^2 \left(dr^2 + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\varphi^2) \right). \quad (5)$$

The scale factor $a(t)$ is related to the redshift, z , through the formula $a(t) = (1 + z)^{-1}$. The motion of the spacelike neutrino in the flat FLRW spacetime is governed by the spacelike geodesics and the corresponding dispersion relation. In the spacelike case, $ds^2 < 0$, we can parametrise the line element in terms of an affine parameter, λ , $ds^2 = -d\lambda^2$ and in the consequence the FLRW metric takes the form

$$g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = -d\lambda^2. \quad (6)$$

Defining the four-momentum, k^μ , in the standard way as

$$k^\mu = \kappa dx^\mu / d\lambda, \quad (7)$$

where κ is the particle mass, we obtain the dispersion relation in the form

$$g_{\mu\nu} k^\mu k^\nu = -\kappa^2. \quad (8)$$

In the case of a flat FLRW one has

$$(k^0)^2 - a(t)^2 \left((k^r)^2 + r^2 \left((k^\theta)^2 + (k^\varphi)^2 \sin^2 \theta \right) \right) = -\kappa^2 \quad (9)$$

so taking into account that

$$g_{ij} k^i k^j = a(t)^2 \left((k^r)^2 + r^2 \left((k^\theta)^2 + (k^\varphi)^2 \sin^2 \theta \right) \right) \equiv \mathbf{k}^2 \quad (10)$$

is the momentum squared, we can rewrite (9) in the standard form

$$(k^0)^2 - \mathbf{k}^2 = -\kappa^2. \quad (11)$$

Now, we can simplify the considerations by taking into account the fact that the direction of the spacelike neutrino is unchanged throughout its motion. This implies $d\theta d\varphi = 0$ and the particle line element (6) reduces to the form

$$-d\lambda^2 = dt^2 - a(t)^2 dr^2. \quad (12)$$

In such a case $k^\theta = k^\varphi = 0$ and $\mathbf{k}^2 = a(t)^2 (k^r)^2$. Substituting (7) into the geodesic equations

$$\frac{d^2 x^\mu}{d\lambda^2} + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\mu \frac{dx^\alpha}{d\lambda} \frac{dx^\beta}{d\lambda} = 0 \quad (13)$$

yields straightforwardly

$$\kappa \frac{dk^\mu}{d\lambda} + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\mu k^\alpha k^\beta = 0 \quad (14)$$

and by calculating the connection coefficients for this case we can reduce (14) to only one independent equation of the form

$$k^0 dk^0 + |\mathbf{k}| \frac{da}{a} = 0. \quad (15)$$

Therefore the geodesic motion of the spacelike neutrino in a flat FLRW spacetime is determined by the dispersion relation (11) and the geodesic condition (15). Solving the system of these two equations one obtains

$$(k^0)^2 = C^2 a^{-2} - \kappa^2 \quad (16)$$

$$|\mathbf{k}| = C a^{-1}. \quad (17)$$

The constant C can be determined by assuming that the emission of the particle with energy E_e took place in the epoch characterised by the redshift z_e

$$C^2 = \frac{E_e^2 + \kappa^2}{(1 + z_e)^2}, \quad (18)$$

using the aforementioned relationship between the scale factor a and z . Finally one obtains the following expression for the neutrino energy, E , in the epoch determined by the redshift z

$$E = \sqrt{(E_e^2 + \kappa^2) \left(\frac{1 + z}{1 + z_e} \right)^2 - \kappa^2}. \quad (19)$$

In particular, $z = 0$ corresponds to an observer on Earth in the present epoch. Eq. 19 states that the energy E is smaller than that with which the neutrino was emitted, E_e . Neglecting the tachyonic neutrino mass terms, κ^2 , compared to the energy of emission, E_e^2 , one obtains the following relation

$$E = E_e \frac{1 + z}{1 + z_e}. \quad (20)$$

The velocity of a neutrino emitted with TeV or higher energies only infinitesimally exceeds the velocity of light in vacuum, c . Spacelike neutrinos have positive energies ($E > 0$) in any local reference frame in which the CNB is isotropic [32].

A neutrino moving through a homogeneous, expanding Universe "experiences" the cosmic time. Our goal is to determine the neutrino survival probability in terms of the cosmic time elapsing during its travel from the point of emission to the point of detection, parametrised by z_e and z , respectively ($z = 0$ on Earth in the present epoch). The standard procedure lies in the relationship of the survival probability differential, $dp_s(z)$, with the cosmic time differential, $dt(z)$, identified with the cosmic distance differential travelled with the velocity of light, which has the form

$$\frac{dp_s(z)}{p_s(z)} = -\frac{\Gamma(E)}{\hbar} dt(z), \quad (21)$$

where the decay width $\Gamma(E)$ is given by (4) but with the energy E replaced by the r.h.s. of Eq. 19. In the Λ CDM model the cosmic time differential is given by

$$dt(z) = -\frac{dz}{(1 + z)H(z)}, \quad (22)$$

with the function $H(z)$ defined as

$$H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_r(1 + z)^4 + \Omega_m(1 + z)^3 + \Omega_k(1 + z)^2 + \Omega_\Lambda}, \quad (23)$$

where H_0 is the Hubble constant, and the normalised energy densities for photons and neutrinos, baryons and dark matter, and dark energy are denoted Ω_r , Ω_m and Ω_Λ , respectively, while $\Omega_k =$

$1 - (\Omega_r + \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda)$ determines a deviation from flatness. According to observations, $\Omega_r + \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda = 1$ so $\Omega_k = 0$. Moreover, Ω_r is very small in our epoch so it can be neglected and consequently $\Omega_m = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda$. Therefore the cosmic time differential (22) takes the form

$$dt(z) = -\frac{dz}{(1+z)H_0\sqrt{(1-\Omega_\Lambda)(1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda}}, \quad (24)$$

where $H_0 = 67.5 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.685$. Integrating (24) over z yields the cosmic time interval between the emission time at z_e and the detection time at z

$$t(z_e, z) = \int_{z_e}^z dt(z') = \frac{1}{3H_0\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda}} \ln \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda} + \sqrt{(1+z)^3(1-\Omega_\Lambda) + \Omega_\Lambda}}{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda} - \sqrt{(1+z)^3(1-\Omega_\Lambda) + \Omega_\Lambda}} \right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda} - \sqrt{(1+z_e)^3(1-\Omega_\Lambda) + \Omega_\Lambda}}{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda} + \sqrt{(1+z_e)^3(1-\Omega_\Lambda) + \Omega_\Lambda}} \right) \right]. \quad (25)$$

Note that the emission time $t_e = t(z_e, z_e) = 0$ while the detection time on Earth in the present epoch is given by $t_d = t(z_e, 0)$ which, up to the factor c , corresponds to the distance between the source and Earth. Now, by means of (4) and (19) one obtains

$$\frac{dp_s(z)}{p_s(z)} = \frac{f n_f G_F^2 (\kappa^4 + 4\mu^4) \sqrt{-\kappa^2 + (E_e^2 + \kappa^2) \left(\frac{1+z}{1+z_e} \right)^2}}{\hbar(1+z)H_0\sqrt{(1-\Omega_\Lambda)(1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda}} dz. \quad (26)$$

Neglecting κ^2 under the square root yields the cancellation of the $(1+z)$ terms in the numerator and the denominator and both sides of Eq. 26 can then be integrated analytically. As a result we obtain the following expression for the neutrino decay probability

$$p_s = \exp \left(-f n_f G_F^2 (\kappa^4 + 4\mu^4) \frac{E_d \tau(z_e, z)}{\hbar} \right) \quad (27)$$

where E_d is the neutrino energy measured presently on Earth, obtained from (20) for $z = 0$. In the following we use the approximation $\kappa \approx \mu$, justified above. The function $\tau(z_e, z)$ is given by the following integral

$$\tau(z_e, z) = \frac{1}{H_0} \int_z^{z_e} \frac{dz'}{\sqrt{(1-\Omega_\Lambda)(1+z')^3 + \Omega_\Lambda}} = W(z_e) - W(z), \quad (28)$$

expressed in terms of the hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$

$$W(z) = \frac{(1+z)}{H_0\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda}} {}_2F_1 \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, \frac{(1+z)^3(\Omega_\Lambda - 1)}{\Omega_\Lambda} \right). \quad (29)$$

Again, for an observer on Earth we put $z = 0$ in (28).

4 Results and discussion

Given the formula (27), we analyse the survival probability of tachyonic neutrinos in terms of the variables E_e , κ and z_e , keeping in mind the relation of the energy with which the neutrino was emitted from the source, E_e and the energy observed on Earth, E_d . We also discuss solutions of Eq. 27 on Earth ($z = 0$) for a preset value of the probability, $p_c = \text{const}$

$$p_s = p_c, \tag{30}$$

which defines what part of the flux emitted from a given source has survived the travel time to Earth. We have adopted a working convention that the neutrino flux reaches the Earth almost unaffected when $p_c > 0.9(0.95)$ and almost entirely vanishes when $p_c < 0.1(0.05)$, therefore the intermediate range between the two values corresponds to fluxes non-negligibly depleted due to decays (the number of observed events additionally depends on the cross-section and detector characteristics). Since in the expanding Universe the proper variable standing for the distance of a source is its redshift, z_e , we show in Fig. 2 constant probability curves on a z_e vs. E_d plot, for a fixed value of $\kappa = 0.55$ eV (KATRIN limit).

In order to compare the predictions with measurements, we consider five neutrino events observed by the IceCube Collaborations: *(i)* 290 TeV from the blazar TXS 0506+056 at $z_e=0.3365$ (3.9 Gly); *(ii)* 300 TeV from the blazar PKS 1502+106 at $z_e=1.839$ (10.2 Gly); *(iii)* 2 PeV from the blazar PKS B1424-418 at $z_e=1.522$ (9.6 Gly); *(iv)* 6.05 ± 0.72 PeV event identified as a Glashow resonance (referred to as a 6.3 PeV event), from an unidentified source; *(v)* 13 ± 5 PeV recently published event, from an unidentified source. The three events from identified sources are marked by full points on the z_e vs. E_d plot (Fig. 2).

Observing one neutrino event from a source with a known z_e allows to roughly estimate an independent upper limit on the neutrino mass by solving (30) for κ , under an assumption of the survival probability, p_c , which brings in an element of uncertainty. Taking $p_c = 0.1$ yields a conservative upper bound $\kappa < 2$ eV, $\kappa < 1.4$ eV and $\kappa < 0.9$ eV for the blazars *(i)*–*(iii)*, respectively. For events with unknown redshifts we adopt $z_e = 0.3365$ or $z_e = 1.839$ as an example. And thus for the Glashow resonance event we obtain $\kappa < 0.9$ eV and $\kappa < 0.7$ eV, respectively, whereas for the 13 PeV event $\kappa < 0.8$ eV and $\kappa < 0.6$ eV. The corresponding constant-probability contours on a κ vs. z_e plot are shown in Fig. 3 for $p_c = 0.1$ and the following energies: $E_d = 6.3$ PeV (Glashow resonance), the highest energy event of IceCube, $E_d = 13$ PeV, and $E_d = 30$ PeV to highlight the perspective. We note that the curves approach asymptotic values of κ as the distance of the neutrino source, z_e , increases towards the horizon of the Universe. One can see that merely a single 13 PeV event constrains the neutrino mass to values much below 1 eV, i.e., near the KATRIN limit, for cosmological sources in the considered (reasonable) range of z_e values. In the passing, even so near a galaxy like NGC 1068 alone ($z_e = 0.0038$) delivers quite a tight, independent bound on the tachyonic neutrino mass of about $5 \div 6$ eV, as inferred from the contour represented by the separate dashed line in Fig. 2.




Figure 2: Solid curves mark contours corresponding to $p_c = 0.9$ or $p_c = 0.1$, as indicated, where p_c is the neutrino survival probability assumed on Earth (30), for $\kappa = 0.55$ eV (KATRIN limit); the accompanying dashed curves are drawn for $p_c = 0.95$ and $p_c = 0.05$, correspondingly. The separate dashed curve shows the prediction for an upper limit of approximately $\kappa = 5.5$ eV ($p_c = 0.9$), based on observing high energy neutrinos from the nearby galaxy NGC 1068 ($z_e = 0.0038$) alone (the horizontal solid line indicates the corresponding energy range).




Figure 3: Contours of fixed neutrino survival probability $p_c = 0.1$, for $E_d = 6.3$ PeV (Glashow resonance), 13 PeV (the highest energy event of IceCube) and 30 PeV for comparison.

Survival probability as a function of the observed neutrino energy is shown in Fig. 4 for a fixed value of $z_e=1.839$ (PKS 1502+106). The dashed black curve corresponds to $\kappa = 0.55$ eV (KATRIN limit) and yields $p_s = 0.95$ for this 300 TeV event (for the blazar TXS 0506+056 one obtains $p_s = 0.99$). Thus one can conclude that the energy spectra from these two sources (should the statistics increase in the future) would be practically undistorted by decays for the range of tachyonic neutrino masses below the KATRIN limit. It can be also seen in Fig. 4 that even at this mass limit the survival probability of the neutrino (from this assumed distance) with the energy of the Glashow resonance, $p_s \approx 0.33$, is still high enough to justify observing one event. Dependence of the survival probability on z_e for two energies, the Glashow resonance energy and for 13 PeV, adopting $\kappa = 0.55$ eV, is shown in Fig. 5. In the former case, neutrinos originating even from distant sources up to $z_e \approx 10$, are still likely to survive the way to Earth, while in the latter one would expect such neutrinos to predominantly decay if emitted from distances larger than that of the blazar PKS 1502+106 (for the above value of κ).

Now, the most suggestive manifestation of neutrino decays would be a depletion of the energy spectrum of cosmological neutrinos, dN/dE_d , near the high-energy end, as suggested by observations [46]. An illustration of this effect is shown in Fig. 6. The neutrino energy spectrum, without referring to any particular type of the source, is drawn assuming a commonly used parametrisation of the energy dependence, $dN/dE_d \propto E_d^{-\gamma}$, where $\gamma = 2.5$ (straight line). The curves represent depleted spectra, obtained as the product of dN/dE_d with the survival probability (27), for a range of values of κ , with the redshift of the hypothetical source fixed to $z_e = 1.839$ (PKS 1502+106). The shaded area marks the region where the flux is depleted by more than an order of magnitude. One can see that the flux of neutrinos with energies 100 PeV or more would already be strongly depleted for $\kappa > 0.35$ eV; similarly, the neutrino flux at 1 EeV would suffer from decays for κ as low as 0.15 eV (for a nearer source one would expect a similar effect however of a smaller magnitude). Moreover, should one experimentally observe a depletion on the basis of a higher statistics data in the future or, similarly, confirm a non-observation of the ultra-high energy neutrino flux above, one could attempt to determine a lower limit of the neutrino mass. We finally note that if the value of the smallest neutrino mass state is very near zero, implying the mass of the heaviest state equal 0.05 eV, the neutrinos can be considered stable over the entire visible Universe for energies even up to about 10 EeV.

Until now we have considered the decay only in the aspect of disappearance of the primary neutrino. However the decay shown in Fig. 1 is a $1 \rightarrow 3$ process, in which the energy of the initial neutrino is shared, in general unequally, among the three secondaries which are emitted at non-zero angles w.r.t. the momentum vector of the primary neutrino. This fact may have consequences for a detailed picture of high and ultra-high energy cosmic neutrinos. Neutrinos which are emitted from the source into the solid angle covering of the Earth and do not decay, travel along a straight line connecting the point of emission (source) and the point of interaction in the detector (Earth). The time-of-flight of such an ultra-high energy neutrino is practically equal to that of a photon, so if a neutrino and a photon are emitted simultaneously at the source, both will reach the Earth in coincidence. As for the neutrinos which potentially do decay, all three secondaries arising at a




Figure 4: Survival probability as a function of tachyonic neutrino energy for $z_e = 1.839$ (PKS 1502+106). Black dashed curve shows the prediction for the KATRIN limit of $\kappa = 0.55$, solid curves are drawn for $\kappa = 0.35, 0.15$ and 0.05 eV. Red vertical dashed lines mark energies of 300 TeV, 6.3 PeV and 13 PeV. The shaded area marks the allowed region for the tachyonic neutrino mass, between the KATRIN limit and the minimal value.




Figure 5: Survival probability vs. z_e for $\kappa = 0.55$ eV (KATRIN limit) and energies $E_d = 6.05 \pm 0.72$ PeV (Glashow resonance – measured values) and $E_d = 13 \pm 5$ PeV (highest energy event in IceCube). The shaded bands represent the range of the respective experimental uncertainties.




Figure 6: Effect of decays on the neutrino energy spectrum, $E_d^2 dN/dE_d \propto E_d^{-0.5}$ from an assumed source at $z_e = 1.839$ (PKS 1502+106). The curves are drawn for the indicated values of neutrino mass, including the lowest possible value, $\kappa = 0.05$ eV. The shaded area marks the region of fluxes depleted by more than one order of magnitude.

random location on the line of sight subsequently miss the Earth. Consider however neutrinos which are not emitted into the solid angle of the Earth which subsequently decay. It may happen that one of the secondaries arising at some angle w.r.t. its direction of flight, enters the solid angle of the detector on Earth. Such neutrinos can still have very high energies but travel a longer distance (time) and can drop off from the coincidence with the electromagnetic component. Assessing whether this is a significant effect requires however a dedicated study of differential distributions $d\Gamma/d\Phi$ (2).

5 Summary and conclusions

We have analysed the decays of high and ultra-high energy neutrinos under an assumption that these particles are spacelike – a hypothesis already standing for some time, inspired by theoretical and experimental results. It has been shown that not observing ultra-high energy neutrinos on Earth can be explained as due to decays, $\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \nu_\beta \bar{\nu}_\beta$, if neutrinos were spacelike fermions. We have calculated the Standard Model width for such decays, with the tachyonic neutrino mass being the only quantity not precisely known. Subsequently we derived an exact expression for survival probability on the way to Earth, parametrised by the emission energy, E_e , or energy measured on Earth, E_d , and the redshift of the source, z_e , in the environment of expanding Universe.

We exploited the fact of observing five high neutrino events (i)–(v) to discuss and demonstrate a possibility to set approximate upper limits on the tachyonic neutrino mass. We have shown that recording the highest energy 13 PeV event allows to put an upper mass limit of about $0.6 \div 0.8$ eV, subject of reasonable assumptions. These approximate values fall very near to the range allowed by the latest measurement of KATRIN, $\kappa < 0.55$ eV at 90% c.l. The consistency of our cosmology-based estimations with the results from a terrestrial β -decay experiment is remarkable. We also show that a neutrino mass in the approximate range indicated in Fig. 6 can explain the non-observation of ultra-high energy tachyonic neutrinos as due to their decays, provided the neutrino mass is not smaller than about 0.15 eV. If the fact of "non-observation" was confirmed experimentally on a sufficient statistics, this could lead to establishing a lower limit on the neutrino mass – first result of this kind as regards the mass of the neutrino. Lastly, the smallness of the neutrino masses seems to provide some rationale to the hypothesis of tachyonic neutrinos. If the neutrino mass amounted to only a few eV, neutrino fluxes from nearby galaxies would be depleted at already TeV energies.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

6 Acknowledgments

We wish to thank W. Bednarek for fruitful discussions regarding cosmic rays and ultra-high energy neutrinos.

References

- [1] IceCube Collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., The IceCube Neutrino Observatory: Instrumentation and online systems, *J. Instrum.* **12**, P03012, (2017).
- [2] IceCube Collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., Evidence for High-Energy Extraterrestrial Neutrinos at the IceCube Detector, *Science* **342**, 1242856 (2013).
- [3] M. Ackermann et al., The spectrum of isotropic diffuse gamma-ray emission between 100 MeV and 820 GeV, *Astrophys. J.* **799**, 86 (2015).
- [4] IceCube Collaboration, M.G. Aartsen et al., Neutrino emission from the direction of the blazar TXS 0506+056 prior to the IceCube-170922A alert, *Science* **361** (2018) 147.
- [5] M. Kadler et al., Coincidence of a high-fluence blazar outburst with a PeV-energy neutrino event, *Nat. Phys.* **12**, 807 (2016).
- [6] V. Lipunov et al., IceCube-190730A: MASTER alert observations and analysis, *The Astronomer's Telegram*, 12971 (2019); www.astronomerstelegam.org/?read=12971.
- [7] IceCube Collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., Time-Integrated Neutrino Source Searches with 10 Years of IceCube Data, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 051103 (2020).
- [8] IceCube Collaboration, R. Abbasi et al., Evidence for neutrino emission from the nearby active galaxy NGC 1068, *Science* **378**, 538 (2022).
- [9] IceCube Collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., First observation of PeV-energy neutrinos with IceCube, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 021103 (2013).
- [10] IceCube Collaboration, M. G. Aartsen et al., Detection of a particle shower at the Glashow resonance with IceCube, *Nature* **591**, 220 (2021); Publisher Correction: Detection of a particle shower at the Glashow resonance with IceCube, *Nature* **592**, E11, (2021).
- [11] IceCube Collaboration, R. Abbasi et al., Updated directions of IceCube HESE events with the latest ice model using DirectFit, *PoS ICRC2023*, (2023);[astro-ph.HE] 2307.13878v1.
- [12] PIERRE AUGER Collaboration, A. Aab, et al., Features of the Energy Spectrum of Cosmic rays above 2.5×10^{18} eV Using the Pierre Auger Observatory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 121106 (2020) [2008.06488].

- [13] PIERRE AUGER Collaboration, J. Abraham et al., Observation of the suppression of the flux of cosmic rays above 4×10^{19} eV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 061101 (2008).
- [14] L. A. Anchordoqui et al., Ultra-high-energy cosmic rays, *Phys. Rep.* **801**, 1 (2019).
- [15] K. Greisen, End to the cosmic ray spectrum?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **16**, 748 (1966).
- [16] G. Zatsepin and V. Kuzmin, Upper limit on the spectrum of cosmic rays, *JETP Lett.* **4**, 78 (1966).
- [17] V. Berezhinsky and G. Zatsepin, Cosmic rays at ultra-high energies (neutrino?), *Phys. Lett. B* **28**, 423 (1969).
- [18] F. Strecker, Diffuse fluxes of cosmic high-energy neutrinos, *Astrophys. J.* **228**, 919 (1979).
- [19] C. T. Hill and D. M. Schramm, Ultrahigh-Energy Cosmic Ray Neutrinos, *Phys. Lett. B* **131**, 247 (1983).
- [20] S. Yoshida and M. Teshima, Energy spectrum of ultrahigh-energy cosmic rays with extragalactic origin, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **89**, 833 (1993).
- [21] S. R. Coleman and S. L. Glashow, Cosmic ray and neutrino tests of special relativity, *Phys. Lett. B* **405**, 249 (1997) [hep-ph/9703240].
- [22] P. W. Gorham et al., Implications of ultrahigh energy neutrino flux constraints for Lorentz-invariance violating cosmogenic neutrinos, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 103006 (2012).
- [23] L. A. Anchordoqui et al., End of the cosmic neutrino energy spectrum, *Phys. Lett. B* **739**, 99 (2014).
- [24] C. Kraus et al. (Mainz Collaboration), Final results from phase II of the Mainz neutrino mass search in tritium β decay, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **40**, 447 (2005).
- [25] V. N. Aseev et al. (Troitsk Collaboration), Upper limit on the electron antineutrino mass from the Troitsk experiment, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 112003 (2011).
- [26] M. Aker, et al., An improved upper limit on the neutrino mass from a direct kinematic method by KATRIN, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 221802 (2019).
- [27] M. Aker et al., Direct neutrino-mass measurement with sub-electronvolt sensitivity, *Nature Physics*, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-021-01463-1> (2022).
- [28] K. Kamoi and S. Kamefuchi, Comments on Quantum Field Theory of Tachyons, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **45**, 1646 (1971).
- [29] N. Nakanishi, Indefinite-Metric Quantum Field Theory, *Progr. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **51**, 1 (1972).

- [30] A. Chodos, A.I. Hauser and V.A. Kostelecký, The neutrino as a tachyon, *Phys. Lett. B* **150**(6), 431 (1985).
- [31] J. Rembieliński, Tachyons and preferred frames, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **12** 1677 (1997).
- [32] J. Rembieliński, P. Caban and J. Ciborowski, Quantum field theory of space-like neutrino, *Eur. Phys. J.* (2021) **81**, 716 (2021).
- [33] D. Baumann et al., First constraint on the neutrino-induced phase shift in the spectrum of baryon acoustic oscillations, *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 465 (2019).
- [34] A. Chodos et al., Null experiments for neutrino masses, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **07**, 467 (1992).
- [35] P. Caban, J. Rembieliński and K. A. Smoliński, Decays of spacelike neutrinos, *Concepts of Phys.*, **3**, 81 (2006); arXiv:hep-ph/9707391.
- [36] R. Ehrlich, Six observations consistent with the electron neutrino being a $m^2 = -0.11 \pm 0.02 \text{ eV}^2$ tachyon, *Astroparticle Phys.* **66**, 11 (2015).
- [37] G. Somogyi, I. Nándori and U. D. Jentschura, Neutrino splitting for Lorentz-violating neutrinos: Detailed analysis, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 035036 (2019).
- [38] C. Schwartz, Toward a Quantum Theory of Tachyon Fields, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **31**, 1650041 (2016).
- [39] A. Cohen and S. L. Glashow, Pair Creation Constrains Superluminal Neutrino Propagation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 181803 (2011).
- [40] I. Esteban et al., The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations, *JHEP* **9**, 178 (2020).
- [41] P. Caban et al., Oscillations do not distinguish between massive and tachyonic neutrinos, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **19**(6), 619 (2006).
- [42] E. Kolb and E. Turner, *The Early Universe*, CRC Press (1994).
- [43] J. V. Narlikar and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Tachyons and Cosmology, *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **175**, 105 (1976).
- [44] R. L. Workman et al., (Particle Data Group), *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [45] S. Dodelson, and F. Schmidt, *Modern cosmology*, Elsevier, (2020).
- [46] L. A. Anchordoqui et al., Evidence for a break in the spectrum of astrophysical neutrinos, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 083009 (2017).