

# Neutrinos produced from $\beta$ decays of neutrons cannot be in coherent superpositions of different mass eigenstates

Shi-Biao Zheng\*

College of Physics and Information Engineering, Fuzhou University,  
Fuzhou 350108, China

The entire wavefunction of the antineutrino-proton-electron system, produced by the  $\beta$  decay of a neutron is analyzed. It is proven that the antineutrino cannot be in coherent superpositions of different mass eigenstates, irrespective of the initial momentum distribution of the neutron.

The discovery of neutrino oscillations represents one of the most remarkable physical advancements achieved during the past three decades [1-6]. These phenomena cannot be interpreted within the framework of the standard model [7]. According to the standard model, there are three generations of leptons, each composed of a charged lepton and a neutrino. Charged leptons gain their mass by the Yukawa interaction, where the left-handed and right-handed leptons are coupled by the Higgs scalar field. Each lepton generation has its own flavor. Charged leptons with different flavors have very different masses, e.g, the muon is heavier than the electron by two orders of magnitude. In distinct contrast, all neutrinos are left-handed so that they cannot get mass from the Higgs field. The leptons belonging to the same family can be transformed into each other by exchanging a W boson. However, the Lagrangian of the lepton model does not contain any term that can change the flavor of a lepton.

To interpret neutrino oscillations, it is postulated that each neutrino flavor is linear superposition of three distinct mass eigenstates [8],

$$|\nu_\alpha\rangle = \sum_j U_{\alpha j} |\nu_j\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$  denotes the neutrino flavor, while  $j = 1$  to 3 labels the mass eigenstate. The three mass eigenstates are assumed to have the same momentum,  $p$ , which is much larger than the mass  $m_j$ . Then the energy of  $|\nu_j\rangle$  can be well approximated by  $E_j \simeq p + m_j^2/(2p)$ , where  $p$  represents the momentum of the neutrino. After a propagation time  $t$ , the mass eigenstate  $|\nu_j\rangle$  accumulates a phase  $\phi_j = -E_j t$ . Consequently, the initial flavor eigenstate  $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$  evolves to  $\sum_j U_{\alpha j} e^{i\phi_j} |\nu_j\rangle$ . The probability for the neutrino to remain in the flavor eigenstate  $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$  is given by

$$P_{|\nu_\alpha\rangle \rightarrow |\nu_\alpha\rangle} = \left| \sum_j U_{\alpha j} U_{\alpha j}^* e^{i\phi_j} \right|^2. \quad (2)$$

Due to the phase difference accumulated by different neutrino mass eigenstates,  $P_{|\nu_\alpha\rangle \rightarrow |\nu_\alpha\rangle}$  exhibits oscillatory behaviors. The quantum coherence among the mass eigenstates is responsible for these behaviors.

In a previous manuscript, I have proved that the neutrino produced by any weak interaction cannot be in a coherent superposition when the entire system has a definite energy [9]. I further showed that the neutrino oscillation can originate from virtual excitation of Z bosons as long as the Z bosonic field can connect different neutrino flavors. Some people claimed that quantum-mechanical uncertainty relations can be responsible for the production of coherent superpositions of neutrino mass eigenstates [10-12]. I here prove that neither the momentum uncertainty nor the energy uncertainty can lead to such superposition states for the electron antineutrino produced by the  $\beta$  decay of a neutron. This proof further strengthen the claim that neutrino oscillations have nothing to do with mass.

*Lemma 1:* For the  $\beta$  decay, when there is no mass-momentum entanglement, the produced electron antineutrino has a definite mass.

The wavefunction of the neutron, before undergoing the  $\beta$  decay, can be expanded in terms of the momentum eigenstates,

$$|\psi_n\rangle = \int \varphi(\mathbf{P}_n) d^3\mathbf{P}_n |\mathbf{P}_n\rangle.$$

---

\*E-mail: t96034@fzu.edu.cn

Suppose that the antineutrino produced by the  $\beta$  decay possesses three different mass eigenstates, which are not entangled with different momentum eigenstates of the proton, electron, and antineutrino. Then the state of the entire proton-electron-antineutrino system can be written as

$$|\psi_{\nu+p+e}\rangle = \int d^3\mathbf{P}_\nu d^3\mathbf{P}_n d^3\mathbf{P}_e F(\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e) |\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e\rangle \left( \sum_j C_j |\bar{\nu}_j\rangle \right), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_\nu$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_n$ , and  $\mathbf{P}_e$  respectively denote the momenta of the antineutrino, proton, and electron. The joint probability amplitude distribution  $F(\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e)$  satisfies the normalization condition

$$\int d^3\mathbf{P}_\nu d^3\mathbf{P}_n d^3\mathbf{P}_e |F(\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e)|^2 = 1. \quad (4)$$

In principle, one can perform measurements on the momenta of the antineutrino, proton, and electron. Suppose the results are  $\mathbf{P}_\nu$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_p$  and  $\mathbf{P}_e$ , respectively. According to the momentum conservation law, the joint momentum state  $|\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e\rangle$  originates from the parent neutron momentum state  $|\mathbf{P}_n\rangle$ , with

$$\mathbf{P}_n = \mathbf{P}_\nu + \mathbf{P}_p + \mathbf{P}_e. \quad (5)$$

The energies of the parent neutron, proton, and electron corresponding to these momenta are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_n &= \sqrt{m_n^2 + P_n^2}, \\ E_p &= \sqrt{m_p^2 + P_p^2}, \\ E_e &= \sqrt{m_e^2 + P_e^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $m_n$ ,  $m_p$ , and  $m_e$  are the masses of the neutron, proton, and electron, respectively. According to the energy conservation law, the antineutrino has a definite energy, given by  $E_\nu = E_n - E_p - E_e$ , and consequently, has a definite mass  $m_\nu = \sqrt{E_\nu^2 - P_\nu^2}$ . This leads to  $m_j = m_\nu$  when  $C_j \neq 0$ . This is inconsistent with the postulation that each flavor eigenstate is a linear superposition of three different mass eigenstates. If the flavor oscillations are caused by nonzero mass, such a state cannot exhibit any oscillatory behavior. It should be noted that here the notion of "measurement" is just used to clarify the underlying physics; the conclusion holds even without performing any real measurement, as interpreted below. When the mass of the antineutrino is not entangled with momenta of the particles produced by the  $\beta$  decay, it is not affected by the measurements of the momenta. In other words, if the antineutrino has a definite mass when the momenta are measured, then it has the same definite mass even if the momenta are not measured.

*lemma 2:* For the  $\beta$  decay, different mass eigenstates of the produced electron antineutrino are necessarily correlated with different joint antineutrino-proton-electron momentum states.

The entire wavefunction, including the neutrino mass state and the joint antineutrino-proton-electron momentum state, can be written in the form of

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_j \int_{\sigma_j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{\nu,j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{n,j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{e,j} G(\mathbf{P}_{\nu,j}, \mathbf{P}_{n,j}, \mathbf{P}_{e,j}) |\mathbf{P}_{\nu,j}, \mathbf{P}_{n,j}, \mathbf{P}_{e,j}\rangle |\bar{\nu}_j\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where  $\sigma_j$  denotes the distribution region of the joint antineutrino-proton-electron momentum associated with the antineutrino mass eigenstate  $|\bar{\nu}_j\rangle$ . Suppose that there is an overlapping between the regions  $\sigma_j$  and  $\sigma_k$  with  $j \neq k$ . Then, if we perform measurements on the momenta of the antineutrino, proton, and electron, there is a probability that the result  $(\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e)$  falls within the overlapping region. In this case, the wavefunction collapses to

$$|\psi'\rangle = |\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e\rangle (C'_j |\bar{\nu}_j\rangle + C'_k |\bar{\nu}_k\rangle), \quad (8)$$

with  $C'_j \neq 0$  and  $C'_k \neq 0$ . According to lemma 1, for  $|\psi'\rangle$  the antineutrino has a definite mass, which implies  $m_j = m_k$ .

In order to satisfy the condition  $m_1 \neq m_2 \neq m_3$ , there should not be any overlapping between the momentum distribution regions associated with different mass eigenstates, i.e.,  $\sigma_j \cap \sigma_k = \emptyset$  for  $j \neq k$ . When the momentum states are traced out, the mass degree of freedom is in a classical mixture, described by the density operator

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\nu &= Tr_{\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e} |\psi\rangle \langle\psi| \\ &= \int d^3\mathbf{P}_\nu d^3\mathbf{P}_n d^3\mathbf{P}_e \langle\mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e| \psi\rangle \langle\psi| \mathbf{P}_\nu, \mathbf{P}_n, \mathbf{P}_e\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j,k} D_{j,k} |\bar{\nu}_j\rangle \langle\bar{\nu}_k|, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{j,k} = & \int_{\sigma_j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{\nu,j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{n,j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{e,j} \int_{\sigma_k} d^3\mathbf{P}_{\nu,k} d^3\mathbf{P}_{n,k} d^3\mathbf{P}_{e,k} \\
& G(\mathbf{P}_{\nu,j}, \mathbf{P}_{n,j}, \mathbf{P}_{e,j}) G^*(\mathbf{P}_{\nu,k}, \mathbf{P}_{n,k}, \mathbf{P}_{e,k}) \\
& \langle \mathbf{P}_{\nu,k}, \mathbf{P}_{n,k}, \mathbf{P}_{e,k} | \mathbf{P}_{\nu,j}, \mathbf{P}_{n,j}, \mathbf{P}_{e,j} \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Since  $\sigma_j \cap \sigma_k = \emptyset$  for  $j \neq k$ , each of the joint momentum eigenstates in the region  $\sigma_j$  is orthogonal to all the momentum eigenstates in  $\sigma_k$ . This implies  $\langle \mathbf{P}_{\nu,k}, \mathbf{P}_{n,k}, \mathbf{P}_{e,k} | \mathbf{P}_{\nu,j}, \mathbf{P}_{n,j}, \mathbf{P}_{e,j} \rangle = 0$  throughout the integral region  $\sigma_j \otimes \sigma_k$ . Therefore, we have

$$\rho_\nu = \sum_j D_{j,j} |\bar{\nu}_j\rangle \langle \bar{\nu}_j|, \tag{11}$$

where

$$D_{j,j} = \int_{\sigma_j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{\nu,j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{n,j} d^3\mathbf{P}_{e,j} |G(\mathbf{P}_{\nu,j}, \mathbf{P}_{n,j}, \mathbf{P}_{e,j})|^2. \tag{12}$$

In other words, the quantum coherence among the mass eigenstates is destroyed by their quantum entanglement with different momentum states.

The entanglement-induced loss of coherence can also be understood in terms of complementarity, according to which the interference between state components of one freedom degree would be destroyed if the information about it is stored in another freedom degree [13-22]. Here the information about the mass of the antineutrino is encoded in the joint antineutrino-proton-electron momentum. This information could be extracted in principle, which is sufficient to destroy the interference between the mass eigenstates. It does not matter whether or not the information is read out. The loss of interference due to entanglement has been demonstrated in a number of experiments [16-22].

If antineutrino flavor eigenstates are defined as superpositions of mass eigenstates, for such a classical mixture  $\rho$ , the populations of the three flavor eigenstates  $|\bar{\nu}_\alpha\rangle$  ( $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ ) are all nonzero, given by  $P_\alpha = \sum_j |D_{j,j} U_{j\alpha}|^2$ , where

$|\bar{\nu}_j\rangle = \sum_\alpha U_{j\alpha}^\dagger |\bar{\nu}_\alpha\rangle$ . In other words, a classical mixture of three mass eigenstates also corresponds to a classical

mixture of three flavor eigenstates. Consequently, the probability for detecting the antineutrino in each flavor has a nonzero probability, which is time-independent. This is inconsistent with the well-known  $\beta$  decay experiments [4], where the produced antineutrino is initially of e-type, and then undergoes flavor oscillations.

In the above argumentation, we have proven that the momentum uncertainty cannot lead a coherent superposition of different mass eigenstates. The problem remains whether or not the uncertainty of the neutron energy can be responsible for the production of such superposition states. The lifetime of the neutron is about  $T \simeq 900$  s [23], which corresponds to an energy uncertainty of the order of  $E \sim \hbar/T \sim 10^{-37}$  J, where  $\hbar$  denotes the reduced Planck constant. Suppose that the momentum of the neutrino produced by the  $\beta$  decay has a magnitude of  $p \sim 10$  keV, and take the mass square difference of the neutrino mass eigenstates to be  $m^2 \sim 10^{-3}$  (eV)<sup>2</sup> [3]. Then the energy difference of the neutrino mass eigenstates,  $E = (m)^2/p$ , is on the order of  $10^{-26}$  J, which is larger than  $E$  by 11 orders of magnitude. This means the energy uncertainty of the neutron can be neglected in comparison with the energy difference of the neutrino mass eigenstates.

In summary, we have shown that the electron antineutrino created by the  $\beta$  decay of a neutron cannot be in a coherent superposition of different mass eigenstates. If the entire antineutrino-proton-electron wavefunction emerging from the  $\beta$  decay involve different mass eigenstates, they are necessarily entangled with different momentum states, as a consequence of the momentum and energy conservation laws. This entanglement would destroy the quantum coherence among these mass eigenstates. This conclusion holds no matter how the momentum of the parent neutron is distributed, which indicates the momentum uncertainty cannot lead to a coherent superposition of mass eigenstates. The energy uncertainty of neutron, which is smaller than the energy difference associated with different antineutrino mass eigenstates by about 11 orders of magnitude, also cannot result in a superposition of these mass eigenstates. The present proof enforces the claim that neutrino oscillations originate from virtual excitation of Z bosons.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12274080.

---

[1] Arthur B. McDonald, Nobel Lecture: The Sudbury Neutrino Observatory: Observation of flavor change for solar neutrinos, Rev. Mod. Phys. 88, 030502 (2016).

- [2] M. Koshiba, Nobel Lecture: Birth of neutrino astrophysics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 75, 1011-1020 (2003).
- [3] Takaaki Kajita, Nobel Lecture: Discovery of atmospheric neutrino oscillations, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 88, 030501 (2016).
- [4] F. P. An et al., Observation of electron-antineutrino disappearance at Daya Bay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 171803 (2012).
- [5] J. Ahn et al. (RENO Collaboration), Observation of reactor electron antineutrinos disappearance in the RENO experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 191802 (2012).
- [6] Y. Abe et al. (Double Chooz Collaboration), Indication of reactor  $\bar{\nu}_e$  disappearance in the Double Chooz experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 131801 (2012).
- [7] V. Parameswaran Nair, *Quantum field theory: a modern perspective*, Springer (2004).
- [8] Z. Maki, N. Nakagawa, and S. Sakata, Remarks on the Unified Model of Elementary Particles, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 28, 870-880 (1962).
- [9] S.-B. Zheng, Neutrino oscillations originate from virtual excitation of Z bosons, arXiv:2407.00954.
- [10] C. Giunti, Coherence and Wave Packets in Neutrino Oscillations, *Found. Phys. Lett.* 17, 103 (2004).
- [11] E. Kh. Akhmedov and A. Yu. Smirnov, Paradoxes of neutrino oscillations, *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* 72, 1363 (2009).
- [12] E. Kh. Akhmedov, D. Hernandez, and A. Yu. Smirnov, Neutrino production coherence and oscillation experiments, arXiv:1201.4128.
- [13] M. O. Scully, B.-G. Englert, and H. Walther, Quantum optical tests of complementarity, *Nature* 351, 111 (1991).
- [14] B.-G. Englert, Fringe visibility and which-way information: an inequality. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 2154 (1996).
- [15] P. Bogár and J. A. Bergou, Entanglement of atomic beams: Tests of complementarity and other applications, *Phys. Rev. A* 53, 49 (1996).
- [16] M. Brune et al., Observing the progressive decoherence of the “meter” in a quantum measurement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 4887 (1996).
- [17] E. Buks, R. Schuster, M. Heiblum, D. Mahalu, and V. Umansky, Dephasing in electron interference by a ‘which-path’ detector, *Nature* 391, 871 (1998).
- [18] S. Dürr, T. Nonn, and G. Rempe, Origin of quantum-mechanical complementarity probed by a ‘which-way’ experiment in an atom interferometer, *Nature* 395, 33 (1998).
- [19] S. Dürr, T. Nonn, and G. Rempe, Fringe visibility and which-way information in an atom interferometer. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 5705 (1998).
- [20] P. Bertet et al., A complementarity experiment with an interferometer at the quantum-classical boundary. *Nature* 411,166 (2001).
- [21] K. Liu et al., A twofold quantum delayed-choice experiment in a superconducting circuit. *Sci. Adv.* 3, e1603159 (2017).
- [22] X.-J. Huang et al., Entanglement-interference complementarity and experimental demonstration in a superconducting circuit, *npj Quantum Information* 9, 43 (2023).
- [23] F. M. Gonzalez et al., Improved neutron lifetime measurement with UCN, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 127, 162501 (2021).