

Cosmic Ray and Neutrino Tests of Special Relativity

Sidney Coleman & Sheldon L. Glashow

Lyman Laboratory of Physics
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138

Searches for anisotropies due to Earth's motion relative to a preferred frame — modern versions of the Michelson-Morley experiment — provide precise verifications of special relativity. We describe other tests, independent of this motion, that are or can become even more sensitive. The existence of high-energy cosmic rays places strong constraints on Lorentz non-invariance. Furthermore, if the maximum attainable speed of a particle depends on its identity, then neutrinos, even if massless, may exhibit flavor oscillations. Velocity differences far smaller than any previously probed can produce characteristic effects at accelerators and solar neutrino experiments.

Is the special theory of relativity, for reasons unspecified and unknown, only an approximate symmetry of nature? To investigate possible violations of Lorentz symmetry, we follow earlier analyses [1] by assuming the laws of physics to be invariant under rotations and translations in a preferred reference frame \mathcal{F} . This frame is often taken to be the ‘rest frame of the universe,’ the frame in which the cosmic microwave background is isotropic. To parameterize departures from Lorentz invariance, standard practice has been to modify Maxwell’s equations while leaving other physical laws intact.

Although we shall shortly consider more general Lorentz non-invariant perturbations, let us for the moment adhere to standard practice: we assume that the only Lorentz non-invariant term in \mathcal{L} is proportional to the square of the magnetic field strength. Thus, the *in vacua* speed of light c differs from the maximum attainable speed of a material body (here taken to be unity). The small parameter $1 - c$ completely characterizes this departure from special relativity in \mathcal{F} . In a frame moving at velocity \vec{u} relative to \mathcal{F} , the velocity of light c' depends on its angle θ relative to \vec{u} . For $u \ll 1$, we find $c'(\theta) \simeq c + 2(c - 1)u \cos \theta$. The failure of rotational invariance in the laboratory frame leads to potentially observable effects that are proportional to $u^2(1 - c^2)$. Searches for these anisotropies yielding null results have provided precision tests of special relativity.

A laser-interferometric Michelson-Morley experiment [2] found $|1 - c| < 10^{-9}$. Atomic physicists obtained stronger constraints using techniques pioneered by Hughes and Drever [3]. Prestage *et al.* [4] found $< 10^{-18}$ and Lamoreaux *et al.* [5] set the current limit on the velocity difference,

$$|1 - c| < 3 \times 10^{-22}. \quad (1)$$

These limits are obtained for \mathcal{F} at rest relative to the cosmic background radiation, whence $u \simeq 10^{-3}$. They would be two orders of magnitude weaker were \mathcal{F} at rest relative to the Sun.

We find additional limits on $1 - c$ that do not require precision experiments, yet are comparable in sensitivity to (1). For $u \ll 1$, the new constraints do not depend on the motion of the laboratory relative to \mathcal{F} . They follow from the mere existence of high-energy cosmic rays. Suppose $c > 1$. Because the photon 4-momentum $(E/c, \vec{E})$ is timelike, a sufficiently energetic photon can and will decay rapidly into an electron-positron pair. The threshold energy for $\gamma \rightarrow e^+ + e^-$ is $E_0 = 2m/\sqrt{c^2 - 1}$, with m the electron mass. In first-order perturbation theory (using an invariant matrix element and the modified photon dispersion relation), we obtain for the decay rate in \mathcal{F} :

$$\Gamma = \alpha(c - 1)E \left\{ 1 - (E_0/E)^2 \right\}^{3/2}. \quad (2)$$

A photon that is produced with energy well above E_0 decays rapidly, with mean lifetime $\tau \simeq 3(E_0/E)/\sqrt{c-1}$ ns. Hence a primary cosmic-ray photon with $E > E_0$ cannot reach Earth. However, primary photons with energies up to 20 TeV have been seen [6]. Thus we obtain the bound:¹

$$c - 1 < 1.5 \times 10^{-15}. \quad (3)$$

(If this bound were saturated, the threshold energy for photon decay would be 18.6 TeV and the mean range of a 20 TeV photon would be 8 cm.) Eq. (3) is weaker than (1), but it arises, so to speak, for free.

Suppose $c < 1$. A charged particle traveling faster than light loses energy rapidly via vacuum Čerenkov radiation. The threshold energy for $p \rightarrow p + \gamma$ is $E'_0 = M/\sqrt{1-c^2}$, with M the particle mass. In first-order perturbation theory, the rate of energy loss in \mathcal{F} is:

$$\frac{dE}{dx} \simeq -\frac{1}{3}\alpha Z^2 E^2 (1-c) \left\{1 - (E'_0/E)^2\right\}^3 \left\{1 - \frac{3}{8}(E'_0/E)^2\right\}. \quad (4)$$

A proton produced with energy well above E'_0 radiates photons copiously until its energy approaches E'_0 . It follows that a primary cosmic-ray proton with $E > E'_0$ cannot reach Earth. However, primary protons with energies up to 10^{20} eV have been seen [7]. We thereby obtain the bound:¹

$$1 - c < 5 \times 10^{-23}. \quad (5)$$

(If this bound were saturated, the vacuum Čerenkov threshold for a proton would be $E'_0 = 9.38 \times 10^{19}$ eV. One traversing empty space with any much greater energy would be reduced to an energy of $1.1 \times E'_0$ less than 140 cm from its point of production.) Eq. (5) is considerably more restrictive than (1).

From a field-theory viewpoint, there is no reason to restrict ourselves to just the effects of a tiny B^2 term. Properly, we should begin with the conventional Lagrangian \mathcal{L} of the standard model of particle physics and introduce all renormalizable Lorentz non-invariant interactions consistent with our symmetry assumptions: rotational and translational invariance in the preferred frame, and the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge symmetry of the standard model. (The condition of renormalizability, that the dimensions of the non-invariant interactions be no greater than four, arises if we assume the fundamental source

¹ If \mathcal{F} moves relativistically (*i.e.*, if $u \sim 1$), our arguments change but our conclusion remains. Lorentz non-invariance would be signaled by a pronounced (and unseen) dipole anisotropy of the highest energy cosmic rays.

of non-invariance to occur at a very large mass scale. Then higher-dimension operators are suppressed by inverse powers of the large mass.) We are preparing a study [8] of the general case; in this note we restrict ourselves to a few observations.

Of the many conceivable Lorentz non-invariant additions to the Lagrangian, some are TCP even, the others odd. Aside from B^2 , the only renormalizable term that affects the propagation of light is the TCP odd expression:

$$\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} F_{\mu\nu} A_\lambda s_\sigma \equiv \vec{A} \cdot \vec{B} s_0 + (\vec{A} \times \vec{E}) \cdot \vec{s}, \quad (6)$$

where s_μ is a fixed 4-vector with dimension of reciprocal length. This term is not gauge invariant, but it makes a gauge-invariant contribution to the action [9]. It causes the linear polarization of a photon that travels a distance r to rotate by the angle $\beta = (s_0 + \vec{s} \cdot \hat{n})r$, where \hat{n} is a unit vector along the photon direction. Analyses of astronomical data [9] [10] severely constrain the rotationally invariant term in (6). They lead to the constraint $s_0 < 10^{-28} \text{ cm}^{-1}$. More recently, indications of an anisotropy of electromagnetic propagation at cosmological distances [11] have been reported. This effect can be interpreted in terms of (6) with $|\vec{s}| \simeq 10^{-27} \text{ cm}^{-1}$. (Accepted at face value, these results would show that s is space-like, and that there is no frame with rotational symmetry.)

The observations discussed above make the detection of any TCP violating effects in the microworld unlikely. Radiative corrections induced by significant TCP violation elsewhere in \mathcal{L} would be expected to induce the term (6), and conversely. Thus, the largest dimensionless 4-vector that might characterize TCP violation in particle physics is s_μ/m (with m the electron mass). Its components have been shown to be less than 4×10^{-38} , far smaller than any of the limits we have discussed. For this reason, we shall examine only those violations of Lorentz invariance conserving TCP.

Tiny Lorentz non-invariant (but TCP conserving) additions to the matter portion of the Lagrangian affect the free propagation of a particle in a fashion depending on its identity and helicity [8]. In particular, neutrinos may differ in their maximum attainable velocities. Massless neutrinos cannot oscillate if special relativity is unbroken. However, they can oscillate if different neutrinos travel at slightly different speeds *in vacua*.

Let ν_i denote the velocity eigenstates of neutrinos with speeds $1 + v_i$, where $|v_i| \ll 1$. These states may not coincide with the flavor eigenstates set by weak interactions. Thus, a massless neutrino produced in one flavor state can appear in another flavor state along its way. Consider oscillations between the two states:

$$\nu_\mu = \cos \theta_v \nu_1 + \sin \theta_v \nu_2, \quad \nu_e = \cos \theta_v \nu_2 - \sin \theta_v \nu_1. \quad (7)$$

A newly-born muon neutrino with definite momentum propagates through empty space as a linear combination of states with slightly different energies: $E_1 - E_2 \simeq \delta v E$, where $\delta v = v_1 - v_2$. The probability for it to be an electron neutrino after traversing a distance R is:

$$P = \sin^2 2\theta_v \sin^2 \{\delta v ER/2\} . \quad (8)$$

A result similar to (8) was obtained [12] in the context of departures from the equivalence principle rather than special relativity. For these (VEP) oscillations, δv is replaced by a difference of terms proportional to the local gravitational potential, with tiny coefficients depending on neutrino identity. The energy dependence of ‘velocity oscillations’ differs from that of conventional ‘mass oscillations,’ for which

$$P \simeq \sin^2 2\theta_m \sin^2 \{\delta m^2 R/4E\} . \quad (9)$$

Observations of neutrinos emitted from supernova SN1987a limit possible Lorentz non-invariance in the neutrino sector. From reference [13], we find $\sin^2 2\theta_v < 0.35$ for $\delta v > 10^{-35}$. Furthermore, the velocity of ν_e (*i.e.*, its dominant velocity eigenstate) cannot differ from the velocity of light by more than two parts in 10^9 [14].

Accelerator and reactor experiments constraining the mass-oscillation parameters δm^2 and θ_m must be reanalyzed to yield constraints on the velocity-oscillation parameters δv and θ_v . For the case of $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ with maximal mixing, a cursory examination of the data yields the tentative estimate:²

$$|v_1 - v_2| < 10^{-21} , \quad (10)$$

a result comparable to the analogous atomic-physics limit (1). Much of the literature concerned with VEP oscillations [17] is applicable to the phenomenology of velocity oscillations. Neutrino experiments at existing accelerators, with longer baselines and higher energies, can search for velocity differences among neutrinos hundreds of times smaller than the current upper bound.

Lorentz non-invariant velocity oscillations, like VEP oscillations [17], can affect the solar neutrino flux. Suppose neutrinos were massless. If their velocity mixing were maximal and δv were 8.3×10^{-24} , all 1 MeV solar electron neutrinos would arrive at Earth as muon neutrinos. This velocity difference is two powers of ten less than the upper bounds (1) or

² Our result follows from the high-energy experiment of Vilain *et al.* [15]. The limit for mass oscillations, $\delta m^2 < 0.09 \text{ eV}^2$, arises from the lower energy experiment of C. Angelini *et al.* [16].

(10). Their characteristic energy dependence should enable experimenters to distinguish vacuum velocity oscillations from other proposed solutions to the solar neutrino problem, and to place stringent new limits on the associated departures from Lorentz invariance.

What if neutrinos do have mass? In this case, there are three possibly distinct bases for their description: flavor eigenstates (set by weak interactions), mass eigenstates (energy eigenstates at zero momentum), and velocity eigenstates (energy eigenstates at infinite momentum). Massive neutrinos may undergo simultaneous velocity and mass oscillations. For a two-state system, the probability for identity change is given [8] by a formula much like (8) or (9):

$$P = \sin^2 2\Theta \sin^2 \{ \Delta R/4E \} , \quad (11)$$

where the mixing angle Θ and phase factor Δ are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \sin 2\Theta &= | \delta m^2 \sin 2\theta_m + 2E^2 \delta v \sin 2\theta_v | , \\ \Delta \cos 2\Theta &= | \delta m^2 \cos 2\theta_m + 2e^{i\phi} E^2 \delta v \cos 2\theta_v | . \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The result depends on E , and as well, on δm^2 , δv , $\cos \theta_m$, and $\cos \theta_v$. An additional parameter ϕ appears because velocity and mass eigenstates, in general, are related by a complex unitary transformation. Eq.(11) reduces to mass mixing (9) for small E , and to velocity mixing (8) for large E . If all three neutrinos are both mass and velocity mixed, the analysis is more complicated and neutrino experimenters would be presented with an intricate challenge.

Searches failing to detect neutrino velocity oscillations can provide new and more sensitive tests of special relativity. Successful searches would reveal a surprising connection between cosmology (which has a preferred reference frame) and particle physics (which ordinarily does not).

Acknowledgement

One of the authors (SLG) is grateful for illuminating discussions with, or communications from: John Bahcall, Jerry Gabrielse, Maurice Goldhaber, John Learned, Sandip Pakvasa, Georg Raffelt, and Xerxes Tata. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant NSF-PHYS-92-18167.

References

- [1] C. M. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics*, (Cambridge University Press, 1993); See also: M. P. Haugan and C. M. Will, *Phys. Today* 40 (May, 1987) 69; E. Fischbach, M. P. Haugan, D. Tadic, and H.-Y. Cheng, *Phys. Rev. D* 32 (1985) 154; G. L. Greene, M. S. Dewey, E. G. Kessler, Jr., and E. Fischbach, *Phys. Rev. D* 44 (1991) 2216. L. Gonzales-Mestres (to be publ.) discusses possible Lorentz non-invariance in a different context.
- [2] A. Brillet and J. L. Hall, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 42 (1979) 549.
- [3] V. W. Hughes, H. G. Robinson, and V. Beltran-Lopez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 4 (1960) 342; R. W. P. Drever, *Philos. Mag.* 6 (1961) 683.
- [4] J. D. Prestage, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 54 (1985) 2387.
- [5] S. K. Lamoreaux, J. P. Jacobs, B. R. Heckel, F. J. Raab, and E. N. Fortson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 57 (1986) 3125.
- [6] J. W. Cronin, K. G. Gibbs, and T. C. Weekes, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 43 (1993) 883.
- [7] J. Wdowczyk and A. W. Wolfendale, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 39 (1989) 43.
- [8] Sidney Coleman and Sheldon L. Glashow, (manuscript in preparation).
- [9] M. Carroll, G.B. Field and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev. D* 40 (1990) 1231.
- [10] Maurice Goldhaber and Virginia Trimble, *J. Astrophys. Astr.* 17 (1996) 17.
- [11] B. Nodland and J.P. Ralston, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78 (1997) 3043
- [12] M. Gasperini, *Phys. Rev. D* 38 (1988) 2635; A. Halprin and C.N. Leung, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 67 (1991) 1833.
- [13] A. Y. Smirnov, D.N. Spergel and J.N. Bahcall, *Phys. Rev. D* 49 (1994) 1369.
- [14] M.J. Longo, *Phys. Rev. D* 36 (1987) 3276; L. Stodolsky, *Phys. Lett.* B201 (1988) 353.
- [15] P. Vilain *et al.*, *Z. Phys.* C64 (1994) 539.
- [16] C. Angelini *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* B179 (1986) 307.
- [17] *E.g.*, J.N. Bahcall, P.I. Krastev and C. N. Leung, *Phys. Rev. D* 52 (1995) 1770; A. Halprin, C.N. Leung, and J. Pantaleone, *Phys. Rev. D* 53 (1996) 5365; S.L. Glashow, A. Halprin, P.L. Krastev, C.N. Leung, and J. Pantaleone (to be published).