No vs Is Good News

Joel Meyers SMU Neutrinos in Physics and Astrophysics 1-18-2025 Based on:

2405.00836 Craig, Green, JM, Rajendran 2407.07878 Green, JM

Image Credits: PICO; ATLAS; Hahn, Abel; Caltech-JPL

History of the Universe





Image Credit: NASA



Cosmological Measurement of Neutrino Mass



 DESI BAO, combined with CMB data, now allows for tightest yet constraint on sum of neutrino masses

$$\sum m_{\nu} < 72 \text{ meV } (95\%)$$

 Uncertainty is approaching level necessary for detection of minimum mass implied by flavor oscillations

Negative Neutrino Mass?





4

 Measurements actually favor negative neutrino mass

$$\sum m_{\nu} = -160 \pm 90 \text{ meV} (68\%)$$

 This measurement disfavors the minimal mass for the normal hierarchy (58 meV) at 99% confidence

Craig, Green, JM, Rajendran (2024)

Cosmic Neutrino Background

Carlos Carlos Carlos

Cosmic Neutrino Background





Cosmic neutrinos are light thermal relics from the early universe

 $\nu + \bar{\nu} \longleftrightarrow e^+ + e^ e + \nu \longleftrightarrow e + \nu$

$$\frac{\Gamma}{H} \sim \left(\frac{T}{1\,{\rm MeV}}\right)^3$$

 $N_{\rm eff}$



CvB makes up significant fraction of radiation energy density at early times

$$\rho_{\rm r} = \rho_{\gamma} \left(1 + \frac{7}{8} \left(\frac{4}{11} \right)^{4/3} N_{\rm eff} \right)$$

Massive neutrinos act like hot dark matter affecting structure growth at more recent times

$$f_{\nu} \equiv \frac{\Omega_{\nu}}{\Omega_{\rm m}} \simeq 4.3 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{\sum m_{\nu}}{58 \text{ meV}} \right)$$

Image Credit: Symmetry Magazine

6

Cosmic Neutrino Background -Instantaneous Decoupling Model



Cosmic neutrinos decoupled from the thermal plasma around 1 MeV, and were then diluted relative to photons by electron-positron annihilation

$$T_{\nu} = \left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{1/3} T_{\gamma}$$

Cosmic neutrino background makes up a significant fraction of the energy density prior to recombination

$$\rho_{\nu} \simeq 0.471 \rho_r$$



Cosmic Neutrino Background -Precision Model



Neutrino Differential Visibility



The energy density of the cosmic neutrino background can be calculated precisely, including the effects of non-instantaneous weak decoupling

$$N_{\rm eff} = \frac{8}{7} \left(\frac{11}{4}\right)^{4/3} \frac{\rho_{\nu}}{\rho_{\gamma}}$$

 $N_{\rm eff}^{\rm SM} = 3.044(1)$

Escudero Abenza (2020); Akita, Yamaguchi (2020); Froustey, Pitrou, Volpe (2020); Bennett, et al (2021); Bond, Fuller, Grohs, JM, Wilson (2024)

Massive Cosmic Neutrinos



normal hierarchy (NH)



Cosmic neutrino background provides an abundance of non-relativistic neutrinos

$$n_{\nu_i,0} = 112 \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$$

Cosmology is sensitive to the gravitational effects of the cosmic neutrino background, allowing a measurement of a sum of neutrino masses

 $\sum m_{\nu} \gtrsim 58 \text{ meV} \qquad \sum m_{\nu} \gtrsim 105 \text{ meV}$

Super-Kamiokande (1999); Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (2001); CMB-S4 (2016)

inverted hierarchy (IH)



10

Massive Neutrinos Suppress Matter Clustering



The large velocities of cosmic neutrinos causes them to free stream out of potential wells and suppress the growth of structure on scales smaller than their free-streaming length

$$f_{\nu} \equiv \frac{\Omega_{\nu}}{\Omega_{\rm m}} \simeq 4.3 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{\sum m_{\nu}}{58 \text{ meV}}\right)$$

 $P(k > k_{\rm fs}) \simeq (1 - 8f_{\nu})P(k > k_{\rm fs})|_{\sum m_{\nu} = 0}$

Hu, Eisenstein, Tegmark (1998); Cooray (1999); Abazajian, et al (2011); Green, JM (2021); Gerbino, Grohs, Lattanzi, et al (2022)

Cosmological Probes of Neutrino Mass

and the second second

Value of Cosmological Neutrino Mass Measurement





Particle Physics

 Absolute neutrino mass scale sets a target for complementary lab-based searches for neutrino mass



- Cosmology
- Provides end-to-end test of cosmic history and is sensitive to new massive species (including gravitinos)



Astrophysics

 Multiple probes of matter power allow neutrino mass to be disentangled from nonlinear and baryonic effects

Green, JM (2021); Gerbino, Grohs, Lattanzi, et al (2022) ¹²

Measuring Clustering with Cosmological Surveys





Sensitivity regimes of various probes of clustering

- Galaxy number density, galaxy weak lensing, counts of galaxy clusters, and weak lensing of the cosmic microwave background (among other probes) are sensitive to the clustering of matter across a wide range of scales and redshifts
- CMB lensing provides an unbiased measurement of integrated matter clustering in the linear regime

Unlensed CMB Polarization





Unlensed E

 $5^{\circ} \times 5^{\circ}$ simulated maps



Unlensed B

Image Credit: Guzman ¹⁴

Lensed CMB Polarization



Lensed E

 $5^{\circ} \times 5^{\circ}$ simulated maps





Ø

Lensed B

Image Credit: Guzman ¹⁵

CMB Lensing Reconstruction





 40σ observation



Neutrino Mass with CMB Lensing



Measuring suppression of clustering with CMB-S4 lensing

17 Planck (2018); CMB-S4 (2016); Green, JM (2021)

CMB Measurements of the Primordial Amplitude





Planck 2018: $\tau = 0.054 \pm 0.007$

- Measurements of the CMB power spectra at l>30 tightly constrain the combination $A_s e^{-2\tau}$, while polarization at l<20 is sensitive to τ^2
- Large scale polarization is most easily measured with a CMB satellite or balloon-borne CMB experiment

Planck (2018); Figure Credit: Reichardt (2015) ¹⁸

Matter Density with Baryon Acoustic Oscillations





- Spectroscopic galaxy surveys such as DESI precisely measure the expansion history using Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) as a standard ruler
- This provides a precise determination of the matter density, essential for a calibration of the amplitude of the matter power spectrum

Current Measurement





 Planck + ACT Lensing + DESI BAO measurements favor negative neutrino mass

$$\sum m_{\nu} = -160 \pm 90 \text{ meV} (68\%)$$

• This measurement disfavors the minimal mass for the normal hierarchy (58 meV) at 99% confidence

Craig, Green, JM, Rajendran (2024) ²⁰

Possible Explanations

and the second second

Optical Depth Systematic





- The best-fit value of the optical depth has evolved over time
- A shift much larger than the statistical error on τ would be required to explain inference of negative neutrino mass

Craig, Green, JM, Rajendran (2024) ²²

Matter Density Systematic





- The preference for negative neutrino mass could be explained by a shift to the matter density
- Measurements of matter density have remained roughly consistent over time

New Physics?



$$P^{(\sum m_{\nu})}(k \gg k_{\rm fs}, z) \approx \left(1 - 2f_{\nu} - \frac{6}{5}f_{\nu}\log\frac{1+z_{\nu}}{1+z}\right) P^{(\sum m_{\nu}=0)}(k \gg k_{\rm fs}, z)$$
Massive neutrinos
do not cluster like
cold dark matter
Dark matter clustering is
suppressed in presence of
free-streaming neutrinos
$$z_{\nu} \approx 100 \left(\frac{m_{\nu}}{50 \text{ meV}}\right)$$
Neutrinos become
non-relativistic at high redshift

Craig, Green, JM, Rajendran (2024) ²⁴



Dark Energy is Unlikely to be Solution





- Like neutrino mass, dark energy impacts the growth of structure
- Because dark energy operates in only the relatively recent cosmic past, a fairly large change to cosmic history is required to achieve the requisite enhanced CMB lensing power
- Non-phantom dark energy acts to suppress clustering, leading to a preference for even more negative neutrino mass

Green, JM (2024) ²⁵



New Physics for Vanishing Neutrino Mass

 10^{-1}



 $k \ (h \,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1})$

 $T_{\nu} = 1.95 \text{ K}$ $T_{\nu} = 0.195 \text{ K}$ $T_{\nu} = 0.0195 \text{ K}$

 10^{-2}

0.96

Neutrino decay

Neutrino annihilation

Neutrino cooling or heating

Time-varying mass

26 Craig, Green, JM, Rajendran (2024)



New Physics for Negative "Neutrino Mass"

$$P^{(\epsilon,\sum m_{\nu})}(k \gg k_{\rm fs}, z) \approx \left(1 - 2f_{\nu} + \frac{6}{5}(\epsilon + f_b)\log\frac{1 + z_{\star}}{1 + z}\right)P^{(\epsilon=0,\sum m_{\nu}=0)}(k \gg k_{\rm fs}, z)$$

Enhancement from long-range force on dark matter

• New long-range force for dark matter

 Primordial trispectrum that mimics CMB lensing

$$\zeta(\vec{x}) = \zeta_{\rm G}(\vec{x}) + \sqrt{\tau_{\rm NL}^{\sigma}} \zeta_{\rm G}(\vec{x}) \sigma(\vec{x})$$
$$\left\langle \zeta_{\vec{k}_1} \zeta_{\vec{k}_2} \zeta_{\vec{k}_3} \zeta_{\vec{k}_4} \right\rangle' = \tau_{\rm NL}^{\sigma} P_{\zeta}(k_1) P_{\zeta}(k_3) P_{\sigma}(|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2|) + \text{permutations}$$

Craig, Green, JM, Rajendran (2024)

27

Conclusion

and the second second

Conclusion





Astrophysics Image Credits: Planck; BEBC/CERN; Springel, et al; Alvarez, Kaehler, Abel

Congratulations George and Baha!

Backup Slides

and the second second

Is DESI Discrepant with Planck?







Green, JM (2024) ³²

CMB Lensing Systematic?





Preference for negative neutrino mass comes from both 2-point and 4-point CMB lensing statistics, and is dominated by 4-point measurement

 Planck and ACT lensing measurements are in good agreement (despite measuring different scales)

Robustness to Different Planck Likelihoods





 Use of PR4 Planck likelihood does not significantly shift inference of negative neutrino mass

• The upward shift compared to Planck 2018 is due to a preference for a larger value of the optical depth

Green, JM (2024) ³⁴

Mock DESI Analysis



Green, JM (2024)



Including SH0ES Data



Including SH0ES Supernova data has essentially no impact on the inference of neutrino mass

 Note that the Hubble tension suggests that this combination of datasets exhibits at least some level of internal inconsistency



Improved Lensing Measurement with Small Correlated Against Large Estimator (SCALE)



Chan, Hlozek, JM, van Engelen (2023) ³⁷



BBN and New Physics in the Neutrino Sector



The precision with which we can measure primordial light element abundances (especially deuterium and Helium-4) allows us to use BBN as a powerful probe of new physics

This becomes an even sharper test when combined with CMB constraints

Fischler, JM (2010); Lague, JM (2020); Bond, Fuller, Grohs, JM, Wilson (2024); Yeh, Shelton, Fields, Olive (2022)

38