

# Can cosmic strangelets reach the earth ?

Shibaji Banerjee<sup>1,a</sup>, Sanjay K. Ghosh<sup>1,b,c</sup>, Sibaji Raha<sup>1,d</sup> and Debapriyo Syam<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Bose Institute, 93/1, A.P.C.Road, Calcutta 700 009, India*

<sup>2</sup>*Physics Department, Presidency College, 86/1, College Street, Calcutta 700 073, India*

The mechanism for the propagation of strangelets with low baryon number through the atmosphere of the Earth has been explored. It has been shown that, under suitable initial conditions, such strangelets may indeed reach depths near mountain altitudes with mass numbers and charges close to the observed values in cosmic ray experiments.

PACS No. : 12.38.Mh, 12.90.+b, 14.80.Dg, 96.40.-z

The existence of Strange Quark Matter (SQM), containing a large amount of strangeness had been postulated by various authors quite a few years ago. In a seminal work in 1984, Witten [1] proposed that SQM with roughly equal numbers of up, down and strange quarks could be the *true* ground state of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), the accepted theory of strong interactions. While only SQM with very large baryon numbers were initially thought to be favorable (in terms of stability), later calculations have shown [2–6] that small lumps of SQM can also be stable. The occurrence of stable (or metastable) lumps of SQM, referred to in the literature as strangelets, would lead to many rich consequences; for a recent review, see [7].

Strangelets may arise from various scenarios; they could be formed in highly energetic nuclear collisions associated with the formation of quark-gluon plasma [3,5], or they might be of cosmological origin, as remnants of the cosmic QCD phase transition [8]. Collisions of strange stars could also lead to the formation of strangelets which could contribute to the cosmic ray flux [7]. In heavy ion collisions, it is thought that strangelets with atomic number  $A$  upto 20 - 30 may be formed [5], the stability of which depend rather sensitively on the parameter values (like the Bag constant) and an underlying shell-like structure. For larger strangelets ( $A > 40$ ), the stability appears to be more robust [6,7]. We confine our attention in this work to such larger strangelets, which may not be readily formed in heavy ion collisions in the laboratory but could be of cosmic origin. A discerning property of such strangelets would be an unusual charge to mass ratio ( $Z/A \ll 1$ ) [7].

The obvious place to look for such strangelets would be in the cosmic ray flux. In this context, it may be recalled that there have been intermittent reports in the literature [9–13] about the detection of exotic cosmic ray events, with unusually low charge to mass ratios; some of these events are tabulated in Table 1. Although it appears natural to identify these events with strangelets, no consensus has yet emerged, primarily because of the ambiguities associated with the mechanism of propagation of strangelets through the terrestrial atmosphere. For example, if a strangelet arriving at the top of the atmosphere has a baryon number  $A \sim 1000$ , there would be a serious problem with its penetrability through the atmosphere, as the *exotic* events are observed at quite low altitudes. One could assume that their geometric cross sections are very small. Alternately, one could conjecture, *a la* Wilk *et al* [14–16] and others [17], that although the initial mass of the strangelet is very large, it decreases rapidly due to collisions with air molecules, until the mass reaches a critical value  $m_{crit}$  below which the strangelet simply evaporates into neutrons.

The difficulties associated with this kind of interpretation are twofold. Firstly, one has to take account of the fact that, unlike ordinary nuclear fragments which tend to break up in collisions, strangelets can become more strongly bound if they absorb matter [1]. Secondly, since a strangelet has a net electric charge, it experiences an ever increasing geomagnetic field, which considerably lengthens its path before reaching a certain altitude. This implies many more interactions with the nuclei of the atmospheric atoms, as a result of which the strangelet would “evaporate” much before the desired depth is reached.

These difficulties can be naturally overcome in a different scenario, proposed recently by the present authors [18], in which the stability of the strangelet plays a very important role. In this model, an initially small strangelet, during its travel through the Earth’s atmosphere, picks up mass, rather than lose it, from the atmospheric atoms. Such a situation may prevail unless the propagation velocity of the strangelet through the atmosphere is so high that in a collision with the atmospheric nucleons, the excitation energy would exceed the binding energy. We have estimated that for our case, where the initial  $A$  is larger than 40, this upper limit on the velocity comes out to be above 0.7c. (We disregard the possibility of fission-like fragmentation of the strangelets.) The equation governing the rate of change of mass with respect to distance traveled is given by,

$$\frac{dm_s}{dh} = \frac{f \times m_n}{\lambda} \quad (1)$$

and the equation of motion reads

$$\frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = -\vec{g} + \frac{q}{m_s}(\vec{v} \times \vec{B}) - \frac{\vec{v}}{m_s} \frac{dm_s}{dt} \quad (2)$$

In the above equation,  $m_s$  and  $\vec{v}$  represent the instantaneous mass and the velocity of the strangelet,  $q$  is the charge and  $\lambda$  is the mean free path of the strangelet in the atmosphere. The factor  $f$  determines the fraction of neutrons that are actually absorbed out of the incident neutrons ( $m_n$ ). In this case,  $\lambda$  is both a function of  $h$  (which determines the density of air molecules) and  $m_s$  (which is related to the interaction cross section). The initial velocity has to be bigger than a threshold value, so that a strangelet of a given initial mass and charge can arrive at an altitude  $\sim 25$  km from the sea level, surmounting the geomagnetic barrier. The upper limit of 25 km is chosen primarily to economise on the computation time and is *a fortiori* justified since the density of the atmosphere above this height is almost negligible for our purpose. The variation of atmospheric density with height has been described by a parametric fit to the data given in the standard reference of Kaye and Laby [19].

According to the above analysis, a strangelet with an initial mass of  $\sim 64$  amu and charge  $\sim 2$  evolves to a mass  $\sim 340$  amu or so, by the end of its journey, an altitude  $\sim 3.6$  km above the sea level (typically the height of a north east Himalayan peak in India, like *Sandakphu*, at a geomagnetic latitude  $\sim 30^\circ N$ ). This mass is quite close to the few available data (see Table 1) and seems to support the interpretation that exotic cosmic ray events with very small  $Z/A$  ratios could result from SQM droplets. However, it was assumed in [18] that only neutrons are absorbed preferentially over the protons from the nuclei of the atmospheric atoms (*i.e.* charge of the strangelet remains constant), the protons being coulomb repelled. It should nonetheless be realized that in the earlier phase of the journey, when the relative velocity between the strangelet and the air molecule is large, some protons will indeed be absorbed, albeit with a lower cross section than that for neutron capture. As the strangelet builds up in mass as well as in charge, the coulomb barrier at the surface of the strangelet gets steeper and the relative velocity also gets further reduced. This will slow down the charge transfer process and ultimately inhibit it. Also, one cannot avoid the issue of loss of energy of the strangelet through ionisation of the surrounding media. As we shall see, the ionisation losses, which become quite significant at comparatively low altitudes, actually provides a lower limit to the height at which the strangelets can be detected successfully.

In this letter, we therefore try to explore the consequences of the absorption of protons by the strangelets in course of their journey through the terrestrial atmosphere in a relativistic setting. The equation of motion (2) can be generalized to a relativistic form in a straightforward manner:

$$\gamma m_s \frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = -m_s \vec{g} + q(\vec{v} \times \vec{B}) - \gamma \vec{v} \left( \frac{dm_{s_n}}{dt} + \frac{dm_{s_p}}{dt} \right) - m_s \vec{v} \frac{d\gamma}{dt} - \frac{f(v)}{\sqrt{3}} \vec{v} \quad (3)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the Lorentz factor. The third term takes care of the deceleration of the strangelet due to the absorption of neutron as well as protons, where the proton absorption term is related to the neutron absorption term as

$$\frac{dm_{s_p}}{dt} = \frac{\sigma_p}{\sigma_n} \frac{dm_{s_n}}{dt} \equiv f_{pn} \frac{dm_{s_n}}{dt} \quad (4)$$

where  $\sigma_p$  and  $\sigma_n$  are the cross sections for neutron and proton absorption, respectively. Treating, classically, the proton of energy  $E$  as a free charged particle of unit charge in the repulsive coulomb field of the strangelet, we can easily estimate the minimum separation  $r_{min}$  along the trajectory to be given by

$$\frac{(mv_o b)^2}{2mr_{min}} + U(r_{min}) = E$$

where  $U(r)$  represents the potential energy of the proton due to the coulomb field of the strangelet;  $v_o$  is the relative speed with which the  $N_2$  nuclei (and hence, its constituent protons) approach the strangelet and  $b$  is the impact parameter. Assuming that charge transfer can take place when  $r_{min} \leq R_s$  (the radius of the strangelet), the corresponding value of  $b$  ( $\equiv b_c$ ) is  $b_c^2 = R_s^2 (1 - U(R_s)/E)$ , so that the proton capture cross section ( $\sigma_p$ ) by a strangelet of atomic number  $Z_s$  is  $\sigma_p = \pi b_c^2 = \pi R_s^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{Z_s e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 R_s} / E \right]$ .

In contrast, the scattering cross section for neutrons ( $\sigma_n$ ) is just  $\pi(r_n + R_s)^2$  and hence,

$$f_{pn} = \frac{R_s^2}{(r_n + R_s)^2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{E} \frac{Z_s e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 R_s} \right) \quad (5)$$

Finally, the last term of equation (3) accounts for the ionisation loss. The expression for  $f(v)$  is given by [20]

$$f(v) = -\frac{dE}{dx} = \frac{Z_s^2 e^4 n Z_{med}}{4\pi\epsilon_0^2 m_e v^2} \ln\left(\frac{b_{max}}{b_{min}}\right) \quad (6)$$

Here,  $n$  represents the number density of the atmospheric atoms at a particular altitude,  $Z_{med}$  is the number of electrons per atom of  $N_2$  which can be ionised,  $m_e$  is the mass of the electron and  $b_{max}$  and  $b_{min}$  are the maximum and minimum values of the impact parameter. At large velocities, expression (6) reduces to, with  $I$  denoting the average ionising energy,

$$f(v) = \frac{Z_s^2 e^4 n Z_{med}}{4\pi\epsilon_0^2 m_e v^2} \ln\left(\gamma^2 \frac{2m_s v^2}{I} - \beta^2\right) \quad (7)$$

However, when the velocity of the strangelet falls below a critical value  $v \leq 2Z_s v_0$  ( $v_0 = 2.2 \times 10^6 m/s$  is the speed of the electron in the first Bohr orbit), electron capture becomes significant which can be accounted for by the replacement  $Z_s \rightarrow Z_s^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{v}{v_0}$  [20,21].

Equation (3) was solved by the 4<sup>th</sup> order Runge-Kutta method with different sets of initial mass, charge and  $\beta$ . It may be mentioned at this point that the first term in eqn (3) is not important in magnitude, as is to be expected. We have nonetheless included it for numerical stability. This serves to define the downward vertical direction in the vector algorithm, especially for very small initial velocities.

In figure 1, we have plotted final masses (for initial masses 42, 54, 60 and 64 *amu*) with initial  $\beta$  for a fixed initial charge 2. This graph shows the following interesting feature; the final value of the mass decreases at first with increasing values of the initial  $\beta$  and then begins to increase again after a critical value of  $\beta$  is reached. This feature, although not apparent from the curve corresponding to the initial mass  $M = 64$  *amu*, clearly reveals itself for lower initial masses. From the same figure, it can also be inferred that the value of  $\beta$  where the 'dip' occurs shifts to the left with increasing values of the initial mass. Although mathematically delicate (it can be seen from eqn(3) that a higher value of speed leads to an increasing value of the mass increment, which in turn slows down the particle), a qualitative explanation of this feature might be given as follows. One can think of the total region through which the strangelet travels being divided into two distinct subregions. In subregion I, corresponding to higher altitudes, the number of atmospheric particles is small, while this number is considerably larger in subregion II, corresponding to lower altitudes. For small initial mass (smaller size), the strangelet has a greater chance to escape subregion I if  $\beta$  is higher, so that it will pick up lesser mass from this region. On the other hand, if  $\beta$  is very high, the volume that the strangelet sees will be contracted (the twisted tube through which it travels will be constricted) as a result of which it will interact with a greater number of atmospheric particles whence it will pick up a larger number of nucleons. It is clear that for an initially bigger (more massive) strangelet, this critical value of  $\beta$  will be lower, as it will be able to sweep through a larger number of atmospheric particles right from the start.

Let us now consider a representative set of data with initial mass 64 *amu* and charge 2 for detailed discussion. The results for  $\beta_0 = 0.6$  are shown in figures 2 and 3, where the variation of speed ( $\beta$ ) and the energy of the strangelet with altitude are depicted. The sharp change seen at  $\sim 13$  km corresponds to the onset of electron capture, which is handled phenomenologically through the effective  $Z_s$ . The insets of figures 2 and 3 show a zoomed-up view of the respective quantities near the endpoint of the journey. It is apparent from the figures that the ionisation term reduces the overall energy and speed considerably from the nondissipative situation [18]. However, the zoomed-up insets in figs.2 and 3 show that the strangelets may have enough energy to be detectable at an altitude of 3.6 km from the sea level. For example, for the values of the initial quantities  $m_{s_o}$  and  $\beta_o$  shown here, the strangelet is left with a kinetic energy  $\sim 8.5$  MeV (corresponding to  $\frac{dE}{dx} = 2.35$  MeV/mg/cm<sup>2</sup> in a Solid State Nuclear Track Detector (SSNTD) like CR-39), which, although small, is just above the threshold of detection  $(\frac{dE}{dx})_{crit} \sim 1 - 2$  MeV/mg/cm<sup>2</sup> for  $\beta < 10^{-2}$  in CR-39 for the present configuration. Below this height, the possibility of their detection with passive detectors like SSNTD reduces to almost zero.

Table 2 lists the final values of the quantities mass, charge,  $\beta$ , and the energy of the strangelet at the end of the journey for different initial velocities. A comparison between tables 1 and 2 shows that the final masses and charges are very similar to the ones found in cosmic ray events.

In conclusion, we have presented a model for the propagation of cosmic strangelets of none-too-large size through the terrestrial atmosphere and shown that when proper account of charge and mass transfer as well as ionisation loss is taken, they may indeed reach mountain altitudes, so that a ground based large detector experiment would have a good chance of detecting them.

The works of SB and SKG were supported in part by the Council of Scientific & Industrial Research, Government of India, New Delhi.

- <sup>a</sup> Electronic Mail : phys@bosemain.boseinst.ernet.in
- <sup>b</sup> Present address : Theory Group, TRIUMF, 4004, Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 2A3, Canada
- <sup>c</sup> Electronic Mail : sanjay@triumf.ca
- <sup>d</sup> Electronic Mail : sibaji@bosemain.boseinst.ernet.in
- [1] E. Witten, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 272 (1984)
  - [2] E. Farhi and R. L. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 2379 (1984); E. P. Gilson and R. L. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 332 (1993)
  - [3] C. Greiner, P. Koch and H. Stöcker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1825 (1987); C. Greiner, D.-H. Rischke, H. Stöcker and P. Koch, *Phys. Rev.* **D38**, 2797 (1988); C. Greiner and H. Stöcker, *Phys. Rev.* **D44**, 3517 (1991)
  - [4] M. G. Mustafa and A. Ansari, *Phys. Rev.* **D53**, 5136 (1996); *Phys. Rev.* **C55**, 2005 (1995)
  - [5] J. Schaffner-Bielich, C. Greiner, A. Diener and H. Stöcker, *Phys. Rev.* **C55**, 3038 (1997); J. Schaffner-Bielich, *J. Phys. G : Nucl. Part. Phys.* **23**, 2107 (1997)
  - [6] Jes Madsen, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 3328 (1994)
  - [7] Jes Madsen, *astro-ph/9809032*; to appear in **Hadrons in Dense Matter and Hadrosynthesis**, *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg.
  - [8] J. Alam, S. Raha and B. Sinha, *Ap. J.* **513**, 572 (1999); A. Bhattacharyya, J. Alam, S. Sarkar, P. Roy, B. Sinha, S. Raha and P. Bhattacharjee, *Nucl. Phys.* **A661**, 629 (1999); *Phys. Rev.* **D61**, 083509 (2000)
  - [9] M. Kasuya *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 2153 (1993)
  - [10] M. Ichimura *et al.*, *Il Nuovo Cim.* **A106**, 843 (1993)
  - [11] P. B. Price *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D18**, 1382 (1978); T. Saito, *Proc. 24<sup>th</sup> ICRC, Rome* **1**, 898 (1995)
  - [12] O. Miyamura, *Proc. 24<sup>th</sup> ICRC Rome* **1**, 890 (1995)
  - [13] J. N. Capdeville, *Il Nuovo Cim.* **19C**, 623 (1996)
  - [14] G. Wilk and Z. Wlodarczyk, *J. Phys. G : Nucl. Part. Phys.* **22**, L105 (1996)
  - [15] G. Wilk and Z. Wlodarczyk, *Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.)* **52B**, 215 (1997)
  - [16] G. Wilk and Z. Wlodarczyk, *Heavy Ion Phys.* **4**, 395 (1996)
  - [17] E. Gadysz-Dziadus and Z. Wlodarczyk, *J. Phys. G : Nucl. Part. Phys.* **23**, 2057 (1996)
  - [18] S. Banerjee, S. K. Ghosh, S. Raha and D. Syam, *J. Phys. G : Nucl. Part. Phys.* **25**, L15 (1999)
  - [19] G. W. C. Kaye and T. H. Laby, *Tables of Physical and Chemical Constants and Some Mathematical Functions*, Longman, New York and London (1986)
  - [20] H. A. Bethe, *Ann. Phys.* **5**, 325 (1930); H. A. Bethe and J. Ashkin, in : *Experimental Nuclear Physics*, Vol. I (ed. E. Segrè), p. 166, John Wiley and Sons, New York and London (1953)
  - [21] Aa. Bohr, *Mat. Fys. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk.* **24**, No. 19 (1948)

<i>Event</i>	<i>Mass</i>	<i>Charge</i>
Counter experiment [9]	$A \sim 350-450$	14
Exotic Track [10]	$A \sim 460$	20
Price's Event [11]	$A > 1000$	46
Balloon Experiments [12,13]	$A \sim 370$	14

TABLE I. Mass and charge obtained from cosmic ray experiments

$\beta_0$	$m_{s_0}$	$m_l$ (amu)	$q_l$	$\beta_l \times (10^{-3})$	$e_l$ (MeV)
0.2	42	294.7	3	2.8	1.05
	54	369.4	4	3.0	1.55
	60	415.8	4	3.0	1.80
	64	446.5	5	3.1	1.98
0.4	42	246.4	6	4.9	2.84
	54	359.5	8	4.7	3.73
	60	415.6	8	4.7	4.25
	64	452.0	9	4.6	4.63
0.6	42	235.8	10	7.4	5.97
	54	357.1	12	6.6	7.15
	60	416.0	13	6.4	7.87
	64	453.6	14	6.3	8.39
0.7	42	236.4	12	8.6	8.16
	54	359.1	14	7.6	9.59
	60	418.3	15	7.3	10.46
	64	456.3	16	7.2	11.11

TABLE II. The final values, denoted with suffix  $l$ , are tabulated along with initial  $\beta$  ( $\beta_0$ )




FIG. 1. Variation of final masses with initial  $\beta$  for different initial masses




FIG. 2. Variation of final  $\beta$  with altitude (a) for constant charge and without ionisation loss and (b) including proton absorption as well as ionisation loss




FIG. 3. Variation of kinetic energy with altitude