

hep-ph/0203021  
RAL-TR-2002-006  
3 Mar 2002

# Neutrino Matter Effect Invariants and the Observables of Neutrino Oscillations

P. F. Harrison

Physics Department, Queen Mary University of London  
Mile End Rd. London E1 4NS. UK <sup>1</sup>

and

W. G. Scott

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory  
Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX. UK <sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

We generalise our previous observation on the invariance of the Jarlskog determinant to matter effects in neutrino oscillations. Within the context of standard neutrino oscillation theory with matter effects, we present the complete set of (five) matter invariant observables for neutrino propagation in matter. We give some examples of their application.

---

<sup>1</sup>E-mail:p.f.harrison@qmul.ac.uk

<sup>2</sup>E-mail:w.g.scott@rl.ac.uk

## 1 Introduction

Neutrino oscillations violate lepton flavour conservation. The amplitude  $A_{\alpha\beta}$  for a neutrino of flavour  $\alpha$  to be detected as a neutrino of flavour  $\beta$  is given as a function of propagation distance  $L$  by the (matrix) equation:

$$A = \exp(-iHL) \quad (1)$$

where  $H$  is the effective Hamiltonian in a flavour basis (ie. in a weak basis in which the charged lepton mass matrices are diagonal - this is defined up to an arbitrary phase redefinition of the charged lepton fields). We may take:

$$H = U \text{diag}(0, \Delta_{21}, \Delta_{31}) U^\dagger \quad (2)$$

where  $U$  is the conventional MNS matrix and the  $\Delta_{ij}$  are defined by  $\Delta_{ij} = (m_i^2 - m_j^2)/2E$ , with  $m_i$  the neutrino masses and  $E$  the neutrino energy. In this paper, all calculations are assumed to be in such a flavour basis.

We will find the following theorem useful. Any function,  $f(H)$ , of a Hermitian operator  $H$ , can be expanded using Lagrange's formula [1]:

$$f(H) = \sum_i f(\lambda_i) X^i \quad (3)$$

where the  $\lambda_i$  are the eigenvalues of  $H$  and the  $X^i$  are hermitian (projection) operators given by:

$$X^i = \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} (H - \lambda_j)}{\prod_{j \neq i} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)}. \quad (4)$$

Since  $H$  satisfies its own characteristic equation, the complete product  $\prod_i (H - \lambda_i)$  (with no factors dropped) clearly vanishes. It follows that the  $X^i$  are both left and right eigenvectors of  $H$  with eigenvalues  $\lambda_i$ , ie.  $(H - \lambda_i)X^i = X^i(H - \lambda_i) = 0$ . With the normalisation defined as in Eq. 4, we have  $(X^i)^2 = X^i$ , so the  $X^i$  are indeed projection operators, representing the (pure) mass-eigenstate density-matrices.

The ancient formula Eq. 3 has been used previously for the specific case of three-family neutrino oscillations in eg. Ref. [2], and has recently re-appeared in the same context in Ref. [3]. Applied to Eq. 1 it gives:

$$A = \sum_i X^i \exp(-i\lambda_i L). \quad (5)$$

Any  $X^i$  is readily computed from the corresponding column of the MNS matrix [4]:

$$X_{\alpha\beta}^i = U_{\alpha i} U_{\beta i}^* \quad (6)$$

(where no summation over  $i$  is implied). We note here that the elements of the matrices  $X^i$  are dependent on the phase-convention chosen for the charged lepton fields and are therefore not observables (likewise, of course, neither are the MNS matrix elements themselves).

Using Eq. 3 we may compute arbitrary powers of  $H$  as follows:

$$H^r = \sum_i \lambda_i^r X^i. \quad (7)$$

Given the eigenvalue spectrum, Eq. 4 determines the matrices  $X^i$  in terms of  $H$ , whilst setting  $r = 1$  in Eq. 7 yields the inverse relation, determining  $H$  in terms of the  $X^i$ . The case  $r = 0$  of Eq. 7 expresses the unitarity of  $U$ . For an  $n \times n$  Hamiltonian, there are only  $n$  independent equations of the form Eq. 7, because the characteristic equation can be used to write higher powers  $r \geq n$  in terms of the  $n$  lowest powers  $H^r, 0 \leq r < n$ .

The squared amplitude  $|A_{\alpha\beta}|^2$  for  $\alpha \neq \beta$  ( $\alpha = \beta$ ) gives the appearance (survival) probabilities as a function of propagation distance (the dependence on neutrino energy is implicit in the factors  $\Delta_{ij}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} P(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) = |A_{\alpha\beta}|^2 &= \delta_{\alpha\beta} - 4 \sum_{i < j} K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij} \sin^2(\Delta_{ij}L/2) \\ &+ 8J_{\alpha\beta} \sin(\Delta_{12}L/2) \sin(\Delta_{23}L/2) \sin(\Delta_{31}L/2) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where

$$K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij} = \text{Re}(X_{\alpha\beta}^i X_{\alpha\beta}^{j*}), \quad (9)$$

and

$$J_{\alpha\beta} = \text{Im}(X_{\alpha\beta}^i X_{\alpha\beta}^{j*}) = \pm J \text{ (for } \alpha \neq \beta \text{) or } = 0 \text{ (for } \alpha = \beta \text{)}. \quad (10)$$

$J$  is Jarlskog's  $CP$ - and  $T$ -violating invariant [5]. Inspection of Eqs. 8-10 indicates that the phase-convention-independent products of the form  $X_{\alpha\beta}^i X_{\alpha\beta}^{j*}$  ( $i \neq j$ ) are observables of the system [6], the real parts  $K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij}$  parameterising  $CP$ -conserving oscillation amplitudes and the imaginary parts  $J_{\alpha\beta}$  parameterising  $CP$  violation. We note that unitarity imposes many constraints among the observables,  $K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij}$  (and  $J$ ), and that once three of these are specified (such that at least two different flavour indices are used) along with  $J$ , the remaining ones may be determined via unitarity.

When neutrinos propagate in matter, the Hamiltonian in the flavour basis is modified:  $H \rightarrow H'$ , with

$$H' = H + \text{diag}(a, 0, 0) \quad (11)$$

where  $a = \sqrt{2}G_F N_e$ . This modifies both the eigenvalues and eigenstates of the neutrino Hamiltonian (in this paper, “primed” symbols will be used to denote the values of quantities when neutrinos propagate in matter and unprimed symbols for their vacuum counterparts).

We recently [7] pointed out that the determinant of the commutator of the lepton mass matrices is invariant with respect to matter effects,

$$\text{Det}[D_\ell^2, H'] = \text{Det}[D_\ell^2, H] \quad (12)$$

where  $D_\ell$  is the charged-lepton mass matrix, which is diagonal by construction in this basis. This allowed the derivation of a matter-invariant quantity, expressible both

as a function of elements of the effective Hamiltonian, and as a combination of the eigenvalue differences,  $\Delta_{ij}$ , and the  $CP$  violation parameter,  $J$  [7]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}(H'_{e\mu}H'_{\mu\tau}H'_{\tau e}) &= \text{Im}(H_{e\mu}H_{\mu\tau}H_{\tau e}) \\ &= \Delta'_{12}\Delta'_{23}\Delta'_{31}J' = \Delta_{12}\Delta_{23}\Delta_{31}J. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

This quantity has found application in several instances [8]. It is not however, the only matter-invariant combination of neutrino oscillation observables. Here we count the number of independent such combinations and derive a complete set.

## 2 A Complete Set of Matter Invariant Observables

Clearly, in a flavour basis, the modification to the effective Hamiltonian induced by matter, Eq. 11, affects only the “ $ee$ ” element:

$$H'_{ee} = H_{ee} + a \quad (14)$$

whereas the remaining eight elements of  $H$  are matter-invariant in this basis, ie.

$$H'_{\alpha\beta} = H_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \alpha\beta \neq “ee”. \quad (15)$$

The invariants of Eq. 15 are not immediately useful, however, as the Hamiltonian (vacuum or matter) is not itself observable. It transforms under (separate) phase redefinitions of the flavour eigenstates:

$$H \rightarrow \Phi H \Phi^\dagger \quad (16)$$

where

$$\Phi = \exp\{i \text{diag}(\phi_e, \phi_\mu, \phi_\tau)\} \quad (17)$$

so that

$$H_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow e^{i(\phi_\alpha - \phi_\beta)} H_{\alpha\beta} \quad (18)$$

without any observable consequence. The  $X^i$  transform similarly. If our invariants are to be readily applicable, we must seek to relate observable quantities directly.

We can count the number of independent observables represented by  $H$  as follows. An arbitrary  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrix comprises  $n^2$  independent real parameters ( $n$  on-diagonal,  $n(n-1)$ , off-diagonal). Eqs. 16-18 imply that for the effective Hamiltonian,  $n-1$  of these are unobservable *relative* phases, so that we would expect, at most,  $n^2 - n + 1$  observable quantities. In addition however, subtraction of any multiple of the identity from  $H$  (a “trace transformation”) leaves all neutrino oscillation observables invariant, so that only eigenvalue *differences* are relevant, leaving finally only  $n(n-1)$  independent observables in neutrino oscillations. For the  $3 \times 3$  MNS oscillation phenomenology, we have six observables, which are conventionally considered to be three real angles, one phase and two mass-squared differences. They could equally well be taken to be three independent  $K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij}$  (see Eq. 8),  $J$  and two eigenvalue differences,  $\Delta_{21}$  and  $\Delta_{31}$ , or alternatively six phase- and trace-invariant functions of

elements of  $H$  (see below). When neutrinos propagate in matter, one parameter is modified, Eq. 14, so that we may expect, in general,  $n(n-1)-1$  matter invariances (eg. five, in the three-family case).

We seek relations analogous to Eqs. 14-15 but involving only functions of the  $H_{\alpha\beta}$  which are invariant under both phase transformations and trace transformations. Taking Eq. 13 as a model, we seek furthermore to write them in terms of the observables of Eq. 8. Six independent such relations should exist. Relations which do not involve the “ee” flavour label will, in addition, be matter-invariant. The off-diagonal elements,  $H_{\alpha\beta}$  ( $\alpha \neq \beta$ ), are already invariant under trace transformations, and we can form phase-transformation invariants simply by taking their moduli-squared:

$$|H'_{\alpha\beta}|^2 = |H_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \quad (19)$$

$$= \left| \sum_i \lambda'_i X'^i_{\alpha\beta} \right|^2 = \left| \sum_i \lambda_i X^i_{\alpha\beta} \right|^2 \quad (20)$$

$$= - \sum_{j < k} \Delta_{jk}^2 K'^{jk}_{\alpha\beta} = - \sum_{j < k} \Delta_{jk}^2 K^{jk}_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \alpha \neq \beta \quad (21)$$

where we have used the relation, Eq. 7 with  $r = 1$  to obtain Eq. 20, and with  $r = 0$  (unitarity) to obtain Eq. 21. The quantities in Eq. 21 are all observable (see eg. Eq. 8) and the three independent combinations are each matter-invariant (only three combinations because  $|H_{\alpha\beta}| = |H_{\beta\alpha}|$ ).<sup>1</sup>

In a complementary fashion, the diagonal elements of  $H$  are already phase-invariant and we can form trace-transformation invariants by taking differences, whereby:

$$\begin{aligned} H'_{\mu\mu} - H'_{\tau\tau} &= H_{\mu\mu} - H_{\tau\tau} \\ = (X'^2_{\mu\mu} - X'^2_{\tau\tau})\Delta'_{21} + (X'^3_{\mu\mu} - X'^3_{\tau\tau})\Delta'_{31} &= (X^2_{\mu\mu} - X^2_{\tau\tau})\Delta_{21} + (X^3_{\mu\mu} - X^3_{\tau\tau})\Delta_{31} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which is matter-invariant, and

$$\begin{aligned} H'_{ee} - \text{Tr}(H')/3 &= H_{ee} - \text{Tr}(H)/3 + 2a/3 \\ = (X'^2_{ee} - \frac{1}{3})\Delta'_{21} + (X'^3_{ee} - \frac{1}{3})\Delta'_{31} &= (X^2_{ee} - \frac{1}{3})\Delta_{21} + (X^3_{ee} - \frac{1}{3})\Delta_{31} + 2a/3 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which may be said to be matter-covariant.

The three invariances of Eq. 20 correspond to the “sum-rules” of Ref. [9], although they are derived in a different way here, without appealing to the commutator of the mass-matrices<sup>2</sup>. Their expression in terms of our observables, Eq. 21, and the relations of Eqs. 22 and 23 are new. Our derivation demonstrates that all the above invariances follow straightforwardly from the fact that the Wolfenstein term affects only the “ee” element of the effective Hamiltonian, Eqs. 14, 15.

<sup>1</sup>The diagonal analogue of Eqs. 19-21:  $-\sum_{j < k} \Delta_{jk}^2 K^{jk}_{\alpha\alpha} = (H_{\alpha\alpha})^2 - (H^2)_{\alpha\alpha}$  is not independent, the LHS equating through unitarity to:  $\sum_{j < k} \Delta_{jk}^2 K^{jk}_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{j < k} \Delta_{jk}^2 K^{jk}_{\alpha\gamma}, \alpha \neq \beta \neq \gamma$ , and the RHS being simply  $-|H_{\alpha\beta}|^2 - |H_{\alpha\gamma}|^2$

<sup>2</sup>The quantities  $Z_{ij}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{ij}$  defined in Ref. [9] are in fact simply the off-diagonal elements of the effective Hamiltonian in vacuum and in matter respectively.

The five combinations Eqs. 21-23 all relate  $CP$ -conserving observables (the diagonal elements  $X_{\alpha\alpha}^i = |U_{\alpha i}|^2$  are observable). The combination Eq. 13 parameterises  $CP$  violation and is therefore independent. It is manifestly matter-, phase- and trace-transformation invariant, as required. We have therefore completed the derivation of six independent identities, Eqs. 13 and 21-23, relating particular combinations of matter-modified neutrino oscillation observables to their vacuum counterparts. Five of the combinations (Eqs. 13, 21 and 22) are matter-invariant, while one combination (Eq. 23) depends in a simple way on the matter-density. As regards neutrino oscillation phenomenology, these six combinations constitute a complete set, whereby any further matter-invariants (which can certainly be found, eg.  $\text{Re}(H_{e\mu}H_{\mu\tau}H_{\tau e})$ ) must always be expressible in terms of those given here.

### 3 Some Applications

As a first application, we show briefly how the formalism presented in the last Section applies to the simple case of two neutrino families. In this case, there is only one independent off-diagonal element of the effective Hamiltonian,  $|H_{e\mu}|$ , which leads to the analogue of the matter-invariant in Eq. 21:

$$\begin{aligned} |H'_{e\mu}|^2 &= |H_{e\mu}|^2 \\ &= -\Delta_{12}^{\prime 2} K_{e\mu}^{\prime 12} = -\Delta_{12}^2 K_{e\mu}^{12} \\ \Rightarrow \Delta_{12}^{\prime 2} \sin^2 2\theta' &= \Delta_{12}^2 \sin^2 2\theta \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

while the two-family analogue of Eq. 23 is

$$\begin{aligned} (X_{ee}' - \frac{1}{2})\Delta_{21}' &= a/2 + (X_{ee}^2 - \frac{1}{2})\Delta_{21} \\ \Rightarrow (\sin^2 \theta' - \frac{1}{2})\Delta_{21}' &= a/2 + (\sin^2 \theta - \frac{1}{2})\Delta_{21} \\ \Rightarrow -\cos 2\theta' \Delta_{21}' &= a - \cos 2\theta \Delta_{21} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we have used the definitions of the  $X^i$  and  $K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij}$  in terms of the  $2 \times 2$  mixing matrix elements to recover the standard results [10]. We have found one matter-invariant combination of observables [11], and one which is matter-covariant, the complete set for the two-family case (compared with five and one respectively for the three family case).

In the case of three families, we consider the appearance probabilities Eq. 8 with  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , in matter of arbitrary (uniform) density. Expanding each term in  $\Delta'_{ij}L/2$  for  $\Delta'_{ij}L/2$  small, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} P'(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) &= -\sum_{i < j} K_{\alpha\beta}^{\prime ij} (\Delta_{ij}^{\prime 2} L^2 - \Delta_{ij}^{\prime 4} L^4 / 24 + \dots) \\ &+ J'_{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{12}' \Delta_{23}' \Delta_{31}' L^3 + \dots \\ &= |H'_{\alpha\beta}|^2 L^2 + \text{Im}(H'_{e\mu} H'_{\mu\tau} H'_{\tau e}) L^3 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta_{ij}^{\prime 4} L^4) + \dots \\ &= |H_{\alpha\beta}|^2 L^2 + \text{Im}(H_{e\mu} H_{\mu\tau} H_{\tau e}) L^3 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta_{ij}^{\prime 4} L^4) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

We have used Eqs. 21 and 13 to identify the coefficients respectively of the  $CP$ -conserving term of order  $L^2$  and the  $CP$ -violating term of order  $L^3$  with manifestly matter-invariant combinations of elements of the effective Hamiltonian. Thus, they are determined directly in terms of elements of the vacuum Hamiltonian. The term of order  $L^4$  is not matter-invariant, and is the lowest-order term through which matter effects enter. The well-known [2] result that matter has no observable effect for small propagation distances, is explained here by the fact that off-diagonal elements of  $H$  are unmodified by matter. The result, Eq. 26, is valid for all mass and mixing patterns, but is, of course, useful only for small propagation distances.

A particular success of the matter invariance, Eq. 13, is that it enables the calculation of the universal  $CP$  violating asymmetry in matter of uniform density, with no restriction to small  $L$ , knowing only the vacuum Hamiltonian and the matter-modified eigenvalue differences [7] (which are readily calculated in terms of vacuum quantities, [2, 12]):

$$P'(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) - P'(\beta \rightarrow \alpha) = \text{Im}(H_{e\mu}H_{\mu\tau}H_{\tau e}) \frac{\sin(\Delta'_{12}L/2) \sin(\Delta'_{23}L/2) \sin(\Delta'_{31}L/2)}{(\Delta'_{12}/2)(\Delta'_{23}/2)(\Delta'_{31}/2)}. \quad (27)$$

This expression does not require knowledge of the matter-modified eigenstates (ie. mixing parameters), whose dependence is contained completely within the matter-invariant factor  $\text{Im}(H_{e\mu}H_{\mu\tau}H_{\tau e})$ . A comparison of the  $CP$ -conserving and  $CP$ -violating terms in Eq. 26 leads us to suspect that, perhaps more generally, the matter-invariant quantities  $|H_{\alpha\beta}|^2$  play a similar role for  $CP$ -conserving observables to that played by  $\text{Im}(H_{e\mu}H_{\mu\tau}H_{\tau e})$  for  $CP$ -violating observables. It is interesting therefore to enquire whether a simplification similar to that of Eq. 27 exists also for the  $CP$ -conserving parts of  $P(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$ , in terms of the matter-invariants  $|H_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ .

Some guidance is obtained by returning briefly to the two-family case. Consider Eq. 8 for the  $e \rightarrow \mu$  appearance probability in matter of uniform density:

$$\begin{aligned} P'(e \rightarrow \mu) &= |A'_{e\mu}|^2 = -4K'^{12}_{e\mu} \sin^2(\Delta'_{21}L/2) \\ &= |H_{e\mu}|^2 \frac{\sin^2(\Delta'_{21}L/2)}{(\Delta'_{21}/2)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where we have used Eq. 24 to write the probability as the product of a matter-invariant part ( $|H'_{e\mu}|^2 = |H_{e\mu}|^2$ ) and a part with a generic dependence on eigenvalue differences of the form  $(\sin \Delta' L / \Delta')^n$ . This exact expression, Eq. 28, is clearly analogous to Eq. 27 in the sense we require.

We do not a priori expect the three-family case to be as straightforward, but it will turn out that much of the above simplicity is retained, especially in the case of a hierarchical neutrino spectrum (as seems to be preferred experimentally). We may start again with Eq. 8, and assume a hierarchical spectrum,  $\Delta'_{21} \ll \Delta'_{31}$ ,  $\Delta'_{31} \simeq \Delta'_{32} \equiv \Delta'$  for all matter-densities considered. Then in the limit  $\Delta'_{21}L/2 \ll 1$  (which is less restrictive than the limit in which Eq. 26 applies), we find for the leading oscillation of the appearance probability (disappearance probabilities are anyway readily obtained

from appearance probabilities through unitarity):

$$\begin{aligned} P'(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) = |A'_{\alpha\beta}|^2 &\simeq -4(K'_{\alpha\beta}{}^{31} + K'_{\alpha\beta}{}^{32}) \sin^2(\Delta' L/2) \\ &= 4|X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3|^2 \sin^2(\Delta' L/2) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the last step follows from unitarity. We also require that  $|X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^2| \Delta'_{21} \ll |X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3| \Delta'_{31}$  for all matter-densities considered, in order that the leading oscillation dominates. This will generally be true, for the hierarchical spectrum we have assumed, but may not be in some special cases eg. if the mixing matrix elements also have an extreme hierarchy, see below.

Applying the same approximations to Eq. 21 we have:

$$|X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3|^2 \Delta'^2 = -(K'_{\alpha\beta}{}^{31} + K'_{\alpha\beta}{}^{32}) \Delta'^2 \simeq |H'_{\alpha\beta}|^2 = |H_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \simeq -(K_{\alpha\beta}^{31} + K_{\alpha\beta}^{32}) \Delta^2 = |X_{\alpha\beta}^3|^2 \Delta^2 \quad (30)$$

(ie. the combination  $|X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3| \Delta'$  is a matter-invariant, as long as  $|X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^2| \Delta'_{21} \ll |X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3| \Delta'_{31}$  remains valid, as already assumed). Combining Eqs. 29 and 30, we find that

$$P'(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) = |A'_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \simeq |H_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \frac{\sin^2(\Delta' L/2)}{(\Delta'/2)^2} \quad (31)$$

which generalises Eq. 28 to the three-family case, when the specified approximations apply.<sup>3</sup>

Thus Eq. 31 comes close (as close as we believe is possible) to being the analogue of Eq. 27 for the CP-conserving case. Where valid, Eq. 31 retains all the calculational expediency previously recognised in connection with Eq. 27, for the CP-violating case. We should say that in general (for arbitrary mass-squared differences, mixing angles and propagation lengths) no such analogy exists between the *CP*-conserving and the *CP*-violating contributions. The simplification exemplified by Eq. 27 is a consequence of the universality (for three families only) of the CP-violating term, as embodied in the Jarlskog parameter,  $J$  [5], but in general, no such universality exists for the CP-conserving  $K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij}$  coefficients (the two-family case being an exception). However, for phenomenologically realistic oscillation parameters (see eg. [13]), Eq. 31 is certainly applicable to the leading oscillation of  $P'(\mu \rightarrow \tau)$  (and of  $P'(\tau \rightarrow \mu)$ ) for most energies of interest, and, unless it turns out that  $|X_{e\beta}^3| \Delta_{31} \sim |X_{e\beta}^2| \Delta_{21}$  for  $\beta = \mu, \tau$  ( $|X_{e\beta}^3|$  depends on the presently poorly determined  $U_{e3}$ ), it should also be relevant for appearance probabilities involving electron neutrinos.

## 4 Relation to Standard Formalism

In order to relate our formulation in terms of matter-invariants to the standard one in terms of mixing angles, we first need to remove the implicit dependence of our

---

<sup>3</sup> The (possibly realised [13]) case  $|U_{e3}|^2 = 0$ , is a specific case which violates the assumption  $|X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^2| \Delta'_{21} \ll |X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3| \Delta'_{31}$  for  $\alpha = e$  or  $\beta = e$ , because then,  $X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3 = 0$ , and the leading oscillation vanishes. However, in this case, the long-wavelength oscillation becomes dominant, and Eqs. 29 and 31 become exactly true, with the substitutions  $|X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^3| \rightarrow |X'_{\alpha\beta}{}^2|$  and  $\Delta' \equiv \Delta'_{21}$  etc.

matter-invariants on the neutrino energy (which has been left in until now in the interests of a concise discussion). We note that all the preceding equations in this paper remain unaltered, if we make the energy re-scaling  $H \rightarrow 2EH \equiv \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\Delta_{ij} \rightarrow 2E\Delta_{ij} \equiv \Delta m_{ij}^2$ ,  $\lambda_i \rightarrow 2E\lambda_i$ ,  $a \rightarrow 2Ea \equiv \mathcal{A}$ ,  $L \rightarrow L/2E$  and likewise for all primed quantities. The observables  $K_{\alpha\beta}^{ij}$ ,  $J$ , and their matter-modified counterparts remain unchanged throughout, as do the oscillation probabilities.

We can now give the relationships between our energy-scaled matter-invariants (and covariant) (Eqs. 13 and 19-23) and the six parameters conventionally used to describe neutrino oscillation phenomenology,  $\theta_{12}$ ,  $\theta_{23}$ ,  $\theta_{13}$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\Delta m_{21}^2$  and  $\Delta m_{31}^2$ . Defining  $D = \Delta m_{31}^2 - \Delta m_{21}^2 s_{12}^2$  and  $F = \frac{1}{8}S_{12}S_{23}S_{13}c_{13}$ , we have:

$$\mathcal{H}_1 \equiv |\mathcal{H}_{e\mu}|^2 = c_{13}^2[s_{23}^2 s_{13}^2 D^2 + \frac{1}{4}c_{23}^2 S_{12}^2 (\Delta m_{21}^2)^2] + 2FD\Delta m_{21}^2 c_\delta \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_2 \equiv |\mathcal{H}_{e\tau}|^2 = c_{13}^2[c_{23}^2 s_{13}^2 D^2 + \frac{1}{4}s_{23}^2 S_{12}^2 (\Delta m_{21}^2)^2] - 2FD\Delta m_{21}^2 c_\delta \quad (33)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_3 \equiv |\mathcal{H}_{\mu\tau}|^2 = \frac{1}{4}\{[c_{13}^2 S_{23} D - (C_{12}S_{23} + S_{12}C_{23}s_{13}c_\delta)\Delta m_{21}^2]^2 + S_{12}^2 s_{13}^2 s_\delta^2 (\Delta m_{21}^2)^2\} \quad (34)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_4 \equiv \text{Im}(\mathcal{H}_{e\mu}\mathcal{H}_{\mu\tau}\mathcal{H}_{\tau e}) = \Delta m_{21}^2 \Delta m_{31}^2 (\Delta m_{31}^2 - \Delta m_{21}^2) F s_\delta \quad (35)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_5 \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\mu\mu} - \mathcal{H}_{\tau\tau} = C_{23}[C_{12}\Delta m_{21}^2 - c_{13}^2 D] - S_{12}S_{23}s_{13}c_\delta \Delta m_{21}^2 \quad (36)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_0 \equiv \mathcal{H}_{ee} - \frac{1}{3}\text{Tr}\mathcal{H} = D(s_{13}^2 - \frac{1}{3}) - \frac{1}{3}C_{12}\Delta m_{21}^2 \quad (37)$$

where we have used the conventional parameterisation [14] and  $c_{ij} = \cos \theta_{ij}$ ,  $s_{ij} = \sin \theta_{ij}$ ,  $C_{ij} = \cos 2\theta_{ij}$ ,  $S_{ij} = \sin 2\theta_{ij}$  etc. Eqs. 32-36 remain true in matter (with primed quantities on the RHS), as well as in vacuum and show that (sums of) products of (matter-density-dependent) oscillation amplitudes and mass-squared-differences are matter-invariant, thereby accounting for the folklore “no-win” theorem [15], that increased mixing-angles in matter seem to be compensated by reduced masses and hence longer oscillation lengths, and vice-versa. The covariant quantity on the LHS of Eq. 37 transforms to the matter case as  $\mathcal{H}'_0 \equiv \mathcal{H}'_{ee} - \text{Tr}(\mathcal{H}')/3 = \mathcal{H}_0 + 2\mathcal{A}/3$ , where  $\mathcal{A} = 2\sqrt{2}G_F N_e E$ , while the quantities on the RHS take their density-dependent values.

The usual six parameters ( $\theta_{12}, \theta_{23}, \theta_{13}, \delta, \Delta m_{21}^2$  and  $\Delta m_{31}^2$ ), are popular for their intuitive relevance, but they *all* have complicated dependencies on the density of the matter through which the neutrinos propagate [2] [16]. Different experiments operating over different baselines at different energies are all subject to different modifications of each of these conventional parameters due to matter effects. However, in each case, only one additional parameter is actually present, the (path-averaged) Wolfenstein term,  $\mathcal{A}$ . By contrast, as we have seen, the five combinations of observables, Eqs. 32-36 are all matter-invariant, while the sixth observable, Eq. 37, has a very simple dependence on the matter density. Clearly, these quantities could be used as the basis for a new parameterisation of neutrino oscillation phenomenology. This is especially true for the matter-invariants involving only off-diagonal elements:  $|\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}|^2 (\alpha \neq \beta)$

and  $\text{Im}(\mathcal{H}_{e\mu}\mathcal{H}_{\mu\tau}\mathcal{H}_{\tau e})$ , which are determined directly in appearance experiments as the amplitudes of the leading  $CP$ -even oscillations (given a strong-enough mass-hierarchy) and the  $CP$ -asymmetry respectively. Not only are they matter-invariant, but they are more directly observed even than the conventional mixing angles.

To some degree then, one may say that the problem of deconvoluting matter effects on the standard mixing parameter set is a problem of man's own making, which is solved (at least in the uniform-density case we have considered) by simply switching to a different parameter set. While it is probably unrealistic to assume that the new parameterisation proposed here will be immediately adopted universally, we believe that our parameters may have a practical value, beyond their evident conceptual importance as matter-invariant observables.

## Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank R. Edgecock for useful comments. This work was supported by the UK Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council (PPARC).

## References

- [1] See eg. R. Shaw, “Linear Algebra and Group Representations”, Vol. 1, Academic Press, 1982.
- [2] V. Barger, K. Whisnant, S. Pakvasa and R.J.N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D22 (1980) 2718.
- [3] T. Ohlsson, H. Snellman J. Math. Phys. 41 (2000) 2768-2788
- [4] P.F. Harrison, D.H. Perkins, W.G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B458 (1999) 79.
- [5] C. Jarlskog, Z. Phys. C29 (1985) 491; Phys. Rev. Lett. 55 (1985) 1039.
- [6] These quantities (for  $\alpha \neq \beta$ ) were dubbed “plaquettes” in the context of quark mixing phenomenology, see eg. J.D. Bjorken and I. Dunietz Phys. Rev. D36 (1987) 2109.
- [7] P.F. Harrison, W.G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B476 (2000) 349.
- [8] H. Yokomakura, K. Kimura, A. Takamura Phys. Lett. B496 (2000) 175.  
Z. Xing, Phys. Rev. D63 (2001) 073012.  
S.J. Parke, T.J. Weiler, Phys. Lett. B501 (2001) 106.  
M. F. Freund. Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 053003 hep-ph/0103300.  
T. Miura, E. Takasugi, Y. Kuno, hep-ph/0102111.
- [9] Z. Xing, Phys. Rev. D64 (2001) 033005, hep-ph/0102021.
- [10] P. Langacker et al. , Phys. Rev. D 27 (1983) 1228.
- [11] E. Kh. Akhmedov et al. , Phys. Lett. B 503 (2001) 133, hep-ph/0011136.
- [12] Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B487 (2000) 327, hep-ph/0002246.
- [13] P.F. Harrison, D.H. Perkins, W.G. Scott, to be published in Phys. Lett. B. hep-ph/0202074.
- [14] D.E. Groom et al. Eur. Phys. J. C15 (2000) 1.
- [15] M.C. Banuls, G. Barenboim, J. Bernabeu, Phys. Lett. B513 (2001) 391. hep-ph/0102184.
- [16] H.W. Zaglauer, K.H. Schwarzer, Z. Phys. C40 (1988) 273.