Recoilless Resonant Capture of Antineutrinos

R. S. Raghavan

Institute for Particle Physics & Astrophysics and Department of Physics Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg VA 24061

Resonant capture of antineutrinos (\tilde{v}_e) can be accomplished by exploiting the monoenergetic \tilde{v}_e emitted in bound state β-decay. Extending this idea, I explore conditions for recoilless resonant capture in the system 3 H - 3 He. Observation of such transitions can set the stage for placing stringent limits on the \tilde{v}_e parameter θ_{13} on an ultra-short baseline of ~9 m and for observing the gravitational red shift of neutrinos.

The antineutrino (\tilde{v}_e) capture reaction

 $\tilde{v}_e + A(Z) + e^{\tilde{z}}(\text{orbital}) \rightarrow A(Z-1)$ (1),

where the electron is captured from atomic orbit in the target atom A(Z) was considered by Fermi¹ and by Mikaelyan et al² who noted the resonant character of the reaction. The resonance energy is:

$$
E(\tilde{v}_{\rm e\,res}) = M(Z) - M(Z-1) = Q \tag{2},
$$

where M are the *atomic* masses of the target and daughter atoms. The rate R of (1) is²:

$$
R \propto |\Psi^2| \rho(E \tilde{v}_{e \text{ res}}) / ft \tag{3},
$$

where $|\Psi^2|$ is the probability of the orbital electron in the nucleus (as in normal orbital electron capture decay), $\rho(E \, \tilde{v}_{e \text{ res}})$ is the resonant spectral density of the inducing \tilde{v}_e beam (the number of \tilde{v}_e per unit energy interval at the resonance energy) and ft is the reduced half-life of the β-decay $A(Z-1) \rightarrow A(Z)$. Ref. 2 considered an incident \tilde{v}_e spectrum from nuclear reactors that falls monotonically up to 10 MeV. Reaction 1) has never been attempted primarily because \tilde{v}_e beams from normal radioactive sources or reactors (the only known \tilde{v}_e sources), have too small a resonant spectral density $\rho(E \tilde{v}_{e \text{ res}})$.

 In this paper I propose a new approach that could make reaction (1) observable (perhaps even in the laboratory) by significantly increasing $\rho(E \, \tilde{v}_{e \, \text{res}})$. The key idea is a way to achieve a source of *monoenergetic* \tilde{v}_e 's with the precise resonance energy required in (2). Such a source is the reverse decay:

$$
A(Z-1) \leftarrow \tilde{v}_e + A(Z) + (e^{\cdot} \text{ in bound state}) \quad (4)
$$

in which the electron emitted in the usual βdecay of A(Z-1) occupies a bound orbit in A(Z) instead of going into the continuum. This process, called bound state β-decay (Bβ), was recognized already in $1947³$ as a competing mode to the normal continuum mode (Cβ). The definitive work on Bβ in the modern V-A theory is due to Bahcall⁴ whose results apply directly to the present work. If the electron final state in the v_e source (4) is the same atomic orbital as that from which it is captured in the target of (1), the resulting \tilde{v}_e is monoenergetic due to the 2-body decay (4) and its energy = $M(Z)-M(Z-1)=Q$, precisely the resonance energy (2). The basic condition for truly resonant \tilde{v}_e capture can thus be satisfied.

The purpose of this Letter is to explore \tilde{v}_e resonance reactions in the favorable case of the 3 H (T)- 3 He system. We extend these studies to explore basic parameters and experimental conditions for dramatically enhancing the resonance cross sections via *recoilless* ν_ε emission and absorption. Possible immediate applications are the study of \tilde{v}_e phenomena such as θ_{13} oscillations on a very short (laboratory scale) baseline and the gravitational red shift of neutrinos.

The nuclear data on the T^{-3} He system is summarized in Table 1. This case satisfies all the basic requirements for observing resonant

Table I. The $T\rightarrow$ ³He nuclear-atomic system

Decay	$E\tilde{v}_{\text{eres}}$	ft(s)	$B\beta/C\beta$
	(keV)	(CB)	(ref. 4)
$\overline{H(T)} \rightarrow \overline{H}$	18.60	1132	4.7×10^{-3}

 \tilde{v}_e capture. It offers the fastest known superallowed β-decay that emits one of the lowest energy \tilde{v}_e 's with a sizable B β /C β ratio. Most importantly, the atomic physics basis is ideal. The initial T atom has a vacancy in the 1S shell for B β decay and the target ³He has two 1S electrons one of which can be captured. 1S electrons are ideal since $|\Psi|^2$ (which appears both in the B β and the \tilde{v}_e capture probabilities), is maximized with the largest overlap of the radial wave function with the nucleus and offers $n = 1$ for the atomic principal quantum number $|\Psi|^2 \propto 1/n^3$).

The resonant \tilde{v}_e capture cross section is²:

$$
\sigma = 4.18 \times 10^{-41} g_o^2 \rho (E \tilde{v}_{e \text{ res}}/MeV) / \text{ft cm}^2 (5)
$$

with $g_0^2 \sim 4 (\alpha Z)^3 \sim 1.2x10^{-5}$ for 1S electrons. What is the spectral density ρ ? Consider a source of T and a 3 He target. at 300K. In this case, the v_e microspectrum will have a Doppler profile due to the motion of the T atoms centered around the resonance energy of 18.6 keV with a FWHM $2\Delta = 2E_v(2kT/Mc^2)^{1/2}$ = $2x18.6 \text{ } x10^3 (2x300 \text{ x } 8.6 \text{ x } 10^5 / 3 \text{ x } 10^9) = 0.11 \text{ eV}$ which applies to source and target. Thus ρ in equation (5) is ~10⁶/0.11. The incident \tilde{v}_e spectrum overlaps only partially with the resonance window in the target because of the nuclear recoil with energy $E_R = E_v/(2Mc^2) =$ 0.055 eV. The resonance cross section is thus²:

$$
\sigma(\text{res}) \sim 4.18x10^{41} \text{ x } 1.2x10^5 \text{ x } 9.1x10^6
$$

x 0.25/1132 \sim 10^{42} \text{ cm}^2 \tag{6}

where the spectral density is given by the Doppler width $2\Delta=0.11$ eV, the factor 0.25 is the resonance overlap of the Doppler \tilde{v}_e profiles at source/target, each of which is recoil shifted by E_R (~ Δ) away from the resonance energy. Note that the cross section of the normal $(v_e + p \rightarrow n + e^+)$ reaction is $\sim 9x10^{-43}$ cm² at E_v = 3 MeV. Comparing the two reactions, three basic points emerge: 1)

The resonance cross section (6) is as large as $\sigma(\tilde{v}_e + p)$ even though the \tilde{v}_e energy is ~150 times smaller. 2) The proposed idea shows how to observe for the first time, \tilde{v}_e reactions well below the \tilde{v}_e +p threshold of 1.8 MeV. 3) The immediate consequence is the attractive possibility of ultra-short baselines for measuring the \tilde{v}_e parameter θ_{13} . The optimum baseline for this measurement, $L(m)/E(keV) =$ 0.5, is only 9.3 m for the $T(B\beta) + {}^{3}He$ resonance reaction in contrast to 1500 m for \tilde{v}_e + p. Clearly, such a prospect encourages deeper study of the T-³He resonance reaction.

As a benchmark for a $(TB\beta^3He)$ θ_{13} measurement on a 9.3 m baseline we estimate using the data of Table 1 and (6), a capture rate: $R = 3x10^{-2}$ /day for 100MCi T source and a 1kg ³He target. The modest rate is due to the modest (for a \tilde{v}_e experiment) target mass. For initial experiments at close geometries at ~ 10 cm the rate is $\sim 10^4$ times higher.

 Two methods are available for measuring the reaction signal. First, the β-activity of the accumulated T can measured if the capture rate is high. For the close geometry case (10 cm), the β rate is $S = 3x10^2$ / (τ(T)= 7000d) =0.04/d *initially* but increasing linearly with time. The time dependence of the activity bestows a useful signature for v_e capture. Secondly, the reaction rate could be measured by determining the number of T atoms accumulated in a given time. The classic reasons for accelerator mass-spectroscopy of long lived radioactivity (such as ${}^{14}C$) directly apply in the present case. Separation of T from 3^3 He may be easier than 14^4 C dating because of the x2 charge difference of T and He ions. The main background in either case will be (n,T) reactions thus requiring heavy neutron shielding. However, background from all sources can be directly measured in a sourceout procedure.

 The question now arises: Is it possible to enhance the spectral density $\rho(E \, \tilde{v}_{e \text{res}})$ even further to increase the cross-section (6)? The question leads logically to *recoilless* \tilde{v}_e *emission and absorption* in the $TB\beta\rightarrow$ ³He system. In that case: a) the absence of recoil

eliminates the resonance mismatch in (6) and b) with proper design, the \tilde{v}_e microspectrum could have a line width << 2∆. On the other hand, the probability of recoilless transitions critically depends on incorporating the source and target atoms in favorable *solid* lattices. The crucial recoilless transition probability is perforce very low because the low-mass T and ³He suffer relatively energetic recoils that must be suppressed by crystal forces. The discussion below illustrates the interplay of parameters.

 The probability of the recoilless effect is given by $f = f_1(T)f_2(He)$. The recoilless fraction f_1 or f_2 is given by⁵

$$
f_x = \exp{-[3E_R/2k\Theta_3{1 + 0.25(T/\Theta_3)}^2 \mathcal{D}(T/\Theta_3)]}
$$
. (7)

 Θ_3 is the effective Debye temperature of the mass 3 atom in a lattice of mass M atoms,. T is the ambient temperature and $\mathcal{D} = (\int x dx / (e^x -$ 1)) taken from 0 to $x = T/\Theta_3$).

Estimates of Θ_3 and thus f depend on the nature of the T and 3 He when incorporated in solids. A huge literature is available on loading 1 H, T, 3 He and He in metallic lattices..⁶ Tritium forms tritides in metals. Thus one could estimate Θ_3 guided by Mőssbauer data of light and heavy impurities such as $Fe⁷$ and $Sn⁸$ in various host lattices. The results show that the effective Θ roughly follows the rule⁹ $\Theta_{\text{eff}} \sim \Theta_{\text{host}}$ x $(M/M^2)^{1/2}$ where M is the host mass and M' the impurity mass. For $M' = 3$, this rule would indicate a substantially higher Θ_3 for most hosts. Lacking detailed specific information, I shall adopt for safety, simply $\Theta_3 \sim \Theta_{\text{host}}$ in Table 2 for two host examples Al and Be. Helium loading is a different situation since it has no solubility in solids and chemical methods fail¹⁰. In this case, ion implantation offers a way out. Helium has been implanted in common metals to several percent and it has remained stable for years at or below 300K.¹¹ The nature of the He in metals is very different from T. It forms ~10nm microbubbles with gas pressures exceeding 1 GPa^{12} . We note that recoilless γ*-rays* have been observed for noble gases such as Kr^{13} and Xe^{14} trapped in microcages in clathrates which may be similar to microbubbles in metals. We arbitrarily

assign a low $\Theta_3 \sim 100K$ for He The recoilless fractions fraction $f = f_1 f_2$, calculated for the assumed Θ_3 are given in Table 2.We stress again that the assumed values above are crude.

Table 2. Probability $f = f_1 f_2$ for recoilless transitions for mass 3 atom in host lattices.

	Θ_3			\rm{I}_2	
	(K)	K)			
Be	100	50		$\sim 10^{-4}$	
Al	143	80	0.11		$\sim 10^{-5}$
Be	520	300	0.35		$-3.5x10^{-5}$

 The next vital parameter is the line width in recoilless emission and absorption. The relevant width is the practical energy width for H or T in solid lattices determined by energy fluctuations via interactions of the nuclear moments with am bient fields. Fortunately, the quadrupole moments of ${}^{3}H$ and T are zero. Magnetic interactions are minimized in diamagnetic or weakly paramagnetic lattices. Magnetic relaxation times T_1 have been measured by NMR for $(Pd-H_{0.7})$ ¹⁵ and for ³He microbubbles accumulated in aged T(Pd) samples¹². These values of T_1 are directly usable as recoilless line widths. Typical measured values of T_1 at 300K are ~10 ms for H(Pd) and \sim 140 ms for ³He(Pd). A 10ms line width is an energy width of $\sim 6.6x10^{-14}$ eV. compared to $2\Delta \sim 0.11$ eV in free recoil.

 If these measured relaxation times are typical, then it is clear that the spectral density is enhanced hugely relative to free recoil, by a factor ~1.7x10¹². Thus even for $f \sim 10^{-5}$ as in Table 2, the recoilless resonant reaction rate is 1.7×10^{7} times larger than the free-recoil resonant reaction rate. This allows more favorable experimental compromises e.g., reducing the source activity to \sim 10 MCi and the target mass, say to 1g. Then, the capture rate for recoilless \tilde{v}_e 's is 50/d (at 9.3m). and \sim 5x10⁵/day (at \sim 10 cm). With these rates, the initial reverse β-decay signal is S ~0.07./d (9.3m) and 70/d (10cm) that approach practicality (see Table 3 for a summary of all rates).

 These prospects open new vistas on neutrino experiments. Besides ultrashort baseline θ_{13}

	Width		Cap. Rate /d	Cap. Rate/d	Init. Rev. β /d		H e
	(eV		9300 cm	10 cm	10 cm	(MCi`	lg,
Free Recoil	0.11		$3.5x10^{-2}$	$3.5x10^2$	0.05	100	10 ³
Recoil-less	$6.\overline{6}x10^{-14}$	10^{-5}	50	$5x10^3$	70	10	

Table 3. Capture and reverse β signal rates for resonant free-recoil & recoilless v_e capture

measurements, another exciting application can be foreseen. The extreme precision of the energy of the recoilless TB β \tilde{v}_e implies a $Q = E/\Delta E = -3x10^{17}$, some five orders of magnitude sharper than the famous M_{össbauer} resonance in $57Fe$. The application to measuring the gravitational red shift of neutrinos is then immediately evident. The available precision of ∆Eν/E $=3x10^{-18}$ compared to the neutrino red shift $(\Delta E_v)_{\text{g}}/E_v=10^{-18}/cm$ fall, allows the measurement of $(\Delta E_v)_{g}$ in a bench top set-up with a fall baseline of a few cm (instead of \sim 2200 cm in the classic Pound-Rebka experiment). The real-time reverse β signal rate of ~7000/d in close geometries after a 100 day exposure may allow scanning of the resonance with Doppler velocities ~ nm/s. Such low speeds may require compromises on close geometries and the S rate above.

 In summary, we have pointed out in this paper the application of \tilde{v}_e 's from B β -decay as a path breaking way to observe very low energy \tilde{v}_e capture in a resonant mode. We described the highly favorable basis of the T-³He system for accomplishing this task. We showed that the capture rates could be enhanced dramatically by recoilless transitions if the source and absorber are embedded in metals in which the T and 3 He relaxation times T_1 are of the order of ~10 ms. Ion implanted T and 3 He in beryllium may offer a promising method for realizing these ideas. Many of the solid state estimates assumed here are crude and must be tested in practice in the chosen source and absorber by NMR and neutron scattering. The current availability of data and expertise in these questions bodes well for rapid technical development for implementing our ideas. The successful observation of recoilless \tilde{v}_e resonance capture (initially in high rate close geometries) would demonstrate the process and open the way to important applications.

One in particular is attempting stringent limits on θ_{13} in a laboratory scale experiment with baselines of ~9 m instead of 1500 m as needed at present for \tilde{v}_e +p experiments with reactor v_e 's. It would also open the dramatic possibility of observing the effect of gravity on neutrinos. Hopefully, recoilless neutrinos would be as fruitful as recoilless γ-rays.

 I dedicate this paper to the memory of John N. Bahcall.

- 4 J. N. Bahcall, Phys. Rev. **124** (1961) 49
- 5 H. Frauenfelder, *The M*ı*ssbauer Effect* (Benjamin 1962)

6 See e.g. G. Alefeld, J. Völkl, *Hydrogen in Metals I & II,* (Springer Verlag, Berlin 1978) and references therein.

- ⁷R.H. Nussbaum et al, Phys.Rev. **173** (1968) 653 8 S. K.Roy, N. Kundu J. Phys F **17** (1987) 1051
- 9 R. M. Housley, F. Hess, Phys. Rev. **146** (1966)
- 517; H. J. Lipkin, Ann. Phys. (NY) **23** (1962) 28

¹⁰See V. P. Bodhin et al, Khim. Vys. Energ. 1 (1967) 187 (Chem Astr**. 68** (1968) 53585e) who report detection of HeF *compounds* in an electromagnetic mass separator.

¹¹ J. H. Evans *Kinetics of bubble growth and point defect migration in metals,* UKAEA FUS (2003) 499 ;

¹² G. Abell & A. Attalia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** (1987) 995

¹³ Y. Hazoni et al, Phys. Lett. **2** (1962) 337

¹⁴ G. J. Perlow, M. R. Perlow, J. Chem. Phys. **48** (1968) 955

 15 See e.g., E. F. W. Seymour et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35** (1973) 165

⁻1 E. Fermi, *Nuclear Physics: A Course given by*

E. Fermi, J. Orear et al (U. Chicago Press) 1950

² L. Mikaelyan et al, Sov J. Nucl. Phys **6** (1968) 254 (*Yad. Fiz. 6 (1967) 349*).

³ R. Daudel et al, Compt.Rend. **224** (1947) 1427