THE PTOLEMY PROJECT

Angelo Esposito

on behalf of the PTOLEMY collaboration

IAS INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

33rd Rencontres de Blois, May 2022

OUTLINE

Goal and idea behind PTOLEMY

• Effects of quantum uncertainty

Conclusion

INTRO

• What we <u>do know</u> about neutrinos:

they are massive

well measured Δm_i^2

cosmic neutrino background should be out there

INTRO

• What we <u>do know</u> about neutrinos:

they are massive well measured Δm_i^2 cosmic neutrino background should be out there

• What we <u>don't know</u> about neutrinos:

absolute mass scale $(m_{\nu} < 0.8 \text{ eV})$

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{mass ordering} \\ (m_{\text{light}} \simeq m_e \text{ or } m_{\tau}) \end{array}$

[KATRIN - Nature Phys. 2022, 2105.08533]

cosmic neutrino background yet to be seen

• Tritium has the largest product of lifetime and capture cross section

$${}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-} + \bar{\nu}_{e}$$

 $\nu_{e} + {}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-}$ $(Q \simeq 18.6 \text{ keV})$

• Tritium has the largest product of lifetime and capture cross section

$${}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-} + \bar{\nu}_{e}$$

 $\nu_{e} + {}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-}$ $(Q \simeq 18.6 \text{ keV})$

• For atomic tritium in vacuum:



• Tritium has the largest product of lifetime and capture cross section

$${}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-} + \bar{\nu}_{e}$$

 $\nu_{e} + {}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-}$ $(Q \simeq 18.6 \text{ keV})$

For atomic tritium in vacuum: 10^{12} • 10^{10} [$yr^{-1})$ measure m_{ν} from here 10^{8} dR/dK_eta (eV⁻ (need high rate) 10^{6} $2m_{\nu}$ 10^{4} 10^{2} 10^{0} -1.2 -1.0 -0.8 -0.6 -0.4 -0.20.0 0.2 0.4 -1.4 $K_{\beta} - K_{\beta}^0$ (eV)

• Tritium has the largest product of lifetime and capture cross section

$${}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-} + \bar{\nu}_{e}$$
 $(Q \simeq 18.6 \text{ keV})$
 $\nu_{e} + {}^{3}\text{H} \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}^{+} + e^{-}$

For atomic tritium in vacuum: 10^{12} 10^{10} yr^{-1} measure m_{ν} from here 10^{8} dR/dK_eta (eV $^-$ (need high rate) 10^{6} $2m_{\nu}$ 10^{4} smoking gun for cosmic 10^{2} neutrino background 10^{0} (need high energy resolution) -1.2 -1.0 -0.8 -0.6 -0.4 -0.20.0 0.20.4 -1.4 $K_{\beta} - K_{\beta}^0$ (eV)

• PTOLEMY aims at a high event rate and a small energy resolution

• PTOLEMY aims at a high event rate and a small energy resolution

High event rate

• Distribute the tritium on a solid state substrate (e.g. graphene)



[see Betti et al. - Nano Lett. 2022]

• PTOLEMY aims at a high event rate and a small energy resolution

High event rate

- Distribute the tritium on a solid state substrate (e.g. graphene)
- Prevents formation of T_2 molecules



[see Betti et al. - Nano Lett. 2022]

• PTOLEMY aims at a high event rate and a small energy resolution

High event rate

- Distribute the tritium on a solid state substrate (e.g. graphene)
- Prevents formation of T_2 molecules
- Allows storage of large quantities of tritium on a small surface

 $\sigma_T \sim 0.5 \text{ mg/cm}^2$

(desired $m_T \sim 10$ mg at the early stages)



[see Betti et al. - Nano Lett. 2022]

small energy resolution

• PTOLEMY aims at using TES detectors with an envisaged resolution of $\Delta E \simeq 0.05$ eV [see e.g. Lolli et al. - Appl. Phys. Lett. 2013]

small energy resolution

- PTOLEMY aims at using TES detectors with an envisaged resolution of $\Delta E \simeq 0.05 \text{ eV}$ [see e.g. Lolli et al. Appl. Phys. Lett. 2013]
- However:
 - I. TES' perform best with energies $O(10 \text{ eV}) \rightarrow$ need to slow the electrons down

small energy resolution

- PTOLEMY aims at using TES detectors with an envisaged resolution of $\Delta E \simeq 0.05 \text{ eV}$ [see e.g. Lolli et al. Appl. Phys. Lett. 2013]
- However:
 - I. TES' perform best with energies $O(10 \text{ eV}) \rightarrow$ need to slow the electrons down
 - 2. TES' are slow response detectors \rightarrow need to reduce the number of electrons coming from β -decay













Distributing tritium on flat graphene has one drawback





uncertainty on tritium's momentum



spread in final electron energy

[Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - PRD 2021, 2101.10069]

Distributing tritium on flat graphene has one drawback

spatially localized tritium



uncertainty on tritium's momentum



spread in final electron energy

[Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - PRD 2021, 2101.10069]

A simple semi-classical calculation returns

$$\Delta K_{\beta} = \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{e} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{p}_{T} \\ E_{He} \end{vmatrix} \sim \frac{p_{e}}{m_{He}} \frac{1}{\Delta x_{T}}$$
spread of initial tritium wave function

Distributing tritium on flat graphene has one drawback

spatially localized tritium



uncertainty on tritium's momentum



spread in final electron energy

[Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - PRD 2021, 2101.10069]

A simple semi-classical calculation returns

$$\Delta K_{\beta} = \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{e} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{p}_{T} \\ E_{He} \end{vmatrix} \sim \frac{p_{e}}{m_{He}} \frac{1}{\Delta x_{T}} \sim 0.6 - 0.8 \text{ eV}$$

an order of magnitude spread of initial tritium wave function are used of a spread of a spread of initial tritium of the spread of a s

• A more accurate calculation for the rate, including different final states, gives



 A more accurate calculation for the rate, including different final states, gives

³He⁺ is mostly freed from the graphene → the cosmic neutrino peak disappears under the decay spectrum



A more accurate calculation for the rate, including different final states, gives



• To reduce the quantum spread we need to delocalize the initial tritium ($\Delta x_T \sim \text{few } \text{\AA}$ should be enough) \rightarrow try to realize an approximate momentum eigenstate

- To reduce the quantum spread we need to delocalize the initial tritium ($\Delta x_T \sim \text{few } \text{\AA}$ should be enough) \rightarrow try to realize an approximate momentum eigenstate
- One proposal: hydrogenated carbon nanotubes

3H

free to move in this direction



- Preliminary studies show that this is a feasible solution
- When passivated with hydrogen, the nanotube potential looks like



external B-field could also prevent the formation of molecules if two atoms are in the same nanotube

- Preliminary studies show that this is a feasible solution
- When passivated with hydrogen, the nanotube potential looks like



external B-field could also prevent the formation of molecules if two atoms are in the same nanotube

• PTOLEMY aims at constraining the neutrino mass and at hunting for the cosmic neutrino background

- PTOLEMY aims at constraining the neutrino mass and at hunting for the cosmic neutrino background
- Possible with a new way of storing tritium (solid state substrate) and precisely measuring the electron energy (electromagnetic filter)

- PTOLEMY aims at constraining the neutrino mass and at hunting for the cosmic neutrino background
- Possible with a new way of storing tritium (solid state substrate) and precisely measuring the electron energy (electromagnetic filter)
- Because of quantum spread the substrate must be carefully chosen [Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - PRD 2021, 2101.10069; PTOLEMY - 2203.11228]

- PTOLEMY aims at constraining the neutrino mass and at hunting for the cosmic neutrino background
- Possible with a new way of storing tritium (solid state substrate) and precisely measuring the electron energy (electromagnetic filter)
- Because of quantum spread the substrate must be carefully chosen [Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - PRD 2021, 2101.10069; PTOLEMY - 2203.11228]
- More things to investigate: Final state effects? Other emitters?

[Nussinov, Nussinov - PRD 2022, 2108.03659; Tan, Cheianov - 2202.07406; Mikulenko, Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - 2111.09292]

- PTOLEMY aims at constraining the neutrino mass and at hunting for the cosmic neutrino background
- Possible with a new way of storing tritium (solid state substrate) and precisely measuring the electron energy (electromagnetic filter)
- Because of quantum spread the substrate must be carefully chosen [Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - PRD 2021, 2101.10069; PTOLEMY - 2203.11228]
- More things to investigate: Final state effects? Other emitters?

[Nussinov, Nussinov - PRD 2022, 2108.03659; Tan, Cheianov - 2202.07406; Mikulenko, Cheipesh, Cheianov, Boyarsky - 2111.09292]

Thank you for your attention!

BACK UP

TRITIUM-GRAPHENE POTENTIAL

- The tritium-graphene potential is strongly dependent on coverage and curvature of the sheet
- For very concave sheets (nanotube) the potential is essentially not binding anymore
- The highest the coverage the deeper is the potential



WHY HYDROGENATED NANOTUBES?

• The reason to passivate the nanotubes with hydrogen is to prevent the tritium from sticking to the walls



Angelo Esposito — IAS

15

MORE DETAILS ON THE ELECTRON SPECTRUM

- Two extreme cases for the ${}^{3}\text{He}^{+}$ wave function (near the endpoint)
- Free helium:

$$\psi_{He}(\mathbf{x}) \sim e^{i\mathbf{k}_{He}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \implies \mathcal{M}_{fi} \sim \exp\left(-\Delta x_T^2 |\mathbf{k}_{He} + \mathbf{k}_e|^2\right)$$

- maximize the probability when $\mathbf{k}_{He} \simeq -\mathbf{k}_{e} \rightarrow \text{probability is}$ maximum in a region $\Delta k_{He} \sim 1/\Delta x_{T} \rightarrow \text{large quantum spread}$
- <u>Bound helium</u>:

$$\psi_{He}(\mathbf{x}) \simeq \psi_T(\mathbf{x}) \implies \mathcal{M}_{fi} \sim \exp\left(-\Delta x_T^2 k_e^2\right) \ll 1$$