

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

## Test of the electron stability with the Borexino detector

To cite this article: A Vishneva *et al* 2017 *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **888** 012193

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

### Related content

- [Test of the electric charge conservation law with Borexino detector](#)  
A Vishneva, M Agostini, S Appel et al.
- [Recent results from Borexino](#)  
G Testera, M Agostini, K Altenmüller et al.
- [Methodology of experimental search for neutrinos from solar flares in Borexino detector](#)  
V S Atroshchenko, L A Borodikhina and M A Toropova

# Test of the electron stability with the Borexino detector

A Vishneva<sup>1</sup>, M Agostini<sup>2</sup>, K Altenmüller<sup>3</sup>, S Appel<sup>3</sup>, V. Atroshchenko<sup>4</sup>, G Bellini<sup>5</sup>, J Benziger<sup>6</sup>, D Bick<sup>7</sup>, G Bonfini<sup>8</sup>, D Bravo<sup>9</sup>, B Caccianiga<sup>5</sup>, F Calaprice<sup>10</sup>, A Caminata<sup>11</sup>, M Carlini<sup>8</sup>, P Cavalcante<sup>89</sup>, A Chepurinov<sup>12</sup>, K Choi<sup>13</sup>, D D'Angelo<sup>5</sup>, S Davini<sup>2</sup>, K de Kerret<sup>14</sup>, H A Derbin<sup>15</sup>, L Di Noto<sup>11</sup>, I Drachnev<sup>2</sup>, A Etenko<sup>4</sup>, K Fomenko<sup>1</sup>, D Franco<sup>14</sup>, F Gabriele<sup>8</sup>, C Galbiati<sup>10</sup>, C Ghiano<sup>11</sup>, M Giammarchi<sup>5</sup>, M Goeger-Neff<sup>3</sup>, A Goretti<sup>10</sup>, M Gromov<sup>12</sup>, C Hagner<sup>7</sup>, E Hungerford<sup>16</sup>, Aldo Ianni<sup>8</sup>, Andrea Ianni<sup>10</sup>, A Jany<sup>17</sup>, K Jedrzejczak<sup>17</sup>, D Jeschke<sup>3</sup>, V Kobychiev<sup>18</sup>, D Korablev<sup>1</sup>, G Korga<sup>8</sup>, D Kryn<sup>14</sup>, M Laubenstein<sup>8</sup>, B Lehnert<sup>19</sup>, E Litvinovich<sup>4,20</sup>, F Lombardi<sup>8</sup>, P Lombardi<sup>5</sup>, L Ludhova<sup>21,22</sup>, G Lukyanchenko<sup>4</sup>, I Machulin<sup>4,20</sup>, S Manecki<sup>9,23</sup>, W Maneschg<sup>24</sup>, G Manuzio<sup>11</sup>, S Marcocci<sup>2</sup>, E Meroni<sup>5</sup>, M Meyer<sup>7</sup>, L Miramonti<sup>5</sup>, M Misiaszek<sup>17,8</sup>, M Montuschi<sup>25</sup>, P Mosteiro<sup>10</sup>, V Muratova<sup>15</sup>, B Neumair<sup>3</sup>, L Oberauer<sup>3</sup>, M Obolensky<sup>14</sup>, F Ortica<sup>26</sup>, M Pallavicini<sup>11</sup>, L Papp<sup>3</sup>, A Pocar<sup>27</sup>, G Ranucci<sup>5</sup>, A Razeto<sup>8</sup>, A Re<sup>5</sup>, A Romani<sup>26</sup>, R Roncin<sup>8,14</sup>, N Rossi<sup>8</sup>, S Schönert<sup>3</sup>, D Semenov<sup>15</sup>, M Skorokhvatov<sup>4,20</sup>, O Smirnov<sup>1</sup>, A Sotnikov<sup>1</sup>, S Sukhotin<sup>4</sup>, Y Suvorov<sup>28,4</sup>, R Tartaglia<sup>8</sup>, G Testera<sup>11</sup>, J Thurn<sup>19</sup>, M Toropova<sup>4</sup>, E Unzhakov<sup>15</sup>, R B Vogelaar<sup>9</sup>, F von Feilitzsch<sup>3</sup>, H Wang<sup>28</sup>, S Weinz<sup>29</sup>, J Winter<sup>29</sup>, M Wojcik<sup>17</sup>, M Wurm<sup>29</sup>, Z Yokley<sup>9</sup>, O Zaimidoroga<sup>1</sup>, S Zavatarelli<sup>11</sup>, K Zuber<sup>19</sup> and G Zuzel<sup>17</sup>  
(Borexino Collaboration)

<sup>1</sup> Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia

<sup>2</sup> Gran Sasso Science Institute (INFN), 67100 L'Aquila, Italy

<sup>3</sup> Physik-Department and Excellence Cluster Universe, Technische Universität München, 85748 Garching, Germany

<sup>4</sup> NRC Kurchatov Institute, 123182 Moscow, Russia

<sup>5</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi e INFN, 20133 Milano, Italy

<sup>6</sup> Chemical Engineering Department, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

<sup>7</sup> Institut für Experimentalphysik, Universität, 22761 Hamburg, Germany

<sup>8</sup> INFN Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso, 67010 Assergi (AQ), Italy

<sup>9</sup> Physics Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA

<sup>10</sup> Physics Department, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

<sup>11</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi e INFN, Genova 16146, Italy

<sup>12</sup> Lomonosov Moscow State University Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, 119234 Moscow, Russia

<sup>13</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA

<sup>14</sup> AstroParticule et Cosmologie, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, CEA/IRFU, Observatoire de Paris, Sorbonne Paris Cité, 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France



- <sup>15</sup> St. Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute NRC Kurchatov Institute, 188350 Gatchina, Russia
- <sup>16</sup> Department of Physics, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204, USA
- <sup>17</sup> M. Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, 30059 Krakow, Poland
- <sup>18</sup> Kiev Institute for Nuclear Research, 06380 Kiev, Ukraine
- <sup>19</sup> Department of Physics, Technische Universität Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany
- <sup>20</sup> National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow Engineering Physics Institute), Kashirskoe highway 31, Moscow, 115409, Russia
- <sup>21</sup> IKP-2 Forschungszentrum Jülich, 52428 Jülich, Germany
- <sup>22</sup> RWTH Aachen University, 52062 Aachen, Germany
- <sup>23</sup> Physics Department, Queen's University, Kingston ON K7L 3N6, Canada
- <sup>24</sup> Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany
- <sup>25</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica e Scienze della Terra Università degli Studi di Ferrara e INFN, Via Saragat 1-44122, Ferrara, Italy
- <sup>26</sup> Dipartimento di Chimica, Università e INFN, 06123 Perugia, Italy
- <sup>27</sup> Amherst Center for Fundamental Interactions and Physics Department, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, USA
- <sup>28</sup> Physics and Astronomy Department, University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), Los Angeles, California 90095, USA
- <sup>29</sup> Institute of Physics and Excellence Cluster PRISMA, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany
- E-mail: [the2cherry2orchard@gmail.com](mailto:the2cherry2orchard@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** Despite the fact that the electric charge conservation law is confirmed by many experiments, search for its possible violation remains a way of searching for physics beyond the Standard Model. Experimental searches for the electric charge non-conservation mainly consider electron decays into neutral particles. The Borexino experiment is an excellent tool for the electron decay search due to the highest radiopurity among all the existing experiments, large detector mass, and good sensitivity at low energies. The process considered in this study is a decay into a photon and a neutrino, for which a new lower limit on the electron lifetime is obtained. This is the best electron lifetime limit up to date, exceeding the previous one obtained at the Borexino prototype at two orders of magnitude.

## 1. Introduction

Electron stability tests are the most common way of searching for possible electric charge conservation violation. Since the electric charge non-conservation (CNC) is incompatible with the Standard model [1], search for CNC processes is a way to discover new physics, or to validate the Standard model in case of their absence.

Processes usually considered in the electron stability tests are decays of electron to neutral particles: decay to 3 neutrinos (disappearance mode), and decay to a neutrino and a photon. Such tests were performed many times at various experiments (for recent review see [2]). Among these experiments Borexino has unique properties to improve the electron lifetime limit for the decay mode  $e \rightarrow \gamma\nu$ .

Borexino is a liquid scintillation neutrino detector located in Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso, Italy [3]. Its active medium consists of 278 tons of pseudocumene (1,2,4-trimethylbenzene) with admixture of PPO (2,5-diphenyloxazole) at a concentration of 1.5 g/l. The energy threshold of Borexino is low enough to provide sensitivity to the electron decay mode  $e \rightarrow \gamma\nu$  which is indicated by a monoenergetic photon of energy equal to half of the electron mass (256 keV). Radioactive background level in this region is  $0.15 \text{ day}^{-1}\text{ton}^{-1}\text{keV}^{-1}$ , which is the lowest one among all the existing experiments. This fact along with large statistics and well-studied background sources provides excellent sensitivity to the electron decay. The expected

improvement of the electron lifetime limit is at two orders of magnitude with respect to the previous best limit which is obtained at the prototype of Borexino [4].

## 2. Analysis approach

The 408 days livetime data set used in the analysis is acquired during the second phase of Borexino. The second phase started after an extensive purification campaign which has led to decrease of the event rates of several background components. The spectrum in the region of interest includes solar neutrinos (pp,  $^7\text{Be}$ , pep, CNO), synthetic pile-up, and decays of radioactive elements ( $^{14}\text{C}$ ,  $^{210}\text{Bi}$ ,  $^{210}\text{Po}$ ,  $^{85}\text{Kr}$  and others). More thorough description of the spectrum composition can be found in [5].

The approach is to perform the spectral fit of the data with the fitting function modified by including the signal from the electron decay. The 256 keV photon emitted in the decay mode  $e \rightarrow \gamma\nu$  is simulated using GEANT4, its rate is fixed at various values and added to the fitting function. Likelihood profile obtained from the corresponding set of spectral fits shows compatibility of the electron decay rate with zero within one standard deviation. The upper limit on the decay rate is 1.23 counts/day per 100 tons at 90% confidence level, which corresponds to the lifetime limit of  $\tau \geq 7.2 \times 10^{28}$  years.

There are also several sources of systematic errors, namely, the uncertainty of the scintillator light yield determination, fiducial mass uncertainty, and the choice of an observable for energy reconstruction. These uncertainties lead to the additional smearing of the likelihood profile, which gives finally  $\tau_{e \rightarrow \gamma\nu} \geq 6.6 \times 10^{28}$  years at 90% CL. Nowadays this result is the best electron lifetime limit for the considered decay mode. More detailed analysis description can be also found in [2], [6].

## 3. Theoretical implications

There is no any non-contradictory theory able to describe the electric charge conservation violation. However, there is an approach proposed by Bahcall [7] for estimating the magnitude of violation using the experimental limits. According to this approach, the CNC Lagrangian has a usual form and includes a small factor serving as a measure of charge non-conservation. For instance, the Lagrangian for the process considered in this study takes form

$$\mathcal{L}_{e\nu\gamma} = \frac{1}{2} e \varepsilon_{e\nu\gamma} \bar{\psi}_e \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \psi_\nu A^\mu + \text{h. c.}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{e\nu\gamma}$  is the small CNC parameter. As was shown in [8], the transition probability for this decay is

$$\lambda_{e\nu\gamma} \simeq \varepsilon_{e\nu\gamma} \frac{\alpha}{32\pi} \frac{m_e c^2}{\hbar} \left( \frac{m_e}{m_\gamma} \right)^2. \quad (2)$$

Taking the best photon mass limit of  $1 \times 10^{-18}$  eV one can get  $\varepsilon_{e\nu\gamma} \leq 3.3 \times 10^{-101}$  (90% CL), which is an almost five orders of magnitude stronger limit than the one obtained previously by DAMA collaboration [8].

## References

- [1] Okun L B 1989 *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **32** 543
- [2] Vishneva A *et al.* (Borexino collaboration) 2016 *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **675** 012025
- [3] Alimonti G *et al.* (Borexino collaboration) 2009 *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **600** 568-593
- [4] Back H O *et al.* (Borexino collaboration) 2002 *Phys. Lett. B* **525** 29
- [5] Bellini G *et al.* (Borexino collaboration) 2014 *Phys. Rev. D* **89** 112007
- [6] Agostini M *et al.* (Borexino collaboration) 2015 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** 231802
- [7] Bahcall J 1978 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **50** 881-903
- [8] Belli P *et al.* 2000 *Phys. Rev. D* **61** 117301