MDvDM 2025, May 22nd 2025

Astrophysical: supernova neutrino overview

Shunsaku Horiuchi Science Tokyo Virginia Tech, Kavli IPMU



Image credit: NASA/ESA

Neutrinos @Earth

Many different sources, energies, physics & detection strategies



Vitagliano et al (2020)

Neutrino detection



Scintillator Imminent

Water Building Liquid argon Building Rock mineral *R & D*





SUPERNOVA NEUTRINOS

Under the hood



(adapted from G. Raffelt's slides)

Under the hood



(adapted from G. Raffelt's slides)

Under the hood



(~0.01% into photons)

(adapted from G. Raffelt's slides)

No prompt explosion

The problem:

The bounce shock loses energy and stalls at ~150 km, eventually gets overwhelmed by infalling mass and collapses





⁽Image from B. Messner)

Hanke et al (2014)

Explosion mechanisms

The problem:

The bounce shock loses energy and stalls at ~150 km, eventually gets overwhelmed by infalling mass and collapses

Many proposed solutions:

- 1. Neutrino mechanism *E(neutrino) Wilson (1985), ...*
- 2. Phase transition *E(gravity) Migdal et al (1971), ...*
- 3. Magneto-rotational *E(rotation) Bisnovatyi-Kogan (1976), ...*
- 4. Others, e.g., exotic neutrinos Kainulainen et al (1991), ...



(Image from B. Messner)

Why are neutrinos so crucial?

Energy source & transfer

Neutrinos cause both energy gain and cooling, but there is a region of net deposition of energy



Why are neutrinos so crucial?

Energy source & transfer

Neutrinos cause both energy gain and cooling, but there is a region of net deposition of energy

Neutrino-powered explosions Many simulations indicate neutrino heating is efficient enough to trigger explosions

> e.g., Fukuoka-NAOJ group, Garching group, MSU-Stockholm group, Oakridge group, Princeton group,

Neutrino luminosity



Mass accretion rate (= progenitor)

SN1987A: Rosetta stone

1987: Massive star explodes as Type II supernova

10-40 MeV neutrino signal lasting ~ 10 s



Some implications

What did it tell us?

- The general picture is correct: massive stars explode as supernovae, emitting most of its energy released as neutrinos
- New physics doesn't affect neutrino emission and cooling at O(1) level

But so much remains

- Explosion mechanism
- Instabilities
- Black hole formation
- Equation of state
- Phase transitions
- New physics ...and much more



Fiorillo et al (2023) Many others, eg Li et al (2023), Vissani (2015)

Supernova neutrino detection frontiers



Features:

- Wait For nature's cooperation
- Precision multi-messenger observations on 1 progenitor
- Surprises?

Milky Way: detection ready

High number of neutrino detections expected from a Galactic core collapse



Experiment	Туре	Mass (kt)	Location	$11.2\ M_\odot$	$27.0\ M_\odot$	$40.0 \; M_{\odot}$
Super-K	$H_2 Q / \bar{\nu}_e$	32	Japan	4000/4100	7800/7600	7600/4900
Hyper-K	$H_2O/\bar{\nu}_e$	220	Japan	28K/28K	53K/52K	52K/34K
IceCube	String/ $\bar{\nu}_{e}$	2500*	South Pole	320K/330K	660K/660K	820K/630K
KM3NeT	String/ $\bar{\nu}_{e}$	150*	Italy/France	17K/18K	37K/38K	47K/38K
LVD	$C_n H_{2n} / \bar{\nu}_e$	1	Italy	190/190	360/350	340/240
KamLAND	$C_n H_{2n} / \bar{\nu}_e$	1	Japan	190/190	360/350	340/240
Borexino	$C_n H_{2n} / \bar{\nu}_e$	0.278	Italy	52/52	100/97	96/65
JUNO	$C_n H_{2n} / \bar{\nu}_e$	20	China	3800/3800	7200/7000	6900/4700
SNO+	$C_n H_{2n} / \bar{\nu}_e$	0.78	Canada	150/150	280/270	270/180
NOνA	$C_n H_{2n} / \bar{\nu}_e$	14	USA	1900/2000	3700/3600	3600/2500
Baksan	$C_n H_{en} / \bar{\nu}_e$	0.24	Russia	45/45	86/84	82/56
HALO	Lead/ ν_{e}	0.079	Canada	4/3	9/8	9/9
HALO-1kT	Lead/ ν_{e}	1	Italy	53/47	120/100	120/120
DUNE	Ar/ν_e	40	USA	2700/2500	5500/5200	5800/6000
MicroBooNe	Ar/ν_e	0.09	USA	6/5	12/11	13/13
SBND	Ar/ν_e	0.12	USA	8/7	16/15	17/18
DarkSide-20k	Ar/any ν	0.0386	Italy	—	250	_
XENONnT	Xe/any ν	0.006	Italy	56	106	_
LZ	Xe/any ν	0.007	USA	65	123	
PandaX-4T	Xe(any ν	0.004	China	37	70	

SNEWS (2022)

The multi-messenger context

Supernova neutrinos come with gravitational waves and photons, each revealing unique complementary information:



But...Galactic supernova rate is ~ 1.5 per century

→ Need to be well prepared!

SNEWS2.0 brings neutrino detectors for the new age of multi-messenger astronomy:



(everyone can sign up for alerts! <u>https://snews2.org/</u>)

Nakamura, Horiuchi et al (2016)

Neutrino pointing

Prompt and automated <u>alert</u> in under 1 hr



Neutrino <u>timing</u> for coincident searches <u>Pointing</u> with neutrino triangulation



<u>Monitoring</u> and <u>coordination</u> with EM follow-up



Monitor candidates

 ↓

 Neutrino burst

 ↓

 Triangulation & alert

 ↓

 Follow-up

→ Eg: 500+ supernova
progenitor candidates, down to
2 with neutrino burst info.

Healy, Horiuchi, et al (2023) Shunsaku Horiuchi



Supernova neutrino detection frontiers



Features:

- Wait For nature's cooperation
- Precision multi-messenger observations on 1 progenitor
- Surprises?

Paleo detector: advantages



Shu

Large, unique signal

Data taking >> inverse of Galactic supernova rate (~few per century) No waiting! Signal is already there. All flavors! CEvNS interaction for SN neutrino energies Competitive exposure! 100 grams over 10⁹ years = 10⁵ t yr



- Model the neutrino spectrum
- Assume target mineral
- Estimate damaga track spectra (SRIM)
- Background considerations
- Track reconstruction assumptions

Baum et al (2020)

Track spectra

Supernova neutrino window: consideration of other neutrinos & backgrounds



Backgrounds in passive detectos:

→ Cannot distinguish on track-by-track basis
 → Search using wide-band track spectrum

Main backgrounds considered

Natural defects:

- Single sites or stretches across sample ightarrow distinguish
- **Cosmogenic:**
 - Muons negligible by \sim 5 km \rightarrow sample from deep underground

Radiogenic:

- ²³⁸U decay chain localized → mostly distinguish
- Neutrons from spontaneous fission, (α ,n) reactions \rightarrow find radiopure sample

Other neutrinos:

• Atmospheric, solar

Uncertainty of neutron backgrounds critical (assumed 1%)



Supernova neutrino detection

Detection with sufficiently old & pure sample:

- Age: 1 Gys
- Mass: 100 g
- *Pure:* ~0.01 *ppb*

→ Depending on the past supernova rate, paleo detectors can be used to detected past neutrinos

(good minerals composed of intermediate mass nuclei, small (α ,n) reactions, low ²³⁸U, and contain hydrogen)





Baum et al (2020) (15nm track resolution) (1% uncertainty on radiogenic backgrounds) (100% uncertainty on neutrino backgrounds)

How high was the past supernova rate?

Was Milky Way's star formation rate higher in the past? Quite possibly, but uncertain. Sufficiently pure minerals can rule out constant supernova rate model



(10 paleo detectors, 100 g each, measuring integrated rates over 100, 200, 300, ..., 1000 Myr)

Supernova neutrino detection frontiers



Features:

- Wait For nature's cooperation
- Precision multi-messenger observations on 1 progenitor
- Surprises?

Features:

- Guaranteed signal (no waiting)
- Many progenitors, population studies
- Cosmological distances
- Surprises?

Diffuse flux: model prediction



Guidance from SN1987A

Look to SN1987A for guidance: the only data set, not quite perfect match.



Yuksel & Beacom (2007); also Krauss (1987), Bahcall (1987), Vissani (2015), others



Not standard candles

Look to simulations for guidance: neutrino emission depends on progenitor



Extreme: collapse to black holes



Black hole channel simulations

Look to simulations for guidance: collapse to black hole are different



Liebendoerfer et al (2004); many others

• Neutrino luminosities all rise quickly 🙂

- Some neutrino energies rise ⁽³⁾
- 🐘 Then abruptly terminate 😕

When time-integrated, shows a systematically higher-energy spectrum



Ando, Ekanger, Horiuchi, Koshio (2023)

Systematic simulation insights

Neutrino mechanism predicts islands of successful explosions & implosions Exact mass ranges subject to large uncertainties → more works ongoing



Janka 2017; based on Ertl et al (2016); see also Ugliano et al (2012), Sukhbold et al (2016), Pejcha & Thompson (2015), Shunsaku Horiuchi Mueller et al (2016), Sukhbold & Adams (2019), Kresse et al (2021)

Diffuse supernova neutrino flux predictions

Winning solution

Black hole formation emits lots of neutrinos

Black hole formation may not be rare

Detecting the diffuse supernova neutrino flux will reveal universal collapse to black holes

See also: Lunardini (2009), Lien et al (2010), Yang & Lunardini (2011), Keehnn & Lunardini (2012), Nakazato (2013), Mathews et al (2014), Yuksel & Kistler (2015), Nakazato et al (2015), Hidaka et al (2016), Priya & Lunardini (2017), Moller et al (2018), Horiuchi et al (2018), Sing & Rentala (2021), Horiuchi et al (2021), Ashida & Nakazato (2022), Ekanger et al (2022), Ziegler et al (2023)



Horiuchi et al (2018)

PyDSNB

Public code to estimate DSNB

https://github.com/shinichiroando/PyDSNB (in process of merging to snewpy)

Input choices:

- Hydro model (x5) + FermiDirac
- Late-time estimate method (x4)
- Initial mass function
- Failed (BH) fraction
- Failed (BH) model
- MSW + neutrino mass hierarchy

Some future plans:

- New CCSN rate estimates
- Binary models
- Accretion models
- Beyond MSW oscillations



Diffuse supernova neutrino searches

Reaching factor of 2 of many predictions





Capture on Gadolinium: proposed in 2003, after many R&D, Super-K was drained in 2018, refurbished, and doped by Gd in 2020

> Beacom & Vagins (2004) SK 2021 (arXiv:2109.00360)



SK-VI: successful Gd performance

Already comparable with ~10 years of pre-Gd result

SuperK with 0.01% Gd by mass → ~50% captures on Gd (approx. doubled cf pre-Gd)





SuperK (in prep)

Future? Beyond nuebar flavor



Moller et al (2018) Suliga et al (2022)

Paleo detector: advantages



Large, unique signal

Operation duration >> inverse of Galactic supernova rate (~few per century) All flavors CEvNS interaction for SN neutrino energies Competitive exposure 100 grams over 10⁹ years = 10⁵ t yr



(cf SK: 22kton over years $\sim 10^5$ t yr)

What if we knew the Galactic supernova rate, to some accuracy? Plausibly, by modeling the billions of stars observed by eg Gaia, or by simulations of Galactic archeology

Baum et al (2020)

Extracting supernova physics

Signal prediction

- Model the neutrino spectrum
- Assume target mineral
- Estimate damaga track spectra (SRIM)
- Background considerations
- Track reconstruction setup

→ Heavy-flavor neutrinos dominate the signal & tracks

eg, in 100-500 nm:

$$egin{aligned} N_{bkg} &\sim 10^5 \ N_{nux} &\sim 10^3 \end{aligned}
ightarrow \sim 6\sigma \end{aligned}$$

Much depends on accuracy of knowledge of backgrounds (neutrons) Use best target from Baum et al (2020)

Epsomite $[Mg(SO_4) \cdot 7(H_2O)]$



Probes of neutrino emissions

DSNB only: Hyper-K & DUNE, 20 years operation. Add 100g paleo detector aged 1 Gyr



Baum et al (2022)

(100g of epsomite with 1 Gyr age, 15nm track resolution) (100% uncertainty on radiogenic & solar neutrino backgrounds) (20% uncertainty on HK & DUNE backgrounds) (10% uncertainty on extragalactic & galactic supernova rates)

Supernova neutrino summary

Astrophysical neutrinos

Pesky background for eg dark matter searches Are rich and related to key physics within supernovae



Supernovae and mineral detectors

Paleo detectors offer new ways to find supernova neutrinos, with unique information for supernova physics.

- Mineral detectors offer a new way to study supernovae in the Milky Way's past
- Mineral detectors are perhaps the best hope of probing the heavy lepton neutrinos in vast numbers of supernovae

Thank you!