

# Non local mirror neutrinos with $R_h = ct$

G. Dungworth

*Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire HP11TP, United Kingdom*

M. D. Sheppeard

*Te Atatu Peninsula, Waitakere, New Zealand*

(Dated: November 2017)

## Abstract

We study two cosmologies, (i) the observationally successful FLRW constraint of Riofrio, a viable alternative to  $\Lambda$ CDM, and (ii) an adaption of this to quantum gravity, including aspects of the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, where neutrinos and mirror neutrinos play a key role. Mirror neutrinos are antineutrinos. The equivalence principle is mildly broken, using McCulloch's approach to quantum inertia and a new holographic principle. There is no dark matter and no dark energy, and mirror neutrino states are informationally connected to the CMB. Consequences include (i) a present day temperature of 2.73K arising as a mirror rest mass, (ii) an estimate of the observable mass of the universe and (iii) an effective sterile mass of 1.29eV, permitted by oscillation results.

## INTRODUCTION

In the Standard Model, three active neutrinos are massless Weyl fermions. Neutrino oscillations suggest that perhaps neutrinos gain mass outside of the Higgs framework, removing the need to explain mass scale ratios with Majorana masses. Only left handed neutrinos exist. Right handed states, if they exist informationally, belong to a mirror copy of the Standard Model spectrum, but this does not necessarily indicate a local mirror Lagrangian for the dark matter sector, because even the modern motivic formulation of the Standard Model is not of this form. We require a cosmology free of dark matter.

Promising candidates for this restriction to Standard Model states employ categorical constructions in quantum gravity, in which braid or ribbon diagrams determine fundamental degrees of freedom. From the twistor point of view [1] mass generation was first studied in [2], indicating the need for a categorical approach to higher dimensional cohomology. Penrose has noted that this involves a two dimensional analogue of his famous impossible triangle, and the Dirac mass is a pairing of two spinors in a second cohomology group  $H^2$ .

Whatever the complexities of the Higgs mechanism in quantum gravity, it is possible that simple quantum masses for neutrinos will provide a golden test bed for both cosmology and neutrino phenomenology. Here we go even further, suggesting that the interplay of neutrino mass with the GUT or Planck scale  $L$  underpins the Higgs mechanism in quantum gravity, as indicated by the rough correspondence  $M_H \simeq \sqrt{m_\nu M_P}$ . Neutrinos at rest give the minimum mass in quantum gravity, while  $M_P$  is an upper limit for particle masses.

With quantum inertia, which mildly breaks the equivalence principle, mass generation is maximally non local, employing wavelengths on cosmological scales. It accounts for galactic rotation curves with a MOND rule, but we will also introduce non local mirror states which can mimic dark matter on large scales. We will show that the present day CMB temperature is closely connected to mirror neutrino rest masses, something quite impossible in the  $\Lambda$ CDM model.

In the  $R_h = ct$  picture, observed CMB photons were created in a distant part of our universe, having taken around 13 billion years to reach us. In  $\Lambda$ CDM one expects these photons to be entangled with distant structure, since primordial perturbations seed structure growth. Similarly, CMB photons that originated near past Earth are entangled with our local structure, when viewed by distant aliens. And yet what we observe is a correlation

between our CMB and our local structure, as if we are the aliens living 13 billion light years away, beyond our horizon, in a mirror image of creation. So maybe we are. After all, we can never otherwise observe such aliens in our present epoch. This is a holographic principle [3].

The only thing we observe around 13 billion years ago is the CMB itself, but the PTOLEMY experiment in the near future will hunt for low energy relic neutrinos [4]. This is an opportunity to distinguish  $\Lambda$ CDM from  $R_h = ct$  models with a solid prediction about the behaviour of neutrinos in the early universe. If neutrinos do not decouple and cool at the expected temperature, tightly constrained in  $\Lambda$ CDM, this will be observed by PTOLEMY.

Riofrio [5] originally derived the baryonic mass fraction in  $\Lambda$ CDM by considering the generation of mass through pair production near black hole horizons [6]. This result may be valid whatever the ontology of PBHs when mass generation is non local, if it is the existence of appropriate horizons that counts. Quantum causality replaces the confinement of fermions in the cyclic cosmology [7] with a link between past and local fermion states, presumably holographic in some sense.

The next two sections introduce (i) the  $R_h = ct$  alternative to the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, incorporating quantum inertia, and (ii) a truly quantum view, in which the true cosmological boundary is represented by the CMB. Neutrinos play a pivotal role in creating a mass gap over the semiclassical view. Finally, we briefly consider neutrino anomalies.

## $R_h = ct$ **WITH QUANTISED INERTIA**

Let  $R_h$  be the Hubble radius and  $t$  the time since the apparent Big Bang. Riofrio [5] has long argued that  $R_h = ct$  does away with dark energy, since a speed of light that varies in cosmological time can account for the luminosity redshift relation of type Ia supernovae. More recently, a statistical analysis [8] of supernovae appears to favour models like  $R_h = ct$  over  $\Lambda$ CDM. Observations listed in [9] also favour the  $R_h = ct$  theory. Initially, the horizon problem is explained with a large value for  $c$  in the early universe, but in the next section we will use quantum gravity to truncate the early universe at the CMB, and the horizon problem will be solved with quantum causality.

We begin with Newton's insight: there is no gravity in the centre of a spherical shell of matter. And yet, although apparently inertial, an interior object accelerates relative to distant objects. Locally there is a Rindler horizon, associated now with the generation of

inertial mass. Far away there will be cosmological horizons. Melia et al [10][11][12] introduce a limiting radius, defined by

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{da}{dt}r = c, \quad (1)$$

where  $R(t)$  is the proper distance for a radial, flat cosmology. Since there is a central acceleration, between the object and the distant cosmos, there is also a gravitational radius. Define the universal mass and associated radius by Riofrio's rule

$$R_h \equiv \frac{2GM_U}{c^2}. \quad (2)$$

Now the FRW metric may be written in terms of  $R/R_h$ . Together with the Friedmann equation, (2) gives the Hubble radius

$$R_h = \frac{c}{H(t)} = ct, \quad (3)$$

showing that the Hubble radius is naturally a gravitational radius.

McCulloch [13] breaks the equivalence principle mildly in attributing local quantum inertia to a Hubble scale horizon censorship principle, using the Casimir effect as inspiration, between both the local Rindler horizon for the accelerated object and a distant cosmological horizon. Classical inertia is corrected by a term that is only important for low accelerations, such as those attributed to dark matter in galaxies. With such a non local mechanism for mass generation,  $R_h = ct$  gets rid of dark energy and quantised inertia gets rid of local dark matter, as shown in a rotation curve analysis [14].

The breaking of the equivalence principle begins with the Unruh radiation associated to the accelerated object, at a temperature

$$kT_U = \frac{\hbar a_U}{4\pi^2 c}, \quad (4)$$

where  $a_U$  is the magnitude of the acceleration. This radiation reduces the gravitational mass. Along with the displacement law

$$E \equiv \frac{\hbar c}{\lambda} = \beta kT_U \quad (5)$$

for Wien's constant  $\beta$  (originally used by Planck to derive the black body spectrum) we obtain the Unruh wavelength

$$\lambda = \frac{4\pi^2 c^2}{\beta a_U}. \quad (6)$$

Assume that Unruh wavelengths only fit the size  $4R_h$ , twice the Hubble diameter. Then the equivalence principle breaks to the relation [14]

$$m_i = m_g(1 - \frac{\lambda}{4R_h}) = m_g(1 - \frac{\pi^2 c^2}{\beta a_U R_h}). \quad (7)$$

Using  $R_h = ct$ , the quantum correction to  $m_i$  is proportional to the velocity ratio  $c/a_U t$ . For  $\lambda = 4R_h$ , when the inertial mass vanishes, the minimal acceleration is

$$a_U = \frac{\pi^2 c}{\beta t}, \quad (8)$$

so that  $a_U t$  is close to the boundary speed of  $2c$ .

Below we will use (5) to relate one neutrino mass supersymmetrically to CMB photons. The connection between quantised inertia and the holographic principle has been studied in [15][16]. Quantum perturbations in the early universe, governing the acoustic peak in the CMB, are closely tied to the characteristic radii of  $R_h = ct$ , starting with the Planck scale. As the universe cools, the wavelength of perturbations grows with the decrease in redshift, linear in the CMB temperature, which directly measures a characteristic energy. We will now quantise this cosmology, considering also the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, by introducing the rest mass gap of neutrinos.

## MIRROR NEUTRINOS WITH HOLOGRAPHY

Although the Hubble radius is a natural limit in the semiclassical cosmology, in quantum gravity we expect a backreaction mechanism to select some special cosmological boundary. This need not be the spheres of classical intuition, but rather an inhomogeneous chaotic boundary, not necessarily connected. We assume this boundary is defined by the observational limit of photons, neutrinos and gravitons, in particular the CMB [19]. The CMB temperature  $T_C$  will be interpreted as a direct measurement of a mirror neutrino mass.

In the quantum cosmology, we envisage a reinterpretation of CMB redshift, allowing for the masses and  $T_C$  to remain fixed, replacing the Big Bang singularity with a more timeless (conformal) Brahma. As in the  $\Lambda$ CDM model, where the CMB defines an absolute frame of reference, the CMB dipole defines a centre of mass for  $M_U$ . Lorentz invariance is never broken locally, and the entropy at a cold boundary is always low [19]. As a model, a de Sitter space roughly represents  $\Lambda$ CDM, and is balanced by an AdS space in which the mirror neutrinos, naturally *at rest* with the CMB, gravitate [35].

*The mirror neutrinos are antineutrinos.* In 2010 [20], the authors noted that the  $\bar{\nu}$  mass square differences at MINOS [21] agreed precisely with the mirror neutrino phase, given below. At the time it was difficult to see how Lorentz invariance could be preserved, but it is simple: we do not require the  $\nu_L$  and  $\bar{\nu}_R$  to form a Dirac spinor, or to annihilate each other. The cosmological boundaries occur everywhere in spacetime, and all antimatter inherits the reversed clock from behind the cosmological horizon. Gravitational renormalisation probably works because antimatter antigravitates.

In mathematical quantum gravity, or even in the categorical formulation of the Standard Model, fundamental degrees of freedom are given by CFT diagrams, such as ribbons for a modular tensor category. The chiral SM particle spectrum is recovered with the braid group on three stands [17][18], excluding a right handed neutrino except in the mirror copy of the spectrum. We propose that quantum mass cohomologically pairs a SM state with its mirror partner, now associated with the cosmological horizon.

Neutrino phenomenology is modelled [22] using a mirror pair of mass triplets, both characterised by the same scale of 0.01 eV. One triplet gives the three active neutrino masses, while the second is presumed at first to represent non local mirror states. We will now justify the resulting exact correspondence [19] between the central mirror mass and the *present day* value of  $T_C$ , using Wien's displacement law (5) in the form

$$mc^2 = \beta k T_C. \quad (9)$$

Here  $T_C$  defines a global bath. The inversion in wavelength dependence, compared to the local formula, is justified by the de Broglie principle, by dualities, and by the inversion of mass in the Hawking temperature

$$k T_H = \frac{hc^3}{16\pi^2 G M}. \quad (10)$$

At 1eV, roughly the CMB temperature at creation, the Hawking mass  $M$  is near  $10^{52}$ kg, close to the observed  $M_U$ . Surely this coincidence suggests that CMB photons are Hawking radiation for the universe itself. Here  $T_H$  replaces  $T_U$  at the local horizon. Now if  $m$  is a particle, take the Unruh wavelength for  $T_C$  to get

$$m = \frac{L^2 \beta a_C}{G}, \quad (11)$$

where  $L$  is the Planck length. To obtain a minimal temperature, at the minimal acceleration, we use (11) to compute a mass of  $10^{-54}$ kg, giving a minimum energy of around  $10^{-37}$ J. This

rule agrees with the holographic Planck mass formula of [15] for the maximal acceleration

$$a_C = a_P \equiv \frac{\sqrt{\pi}c^2}{\beta L}. \quad (12)$$

It is the rest mass of mirror neutrinos that is converted into CMB photons. Although the black body spectrum requires a range of energies, we can expect the simplest models of quantum gravity to select a peak value. Only mirror masses are redshifted back to the early universe in the  $R_h = ct$  picture, leaving neutrinos to behave themselves most of the time. The use of (5) for neutrino mass is further justified by a supersymmetric relation between SM states, in which the  $3 \times 3$  quantum Fourier transform  $F\nu F^\dagger$  sends a neutrino braid to the photon [22].

There appear to be no oscillations into local sterile states in a  $3 + s$  scenario, but we should now consider effective sterile states that arise from mirror information associated to a cosmological horizon. Our non local sterile neutrino belongs in the so called early universe even as we *observe it on Earth*. Applying the CMB redshift of  $z = 1090$  to the central mirror mass, we obtain an apparent sterile mass of precisely 1.29 eV, still permitted by current data [23][24][25]. *These mirror masses are the antineutrino masses*. Reactor  $\bar{\nu}$  states are all mirror states, some of which may tunnel into the redshifted regime. Similarly, the MiniBooNe asymmetry is attributed to the mirrored nature of antimatter, although the mixing parameters may be the same. There is no dark matter at all, as predicted by quantum inertia.

This discovery originated in the Brannen model [26] for quantum gravity, where a neutrino phase of  $\pm\pi/12$  perturbs the basic lepton phase in the Brannen-Koide relations for neutrinos [27][28][29], which we now summarise. Neutrino oscillations [30][31] prove that neutrinos have mass, and that mass and flavor bases are distinct. Both the charged lepton and neutrino mass triplets are given by the eigenvalues of a mass matrix  $M$ , where

$$\sqrt{M} = \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & e^{i\theta} & e^{-i\theta} \\ e^{-i\theta} & \sqrt{2} & e^{i\theta} \\ e^{i\theta} & e^{-i\theta} & \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

for  $\mu$  a scale parameter. Global fits give a scale of  $\mu = 0.01$  eV for the active neutrinos, whose eigenvalues are

$$m_k = \mu(1 + \sqrt{2}\cos(\frac{2}{9} + \frac{\pi}{12} + \frac{2\pi k}{3}))^2 \quad (14)$$

TABLE I. neutrino masses (eV)

$L$	0.0507	0.0089	0.0004
$R$	0.0582	0.00117	0.0006

for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ , where the  $2/9$  phase differs from the charged lepton phase by a very small quantity. Fixing  $\mu$  for both neutrinos and their mirrors, and selecting  $-\pi/12$  as the mirror offset, we obtain the six masses in Table I. The central 0.00117 eV gives the CMB temperature  $T_C$  [19]. The precisely known value of  $T_C$  was used to further constrain  $\nu$  masses [22].

## CONCLUSIONS

The synthesis of  $R_h = ct$ , quantised inertia and holography is a viable cosmology, which efficiently eliminates many so called problems, notably dark energy and dark matter. When combined with the mirror neutrino hypothesis, it potentially provides a derivation of many other cosmological and Standard Model parameters, including the CMB temperature, with very little input. The current Brannen-Koide neutrino phenomenology is also efficient in its use of parameters, launching an exciting era of quantitative results beyond the SM.

On supercluster scales, mirror states may behave a lot like dark matter, as one would expect in the  $\Lambda$ CDM model. This solves the problem [33] of reconciling MOND on small scales, which follows from quantised inertia, with galaxy cluster dynamics.

Our detailed knowledge of the solar system and solar neutrinos, including the measurement of the pp flux at Borexino [34], already puts tight constraints on any proposal for local dark matter. The proposed PTOLEMY experiment will search for relic neutrinos from the CMB epoch, which in  $\Lambda$ CDM have a present energy just above the endpoint of tritium decay. In  $R_h = ct$  with mirror neutrinos, since  $M_U$  evolves in cosmic time, the early universe relation between neutrino and CMB temperatures presumably changes. But it would be preferable to have a clean theory for the relation between active and mirror states before PTOLEMY. Note that mirror neutrinos at the CMB epoch must be non relativistic to meet known constraints.

In the  $1 + 1D$  ribbon scheme, every chiral fermion has a mirror partner state. We have associated SM states (including right handed singlets for charged leptons and quarks) to



*mass* interior to spacetime and mirror states to *information* on the boundary, implementing a holographic principle. An important open question is the role of mirror states for the charged leptons and quarks.

In summary, although the  $\Lambda$ CDM model is a great empirical success, at some point it must confront the quantum nature of reality even on large scales.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MDS briefly met Fulvio Melia around 2007 at the University of Canterbury when he was visiting Roy Kerr. His talks on the black hole at the centre of the Milky Way were notable, but she had no idea that he was starting to work on the  $R_h = ct$  idea. MDS learned of this years earlier from the blog of Louise Riofrio herself, who participated in many enjoyable online discussions over the following years, along with Carl Brannen and others. In 2009, she heard Roger Penrose comment on the problem of  $H^2$ , and briefly met up with Subir Sarkar and colleagues at the University of Oxford. One of them, whose name is unknown, tried to talk about statistics problems with type Ia supernovae, but MDS was already suffering from depression and abuse, no doubt partly due to her support for  $R_h = ct$ , and many of these ideas were lost to her. Only in October 2017 did she finally discover the cosmology papers of Melia et al, and the work of McCulloch. It was then immediately apparent that this was the correct context for non local mirror neutrinos.

- 
- [1] R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and spacetime*, vols I/II, Cambridge U. P., 1986
  - [2] L. P. Hughston and T. R. Hurd, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A378, 141-154, 1981
  - [3] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 256, 727, 1985
  - [4] G. Y. Huang and S. Zhou, arxiv:1610.01347
  - [5] L. Riofrio, riofriospacetime.blogspot.com
  - [6] F. Melia, *The galactic supermassive black hole*, Princeton U. P., 2007
  - [7] R. Penrose, Proc. EPAC Scotland, 2759-2767, 2006
  - [8] J. T. Nielsen, A. Guffanti and S. Sarkar, Sci. Rep. 6, 35596, 2016
  - [9] F. Melia, arXiv:1609.0857

- [10] F. Melia, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 382, 1917-1921, 2007
- [11] F. Melia and M. Abdelqader, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D18, 1889, 2009
- [12] F. Melia and A. S. H. Shevchuk, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 419, 2579-2586, 2012
- [13] M. McCulloch, arXiv:1302.2775
- [14] M. McCulloch, arXiv:1207.7007
- [15] J. Gine, Mod. Phys. A27, 34, 1250208, 2012
- [16] M. E. McCulloch and J. Gine, Mod. Phys. A32, 28, 1750148, 2017
- [17] S. O. Bilson-Thompson, arXiv:hep-ph/0503213
- [18] M. D. Sheppeard, PhD Thesis, University of Canterbury, 2007
- [19] G. Dungworth and M. D. Sheppeard, viXra:1102.0010
- [20] G. Dungworth and M. D. Sheppeard, June 2010 posts at both the *GalaxyZoo* forum and the blog *Arcadian Pseudofunctor*.
- [21] MINOS Collaboration, <https://www.numi.fnal.gov>
- [22] M. D. Sheppeard, viXra:1709.0035; viXra:1304.0003
- [23] P. Adamson et al. (Daya Bay Collaboration, MINOS Collaboration) Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 151801, 2016; Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 209901, 2016
- [24] G.H. Collin, C.A. Argelles, J.M. Conrad and M.H. Shaevitz, Nucl. Phys. B908, 354-365, 2016; arXiv:1602.00671
- [25] S. Gariazzo, C. Giunti, M. Laveder and Y.F. Li, J. High Energ. Phys. 2017, 135, 2017; arXiv:1703.00860
- [26] C. A. Brannen, viXra:1708.0267
- [27] C. A. Brannen, <http://www.brannenworks.com/>
- [28] Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. D28, 1, 252-254, 1983
- [29] Y. Koide, Phys. Lett. B120, 161-165, 1983
- [30] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP, 7, 172, 1958
- [31] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. 28, 870, 1962
- [32] P. F. de Salas, D. V. Forero, C. A. Ternes, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, arXiv:1708.01186
- [33] L. Berezhiani and J. Khoury, Phys. Rev. D92, 103510, 2015; arXiv:1507.01019
- [34] G. Bellini et al. (Borexino Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 051302, 2012
- [35] Such geometries are used to study the metastability of the Higgs mass