

Fundamental impossibility of a superradiant neutrino laser

Yu-Kun Lu, Hanzhen Lin (林翰桢), and Wolfgang Ketterle

*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA and
MIT-Harvard Center for Ultracold Atoms, Cambridge, MA, USA*

Here we address the fundamental question whether an idealized system of N atoms will show collective behavior and superradiance when it emits fermions instead of photons. We show that the maximum emission is $\propto N$ and not $\propto N^2$ which proves the absence of superradiance and shows that the recent proposal to realize a superradiant neutrino laser is impossible. This can be understood as either destructive interference of fermionic transition amplitudes, or Pauli blockade by collective excitations with fermionic nature. On the other hand, states with low excitation can show collective behavior. We derive the exact solution of the fermionic Dicke problem and analyze the decay dynamics in various regimes.

Superradiance and statistics. Collective emission of light by atoms leads to superradiance, a coherence-brightened laser [1, 2] which works without a cavity. N atoms emit light with a rate proportional to N^2 due to constructive interference of the amplitudes for spontaneous emission. This paradigmatic system has been discussed in various idealized models and realized in different systems [2–6].

In the original papers by Dicke, the emitters are localized and their quantum statistics do not play any role [7]. This is different for delocalized atoms, e.g. in a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC). After the experimental observation of Rayleigh superradiance in a BEC, there was a controversy whether this relies on coherent matter wave amplification and would be therefore impossible in thermal or fermionic clouds. It was predicted that such superradiance is possible, despite additional Doppler broadening and a shortening of the coherence time caused by thermal or Fermi velocity [8, 9], and this was experimentally confirmed [10, 11]. Of course, if the momentum of the emitted photon is smaller than the Fermi momentum, there is Pauli blocking [12–14]. Rayleigh superradiance in atomic gases can be understood as the amplification of a bosonic excitation (density modulation or phonon) [8], which is possible in both fermionic and bosonic gases. Numerous papers explored various aspects of superradiance in fermionic systems [15–19].

However, almost all discussions of superradiance and quantum statistics focused on the case of fermionic emitter. Here we raise the question: What happens if the emitted particle is a fermion? In principle, there are two-level systems which emit neutrinos via electron capture, or one could speculate about collective emission of photinos, the fermionic supersymmetric partner of the photon. Some aspects of emission of fermionic particles have been discussed in the context of the dissociation of a bosonic molecule into two fermionic constituents [20, 21], or for the case of localized fermionic impurities coupled to the continuum [22] as a model for fermionic quantum optics. The topic of fermionic superradiance is extensively discussed in the context of black hole physics and Hawking

radiation [23].

Our work was motivated by a recent proposal to use a radioactive BEC of ^{83}Rb atoms which decays to ^{83}Kr via electron capture to realize a superradiant neutrino laser [24]. It was predicted that superradiance can reduce the decay lifetime from 86 days (10^7 s) to 1 min, an increase of the decay rate by 5 orders of magnitude, through collective decay of $N = 10^6$ atoms. In an accompanying paper, we analyze in general whether it is possible to use a BEC to enhance radioactive decay at MeV energies and conclude that the recent proposals [24, 25] neglect the multi-mode aspect and the short coherence time (due to recoil energies and subsequent decay) and have gains of only 10^{-20} or less [26]. This applies to all proposals independent of the specific decay and symmetry of the emitted particle.

Here we focus on the question of fermionic symmetry of the emitted particles in system where all limitations of multi-mode emission and recoil are absent. We assume an idealized system with an ensemble of atoms (either bosonic or fermionic) which decay by neutrino emission to a daughter atom of the opposite statistics. We assume that the atoms are individually localized to a region much smaller than the neutrino wavelength (e.g. by assuming emission of neutrinos at sub-eV energies) to eliminate recoil energies and Doppler shifts. We also assume a stable daughter atom without a K shell vacancy (which would decay on a fs scale). This could be realized with a highly ionized parent with only one electron, e.g. $^{83}\text{Rb}^{36+}$. The daughter ion (e.g. $^{83}\text{Kr}^{36+}$) is electronically stable since there are no electrons left.

These assumptions lead to the ideal Dicke model [1, 7] formulated for the emission of neutrinos instead of photons. Our main result is the analytic solution of this model including classification of all states. We show that superradiance in such a system is absent — the maximum possible rate of spontaneous emission is $N\Gamma_0$ in contrast to photons where it is $N^2\Gamma_0/4$ where Γ_0 is the natural decay rate of a single atom.

In the neutrino laser proposal, the authors argued that Pauli blocking should not play any role if the neutrinos




FIG. 1. Superradiant “laserlike” emission of light has been observed from sodium BEC after laser excitation [27]. Recently, it has been suggested that radioactive BEC can be used to realize neutrino lasers [24]. However, as we explain in this paper, fermionic emission cannot be enhanced.

are emitted sufficiently slowly so there is $\ll 1$ neutrino in the system at any given time [24]. There is also no Pauli blocking for the fermionic parent or daughter atom when the atoms are individually localized. However, our analysis shows that fermionic emission creates collective fermionic excitations, and Pauli blocking of these excitations restrict the whole system to emit only one fermion in the absence of state mixing by decoherence (Fig. 1). Furthermore, we extend the neutrino Dicke model to multi-mode emission and introduce additional forms of dissipation which we discuss with Lindblad master equations.

Description of the fermionic Dicke system. We consider a system of N atoms tightly localized in individual traps, and the whole system is much smaller than the wavelength λ of the emission. We consider the case that the parent atom is a boson and the daughter a fermion, but the behavior is almost identical in the opposite case (see End Matter). Similar to many discussions of photonic superradiance, we assume the atoms to interact only by coupling to the same mode of the neutrino field and neglect other interactions between the atoms, analogous to neglecting dipole-dipole interactions in the photonic case [2, 28]. We use b, f, ν as the annihilation operators for the emitting parent, daughter and emitted neutrino, state $|e\rangle$ and $|g\rangle$ to represent a site occupied by the parent and daughter respectively. The decay can be described by the operator $\nu^\dagger f_i^\dagger b_i$ on site i ($0 \leq i \leq N-1$). As the neutrino leaves the system quickly and can be adiabatically eliminated (see End Matter), we can describe the effect of neutrino emissions by the on-site jump operators $c_i \equiv f_i^\dagger b_i$ which annihilates an excitation of the system by flipping one atom from the bosonic parent to the fermionic daughter state. We can verify that c_i satisfy the anti-commutation relation for fermion operators: $\{c_i, c_j\} = 0$ and $\{c_i, c_j^\dagger\} = (f_i^\dagger f_i + b_i^\dagger b_i) \delta_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$. In the last equality, we used the fact that there is always one atom per site. All atoms couple identically to the

neutrino mode (since the system size $\ll \lambda$), so the neutrino emission occurs via the collective jump operator $L = \sqrt{N\Gamma_0}C$ with $C \equiv \sum_i c_i/\sqrt{N}$. For photonic emission, the definitions are analogous, but since the parent and daughter have the same statistics, c_i on different sites commute, and L is proportional to the lowering operator S^- for the collective spin, which (via the Holstein–Primakoff transformation) approximates a bosonic annihilation operator.

No coherent addition of fermionic amplitudes.

In superradiance of photons, the emission rate can be proportional to N^2 due to constructive interference of the transition amplitudes. Now we show this is fundamentally impossible for neutrino emission. Consider having N atoms where each is formally in a superposition between parent ($|e\rangle$) and daughter ($|g\rangle$) state $|\Psi\rangle = 2^{-N/2}(|g\rangle + |e\rangle)^{\otimes N}$ [29]. Using the collective jump operator the total emission rate is given by $R = \langle\Psi|L^\dagger L|\Psi\rangle = \Gamma_0 \sum_{i,j} \langle\Psi|c_i^\dagger c_j|\Psi\rangle$. In the bosonic case, since the jump operators c_i commute, one finds $\langle\Psi|c_i^\dagger c_j|\Psi\rangle = 1/4 + \delta_{ij}/4$ and $R = \Gamma_0 N(N+1)/4$.

For fermionic emission, the jump operators for different sites *anticommute*, so we have $\langle\Psi|c_i^\dagger c_j|\Psi\rangle = \delta_{ij}/2 - (\delta_{i,j-1} + \delta_{i-1,j})/4$ and $R = \Gamma_0/2$ (see End Matter). One can ask if the cancellation of matrix element for neutrino emission can be compensated for by preparing states on site i with different phases $(|g\rangle + e^{i\alpha_i}|e\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The total emission rate depends only on phases difference ϕ between neighboring sites, and one obtains $R = \Gamma_0(\frac{N-1}{2}(1 - \cos(\phi)) + \frac{1}{2})$ with an upper bound of $R = \Gamma_0(N-1/2)$ for $\phi = \pi$. Therefore, the collective decay rate of fermionic emission is bounded by $N\Gamma_0$, similar to incoherent radiation, in contrast to the bosonic result $R \approx N^2\Gamma_0/4$. This demonstrates that emission amplitudes do not add constructively for fermions and implies the absence of neutrinos superradiance.

No emission cascade for fermionic radiation.

Since the fermionic jump operators c_i obey fermionic anticommutators, it follows immediately that $L^2 = 0$ for the collective jump operator. Therefore, an arbitrary state can emit at most one neutrino and enter a dark state. Therefore, the radiation properties of the 2^N states of the system are very different from the bosonic case. We explicitly show the solutions for $N = 2$ and $N = 3$ (Fig. 2). In the bosonic case, the states form vertically connected ladders, each corresponding to a specific value of the total spin S . The collective S^- jump operator causes sequential transitions from the highest to the lowest state for a given S . In contrast, the fermionic emission always ends after one emitted neutrino. For $N = 2$, the triplet state with one excitation is dark, whereas the singlet state $(|ge\rangle - |eg\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ decays to the triplet ground state, i.e. fermionic emission can connect an antisymmetric to a symmetric state. The analytic solution for three particles illustrates similar features: the energy level diagram

breaks up into pairs of a bright state and a dark state, connected by the same transition rate $3\Gamma_0$. The bosonic case shows the highest transition rate for the fully symmetric states with $S = 3/2$ and a speedup between the first and second photon emission (Fig. 2).

To group and label the states connected by decay for N atoms (Fig. 2), we solve the eigenvalue problem for the emission rate operator $L^\dagger L$ and the excitation number $N_e = \sum b_i^\dagger b_i$. There are only two eigenvalues for $L^\dagger L$, $N\Gamma_0$ and 0, which correspond to the bright and dark states. Each bright state is paired with a dark state by the jump operator L . The labeling of degenerate states with the same N_e is defined up to a unitary transformation.

This procedure can be formalized by defining operators for collective excitations $\tilde{f}_k^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j f_j^\dagger b_j e^{ij \frac{2\pi k}{N}}$, $0 \leq k \leq N-1$. \tilde{f}_k also fulfills the commutation relations for fermions. So instead of using localized fermionic daughter atoms basis f_i^\dagger , we transform to collective fermionic excitations basis \tilde{f}_k^\dagger . The important mode is $k=0$ since the collective jump operator $L = \sqrt{N}\Gamma_0 C = \sqrt{N}\Gamma_0 \tilde{f}_0^\dagger$. All other collective modes can be arbitrarily chosen to be orthogonal to each other and to $\tilde{f}_{k=0}$.

By classifying the states using occupation numbers in the collective \tilde{f}_k modes, we can single out the states with an unpopulated $k=0$ mode: they can emit exactly one neutrino since the emission can create an excitation in this mode. This excitation will now Pauli block further emission of neutrinos. This structure fully explains why a system of bosonic atoms can emit at most one neutrino, despite the apparent absence of direct Pauli blocking via the neutrinos or separately localized daughters. The Pauli blocking occurs through the fermionic collective excitation $\tilde{f}_{k=0}^\dagger$. The initial state of all atoms in the bosonic parent state is the vacuum of all collective fermionic modes $|00 \dots 0\rangle$ where the labels are the occupation numbers of the N modes. The initial state decays to the state $|10 \dots 0\rangle$. The lowest state is the state $|11 \dots 1\rangle$ and is connected to the bright state $|01 \dots 1\rangle$. All transition rates out of bright states have the same value $N\Gamma_0$.

For an arbitrary initial state $|\psi\rangle$, the emission rate is $R = N\Gamma_0 \langle \psi | C^\dagger C | \psi \rangle = N\Gamma_0 n_0 \leq N\Gamma_0$, with $n_0 = \langle C^\dagger C \rangle$ being the bright mode population. Therefore, $N\Gamma_0$ is the fastest collective decay rate possible.

Dynamics. We now present various solutions for the decay dynamics of the Dicke system. For this, we describe the coherent coupling between the atoms and neutrinos with the Hamiltonian $H = g \sum_i \nu^\dagger f_i^\dagger b_i + \text{h.c.} = g\sqrt{N} (\nu^\dagger C + C^\dagger \nu)$ [5, 21]. Here, g represents the coupling strength for the decay process of the bosonic parent atom into the fermionic daughter atom and the neutrino. This Hamiltonian assumes that the neutrino is emitted into a single mode of a “neutrino cavity”.

This Hamiltonian describes a unitary time evolution,




FIG. 2. Comparison of the collective emission process for bosonic and fermionic radiation. In the bosonic case, the emission occurs along Dicke “ladders”, whereas for fermions the emission stops after emitting a single neutrino due to Pauli blocking by a fermionic excitation left behind after the emission. For neutrino emission, the states form coupled pairs of bright and dark states.

where a single neutrino is emitted and reabsorbed by the atoms, leading to Rabi oscillation in the bright mode population $n_0(t) = \cos^2(g\sqrt{N}t)$.

Note that the Heisenberg equations of motion for fermionic emission differ by a minus sign compared to the case of bosons [21]. As a result, the undamped solutions for bosons are initially exponential cosh and sinh functions instead of sinusoidal Rabi oscillations for the fermionic case.

We can now add a damping term κ to the neutrino cavity. For the weakly damping case $\kappa < g\sqrt{N}$, the population in the bright mode exhibits damped oscillations with $n_0(t) \approx e^{-\kappa t/2} \left(1 + \cos(2g\sqrt{N}t) + \frac{\kappa \sin(2g\sqrt{N}t)}{4g\sqrt{N}} \right) / 2$. In the strong loss limit $\kappa \gg g$, the neutrino mode can be adiabatically eliminated, and the bright mode population decays exponentially $n_0(t) = \exp(-4Ng^2t/\kappa) = \exp(-N\Gamma_0 t)$ with $\Gamma_0 = 4g^2/\kappa$ being the single-particle decay rate [22]. Adiabatically eliminating the radiation field for photons leads to an initial exponential gain for bosonic emission — this is the limit of superradiance.

The discussions above assumed no dephasing mecha-




FIG. 3. Fermion emission structure for 4 atoms and 3 modes. The 16 total possible states are grouped into two sectors of 8 states each. Each sector is coupled by solid, dashed and dotted lines representing fermion emission into mode A, B and C. Connectivity in each sector is identical to a cube. For two modes, the dotted lines are eliminated, and the states fragment into 4 groups of 4 states.

nism for the atomic states, so only one neutrino emission is possible. In reality, effects such as Doppler effects introduce inhomogeneous broadening mechanisms and lead to dephasing with rate κ_ϕ . The dephasing transfers population of dark modes into bright modes, and enables subsequent neutrino emission after dephasing time $1/\kappa_\phi$. In the weak dephasing limit $\kappa_\phi \ll N\Gamma_0$, each step of neutrino emission occurs at rate $N\Gamma_0$, but there needs to be a dephasing time $1/\kappa_\phi$ before the next emission occurs. In the strong dephasing limit $\kappa_\phi \gg N\Gamma_0$, rapid dephasing occurs within $1/\kappa_\phi$. The collective nature of the decay disappears, and each particle decays with the single-particle decay rate Γ_0 . This result emphasizes that the dark states are collective excitations that require phase-coherence between the atoms. Dephasing eliminates the Pauli blocking by the population of the collective mode \tilde{c}_0 . The solution of the full dynamics can be found in End Matter.

Extended Samples In an extended sample with size $\geq \lambda$, the $k = 0$ mode is not the only mode for neutrino emission, and the problem becomes multi-mode. We can easily extend our model to two and three orthogonal modes. Two modes could be realized with an array of emitters in a 1D waveguide [22]. Using the same eigenstates as before, each state is now connected to two (three) other states through absorption or emission. A maximally bright state can now emit two (three) neutrinos and has then reached a dark state. For two allowed modes, the Hilbert space is segmented into groups of four states in the form of a rhombus (Fig. 3, solid and dashed lines). The emission rates are now 0, $N\Gamma_A$, $N\Gamma_B$, and $N(\Gamma_A + \Gamma_B)$. For three allowed modes the Hilbert space fragments into sectors of eight states with the same connectivity as a cube (Fig. 3, all lines). If N

modes are allowed, the Hilbert space is separated into sectors with 2^N atoms connected as a N -dimensional hypercube. The maximum possible emission rate is $N\Gamma_0$ where now $\Gamma_0 = \sum \Gamma_i$. The N scaling implies absence of superradiance. Eventually, when the number of modes is comparable to the number of atoms, there are no longer any subradiant states, and the system will no longer show any collective effects.

Discussion. This work has shown the dramatic difference between fermionic and bosonic emission. In the bosonic case, the first emitted photon leaves behind a bosonic excitation (phonon, magnon etc.) — this is, in the words of Dicke, the memory of the emitted photon [7], which enhances further excitation in the same mode (via bosonic stimulation). Fermionic emission is also imprinted into the memory of the emitting system, but via a collective fermionic excitation that blocks any emission into the same mode, as illustrated in figure 2. The dephasing model discussed above introduces “loss of memory”, and then the system can emit again.

Pauli blocking by neutrinos. Ref. [24] claimed that superradiance should be independent of the quantum statistics of the radiation as long as much less than one neutrino (or photon) would be present in the system. This condition could be physically imposed by surrounding the emitting condensate with an absorber. However, since this is equivalent to have them propagate into empty space, this creates a contradiction. For superradiance of photons, N photons are emitted in a single pulse of duration $\approx \ln(N/G)$ with a Fourier limited frequency spread. Here $G = N\Gamma\Omega$ is the emission rate into a superradiant mode of solid angle Ω [26]. The temporal coherence of the superradiant pulse follows also from the semiclassical picture that the superradiant pulse is emitted by a macroscopic collective dipole moment (or Bloch vector) precessing at a constant frequency (the transition frequency of the two-level system). Therefore, all N photons populate a single temporal mode in form of the uncertainty-limited wave packet. Similarly, a hypothetical superradiant neutrino pulse of duration τ would put all the neutrinos into a single mode of extension $c\tau$, clearly a contradiction. This implies that neutrino superradiance is impossible due to Pauli blocking of neutrinos. This argument also implies that in the case of neutrinos, it is impossible to have a macroscopic Bloch vector, i.e. transition matrix elements of many atoms which add up constructively.

We want to point out that stimulation by atomic coherence (i.e. superradiance) and stimulation by the radiation (i.e. lasing) are not separable. There are two different ways to understand photon superradiance in extended ensembles [2, 30]. One can regard the whole system as a radiating system, and every photon which comes out is the result of spontaneous emission into empty space. One can also use a local description, where a photon is emitted at one point and travels through the

system. This photon is necessarily amplified since the threshold for superradiance requires the optical density to be larger than one. Experimentally, it was observed that more recoiling atoms were produced at the ends of the elongated condensate, clear evidence for light propagating and being amplified within the condensate [30]. Since the transition rate for fermionic fields is suppressed by $1 - n$ instead of the bosonic enhancement factor $1 + n$ (where n is the occupation of the relevant mode) this is impossible for neutrinos. Interestingly, our solution of the fermionic Dicke problem adiabatically eliminated the emitted neutrinos, but then showed that only one neutrino can be emitted into a given mode without invoking the Pauli principle for neutrinos.

In conclusion, we have shown that fermionic superradiance is impossible. Nevertheless, collective emission of fermions is possible. All bright states in the fermionic Dicke ladder have a rate of emission of $N\Gamma_0$ even if the number of excitations (bosonic parent atoms) $N_e \ll N$. This includes the state with $N_e = 1$: the first fermionic Dicke state has the same enhanced emission rate $N\Gamma_0$ as the first bosonic Dicke state. This is almost trivial, since the N -fold enhancement is the time reversal of the fact that N ground state atoms absorb a single photon or neutrino with a probability proportional to N , but it is still a collective enhancement. Those effects could be experimentally studied in the dissociation of diatomic molecules into pairs of fermions [20, 21]. These are the same systems which feature the BEC-BCS cross over in their phase diagram [31]. Another platform are localized fermionic atoms in an optical lattice coupled via microwaves to propagating states [22]. So far, experiments have been done with bosonic atoms and explored superradiance and subradiance [32].

Acknowledgments.—The authors are grateful to many people for helpful discussions, including Joe Formaggio, Ben Jones, James Thompson, Ana-Maria Rey, and our whole research group. We thank William Milner and Guoxian Su for comments on the manuscript. Our research has been supported by NSF (grant No. PHY-2208004), from the Center for Ultracold Atoms (an NSF Physics Frontiers Center, grant No. PHY-2317134), by the Vannevar-Bush Faculty Fellowship (grant no. N00014-23-1-2873), by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation GBMF ID # 12405), and by the Army Research Office (contract No. W911NF2410218).

-
- [1] R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **93**, 99 (1954).
 - [2] M. Gross and S. Haroche, Physics Reports **93**, 301 (1982).
 - [3] M. E. Benedict,
Super-radiance: Multiatomic Coherent Emission (1st ed.)
(CRC Press, 1996).
 - [4] R. Bonifacio, B. W. J. McNeil, and P. Pierini, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4467 (1989).
 - [5] W. Ketterle and S. Inouye, Collective enhancement and suppression in dilute bose-einstein condensates, compte rendus de l'académie des sciences, série iv - physique astrophysique, vol. 2, pp. 339-380 (2001) (2001), arXiv:cond-mat/0101424 [cond-mat.soft].
 - [6] M. Scheibner, T. Schmidt, L. Worschech, A. Forchel, G. Bacher, T. Passow, and D. Hommel, Nature Physics **3**, 106 (2007).
 - [7] R. H. Dicke, The coherence brightened laser, in: Proceedings of the third international congress on quantum electronics, edited by p. grivet and n. bloembergen (dunod Éditeur, paris, and columbia university press, new york, 1964), p. 35 (1964).
 - [8] W. Ketterle and S. Inouye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4203 (2001).
 - [9] M. G. Moore and P. Meystre, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4199 (2001).
 - [10] Y. Yoshikawa, Y. Torii, and T. Kuga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 083602 (2005).
 - [11] P. Wang, L. Deng, E. W. Hagley, Z. Fu, S. Chai, and J. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 210401 (2011).
 - [12] Y. Margalit, Y.-K. Lu, F. Çağrı Top, and W. Ketterle, Science **374**, 976 (2021).
 - [13] C. Sanner, L. Sonderhouse, R. Hutson, L. Yan, W. Milner, and J. Ye, Science **374**, 979 (2021).
 - [14] A. B. Deb and N. Kjærgaard, Science **374**, 972 (2021).
 - [15] J. Keeling, M. J. Bhaseen, and B. D. Simons, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 143002 (2014).
 - [16] F. Piazza and P. Strack, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 143003 (2014).
 - [17] Y. Chen, Z. Yu, and H. Zhai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 143004 (2014).
 - [18] B.-H. Wu, X.-X. Yang, W. Zhang, and Y. Chen, Phys. Rev. Res. **7**, 013056 (2025).
 - [19] X. Zhang, Y. Chen, Z. Wu, J. Wang, J. Fan, S. Deng, and H. Wu, Science **373**, 1359 (2021).
 - [20] M. W. Jack and H. Pu, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 063625 (2005).
 - [21] K. V. Kheruntsyan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110401 (2006).
 - [22] B. Windt, M. Bello, E. Demler, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **109**, 023306 (2024).
 - [23] D.-C. Dai and D. Stojkovic, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 084024 (2023).
 - [24] B. J. P. Jones and J. A. Formaggio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **135**, 111801 (2025).
 - [25] L. Marmugi, P. M. Walker, and F. Renzoni, Physics Letters B **777**, 281 (2018).
 - [26] H. Lin, Y.-K. Lu, and W. Ketterle, Can bose-einstein condensates enhance radioactive decay?, preprint (2025).
 - [27] S. Inouye, A. P. Chikkatur, D. M. Stamper-Kurn, J. Stenger, D. E. Pritchard, and W. Ketterle, Science **285**, 571 (1999).
 - [28] For the photonic case, this could be realized by placing the atoms in a ring geometry where, by symmetry, all atoms experience the same level shift. This causes a frequency chirp of the superradiant light pulse, but does not affect the decay dynamics [2]. Since for neutrino emission, the atoms do not stay in the fully symmetric state, the role of interactions between the emitters (caused by virtual neutrino exchange) should be revisited. ().

- [29] In the case of neutrino emission, a superposition state $(|g\rangle + |e\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ cannot have a well-defined phase due to the superselection rule which does not allow matrix elements between bosonic and fermionic states [33, 34]. We use the product state as a tool to construct an N -body trial wavefunction. The real state is a statistical mixture of this wavefunction and the wavefunction rotated by 2π . We show in the end, that the rate of neutrino emission depends only on the relative phase ϕ between two fermions on neighboring sites which is invariant to a global 2π rotation. ().
- [30] D. Schneble, Y. Torii, M. Boyd, E. W. Streed, D. E. Pritchard, and W. Ketterle, *Science* **300**, 475 (2003).
- [31] W. Ketterle and M. W. Zwierlein, *La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento* **31**, 247 (2008).
- [32] Y. Kim, A. Lanuza, and D. Schneble, *Nature Physics* **21**, 70 (2025).
- [33] C. Cisneros, R. P. M. y Romero, H. N. Núñez-Yépez, and A. L. Salas-Brito, *European Journal of Physics* **19**, 237 (1998).
- [34] M. R. Dowling, S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 052113 (2006).
- [35] E. M. Purcell, in Confined electrons and photons: new physics and applications (Springer, 1995) pp. 839–839.

END MATTER

Fermions emitting fermions

Almost identical results are obtained when the daughter atom is fermionic. The collective jump operator for neutrino emission is now L^\dagger instead of L . In the $N = 2$ Dicke problem (Fig. 2), the singlet state is now dark and the triplet state with $N_e = 1$ is bright. For each atom in an equal superposition state between parent and daughter state, the total emission rate is now $\Gamma = \Gamma_0(\frac{N-1}{2}(1 + \cos(\phi)) + \frac{1}{2})$ and has its upper limit if all phase differences ϕ between neighboring sites are zero. If we define the collective mode operators via $\tilde{f}_k^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j f_j b_j^\dagger e^{ij \frac{2\pi k}{N}}$ we arrive at the same picture that each neutrino emission would create population in the fermionic mode \tilde{f}_0 . Using the alternative definition $\tilde{f}_k^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j f_j^\dagger b_j e^{ij \frac{2\pi k}{N}}$ would result in the picture that

the system initially is in a Fermi sea of collective excitations, and each neutrino emission creates a hole in the mode \tilde{f}_0 . Now the emission stops after a single neutrino because we have Pauli blocking via a collective hole excitation.

Calculation of the emission matrix elements

Define the superposition state [29]:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \left(\frac{|g\rangle + |e\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\otimes N} = \prod_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{(f_i^\dagger + b_i^\dagger)}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle \quad (1)$$

The emission rate is $\langle \Psi | L^\dagger L | \Psi \rangle = \Gamma_0 \sum_{i,j} \langle \Psi | b_i^\dagger f_i f_j^\dagger b_j | \Psi \rangle$. To evaluate each matrix element, we push $f_j^\dagger b_j$ to the right side and $b_i^\dagger f_i$ to the left side:

$$\begin{aligned} & f_j^\dagger b_j \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\frac{f_n^\dagger + b_n^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |0\rangle \\ &= \prod_{n_1=0}^{j-1} \left(\frac{-f_{n_1}^\dagger + b_{n_1}^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \left(\frac{-f_j^\dagger + b_j^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} f_j^\dagger b_j + \frac{f_j^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \prod_{n_2=j+1}^{N-1} \left(\frac{f_{n_2}^\dagger + b_{n_2}^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |0\rangle \\ &= \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\frac{-f_n^\dagger + b_n^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) f_j^\dagger b_j |0\rangle + \prod_{n_1=0}^{j-1} \left(\frac{-f_{n_1}^\dagger + b_{n_1}^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \frac{f_j^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \prod_{n_2=j+1}^{N-1} \left(\frac{f_{n_2}^\dagger + b_{n_2}^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |0\rangle \\ &= \prod_{n_1=0}^{j-1} \left(\frac{-f_{n_1}^\dagger + b_{n_1}^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \frac{f_j^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \prod_{n_2=j+1}^{N-1} \left(\frac{f_{n_2}^\dagger + b_{n_2}^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |0\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Similar calculations can be done when pushing $b_i^\dagger f_i$ to the left. The matrix element is then obtained by taking the inner product of the two results. If $i = j$, we have $\langle b_i^\dagger f_i f_i^\dagger b_i \rangle = 1/2$. If $|i-j| = 1$, we have contribution from indices i and j such that $\langle b_i^\dagger f_i f_j^\dagger b_j \rangle = -(1/2)^2 = -1/4$. If $|i-j| > 1$, the matrix element $\langle b_i^\dagger f_i f_j^\dagger b_j \rangle = 0$ because of the contribution from $\langle (-f_m + b_m)(f_m^\dagger + b_m^\dagger) \rangle = 0$ for $i < m < j$. Combine the results above, we obtain that $\langle c_i^\dagger c_j \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{4} (\delta_{i,j-1} + \delta_{i,j+1})$. For the general case of $|\Psi\rangle = \left(\frac{|g\rangle + e^{i\alpha_i} |e\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^{\otimes N} = \prod_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{(f_i^\dagger + e^{i\alpha_i} b_i^\dagger)}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle$, we have $\langle c_i^\dagger c_j \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} - \frac{e^{i(\alpha_j - \alpha_i)}}{4} (\delta_{i,j-1} + \delta_{i,j+1})$.

Lindblad equation for atoms

Here, we derive the time evolution of the entire system of parent and daughter atoms and neutrinos using

Lindblad equations. We assume the neutrinos are emitted into a single mode of a “neutrino cavity” with decay rate κ . The Hamiltonian and jump operator read:

$$H = g\sqrt{N}(\nu^\dagger C + C^\dagger \nu), \quad L = \sqrt{\kappa} \nu \quad (2)$$

The fermionic modes C, ν obey

$$\{C, C^\dagger\} = 1, \quad \{\nu, \nu^\dagger\} = 1, \quad \{C, \nu\} = \{C, \nu^\dagger\} = 0. \quad (3)$$

The adjoint Lindblad equation for any operator O reads:

$$\dot{O} = i[H, O] + \kappa(\nu^\dagger O \nu - \frac{1}{2}\{\nu^\dagger \nu, O\}). \quad (4)$$

Define the (closed) set of second moments:

$$n_C \equiv C^\dagger C, \quad n_\nu \equiv \nu^\dagger \nu, \quad s \equiv \nu C^\dagger, \quad s^\dagger \equiv C \nu^\dagger, \quad (5)$$

then we can write down their equation of motion. For convenience, we define $s = r + iu$ with $r = \Re s$, $u = \Im s$.

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n}_C &= -2g\sqrt{N}u, \\ \dot{n}_\nu &= 2g\sqrt{N}u - \kappa n_\nu, \\ \dot{r} &= -\frac{\kappa}{2}r, \\ \dot{u} &= g\sqrt{N}(n_C - n_\nu) - \frac{\kappa}{2}u.\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

Now we can discuss the properties of the solutions in different regimes.

Steady state (with a non-zero κ):

$$\langle s \rangle_\infty = 0, \quad \langle n_\nu \rangle_\infty = 0, \quad \langle n_C \rangle_\infty = 0. \quad (7)$$

This means that after a long time, the bright mode will be depleted by emitting one neutrino.

Lossless limit ($\kappa = 0$):

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}(n_C - n_\nu) + 4g^2N(n_C - n_\nu) = 0. \quad (8)$$

From initial condition $\langle n_C(0) \rangle = 1$, $\langle n_\nu(0) \rangle = \langle u(0) \rangle = 0$, we have the dynamics of populations:

$$\langle n_C(t) \rangle = \cos^2(g\sqrt{N}t), \quad \langle n_\nu(t) \rangle = \sin^2(g\sqrt{N}t). \quad (9)$$

Physically, this means that the neutrino is emitted and reabsorbed by the atom, so the population of the bright mode and the neutrino mode exhibits Rabi oscillations.

Weak damping limit ($\kappa \ll g\sqrt{N}$): In this regime, we have the physics of damped Rabi oscillation with

$$n_C(t) \approx \frac{e^{-\kappa t/2}}{2} \left(1 + \cos(2g\sqrt{N}t) + \frac{\kappa \sin(2g\sqrt{N}t)}{4g\sqrt{N}} \right). \quad (10)$$

Bad cavity limit ($\kappa \gg g\sqrt{N}$) (adiabatic elimination):

$$u \approx \frac{2g\sqrt{N}}{\kappa} n_C, \quad n_\nu \approx \frac{4Ng^2}{\kappa^2} n_C \approx 0, \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle n_C \rangle \approx -\frac{4g^2N}{\kappa} \langle n_C \rangle \quad (12)$$

$$\langle n_C(t) \rangle \approx \langle n_C(0) \rangle e^{-(4g^2N/\kappa)t} = \langle n_C(0) \rangle e^{-N\Gamma_0 t} \quad (13)$$

It shows that the population in the bright mode decays exponentially with rate $N\Gamma_0$ with $\Gamma_0 = 4g^2/\kappa$. This is analogous to the Purcell effect in cavity QED [35].

So far we have considered an idealized case without dephasing. Inhomogeneous broadening will introduce dephasing and modify the decay dynamics. We study this by adding the following jump operator to the Lindblad equation:

$$L_{\phi,i} = \sqrt{\kappa_\phi} n_i, \quad n_i \equiv c_i^\dagger c_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, N). \quad (14)$$

The adjoint Lindblad equation for any operator O now reads:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{O} &= i[H, O] + \kappa (\nu^\dagger O \nu - \frac{1}{2} \{\nu^\dagger \nu, O\}) \\ &+ \kappa_\phi \sum_{i=1}^N (n_i O n_i - \frac{1}{2} \{n_i, O\}).\end{aligned}\quad (15)$$

Denoting the site average $\bar{n} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_i n_i$ and working out the commutators, one finds the closed set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n}_C &= -2g\sqrt{N}u - \kappa_\phi(n_C - \bar{n}), \\ \dot{n}_\nu &= 2g\sqrt{N}u - \kappa n_\nu, \\ \dot{r} &= -\frac{\kappa + \kappa_\phi}{2}r, \\ \dot{u} &= g\sqrt{N}(n_C - n_\nu) - \frac{\kappa + \kappa_\phi}{2}u, \\ \dot{\bar{n}} &= -\frac{2g\sqrt{N}}{N}u,\end{aligned}\quad (16)$$

The term $-\kappa_\phi(n_C - \bar{n})$ relaxes the bright-mode population towards \bar{n} by eliminating inter-site coherences; both κ and κ_ϕ damp the pair coherence s .

In the bad cavity limit ($\kappa \gg \kappa_\phi, g\sqrt{N}$), the fast variables u can be adiabatically eliminated:

$$0 \simeq \dot{u} = g\sqrt{N}(n_C - n_\nu) - \frac{\kappa}{2}u \quad \Rightarrow \quad u \simeq \frac{2g\sqrt{N}}{\kappa} n_C. \quad (17)$$

Putting this into the equations for $\dot{n}_C, \dot{\bar{n}}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{n}_C &\simeq -N\Gamma_0 n_C - \kappa_\phi(n_C - \bar{n}), \\ \dot{\bar{n}} &\simeq -\Gamma_0 n_C,\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

It is convenient to introduce the bright contrast $x \equiv n_C - \bar{n}$. In terms of (n_C, x) the dynamics is linear:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} n_C \\ x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -N\Gamma_0 & -\kappa_\phi \\ -N\Gamma_0(1 - \frac{1}{N}) & -\kappa_\phi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n_C \\ x \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

The eigenvalues are

$$\lambda_{\pm} = -\frac{N\Gamma_0 + \kappa_\phi}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(N\Gamma_0 + \kappa_\phi)^2 - 4\Gamma_0\kappa_\phi} < 0, \quad (20)$$

so both modes decay exponentially, leading to the steady state

$$\langle n_C \rangle_\infty = \langle \bar{n} \rangle_\infty = 0, \quad \langle n_\nu \rangle_\infty = 0, \quad \langle s \rangle_\infty = 0. \quad (21)$$

For $\kappa_\phi \ll N\Gamma_0$, the two decay rates are κ_ϕ/N and $N\Gamma_0$. This is the weak dephasing regime, where the first neutrino is emitted at a rate $N\Gamma_0$. But then the bright mode is depleted and the subsequent decay slows down. In other words, there is a wait time of $1/\kappa_\phi$ for dephasing

to occur before the next neutrino can be emitted, so the time constant for the N atoms to decay is N/κ_ϕ .

For $\kappa_\phi \gg N\Gamma_0$, the two decay rates are κ_ϕ and Γ_0 .

Physically, this is the strong dephasing regime, and rapid dephasing happens within time $1/\kappa_\phi$. After that, the coherence between different atoms disappears, and each atom decays independently at the single-particle rate Γ_0 .