

Recent Results and Prospects in Neutrino Physics

Towards CP Violation in Neutrino Physics
Prague
October 7th, 2011

Dave Wark
Imperial/RAL




Science & Technology
Facilities Council

Imperial College
London

Where did the idea of the neutrino come from?

There were problems in the early days of β decay.

β spectra were continuous



Instead of discrete

And the spins didn't add up... $^{14}\text{C} \rightarrow ^{14}\text{N} + e^-$
 spin 0 spin 1 spin 1/2

Bohr: maybe energy/momentum not conserved in β decay?

Pauli's Solution...



Dear Radioactive Ladies and Gentlemen,

As the bearer of these lines, to whom I graciously ask you to listen, will explain to you in more detail, how because of the "wrong" statistics of the N and Li^6 nuclei and the continuous beta spectrum, I have hit upon a desperate remedy to save the "exchange theorem" of statistics and the law of conservation of energy. Namely, the possibility that there could exist in the nuclei electrically neutral particles, that I wish to call neutrons, which have spin $1/2$ and obey the exclusion principle and which further differ from light quanta in that they do not travel with the velocity of light. The mass of the neutrons should be of the same order of magnitude as the electron mass and in any event not larger than 0.01 proton masses. The continuous beta spectrum would then become understandable by the assumption that in beta decay a neutron is emitted in addition to the electron such that the sum of the energies of the neutron and the electron is constant...

I agree that my remedy could seem incredible because one should have seen those neutrons very earlier if they really exist. But only the one who dare can win and the difficult situation, due to the continuous structure of the beta spectrum, is lighted by a remark of my honoured predecessor, Mr Debye, who told me recently in Bruxelles: "Oh, It's well better not to think to this at all, like the new taxes". From now on, every solution to the issue must be discussed. Thus, dear radioactive people, look and judge. Unfortunately, I cannot appear in Tübingen personally since I am indispensable here in Zurich because of a ball on the night of 6/7 December. With my best regards to you, and also to Mr Back.

Your humble servant
. W. Pauli

How to detect them?


- *The detection of neutrinos was an extreme challenge for the experiments of the mid-twentieth century – Pauli, in fact, apologized for hypothesizing a particle that could not be detected.*
- *In a Chalk River report in 1946, Bruno Pontecorvo pointed out the advantages of a radiochemical experiment based on $\nu_e + {}^{37}\text{Cl} \rightarrow {}^{37}\text{Ar} + e^-$ (and even mentioned solar neutrino detection using this method).*
- *However the first detection of neutrinos used another method...*

Detection of the Free Neutrino*

F. REINES AND C. L. COWAN, JR.
*Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, University of California,
 Los Alamos, New Mexico*

(Received July 9, 1953; revised manuscript received September 14, 1953)

AN experiment¹ has been performed to detect the free neutrino. It appears probable that this aim has been accomplished although further confirmatory work is in progress. The



PHYSICAL REVIEW

VOLUME 117, NUMBER 1



JANUARY 1, 1960

Detection of the Free Antineutrino*

F. REINES,[†] C. L. COWAN, JR.,[‡] F. B. HARRISON, A. D. MCGUIRE, AND H. W. KRUSE
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, University of California, Los Alamos, New Mexico

(Received July 27, 1959)

The antineutrino absorption reaction $\bar{\nu}(\beta^+, \gamma)n$ was observed in two 200-liter water targets each placed between large liquid scintillation detectors and located near a powerful production fission reactor in an antineutrino flux of $1.2 \times 10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$. The signal, a delayed-coincidence event consisting of the annihilation of the positron followed by the capture of the neutron in cadmium which was dissolved in the water target, was subjected to a variety of tests. These tests demonstrated that reactor-associated events occurred at the rate of 3.0 hr^{-1} for both targets taken together, consistent with expectations; the first pulse of the pair was due to a positron; the second to a neutron; the signal depended on the presence of protons in the target; and the signal was not due to neutrons or gamma rays from the reactor.




More Ancient History...

- Question in the late 50's: Are the neutrinos in these reactions the same thing?:



- If so, why no $\mu \rightarrow e + \gamma$ via diagrams like?:



OBSERVATION OF HIGH-ENERGY NEUTRINO REACTIONS AND THE EXISTENCE OF TWO KINDS OF NEUTRINOS*

G. Danby, J-M. Gaillard, K. Goulianos, L. M. Lederman, N. Mistry, M. Schwartz,† and J. Steinberger†

Columbia University, New York, New York and Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York
(Received June 15, 1962)

Next year will be 50th anniversary!





FIG. 1. Plan view of AGS neutrino experiment.




FIG. 9. Spark distribution for 400-MeV/c electrons normalized to expected number of showers. Also shown are the "shower" events.

The Discovery of Neutral Currents



Simon van der Meer, 1925 - 2011




The 1st Neutrino Horn –
Van den Meer, CERN, 1961



The Gargamelle
CF₃Br Bubble Chamber

The Discovery of Neutral Currents



Most of the basic techniques were now in place, and since then we have built them bigger/faster/more sensitive. Learn from my advisor...

Three neutrino mixing.

If neutrinos have mass: $|\nu_l\rangle = \sum U_{li} |\nu_i\rangle$

$$U_{li} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{e1} & U_{e2} & U_{e3} \\ U_{\mu1} & U_{\mu2} & U_{\mu3} \\ U_{\tau1} & U_{\tau2} & U_{\tau3} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{i\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13}e^{-i\delta} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $c_{ij} = \cos\theta_{ij}$, and $s_{ij} = \sin\theta_{ij}$





$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) = & 4C_{13}^2 S_{13}^2 S_{23}^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \times \left(1 + \frac{2a}{\Delta m_{31}^2} (1 - 2S_{13}^2) \right) \\ & + 8C_{13}^2 S_{12} S_{13} S_{23} (C_{12} C_{23} \cos \delta - S_{12} S_{13} S_{23}) \cos \frac{\Delta m_{32}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{4E} \\ & - 8C_{13}^2 C_{12} C_{23} S_{12} S_{13} S_{23} \sin \delta \sin \frac{\Delta m_{32}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{4E} \\ & + 4S_{12}^2 C_{13}^2 \{ C_{12}^2 C_{23}^2 + S_{12}^2 S_{23}^2 S_{13}^2 - 2C_{12} C_{23} S_{12} S_{23} S_{13} \cos \delta \} \sin^2 \frac{\Delta m_{21}^2 L}{4E} \\ & - 8C_{13}^2 S_{13}^2 S_{23}^2 \cos \frac{\Delta m_{32}^2 L}{4E} \sin \frac{\Delta m_{31}^2 L}{4E} \frac{aL}{4E} (1 - 2S_{13}^2) \end{aligned}$$

Remember degeneracies
And covariances!

How well do we know θ_{12} ?

arXiv:1009.4771v3 [hep-ex] 25 Mar 2011


Gonzalez-Garcia, Maltoni, Salvado
arXiv:1001.4524v4 [hep-ph] 16 Jun 2011



From Ranucci's BOREXINO talk at EPS 2011


How well do we know θ_{23} ?

Gonzalez-Garcia, Maltoni, Salvado
arXiv:1001.4524v4 [hep-ph] 16 Jun 2011




What is the pattern of neutrino masses?

It “probably” looks something like this




What is the pattern of neutrino masses?


But it could look like this



This makes a factor of two difference in the cosmological contribution, but a factor of two on what?



Even more significant is the absolute scale.






Does this look natural?







How well do we know θ_{23} ?

Tension between ν and $\bar{\nu}$ in MINOS relieved by new data....



But what about θ_{13} ?

T2K



T2K Overview




30 GeV proton beam from J-PARC Main Ring (MR)

Pions decay in $\approx 100\text{m}$ decay volume

MUMON monitor measures muons from pion decay


Off-axis at 295 km, Super-Kamiokande (SK) water cherenkov detector measures oscillated flux




Beam on 90 cm graphite target
3 magnetic horns focus positively charged hadrons

At 280 m, on-axis INGRID detector measures neutrino rate, beam profile
Off-axis ND280 detector measures spectra for various neutrino interactions

Beam peaked at 1st max $E \approx 600$ MeV



T2K Overview



Beam on 90 cm graphite target


3 magnetic horns focus positively charged hadrons

At 280 m, on-axis INGRID detector measures neutrino rate, beam profile

Off-axis ND280 detector measures spectra for various neutrino interactions

Beam peaked at 1st max $E \approx 600 \text{ MeV}$

- Off-Axis Pros –
 - Increases flux at the oscillation maximum
 - Reduces high-E tail, and thus NC backgrounds
 - Reduces ν_e contamination from K and μ decay
- Off-Axis Cons –
 - Measure oscillations at a single L/E
 - Increases near/far differences
 - Have to know angle!







CCQE rel. σ max!

What are we trying to measure?

ν_μ disappearance


No oscillation




Precision measurements

$\delta(\sin^2 2\theta) \sim 0.01$
 $\delta(\Delta m^2) < 1 \times 10^{-4} (\text{eV}^2)$


What are we trying to measure?

 ν_e appearance


Optimal Far Detector – Super Kamiokande




Background
from NC
interactions



ν_μ
disappearance
signal



ν_e
appearance
signal




In this energy range, Super
Kamiokande well understood,
Excellent for separating
electrons, μ , π^0

Optimal Near Detector (?)

- *Naively you would want the near and far detectors to be “identical”, and then you just subtract.*
- *That was where we started out, but it was clear from very early that a water Cerenkov was not usable at the “near” site (280m).*
- *In fact near and far are never identical. There are differences in:*
 - *Size (and everything that goes with that)*
 - *Rate*
 - *Geometry with respect to the beam (a much more severe problem in an off-axis geometry)*
 - *Backgrounds*
- *For the appearance experiment it is even more complicated, because half your backgrounds arise from the ν_μ , and these oscillate into ν_τ at the far detector.*
- *So a straight subtraction is not possible, and you need to understand the beam and interactions in detail.*


Critical σ 's poorly known in range 0.1-10 GeV.

Total ν_μ CC cross section




Cross sections are poorly known in range 0.1-10 GeV

Data compiled by G.Zeller, hep-ex/0312061




Cross sections are poorly known in range 0.1-10 GeV

Data compiled by G.Zeller, hep-ex/0312061




Cross sections are poorly known in range 0.1-10 GeV

Data compiled by G.Zeller, hep-ex/0312061




Some are worse than others...

Data compiled by G.Zeller, hep-ex/0312061



And lets not even talk about $\bar{\nu}$...



Optimal Near Detector (?)

- Naively you would want the near and far detectors to be “identical”, and then you just subtract.
- That was where we started out, but it was clear from very early that a water Cerenkov was not usable at the “near” site (280m).
- In fact near and far are never identical. There are differences in:
 - Size (and everything that goes with that)
 - Rate
 - Geometry with respect to the beam (a much more severe problem in an off-axis geometry)
 - Backgrounds
- For the appearance experiment it is even more complicated, because half your backgrounds arise from the ν_μ , and these oscillate into ν_τ at the far detector.
- So a straight subtraction is not possible, and you need to understand the beam and interactions in detail.
- The far detector must be huge, but the near detector doesn't need to be, so you can make it much more complex (and capable), if you are willing to go with a different technology.

⇒ 280m near detectors

J-PARC Facility (KEK/JAEA)

North ↑



Construction
JFY2001~2008

Bird's eye photo in January of 2008

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

J-PARC Facility (KEK/JAEA)

North ↑



— CY2007 Beams

Construction
JFY2001~2008

Bird's eye photo in January of 2008

Wednesday, March 16, 2011

J-PARC Facility (KEK/JAEA)

North ↑



— CY2007 Beams
— JFY2008 Beams

Construction
JFY2001~2008

Bird's eye photo in January of 2008

Wednesday, March 16, 2011


J-PARC Facility (KEK/JAEA)

North ↑



Wednesday, March 16, 2011


J-PARC neutrino beamline overview



ND280 (Near) Detector complex



ND280



Off-Axis (ND280)

suite of fine grain detectors/tracker in 0.2 T magnetic field (UA1/NOMAD magnet)


measurements of

- $CC \nu_{\mu}$ events (normalization, E_{ν} -spectrum)
- $NC \pi^0$, $CC \nu_e$ events (backgrounds to ν_e appearance)
- *general neutrino interaction properties*

On-axis (INGRID) scintillator-iron detectors

measurement of beam direction and profile

ND280 on-axis detector overview



- **14 identical modules + 2 off-cross modules**

- Beam coverage $\sim 10 \times 10 \text{ m}^2$, Iron target mass $\sim 7 \text{ ton/module}$
- Sandwiched scintillator/iron planes + veto planes
- Plastic scintillator + WLS fiber + **Multi-Pixel Photon Counter (MPPC)**

- **Monitor neutrino beam profile/direction/intensity**

- $\sim 700 \nu$ interactions/day at 50 kW operation
- Off-axis angle precision goal is $< 1 \text{ mrad}$
(1 mrad corresponds to 2% change in the SK flux at the peak energy)

ND280 on-axis detector performance




- Data taking efficiency is 99.9 % during 2010a


- ν event selection:

(1) Tracking \rightarrow (2) veto cut \rightarrow (3) FV cut

Typical ν event




Event timing of ν events






\rightarrow Clear 6 bunch structure (581 ns bunch period)

ν beam intensity

(normalized by proton beam intensity)



ND280 detector technologies



Scintillator + WLS fibre read out by novel MPPC ND280

- Low cost high performance and uniformity detector element
- novel solid state photosensor insensitive to magnetic field
- Photon counting, high PDE, low power consumption, ceramic package
- ~ 56 800 channels
- T2K first experiment to use MPPC at such a large scale

Very Large TPC based on MicroMegas read out

- 3x large modules with double wall structure
- Sensitive volume 180 x 200 x 70 cm
- Precise assembly, commissioning and alignment within mm
- 124 000 channels


ND280 off-axis detector overview



Two main target regions:

- *Pi-0 Detector (P0D): optimised for (NC) π^0 events*
- *Tracker: optimised for charged particle final states*

Both regions have passive water planes



P0D, Barrel and DownStream ECAL

Scintillator planes with radiator
 Measure EM showers from inner detector
 (γ for NC π^0 , bremsstrahlung in ν_e measurement)
 Sand muon rejection

UA1 magnet (0.2T) Inner volume 3.5x3.6x7m³

Yoke Fe mass ~ 900 tons

SMRD (Side Muon Range Detector)

Scintillator planes in magnet yoke.
 Detect muons from inner detector
 (neutrino rate, side muon veto, cosmic trigger)
 Momentum measurement

P0D (π^0 Detector)

Scintillators planes interleaved with water and lead/brass layers
 Optimised for γ detection





P0D mass:
 16.1 tons w/ water
 13.3 tons w/o water

2 FGDs (Fine Grained Detectors) 3 TPCs (Time Projection Chambers):


Thin, wide scintillator planes *Momentum measurement of charged particles from FGD and P0D*
 Provides active target mass *PID via dE/dx measurement*
 Optimised for p recoil detection

FGD1: Scintillator planes ~ 1 ton,
 FGD2: Scinti. & H₂O planes ~ 0.5 & 0.5 ton

ND280 off-axis event gallery



Total # of protons used for analysis



Run 1 (Jan. '10 - June '10)

- 3.23×10^{19} p.o.t. for analysis
- 50kW stable beam operation

Run 2 (Nov. '10 - Mar. '11)

- 11.08×10^{19} p.o.t. for analysis
- ~145kW beam operation

Total # of protons used for this analysis is 1.43×10^{20} pot
2% of T2K's final goal and ~5 times exposure of the previous report


Number of events in on-timing windows (-2 ~ +10 μ sec)

Class / Beam run	RUN-1	RUN-2	Total	non-beam background
POT ($\times 10^{19}$)	3.23	11.08	14.31	
Fully-Contained (FC)	33	88	121	0.023


$$N_{SK}^{exp} = R_{ND}^{\mu, Data} \times \frac{N_{SK}^{MC}}{R_{ND}^{\mu, MC}}$$

ND ν_μ event rate measurement

F/N ratio is estimated by using MC which is based on measurements




μ decay is dominated at low energy



NA61 pion measurement predicts the beam ν_e from pion origin

ND Measurement of muon momentum in inclusive ν_μ CC events ($\nu_\mu + N \rightarrow \mu^+ + X$)



$$\frac{R_{ND}^{\mu, Data}}{R_{ND}^{\mu, MC}} = 1.036 \pm 0.028(\text{stat.})_{-0.037}^{+0.044}(\text{det. syst.}) \pm 0.038(\text{phys. syst.})$$

● The number of beam ν_e background events at far detector is predicted using the ν beam simulation based on NA61 measurements (pion) and FLUKA (kaon)

- ND measurements (μ momentum and event rate) are consistent with MC based on the ν beam simulation

The expected number of events with 1.43×10^{20} p.o.t.

$$N_{SK \text{ tot.}}^{exp} = 1.5 \text{ events for } \sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0$$

	Beam ν_e background	NC background	Oscillated $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ (solar term)	Total
The expected # of events at SK	0.8	0.6	0.1	1.5

Total Systematic uncertainties

Summary of systematic uncertainties on $N^{\text{exp}}_{SK \text{ total}}$ for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}=0$ and 0.1

Error source	$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0$	$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.1$	cf.
(1) Beam flux	$\pm 8.5\%$	$\pm 8.5\%$	$\sin^2 2\theta_{13}=0$: #sig = 0.1 #bkg = 1.4
(2) ν int. cross section	$\pm 14.0\%$	$\pm 10.5\%$	
(3) Near detector	$+5.6\%$ -5.2%	$+5.6\%$ -5.2%	$\sin^2 2\theta_{13}=0.1$: #sig = 4.1 #bkg = 1.3
(4) Far detector	$\pm 14.7\%$	$\pm 9.4\%$	
(5) Near det. statistics	$\pm 2.7\%$	$\pm 2.7\%$	
Total	$+22.8\%$ -22.7%	$+17.6\%$ -17.5%	

(due to small Far det.
uncertainty for signal)



$N^{\text{exp}}_{SK \text{ tot.}} = 1.5 \pm 0.3$ events for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}=0$ (w/ 1.43×10^{20} p.o.t.)

Apply ν_e event selection







defined before the data collection
6 selection cuts in addition FC cut

Fiducial volume cut

(distance between recon. vertex and wall $> 200\text{cm}$)




T2K ν_e Appearance Data Reduction





All cuts optimized for low statistics and fixed before data taken.




Check many distributions....



You win some...





No excess outside FV or in OD,
but KS prob. for R^2 is $\sim 3\%$



You lose some.

Allowed region of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ as a function of δ_{CP}

(assuming $\Delta m_{23}^2 = 2.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 1$)



90% C.L. interval & Best fit point (assuming $\Delta m_{23}^2 = 2.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 1$, $\delta_{CP} = 0$)




$$0.03 < \sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.28$$

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.11$$

$$0.04 < \sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.34$$

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.14$$

What about θ_{13} ?



T2K (2.5σ)


MINOS (1.7σ)

ν_e appearance, $\theta_{13} > 0$?

Evidence of $\theta_{13} > 0$ from global neutrino data analysis

G.L. Fogli,^{1,2} E. Lisi,² A. Marrone,^{1,2} A. Palazzo,³ and A.M. Rotunno¹

Synopsis of global 3ν oscillation analysis



Interesting hints that $\theta_{13} > 0$, but clearly more data needed.

SK ν_μ event reduction


- 1 single ring μ -like \rightarrow 33 events
- Additional cuts:
 - Less than 2 decay electrons
 - Reconstructed μ momentum larger than 200 MeV
- 31 events pass all the selections

Expected final sample composition with oscillations


CCQE	CCnonQE	NC	$\bar{\nu}_\mu$	ν_e
57%	30%	6%	6%	<1%

- Systematics on the number of expected events computed using enriched samples of **CCQE**, **CCnonQE** and **NC** in SK atmospheric data
- Dominant systematics on SK efficiency given by the ring counting efficiency

N decay electrons $<2 \rightarrow N=31$





$P(\mu)^{rec} > 200 \text{ MeV} \rightarrow N=31$



Neutrino energy spectrum





- Observed events at SK satisfying ν_μ disappearance criteria: 31
- Oscillation parameters extracted from an oscillation fit on $E(\nu)^{\text{rec}}$
- The oscillation pattern due to the disappearance of ν_μ is clearly visible in the reconstructed energy spectrum \rightarrow advantage of using off-axis configuration



Comparison with SK and MINOS




- T2K results are in good agreement with results from SK and MINOS






5/11, 14:46, all Hell broke loose...





Much exterior damage, but inside equipment shows no major damage so far. Much to check yet! Will try to restart late this year...





What else to talk about?

- Another round of supererbeams?:
 - Water Cerenkov or Liquid Argon?
 - Upgrade of T2K
 - LBNE
 - LBNO
- The further future?:
 - β beams
 - Neutrino Factory
- Cosmological ν
- Supernovae ν and the OPERA time anomaly
- Sterile neutrinos?
- Support Experiments...



Even some 90% CP violation sensitivity...

arXiv:0907.1896v1 [hep-ph] 10 Jul 2009



An incremental approach to CP ?


- **Excitement** \Rightarrow H. Murayama presented his (anarchical) prediction for mixing angles $\theta_{12}, \theta_{23}, \theta_{13}$ which hinted at a large θ_{13}

$$P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) - P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) = -16 \underbrace{s_{12}}_{\text{red}} \underbrace{c_{12}}_{\text{blue}} \underbrace{s_{13}^2}_{\text{orange}} \underbrace{c_{13}^2}_{\text{orange}} \underbrace{s_{23}}_{\text{orange}} \underbrace{c_{23}}_{\text{orange}} \underbrace{\sin \delta}_{\text{blue}} \underbrace{\sin \frac{\Delta m_{12}^2 L}{4E}}_{\text{red}} \underbrace{\sin \frac{\Delta m_{13}^2 L}{4E}}_{\text{orange}} \underbrace{\sin \frac{\Delta m_{23}^2 L}{4E}}_{\text{orange}}$$

all parameters turned out to be favorable !!!


• What about δ_{CP} ?

- \Rightarrow the favorable values $\delta_{CP}=90, 270^\circ$ are still allowed. Will Nature be kind again ?
- \Rightarrow if so, one could find evidence for CP violation in the lepton sector early on
- \Rightarrow if not, we can upgrade the sensitivity by increasing the far detector mass and/or beam power




Conclusions

- Neutrino oscillations are the first confirmed physics beyond the SM!
- Current indications are that $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \geq \sim 0.01$, which could give existing experiments the first sensitivity to CP violation in the neutrino sector.
- Do not assume we know everything that is going on – redundancy is essential!
- There are three next-generation superbeam projects, and I think the physics will justify at least two.
- In my opinion, a large LAr tracking calorimeter will be used in at least one experiment, making LAr development a high priority.
- There will be many other opportunities for smaller-scale involvement in cross-section, hadron production, and perhaps short-baseline projects.
- Neutrino experiments have a guaranteed future. JOIN US!




Simultaneous solution to CP and mass hierarchy problems



Longer baselines
are better to
determine mass
hierarchy

OK, then what?



- Three “conventional” beam proposals:
 - An upgrade of T2K based on reaching 1.6 MW beam power and a new far detector.
 - LBNE – a plan to build a new neutrino beam at Fermilab aimed at Homestake, where either a large water Cerenkov detector or a LAr tracking calorimeter would be built.
 - LAGUNA-LBNO – three different options for new long baseline in Europe.

[Return](#) ↑


The second CNGS neutrino interaction in ICARUS T600

CNGS ν beam direction



Drift time coordinate (1.4 m)



Collection view



Wire coordinate (8 m)





~kT scale LAr now a working technology
Must now work on scalability and cost
Must figure out how to analyze!





normal

inverted



ν


anti- ν





Return ↑

Towards CP Violation

Scenarios in Japan




Kamioka $L=295\text{km}$ $OA=2.5\text{deg}$




Okinoshima $L=658\text{km}$ $OA=0.78\text{deg}$
Almost On-Axis

J-PARC
→ 1.7MW



T32 test beam at J-PARC

Setup of Oct-2010 test-beam




PMT

Fiducial mass	170kg
Total LAr mass	~400kg
Field cage dimension	42cm x 42cm x 78cm
Fiducial volume	40cm x 40cm x 76cm
Typical Drift Field	~225V / cm
Maximum drift voltage	12kV
Readout method	single phase (temporary)
Number of readout channels	76 strips (1cm)

- Double phase component is under testing at CERN. (Unfortunately, not in time for the test-beam.)




Charged particle test-beam @J-PARC (Oct/24-31)



76 strips (1cm) anode




- ◆ First beam data taken in Oct/Nov, 2010
- ◆ Results will be presented in PAC (Jul.2011)
- ◆ Possible beam 2011(?)
- ◆ See Maruyama's talk

File: physicoct12_1/i: 25 / Spill: 27 / Event: 2940



US: Long Baseline Neutrino Experiment


CD 0: January 2010





Collaboration:
288 members from 54 institutions (India, Italy, Japan, UK, US)
Continue to grow!

Conceptual Design Overview – Water Cherenkov

[Return ↑](#)




Alternative is 34 kT of LAr



Technology choice underway

Three main options


3 main options selected for LAGUNA-LBNO



CN2PY
 L=2288 km, CERN SPS 400 GeV
 + new beam line 0.75 MW
 + near detector infrastructure
 Longer term: 2MW with LP-SPL+HPPS accelerator

Possible synergy with a NF beam

Joint Japanese/European approach




CN2FR
 L=130 km,
 HP-SPL 5 GeV 4 MW LINAC +
 accumulator ring
 + MMW target + horn
 + near detector infrastructure

Possible synergy with a β beam

CNGS-Umbria
 L=658 km, 1 deg OA
 CERN SPS 400 GeV
 presently operating 0.3 MW
 (0.5 MW max)
 no near detector infrastructure

Baseline consideration



The optimal baselines are in the range 1300-2500 km

LAGUNA Pyhäsalmi w/ GLACIER



LAGUNA infrastructure at site


2500-4000 m.w.e

Finland

T=16C
MEMPHYS
DEPTH 1100 m

GLACIER
DEPTH 900 m

≈500m



Main aspects of the infrastructure

- existing working mine with very high standards
- existing decline tunnel access to deepest level
- excellent excavation strategy
- efficient rock disposal
- no disturbance with hosting site
- sufficient fresh air inlet
- effective outlet of return air
- safety
- supply routes for construction
- storage of material
- quality control of material at the vicinity
- supply route (pipe lines) for liquids



Cafeteria, meeting room and sauna at 1400 m below ground





250 m long tunnel and a cavern at 1400m excavated for LAGUNA R&D

CERN new conventional beams option



Option B:
Target station close to existing one for the North Area

- Feasibility of new beams approved by CERN study (LAGUNA-LBNO/2011-2014)
- New beam facility accepts protons from 400 GeV SPS and eventual new 50 GeV HP-PS
- Will produce conceptual design reports within 2014




• Task 4.5 Definition of the accelerators and beamlines layout at CERN
 • Task 4.6 Study of the Magnetic Configuration for the LAGUNA detector
 • Task 4.7 Definition of near detector requirements and development of conceptual design
 • Exploring within LAGUNA an LoI for a facility upgrade to neutrino beams

Exploring within LAGUNA an LoI for a 10 kT LAr with a muon ranger combined with a new beam in the NA.

Return ↑


- Task 4.5 Definition of the accelerators and beamlines layout at CERN
- Task 4.6 Study of the Magnetic Configuration for the LAGUNA detector
- Task 4.7 Definition of near detector requirements and development of conceptual design

CERN Beta Beams, Synoptic




Decay Ring: $B\rho \sim 500 \text{ Tm}$, $B = \sim 6 \text{ T}$, $C = \sim 6900 \text{ m}$, $L_{SS} = \sim 2500 \text{ m}$, $\gamma = 100$, all ions

Neutrino Factory Baseline




Two Magnetised Iron Neutrino Detectors (MIND):


- 100 kton at 2500-5000 km
- 50 kton at 7000-8000 km




Baseline constantly under review in light of new physics results




- **CMB** probes the relativistic to non-relativistic transition of neutrinos via the **early ISW effect**.



- **LSS** measures **suppression of power** on small scales due to non-clustering neutrinos.



Present constraints...




CMB (WMAP7+ACBAR+BICEP+QuaD)
+ LSS (SDSS-HPS)
+ HST+SN Ia

$$\sum m_\nu < 0.44 \rightarrow 0.76 \text{ eV (95\% CI)}$$

depending on the model complexity

Hannestad, Mirizzi, Raffelt & Y³W 2010
Gonzalez-Garcia et al. 2010, etc.

Present constraints and future sensitivities...



CMB (WMAP7+ACBAR+BICEP+QuaD)
 + LSS (SDSS-HPS)
 + HST+SN Ia

$$\sum m_\nu < 0.44 \rightarrow 0.76 \text{ eV (95\% CI)}$$

depending on the model complexity

Hannestad, Mirizzi, Raffelt & Y³W 2010
 Gonzalez-Garcia et al. 2010, etc.

Planck alone (1 year)

$$\sum m_\nu < 0.38 \rightarrow 0.84 \text{ eV (95\% CI)}$$

Perotto et al. 2006

Planck+Weak lensing (LSST)

$$\sum m_\nu < 0.074 \rightarrow 0.086 \text{ eV (95\% CI)}$$

Hannestad, Tu & Y³W 2006

If you are measuring a mass you must

Correspondence of Electron Spectra from Photoionization and Nuclear Internal Conversion

D. L. Wark,^(a) R. Bartlett, T. J. Bowles, R. G. H. Robertson, D. S. Sivia, W. Trela, and J. F. Wilkerson
Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

G. S. Brown

Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory, P.O. Box 4349, Bin 69, Stanford, California 94305

B. Crasemann, S. L. Sorensen,^(b) and S. J. Schaphorst

Physics Department, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403

D. A. Knapp and J. Henderson

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, Livermore, California 94550


J. Tulkki and T. Åberg

Laboratory of Physics, Helsinki University of Technology, 02150 Espoo, Finland

(Received 26 December 1990)

Electron energy spectra have been measured for two different mechanisms: (1) photoionization and (2) nuclear internal conversion. It is demonstrated experimentally that the primary 1s-electron peak, are identical. The spectra agree well with a model which is attributed to excitation and ionization of the 1s-electron.

PACS numbers: 32.80.Fb, 23.20.Nx



VOLUME 67, NUMBER

Limit

R. G. H. Robertson
Physics Department

TABLE II. Contributions to the total error in standard deviation.

Analysis (through Statistics)
 Beta monitor
 Energy loss: 18% in theory, 5% uncertainty

Resolution:

Variance of response function 5

Tail 15

Final States:

Differences between theories 8

Limited configuration space 10

Sudden approximation 2

Apparatus efficiency:


Linear vs quadratic 32



Total 79

SNO Systematic Flux Uncertainties

Error Source	CC error (%)	ES error (%)
Energy scale	-5.2, +6.1	-3.5, +5.4
<p>Unless a real error analysis is done for astrophysical mass “limits” they cannot really be considered equivalent to laboratory limits.</p>	Low energy background	± 0.3
	Instrumental background	± 0.4
	Trigger efficiency	± 3.3
	Live time	± 0.4
	Cut acceptance	± 2.2
	Earth orbit eccentricity	-1.9, +0.0
	^{17}O , ^{18}O	-0.2, +0.0
Experimental uncertainty	-6.2, +7.0	-5.7, +6.8
Cross-section	3.0	0.5
Solar Model	-16, +20	-16, +20

In any case why would you waste precious cosmological data constraining m_ν ?






February 1984



March 8, 1987

A supernova
converts
 $\sim 1 M_{\odot}$ to ν

$$|\Delta t| = \frac{1}{2} L m_\nu^2 \frac{|E_1^2 - E_2^2|}{E_1^2 E_2^2}$$




Limit from SN1987a is $m_{\nu_e} > 23$ eV (PDG)


Best you can do is ~5-10 eV, which isn't good enough

Light and neutrinos got here on the same day after travelling for ~160k yrs, so $|v_\nu - c|/c < 2 \times 10^{-9}$ at $E_\nu \sim 10$ MeV


Towards CP Violation




CERN NEUTRINOS TO GRAN SASSO Underground structures at CERN



06 / 2003
CERN-AC-DI-MM







Dusini at EPS OPERA τ appearance event....



.... has no friends yet. Expect 1.65 ± 0.16


Phys. Lett. B 691 (2010) 138-145


imperial college




$|v_v - c|/c = (2.48 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.30) \times 10^{-5}$

Return ↑






LSND Starts it all...




Short baselines (L/E ~ 1) and sterile ν.





MiniBooNE says....


Neutrino ν_e Appearance Results (6.5E20POT)



Antineutrino $\bar{\nu}_e$ Appearance Results (5.66E20POT)




CERN-SPSC/99-26 SEARCH FOR $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ OSCILLATION AT THE CERN PS August 30, 1999




A low/high-energy neutrino (short baseline) beam in the CERN North Area

NA could host LBL and SBL neutrino beams



Also extensive programme planned at Fermilab....


High and low energy beam options possible for detector R&D, cross-section measurements, oscillations @ $L/E \approx 1 \text{ eV}^2$, electroweak physics,...



In the systematics dominated era support measurements are essential!


CERN NA61 measurements

Evaluation of Particle Yields in 30 GeV p+C Inelastic Interactions and in the T2K replica target



TPC Readout Upgrade 2008

thin target: 2.5x2.5x2 cm³ int. length ~ 0.04 ~600k triggers in 2007





3 ToFs
 $\sigma(\text{ToF-F}) = 120 \text{ ps}$
 $\sigma(\text{ToF-L/R}) = 60 \text{ ps}$
 Full Coverage of T2K phase space

p+C @ 31 GeV/c

Particle ID methods used:




- 1) dE/dx ($p < 1 \text{ GeV/c}$, $p > 4 \text{ GeV/c}$)
- 2) Combined dE/dx + ToF ($1 < p [\text{GeV/c}] < 4$)
- 3) Negatively charged hadron h- analysis (π^- only)



Neutrino interaction properties must also be measured...

But also need....

Near Detectors....



[Phys. Rev. D 81, 033004 \(2009\)](#)
[Phys. Rev. D 81, 111102\(R\) \(2009\)](#)

Return ↑

Dave Wark
 Imperial College/RAL

