Observation of Electron Anti-neutrino Disappearance at Daya Bay

Yifang Wang
Institute of High Energy Physics

CERN，March 20, 2012

Outline

- Introduction
- Data set & quality control
- Calibration and Event reconstruction
- Event selection
- Backgrounds & uncertainties
- Efficiencies & systematic errors
- Expectation
- Results of neutrino oscillation
- Summary

F.P. An et al., Daya Bay Coll., “ A side-by-side comparison of Daya Bay anti-neutrino detectors”, arXiv: 1202.6181[physics.ins-det], submitted to NIM

F.P. An et al., Daya Bay Coll., “Observation of electron anti-neutrino disappearance at Daya Bay”, arXiv: 1203.1669[hep-ex], submitted to PRL

Neutrinos & Neutrino Oscillation

◆ **Fundamental building blocks of matter:**

$$\begin{pmatrix} e & \mu & \tau \\ \nu_e & \nu_\mu & \nu_\tau \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} u & c & t \\ d & s & b \end{pmatrix}$$

◆ **Neutrino mass: the central issue of neutrino physics**

- ⇨ **Tiny mass but huge amount**
- ⇨ **Influence to Cosmology: evolution, large scale structure, …**
- ⇨ **Only evidence beyond the Standard Model**

◆ **Neutrino oscillation: a great method to probe the mass**

Oscillation probability:

$$P(\nu_e\text{->}\nu_\mu) = \sin^2(2\theta)\,\sin^2(1.27\Delta m^2 L/E)$$

Oscillation amplitude

Oscillation frequency

Daya Bay: for a New Type of Oscillation

- **Goal: search for a new oscillation θ_{13}**



- **Neutrino mixing matrix:**

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13} \\ 0 & e^{-i\delta} & 0 \\ -s_{13} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\rho} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\sigma} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Unknown mixing parameters: θ_{13}, δ + 2 Majorana phases

Need sizable θ_{13} for the δ measurement

Two ways to measure θ_{13}

Reactor experiments:

$$P_{ee} \approx 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sin^2(1.27\Delta m^2_{13}L/E) - \cos^4\theta_{13}\sin^2 2\theta_{12}\sin^2(1.27\Delta m^2_{12}L/E)$$

Long baseline accelerator experiments:

$$P_{\mu e} \approx \sin^2\theta_{23}\sin^2 2\theta_{13}\sin^2(1.27\Delta m^2_{23}L/E) + \cos^2\theta_{23}\sin^2 2\theta_{12}\sin^2(1.27\Delta m^2_{12}L/E) - A(\rho)\bullet\cos^2\theta_{13}\sin\theta_{13}\bullet\sin(\delta)$$



At reactors:

- Clean signal, no cross talk with δ and matter effects
- Relatively cheap compared to accelerator based experiments
- Provides the direction to the future of neutrino physics

Direct Searches in the Past

- **Palo Verde & Chooz: no signal**

$Sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.15$ @ 90%C.L.
if $\Delta M^2_{23} = 0.0024\ eV^2$



- **T2K: 2.5 σ over bkg**

$0.03 < Sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.28$ @ 90%C.L. for NH
$0.04 < Sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.34$ @ 90%C.L. for IH

- **Minos: 1.7 σ over bkg**

$0 < Sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.12$ @ 90%C.L. NH
$0 < Sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.19$ @ 90%C.L. IH

- **Double Chooz: 1.7 σ**

$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.086 \pm 0.041(stat) \pm 0.030(sys)$

Reactor Experiment: comparing observed/expected neutrinos



Typical precision: 3-6%

Precision of past exp.

- Reactor power: ~ 1%
- Spectrum: ~ 0.3%
- Fission rate: 2%

- Backgrounds: ~1-3%

- Target mass: ~1-2%
- Efficiency: ~ 2-3%

Our design goal: a precision of ~ 0.4%

Daya Bay Experiment: Layout





Redundancy !!!

- ◆ **Relative measurement to cancel Corr. Syst. Err.**
  - ⇨ 2 near sites, 1 far site
- ◆ **Multiple AD modules at each site to reduce Uncorr. Syst. Err.**
  - ⇨ Far: 4 modules, near: 2 modules

Cross check; Reduce errors by $1/\sqrt{N}$

- ◆ **Multiple muon detectors to reduce veto eff. uncertainties**
  - ⇨ Water Cherenkov： 2 layers
  - ⇨ RPC： 4 layers at the top + telescopes

Underground Labs



	Overburden（MWE）	**R_μ（Hz/m^2）**	**E_μ（GeV）**	**D1,2 (m)**	**L1,2 (m)**	**L3,4 (m)**
EH1	250	1.27	57	364	857	1307
EH2	265	0.95	58	1348	480	528
EH3	860	0.056	137	1912	1540	1548

Anti-neutrino Detector (AD)

- **Three zones modular structure:**
  1. **target: Gd-loaded scintillator**
  2. **γ-catcher: normal scintillator**
  3. **buffer shielding: oil**
- **192 8” PMTs/module**
- **Two optical reflectors at the top and the bottom, Photocathode coverage increased from 5.6% to 12%**





~ 163 PE/MeV

Target: 20 t, 1.6m

γ-catcher: 20t, 45cm

Buffer: 40t, 45cm

Total weight: ~110 t

Neutrino Detection: Gd-loaded Liquid Scintillator

$$\bar{\nu}_e + p \rightarrow e^+ + n$$



$\tau \approx 28\ \mu s$(0.1% Gd)

n + p → d + γ (2.2 MeV)

n + Gd → Gd* + γ (8 MeV)

Neutrino Event: coincidence in time, space and energy

Neutrino energy:

$$E_{\bar{\nu}} \cong \boxed{T_{e^+}} + \underbrace{T_n}_{10\text{-}40\ keV} + \underbrace{(M_n - M_p) + m_{e^+}}_{1.8\ MeV\text{: Threshold}}$$


From Bemporad, Gratta and Vogel

Gd-loaded Liquid Scintillator

- Liquid production, QA, storage and filling at Hall 5
  - ⇨ 185t Gd-LS, ~180t LS, ~320t oil
- LAB+Gd (TMHA)^3+PPO+BisMSB
- Stable over time
  - ⇨ Light yield: ~163 PE/MeV

Liquid hall: LS production and filling



UV-vis of 4-ton Dry Run Gd-LS



Automatic Calibration System

- **Three Z axis:**
  - One at the center
    - ✓ For time evolution, energy scale, non-linearity…
  - One at the edge
    - ✓ For efficiency, space response
  - One in the γ-catcher
    - ✓ For efficiency, space response
- **3 sources for each z axis:**
  - LED
    - ✓ for T_0, gain and relative QE
  - ^{68}Ge (2×0.511 MeV γ's)
    - ✓ for positron threshold & non-linearity…
  - ^{241}Am-^{13}C + ^{60}Co (1.17+1.33 MeV γ's)
    - ✓ For neutron capture time, …
    - ✓ For energy scale, response function, …
- **Once every week:**
  - 3 axis, 5 points in Z, 3 sources



Automated Calibration

Muon Veto Detector



Two active cosmic-muon veto's

- ➢ Water Cerenkov: Eff.>97%
- ➢ RPC Muon tracker: Eff. > 88%

- ◆ **RPCs**
  - ⇨ 4 layers/module
  - ⇨ 54 modules/near hall, 81 modules/far hall
  - ⇨ 2 telescope modules/hall
- ◆ **Water Cerenkov detector**
  - ⇨ Two layers, separated by Tyvek/PE/Tyvek film
  - ⇨ 288 8" PMTs for near halls; 384 8" PMTs for the far hall
- ◆ **Water processing**
  - ⇨ High purity de-ionized water in pools also for shielding
  - ⇨ First stage water production in hall 4
  - ⇨ Local water re-circulation & purification

Two ADs Installed in Hall 1



Hall 1(two ADs) Started the Operation on Aug. 15, 2011

One AD insalled in Hall 2
Physics Data Taking Started on Nov.5, 2011



Three ADs insalled in Hall 3
Physics Data Taking Started on Dec.24, 2011



Trigger Performance

- **Threshold for a hit:**
  - AD & pool: ¼ PE
- **Trigger thresholds:**
  - AD: ~ N_{HIT}=45, E_{tot}= ~ 0.4 MeV
  - Inner pool: N_{HIT}=6
  - Outer pool: N_{HIT}=7 (8 for far hall)
  - RPC: 3/4 layers in each module
- **Trigger rate(EH1)**
  - AD singles rate:
    - ✓ >0.4MeV, ~ 280Hz
    - ✓ >0.7MeV, ~ 60Hz
  - Inner pool rate: ~170 Hz
  - Outer pool rate: ~ 230 Hz





Data Set

- Dec. 24, 2011- Feb. 17, 2012， 55 days
- Data volume: 15TB
- DAQ eff. ～97%
- Eff. for physics: ～89%



Flashers: Imperfect PMTs



Quadrant 4

Quadrant 3

Quadrant 2

Quadrant 1, where the hottest PMT locates



$$\log_{10}\left(\left(\frac{Quadrant}{1.}\right)^2+\left(\frac{MaxQ}{0.45}\right)^2\right) < 0$$

Quadrant = Q3/(Q2+Q4)

MaxQ = maxQ/sumQ

- **Spontaneous light emission by PMT**
- **~ 5% of PMT, 5% of event**
- **Rejection: pattern of fired PMTs**
  - **Topology: a hot PMT + near-by PMTs and opposite PMTs**

Inefficiency to neutrinos:

0.024% ± 0.006%(stat)

Contamination: < 0.01%

Single Rate: Understood

- Design: ~50Hz above 1 MeV
- Data: ~60Hz above 0.7 MeV, ~40Hz above 1 MeV

- From sample purity and MC simulation, each of the following component contribute to singles
  - ~ 5 Hz from SSV
  - ~ 10 Hz from LS
  - ~ 25 Hz from PMT
  - ~ 5 Hz from rock

- All numbers are consistent



Event Reconstruction: PMT Calibration

- **PMT gains from low-intensity LED:**
  - **PMT HV is set for a gain of 1×10^7**
  - **Gain stability depends on environments such as temperature ➔ All three halls are kept in a temperature within ± 1 °C**


Fit to one PMT SPE distribution


SPE peaks for AD1/AD2



Event Reconstruction: Energy Calibration

- PMT gain calibration ➔ No. of PEs in an AD
- ^{60}Co at the center ➔ raw energies,
    - time dependence corrected
    - different for different ADs
- ^{60}Co at different R & Z to obtain the correction function, $f(R,Z) = f_1(R) * f_2(Z)$
    - space dependence corrected
    - same for all the ADs







~% level residual non-uniformities

Event Reconstruction: Energy Calibration

- **Correct for energy non-linearity: normalize to neutron capture peak**
- **Energy uncertainty among 6 ADs (uncorrelated):**
  - ⇨ **Relative difference between ADs is better than 0.5%**
  - ⇨ **Uncertainties from time-variation, non-linearity, non-uniformity… are also within 0.5%**



Uniformity at different location



Peak energy of different sources



An Alternative Method

- Using spallation neutrons in each space grid to calibrate the energy response
- Neutrons from neutrinos can then be reconstructed correctly
- Consistent with methods within 0.5%

Uniformity of energy response



Residual non-uniformities



Energy of spallation neutron



Event Signature and Backgrounds

- **Signature:** $\bar{\nu}_e + p \rightarrow e^+ + n$
  - Prompt: e^+, 1-10 MeV,
  - Delayed: n, 2.2 MeV@H, 8 MeV @ Gd
  - Capture time: 28 μs in 0.1% Gd-LS



- **Backgrounds**
  - Uncorrelated: random coincidence of γγ, γn or nn
    - ✓ γ from U/Th/K/Rn/Co… in LS, SS, PMT, Rock, …
    - ✓ n from α-n, μ-capture, μ-spallation in LS, water & rock
  - Correlated:
    - ✓ Fast neutrons: prompt—n scattering, delayed—n capture
    - ✓ ^{8}He/^{9}Li: prompt—β decay, delayed—n capture
    - ✓ Am-C source: prompt—γ rays, delayed—n capture
    - ✓ α-n: $^{13}C(\alpha,n)^{16}O$

Neutrino Event Selection

- **Pre-selection**
  - **Reject Flashers**
  - **Reject Triggers within (-2 μs, 200 μs) to a tagged water pool muon**
- **Neutrino event selection**
  - **Multiplicity cut**
    - ✓ Prompt-delayed pairs within a time interval of 200 μs
    - ✓ No triggers(E > 0.7MeV) before the prompt signal and after the delayed signal by 200 μs
  - **Muon veto**
    - ✓ *1s* after an AD shower muon
    - ✓ *1ms* after an AD muon
    - ✓ *0.6ms* after an WP muon
  - **0.7MeV < E_{prompt} < 12.0MeV**
  - **6.0MeV < $E_{delayed}$ < 12.0MeV**
  - **1μs < $\Delta t_{e^+\text{-}n}$ < 200μs**



Selected Signal Events： Good Agreement with MC





Time between prompt-delayed



Distance between prompt-delayed



Accidental Backgrounds



Simple calculation:

$$N_{\mathrm{accBkg}} = \sum_i N^i_{\text{n-like singles}} \bullet \left(1 - e^{-R^i_{e^+\text{–like triggers}} \bullet 200\,\mu s}\right) \pm \frac{N_{\mathrm{accBkg}}}{\sqrt{\sum_i N^i_{\text{n-like singles}}}}$$

	EH1-AD1	EH1-AD2	EH2-AD1	EH3-AD1	EH3-AD2	EH3-AD3
Rate(/day)	9.82±0.06	9.88±0.06	7.67±0.05	3.29±0.03	3.33±0.03	3.12±0.03
B/S	1.37%	1.38%	1.44%	4.58%	4.77%	4.43%

Cross Check: Outside the space and time window

- ◆ **Prompt-delayed distance distribution. Check the fraction of prompt-delayed pair with distance>2m**
- ◆ **Off-window coincidence → 'measure' the accidental background**
- ◆ **Results in agreement within 1%.**





Uncertainty: < 1%

Fast Neutrons

- **Look at the prompt energy spectrum above 12 MeV, to estimate backgrounds in the region of [0.7MeV, 12MeV]:**
  - ⇨ **A fit to the spectrum in the region of [12MeV, 80 MeV] ➔ extrapolate to [0.7MeV, 12 MeV]**
  - ⇨ **Difference of the fitting function, 0th-order or 1st-order polynomial, gives systematic uncertainties**



Cross Check: sum up all the sources

- **Fast neutrons from water pools**
  - Obtain the rate and energy spectrum of fast neutrons by tagged muons in water pool. Consistent with MC simulation.
  - Estimate the untagged fast neutron by using water pool inefficiency
- **Fast neutrons from nearby rock**
  - Estimated based on MC simulation



	Fast neutron (event/day)	Cross checks(event/day)
AD1	0.84±0.28	0.6±0.4
AD2	0.84±0.28	0.6±0.4
AD3	0.74±0.44	0.6±0.4
AD4	0.04±0.04	0.04±0.04
AD5	0.04±0.04	0.04±0.04
AD6	0.04±0.04	0.04±0.04

Results are consistent

Backgrounds –^{8}He/^{9}Li

- Cosmic μ produced ^{9}Li/^{8}He in LS
  - ⇨ β-decay + neutron emitter
  - ⇨ $\tau(^8\text{He}/^9\text{Li}) = 171.7\text{ms}/257.2\text{ms}$
  - ⇨ ^{8}He/^{9}Li, Br(n) = 12%/48%, ^{9}Li dominant
  - ⇨ Production rate follow $E_\mu^{0.74}$ power law
- Measurement:
  - ⇨ Time-since-last-muon fit

$$f(t) = B/\lambda \cdot e^{-t/\lambda} + S/T \cdot e^{-t/T}$$

  - ⇨ Improve the precision by reducing the muon rate:
    - ✓ Select only muons with an energy deposit >1.8MeV within a [10us, 200us] window
    - ✓ Issue: possible inefficiency of ^{9}Li
  - ⇨ Results w/ and w/o the reduction is studied





Error follows

$$\boxed{\sigma_b = \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sqrt{(1 + \tau R_\mu)^2 - 1}}$$

NIM A564 (2006)471

Measurement in EH1+EH2 & Prediction in EH3

- **Measurement in EH1/EH2 with good precision, but EH3 suffers from poor statistics**
- **Results w/ and w/o the muon reduction consistent within 10%**
- **Correlated ^{9}Li production ($E_{\mu}^{0.74}$ power law) allow us to further constraint ^{9}Li yield in EH3**
- **Cross check: Energy spectrum consistent with expectation**





^{241}Am-^{13}C Backgrounds

- **Uncorrelated backgrounds:**

  R = 50 Hz × 200 μs × $R_{n\text{-like}}$ (events/day/AD)

  - ⇨ $R_{n\text{-like}}$ Measured to be ~230/day/AD, in consistent with MC Simulation
  - ⇨ R is not a negligible amount, particularly at the far site (B/S ~ 3.17%)
  - ⇨ Measured precisely together with all the other uncorrelated backgrounds

- **Correlated backgrounds:**
  - ⇨ Neutron inelastic scattering with ^{56}Fe + neutron capture on ^{57}Fe
  - ⇨ Simulation shows that correlated background is 0.2 events/day/AD, corresponding to a B/S ratio of 0.03% at near site, 0.3% at far site





Uncertainty: 100%

Backgrounds from $^{13}C(\alpha,n)^{16}O$

- Identify α sources:
  ^{238}U, ^{232}Th, ^{227}Ac, ^{210}Po,…
- Determine α rate from cascade decays
- Calculate backgrounds from α rate + (α,n) cross sections



	Components	Total α rate	BG rate
Region A	Acc. Coincidence of ^{210}Po & ^{210}Po	^{210}Po: 10Hz at EH1 8Hz at EH2 6Hz at EH3	0.02/day at EH1 0.015/day at EH2 0.01/day at EH3
Region B	Acc. Coincidence of ^{210}Po & ^{40}K		
Region C	Acc. Coincidence of ^{40}K & ^{210}Po		
Region D	Acc. Coincidence of ^{208}Tl & ^{210}Po		
Region E	Cascade decay in ^{227}Ac chain	1.4 Bq	0.01/day
Region F	Cascade decay in ^{238}U chain	0.07Bq	0.001/day
Region G	Cascade decay in ^{232}Th chain	1.2Bq	0.01/day

Uncertainty: 50%

Signals and Backgrounds

	AD1	**AD2**	**AD3**	**AD4**	**AD5**	**AD6**
Neutrino candidates	28935	28975	22466	3528	3436	3452
DAQ live time (day)	49.5530		49.4971	48.9473		
Veto time (day)	8.7418	8.9109	7.0389	0.8785	0. 8800	0.8952
Efficiency $\varepsilon_{\mu}*\varepsilon_{m}$	0.8019	0.7989	0.8363	0.9547	0.9543	0.9538
Accidentals (/day)	9.82±0.06	9.88±0.06	7.67±0.05	3.29±0.03	3.33±0.03	3.12±0.03
Fast neutron (/day)	0.84±0.28	0.84±0.28	0.74±0.44	0.04±0.04	0.04±0.04	0.04±0.04
^{8}He/^{9}Li (/day)	3.1±1.6		1.8±1.1	0.16±0.11		
Am-C corr. (/day)	0.2±0.2					
^{13}C(α, n)^{16}O background (/day)	0.04 ±0.02	0.04 ±0.02	0.035 ±0.02	0.03 ±0.02	0.03 ±0.02	0.03 ±0.02
Neutrino rate (/day)	714.17 ±4.58	717.86 ±4.60	532.29 ±3.82	71.78 ±1.29	69.80 ±1.28	70.39 ±1.28

Signal+Backgound Spectrum







	B/S @EH1/2	B/S @EH3
Accidentals	~1.4%	~4.5%
Fast neutrons	~0.1%	~0.06%
^{8}He/^{9}Li	~0.4%	~0.2%
Am-C	~0.03%	~0.3%
α-n	~0.01%	~0.04%
Sum	1.5%	4.7%

Energy Cuts Efficiency and Systematics

- **Delayed energy cut $E_n > 6$ MeV**
  - ⇨ Energy scale uncertainty 0.5% ➔
  - ⇨ Efficiency uncertainty ~ 0.12%
- **Prompt energy cut $E_p > 0.7$ MeV**
  - ⇨ Energy scale uncertainty 2 % ➔
  - ⇨ Efficiency uncertainty ~ 0.01%



The inefficiency mainly comes from edges





	Eff.	Corr.	Un-corr.
Delayed energy cut	90.9%	0.6%	0.12%
Prompt energy cut	99.88%	0.10%	0.01%

Spill-in effect and Systematics

- Neutrons generated in acrylic and LS can spill into Gd-LS and be captured on Gd.
- Simulation shows that Gd capture is increased by 5%.
- The relative differences in acrylic vessel thickness, acrylic density and liquid density are modeled in MC



	Eff.	Corr.	Un-corr.
Spill-in	105.0%	1.5%	0.02%

Muon Veto and Multiplicity Cut

- **Muon veto**
  - Total veto time is the sum of all the veto time windows
  - Temporal overlap is taken into account
- **Multiplicity cut**
  - Efficiency = $\varepsilon_1 \times \varepsilon_2 \times \varepsilon_3$
- **Total efficiency**
  - Uncertainty coming mainly from the average neutron capture time. It is correlated.

1s after an AD shower mu
1ms after an AD mu
0.6ms after an WP mu

Prompt-delayed pairs within 200 μs
No triggers before the prompt and after the delayed signal by 200 μs

	Corr.	Un-corr.
Multiplicity cut	0.02%	< 0.01%

Efficiency is AD dependent, see page 38



Gd Capture Fraction: H/Gd and Systematics



Neutron capture time from Am-C



- Uncertainty is large if takes simply the ratio of area
- Relative Gd content variation 0.1% → evaluated from neutron capture time
- Geometry effect on spill-in/out 0.02% → relative differences in acrylic thickness, acrylic density and liquid density are modeled in MC

	Eff.	Corr.	Un-corr.
Gd capture ratio	83.8%	0.8%	<0.1%

Time Correlation Cut: $1\mu s < \Delta t_{e^{\pm}-n} < 200\mu s$

◆ **Uncertainty comes from Gd concentration difference and possible trigger time walk effect (assuming 20ns)**



	Eff.	Corr.	Un-corr.
Capture time cut	98.6%	0.12%	0.01%

Livetime

- **Synchronization of 3 Halls**
  - **Divide data taking time into one-hour slices**
  - **Discard data in a whole slice if not all 3 halls are running**
- **Uncertainty**
  - **Comes from the case when electronics buffer is full.**
  - **This estimated to be less than 0.0025%, by either blocked trigger ratio or accumulating all buffer full periods.**

	Eff.	Corr.	Un-corr.
Livetime	100%	0.002%	< 0.01%

Alternative Analysis

- Using an alternative energy calibration algorithm based on spallation neutron peak
- Different neutrino selection criteria
  - **Muon cut:** 0.4s after an AD shower muon (different shower muon threshold), 1.4ms after an AD muon, 0.6ms after a WP muon
  - **A different multiplicity cut**
- Results: consistent within statistical errors





Side-by-side Comparison

- **Expected ratio of neutrino events: R(AD1/AD2) = 0.981**
  - ⇨ The ratio is not 1 because of target mass, baseline, etc.
- **Measured ratio: 0.987 ± 0.008(stat) ± 0.003(syst)**





This final check shows that systematic errors are under control

Predictions

- Baseline
- Target mass
- Reactor neutrino flux

- These three predictions are blinded before we fix our analysis cuts and procedures
- They are opened on Feb. 29, 2012
- The physics paper is submitted to PRL on March 7, 2012

Baseline

- **Survey:**
  - **Methods: GPS, Total Station, laser tracker, level instruments, …**
  - **Results are compared with design values, and NPP coordinates**
  - **Data processed by three independent software**
- **Results: sum of all the difference less than 28 mm**
- **Uncertainty of the fission center from reactor simulation:**
  - **2 cm horizontally**
  - **20 cm vertically**
- **The combined baseline error is 35mm, corresponding to a negligible reactor flux uncertainty (<0.02%)**



By Total station

By GPS

Target Mass & No. of Protons

- Target mass during the filling measured by the load cell, precision ~ 3kg ➔ 0.015%
- Checked by Coriolis flow meters, precision ~ 0.1%
- Actually target mass:

$$M_{target} = M_{fill} - M_{overflow} - M_{bellow}$$

- $M_{overflow}$ and $M_{bellows}$ are determined by geometry
- $M_{overflow}$ is monitored by sensors





One batch LAB

Quantity	Relative	Absolute
Free protons/Kg	neg.	0.47%
Density	neg.	0.0002%
Total mass	0.015%	0.015%
Bellows	0.0025%	0.0025
Overflow tank	0.02%	0.02%
Total	0.03%	0.47%

Reactor Neutrinos

- **Reactor neutrino spectrum**

$$S(E_\nu) = \frac{W_{th}}{\sum_i (f_i/F)e_i} \sum_i^{istopes} (f_i/F)S_i(E_\nu)$$

- **Thermal power, W_{th}, measured by KIT system, calibrated by KME method**
- **Fission fraction, f_i, determined by reactor core simulation**
- **Neutrino spectrum of fission isotopes $S_i(E_\nu)$ from measurements**
- **Energy released per fission e_i**





Isotope	E_{fi}, MeV/fission
^{235}U	201.92 ± 0.46
^{238}U	205.52 ± 0.96
^{239}Pu	209.99 ± 0.60
^{241}Pu	213.60 ± 0.65



Reactor			
Correlated		Uncorrelated	
Energy/fission	0.2%	Power	0.5%
$\overline{\nu}_e$/fission	3%	Fission fraction	0.6%
		Spent fuel	0.3%
Combined	3%	Combined	0.8%

Kopeikin et al, Physics of Atomic Nuclei, Vol. 67, No. 10, 1892 (2004)

Relative measurement ➔ independent from the neutrino spectrum prediction

Daily Rate

- Three halls taking data synchronously allows near-far cancellation of reactor related uncertainties
- Rate changes reflect the reactor on/off.



Predictions are absolute, multiplied by a normalization factor from the fitting

Complete Efficiency and Systematics



Detector

	Efficiency	Correlated	Uncorrelated
Target Protons		0.47%	0.03%
Flasher cut	99.98%	0.01%	0.01%
Delayed energy cut	90.9%	0.6%	0.12%
Prompt energy cut	99.88%	0.10%	0.01%
Multiplicity cut		0.02%	<0.01%
Capture time cut	98.6%	0.12%	0.01%
Gd capture ratio	83.8%	0.8%	<0.1%
Spill-in	105.0%	1.5%	0.02%
Livetime	100.0%	0.002%	<0.01%
Combined	78.8%	1.9%	0.2%

Reactor

Correlated		Uncorrelated	
Energy/fission	0.2%	Power	0.5%
$\overline{\nu}_e$/fission	3%	Fission fraction	0.6%
		Spent fuel	0.3%
Combined	3%	Combined	0.8%

TDR: (0.18 - 0.38) %

Electron Anti-neutrino Disappearence

Using near to predict far:

$$R = \frac{Far_{measured}}{Far_{expected}} = \frac{M_4 + M_5 + M_6}{\sum_{i=4}^{6}(\alpha_i(M_1 + M_2) + \beta_i M_3)}$$

$$M_i = \frac{IBD_i - B_i^{Acc} - B_i^{FNeutron} - B_i^{9Li/8He} - B_i^{AmC} - B_i^{\alpha-n}}{\epsilon_i^{muon}\epsilon_i^{multi} TMass_i}$$

Determination of α, β:

1)Set R=1 if no oscillation

2)Minimize the residual reactor uncertainty



Observed: 9901 neutrinos at far site,

Prediction: 10530 neutrinos if no oscillation

R = 0.940 ±0.011 (stat) ±0.004 (syst)

Spectral distortion
Consistent with oscillation

χ^2 Analysis

$\chi^2 = \mathrm{m}$

$+ \sum$

$a=1$

$\mathrm{Sin}^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.092 \pm 0.016(\mathrm{stat}) \pm 0.005(\mathrm{syst})$

$\chi^2/\mathrm{NDF} = 4.26/4$

5.2 σ for non-zero θ_{13}

ute
the near-
ent.



Future plan

- Assembly of AD7 and AD8 is underway now, to be completed before summer
- Current data taking will continue until the summer
- Summer activities:
  - Installation of AD7 & AD8
  - Detector calibration
- Re-start data taking after summer

The Daya Bay Collaboration



Europe (2)

JINR, Dubna, Russia

Charles University, Czech Republic

North America (16)

BNL, Caltech, LBNL, Iowa State Univ., Illinois Inst. Tech., Princeton, RPI, UC-Berkeley, UCLA, Univ. of Cincinnati, Univ. of Houston, Univ. of Wisconsin, William & Mary, Virginia Tech., Univ. of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, Siena

~250 Collaborators

Asia (20)

IHEP, Beijing Normal Univ., Chengdu Univ. of Sci. and Tech., CGNPG, CIAE, Dongguan Polytech. Univ., Nanjing Univ., Nankai Univ., NCEPU, Shandong Univ., Shanghai Jiao tong Univ., Shenzhen Univ., Tsinghua Univ., USTC, Zhongshan Univ., Univ. of Hong Kong, Chinese Univ. of Hong Kong, National Taiwan Univ., National Chiao Tung Univ., National United Univ.

Summary

- Electron anti-neutrino disappearance is observed at Daya Bay,

  R = 0.940 ±0.011 (stat) ±0.004 (syst),

  together with a spectral distortion

- A new type of neutrino oscillation is thus discovered

$\mathrm{Sin}^2 2\theta_{13}=0.092\pm 0.016\ (\mathrm{stat})\pm 0.005(\mathrm{syst})$

$\chi^2/\mathrm{NDF} = 4.26/4$

$5.2\ \sigma$ for non-zero θ_{13}