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What do you need for a long-baseline accelerator neutrino experiment?

- Long baseline
- Powerful neutrino beam
- Large Far Detector (FD) to look for oscillations
  \[ \nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu \quad \bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\mu \]
  \[ \nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e \quad \bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e \]
- Smaller Near Detector (ND) to measure flux before oscillations.
- And one more thing…
The Fermilab NuMI beam accelerates 120 GeV protons onto a graphite target.

At 14.6 mRad off axis, neutrino energy peaks from 1-3 GeV, and is mostly independent of pion energy.

$\pi^\pm$ are selected by two focusing horns, and decay into neutrinos/antineutrinos.

At 14.6 mRad off axis, neutrino energy peaks from 1-3 GeV, and is mostly independent of pion energy.
The NuMI beam achieved 700 kW design intensity in tests on June 13.

Continued at ~560 kW until summer shutdown.

NOvA Second Analysis uses data from Feb 6 2014 to May 2 2016.

6.05x10^{20} POT in full 14 kton detector.

(More than double the exposure of the 2015 analysis)
Functionally-identical PVC-cell Near and Far Detectors filled with 10.2M liters of scintillator

Layered planes of orthogonal views

Extruded PVC cells filled with 10.2M liters of scintillator instrumented with wavelength-shifting fibre and APDs

Low-Z materials, 65% active

DAQ runs with zero deadtime

Triggers on beam, SNEWS, exotics, cosmic ray calibration samples

344,000 channels in FD, on surface

20,000 channels in ND, underground
Wonderful 200+ collaborators spanning 41 institutions and 7 countries
NOvA’s physics goals include long baseline oscillation

$\nu_\mu$ CC
Disappearance

This talk!

Suppression of signal as a function of energy

Measurements of:

$|\Delta m_{32}^2|$, $\sin^2(2\theta_{23})$

$\nu_e$ CC
Appearance

J. Bian’s talk @ 14:20

Matter effects enhance appearance (NH) $\sim$30% over 810 km baseline

Sensitivity to:

Mass Hierarchy
Octant of $\theta_{23}$

$\delta_{CP}$

2015 analysis results:
Phys.Rev.D93.051104

2015 analysis results:
PRL.116.151806
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NOvA’s great granularity produces distinct event topologies

$\nu_\mu$ CC

Long, straight track

$\nu_e$ CC

Shorter, wider, ‘fuzzier’ shower

NC

Diffuse activity from nuclear recoil system

\~ 5 m for 2 GeV $\nu$

\~ 2.5 m for 2 GeV $\nu$
Cosmic ray muons are our standard candle for calibration and energy scale

Cells individually corrected for:
- Light attenuation along cell length
- Shadowing due to detector bulk
- Threshold effects far from readout

Energy scale set by dE/dx near the end of stopping muons
- Cross-checks, including pi0 mass peak, Michel e⁻ spectrum, beam muon dE/dx
- Take 5% absolute and relative errors

Attenuation Calibration of the NOvA Detectors (372)

P. Singh
Goal: isolate a pure sample of $\nu_\mu$ charge-current events < 5 GeV

Suppress NC and cosmic events

Containment cuts
Remove events with activity close to detector walls

Four variable kNN used to identify muons:
- Track length
- dE/dx along track
- Scattering along track
- Track-only plane fraction

Selection 81% efficient for $\nu_\mu$ signal, 95% pure
A 10 μs beam spill window provides cosmic rejection at $O(10^5)$ — cosmic cuts at another $O(10^7)$

 Cosmic rates in data are measured in time windows adjacent to the spill

 Event topology and a BDT (boosted decision tree) provide another factor $O(10^7)$ reduction in cosmics. BDT uses:

- Track direction
- Track start and end points
- Track length
- Energy
- Number of hits

NOvA Muon Neutrino Selection (1664)
V. Bychkov and L. Corwin
Impact of Near Detector: data suggests an unsimulated process between QE and $\Delta$ production

MINERvA reported a similar excess in their data
P.A. Rodrigues et al., PRL 116 (2016) 071802
We enable GENIE’s empirical Meson Exchange Current model

We reweight the model to match our observed excess as a function of $p$ transfer

This reduces our largest systematic uncertainties

- Hadronic energy scale
- QE cross-section modeling

Reduce single non-resonant pion production by 50% (P.A. Rodrigues et al, arXiv:1601.01888.)

Take 50% systematic uncertainty on MEC component

Neutrino energy is reconstructed as
\[ E_\mu(L_{\text{track}}) + \text{hadronic contributions} \]

\[ E_I = E_\mu(L_{\text{track}}) + E_{\text{had}} \]
(\[ E_I \] resolution \( \sim 7\% \))

\[ E_\nu = E_\mu(L_{\text{track}}) + E_{\text{had}} \]

Muon dE/dx used in length-to-energy conversion, \( E_\mu(L_{\text{track}}) \)

Hadronic energy \( E_{\text{had}} \) estimated calorimetrically
Neutrino energy is reconstructed as $E_\mu(L_{\text{track}}) + \text{hadronic contributions}$

$E_\nu = E_\mu(L_{\text{track}}) + E_{\text{had}}$

($E_\nu$ resolution $\sim 7\%$)
ND to FD extrapolation is a three step process

1) Convert ND reconstructed energy to true energy
2) Use Far/Near ratio to convert to FD true energy spectrum
3) Translate back to reconstructed energy
We consider multiple possible sources of systematic error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systematic</th>
<th>Effect on $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$</th>
<th>Effect on $\Delta m^2_{32}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normalisation</td>
<td>$\pm 1.0%$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muon E scale</td>
<td>$\pm 2.2%$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.8%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration</td>
<td>$\pm 2.0%$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative E scale</td>
<td>$\pm 2.0%$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.9%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sections + FSI</td>
<td>$\pm 0.6%$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osc. parameters</td>
<td>$\pm 0.7%$</td>
<td>$\pm 1.5%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam backgrounds</td>
<td>$\pm 0.9%$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scintillation model</td>
<td>$\pm 0.7%$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All systematics</strong></td>
<td><strong>$\pm 3.4%$</strong></td>
<td><strong>$\pm 2.4%$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stat. Uncertainty</strong></td>
<td><strong>$\pm 4.1%$</strong></td>
<td><strong>$\pm 3.5%$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each case:

- The effect is propagated through the extrapolation
- We include those effects as pull terms in the fit
- The increase (in quadrature) of the parameter measurement error is recorded
We expect 473 FD $\nu_\mu$ CC events without oscillation, and observe 78

82 predicted at the best fit point, including 3.7 beam background and 2.9 cosmic events
Our best fit excludes maximal mixing at 2.5σ

Our best fit is at:

\[ \Delta m_{32}^2 = (2.67 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2 (\text{NH}) \]

\[ \sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.40^{+0.03}_{-0.02}(0.63^{+0.02}_{-0.03}) \]
Our best fit $\chi^2$/DOF = 41.5/17 is driven by the region above 2.5 GeV. There is no significant pull in the oscillation fit from bins in the region above 2.5 GeV.
The non-maximal fit is driven by bins in the oscillation dip (1-2 GeV)

Forcing maximal mixing gives us:

$$\Delta m_{32}^2 = (2.46) \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$$

with $\chi^2$ at 6.4 above the non-maximal fit

(Compare to

$$\Delta m_{32}^2 = (2.67 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$$

for non-maximal mixing)
Takeaway

Our best fit:

\[ \Delta m_{32}^2 = (2.67 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2 \]

\[ \sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.40^{+0.03}_{-0.02}(0.63^{+0.02}_{-0.03}) \]

1) We observe \( \nu_\mu \) disappearance

2) We exclude maximal mixing at 2.5\( \sigma \)

3) Inclusion of GENIE’s empirical MEC model, tuned to NOvA data, fills in an excess (and improves our systematics)

4) Tune in for our \( \nu_\text{e} \) appearance talk (coming up next)!

[Graph showing reconstructed neutrino energy distribution and comparison with predictions and data]
Visit the poster session to explore many other interesting NOvA studies!

Cross-section measurements with the NOvA ND (Poster 1666)  K. Sachdev

Constraints on the Neutrino Flux in NOvA using the Near Detector Data (Poster 1334)  K. Maan
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Attenuation Calibration of the NOvA Detectors (Poster 372)  P. Singh
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Search for highly-ionizing particles in the NOvA Far Detector (Poster 1322)  C. Principato

Looking amongst the neutrinos for Lightweight Dark Matter in the NOvA Near Detector (Poster 1015)  F. Jediny, B. Wang

Search for Magnetic Monopoles with the NOvA Far Detector (Poster 981)  E. Song

Looking for Sterile Neutrinos with NOvA (Poster 1665)  S. Yang

Neutrino Identification with a Convolutional Neural Network in the NOvA Detectors (Poster 950)  A. Radovic

Systematic Uncertainties in the NOvA Electron Neutrino Appearance Analysis (Poster 418)  E. Niner
Backup
1-D Profiles

Recall our best fit:

\[ \Delta m_{32}^2 = (2.67 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2 \text{ (NH)} \]

\[ \sin^2 \theta_{23} = 0.40^{+0.03}_{-0.02} \ (0.63^{+0.02}_{-0.03}) \]

NOvA Preliminary

Normal Hierarchy

**Reject max. mix./osc.:** 2.5 \( \sigma \)

1-\( \sigma \) ranges:

- 0.379-0.431
- 0.597-0.648

NOvA Preliminary
Performing the fit below 2.5 GeV improves $\chi^2$ substantially, but does not much change fit results, sensitivity, or exclusion of maximal mixing.
Fit Checks

Our best fit oscillation prediction matches other distributions well.
Inverted hierarchy contours
Muon selection

NOvA Preliminary

- Simulated selected events
- Simulated background
- Data
- Shape-only 1-σ syst. range
- ND area norm., $3.72 \times 10^{20}$ POT

NOvA Preliminary

- Simulated selected events
- Simulated background
- Data
- Shape-only 1-σ syst. range
- ND area norm., $3.72 \times 10^{20}$ POT
Muon neutrino FD data

NOvA Preliminary

FD Data
Best-fit prediction
Background

Events

\[ \cos^2\theta_{\text{NuMi}} \]

6.05 \times 10^{20} \text{ POT-equiv.}

Total number of hits

FD Data
Best-fit prediction
Background

POT-equiv.

NOvA Preliminary

Vertex X (m)
Vertex Y (m)
Vertex Z (m)

Fermilab  K. Matera, ICHEP 2016
Calibration

Stopping cosmic muon tracks are used as our standard candle.

dE/dx is approximately constant and well predicted in the region 100-200 cm from the end of the track.
Beam Performance

Achieved design power 700kW!

Beam Intensity =48.55E12 Pwr =700.27 KW (DT=1.33300 s) - A9 event 2016-06-13 16:00:49

Time interval 45 minutes

- Beam Intensity
- Beam Power
Detector Performance
Simulation

- Beam line production, propagation, and neutrino flux: FLUKA/Flugg
- Cosmic Ray flux: CRY
- Neutrino interaction and FSI: GENIE
- Detector simulation: Geant4
- Detector response: custom simulation routines
Reconstruction

**Vertexing:** Find lines of energy depositions w/ Hough transform CC events: 11 cm resolution

**Clustering:** Find clusters in angular space around vertex. Merge views via topology and prong dE/dx

**Tracking:** Trace particle trajectories with Kalman filter tracker. Also, cosmic ray tracker: lightweight, fast, and for large calibration samples, online monitoring.
Near Det data suggests an unsimulated process between QE and $\Delta$ production.

MINERvA reported a similar excess in their data in P.A. Rodrigues et al., PRL 116 (2016) 071802.
We enable GENIE’s empirical Meson Exchange Current model

We reweight the model to match our observed excess as a function of $p$ transfer.

Reduce single non-resonant pion production by 50% (P.A. Rodrigues et al, arXiv: 1601.01888.)

Take 50% systematic uncertainty on MEC component.

This reduces our largest systematic uncertainties:
- Hadronic energy scale
- QE cross-section modeling

The addition of MEC events improves the simulated hadronic energy distribution.

The hadronic energy scale uncertainty was reduced from 14% to 5%.

The reconstructed ND neutrino energy spectrum is next unfolded, and used to extrapolate ND data for a FD prediction.

\[ E_V = E_\mu(L_{\text{track}}) + E_{\text{had}} \]