# Variation of Reactor Antineutrino Yield at RENO

Hyunkwan Seo for the RENO Collaboration
Seoul National University

XVIII International Workshop on Neutrino Telescopes
Palazzo Franchetti, Istituto Veneto, Venezia, Italy, March. 18-22, 2019

RENO Collaboration

Reactor **E**xperiment for **N**eutrino **O**scillation

(9 institutions and 40 physicists)

- Chonnam National University
- Dongshin University
- GIST
- Gyeongsang National University
- KAIST
- Kyungpook National University
- Seoul National University
- Seoyeong University
- Sungkyunkwan University

- Total cost : **$10M**
- Start of project : **2006**
- The first experiment running with both near & far detectors from **Aug. 2011**

YongGwang (靈光) :

RENO Experimental Set-up

120 m.w.e.

Near Detector

290m

1380m

Far Detector

450 m.w.e.

Near Detector
70m high

Reactors

200m high

Far Detector

100m 290m

1,380m

270m

New Results from RENO

■ Precise measurement of $|\Delta m_{ee}^2|$ and θ_{13} using ~2200 days of data (Aug. 2011 – Feb 2018)

"Measurement of Reactor Antineutrino Oscillation Amplitude and Frequency at RENO" (Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 201801 (2018. 11. 15))

■ Fuel-composition dependent reactor antineutrino yield

"Fuel-composition dependent reactor antineutrino yield at RENO" (submitted to PRL (arXiv: 1806.00574))

# Measured Spectra of IBD Prompt Signal

Clear excess at 5 MeV

Near Live time = 1807.88 days
# of IBD candidate = 850,666
Background : 2.03±0.06%

Far Live time = 2193.04 days
# of IBD candidate = 103,212
Background : 4.76±0.20%

Far/Near Shape analysis

Energy-dependent disappearance of reactor antineutrinos

Results of θ_{13} and $|\Delta m^2_{ee}|$

RENO 2200 days

$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.0896 \pm 0.0048(\text{stat.}) \pm 0.0047(\text{syst.})$ ($\pm$ 7.6%)

$|\triangle m_{ee}^2| = 2.68 \pm 0.12(\text{stat.}) \pm 0.07(\text{syst.})$ ($\times 10^{-3}$ eV^2) ($\pm$ 5.2 %)

Observed L/E Dependent Oscillation

RENO 2200 days

$$P(\overline{\nu}_e \rightarrow \overline{\nu}_e) \approx 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sin^2\left(\Delta m_{ee}^2 \frac{L}{4E_\nu}\right)$$

8

Comparison of θ_{13} and $|\Delta m^2_{ee}|$

RENO   PRL 121 (2018), 201801

PDG 2018

Daya Bay   PRL 121 (2018), 241805

Double Chooz   arXiv:1901.09445 (2019)

T2K   PRD 96 (2017) no.9, 092006

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

NH   IH

RENO   PRL 121 (2018), 201801

PDG 2018

Daya Bay   PRL 121 (2018), 241805

T2K   PRD 96 (2017) no.9, 092006

MINOS   PRL 112 (2014), 191801

NOvA   PRL 118 (2017) no.15, 151802

$\left| \Delta m^2_{32} \right|$ $(\times 10^{-3} \, eV^2)$

9

Motivation for the study of fuel composition dependent reactor antineutrino yield

Reactor Antineutrino Anomaly

- ~6% deficit of measured reactor neutrino flux compared to the prediction with new predicted flux evaluation in 2011 by Huber and Mueller.

- Deficit of observed reactor neutrino fluxes relative to the prediction (Huber + Mueller model) indicates an overestimated flux or possible oscillation to sterile neutrinos.

The possibility that reactor anomaly is due to miscalculation of one or more of the ^{235}U, ^{239}Pu, ^{238}U and ^{241}Pu antineutrino fluxes is investigated by observing **fuel-composition dependent variation of reactor antineutrino yield and spectrum.**

C. Giunti, Phys. Lett. B 764, 145 (2017)

F. P. An et al. (Daya Bay Collaboration), PRL 118, 251801 (2017)

**RENO Collaboration, arXiv:1806.00574 (submitted to PRL)**

Reactor: A copious and isotropic source of electron antineutrinos

~3 GW_{th} or ~1 GW_{elec} per reactor

3 GW_{th} reactor
→ ~6×10^{20} $\bar{\nu}_e$/sec

Neutrino fluxes from main fuel components

- 235U
- 239Pu
- 241Pu
- 238U

Nb neutrino/fission

Energy (MeV)

- 3-4% accurate neutrino source
- 0.13% uncertainty of IBD cross section

[* P. Huber, Phys. Rev. C84, 024617 (2011)
   T. Mueller *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C83, 054615 (2011)]

# Evolution of Fuel Isotope Fraction in Single Reactor

The **Fission fraction** of an isotope varies with **fuel-burning**

Observable Reactor Neutrino Spectrum


From Bemporad, Gratta and Vogel

Observable ν̄ Spectrum

Flux

Cross Section

E_ν (MeV)

Evolution of Fuel Composition at RENO

Average fission fraction $f_{235} : f_{239} : f_{238} : f_{241} = 0.573 : 0.299 : 0.073 : 0.055$

Effective fission fraction of ^{235}U (weighted by each reactor's thermal power and baseline)

8 groups of near IBD samples with equal statistics according to ^{235}U isotope fraction

Effective Fission fraction for each isotope

$$F_i(t) = \sum_{r=1}^{6} \frac{W_{th,r}(t)\bar{p}_r(t)f_{i,r}(t)}{L_r^2 \bar{E}_r(t)} \Big/ \sum_{r=1}^{6} \frac{W_{th,r}(t)\bar{p}_r(t)}{L_r^2 \bar{E}_r(t)}$$

14

Predicted IBD Yield per Fission

IBD yield per fission for each isotope

(Total # of produced IBD events)

$$y_i = \int \boxed{\sigma(E_\nu)} \boxed{\phi_i(E_\nu)} dE_\nu$$

IBD cross section (red)

Antineutrino spectrum (H-M model)

(i : each isotope)

Average IBD yield per fission

(for each 8 group, j)

$$\bar{y}_{f,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \bar{F}_{i,j} y_i$$

$\overline{F}_{i,j}$: Effective Fission fraction for each isotope

	H-M model $(10^{-43}$ cm²/fission)
y_{235}	6.70 +- 0.14
y_{239}	4.38 +- 0.11
y_{238}	10.07 +- 0.82
y_{241}	6.07 +- 0.13

Measurement of IBD Yield per Fission using RENO data

Measurement of IBD yield per fission ($\overline{y}_{f,j}$) for each group

- Number of IBD events after subtracting background is obtained for each group, j. Then $\overline{y}_{f,j}$ is determined by solving the following equation.

$$N_j = \overline{y}_{f,j} \sum_{r=1}^{6} \frac{N_p}{4\pi L_r^2} \int dt \left[\frac{W_{th,r}(t) \overline{P}_{sur}^{r}(t)}{\sum_i f_{i,r}(t) E_i} \right] \epsilon_d(t)$$

# of Observed IBD

# of Target proton

# of fission

Detection Efficiency

'Measured IBD yield per fission' corresponding to average IBD yield per fission

Average IBD yield per fission
(for each 8 group, j)

$$\overline{y}_{f,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \overline{F}_{i,j} y_i \qquad \overline{F}_{i,j} : \text{Effective Fission fraction for each isotope}$$

Fuel-Composition Dependent Reactor Neutrino Yield

Measured total averaged IBD yield per fission ($\overline{y}_f$)
= (5.84 $\pm$ 0.13)$\times$10^{-43} cm²/fission

Ratio (Data /H-M model) for the total average IBD yield
= 0.940 $\pm$ 0.021 $\rightarrow$ (6.0 $\pm$ 2.1)% deficit

Averaged IBD yield per fission ($\overline{y}_f$) vs $\overline{F}_{i,j}$
$\rightarrow$ slope means **different neutrino yield** for each isotope
$\rightarrow$ **rules out the no fuel-dependent variation at 6.6σ**

The scaled model indicates the **reactor antineutrino anomaly**

The best-fit measured yields per fission of ^{235}U and ^{239}Pu

1807.9 days of near data

The best-fit values

y_{235} = 6.15 ± 0.19 (2.8σ deficit)
y_{239} = 4.18 ± 0.26 (0.8σ deficit)

H-M model

y_{235} = 6.70 ± 0.14
y_{239} = 4.38 ± 0.11

Reevaluation of the y_{235} may **mostly solve** the reactor antineutrino **anomaly.**
But ^{239}Pu is **not entirely** ruled out as a possible source of the anomaly.

18

Correlation of 5 MeV excess with fuel ^{235}U

2.9σ indication of 5 MeV excess coming from ^{235}U fuel isotope fission !!

(2.56±0.06) %

Summary

- **More precise measurement of θ_{13} and $|\Delta m_{ee}^2|$ (2200 days)**

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.0896 \pm 0.0068 \text{ (7.6 \%)}$$

$$|\triangle m_{ee}^2| = 2.68 \pm 0.14 \ (\times 10^{-3} \ eV^2) \text{ (5.2 \%)}$$

- **Observation of fuel composition dependent IBD yield at 6.6σ CL**

- **Measured IBD yield per fission (10^{-43} cm^2)**

  ^{235}U   : 6.15 ± 0.19 (smaller than the H-M prediction at **2.8σ**)
  ^{239}Pu : 4.18 ± 0.26 (smaller than the H-M prediction at **0.8σ**)

- **First hint for 2.9σ correlation between 5 MeV excess and ^{235}U fission fraction**

Thanks for your attention!