Review and Summary of Short Baseline Neutrino Experiments

Josh Spitz, University of Michigan

NuFACT 2019, 8/26/2019

Short baseline summary

- Why are there short baseline neutrino experiments?
  - Mainly: various hints of anomalous electron-flavor appearance and disappearance may be indicative of a new neutrino participating in oscillations and/or some other new physics.
  - But, also:
    - Neutrino cross sections for informing long-baseline oscillations measurements.
    - Neutrino cross sections for understanding the neutrino interaction with matter.
    - Exotic searches (e.g. dark matter production) with high luminosity, fixed target.
    - Detector R&D.

Outline

- Non-oscillation physics
- Short review of the existing anomalies at short-baseline
- Discussion of the MiniBooNE anomaly
- A quick tour of current/future experiments

Outline

- Non-oscillation physics
- Short review of the existing anomalies at short-baseline
- Discussion of the MiniBooNE anomaly
- A quick tour of current/future experiments

Why neutrino cross section measurements at short-baseline?

Reminder



Turning near and far rate measurements into flux evolution (oscillation) measurements requires cross section knowledge.

Why neutrino cross section measurements at short-baseline?

- Neutrino interactions with nuclei are complicated!
  - Fermi motion.
  - Correlations between nucleons.
  - Final state interactions.
  - One nucleus is different than the next.
- Detector limitations
  - Energy resolution.
  - Event classification issues.
  - Cerenkov threshold.



Adapted from K. McFarland

Why neutrino cross section measurements at short-baseline?

- Neutrino interactions with nuclei are complicated!
  - Fermi motion
  - C
  - F
  - O
- Dete
  - Energy resolution.
  - Event classification issues.
  - Cerenkov threshold.

Solving these problems for the purposes of informing oscillation physics requires neutrino-nucleus cross section measurements in all relevant interaction channels, nuclear targets, and energies.

Accelerator-based short-baseline experiments are tackling these issues.



Adapted from K. McFarland

A few new cross section results

MicroBooNE CC-inclusive measurement

First Measurement of Inclusive Muon Neutrino Charged Current
Differential Cross Sections on Argon at $E_\nu \sim 0.8$ GeV with the MicroBooNE Detector



1905.09694 (accepted by PRL)

A few new cross section results

MiniBooNE KDAR measurement





Booster Neutrino Experiment

about BooNE | about neutrinos | virtual tour | BooNE at work | Fermilab at work | PPD home page

Data Release for "First Measurement of Monoenergetic Muon Neutrino Charged Current Interactions" [Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 141802 (2018)]

Description

This is a simple website dedicated to allowing comparisons between theoretical predictions and the measurements of KDAR neutrinos made by MiniBooNE. Through the exact same procedure used in the full analysis, an input model is compared to the data and then given a corresponding χ^2 value and probability. All comparisons made using this tool should be treated carefully, and any anomalies should be reported to the authors.

Instructions

The input to the theory-data comparison is a single text file (.txt) which contains the model T_μ spectrum. The file should contain a single column of numbers specifying the model's bin contents in 1 MeV bins (i.e. at 0.5 MeV, 1.5 MeV, etc.). The comparison is shape-only (including endpoint) so the spectrum will be normalized appropriately by the program. An example file for the best fit beta distribution is linked here.

Files can be uploaded using this link. Results of the comparison will be printed in your browser after the file is uploaded.

Examples

Below are a few example text files for T_μ models which can be compared to the data:

Genie [C. Andreopoulos *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. A **614** 87 (2010).]

Martini et al. [M. Martini, M. Ericson, G. Chanfray, and J. Marteau, Phys. Rev. C **80** 065501 (2009); M. Martini, M. Ericson, and G. Chanfray, Phys. Rev. C **84** 055502 (2011).]

Nuance (kappa=1.0, M_A=1.23) [D. Casper, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **112** 161 (2002).]

NuWro [C. Juszczak, Acta Phys. Pol. B **40** 2507 (2009); T. Golan, C. Juszczak, and J. Sobczyk, Phys. Rev. C **86** 015505 (2012).]

Singh et al. (M_A=1.2) [F. Akbar, M. Sajjad Athar, and S.K. Singh, arXiv:1708.00321 [nucl-th] (2017).]

A number of plots comparing these models to the best fit results with stat-only errors for the corresponding end points are shown below. The shaded red region represents the 1σ (χ^2_{min}+3.53) stat-only allowed region from our measurement, in consideration of 3 parameters (shape and endpoint). The models and data are normalized appropriately.

Website allows you to upload an arbitrary model prediction to be compared to our result.

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS **120,** 141802 (2018)

Editors' Suggestion | Featured in Physics

First Measurement of Monoenergetic Muon Neutrino Charged Current Interactions

A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo,[13] B. C. Brown,[6] L. Bugel,[12] G. Cheng,[5] E. D. Church,[20] J. M. Conrad,[12] R. L. Cooper,[10,16] R. Dharmapalan,[1] Z. Djurcic,[2] D. A. Finley,[6] R. S. Fitzpatrick,[14,*] R. Ford,[6] F. G. Garcia,[6] G. T. Garvey,[10] J. Grange,[2,†] W. Huelsnitz,[10] C. Ignarra,[12] R. Imlay,[11] R. A. Johnson,[3] J. R. Jordan,[14,‡] G. Karagiorgi,[5] T. Katori,[17] T. Kobilarcik,[6] W. C. Louis,[10] K. Mahn,[5,15] C. Mariani,[19] W. Marsh,[6] G. B. Mills,[10] J. Mirabal,[10] C. D. Moore,[6] J. Mousseau,[14] P. Nienaber,[18] B. Osmanov,[7] Z. Pavlovic,[10] D. Perevalov,[6] H. Ray,[7] B. P. Roe,[14] A. D. Russell,[6] M. H. Shaevitz,[5] J. Spitz,[14,§] I. Stancu,[1] R. Tayloe,[9] R. T. Thornton,[10] R. G. Van de Water,[10] M. O. Wascko,[8] D. H. White,[10] D. A. Wickremasinghe,[3] G. P. Zeller,[6] and E. D. Zimmerman[4]

(MiniBooNE Collaboration)

[1]*University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487, USA*
[2]*Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA*
[3]*University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA*
[4]*University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA*
[5]*Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, USA*
[6]*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA*
[7]*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA*
[8]*Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*
[9]*Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA*
[10]*Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*
[11]*Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803, USA*
[12]*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*
[13]*Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, D.F. 04510, Mexico*
[14]*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA*
[15]*Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA*
[16]*New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003, USA*
[17]*Queen Mary University of London, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom*
[18]*Saint Mary's University of Minnesota, Winona, Minnesota 55987, USA*
[19]*Center for Neutrino Physics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061, USA*
[20]*Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520, USA*

(Received 11 January 2018; published 6 April 2018)

We report the first measurement of monoenergetic muon neutrino charged current interactions. MiniBooNE has isolated 236 MeV muon neutrino events originating from charged kaon decay at rest ($K^+ \to \mu^+\nu_\mu$) at the NuMI beamline absorber. These signal ν_μ-carbon events are distinguished from primarily pion decay in flight ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ backgrounds produced at the target station and decay pipe using their arrival time and reconstructed muon energy. The significance of the signal observation is at the 3.9σ level. The muon kinetic energy, neutrino-nucleus energy transfer ($\omega = E_\nu - E_\mu$), and total cross section for these events are extracted. This result is the first known-energy, weak-interaction-only probe of the nucleus to yield a measurement of ω using neutrinos, a quantity thus far only accessible through electron scattering.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.141802

Exotic searches at short-baseline

High luminosity proton beam (100s of MeV to 10s of GeV)

Simple idea: make a new particle with your $10^{20\text{-something}}$ protons on target and then watch it decay or interact in your neutrino detector

Dark Photon





Dipole Model



$$\mathrm{Br}(\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.99$$
$$\mathrm{Br}(\eta \to \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.39$$



Large boost means there are less kinematic constraints on the scattering, compared to traditional direct DM searches

Exotic searches at short-baseline

example: vector portal



Short-baseline neutrino experiments are very competitive with other techniques when it comes to exotic searches.

Outline

- Non-oscillation physics
- Short review of the existing anomalies at short-baseline
- Discussion of the MiniBooNE anomaly
- A quick tour of current/future experiments

A number of anomalies seem to indicate that there may be a new characteristic oscillation frequency mode (indicative of a new neutrino state).

Experiment name	Type	Oscillation channel	Significance
LSND	Low energy accelerator	muon to electron (antineutrino)	3.8σ
MiniBooNE	High(er) energy accelerator	muon to electron (antineutrino)	2.8σ
MiniBooNE	High(er) energy accelerator	muon to electron (neutrino)	4.5σ
Reactors	Beta decay	electron disappearance (antineutrino)	(varies)
GALLEX/SAGE	Source (electron capture)	electron disappearance (neutrino)	2.8σ

Now: 4.8σ (combined)

(there are also various null results in this “high-frequency oscillation” parameter space); MINOS(+), IceCube, KARMEN, CDHS, OPERA, …

Pion and muon decay-at-rest neutrinos

(LSND anomaly)





$$\pi^+ \to \mu^+ \nu_\mu$$
$$\mu^+ \to e^+ \nu_e \overline{\nu}_\mu$$

The Liquid Scintillator Neutrino Detector anomaly



- **LSND observed $\overline{\nu}_\mu \to \overline{\nu}_e$ at 3.8σ significance with a characteristic oscillation frequency of $\Delta m^2 \sim 1\ \mathrm{eV}^2$.**

$$\Delta m^2_{\mathrm{LSND}} \gtrsim 0.2\,\mathrm{eV}^2 \qquad (\gg \Delta m^2_{\mathrm{ATM}} \gg \Delta m^2_{\mathrm{SOL}})$$

The Liquid Scintillator Neutrino Detector anomaly



- LSND observed $\overline{\nu}_\mu \to \overline{\nu}_e$ at 3.8σ significance with a characteristic oscillation frequency of $\Delta m^2 \sim 1\ eV^2$.
- That's odd. There are two characteristic oscillation frequencies in the three neutrino picture and they are precisely measured.

$$\Delta m^2_{\rm LSND} \gtrsim 0.2\,{\rm eV}^2 \qquad (\gg \Delta m^2_{\rm ATM} \gg \Delta m^2_{\rm SOL})$$

Pion decay-in-flight

(MiniBooNE anomaly)



The MiniBooNE anomalies

MiniBooNE Collab., PRL 122 221801 (2018)





Note: MiniBooNE does not have the ability to distinguish between electrons and single-gammas.
That is, it's not clear if the excess is electron-like or gamma-like.

LSND and MiniBooNE



MiniBooNE Collab., PRL 122 221801 (2018)

Lack of observed muon disappearance rules out a generic 1 sterile neutrino model

IceCube, MINOS(+), NOvA, MiniBooNE, CDHS see no muon-flavor disappearance at high-Δm^2

Taking the observed MiniBooNE+LSND results at face value and assuming the addition of 1 light sterile neutrino, muon-flavor disappearance should have been seen by now.

$$P_{ee} = 1 - 4|U_{e4}|^2(1 - |U_{e4}|^2)\sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m^2_{41} L}{4E}\right)$$

$$P_{\mu\mu} = 1 - 4|U_{\mu 4}|^2(1 - |U_{\mu 4}|^2)\sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m^2_{41} L}{4E}\right)$$

$$P_{\mu e} = 4|U_{\mu 4}|^2|U_{e4}|^2\sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m^2_{41} L}{4E}\right)$$



$$\sin^2 2\theta_{\mu e} = 4|U_{\mu 4}|^2|U_{e4}|^2$$

M. Dentler et al., JHEP **08**, 010 (2018), 1803.10661

What is going on?

- 3+1 doesn't work.
  - A number of global-fit papers consider the removal of an experiment or class of experiments when performing a 3+1 or 3+0 fit. In general, it is *still* hard to perform a reasonable fit in these cases.
- It is fairly clear that any new physics explanation likely requires 'multiple layers' to explain all the results.
  - One sterile neutrino and a new interaction or decay? Two/three sterile neutrinos?
- There may be new physics here. But, the possibility of underestimated/unknown systematics ("bad data") remains. Global fits suffer badly from this very real possibility. We shouldn't forget: Neutrino experiments are hard.
- Unfortunately, we have entered the realm of 'sigmas doesn't matter', recalling that the MiniBooNE+LSND combo (w/o considering others) is now 6.1σ.
  - **A wiggle in L/E, observation in multiple channels with *coherence* among the results (and cosmology), or some other smoking gun, needs to be seen for discovery!**
- What to do? Keep pushing with better detectors and better neutrino sources. **We must figure this out!**
  - Even in the absence of an actual light sterile neutrino or other new physics, short-baseline experiments remain highly compelling.

Outline

- Non-oscillation physics
- Short review of the existing anomalies at short-baseline
- Discussion of the MiniBooNE anomaly
- A quick tour of current/future experiments

What is the source of the MiniBooNE anomaly?



Energy distributions of the excesses



Angular distributions of the excesses

A good model for the excess must agree with all of these distributions simultaneously and the beam-dump mode results

Ok, so 3+1 is ruled out.
Can the MiniBooNE anomaly be due to something else exotic, perhaps not involving neutrinos?

The MiniBooNE beam dump null result provides a pretty good answer to this question.
Answer: probably not.
[The exotic particle should probably be produced in beam dump running as well, but no excess is seen]



beam dump mode electron-like search is consistent with background



MiniBooNE-DM Collab., PRD 98 112004 (2018)

What is the source of the MiniBooNE anomaly?

J. Jordan, Y. Kahn, G. Krnjaic, M. Moschella, J. Spitz, PRL 122 081801 (2019)



What is the source of the MiniBooNE anomaly?

J. Jordan, Y. Kahn, G. Krnjaic, M. Moschella, J. Spitz, PRL 122 081801 (2019)



The MiniBooNE excess is broadly consistent with having something to do with neutrinos sourced from charged pion/kaon decays in the beamline, rather than something else new (dark matter, millicharged particle, light scalar, etc.). New physics or systematics?

Also, it's very hard to imagine new physics explaining both LSND and MiniBooNE simultaneously without invoking oscillations (and recalling that the LSND signal signature was a positron PLUS neutron capture).

Outline

- Non-oscillation physics
- Short review of the existing anomalies at short-baseline
- Discussion of the MiniBooNE anomaly
- A quick tour of current/future experiments

A quick tour of *selected* and *representative* running and 'now or next-two-years' short-baseline experiments

[w/ apologies to other experiments (adequately covered elsewhere at NuFACT)]

- SBN at Fermilab (pion decay-in-flight)
- JSNS^2 (pion/muon/kaon decay-at-rest)
- PROSPECT (reactor)

Please see: C. Giunti, T. Lasserre, arXiv:1901.08330 for a recent review on eV-scale sterile neutrinos, including current/future experiments

SBN Program at Fermilab

3 LArTPCs in the Booster Neutrino Beamline, looking for (among other things) muon->electron flavor oscillations as a function of L/E



SBND (first data in 2021)
MicroBooNE (running since late-2015)
ICARUS (fill in late-2019; first data in 2020)

SBN Program at Fermilab

3 LArTPCs in the Booster Neutrino Beamline

SBN proposal: 1503.01520











See SBND/ICARUS NuFACT talks by:
Stephen Dennis, Jaehoon Yu

SBN's LArTPC technology provides the ability to "see" all aspects of a neutrino interaction (w/ few exceptions) and differentiate between electrons and gammas

LArTPC



(compare to MiniBooNE)




μBooNE
13 cm
BNB DATA : RUN 5370 EVENT 7227. MARCH 10, 2016.


μBooNE
13 cm
BNB DATA : RUN 5360 EVENT 45. MARCH 8, 2016.


μBooNE
18 cm
BNB DATA : RUN 5929 EVENT 1582. APRIL 15, 2016.


μBooNE
30 cm
Run 3493 Event 27435, October 23rd, 2015





Although the challenge of LArTPC hardware gets most of the attention, teaching a computer to reconstruct LArTPC events is just as difficult IMHO.





MicroBooNE is laying the groundwork for SBN+DUNE

So far: LArTPC hardware R&D, reconstruction and pattern recognition, detector physics and calibration, and cross section measurements…with lots more to come, including a detailed study of the MiniBooNE excess region.

See MicroBooNE NuFACT talks by:

Adrien Hourlier
Pip Hamilton
Mark Ross-Lonergan

Publications/Documents by the MicroBooNE Collaboration

- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Calibration of the Charge and Energy Response of the MicroBooNE Liquid Argon Time Projection Chamber Using Muons and Protons", arXiv:1907.11736, submitted to JINST
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "First Measurement of Inclusive Muon Neutrino Charged Current Differential Cross Sections on Argon at Enu ~0.8 GeV with the MicroBooNE Detector", arXiv:1905.09694, accepted by PRL
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Design and Construction of the MicroBooNE Cosmic Ray Tagger System", arXiv:1901.02862, JINST 14, P04004 (2019)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Rejecting Cosmic Background for Exclusive Neutrino Interaction Studies with Liquid Argon TPCs: A Case Study with the MicroBooNE Detector", arXiv:1812.05679, accepted by Eur. J. Phys. C.
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "First Measurement of Muon Neutrino Charged Current Neutral Pion Production on Argon with the MicroBooNE LAr TPC", arXiv:1811.02700, Phys. Rev. D99, 091102(R) (2019)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "A Deep Neural Network for Pixel-Level Electromagnetic Particle Identification in the MicroBooNE Liquid Argon Time Projection Chamber", arXiv:1808.07269, Phys. Rev. D99, 092001 (2019), Fermilab News article (09/12/18), DOE HEP Science Highlight (01/30/19)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Comparison of Muon-Neutrino-Argon Multiplicity Distributions Observed by MicroBooNE to GENIE Model Predictions", arXiv:1805.06887, Eur. Phys. J. C79, 248 (2019), Fermilab News article (05/31/18)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Ionization Electron Signal Processing in Single Phase LAr TPCs II: Data/Simulation Comparison and Performance in MicroBooNE", arXiv:1804.02583, JINST 13, P07007 (2018), Fermilab News article (07/09/18), DOE HEP Science Highlight (05/21/19)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Ionization Electron Signal Processing in Single Phase LAr TPCs I: Algorithm Description and Quantitative Evaluation with MicroBooNE Simulation", arXiv:1802.08709, JINST 13, P07006 (2018), Fermilab News article (07/09/18), DOE HEP Science Highlight (05/21/19)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "The Pandora Multi-Algorithm Approach to Automated Pattern Recognition of Cosmic Ray Muon and Neutrino Events in the MicroBooNE Detector", arXiv:1708.03135, Eur. Phys. J. C78, 1, 82 (2018)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Measurement of Cosmic Ray Reconstruction Efficiencies in the MicroBooNE LAr TPC Using a Small External Cosmic Ray Counter", arXiv:1707.09903, JINST 12, P12030 (2017)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Noise Characterization and Filtering in the MicroBooNE Liquid Argon TPC", arXiv:1705.07341, JINST 12, P08003 (2017), Fermilab News article (07/05/17), DOE HEP Science Highlight (05/16/18)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Michel Electron Reconstruction Using Cosmic Ray Data from the MicroBooNE LAr TPC", arXiv:1704.02927, JINST 12, P09014 (2017)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Determination of Muon Momentum in the MicroBooNE LAr TPC Using an Improved Model of Multiple Coulomb Scattering", arXiv:1703.06187, JINST 12 P10010 (2017)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Convolutional Neural Networks Applied to Neutrino Events in a Liquid Argon Time Projection Chamber", arXiv:1611.05531, JINST 12, P03011 (2017)
- MicroBooNE collaboration, "Design and Construction of the MicroBooNE Detector", arXiv:1612.05824, JINST 12, P02017 (2017)

JSNS^2: J-PARC E56 Sterile ν search @MLF

http://research.kek.jp/group/mlfnu/



Bird's eye photo in January of 2008

J-PARC Sterile Neutrino Search at the J-PARC Spallation Neutron Source (JSNS²)



MLF Beam Layout



$$\pi^+ \to \mu^+ \nu_\mu$$
$$\mu^+ \to e^+ \nu_e \overline{\nu}_\mu$$

- Direct test of LSND
- Target volume is Gd-loaded liquid scintillator
  - Phase 0: 17 tons w/ ~150 10” PMTs @ 24 m
  - Future phases: multi-detector
- Energy resolution $\sim 15\%/\sqrt{\mathrm{E}\ (\mathrm{MeV})}$
- Beam: 525 kW @ 3 GeV (w/ duty factor ~5x10^{-6})
  - Ramping up to 700 kW in early-2020, eventually 1 MW.
- First data in early-2020!

See JSNS² NuFACT talks by:
Tomoyuki Konno
Fumihiko Suekane

JSNS² TDR: 1705.08629

Signal and background

Signal

$$\overline{\nu}_\mu \to \overline{\nu}_e, \quad \overline{\nu}_e + p \to e^+ + n$$

prompt signal

delayed signal (n-capture)

Background



JSNS² timing

IBD signature:

	Time from beam	Energy
Prompt signal	$1<T_p<10\mu s$	20<E<60MeV
Delayed signal	$T_p<T_d<100\mu s$	7<E<12MeV



$$\pi^+ \to \mu^+ \nu_\mu$$

$$\mu^+ \to e^+ \nu_e \overline{\nu}_\mu$$

$$K^+ \to \mu^+ \nu_\mu$$



@25 Hz

JSNS2 is sensitive to the smoking gun signature of oscillations: a wiggle in L/E



$$\overline{\nu}_\mu \to \overline{\nu}_e \ ?$$

$$\overline{\nu}_\mu \to \overline{\nu}_e, \quad \overline{\nu}_e + p \to e^+ + n$$

prompt signal

delayed signal (n-capture)

Expected spectrum



Case $\Delta m^2 = 2.5 eV^2, \sin^2 2\theta = 0.003$



Case $\Delta m^2 = 1.2 eV^2, \sin^2 2\theta = 0.003$

(3 years of running)

JSNS^2 status
(first data will be taken in early-2020)





PROSPECT

- Segmented liquid scintillator (4 tons in Phase 1)
- Highly-enriched uranium reactor @ 85 MW
- Moveable w/ 7-12 m baselines
- Initial oscillation results reported for 33 days of reactor-on (750 IBD events/day).
- First oscillation analysis excludes Reactor Antineutrino Anomaly best-fit at 2.3σ.







PROSPECT Collab., PRL 121 251802 (2018)

In general, it's a great time to be a reactor neutrino physicist. There are lots of reactor experiments taking/reporting data. As usual, though: need more data for definitive statements about reactor anomaly!



NEOS, PRL 121 (2016)

DANSS, Lepton-Photon 2019



STEREO, Moriond 2019





PROSPECT Collab., PRL 121 251802 (2018)

Conclusion

- A number of neutrino anomalies at short baseline may be indicative of new physics.
- The parameter space of new oscillations/interactions continues to be explored with accelerator-based, including decay-in-flight and decay-at-rest, and reactor-based experiments.
- We can look forward to many more results with short-baseline experiments in the future, including impactful cross section measurements, exotic searches, and R&D, all in addition to the anomaly probes.

Backup

Reactor anomaly

The oscillation modes associated with reactor neutrinos



Update: recent reactor results

arXiv:1803.10661





DANSS and NEOS

Update: recent reactor results

arXiv:1809.10561



Neutrino-4

SBN sensitivity

3 yrs





JSNS² sensitivity



JSNS2 TDR:
1705.08629

Sterile neutrino limits





Dark Neutrino Portal Model

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{m^2_{Z_\mathcal{D}}}{2} Z_{\mathcal{D}\mu} Z^\mu_\mathcal{D} + g_\mathcal{D} Z^\mu_\mathcal{D} \bar{\nu}_\mathcal{D} \gamma_\mu \nu_\mathcal{D}$$

$$+ e\epsilon Z^\mu_\mathcal{D} J^{em}_\mu + \frac{g}{c_W} \epsilon' Z^\mu_\mathcal{D} J^Z_\mu$$





E. Bertuzzo, S. Jana, P. A. N. Machado and R. Zukanovich Funchal, (2018), 1807.09877