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From the original charge to NuSAG:

…we ask the NuSAG to make recommendations on the specific experiments that should form part of the broad U.S. neutrino science program.

• September 1, 2005: Recommendations to the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation on a United States Program in Neutrino-less Double Beta Decay
• February 28, 2006: Recommendations to the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation on a U.S. Program of Reactor- and Accelerator-based Neutrino Oscillation Experiments
From NuSAG’s second charge letter:

“Assuming a **megawatt class proton accelerator** as a neutrino source, please answer the following questions for accelerator-detector configurations including those needed for a **multi-phase off-axis program** and a **very-long-baseline broad-band program**.”

The questions:
- Scientific potential
- Associated detector options, including rough cost
- Optimal timeline, including international context
- What other scientific inputs are needed?
- What additional physics can be addressed?
Historical context (c.2005-6) and the BNL/FNAL Study Group

• T2K and NOvA use “off-axis” neutrinos to create narrow-band beams, and both lay out potential programs including upgraded accelerator power, beams, and detectors.
• An alternate approach using a “wide-band beam” has been proposed by a Brookhaven group.

These are the approaches NuSAG is charged to evaluate.

Concurrently, BNL and FNAL convened a Study Group spanning both approaches – NuSAG’s major input.

General consensus: FNAL Main Injector would be the proton source for either approach in the U.S.
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Neutrino Oscillation Basics

The mixing matrix is:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
\nu_e \\
\nu_\mu \\
\nu_\tau
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
U_{e1} & U_{e2} & U_{e3} \\
U_{\mu1} & U_{\mu2} & U_{\mu3} \\
U_{\tau1} & U_{\tau2} & U_{\tau3}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\nu_1 \\
\nu_2 \\
\nu_3
\end{pmatrix}
$$

Where: $c_{ij} = \cos \theta_{ij}$
$s_{ij} = \sin \theta_{ij}$

Atmospheric $\nu_\mu$
Accelerator $\nu_\mu$
Solar $\nu_e$

$$
U =
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\
0 & -s_{23} & c_{23}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{i\delta} \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
-s_{13}e^{-i\delta} & 0 & c_{13}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\
-s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
e^{i\alpha_1/2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & e^{i\alpha_2/2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
$$

$\theta_{23} \approx \theta_{atm} \approx 45^\circ$; $\theta_{12} \approx \theta_{\odot} \approx 34^\circ$; $\theta_{13} \leq 12^\circ$

$\delta$ and matter effects can lead to $P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta) \neq P(\bar{\nu}_\alpha \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\beta)$

Majorana CP phases are not accessible through oscillation experiments
The possible mass hierarchies

\( \Delta m^2 \) oscillations are sensitive only to \( \Delta m^2_{\text{atm}} \), not to the scale of \( m_\nu \).

**Quasi-degenerate:** \( m_{\text{low}}^2 \gg \Delta m^2_{\text{atm}} \gg \Delta m^2_{\text{sol}} \)

\((O. \ Cremonesi - LP2005)\)

Oscillations are sensitive only to \( \Delta m^2 \), not to the scale of \( m_\nu \).
Goals of the next phases of the worldwide experimental program in neutrino oscillations beyond T2K, NO\(\nu\)A and reactors

Fill out our understanding of 3-neutrino mixing and oscillations:

• What are the mixing angles? Is \(\theta_{13}\) large enough to search for CP violation?
• What are the orderings and splittings of the neutrino mass states?
• Is there CP violation in neutrino mixing?

A world-wide effort has laid out an ambitious program that can do all of this – subject to the values of the unknown parameters, a risk inherent to this experiment-driven field.
“Phase 1”: currently approved or planned Reactor experiments
• Double Chooz: $3\sigma$ sens $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sim 0.05$ by 2012
• Daya Bay: $3\sigma$ sens $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sim 0.02$ by 2013

Accelerator experiments (with currently planned beam power)
• T2K: $3\sigma$ sens $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \sim 0.01$ by 2014 (est.)
• NOvA: $3\sigma$ sens $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \sim 0.005$ by 2016 (est.)
• NOvA+T2K: some sensitivity to mass hierarchy at the highest currently allowed $\theta_{13}$’s

“Phase 2”: NuSAG’s current charge
• Next round of accelerator experiments to extend mass-hierarchy and CP violation sensitivity to $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sim 0.01$
How large is $\theta_{13}$?

Predictions of All 63 Models

To a good approximation, the probability \( P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e) \) for the neutrino oscillation is given by:

\[
P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e) \simeq \sin^2 2\theta_{13} T_1 - \alpha \sin 2\theta_{13} T_2 + \alpha \sin 2\theta_{13} T_3 + \alpha^2 T_4
\]

Where \( \alpha \equiv \Delta m^2_{21}/\Delta m^2_{31} \) is the small (~1/35) ratio between the solar and atmospheric (Mass)\(^2\) splittings

\[
T_1 = \sin^2 \theta_{23} \frac{\sin^2 [(1 - x)\Delta]}{(1 - x)^2}
\]

\[
T_2 = \sin \delta_{CP} \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{23} \sin \Delta \frac{\sin(x\Delta) \sin [(1 - x)\Delta]}{x (1 - x)}
\]

\[
T_3 = \cos \delta_{CP} \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{23} \cos \Delta \frac{\sin(x\Delta) \sin [(1 - x)\Delta]}{x (1 - x)}
\]

\[
T_4 = \cos^2 2\theta_{23} \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \frac{\sin^2(x\Delta)}{x^2}
\]

And:

\[
\Delta = \Delta m^2_{31} L/4E_\nu
\]

\[
x = 2\sqrt{2}G_F N_e E_\nu / \Delta m^2_{31}
\]

Atmospheric Interference:

CP violating

CP conserving

Solar

Kinematical oscillation phase

Matter effects: \( G_F = \) Fermi coupling

\( N_e = \) electron density
Bi-Probability Plot

$E_\nu = 2.3$ GeV, $L = 810$ km - NO$\nu$A Parameters

CP violation – vacuum oscillations

$P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$

$P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e)$

$\cos \delta_{CP}$ term

$\sin \delta_{CP}$ term

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

$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.10$
Bi-Probability Plot

$E_{\nu}=2.3$ GeV, $L=810$ km - NOvA Parameters

CP violation – vacuum oscillations

\[ P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) \]

\[ P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \]

- $\cos \delta_{CP}$ term
- $\sin \delta_{CP}$ term
- $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ increasing
- $\delta_{CP} = 0$
- $= \frac{1}{2}\pi$
- $= \pi$
- $= \frac{3}{2}\pi$
- $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.10$
Bi-Probability Plot

$E_\nu = 2.3$ GeV, $L = 810$ km - NO$\nu$A Parameters

CP violation – vacuum oscillations

$P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e)$

$P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$

$\cos \delta_{CP}$

$\sin \delta_{CP}$

$\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ increasing from 0.01 to 0.10
Bi-Probability Plot

$E_{\nu} = 2.3 \text{ GeV}, \ L = 810 \text{ km}$ - NO$\nu$A Parameters

CP violation – matter oscillations

$\Delta m_{31}^2 < 0$

$\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ increasing from 0.01 to 0.10

$\Delta m_{31}^2 > 0$
Bi-Probability Plot

$E_\nu=2.3$ GeV, $L=810$ km - NO$\nu$A Parameters

CP violation – matter oscillations

$\Delta m^2_{31} < 0$

$\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ increasing from 0.01 to 0.10

$\Delta m^2_{31} > 0$

Get parameter degeneracies independent of measurement errors with mono-energetic beam model
Bi-Probability Plot

\[ E_\nu = 0.6 \text{ GeV}, \; L = 295 \text{ km} \]

**T2K Parameters**

\[ \Delta m_{31}^2 < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sin^2 2\theta_{13} \text{ increasing from 0.01 to 0.10} \]

\[ \Delta m_{31}^2 > 0 \]

\[ P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) \]

\[ P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \]

\[ \text{For } \Delta m_{31}^2 < 0 \text{ and } \delta_{\text{CP}} \text{ near } \pi/2 \]

\[ \text{Or } \Delta m_{31}^2 > 0 \text{ and } \delta_{\text{CP}} \text{ near } 3\pi/2 \text{ - Solution may be unique} \]

\[ E_\nu = 2.3 \text{ GeV}, \; L = 810 \text{ km} \]

**NOvA Parameters**

\[ \sin^2 2\theta_{13} \text{ increasing from 0.01 to 0.10} \]

\[ \Delta m_{31}^2 < 0 \]

\[ \Delta m_{31}^2 > 0 \]

\[ P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) \]

\[ P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \]
Breaking degeneracies

Reactor experiments measure the survival probability of $\bar{\nu}_e$

\[ P(\bar{\nu}_c \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_c) = 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sin^2 \Delta - \cos^4 \theta_{13} \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \sin^2 \Delta_\odot \]

- Depends only mixing parameter
- No dependence on $\delta_{CP}$ or mass hierarchy

Solar term

Note for accelerator experiments:

Matter effects increase with larger energy

\[ \sin^2 2\theta_{matter} \cong \sin^2 2\theta_{13} \left[ 1 \pm S \frac{E_\nu}{6 \text{ GeV}} \right] \]

$S = \pm 1$ for $\nu_\mu$, ($\bar{\nu}_\mu$) beam

$S = \pm 1$ for $\Delta m^2_{31} > 0$ ($\Delta m^2_{31} < 0$)

CP effects increase with smaller energy

\[ A_{CP} = \frac{P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) - P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e)}{P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) + P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e)} \cong \frac{\Delta m^2_{12} L}{4E_\nu} \cdot \frac{\sin 2\theta_{12}}{\sin \theta_{13}} \cdot \sin \delta_{CP} \]

Using information from 2nd appearance maximum can help
The signal:

\[ \pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \rightarrow \nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e \rightarrow e^+ \sim 1000 \text{ km} \]

Accelerator beam produces mostly \( \nu_\mu \) with small contamination of \( \nu_e \)

The signal is neutrino reactions producing electrons in a distant detector

There are two principal backgrounds:

1. \( \pi^0 \) interactions from neutral current interactions of \( \nu_\mu \) where the two \( \gamma \) -rays are not distinguished from a single electron.

2. Intrinsic \( \nu_e \) in the beam from the accelerator. This background is irreducible.

Backgrounds are measured in near detector to reduce systematic error.
Backgrounds

Background 1: Reject through electron detection mechanism

Water Cherenkov detectors (ala Super-Kamiokande) – select only quasi-elastic events, reconstruct neutrino energy and direction (within Fermi momentum uncertainty) from electron energy and direction.

Segmented liquid scintillator detectors (ala NOνA) – similar strategy, but scintillator permits detection of recoil nucleons and other sub-Cherenkov threshold particles. (No proponents)

Liquid argon time-projection chamber – excellent spatial resolution distinguishes $\pi^0$ from electron. Allows use of most $\nu_e$ charged current channels giving $\sim 3$ times higher detection efficiency per unit mass.

Will return to suppressing $\pi^0$ production later.
Backgrounds

Background 2: Irreducible background from beam $\nu_e$

$K$ mesons (and muons) decay to $\nu_e$ at accelerator source. This background limits $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ to $\sim 0.005$ for discovery and $\sim 0.01$ for CP and mass hierarchy study.

This background does not occur for the $\beta$–beam and neutrino factory beam technologies that are under development, especially in Europe.
Experimental Approaches

T2K and NOνA use an “off-axis” beam to obtain a narrow band of $E_\nu$

Off-Axis: Match maximum flux to appearance maximum

WBB: Cover multiple nodes – use different L/E of nodes

(B. Viren)  (G. Feldman)
Experimental Approaches

The off-axis beam approach

• Is the experimental realization of the simple model of appearance experiments shown in bi-probability plots.
• Suppresses $\pi^0$s by reducing high energy neutrino flux
• Uses upgraded NUMI beam

The wide-band beam approach

• Uses a spectrum of energies to lift degeneracies
• Maximize flux for long baselines
• Uses longer baselines to enhance the matter effect
U.S. experimental scenarios using these approaches

All start with Fermilab Main Injector
  • Max achieved beam power: 315 kW @ 120 GeV
  • Initial upgrade plan to 700 kW
  • Longer-term upgrade plan to 1.2 MW
  • Less beam power at lower energies

Off-axis
  • ~100 kt of Liquid Argon TPC – on or near surface
  • Use existing/upgraded NuMI beam
  • Deploy all at NOvA site, or split with “2\textsuperscript{nd} max”, or other

Wide-band beam, very long baseline
  • ~300-500 kt of water Cherenkov (or ~100 kt LArTPC)
  • In DUSEL
  • New neutrino beam
Examples:
With \( P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) = 0.02 \):

- \( P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) > 0.025 \) determines mass hierarchy, > 0.035 establishes CP violation

  or:

- Reactor measures \( \sin^2 2\theta_{13} > 0.05 \): mass hierarchy determined

(G.Feldman – NO\(\nu\)A)
Examples:
With $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e) = 0.02$:

- $P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e) > 0.025$ determines mass hierarchy, > 0.035 establishes CP violation

  or:

- Reactor measures $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} > 0.05$: mass hierarchy determined

But – unbroken degeneracy  
(G.Feldman – NO$\nu$A)
A harder case:
With $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) = 0.01$:

- $P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e) \sim 0.015$
leaves mass hierarchy and CP violation unknown
- Reactor unlikely to settle things in this region
More contourology – Wide-band Beam

28 GeV protons, 5 yrs $\nu$ at 1 MW, 5 yrs $\bar{\nu}$ at 2 MW, 300 kton detector

Discovery for normal mass Hierarchy
1300 km

(\text{V. Barger, et al.,} PRD 74, 073004 (2006))
In band A: max CPV/normal $\sim$ no CPV/inverted

In band B: node $\ne$ peak

Degeneracy broken
Summary for neutrino oscillation physics

**Off-axis approach:**

- Narrow band neutrino beam
- Suppression of high energy neutrinos reduces $\pi^0$ background
- Irreducible background from high energy K meson decay
- May require second off-axis detector at 2nd appearance maximum for resolution of parameter degeneracies

**Wide-band beam approach**

- The $\pi^0$ rejection looks OK at 60 GeV, waiting for 120 GeV
- Longer baseline gives larger matter effects
Other Physics

Nucleon decay

• Water Cherenkov detector 15 times Super-K fiducial volume excellent general purpose detector

• Liquid argon TPC – excellent for SUSY preferred decay $p \rightarrow K^+ \nu_\tau$ due to good tracking

• Could become high priority if Super-K sees candidates

Low energy astrophysics

• Neutrino burst from galactic supernova

• Diffuse supernova neutrino background

• Some solar neutrino physics

Other physics may increase costs (e.g. more PMT’s for Low E)
Detector technologies

Water Cherenkov
• Known, successful technology for $\nu$ osc and $p$ decay
• Large – 300 kton fiducial volume
• Must be underground to avoid cosmic rays: DUSEL
• PMT’s drive cost and construction time
• R&D for new light sensors
• More PMTs needed for proton decay,

LArTPC
• Ability to reconstruct events in detail $\rightarrow$ excellent $\pi^0$ rejection and $\sim 3 \times$ efficiency of Water-C
• Aggressive R&D needed to prove feasibility at 50-100 kt scale with drastically reduced costs
• Can it work at surface? – proof needed
• $p \rightarrow K^+\nu$, a possibly favored proton decay mode
Monolithic Water Cherenkov Detector

UNO Detector Conceptual (Baseline) Design

A Water Cherenkov Detector optimized for:
- Light attenuation length limit
- PMT pressure limit
- Cost (built-in staging)

UNO Collaboration
101 Physicists
43 Institutions
9 Countries

May 20, 2006, NuSAG

Only optical separation

60x60x60m³ x 3
Total Vol: 650 kton
Fid. Vol: 440 kton (20xSuperK)
# of 20” PMTs: 56,000
# of 8” PMTs: 14,900

(C.-K. Jung)
Modular Water Cherenkov Detector

Build ten 100 kton detector modules – each looks like a scaled up Super-Kamiokande, probably with fewer PMTs.

NuSAG presentation proposes starting with three modules.
Liquid Argon Detector

What is time scale for R&D, construction?

Modularized drift regions inside tank

6 Wire Sectors, each containing 6 Wire Planes

7 Cathode Planes

Active volume
Diameter: 40m
Height: 30m

Scalable → 15-50 kTons
4 - 6 wire planes

(B. Flemming)
Off-axis

Pro:
• Reduced $\pi^0$ background
• Known $\nu$ energy: use all CC events?
• Use existing NUMI beam
• Near detector same technology as far detector
• Allows incremental program (but steps still $$!$$)

Con:
• Must deal with ambiguities of ~single energy
• 2nd-max site has very low event rates, HE $\nu$’s from K’s
• Detector must be on surface to use NuMI beam – cannot use Water-C
• LArTPC needs intensive R&D
• Near detector sees very different beam
Wide-band beam, very long baseline

Pro:
• Full energy spectrum for resolving ambiguities
• Proven technology
• DUSEL deployment gives broader physics program
• Recent progress in Water-C $\pi^0$ rejection

Con:
• Large, ~all-at-once cost
• DUSEL timeline consistent with other constraints?
• With PMT’s the cost driver, cost sensitive to coverage needed for $\pi^0$ rejection, other physics
• Near detector can’t be Water-Cherenkov
Current status and NuSAG plans

• NuSAG is educated on the issues, including current thinking in Asia and Europe
• Findings on technical issues mostly in place, strategy recommendations need sensitivity info
• BNL/FNAL Study Group working on directly-comparable sensitivity calculations for the different scenarios
• One strategic issue seems clear: can’t start construction on Phase 2 without an observation of non-zero $\theta_{13}$
• These define detector mass needed (cost) and may rule out some scenarios
• R&D needed: LArTPC, PMT’s, large caverns, high beam power
• NuSAG report will be available before next HEPAP/NSAC meetings