Neutrino Oscillations and the Neutrino Mass Hierarchy



Tyce DeYoung Department of Physics Pennsylvania State University

Neutrinos Beyond IceCube Arlington, Virginia April 24, 2014

The IceCube Neutrino Observatory

Cross-section

- Original IceCube design focused on neutrinos with energies above a few hundred GeV
- IceCube Lab DeepCore provides IceTop 81 Stations, each with 2 IceTop Cherenkov detector tanks 50 m increased effective 2 optical sensors per tank 324 optical sensors volume at 10-100 GeV IceCube Arrav 86 strings including 8 DeepCore strings 60 optical sensors on each string 5160 optical sensors December, 2010: Project completed, 86 strings 1450 m Amanda II Array (precurser to IceCube) DeepCore 8 strings-spacing optimized for lower energies 360 optical sensors **Eiffel Tower** 324 m 2450 m 2820 m Bedrock

The IceCube Neutrino Observatory

- Original IceCube design focused on neutrinos with energies above a few hundred GeV
- DeepCore provides increased effective volume at 10-100 GeV
 - Higher efficiency far outweighs
 reduced geometrical volume
 - Note: comparison at trigger level – analysis efficiencies not included, typically *O*(10%)
- Focus on dark matter searches, neutrino oscillation measurements



Cross-section

IceCube DeepCore

- A more densely instrumented region at the bottom center of IceCube
 - Eight special strings plus 12 nearest standard strings
 - High Q.E. PMTs
 - ~5x higher effective photocathode density
- In the clearest ice, below 2100 m
 - $\lambda_{atten} \approx 45-50$ m, very low levels of radioactive impurities
- IceCube provides an active veto against cosmic ray muon background



DeepCore Physics

Dark matter searches

- Primarily sensitive to WIMP masses above ~50 GeV/c² due to energy threshold
- Solar WIMP annihilation: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110, 131302 (2013)
- Galactic Halo: coming soon
- Direct searches for exotic particles
 - E.g. monopoles: arXiv:1402.3460, submitted to Eur. Phys. J. C
- Measurement of atmospheric electron neutrino spectrum
 - First measurement above 50 GeV: Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 151105 (2013)
- Measurement of atmospheric neutrino oscillations
 - First IceCube observation: Phys Rev. Lett. 111, 081801 (2013)
 - Improved results coming this summer new analysis with reduced energy threshold of ~10 GeV will greatly improve precision

Oscillation Physics with Atmospheric Neutrinos

- Neutrinos oscillating over one Earth diameter have a v_{μ} survival minimum at ~25 GeV
 - Hierarchy-dependent matter effects on v or \bar{v} (MSW etc.) below 10-20 GeV
- Neutrinos are available over a wide range of energies and baselines
 - Oscillations produce distinctive patterns in energy-angle space
 - Allows us to control systematics using events in "side band" regions – trade statistics for constraints on systematics



Atmospheric Oscillations – First Analysis

Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 081801 (2013)



Statistically significant angle-dependent suppression at low energy, high energy sample provides constraint on uncertainties in simultaneous fit

 Shaded bands show range of uncorrelated systematic uncertainties; hatched regions show overall normalization uncertainty

Atmospheric Oscillations – 2nd Generation

- Improved event selection – 2,500 events per year
- Significantly better reconstructions, enabling use of multiple energy bins in oscillation energy range
 - Permits tighter constraints on systematics from the data



Atmospheric Oscillations – 2nd Generation

- Project data onto reconstructed (L/E_v) for illustration
 - Actual analysis is performed in 2D
- Second muon survival maximum just below
 DeepCore's energy threshold – accessible with PINGU



Atmospheric Oscillations – 2nd Generation

- Expected contours from current analysis are becoming competitive with world's leading measurements
 - Data to be "unblinded" before Neutrino 2014
 - Here: injecting maximal mixing to illustrate sensitivity
- 3rd generation of event selections and reconstructions in the pipeline – we will soon do even better!



Neutrinos Beyond IceCube: Particle Physics

- With its DeepCore extension, IceCube is competitive in indirect dark matter searches, neutrino oscillation measurements
 - Primary limitation is energy threshold: second oscillation maximum, hierarchydependent matter effects, low-mass dark matter just out of reach
- A further augmentation of IceCube DeepCore would provide an energy threshold low enough to enable a broad range of physics, including determination of the neutrino mass hierarchy
 - Follow IceCube design closely: quick to deploy, low technical risk, relatively moderate cost
- Also provide platform for more precise understanding of the ice
 - Improved in situ calibration light sources, and emitter-detector baselines $\ll \lambda_{scatt}$
 - Would provide a benefit for both high energies and low energy physics

PRECISION ICECUBE NEXT GENERATION UPGRADE





- Baseline 40 additional strings of 60 Digital Optical Modules each, deployed inside the DeepCore volume
 - 20 m string spacing (cf. 125 m for IceCube, 72 m for DeepCore)
 - ~15x higher photocathode density
 - Precise geometry under study significantly improved performance possible with some additional instrumentation
- Use the same updated IceCube DOMs, electronics, drill as for a high-energy extension
 - Also take opportunity to install R&D prototypes for novel instrumentation



Signatures of the Neutrino Mass Hierarchy

- Matter effects alter oscillation probabilities for neutrinos or antineutrinos traversing the Earth
 - Maximum effects seen for specific energies and baselines (= zenith angles) due to the Earth's density profile
 - Neutrino oscillation probabilities affected if hierarchy is normal, antineutrinos if inverted
 - Rates of all flavors are affected
- At higher energies, v_{μ} CC events distinguishable by the presence of a muon track
 - Distinct signatures observable in both track (v_µ CC) and cascade (v_e and v_τ CC, v_x NC) channels





Muon Neutrino + Antineutrino Rates (True)

- Cannot distinguish v from v directly – rely instead on differences in fluxes, cross section (and kinematics)
- Differences clearly visible in expected atm. muon (v + v̄) rate even with 1 year's data
 - Note: detector resolutions *not* yet included



Normal Mass Hierarchy

Muon Neutrino + Antineutrino Rates (True)

- Cannot distinguish v from \bar{v} directly – rely instead on differences in fluxes, cross section (and kinematics)
- Differences clearly visible in expected atm. muon ($v + \bar{v}$) rate even with 1 year's data
 - Note: detector resolutions not yet included



Inverted Mass Hierarchy

Observed Muon Neutrino + Antineutrino Rates

- Including detector angular and energy resolutions, signature is barely distinguishable by eye with only a single year of muon neutrino data
 - Distortion of a complicated pattern
 - Detector resolution determined by full MC simulation using lceCube tools modified for low energy events



Tyce DeYoung

Observed Muon Neutrino + Antineutrino Rates

- Including detector angular and energy resolutions, signature is barely distinguishable by eye with only a single year Energy [GeV] of muon neutrino data
 - Distortion of a complicated pattern
 - Detector resolution determined by full MC simulation using IceCube tools modified for low energy events



Inverted Mass Hierarchy

Hierarchy Signature: $v_{\mu} + \overline{v}_{\mu}$ Rate Differences

- The signature of the hierarchy is more visible by looking at the pattern of expected excesses and deficits in the E vs. cos(θ) plane
 - Structure of the pattern gives some protection against systematics
 - Note: reconstructions included in these plots, but not particle ID



Experimental Signatures of the Mass Hierarchy

arXiv:1401.2046



- Distinctive (and quite different) hierarchy-dependent signatures are visible in both the track and cascade channels
 - Quantity shown is an illustration of statistical significance per bin (as per Akhmedov et al. arXiv:1205.7071)
 - Full MC for detector efficiency, reconstruction, and particle ID included

PINGU Hierarchy Sensitivity

- With baseline geometry, a determination of the mass hierarchy with 3σ significance appears possible with 3.5 years of data
 - Primary estimate uses parametric detector response model based on simulations
 - Vetted against full Monte Carlo studies with more limited statistics and range of systematics
- Optimization of detector geometry & analysis techniques and more detailed treatment of systematics underway



Other Scientific Goals of PINGU

- World-class measurements of atmospheric oscillation parameters
 - DeepCore already becoming competitive with current generation of experiments, and further improvements coming soon
 - PINGU would provide access to multiple oscillation maxima preliminary estimates of measurement precision are extremely encouraging
- High-statistics measurement of v_{τ} appearance
 - In the standard oscillation scenario, the disappearing v_{μ} are converted to v_{τ} – confirmation of tau appearance at expected rate is an interesting test of unitarity of 3x3 mixing matrix
- Search for dark matter with masses below 10 GeV
 - Indirect search for solar annihilations a uniquely background-free channel

Tau Appearance Measurement

- Higher energy range of PINGU vs. OPERA, Super-K substantially improves appearance rate
 - Reduced kinematic suppression due to tau lepton mass
- Tau appearance visible as distortion of cascade energyangle distribution
 - Preliminary studies suggest 5σ observation of v_τ possible with less than a year of PINGU data

Ahkmedov style (1 year)



PINGU in Context

- Several current or planned experiments will have sensitivity to the neutrino mass hierarchy in the next 10-15 years
 - NB: median outcomes shown large fluctuations possible



after Blennow et al., arXiv:1311.1822

PINGU in Context

- The neutrino sector is the least well understood part of the Standard Model rapid progress in measurement, potential for new physics
- PINGU has a unique place in the world-wide neutrino program
 - Measurements at higher energies/longer baselines, with high statistics
- δ_{CP} has minimal effect on our hierarchy measurement
 - Helps to resolve degeneracy of CP violation and hierarchy in long baseline experiments (e.g., T2K + NOvA)
- Opportunity to discover new physics is greatly enhanced by PINGU's statistical reach and complementarity with other experiments
 - Over-constraint of parameters in the standard oscillation paradigm is necessary for searching for new physics in the neutrino sector – multiple measurements using different techniques are essential

PINGU and Next-Generation IceCube

- PINGU would be a natural part of a Next Generation IceCube Observatory
 - Marginal cost of PINGU is relatively modest in MREFC scenario
- PINGU would use the same hardware and techniques as in-ice extensions of IceCube to high energies
 - Common design gives flexibility to optimize based on progress of the field
- PINGU is a potential leader of a very competitive community measurement. Rapid development of PINGU (as a first phase or a standalone project) would pave the way for high energy expansion of IceCube – engineering, drill equipment, etc.
 - Considerable interest in PINGU from non-US partners who were not involved in IceCube, but substantial US contribution clearly required

Final Thoughts

- The South Pole ice cap is a unique site for underground physics, as well as for neutrino astronomy
 - Excellent optical Cherenkov medium, very low levels of radioactive impurities
 - Substantial overburden, with a highly efficient active muon veto neutrino observatory facility already in place
 - Polar ice cap functions as both Cherenkov radiator and support structure: cost is driven by instrumentation, not installation – *independent of scale*
- PINGU will establish IceCube and the South Pole as a world-class facility for fundamental physics, as well as astrophysics
 - Beginning to evaluate potential capabilities to search for proton decay, observe extragalactic supernova neutrinos
 - Next Generation IceCube will provide opportunities for detector R&D with potential for breakthrough reductions in cost

The IceCube-PINGU Collaboration

Canada University of Alberta-Edmonton University of Toronto

USA

Clark Atlanta University Georgia Institute of Technology Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory **Ohio State University** Pennsylvania State University South Dakota School of Mines & Technology Southern University and A&M College **Stony Brook University** University of Alabama University of Alaska Anchorage University of California, Berkeley University of California, Irvine University of Delaware **University of Kansas** University of Maryland University of Wisconsin-Madison University of Wisconsin-River Falls **Yale University**

Japan Chiba University

Sungkyunkwan University, Korea

> University of Oxford University of Manchester

University of Tokyo

Belgium Université Libre de Bruxelles Université de Mons Universiteit Gent Vrije Universiteit Brussel

Niels Bohr Institutet, Denmark

Stockholms universitet
 Uppsala universitet

Germany

Sweden

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin Max-Planck-Institut für Physik Ruhr-Universität Bochum RWTH Aachen Technische Universität München Universität Bonn Technische Universität Dortmund Universität Mainz Universität Wuppertal

- Université de Genève, Switzerland

University of Adelaide, Australia

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

International Funding Agencies

Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique (FRS-FNRS) Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-Vlaanderen (FWO-Vlaanderen)

Federal Ministry of Education & Research (BMBF) German Research Foundation (DFG) Deutsches Elektronen–Synchrotron (DESY) Inoue Foundation for Science, Japan Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation NSF–Office of Polar Programs NSF–Physics Division

Swedish Polar Research Secretariat The Swedish Research Council (VR) University of Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) US National Science Foundation (NSF)

