

# Configuring the Long-Baseline Neutrino Experiment

Vernon Barger,<sup>1</sup> Atri Bhattacharya,<sup>2</sup> Animesh Chatterjee,<sup>2</sup> Raj Gandhi,<sup>2</sup> Danny Marfatia,<sup>3,4,5</sup> and Mehedi Masud<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhansi, Allahabad 211 019, India*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045, USA*

<sup>5</sup>*Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA*

We study the neutrino oscillation physics performance of the Long-Baseline Neutrino Experiment (LBNE) in various configurations. In particular, we compare the case of a surface detector at the far site augmented by a near detector, to that with the far site detector placed deep underground but no near detector. In the latter case, information from atmospheric neutrino events is also utilized. For values of  $\theta_{13}$  favored by reactor experiments and a 100 kt-yr exposure, we find roughly equivalent sensitivities to the neutrino mass hierarchy, the octant of  $\theta_{23}$ , and to CP violation. We also find that as the exposure is increased, the near detector helps increase the sensitivity to CP violation substantially more than atmospheric neutrinos.

Neutrino oscillations in the standard three flavor framework are governed by a) two mass-squared differences  $\Delta m_{j1}^2 = m_j^2 - m_1^2$ ,  $j = 2, 3$ , b) three mixing angles  $\theta_{12}$ ,  $\theta_{23}$  and  $\theta_{13}$  and c) one Dirac CP phase  $\delta_{CP}$ . The mass-squared differences and the angles  $\theta_{12}$  and  $\theta_{23}$  are precisely known, and we now have incontestable evidence that  $\theta_{13} \neq 0$  [1]. Answers to outstanding questions, such as the nature of the *mass hierarchy* (i.e., whether the hierarchy is *normal* with  $m_3 > m_1$  or *inverted* with  $m_3 < m_1$ ), the *octant of  $\theta_{23}$*  (i.e., whether  $\theta_{23}$  lies in the lower octant with  $\theta_{23} < \pi/4$  or in the higher octant with  $\theta_{23} > \pi/4$ ), and whether CP is violated in the leptonic sector, are now within reach, and will be addressed, for instance, by the Long-Baseline Neutrino Experiment (LBNE) [2].

LBNE is a proposed neutrino detector that will be housed at the Homestake mine. In its first stage, it is envisioned as a 10 kt Liquid Argon (LAr) Time Projection Chamber that will detect neutrinos from a beam produced at Fermilab at a 1300 km baseline. A small near detector (ND) at Fermilab is a possibility that would assist the LBNE program. Detector configurations for LBNE are the subject of much recent discussion [3]. It must be emphasized that both an underground far detector (FD) and the ND have utilities beyond that for oscillation physics. Having the FD underground, apart from being sensitive to atmospheric neutrinos, also allows studies of proton decay and the detection and measurement of neutrino fluxes from a core collapse supernova. A fine-grained tracker as an ND would enable precise measurements of such Standard Model parameters as the weak-mixing angle  $\theta_W$ , and also enable precision measurements of the neutrino nucleon cross sections and searches for new physics. In what follows, we only compare the various detector configurations from the point of view of sensitivities to neutrino oscillation physics.

Placing the FD underground has the advantage that it is sensitive to both beam and atmospheric neutrinos, allowing the datasets from the two sources to be combined. Since detector magnetization significantly impacts the analysis of atmospheric neutrinos, where appropriate, we consider both a magnetized and an unmagnetized de-

tector. On the other hand, having an ND is expected to significantly reduce background systematics. We evaluate whether it is better to have an underground FD but no ND, or to have a surface FD and an ND. We also provide results for a more ambitious program with an underground FD and an ND. Specifically, we present results for the following experiments:

1. A beam experiment without an ND with the FD on the surface,
2. A beam experiment with an ND to help reduce systematics at the surface FD,
3. An experiment without an ND that combines beam and atmospheric neutrino data collected at the underground FD, and
4. An experiment with an ND that combines beam and atmospheric neutrino data collected at the underground FD (both magnetized and unmagnetized).

Our focus is on a 100 kt-yr exposure that would result from taking data in a 700 kW beam over a 10 year period with 5 years in neutrino mode and 5 years in antineutrino mode. However, we point out and present the effects of a 350 kt-yr exposure in the case of CP violation where the larger exposure makes a qualitative difference.

LAr detectors are sensitive to  $\nu_e$  and  $\nu_\mu$  over the entire energy range of interest, i.e., 1 – 10 GeV, for beam and atmospheric neutrinos. We simulate atmospheric neutrino events and both  $\nu_e$  appearance and  $\nu_\mu$  disappearance channel events from the beam in the neutrino and antineutrino modes with an event reconstruction efficiency of 85%. For the beam experiment without an ND, we adopt a 5% systematic uncertainty for the signal (both for  $\nu_e$  and  $\nu_\mu$ ) at the far detector, and 10% and 45% systematics for the background to the  $\nu_e$  and  $\nu_\mu$  signals, respectively. We suppose that the ND reduces systematics at the far detector to 1% for the  $\nu_e$  and  $\nu_\mu$  signals and 5% and 1% for the backgrounds, respectively. We employ the signal and background efficiencies, and resolution functions from [2] and utilize the GLOBES software [4].




FIG. 1: Sensitivity to the mass hierarchy for a true normal hierarchy (NH) and a true inverted hierarchy (IH) with a 100 kt-yr exposure at the magnetized (mag) far detector configured with and without a near detector (ND), and also with an unmagnetized (unmag) FD and an ND. A run-time of 5 years each with a  $\nu$  and  $\bar{\nu}$  beam is assumed.

For our simulation of atmospheric neutrino data, the energy and angular resolutions of the detector are as described in Ref. [5]. We take the atmospheric fluxes from Ref. [6], the earth matter density profile from Ref. [7], and the flux and systematic uncertainties from Ref. [5]. The atmospheric neutrino events are divided in energy bins of width 1 GeV from 1–10 GeV. Events in each energy bin are further subdivided into 18 zenith angle bins in the interval  $\cos \theta \in [-1.0, -0.1]$ .

The atmospheric neutrino data analysis depends on whether the FD is magnetized or not. For the former case,  $\chi_{\text{mag}}^2 = \chi_{\mu^-}^2 + \chi_{\mu^+}^2 + \chi_{e^-}^2 + \chi_{e^+}^2$ . If the FD is unmagnetized, and charge identification of the produced lepton is not possible, then,  $\chi_{\text{unmag}}^2 = \chi_{\mu^- + \mu^+}^2 + \chi_{e^- + e^+}^2$ , where  $\chi_{\mu^- + \mu^+}^2$  ( $\chi_{e^- + e^+}^2$ ) is the  $\chi^2$  after summing the  $\mu^-$  ( $e^-$ ) and  $\mu^+$  ( $e^+$ ) events.

Throughout, we assume that placing the detector underground does not result in a significant change of the signal and background analysis, apart from making the detector also sensitive to the atmospheric neutrino events, and thus allowing a combined analysis of the beam and atmospheric data simultaneously over the entire duration of the experiment.

To investigate the sensitivity, for instance, to the mass hierarchy using only atmospheric neutrinos, we take the hierarchy to be the normal and evaluate the ability to exclude the inverted hierarchy, and vice versa. We use these events to calculate  $\chi^2$  for a fixed set of parameters, assuming the widely used standard Gaussian approximation, including systematic and statistical uncertainties. We note that the Gaussian approximation has been shown [8] to provide an accurate measure of the sensitivity for LBNE and recourse to the method of Ref. [9] is not necessary. We then marginalize over the following

parameter ranges:  $\theta_{23} \in [0.628, 0.942]$  (i.e.,  $[36^\circ, 54^\circ]$ ),  $|\Delta m_{31}^2| \in [2.19, 2.62] \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ ,  $\theta_{13} \in [0.052, 0.192]$  (i.e.,  $[3^\circ, 11^\circ]$ ), and  $\delta_{\text{CP}} \in [-\pi, \pi]$ .

For the combined analysis of atmospheric and beam events, we sum the  $\chi^2$  obtained from the separate fixed parameter analyses and marginalize over the parameter set, to determine the minimum  $\chi^2$ .

The sensitivities to the mass hierarchy, octant and CP violation are shown in Figs. 1, 2 and 3. From these figures, it is clear that, as expected, the best sensitivities are obtained from a combination of beam and atmospheric neutrino data collected by an FD in conjunction with an ND (solid green lines in Figs. 1–3). However, this optimal configuration is not expected for the first phase of LBNE.

As is evident from Fig. 1, for a range of  $\delta_{\text{CP}}$  values, the determination of the mass hierarchy benefits more from having an underground FD than from having an ND with an FD on the surface (compare the dashed green lines with the solid magenta lines). Specifically, the underground detector provides significantly better results for the mass hierarchy resolution where the sensitivity to  $\delta_{\text{CP}}$  is generally poor ( $\delta_{\text{CP}} \in [0.25\pi, 0.75\pi]$  for the normal hierarchy and  $\delta_{\text{CP}} \in [-0.75\pi, -0.25\pi]$  for the inverted hierarchy).

However, given the recent evidence from reactor experiments that  $\theta_{13}$  is quite large [1], neither having an ND nor taking the FD underground is important to the mass hierarchy determination. Even for the most pessimistic values of  $\delta_{\text{CP}}$ , the mass hierarchy is expected to be resolved at more than the  $3\sigma$  confidence level with a 100 kt-yr exposure of a surface FD alone. Identical conclusions vis-a-vis going underground or having an ND can be drawn for a 35 kt FD with 10 years of data; in this case the mass hierarchy is resolved well beyond  $5\sigma$






FIG. 3: Sensitivity to CP violation for 100 kt-yr and 350 kt-yr exposures (with magnetization) assuming  $\sigma(\sin^2(2\theta_{13})) = 0.05 \times \sin^2(2\theta_{13})$ . Atmospheric neutrino data have very little CP sensitivity. The blue dotted curve shows the combined sensitivity of NO $\nu$ A (15 kt T ASD, 3 years  $\nu$  + 3 years  $\bar{\nu}$ ), T2K (22.5 kt water cherenkov, 5 years  $\nu$ ) and LBNE (100 kt-yr LAr FD) beam data.

possible to exclude a large fraction of  $\delta_{CP}$  values at high significance.

*Acknowledgments:* AB, AC, RG and MM thank Sanjib Mishra and Pomita Ghoshal for very helpful discussions. This work was supported by US DOE grants DE-FG02-95ER40896, DE-FG02-13ER42024 and DE-FG02-04ER41308, and US NSF grant PHY11-25915. RG acknowledges the support of the XI Plan Neutrino Project

under DAE and is grateful to the Phenomenology group at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the LBNE collaboration at Fermilab for its hospitality while this work was in progress. DM thanks the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics for its hospitality during the completion of this work.

- 
- [1] See *e.g.*, F. P. An *et al.* [Daya-Bay Collaboration], Chin. Phys. C **37**, 011001 (2013).
  - [2] T. Akiri *et al.* [LBNE Collaboration], arXiv:1110.6249 [hep-ex].
  - [3] Physics Working Group Report to the LBNE Reconfiguration Steering Committee, [http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/lbne\\_reconfiguration/files/LBNE-Reconfiguration-PhysicsWG-Report-August2012.pdf](http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/lbne_reconfiguration/files/LBNE-Reconfiguration-PhysicsWG-Report-August2012.pdf)
  - [4] P. Huber, J. Kopp, M. Lindner, M. Rolinec and W. Winter, Comput. Phys. Commun. **177**, 432 (2007).
  - [5] V. Barger, R. Gandhi, P. Ghoshal, S. Goswami, D. Marfatia, S. Prakash, S. K. Raut and S. U. Sankar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 091801 (2012).
  - [6] M. Honda, T. Kajita, K. Kasahara and S. Midorikawa, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 043008.
  - [7] A. M. Dziewonski and D. L. Anderson, Phys. Earth Planet. Interiors **25** (1981) 297.
  - [8] M. Blennow, P. Coloma, P. Huber and T. Schwetz, arXiv:1311.1822 [hep-ph].
  - [9] X. Qian, A. Tan, W. Wang, J. J. Ling, R. D. McKeown and C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 113011 (2012) [arXiv:1210.3651 [hep-ph]].
  - [10] R. Gandhi, P. Ghoshal, S. Goswami, P. Mehta, S. U. Sankar and S. Shalgar, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 073012 (2007) [arXiv:0707.1723 [hep-ph]]; M. Ghosh, P. Ghoshal, S. Goswami and S. K. Raut, arXiv:1306.2500 [hep-ph].
  - [11] NO $\nu$ A Collaboration, arXiv:hep-ex/0503053.
  - [12] T2K Collaboration, arXiv:hep-ex/0106019.