

Light sterile neutrinos: the current picture from neutrino oscillations

Stefano Gariazzo

Instituto de Física Corpuscular (CSIC-Universitat de València)
Parc Científic UV, C/ Catedrático José Beltrán, 2, E-46980 Paterna (Valencia), Spain

E-mail: gariazzo@ific.uv.es

Abstract. Light sterile neutrinos with a mass around 1 eV have been studied for many years as a possible explanation of the so called short-baseline neutrino oscillation anomalies. Recently, several neutrino oscillation experiments reported preferences for non-zero values of the mixing angles and squared mass differences for active-sterile mixing, which however are not always in agreement. I will review our current knowledge on the light sterile neutrino in the 3+1 model, starting with a separate discussion on the status of the most relevant searches and then analyzing the problems that arise when combining different probes in a global fit.

Our current knowledge of the oscillation parameters in the three neutrino scheme has been improved noticeably in the last twenty years, see e.g. [1]. Yet, several anomalous experimental results remain unexplained [2]. The anomalies, discussed in the following, might have a common explanation if a new neutrino eigenstate exists. Such scenario is usually labeled “3+1” neutrino model and it proposes oscillations between the three standard and the fourth, sterile, neutrino, driven by a new squared mass difference $\Delta m_{41}^2 = m_4^2 - m_1^2 \simeq 1 \text{ eV}^2$, in order to explain the observed anomalies.

Given the above mass splitting, oscillations between active and sterile neutrinos are dominant when (see below) $\Delta m_{41}^2 L/E \simeq 1$, where L and E are the traveled distance and the neutrino energy, respectively. These parameters define what we call Short BaseLine (SBL) oscillations, which are not influenced by the three neutrino mixing parameters, since the terms corresponding to the solar and atmospheric mass splittings cannot develop at the considered L/E . At SBL, therefore, only the effect of Δm_{41}^2 must be considered and one can write the transition probability between a neutrino or antineutrino of flavor α and one of flavor β as (see e.g. [2]):

$$P_{\nu_{\alpha} \rightarrow \nu_{\beta}}^{\text{SBL}(-)(-)} \simeq \sin^2 2\vartheta_{\alpha\beta} \sin^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{41}^2 L}{4E} \right), \quad (\alpha \neq \beta) \quad (1)$$

$$P_{\nu_{\alpha} \rightarrow \nu_{\alpha}}^{\text{SBL}(-)(-)} \simeq 1 - \sin^2 2\vartheta_{\alpha\alpha} \sin^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{41}^2 L}{4E} \right), \quad (2)$$

where the effective angles $\vartheta_{\alpha\alpha}$ and $\vartheta_{\alpha\beta}$ depend on the fourth column of the mixing matrix U :

$$\sin^2 2\vartheta_{\alpha\beta} = 4 |U_{\alpha 4}|^2 |U_{\beta 4}|^2, \quad (\alpha \neq \beta) \quad (3)$$

$$\sin^2 2\vartheta_{\alpha\alpha} = 4 |U_{\alpha 4}|^2 (1 - |U_{\alpha 4}|^2). \quad (4)$$

Since we generally expect the mixing matrix elements $|U_{\alpha 4}|^2$ ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) to be small, in order not to alter excessively the phenomenology of three-neutrino oscillations observed in non-SBL experiments, we expect the *appearance* effective mixing angles $\vartheta_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\alpha \neq \beta$) to be quadratically suppressed with respect to the *disappearance* ones, $\vartheta_{\alpha\alpha}$.

The first anomaly in the electron neutrino disappearance channel, with a statistical significance slightly smaller than 3σ , was reported by the GALLEX and SAGE experiments [3, 4], which observed a deficit of electron neutrinos at distances of order 1 m from the source.

In 2011, the new calculation of the electron antineutrino fluxes from nuclear reactors [5, 6] lead to the discovery of a second anomaly, coming from a smaller observed event rate in a number of existing neutrino experiments at reactors [7] with respect to the predicted one. The significance is again $\sim 3\sigma$.

A possible explanation for both anomalies is that there may be errors in the calculation of the unoscillated fluxes. If the theoretical estimates of the reactor antineutrino flux were wrong, for instance, the reactor anomaly would also be wrong, and the same applies to the Gallium case. Another possibility is that the two anomalies come from a suppression of the measured flux due to a disappearance generate by a non-zero effective angle ϑ_{ee} .

In order to better investigate a possible neutrino oscillations explanation of these anomalies, in the recent years several experiments at SBL started to measure the antineutrino flux at different distances from nuclear reactors. Such observations can be used to compute flux ratios, that depend only on neutrino oscillation effects and not on other systematics that are usually independent of distance, for example the normalization of the unoscillated flux. Experiments of this class provide *model-independent* results because the theoretical model for the unoscillated flux is nearly irrelevant when computing the fit.

The first experiment to provide results obtained with a ratio method was NEOS [8], in South Korea. A second experiment of this kind is DANSS [9], in Russia, which has a movable detector that can be placed at three different distances between ~ 10.5 and 12.5 m from the reactor core. The combined results of NEOS and DANSS, in 2018, indicated a preference in favor of $\Delta m_{41}^2 \simeq 1.3 \text{ eV}^2$ and $|U_{e4}|^2 \simeq 0.01$ over the standard three neutrinos case, with a significance of $\sim 3.5\sigma$ [10, 11]. Considering the new full dataset by DANSS, presented for the first time in the EPS-HEP conference in July 2019 [12], together with NEOS [8] and PROSPECT [13] observations, we obtain a new best-fit point at $\Delta m_{41}^2 \simeq 0.4 \text{ eV}^2$ and $|U_{e4}|^2 \simeq 0.01$, nearly degenerate with the previous one, and a reduced model-independent preference in favor of the light sterile neutrino of $\sim 2.5\sigma$ [14].

In the muon (anti)neutrino disappearance channel, current experiments only provide strong upper bounds on the matrix element $|U_{\mu 4}|^2$, since no anomaly was ever observed.

Two classes of experiments fall in this category: atmospheric neutrino oscillation probes, mainly driven by the IceCube [15, 16] observations, and measurements using accelerator (anti)neutrinos, dominated by the MINOS+ experiment [17].

MINOS+ [17], with its near (~ 500 m from the source) and far (~ 800 km) detectors, currently provide the strongest bounds on $|U_{\mu 4}|^2$ over a broad range of Δm_{41}^2 values. We have verified that the bounds on $|U_{\mu 4}|^2$ do not change significantly when the three-neutrino mixing parameters or the other active-sterile mixing angles are varied in the analysis [14]. Given the position of the near detector, at which for mass splittings $\Delta m_{41}^2 \gtrsim 1 \text{ eV}^2$ active-sterile oscillations can develop, MINOS+ can use a far-to-near flux ratio to constrain the neutrino mixing in a model-independent way only for $\Delta m_{41}^2 \lesssim 1 \text{ eV}^2$. For this reason, in the latest analyses the MINOS+ collaboration decided to use a full two-detectors fit instead of a ratio fit, although in the high Δm_{41}^2 range the bounds have a significant dependence on cross-section systematics. We have checked that, in the most interesting region below $\Delta m_{41}^2 \lesssim 10 \text{ eV}^2$, a far-to-near ratio analysis gives results very similar to those obtained with the full two-detectors fit [14].

The LSND [18] and MiniBooNE [19] (anti)neutrino appearance experiments are responsible for the most controversial anomalies in SBL oscillations until now.

The LSND experiment, considering a beam of muon antineutrinos, was the first one to report the anomalous appearance of electron antineutrinos, with a significance of $\sim 3.8\sigma$. The KARMEN experiment, working at slightly smaller distances, never confirmed the anomaly [20].

The MiniBooNE experiment, built to test the LSND anomaly, uses neutrinos at higher energies, preserving approximately the same L/E . The most recent MiniBooNE results [19] are in partial agreement with the LSND ones. The preferred best-fit by MiniBooNE, corresponding to maximal mixing between active and sterile states, is however in tension with the ICARUS [21] and OPERA [22] results, and moreover it is not really sufficient to fully explain the excess in the two bins at the lowest studied energies. For these reasons, a new experiment, MicroBooNE [23], was proposed to check the LSND and MiniBooNE excess. MicroBooNE uses liquid Argon time projection chamber (LArTPC) technology with the aim of being able to achieve a better level of signal/background separation. This should allow us to determine if the anomalous events are really due to neutrino oscillations or to some other kind of new physics.

The effective angles entering electron (anti)neutrino disappearance (ϑ_{ee}), muon (anti)neutrino disappearance ($\vartheta_{\mu\mu}$) and electron (anti)neutrino appearance ($\vartheta_{e\mu}$) oscillation formulas can be written in terms of two elements of the fourth column of the neutrino mixing matrix: $|U_{e4}|^2$ and $|U_{\mu4}|^2$. When combining appearance and disappearance data in a global fit, we constrain such matrix elements. From the model-independent fit of NEOS and DANSS data we obtain a 3σ upper limit $|U_{e4}|^2 \lesssim 3 \times 10^{-2}$. From the muon disappearance channel, mainly driven by MINOS+ and IceCube, we have a 3σ upper bound $|U_{\mu4}|^2 \lesssim 10^{-2}$. The combined bound from disappearance probes is therefore $\sin^2 2\vartheta_{e\mu} = 4|U_{e4}|^2|U_{\mu4}|^2 \lesssim 10^{-3}$ at 3σ , but the LSND and MiniBooNE anomalies require a mixing angle $\sin^2 2\vartheta_{e\mu} \gtrsim 10^{-3}$, again at 3σ . We do not need further details to see that there is a tension between appearance and disappearance observations.

For quantifying the tension between the two sets of constraints, adopting a parameter goodness of fit (PG) test on the best-fit point is the easiest way. The p -value of the PG for the full combination of appearance and disappearance data, including the most recent results, is around 10^{-9} [14], certainly too small to be due to random realizations of the same underlying model. This indicates that there is no common sterile neutrino solution for the SBL anomalies. In order to reconcile appearance and disappearance probes some additional explanation is required.

Using the PG, one can test which experiment is mostly responsible for the tension [14, 24]. Assuming that the model-independent observations of NEOS and DANSS are not influenced by unaccounted systematics or new physics, and since the muon disappearance experiments observe no anomaly, we are left with questioning the effects of LSND, MiniBooNE or both. When we perform the global fit excluding MiniBooNE, which alone has a 4.8σ preference in favor of a sterile neutrino, the p -value becomes close to 10^{-6} : significantly larger, but not enough to solve the tension. On the other hand, if we remove LSND, with its 3.8σ preference in favor of the 3+1 neutrinos case, we obtain a p -value of approximately 10^{-5} : an order of magnitude larger than in the case without MiniBooNE. From these numbers we learn that each experiment alone can quote a preference for the 3+1 model which does not reflect its role in the global fit. LSND has a bigger effect on the global analysis because its best-fit is not as much in tension with other experiments as the MiniBooNE one. Only if all the other data are ignored, therefore, one can claim that MiniBooNE currently gives the strongest preference in favor of the 3+1 scenario.

If we finally remove both LSND and MiniBooNE from the global analysis, we are left with no anomalous signal in the appearance channel. The tension vanishes and the remaining experiments give a consistent fit where $|U_{\mu4}|^2$ is compatible with zero and $|U_{e4}|^2$ is given by reactor experiments. Such analysis makes sense if there is new physics beyond the light sterile neutrino: if additional new physics is responsible for the LSND and MiniBooNE anomalies, it is incorrect to include their data in a global fit of the 3+1 mixing parameters.

In the incoming months, many experiments will publish more results. Among the ones that are expected to have a significant impact, we have STEREO [25, 26] and PROSPECT [13], whose current limits are not competitive enough to confirm or reject the best-fit by DANSS and NEOS, but they will reach soon the required sensitivity. Within the next few years, with more data, we will either have a strong preference in favor of a common preferred point or a final rejection of the light sterile neutrino explanation of the anomalies. In the former case, with many experiments independently observing oscillations that involve a new neutrino state and the same mixing parameters, we will have the cleanest signal ever observed in favor of new physics beyond the standard model. In any case, the already mentioned MicroBooNE [23] experiment, apart for giving a final confirmation or disproof of the sterile neutrino interpretation of the LSND and MiniBooNE results, is also expected to indicate us if the anomalies can be due to some other kind of new physics, whatever it is.

All together, these new experiments will drive us towards a deeper understanding of the SBL anomalies and of the new physics that potentially produces them. If a consistent explanation in terms of a light sterile neutrino is viable, moreover, we will finally know which are the mixing parameters associated to it.

Acknowledgements

The author receives support from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie individual grant agreement No. 796941.

References

- [1] de Salas P, Forero D, Ternes C, Tórtola M and Valle J 2018 *Phys.Lett.* **B782** 633–640 (*Preprint* 1708.01186)
URL <https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.physletb.2018.06.019>
- [2] Gariazzo S, Giunti C, Laveder M, Li Y F and Zavanin E M 2016 *J.Phys.G* **43** 033001 (*Preprint* 1507.08204)
- [3] Giunti C and Laveder M 2011 *Phys.Rev.C* **83** 065504 (*Preprint* 1006.3244)
- [4] Kostensalo J, Suhonen J, Giunti C and Srivastava P C 2019 *Phys.Lett.B* **795** 542–547 (*Preprint* 1906.10980)
- [5] Mueller T A *et al.* 2011 *Phys.Rev.C* **83** 054615 (*Preprint* 1101.2663)
- [6] Huber P 2011 *Phys.Rev.C* **84** 024617 [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.C*85,029901(2012)] (*Preprint* 1106.0687)
- [7] Mention G, Fechner M, Lasserre T, Mueller T A, Lhuillier D, Cribier M and Letourneau A 2011 *Phys.Rev.D* **83** 073006 (*Preprint* 1101.2755)
- [8] Ko Y J *et al.* 2017 *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **118** 121802 (*Preprint* 1610.05134)
- [9] Alekseev I *et al.* (DANSS) 2018 *Phys.Lett.* **B787** 56–63 (*Preprint* 1804.04046)
- [10] Gariazzo S, Giunti C, Laveder M and Li Y F 2018 *Phys.Lett.* **B782** 13–21 (*Preprint* 1801.06467)
- [11] Dentler M, Hernández-Cabezudo A, Kopp J, Maltoni M and Schwetz T 2017 *JHEP* **1711** 099 (*Preprint* 1709.04294)
- [12] Danilov M New results from the DANSS experiment Talk at *EPS-HEP 2019*, 10–17 July 2019, Ghent, Belgium
- [13] Ashenfelter J *et al.* (PROSPECT) 2018 *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **121** 251802 (*Preprint* 1806.02784)
- [14] Gariazzo S, Giunti C and Ternes C in preparation
- [15] Aartsen M G *et al.* (IceCube) 2017 *Phys.Rev.D* **95** 112002 (*Preprint* 1702.05160)
- [16] Aartsen M G *et al.* (IceCube) 2016 *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **117** 071801 (*Preprint* 1605.01990)
- [17] Adamson P *et al.* (MINOS) 2019 *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **122** 091803 (*Preprint* 1710.06488)
- [18] Aguilar-Arevalo A *et al.* (LSND) 2001 *Phys.Rev.D* **64** 112007 (*Preprint* hep-ex/0104049)
- [19] Aguilar-Arevalo A *et al.* (MiniBooNE) 2018 *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **121** 221801 (*Preprint* 1805.12028)
- [20] Armbruster B *et al.* (KARMEN) 2002 *Phys.Rev.* **D65** 112001 (*Preprint* hep-ex/0203021)
- [21] Antonello M *et al.* (ICARUS) 2013 *Eur.Phys.J.C* **73** 2599 (*Preprint* 1307.4699)
- [22] Agafonova N *et al.* (OPERA) 2013 *JHEP* **07** 004 [Addendum: *JHEP*07,085(2013)] (*Preprint* 1303.3953)
- [23] Chen H *et al.* (MicroBooNE) 2007
- [24] Dentler M *et al.* 2018 *JHEP* **08** 010 (*Preprint* 1803.10661)
- [25] Almazán H *et al.* (STEREO) 2018 *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **121** 161801 (*Preprint* 1806.02096)
- [26] Bernard L (STEREO) 2019 Results from the STEREO Experiment with 119 days of Reactor-on Data (*Preprint* 1905.11896)