Updates to the Low Energy Excess in MiniBooNE

Chris Polly, Indiana University*
*now at Urbana-Champaign









The MiniBooNE Collaboration

A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo[e], C. E. Anderson[p], L. M. Bartoszek[g], A. O. Bazarko[m], S. J. Brice[g], B. C. Brown[g], L. Bugel[e], J. Cao[ℓ], L. Coney[e], J. M. Conrad[e], D. C. Cox[i], A. Curioni[p], Z. Djurcic[e], D. A. Finley[g], B. T. Fleming[p], R. Ford[g], F. G. Garcia[g], G. T. Garvey[j], C. Green[j,g], J. A. Green[i,j], T. L. Hart[d], E. Hawker[j,c], R. Imlay[k], R. A. Johnson[c], G. Karagiorgi[e], P. Kasper[g], T. Katori[i], T. Kobilarcik[g], I. Kourbanis[g], S. Koutsoliotas[b], E. M. Laird[m], S. K. Linden[p], J. M. Link[o], Y. Liu[ℓ], Y. Liu[a], W. C. Louis[j], K. B. M. Mahn[e], W. Marsh[g], P. S. Martin[g], G. McGregor[j], W. Metcalf[k], H.-O. Meyer[i], P. D. Meyers[m], F. Mills[g], G. B. Mills[j], J. Monroe[e], C. D. Moore[g], R. H. Nelson[d], V. T. Nguyen[e], P. Nienaber[n], J. A. Nowak[k], S. Ouedraogo[k], R. B. Patterson[m], D. Perevalov[a], C. C. Polly[i], E. Prebys[g], J. L. Raaf[c], H. Ray[j,h], B. P. Roe[ℓ], A. D. Russell[g], V. Sandberg[j], W. Sands[m], R. Schirato[j], G. Schofield[k], D. Schmitz[e], M. H. Shaevitz[e], F. C. Shoemaker[m], D. Smith[f], M. Soderberg[p], M. Sorel[e 1], P. Spentzouris[g], I. Stancu[a], R. J. Stefanski[g], M. Sung[k], H. A. Tanaka[m], R. Tayloe[i], M. Tzanov[d], R. Van de Water[j], M. O. Wascko[k 2], D. H. White[j], M. J. Wilking[d], H. J. Yang[ℓ], G. P. Zeller[e,j], E. D. Zimmerman[d]

~80 physicists from ~18 institutions

OUTLINE

- Recap of last year's neutrino oscillation result
- Analysis updates, emphasis on ν_e-like excess at low energy
- Status of antineutrino running

MiniBooNE's Motivation: The LSND signal



- LSND found an excess of $\overline{\nu}_e$ in $\overline{\nu}_\mu$ beam
- Excess: 87.9 ± 22.4 ± 6.0 (3.8σ)
- Under a 2ν mixing hypothesis:

$$P(\overline{\nu}_\mu \to \overline{\nu}_e) = \sin^2(2\theta)\sin^2\left(\frac{1.27\ L\,\Delta m^2}{E}\right)$$
$$= 0.245 \pm 0.067 \pm 0.045\ \%$$

MiniBooNE's Motivation: The LSND signal



- LSND found an excess of $\bar{\nu}_e$ in $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ beam
- Excess: 87.9 ± 22.4 ± 6.0 (3.8σ)
- Under a 2ν mixing hypothesis:

$$P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e) = \sin^2(2\theta)\sin^2\left(\frac{1.27\ L\,\Delta m^2}{E}\right)$$
$$= 0.245 \pm 0.067 \pm 0.045\ \%$$



- $\Delta m^2 \sim 1$ eV^2 impossible with only 3ν
- Requires extraordinary physics!
  - Sterile neutrinos *hep-ph/0305255*
  - Neutrino decay *hep-ph/0602083*
  - Lorentz/CPT viol. *PRD(2006)105009* (T. Katori, A. Kostelecky, R. Tayloe)
  - Extra dimensions h*ep-ph/0504096*
- Unlike atmos and solar...LSND unconfirmed

The MiniBooNE design strategy...must make ν_μ



- Start with 8 GeV proton beam from FNAL Booster
- Add a 174 kA pulsed horn to gain a needed x 6
- Requires running ν (not anti-ν) to get flux
- Pions decay to ν with E_ν in the 0.8 GeV range
- Place detector to preserve LSND L/E:

  MiniBooNE: (0.5 km) / (0.8 GeV)
  LSND: (0.03 km) / (0.05 GeV)
- Detect ν interactions in 800T pure mineral oil detector
  - 1280 8" PMTs provide 10% coverage of fiducial volume
  - 240 8" PMTs provide active veto in outer radial shell



Key points about the signal

- LSND oscillation probability is < 0.3%
- After cuts, MiniBooNE has to be able to find ~300 ν_e CCQE interactions in a sea of ~150,000 ν_μ CCQE
- Intrinsic ν_e background
  - Actual ν_e produced in the beamline from muons and kaons
  - Irreducible at the event level
  - E spectrum differs from signal
- Mis-identified events
  - ν_μ CCQE easy to identify, i.e. 2 "subevents" instead of 1. However, lots of them.
  - Neutral-current (NC) π^0 and radiative Δ are more rare, but harder to separate
  - Can be reduced with better PID
- Effectively, MiniBooNE is a ratio meas. with the ν_μ constraining flux X cross-section













Analysis Chain: Flux Prediction



Meson production at the target

Pions:



HARP collaboration, hep-ex/0702024

- MiniBooNE members joined the HARP collaboration
  - 8 GeV proton beam
  - 5% λ Beryllium target
- Data were fit to Sanford-Wang parameterization

Kaons:



- Kaon data taken on multiple targets in 10-24 GeV range
- Fit to world data using Feynman scaling
- 30% overall uncertainty assessed

Meson production at the target

Pions:



HARP collaboration, hep-ex/0702024

- MiniBooNE members joined the HARP collaboration
  - 8 GeV proton beam
  - 5% λ Beryllium target
- Data were fit to Sanford-Wang parameterization

Aside on relevance to Project X:

- MiniBooNE flux carefully tuned and verified with ν beam ⇒ most robust MC available for predicting π and K fluxes at Booster energies.
- Muon g-2 example: MB provided flux prediction for very forward (θ<45mrad) 3 GeV pions.
- Very forward HARP data not yet published ⇒ reliance on SW fit creates some extrap. error.
- Also used E910 production data.



Final neutrino flux estimation



- Flux intersecting MB detector (not cross-section weighted)
- Intrinsic contamination ν_e/ν_μ = 0.5%
  - $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \bar{\nu}_\mu \nu_e$ (52%)
  - $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu_e$ (29%)
  - $K^0 \rightarrow \pi e \nu_e$ (14%)
  - Other (5%)
- Wrong-sign $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ content: 6%

Analysis Chain: X-Section Mode



Nuance Monte Carlo

D. Casper, NPS, 112 (2002) 161

- Comprehensive generator, covers entire E_ν range
- Predicts rates and kinematics of specific ν interactions from input flux
- Expected interaction rates in MiniBooNE (before cuts) shown below
- Based on world data, ν_μ CC shown below right













Nuance Monte Carlo

D. Casper, NPS, 112 (2002) 161

- Comprehensive generator, covers entire E_ν range
- Predicts relative rate and kinematics of specific ν interactions from input flux
- Expected interaction rates in MiniBooNE (before cuts) shown below
- Based on world data, ν_μ CC shown below right
- Also tuned on internal data













Tuning Nuance on internal ν_μ CCQE data



Before correction



After correction



- Poor agreement in Q^2
- From Q^2 fits to MB ν_μ CCQE data extract:
  - M_A^{eff} -- effective axial mass
  - κ -- Pauli Blocking parameter
- Beautiful agreement after Q^2 fit, even in 2D
- Ability to make these 2D plots is unique due to MiniBooNE's high statistics

Tuning Nuance on internal NC π^0 data

- NC π^0 important background
- 97% pure π^0 sample (mainly $\Delta \rightarrow N\pi^0$)
- Measure rate as function of momentum
- Default MC underpredicts rate at low momentum
- $\Delta \rightarrow N\gamma$ also constrained

Invariant mass distributions in momentum bins





Analysis Chain: Track-Based Likelihood Reconstruction and Particle ID



TBL Analysis: Separating e from μ

- Analysis pre-cuts
  - Only 1 subevent
  - Veto hits < 6
  - Tank hits > 200
  - Radius < 500 cm

ν_μ CCQE events (2 subevent)







- Event is a collection of PMT-level info (q,t,x)
- Form sophisticated Q and T pdfs, and fit for 7 track parameters under 2 hypotheses
  - The track is due to an electron
  - The track is coming from a muon





Separating e from π^0

- Extend fit to include two e-like tracks
- Very tenacious fit...8 minutes per event
- Nearly 500k CPU hours used (thanks OSG!)









TBL Analysis: Expected event totals



475 MeV – 1250 MeV

ν_e^K	94
ν_e^μ	132
π^0	62
dirt	17
$\Delta \rightarrow N\gamma$	20
other	33
total	358

LSND best-fit $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ 126





Data/fit result after blind analysis complete...



- TBL shows no sign of an excess in the analysis region (where the LSND signal is expected for the 2ν mixing hypothesis)
- Visible excess at low E



- What does it all mean? There are a few possibilities...
  - Some problem with LSND, e.g. mis-estimated background?
  - Difference between neutrinos and antineutrinos?
  - The physics causing the excess in LSND doesn't scale with L/E?
    - Low E excess in MB related?

Exploring the Low E Excess

The low E excess has fueled much speculation...

Commonplace

- Muon bremsstrahlung
  (Bodek, 0709.4004)



- Easy to study in MB with much larger stats from events with a Michel tag
- Proved negligible with MB data in 0710.3897

SM, but odd

- Anomaly-mediated γ
  (Harvey, Hill, Hill, 0708.1281)



- Still under study, nuc. effects neglected, δg_ω
- Has to contribute...how much?

Beyond the SM

- New gauge boson
  (Nelson, Walsh,0711.1363)



- Can accommodate LSND and MiniBooNE
- Firm prediction for anti-neutrinos

Extending the analysis to lower energies



- Original excess quoted in initial oscillation PRL 98, 231801 (2007)
  - 475–1250 MeV, 22 ± 40, 0.6σ
  - 300–475 MeV, 96 ± 26, 3.7σ
- In summer 2007 extended analysis down to 200 MeV
  - 200–300 MeV, 92 ± 37, 2.5σ
- Combined significance with proper systematic correlations
  - 200–475 MeV, 188 ± 54, 3.5σ

Extending the analysis to lower energies



- Original excess quoted in initial oscillation PRL 98, 231801 (2007)
  - 475–1250 MeV, 22 ± 40, 0.6σ
  - 300–475 MeV, 96 ± 26, 3.7σ
- In summer 2007 extended analysis down to 200 MeV
  - 200–300 MeV, 92 ± 37, 2.5σ
- Combined significance with proper systematic correlations
  - 200–475 MeV, 188 ± 54, 3.5σ

- Might have seen this presented in past with some caveats...
- Work was underway for a comprehensive review bkgs/errors (emphasis at low E), but also wanted to rapidly respond to inquiries about excess below 300 MeV.
- Starting with this talk...no more disclaimers. PRL draft already circulating that covers ~1 year of very careful follow-up work.

Update #1: Treatment of π flux errors

OLD METHOD:

- Fit HARP/E910 data to SW parameterization.
  - Use SW fit as central value (CV) MC
  - Use covariance matrix governing SW parameters in χ^2 fit to assess error
- Problem: poor χ^2 due to SW parameterization not fully describing data at HARP's precision
- Old Solution: uniformly inflate HARP error until χ^2 is acceptable.
- Inflates HARP's ~7% error to closer to ~15%



xsec (mb) vs p_π (GeV)





Update #1: Treatment of π flux errors

OLD METHOD:

- Fit HARP/E910 data to SW parameterization.
  - Use SW fit as central value (CV) MC
  - Use covariance matrix governing SW parameters in χ^2 fit to assess error
- Problem: poor χ^2 due to SW parameterization not fully describing data at HARP's precision
- Old Solution: uniformly inflate HARP error until χ^2 is acceptable.
- Inflates HARP's ~7% error to closer to ~16%
- Sounds dumb, but...
  - Getting a good 2-dim parameterization in (p,θ) not as easy as you might think
  - Totally unimportant for ν_e appearance where the π flux is heavily constrained from the *in situ* ν_μ measurement



Update #1: Treatment of π flux errors

NEW METHOD:

- Forget SW, use HARP data and fit with spline interpolation
- Vary HARP data with their own covariance matrix to produce flux systematic error
- Update #1 bottom line: No impact on ν_e appearance
  - Largest diff at low p_π ,not much ν flux hitting det
  - Still have additional 5% in errors from horn modeling and secondary interactions



xsec (mb) vs p_π (GeV)





81% of ν flux crossing MB covered by HARP



Update #2: Improved π^0/radiative Δ analysis



- Complete re-extraction of π^0 weights
  - Independent code, improved unsmearing technique, 11 bins, consistent with old result
  - Fit over 9 bins in p_π to smooth reweighting function



$\nu_\mu(p,n) \rightarrow \nu_\mu(p,n)\pi^0, \pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$



Update #2: Improved π^0/radiative Δ analysis





- Applied *in situ* measurement of the coherent/resonant production rate
  - Coherent event kinematics more forward
  - Resonant production increased by 5%
- Improvements to Δ->Nγ bkg prediction
  - Resonant π^0 fraction measured more accurately
  - Old analysis, π created in struck nucleus not allowed to reinteract to make new Δ
  - Complete combinatorial derivation based on branching ratios (Γ_γ, Γ_{π^0}) and the pion escape probability (ε)

$$\frac{N_C(\Delta \rightarrow N\gamma)}{N_C(\Delta \rightarrow N\pi^0)} = \frac{3\Gamma_\gamma}{2\Gamma_{\pi^0}\varepsilon}$$

  - Error on Δ->Nγ bkg increased from 9 to 12%
- Update #2 bottom line: Overall, produces a small change in ν_e appearance bkgs

Update #3: Hadronic bkgs/errors in ν interactions

OLD HADRONIC PROCESSES/ERRORS:

- Mainly due to charged π absorption and charge exchange in the mineral oil, analogous to the same processes in the struck nucleus
- Use GEANT3 MC with GCALOR instead of GFLUKA default
  - better π abs/cex handling (error=max{Ashery error,Ashery-GCALOR})
  - better neutron scattering
- Cross-check: Accounting for cex/abs differences GCALOR & GFLUKA give same result for ν_e appearance bkgs





Update #3: Hadronic bkgs/errors in ν interactions

ADDITIONAL HADRONIC PROCESSES:

- Charged π – C elastic scattering
  - Found π± elastic scattering to be nearly absent in GCALOR
  - Possibility that NC π± have more scattering ⇒ making Cerenkov ring look more e-like
- Radiative π⁻ capture
  - π⁻ capture is in GCALOR, but missing radiative branching fraction (40%, ~100MeV gamma)
- π± induced Δ->Nγ
  - Abs/cex allowed in GCALOR, but radiative γ branch missing
  - Not as dangerous as in struck nucleus, since π propagates for some time and can give multiple rings
- None of these processes contributed a significant number of bkg events.



Update #3: Hadronic bkgs/errors in ν interactions

ADDITIONAL HADRONIC PROCESSES:

- Photonuclear interactions
  - Absent in GEANT3
  - Can delete a γ in a NC pi0 interactions, thus creating a single e-like ring
  - 40,000 NC pi0 interactions
  - Well-known cross-section, in fact in GEANT4 which allowed for cross-check
  - Uncertainties enter via final states
- Only hadronic process found to contribute significantly





Update #3: Hadronic bkgs/errors in ν interactions

ADDITIONAL HADRONIC PROCESSES:

- Update #3 bottom line:
  - Additional p0 mis-id due to all modified hadronic processes (dominated by PN)
    - 200-300 MeV, 40 events
    - 300-475 MeV, 25 events
    - 475-1250 MeV, 1 event
  - Additional systematic error negligible relative to other errors



Update #4: Additional cut to remove dirt events

- Dirt backgrounds tend to come from γ that sneak through the veto and convert in tank $\Rightarrow$ pile up at high radius
- Don't carry full ν energy $\Rightarrow$ pile up at low visible energy
- Define R-to-wall cut, distance back to wall along reconstructed track direction
- Apply 2d cut as shown





Update #4: Additional cut to remove dirt events

- Update #4 bottom line: Removes ~85% of the dirt backgrounds at low energy

No DIRT cuts



With DIRT Cuts



Update #4: Additional cut to remove dirt events

- Consistency-check: look at radial distribution after dirt cut applied
  - Uniform excess throughout tank



Update #5: New data

- Extra 0.83E20 POT during combined MiniBooNE/SciBooNE ν running
  - ν_e-like events per POT evenly distributed throughout duration of run
- Update #5 bottom line: ν_e-like event rate slightly higher for new data, but perfectly acceptable





Final Results: Background event breakdown

Process	$200-300$	$300-475$	$475-1250$
ν_μ CCQE	9.0	17.4	11.7
$\nu_\mu e \rightarrow \nu_\mu e$	6.1	4.3	6.4
NC π^0	103.5	77.8	71.2
NC $\Delta \rightarrow N\gamma$	19.5	47.5	19.4
Dirt Events	11.5	12.3	11.5
Other Events	18.4	7.3	16.8
ν_e from μ Decay	13.6	44.5	153.5
ν_e from K^+ Decay	3.6	13.8	81.9
ν_e from K^0_L Decay	1.6	3.4	13.5
Total Background	186.8 ± 26.0	228.3 ± 24.5	385.9 ± 35.7

- Above 475 MeV still dominated by intrinsic nue
- At low E transitions to NC π^0 and Δ->Nγ dominated bkgs

Final Results: Impact on oscillation analysis







- No impact on primary oscillation analysis!

Final Results: Extend 2ν fit to low E





	E_ν>475 MeV	E_ν>200 MeV
Null fit χ^2 (prob.):	9.1(91%)	22(28%)
Best fit χ^2 (prob.):	7.2(93%)	18.3(37%)

- Adding 3 bins to fit causes chi^2 to increase by 11 (expected 3)
- Can see the problem...the best 2ν fit that can be found does not describe the low E excess.

Final Results: Compare update stages

Event Sample	Analysis 1	Analysis 2	Analysis 3	Analysis 4
200 – 300 MeV				
Data	375	368	427	232
Background	283 ± 37	332.4 ± 38.9	386.0 ± 44.3	186.8 ± 26.0
Excess	92 ± 37	35.6 ± 38.9	41.0 ± 44.3	45.2 ± 26.0
Significance	2.5σ	0.9σ	0.9σ	1.7σ
300 – 475 MeV				
Data	369	364	428	312
Background	273 ± 26	282.9 ± 28.3	330.0 ± 31.8	228.3 ± 24.5
Excess	96 ± 26	81.1 ± 28.3	98.0 ± 31.8	83.7 ± 24.5
Significance	3.7σ	2.9σ	3.1σ	3.4σ
200 – 475 MeV				
Data	744	732	855	544
Background	556 ± 54	615.3 ± 58.0	716.1 ± 66.2	415.2 ± 43.4
Excess	188 ± 54	116.7 ± 58.0	138.9 ± 66.2	128.8 ± 43.4
Significance	3.5σ	2.0σ	2.1σ	3.0σ
475 – 1250 MeV				
Data	380	369	431	408
Background	358 ± 40	356.0 ± 33.3	412.7 ± 37.6	385.9 ± 35.7
Excess	22 ± 40	13.0 ± 33.3	18.3 ± 37.6	22.1 ± 35.7
Significance	0.6σ	0.4σ	0.5σ	0.6σ

FINAL

- In 475–1250 MeV, excess is small/stable through all updates
- In 200–475 MeV, excess significance reduced due to additional hadronic bkgs, compensated by reduction in dirt background
- Excess at low E remains > 3 sigma after the comprehensive review

Final Results: Visible energy distribution



- Visible energy interesting to look at in case excess is not really due to ν_e CCQE
- Excess piles up below 400 MeV, analysis threshold set at 140 MeV Evis



Anti-neutrinos in MiniBooNE

Antineutrinos in MiniBooNE

- Event rates after fiducial volume cuts:

ν channel	events
all channels	810k
CC quasielastic	340k
NC elastic	150k
CC π^+	180k
CC π^0	30k
NC π^0	48k
NC $\pi^{+/-}$	27k
CC/NC DIS, multi-π	35k

6×10^{20} POT
ν mode

$\bar{\nu}$ channel	events
all channels	54k
CC quasielastic	24k
NC elastic	10k
CC π^-	8.9k
CC π^0	1.7k
NC π^0	4.9k
NC $\pi^{+/-}$	1.8k
CC/NC DIS, multi-π	1.9k

2×10^{20} POT
$\bar{\nu}$ mode



- Have collected 3.3E20 POT in antineutrino mode
  - Direct check of LSND result
  - Cross-sections measurements
  - Understanding low E excess



Conclusions and references

- Summary
  - A comprehensive review of all backgrounds and errors (with a particular emphasis at low E) has been completed
  - No change to the analysis above 475 MeV
  - The excess at low E energy is still >3.0σ significant, and remains a mystery
  - Next step: pulling together additional information from NuMI events and antineutrinos (still blind) into a global picture.
- For more info on MiniBooNE see
  - *Measurement of Muon Neutrino Quasi-Elastic Scattering on Carbon,* **PRL 100, 032310 (2008)**
  - *First Observation of Coherent π^0 Production in Neutrino Nucleus Interactions with En<2 GeV,* **Phys Lett B. 664, 41 (2008)**
  - *Compatibility of High Δm^2 ν_e and Anti-ν_e Neutrino Oscillations Searches,* **Phys. Rev D 78, 012007 (2008)**
  - *The Neutrino Flux Prediction at MiniBooNE,* **Accepted by PRD [arXiv:0806:1449]**
  - *The MiniBooNE Detector,* **Submitted to NIM A [arXiv:0806.4201]**
- Papers on the immediate horizon
  - NuMI events in MiniBooNE
  - BDT/TBL combination technique and result
  - Analyzing the low E events in MiniBooNE (this work)
  - CCpi+/CCQE ratio measurement
  - ν_μ disappearance in MiniBoone

Extra slides

Antineutrino