Reactor Antineutrino Directionality via Elastic Electron Scattering in Gd-Doped Water Cherenkov Detectors

Applied Antineutrino Physics 2015
Arlington, VA

December 8, 2015

Daniel Hellfeld

University of California, Berkeley
Department of Nuclear Engineering

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Rare Event Detection Group

Outline

- Antineutrino interactions and directionality
- Reactor antineutrino energy spectrum
- Expected signal
- Backgrounds
- Sensitivity vs. radon, depth, and detector size
- Conclusions

Antineutrino Interactions

Inverse Beta Decay



$$\bar{\nu}_e + p \rightarrow e^+ + n$$

E. Caden (AAP, 2012)

Electron Scattering



$$\bar{\nu}_e + e^- \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e + e^-$$



Directionality

- Reduce background from multiple nearby reactors
- Search for clandestine reactors
- Supernova pointing

Inverse Beta Decay



C. Langbrandtner (Ph.D. Thesis, 2011)

Electron Scattering



Reactor Energy Spectrum*



Detectable = folded with cross section

Summed = weighted sum using typical mid-cycle PWR fission fractions

(49.6% ^{235}U, 35.1% ^{239}Pu, 8.7% ^{238}U, 6.6% ^{241}Pu)**

* *P. Vogel, J. Engel, Phys. Rev. D 39, 3378 (1989)*

** *G. Zacek et al., Phys. Rev. D 34, 2621 (1986)*

Baseline Detector Design

- Access to existing GEANT4 simulation of WATCHMAN detector



- 3.1 kilotons of Gd-doped water total
- 2.1 kiloton target
  - ~ 4300 12-inch PMTs facing target
- 1 kiloton veto
  - ~ 480 12-inch PMTs facing veto
- 1 kiloton fiducial
- 1.5 meter buffer
- Assume low-background PMTs
- 1500 m.w.e. overburden
- 13 km standoff from 3.758 GWth LWR

Note: WATCHMAN not originally designed for directionality

Expected ES Signal

$$R_{\bar{\nu}_e/e^-} = \frac{N_e}{4\pi d^2} \sum_i f_i \int \phi_i(E_{\bar{\nu}_e})\sigma(E_{\bar{\nu}_e})dE_{\bar{\nu}_e} \quad (\sim 9270 \text{ events/5 years})$$

- Simulations done with GEANT4 simulation **RMSim**
- Event reconstruction done with **BONSAI**





RMSim imposes 16 PE trigger threshold
→ 17% detection efficiency

Cosmogenic Radionuclides

- $\beta^{+/-}$ decay of ^{16}N, ^{15}C, ^{11}Be, ^{8}B, ^{8}Li
  - Utilize yields from Super-K FLUKA study*
- Muon rates (relative to KamLAND) obtained from GEANT4 simulation of muons as a function of depth
  - provided by David Reyna (SNL)**
- Impose a 10 sec position sensitive veto
  - 1 meter tube for non-showering muons
  - 2 meter tube for showering muons
    - Results in 67% livetime
- Remove events that reconstruct as more than one Cherenkov cone
  - evidence of coincident β and γ



* *S. Li, J. Beacom, Phys. Rev. C 89, 045801 (2014)*
** *D. Reyna, arXiv:0604145v2 (2006)*

PMT Backgrounds

- Mostly interact in buffer, however uncertainty in reconstruction can place them in the fiducial volume



→ Use exponential behavior to estimate backgrounds

^{222}Rn / ^{214}Bi

- Presence of radon gas in detector medium
  - Trace amounts of naturally occurring ^{238}U
  - Radon gas migrating out of PMT glass
  - Radon gas leaking into detector from mine air
- Estimate with radon contamination of 10^{-14} gU/gD_2O published by SNO*
  - Including 67% livetime and 20% detection efficiency results in **1350 events/day** (~ 2.5 x 10^6 events/5 years)

→ <u>Progress must be made in radon removal</u>

- Radon free air
- Uranium removal
- Directed clean water flow (permeable acrylic barrier)

→ Beginning to investigate these methods

* *I. Belvis et al., Nucl. Instrum. Methods A 517, 139 (2004)*

Other Backgrounds

- Steel/rock γ's and solar ν scaled from IsoDAR study on KamLAND*
  - Take into account larger fiducial volume and different livetime
- Misidentified IBD interactions estimated assuming an event rate of 20 events/day and a 20% missed neutron rate



→ Look to higher energies
→ Reduce fiducial volume
→ Reduce radon

→ More overburden

* *M. Toups et al., Phys. Rev. D 89, 072010 (2014)*

WATCHMAN vs. Radon

*5 years

PMT Triggers	FV (m^3)	ES	Exp. Slope		RN	PMTs	Other	Radon (x SNO)		
								1	10^{-2}	10^{-4}
25 → 65	187	**80**	4.6		741	1212	438	638670	6387	64
				Total BG				**641061**	**8778**	**2455**
				Significance				**0.2σ**	**1.6σ**	**2.9σ**
50 → 80	400 - 500	**48**	6.0		1717	906	735	125430	1254	13
				Total BG				**128788**	**4612**	**3371**
				Significance				**0.3σ**	**1.5σ**	**1.8σ**
60 → 90	500 - 1000	**43**	6.7		3947	227	1171	34390	344	3
				Total BG				**39735**	**5689**	**5348**
				Significance				**0.5σ**	**1.3σ**	**1.4σ**

- Low energy slice only relevant with significant fiducialization and radon reduction
- Without radon reduction, high energy cuts must be used
  - But radionuclides begin to dominate

Sensitivity vs. Depth

- Determine RN background as function of depth
- Recalculate significance for each depth and various radon levels

*5 years



$1 \times$ SNO radon　　$10^{-2} \times$ SNO radon　　$10^{-4} \times$ SNO radon

*Data represents mean value of multiple repeated experiments

Sensitivity vs. Depth vs. Size

- Now determine the detector size required for 3σ
- Scale signal with volume, scale significance with signal to noise ratio

*5 years



1 × SNO Radon



10^{-2} × SNO Radon



10^{-4} × SNO Radon

*Data represents mean value of multiple repeated experiments

Conclusions

- Similar radon contamination as SNO → need much larger detector (> 40 ktons)
- ×100 reduction in radon → need combination of a larger and deeper detector
- ×10,000 reduction in radon → 3 kton detector at 1500 m.w.e. (WATCHMAN) should be directionally sensitive

- Assumes full power reactor operation with no shutdown periods
- Fission fractions are constant in time (no burnup)
- Technically the directional sensitivity with respect to an assumed direction
  - Need statistical penalty for testing in multiple directions

- **Paper being submitted to journal soon**
- **Currently at arXiv:1512.00527**

Questions?





Acknowledgements and Disclaimer

Steven Dazeley, LLNL
Adam Bernstein, LLNL
Craig Marianno, TAMU
Marc Bergevin, LLNL
Michael Smy, UCI

This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration under Award Number: DE-NA0000979 through the Nuclear Science and Security Consortium.

Supplementary Slides

Significance Calculation

- Background assumed to be isotropic (ignore solar anisotropy)
- Fit signal with constant + exponential ($A + B\mathrm{e}^{Cx}$)
- Use calibration source to predetermine exponential slope, C
- Use uncertainty in exponential normalization B to determine signal significance



Sensitivity vs. Depth

Muon rate scaling with depth (relative to KamLAND)



Adjust veto time to reduce more RN with depth



→ As we increase the depth, we can increase veto time without sacrificing livetime

More References

[1] N. Bowden et. al., Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A 572, 985 (2007).
[2] L. Mikaelyan, in: Proceedings of the International Conference "Neutrino 77", Vol. 2, Nauka, Moscow, 1978, pp. 383–385.
[3] A. Bernstein, N. Bowden, A. Misner, and T. Palmer, J. Appl. Phys. 103, 074905 (2008).
[4] A. Bernstein et al, Science & Global Security 18, 127 (2010).
[5] T. Lasserre et. al., arXiv:11011.3850.
[6] A. Bernstein et. al., arXiv:1502.01132.
[7] M. Apollonio et. al., Physical Review D 61, 012001 (1999).
[8] C. Giunti, C. Kim, Fundamentals of Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
[9] P. Vogel, J. Engel, Physical Review D 39, 3378 (1989).
[10] G. Zacek et. al., Physical Review D 34, 2621 (1986).
[11] S. Agostinelli et. al [GEANT4 Collaboration], Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A 506, 250 (2003).
[12] The Water Cherenkov Simulator (WCSim) (Repository: https://github.com/WCSim).
[13] M. Smy, in: Proceedings of the International Cosmic Ray Conference, Vol. 5 (HE part 2), Mexico City, Mexico, 2008, pp. 1279–1282.
[14] S. Li, J. Beacom, Physical Review C 89, 045801 (2014).
[15] S. Abe et. al., Physical Review C 84, 035804 (2011).
[16] S. Abe et. al., Physical Review C 81, 025807 (2010).
[17] D. Reyna, arXiv:0604145v2.
[18] J. Felde, Private Communication (Internal LBNE DocDB document number 729-v1) (2010).
[19] I. Belvis et. al., arXiv:0305022v2.
[20] M. Toups et. al., Physical Review D 89, 072010 (2014).
[21] Y. Koshio, Ph.D. thesis, University of Tokyo.
[22] IAEA Safeguards Glossary, International Nuclear Verification Series 3, The International Atomic Energy Agency, 2003, http://www-pub.iaea.org/books/IAEABooks/6663/IAEA-Safeguards-Glossary.