

1 **The Sensitivity to Oscillation Parameters**
2 **from a Simultaneous Beam and**
3 **Atmospheric Neutrino Analysis that**
4 **combines the T2K and SK Experiments**



6 Daniel Robert Clement Barrow
7 Magdalen College
8 University of Oxford

9 A thesis submitted for the degree of
10 *Doctor of Philosophy*
11 Michaelmas 2022

Abstract

12

13 Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Pellentesque sit amet
14 nibh volutpat, scelerisque nibh a, vehicula neque. Integer placerat nulla massa,
15 et vestibulum velit dignissim id. Ut eget nisi elementum, consectetur nibh in,
16 condimentum velit. Quisque sodales dui ut tempus mattis. Duis malesuada arcu
17 at ligula egestas egestas. Phasellus interdum odio at sapien fringilla scelerisque.
18 Mauris sagittis eleifend sapien, sit amet laoreet felis mollis quis. Pellentesque
19 dui ante, finibus eget blandit sit amet, tincidunt eu neque. Vivamus rutrum
20 dapibus ligula, ut imperdiet lectus tincidunt ac. Pellentesque ac lorem sed
21 diam egestas lobortis.

22 Suspendisse leo purus, efficitur mattis urna a, maximus molestie nisl. Aenean
23 porta semper tortor a vestibulum. Suspendisse viverra facilisis lorem, non
24 pretium erat lacinia a. Vestibulum tempus, quam vitae placerat porta, magna
25 risus euismod purus, in viverra lorem dui at metus. Sed ac sollicitudin nunc.
26 In maximus ipsum nunc, placerat maximus tortor gravida varius. Suspendisse
27 pretium, lorem at porttitor rhoncus, nulla urna condimentum tortor, sed suscipit
28 nisi metus ac risus.

29 Aenean sit amet enim quis lorem tristique commodo vitae ut lorem. Duis
30 vel tincidunt lacus. Sed massa velit, lacinia sed posuere vitae, malesuada vel
31 ante. Praesent a rhoncus leo. Etiam sed rutrum enim. Pellentesque lobortis
32 elementum augue, at suscipit justo malesuada at. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet,
33 consectetur adipiscing elit. Praesent rhoncus convallis ex. Etiam commodo nunc
34 ex, non consequat diam consectetur ut. Pellentesque vitae est nec enim interdum
35 dapibus. Donec dapibus purus ipsum, eget tincidunt ex gravida eget. Donec
36 luctus nisi eu fringilla mollis. Donec eget lobortis diam.

37 Suspendisse finibus placerat dolor. Etiam ornare elementum ex ut vehicula.
38 Donec accumsan mattis erat. Quisque cursus fringilla diam, eget placerat neque
39 bibendum eu. Ut faucibus dui vitae dolor porta, at elementum ipsum semper.
40 Sed ultrices dui non arcu pellentesque placerat. Etiam posuere malesuada turpis,
41 nec malesuada tellus malesuada.

Acknowledgements

⁴³ Personal

⁴⁴ This is where you thank your advisor, colleagues, and family and friends.

⁴⁵ Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Vestibulum feugiat
⁴⁶ et est at accumsan. Praesent sed elit mattis, congue mi sed, porta ipsum. In
⁴⁷ non ullamcorper lacus. Quisque volutpat tempus ligula ac ultricies. Nam sed
⁴⁸ erat feugiat, elementum dolor sed, elementum neque. Aliquam eu iaculis est,
⁴⁹ a sollicitudin augue. Cras id lorem vel purus posuere tempor. Proin tincidunt,
⁵⁰ sapien non dictum aliquam, ex odio ornare mauris, ultrices viverra nisi magna
⁵¹ in lacus. Fusce aliquet molestie massa, ut fringilla purus rutrum consectetur.
⁵² Nam non nunc tincidunt, rutrum dui sit amet, ornare nunc. Donec cursus
⁵³ tortor vel odio molestie dignissim. Vivamus id mi erat. Duis porttitor diam
⁵⁴ tempor rutrum porttitor. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing
⁵⁵ elit. Sed condimentum venenatis consectetur. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet,
⁵⁶ consectetur adipiscing elit.

⁵⁷ Aenean sit amet lectus nec tellus viverra ultrices vitae commodo nunc. Mauris
⁵⁸ at maximus arcu. Aliquam varius congue orci et ultrices. In non ipsum vel
⁵⁹ est scelerisque efficitur in at augue. Nullam rhoncus orci velit. Duis ultricies
⁶⁰ accumsan feugiat. Etiam consectetur ornare velit et eleifend.

⁶¹ Suspendisse sed enim lacinia, pharetra neque ac, ultricies urna. Phasellus sit
⁶² amet cursus purus. Quisque non odio libero. Etiam iaculis odio a ex volutpat, eget
⁶³ pulvinar augue mollis. Mauris nibh lorem, mollis quis semper quis, consequat
⁶⁴ nec metus. Etiam dolor mi, cursus a ipsum aliquam, eleifend venenatis ipsum.
⁶⁵ Maecenas tempus, nibh eget scelerisque feugiat, leo nibh lobortis diam, id laoreet
⁶⁶ purus dolor eu mauris. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus
⁶⁷ et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Nulla eget tortor eu arcu sagittis euismod
⁶⁸ fermentum id neque. In sit amet justo ligula. Donec rutrum ex a aliquet egestas.

⁶⁹ Institutional

⁷⁰ If you want to separate out your thanks for funding and institutional support,
⁷¹ I don't think there's any rule against it. Of course, you could also just remove
⁷² the subsections and do one big traditional acknowledgement section.

⁷³ Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut luctus tempor ex at
⁷⁴ pretium. Sed varius, mauris at dapibus lobortis, elit purus tempor neque, facilisis
⁷⁵ sollicitudin felis nunc a urna. Morbi mattis ante non augue blandit pulvinar.
⁷⁶ Quisque nec euismod mauris. Nulla et tellus eu nibh auctor malesuada quis
⁷⁷ imperdiet quam. Sed eget tincidunt velit. Cras molestie sem ipsum, at faucibus
⁷⁸ quam mattis vel. Quisque vel placerat orci, id tempor urna. Vivamus mollis,
⁷⁹ neque in aliquam consequat, dui sem volutpat lorem, sit amet tempor ipsum felis
⁸⁰ eget ante. Integer lacinia nulla vitae felis vulputate, at tincidunt ligula maximus.
⁸¹ Aenean venenatis dolor ante, euismod ultrices nibh mollis ac. Ut malesuada
⁸² aliquam urna, ac interdum magna malesuada posuere.

Contents

83

84	1 Introduction	1
85	2 Neutrino Oscillation Physics	2
86	2.1 Discovery of Neutrinos	3
87	2.2 Theory of Neutrino Oscillation	4
88	2.3 Neutrino Oscillation Measurements	8
89	2.4 Summary Of Oscillation Parameter Measurements	18
90	3 T2K and SK Experiment Overview	20
91	3.1 The Super-Kamiokande Experiment	20
92	3.2 The Tokai to Kamioka Experiment	31
93	4 Bayesian Statistics and Markov Chain Monte Carlo Techniques	46
94	4.1 Bayesian Statistics	47
95	4.2 Monte Carlo Simulation	48
96	4.3 Understanding the MCMC Results	57
97	5 Simulation, Reconstruction, and Event Reduction	62
98	5.1 Simulation	62
99	5.2 Event Reconstruction at SK	67
100	5.3 Event Reduction at SK	76
101	6 Sample Selections and Systematics	83
102	6.1 Atmospheric Samples	85
103	6.2 Near Detector Beam Samples	91
104	6.3 Far Detector Beam Samples	94
105	6.4 Systematic Uncertainties	98
106	7 Oscillation Probability Calculation	119
107	7.1 Overview	120
108	7.2 Treatment of Fast Oscillations	128
109	7.3 Calculation Engine	134
110	7.4 Matter Density Profile	138
111	7.5 Production Height Averaging	143

112	8 Oscillation Analysis	146
113	8.1 Monte Carlo Prediction	147
114	8.2 Likelihood Calculation	148
115	8.3 Sensitivities	162
116	9 Conclusions and Outlook	210
117	Appendices	
118	A Atmospheric Sample Spectra	212
119	A.1 Binning	212
120	A.2 Fully Contained Sub-GeV Samples	212
121	A.3 Fully Contained Multi-GeV Samples	216
122	A.4 Fully Contained Multi-Ring Samples	217
123	A.5 Partially Contained Samples	218
124	A.6 Upward-Going Muon Samples	219

1

125

126

Introduction

2

127

128

Neutrino Oscillation Physics

129 When first proposed, neutrinos were expected to be massless fermions that only
130 interact through weak and gravitational forces. This meant they were very
131 difficult to detect as they can pass through significant amounts of matter without
132 interacting. Despite this, experimental neutrino physics has developed with
133 many different detection techniques and neutrino sources being used today. In
134 direct tension with standard model physics, neutrinos have been determined to
135 oscillate between different lepton flavours, requiring them to have mass.

136 The observation techniques which led to the discovery of the neutrino are doc-
137 umented in section 2.1. The theory underpinning neutrino oscillation is described
138 in section 2.2 and includes the approximations which can be made to simplify
139 the understanding of neutrino oscillation in the two-flavour approximation. Past,
140 current, and future neutrino experiments are detailed in section 2.3, including the
141 reactor, atmospheric, and long-baseline accelerator neutrino sources that have
142 been used to successfully constrain oscillation parameters. Finally, the current
143 state of oscillation parameter measurements are summarised in section 2.4.

2.1 Discovery of Neutrinos

At the start of the 20th century, the electrons emitted from the β -decay of the nucleus were found to have a continuous energy spectrum [1, 2]. This observation seemingly broke the energy conservation invoked within that period's nuclear models. Postulated in 1930 by Pauli as the solution to this problem, the neutrino (originally termed "neutron") was theorized to be an electrically neutral spin-1/2 fermion with a mass of the same order of magnitude as the electron [3]. This neutrino was to be emitted with the electron in β -decay to alleviate the apparent breaking of energy conservation. As a predecessor of today's weak interaction model, Fermi's theory of β -decay developed the understanding by coupling the four constituent particles: electron, proton, neutron, and neutrino, into a consistent model [4].

Whilst Pauli was not convinced of the ability to detect neutrinos, the first observations of the particle were made in the mid-1950s when neutrinos from a reactor were observed via the inverse β -decay (IBD) process, $\bar{\nu}_e + p \rightarrow n + e^+$ [5, 6]. The detector consisted of two parts: a neutrino interaction medium and a liquid scintillator. The interaction medium was built from two water tanks. These were loaded with cadmium chloride to allow increased efficiency of neutron capture. The positron emitted from IBD annihilates, $e^+ + e^- \rightarrow 2\gamma$, generating a prompt signal and the neutron is captured on the cadmium via $n + ^{108}Cd \rightarrow ^{109}Cd + \gamma$, producing a delayed signal. An increase in the coincidence rate was observed when the reactor was operating which was interpreted as interactions from neutrinos generated in the reactor.

After the discovery of the ν_e , the natural question of how many flavours of neutrino exist was asked. In 1962, a measurement of the ν_μ was conducted at the Brookhaven National Laboratory [7]. A proton beam was directed at a beryllium target, generating a π -dominated beam which then decayed via $\pi^\pm \rightarrow \mu^\pm + (\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu)$, and the subsequent interactions of the ν_μ were observed. As the subsequent interaction of the neutrino generates muons rather than

173 electrons, it was determined the ν_μ was fundamentally different from ν_e . The
174 final observation to be made was that of the ν_τ from the DONUT experiment [8].
175 Three neutrinos seem the obvious solution as it mirrors the known number of
176 charged lepton (as they form weak isospin doublets) but there could be evidence
177 of more. Several neutrino experiments have found anomalous results [9, 10]
178 which could be attributed to “sterile” neutrinos. These hypothesised particles
179 are not affected by gauge interactions in the standard model so their presence
180 can only be inferred through the observation of non-standard oscillation modes.
181 However, cosmological observations indicate the number of neutrino species
182 $N_{eff} = 2.99 \pm 0.17$ [11], as measured from the cosmic microwave background
183 power spectrum. LEP also measured the number of active neutrino flavours to
184 be $N_\nu = 2.9840 \pm 0.0082$ [12] from measurements of the Z-decay width, but this
185 does not strongly constrain the number of sterile neutrinos.

186 2.2 Theory of Neutrino Oscillation

187 A neutrino generated with lepton flavour α can change into a different lepton
188 flavour β after propagating some distance. This phenomenon is called neutrino
189 oscillation and requires that neutrinos must have a non-zero mass. This behaviour
190 has been characterised by the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) [13–
191 15] mixing matrix which describes how the flavour and mass of neutrinos are
192 associated. This is analogous to the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) [16]
193 matrix measured in quark physics.

194 2.2.1 Three Flavour Oscillations

195 The PMNS parameterisation defines three flavour eigenstates, ν_e , ν_μ and ν_τ
196 (indexed ν_α), which are eigenstates of the weak interaction and three mass
197 eigenstates, ν_1 , ν_2 and ν_3 (indexed ν_i). Each mass eigenstate is the superposition

¹⁹⁸ of all three flavour states,

$$|\nu_i\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} U_{\alpha i} |\nu_{\alpha}\rangle. \quad (2.1)$$

¹⁹⁹ Where U is the 3×3 PMNS matrix which is unitary and connects the mass
²⁰⁰ and flavour eigenstates.

²⁰¹ The weak interaction couples to flavour eigenstates so neutrinos interact with
²⁰² leptons of the same flavour. The propagation of a neutrino flavour eigenstate, in
²⁰³ a vacuum, can be re-written as a plane-wave solution to the time-dependent
²⁰⁴ Schrödinger equation,

$$|\nu_{\alpha}(t)\rangle = \sum_i U_{\alpha i}^* |\nu_i\rangle e^{-i\phi_i}. \quad (2.2)$$

²⁰⁵ The probability of observing a neutrino of flavour eigenstate β from one
²⁰⁶ which originated as flavour α can be calculated as,

$$P(\nu_{\alpha} \rightarrow \nu_{\beta}) = |\langle \nu_{\beta} | \nu_{\alpha}(t) \rangle|^2 = \sum_{i,j} U_{\alpha i}^* U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha j} U_{\beta j}^* e^{-i(\phi_j - \phi_i)} \quad (2.3)$$

²⁰⁷ The ϕ_i term can be expressed in terms of the energy, E_i , and magnitude of
²⁰⁸ the three momenta, p_i , of the neutrino, $\phi_i = E_i t - p_i x$ (t and x being time and
²⁰⁹ position coordinates). Therefore,

$$\phi_j - \phi_i = E_j t - E_i t - p_j x + p_i x. \quad (2.4)$$

²¹⁰ For a relativistic particle, $E_i \gg m_i$,

$$p_i = \sqrt{E_i^2 - m_i^2} \approx E_i - \frac{m_i^2}{2E_i}. \quad (2.5)$$

²¹¹ Making the approximations that neutrinos are relativistic, the mass eigenstates
²¹² were created with the same energy and that $x = L$, where L is the distance
²¹³ traveled by the neutrino, Equation 2.4 then becomes

$$\phi_j - \phi_i = \frac{\Delta m_{ij}^2 L}{2E}, \quad (2.6)$$

214 where $\Delta m_{ij}^2 = m_i^2 - m_j^2$. This, combined with further use of unitarity relations
215 results in Equation 2.3 becoming

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta) &= \delta_{\alpha\beta} - 4 \sum_{i>j} \Re \left(U_{\alpha i}^* U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha j} U_{\beta j}^* \right) \sin^2 \left(\frac{\Delta m_{ij}^2 L}{4E} \right) \\ &\quad + (-) 2 \sum_{i>j} \Im \left(U_{\alpha i}^* U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha j} U_{\beta j}^* \right) \sin \left(\frac{\Delta m_{ij}^2 L}{2E} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

216 Where $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ is the Kronecker delta function and the negative sign on the last
217 term is included for the oscillation probability of antineutrinos. As an important
218 point to note, the observation of oscillation probability requires that a non-zero
219 value of Δm_{ij}^2 , which in turn requires that neutrinos have differing masses.

220 Typically, the PMNS matrix is parameterised into three mixing angles, a
221 charge parity (CP) violating phase δ_{CP} , and two Majorana phases $\alpha_{1,2}$,

$$U = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{Atmospheric, Accelerator}} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{-i\delta_{CP}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13}e^{-i\delta_{CP}} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{Reactor, Accelerator}} \times \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{Reactor, Solar}} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} e^{i\alpha_1/2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\alpha_2/2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{Majorana}}. \quad (2.8)$$

222 Where $s_{ij} = \sin(\theta_{ij})$ and $c_{ij} = \cos(\theta_{ij})$. The oscillation parameters are often
223 grouped: (1,2) as “solar”, (2,3) as “atmospheric” and (1,3) as “reactor”. Many
224 neutrino experiments aim to measure the PMNS parameters from a wide array
225 of origins, as is the purpose of this thesis.

226 The Majorana phase, $\alpha_{1,2}$, included within the fourth matrix in Equation 2.8
227 is only included for completeness. For an oscillation analysis experiment, any
228 terms containing this phase disappear due to taking the expectation value of
229 the PMNS matrix. Measurements of these phases are typically performed by
230 experiments searching for neutrino-less double β -decay [17].

231 A two flavour approximation can be obtained when one assumes the third
232 mass eigenstate is degenerate with another. As discussed in section 2.3, it is
233 found that $\Delta m_{21}^2 \ll |\Delta m_{31}^2|$. This results in the two flavour approximation being
234 reasonable for understanding the features of the oscillation. In this two flavour
235 case, the mixing matrix becomes,

$$U_{2\text{ Flav.}} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & \sin(\theta) \\ -\sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.9)$$

236 This culminates in the oscillation probability,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\alpha) &= 1 - \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m^2 L}{4E}\right), \\ P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta) &= \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m^2 L}{4E}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

237 Where $\alpha \neq \beta$. For a fixed neutrino energy, the oscillation probability is
238 a sinusoidal function depending upon the distance over which the neutrino
239 propagates. The frequency and amplitude of oscillation are dependent upon
240 $\Delta m^2/4E$ and $\sin^2 2\theta$, respectively. The oscillation probabilities presented thus far
241 assume $c = 1$, where c is the speed of light in vacuum. In more familiar units, the
242 maximum oscillation probability for a fixed value of θ is given at $L[\text{km}] / E[\text{GeV}] \sim$
243 $1.27/\Delta m^2$. It is this calculation that determines the best L/E value for a given
244 experiment to be designed around for measurements of a specific value of Δm^2 .

245 2.2.2 The MSW Effect

246 The theory of neutrino oscillation in a vacuum has been described in subsec-
247 tion 2.2.1. However, the beam neutrinos and atmospheric neutrinos originating
248 from below the horizon propagate through matter in the Earth. The coherent
249 scattering of neutrinos from a material target modifies the Hamiltonian of the
250 system. This results in a change in the oscillation probability. Notably, charged
251 current scattering ($\nu_e + e^- \rightarrow \nu_e + e^-$, propagated by a W boson) only affects
252 electron neutrinos whereas the neutral current scattering ($\nu_l + l^- \rightarrow \nu_l + l^-$,

253 propagated by a Z^0 boson) interacts through all neutrino flavours equally. In the
254 two-flavour approximation, the effective mixing parameter becomes

$$\sin^2(2\theta) \rightarrow \sin^2(2\theta_m) = \frac{\sin^2(2\theta)}{(A/\Delta m^2 - \cos(2\theta))^2 + \sin^2(2\theta)}, \quad (2.11)$$

255 where $A = 2\sqrt{2}G_F N_e E$, N_e is the electron density of the medium and G_F is
256 Fermi's constant. It is clear to see that there exists a value of $A = \Delta m^2 \cos(2\theta)$
257 for $\Delta m^2 > 0$ which results in a divergent mixing parameter. This resonance is
258 termed the Mikheyev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein (MSW) effect (or more colloquially,
259 the matter resonance) which regenerates the electron neutrino component of the
260 neutrino flux [18–20]. The density at which the resonance occurs is given by

$$N_e = \frac{\Delta m^2 \cos(2\theta)}{2\sqrt{2}G_F E}. \quad (2.12)$$

261 At densities lower than this critical value, the oscillation probability will
262 be much closer to that of vacuum oscillation. For antineutrinos, $N_e \rightarrow -N_e$
263 [21]. The resonance occurring from the MSW effect depends on the sign of Δm^2 .
264 Therefore, any neutrino oscillation experiment which observes neutrinos and
265 antineutrinos which have propagated through matter can have some sensitivity
266 to the ordering of the neutrino mass eigenstates.

267 2.3 Neutrino Oscillation Measurements

268 As evidence of beyond standard model physics, the 2015 Nobel Prize in Physics
269 was awarded to the Super-Kamiokande (SK) [22] and Sudbury Neutrino Ob-
270 servatory (SNO) [23] collaborations for the first definitive observation of solar
271 and atmospheric neutrino oscillation [24]. Since then, the field has seen a wide
272 array of oscillation measurements from a variety of neutrino sources. As seen
273 in subsection 2.2.1, the neutrino oscillation probability is dependent on the ratio
274 of the propagation baseline, L , to the neutrino energy, E . It is this ratio that
275 determines the type of neutrino oscillation a particular experiment is sensitive to.

As illustrated in Figure 2.1, there are many neutrino sources that span a wide range of energies. The least energetic neutrinos are from diffuse supernovae and terrestrial neutrinos at $O(1)$ MeV whereas the most energetic neutrinos originate from atmospheric and galactic neutrinos of $> O(1)$ TeV.




Figure 2.1: The cross-section of neutrinos from various natural and man-made sources as a function of neutrino energy. Taken from [25]

2.3.1 Solar Neutrinos

Solar neutrinos are emitted from fusion reaction chains at the center of the Sun. The solar neutrino flux, given as a function of neutrino energy for different fusion and decay chains, is illustrated in Figure 2.2. Whilst proton-proton fusion generates the largest flux of neutrinos, the neutrinos are of low energy and are difficult to reconstruct due to the IBD interaction threshold of 1.8MeV. Consequently, most experiments focus on the neutrinos from the decay of 8B (via ${}^8B \rightarrow {}^8Be^* + e^+ + \nu_e$), which are higher energy.

The first measurements of solar neutrinos observed a significant reduction in the event rate compared to predictions from the Standard Solar Model [27, 28]. A




Figure 2.2: The solar neutrino flux as a function of neutrino energy for various fusion reactions and decay chains as predicted by the Standard Solar Model. Taken from [26].

proposed solution to this “solar neutrino problem” was $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_\mu$ oscillations in a precursory version of the PMNS model [29]. The Kamiokande [30], Gallex [31] and Sage [32] experiments confirmed the ~ 0.5 factor deficit of solar neutrinos.

The conclusive solution to this problem was determined by the SNO collaboration [33]. Using a deuterium water target to observe 8B neutrinos, the event rate of charged current (CC), neutral current (NC), and elastic scattering (ES) interactions (Given in Equation 2.13) was simultaneously measured. CC events can only occur for electron neutrinos, whereas the NC channel is agnostic to neutrino flavour, and the ES reaction has a slight excess sensitivity to electron neutrino interactions. This meant that there were direct measurements of the ν_e and ν_x neutrino flux. It was concluded that the CC and ES interaction rates were consistent with the deficit previously observed. Most importantly, the NC reaction rate was only

302 consistent with the others under the hypothesis of flavour transformation.

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_e + d &\rightarrow p + p + e^- & (CC) \\ \nu_x + d &\rightarrow p + n + \nu_x & (NC) \\ \nu_x + e^- &\rightarrow \nu_x + e^- & (ES) \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

303 Many experiments have since measured the neutrino flux of different interac-
 304 tion chains within the sun [34–36]. The most recent measurement was that of CNO
 305 neutrinos which were recently observed with 5σ significance by the Borexino
 306 collaboration. Future neutrino experiments aim to further these spectroscopic
 307 measurements of different fusion chains within the Sun [37–39].

308 2.3.2 Atmospheric Neutrinos

309 The interactions of primary cosmic ray protons in Earth’s upper atmosphere
 310 generate showers of energetic hadrons. These are mostly pions and kaons which
 311 when they decay produce a natural source of neutrinos spanning energies of
 312 MeV to TeV [40]. The main decay is via

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^\pm &\rightarrow \mu^\pm + (\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu) \\ \mu^\pm &\rightarrow e^\pm + (\nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu) + (\nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e) \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

313 such that for a single pion decay, three neutrinos are typically produced.
 314 The atmospheric neutrino flux energy spectra as predicted by the Bartol [41],
 315 Honda [42–44], and FLUKA [45] models are illustrated in Figure 2.3. The flux
 316 distribution peaks at an energy of $O(10)\text{GeV}$. The uncertainties associated with
 317 these models are dominated by the hadronic production of kaon and pions as
 318 well as the primary cosmic flux.

319 Unlike long-baseline experiments which have a fixed baseline, the distance
 320 atmospheric neutrinos propagate is dependent upon the zenith angle at which
 321 they interact. This is illustrated in Figure 2.4. Neutrinos that are generated
 322 directly above the detector ($\cos(\theta) = 1.0$) have a baseline equivalent to the




Figure 2.3: Left panel: The atmospheric neutrino flux for different neutrino flavours as a function of neutrino energy as predicted by the 2007 Honda model (“This work”) [42], the 2004 Honda model (“HKKM04”)[43], the Bartol model [41] and the FLUKA model [45]. Right panel: The ratio of the muon to electron neutrino flux as predicted by all the quoted models. Both figures taken from [42].

height of the atmosphere whereas neutrinos that interact directly below the detector ($\cos(\theta) = -1.0$) have to travel a length equal to the diameter of the Earth. This means atmospheric neutrinos have a baseline that varies from $O(20)\text{km}$ to $O(6 \times 10^3)\text{km}$. Any neutrino generated at or below the horizon will be subject to matter effects as they propagate through the Earth.

Figure 2.5 highlights the neutrino flux as a function of the zenith angle for different slices of neutrino energy. For medium to high-energy neutrinos (and to a lesser degree for low-energy neutrinos), the flux is approximately symmetric around $\cos(\theta) = 0$. To the accuracy of this approximation, the systematic uncertainties associated with atmospheric flux for comparing upward-going and down-going neutrino cancels. This allows the down-going events, which are mostly insensitive to oscillation probabilities, to act as an unoscillated prediction (similar to a near detector in an accelerator neutrino experiment).

Precursory hints of atmospheric neutrinos were observed in the mid-1960s searching for $\nu_\mu^- + X \rightarrow X^* + \mu^\pm$ [47], although it was called an anomaly




Figure 2.4: A diagram illustrating the definition of zenith angle as used in the Super Kamiokande experiment [46].




Figure 2.5: Prediction of $\nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e, \nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu$ fluxes as a function of zenith angle as calculated by the HKKM model [44]. The left, middle and right panels represent three values of neutrino energy, 0.32GeV, 1.0GeV and 3.2GeV respectively. Predictions for other models including Bartol [41], Honda [42] and FLUKA [45] are given in [46].

at the time of measurement. This was succeeded with the IMB-3 [48] and Kamiokande [49] experiments which measured the ratio of muon neutrinos compared to electron neutrinos $R(\nu_\mu/\nu_e)$. Both experiments were found to have a consistent deficit of muon neutrinos, with $R(\nu_\mu/\nu_e) = 0.67 \pm 0.17$ and $R(\nu_\mu/\nu_e) = 0.60^{+0.07}_{-0.06} \pm 0.05$. Super-Kamiokande (SK) [46] extended this analysis by fitting oscillation parameters in $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$ which found best fit parameters $\sin^2(2\theta) > 0.92$ and $1.5 \times 10^{-3} < \Delta m^2 < 3.4 \times 10^{-3}$ eV².

Since then, atmospheric neutrino experiments have been making precision

346 measurements of the $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ and Δm_{32}^2 oscillation parameters. Atmospheric
 347 neutrino oscillation is dominated by $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau)$, where SK observed a 4.6σ
 348 discovery of ν_τ appearance [50]. Figure 2.6 illustrates the current estimates
 349 on the atmospheric mixing parameters from a wide range of atmospheric and
 350 accelerator neutrino observatories.




Figure 2.6: Constraints on the atmospheric oscillation parameters, $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ and Δm_{32}^2 , from atmospheric and long baseline experiments: SK [51], T2K [52], NOvA [53], IceCube [54] and MINOS [55]. Figure taken from [56].

351 2.3.3 Accelerator Neutrinos

352 The concept of using a man-made “neutrino beam” was first realised in 1962 [57].
 353 Since then, many experiments have followed which all use the same fundamental
 354 concepts. Typically, a proton beam is aimed at a target producing charged mesons
 355 that decay to neutrinos. The mesons can be sign-selected by the use of magnetic
 356 focusing horns to generate a neutrino or antineutrino beam. Pions are the primary
 357 meson that decay and depending on the orientation of the magnetic field, a muon
 358 (anti-)neutrino beam is generated via $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$ or $\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu$. The
 359 decay of muons and kaons does result in an irreducible intrinsic electron neutrino
 360 background. In T2K, this background contamination is $O(< 1\%)$ [58]. There is

361 also an approximately $\sim 5\%$ “wrong-sign” neutrino background of $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ generated
 362 via the same decays. As the beam is generated by proton interactions (rather
 363 than anti-proton interactions), the wrong-sign component in the antineutrino
 364 beam is larger when operating in neutrino mode.

365 Tuning the proton energy in the beam and using beam focusing techniques
 366 allows the neutrino energy to be set to a value that maximises the disappear-
 367 ance oscillation probability in the L/E term in Equation 2.10. This means that
 368 accelerator experiments are typically more sensitive to the mixing parameters as
 369 compared to a natural neutrino source. However, the disadvantage compared to
 370 atmospheric neutrino experiments is that the baseline has to be shorter due to
 371 the lower flux. Consequently, there is typically less sensitivity to matter effects
 372 and the ordering of the neutrino mass eigenstates.

373 A neutrino experiment measures

$$R(\vec{x}) = \Phi(E_\nu) \times \sigma(E_\nu) \times \epsilon(\vec{x}) \times P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta), \quad (2.15)$$

374 where $R(\vec{x})$ is the event rate of neutrinos at position \vec{x} , $\Phi(E_\nu)$ is the flux of
 375 neutrinos with energy E_ν , $\sigma(E_\nu)$ is the cross-section of the neutrino interaction and
 376 $\epsilon(\vec{x})$ is the efficiency and resolution of the detector. In order to leverage the most
 377 out of an accelerator neutrino experiment, the flux and cross-section systematics
 378 need to be constrained. This is typically done via the use of a “near detector”,
 379 situated at a baseline of $O(1)\text{km}$. This detector observes the unoscillated neutrino
 380 flux and constrains the parameters used within the flux and cross-section model.

381 The first accelerator experiments to precisely measure oscillation parameters
 382 were MINOS [59] and K2K [60]. These experiments confirmed the ν_μ disappear-
 383 ance seen in atmospheric neutrino experiments by finding consistent parameter
 384 values for $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ and Δm_{23}^2 . The current generation of accelerator neutrino
 385 experiments, T2K and NO ν A extended this field by observing $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$ and
 386 lead the sensitivity to atmospheric mixing parameters as seen in Figure 2.6
 387 [61]. The two experiments differ in their peak neutrino energy, baseline, and
 388 detection technique. The NO ν A experiment is situated at a baseline of 810km

389 from the NuMI beamline which delivers 2GeV neutrinos. The T2K neutrino
 390 beam is peaked around 0.6GeV and propagates 295km. The NO ν A experiment
 391 also uses functionally identical detectors (near and far) which allow the
 392 approximate cancellation of detector systematics whereas T2K uses a plastic
 393 scintillator technique at the near detector and a water Cherenkov far detector.
 394 The future generation experiments DUNE [62] and Hyper-Kamiokande [63]
 395 will succeed these experiments as the high-precision era of neutrino oscillation
 396 parameter measurements develops.

397 Several anomalous results have been observed in the LSND [9] and Mini-
 398 BooNE [10] detectors which were designed with purposefully short baselines.
 399 Parts of the neutrino community attributed these results to oscillations induced
 400 by a fourth “sterile” neutrino [64] but several searches in other experiments,
 401 MicroBooNE [65] and KARMEN [66], found no hints of additional neutrino
 402 species. The solution to the anomalous results is still being determined.

403 2.3.4 Reactor Neutrinos

404 As illustrated in the first discovery of neutrinos (section 2.1), nuclear reactors are
 405 a very useful man-made source of electron antineutrinos. For reactors that use
 406 low-enriched uranium ^{235}U as fuel, the antineutrino flux is dominated by the
 407 β -decay fission of ^{235}U , ^{238}U , ^{239}Pu and ^{241}Pu [67] as illustrated in Figure 2.7.

408 Due to their low energy, reactor electron antineutrinos predominantly interact
 409 via the inverse β -decay (IBD) interaction. The typical signature contains two
 410 signals delayed by $O(200)\mu\text{s}$; firstly the prompt photons from positron annihila-
 411 tion, and secondly the photons emitted ($E_{tot}^\gamma = 2.2\text{MeV}$) from de-excitation after
 412 neutron capture on hydrogen. Searching for both signals improves the detector’s
 413 ability to distinguish between background and signal events [69].

414 There are many short baseline experiments ($L \sim O(1)\text{km}$) that have measured
 415 the $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ and Δm_{23}^2 oscillation parameters. Daya Bay [70], RENO [71] and
 416 Double Chooz [72] have all provided precise measurements, with the first discov-
 417 ery of a non-zero θ_{13} made by Daya Bay and RENO (and complemented by T2K



Figure 2.7: Reactor electron antineutrino fluxes for ^{235}U (Black), ^{238}U (Green), ^{239}Pu (Purple), and ^{241}Pu (Orange) isotopes. The inverse β -decay cross-section (Blue) and corresponding measurable neutrino spectrum (Red) are also given. Top panel: Schematic of Inverse β -decay interaction including the eventual capture of the emitted neutron. This capture emits a γ -ray which provides a second signal of the event. Taken from [68].

[72]). The constraints on $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ by the reactor experiments lead the field and are often used as external inputs to accelerator neutrino experiments to improve their sensitivity to δ_{CP} and mass hierarchy determination. JUNO-TAO [73], a small collaboration within the larger JUNO experiment, is a next-generation reactor experiment that aims to precisely measure the isotopic antineutrino yields from the different fission chains.

Kamland [74] is the only experiment to have observed reactor neutrinos using a long baseline (flux weighted averaged baseline of $L \sim 180\text{km}$) which allows it to have sensitivity to Δm_{12}^2 . Combined with the SK solar neutrino experiment, the combined analysis puts the most stringent constraint on Δm_{12}^2 [75].

2.4 Summary Of Oscillation Parameter Measurements

Since observing the first evidence of neutrino oscillations in the late 1990's, numerous measurements of the mixing parameters have been made. Many experiments use neutrinos as a tool for discovery of new physics (diffuse supernova background, neutrinoless double beta decay and others) so the PMNS parameters are summarised in the Particle Data Group (PDG) review tables. The analysis presented in this thesis focuses on the 2020 T2K oscillation analysis presented in [76] where the 2020 PDG constraints [77] were used. These constraints are outlined in Table 2.1.

Parameter	2020 Constraint
$\sin^2(\theta_{12})$	0.307 ± 0.013
Δm_{21}^2	$(7.53 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$
$\sin^2(\theta_{13})$	$(2.18 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-2}$
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (I.H.)	0.547 ± 0.021
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (N.H.)	0.545 ± 0.021
Δm_{32}^2 (I.H.)	$(-2.546^{+0.034}_{-0.040}) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$
Δm_{32}^2 (N.H.)	$(2.453 \pm 0.034) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$

Table 2.1: The 2020 Particle Data Group constraints of the oscillation parameters taken from [77]. The value of Δm_{23}^2 is given for both normal hierarchy (N.H.) and inverted hierarchy (I.H.) and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is broken down by whether its value is below (Q1) or above (Q2) 0.5.

The $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ measurement stems from the electron antineutrino disappearance, $P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e)$, and is take as the average best-fit from the combination of Daya Bay, Reno and Double Chooz. It is often used as a prior uncertainty within other neutrino oscillation experiments, typically termed the reactor constraint. The $\sin^2(\theta_{12})$ parameter is predominantly measured through electron neutrino disappearance, $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_{\mu,\tau})$, in solar neutrino experiments. The long-baseline reactor neutrino experiment Kamland also has sensitivity to this parameter and is used in a joint fit to solar data from SNO and SK, using the reactor constraint. Measurements of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ are made by long-baseline and atmospheric neutrino experiments. The PDG value is a joint fit of T2K, NO ν A , MINOS and IceCube DeepCore experiments. The latest T2K-only measurement, provided at

448 Neutrino2020 and is the basis of this thesis, is given as $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.546^{+0.024}_{-0.046}$ [76].
 449 The PDG constraint on Δm_{12}^2 is provided by the KamLAND experiment using
 450 solar and geoneutrino data. This measurement utilised a $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ constraint
 451 from accelerator (T2K, MINOS) and reactor neutrino (Daya Bay, RENO, Double
 452 Chooz) experiments. Accelerator measurements make some of the most stringent
 453 constraints on Δm_{23}^2 although atmospheric experiments have more sensitivity
 454 to the mass hierarchy determination. The PDG performs a joint fit of accelerator
 455 and atmospheric data, in both normal and inverted hierarchy separately. The
 456 latest T2K-only result is $\Delta m_{32}^2 = 2.49^{+0.058}_{-0.082} \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ favouring normal hierarchy
 457 [76]. The value of δ_{CP} is largely undetermined. CP-conserving values of 0 and π
 458 were rejected with $\sim 2\sigma$ intervals, as published in Nature, although more recent
 459 analysis have reduced the rejection intervals to 90%. Since the 2020 PDG publi-
 460 cation, there has been a new measurement of $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) = (2.20 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-2}$
 461 [78], alongside updated Δm_{23}^2 and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ measurements.

462 Throughout this thesis, several sample spectra predictions and contours
 463 are presented which require oscillation parameters to be assumed. Table 2.2
 464 defines two sets of oscillation parameters, with “Asimov A” set being close to
 465 the preferred values from a previous T2K-only fit [79] and “Asimov B” being
 466 CP-conserving and further from maximal θ_{23} mixing.

Parameter	Asimov A	Asimov B
Δm_{12}^2	$7.53 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$	
Δm_{32}^2	$2.509 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$	
$\sin^2(\theta_{12})$	0.304	
$\sin^2(\theta_{13})$	0.0219	
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$	0.528	0.45
δ_{CP}	-1.601	0.0

Table 2.2: Reference values of the neutrino oscillation parameters for two different oscillation parameter sets.

3

467

468

T2K and SK Experiment Overview

469 As the successor of the Kamiokande experiment, the Super-Kamiokande (SK)
470 collaboration has been leading atmospheric neutrino oscillation analyses for
471 over two decades. The detector has provided some of the strongest constraints
472 on proton decay and the first precise measurements of the Δm_{23}^2 and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$
473 neutrino oscillation parameters. The history, detection technique, and operation
474 of the SK detector is described in section 3.1.

475 The Tokai-to-Kamioka (T2K) experiment was one of the first long-baseline
476 experiments to use both neutrino and antineutrino beams to precisely measure
477 the charge parity violation within the neutrino sector. The T2K experiment
478 observed the first hints of a non-zero $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ measurement and continues to
479 lead the field with the constraints it provides on $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, Δm_{23}^2 and
480 δ_{CP} . In section 3.2, the techniques that T2K use to generate the neutrino beam and
481 constrain systematic parameter through near detector constraints are described.

482

3.1 The Super-Kamiokande Experiment

483 The SK experiment began taking data in 1996 [80] and has had many modifi-
484 cations throughout its operation. There have been seven defined periods of
485 data taking as noted in Table 3.1. Data taking began in SK-I which ran for five

486 years. Between the SK-I and SK-II periods, approximately 55% of the PMTs were
 487 damaged during maintenance [81]. Those that survived were equally distributed
 488 throughout the detector in the SK-II era, which resulted in a reduced 19% photo-
 489 coverage. From SK-III onwards, repairs to the detector meant the full suite of
 490 PMTs was operational recovering the 40% photocoverage. Before the start of
 491 SK-IV, the data acquisition and electronic systems were upgraded. Between
 492 SK-IV and SK-V, a significant effort was placed into tank open maintenance
 493 and repair/replacement of defective PMTs, a task for which the author of this
 494 thesis was required. Consequently, the detector conditions were significantly
 495 different between the two operational periods. SK-VI marked the start of the
 496 SK-Gd era, with the detector being doped with gadolinium at a concentration
 497 of 0.01%. SK-VII, which started during the writing of this thesis, has increased
 498 the gadolinium concentration to 0.03% for continued operation [82].

499 The oscillation analysis presented within this thesis focuses on the SK-IV
 500 period of running and the data taking within it. This follows from the recent
 501 SK analysis presented in [83]. Therefore, the information presented within this
 502 section focuses on that period.

Period	Start Date	End Date	Live-time (days)
I	April 1996	July 2001	1489.19
II	October 2002	October 2005	798.59
III	July 2006	September 2008	518.08
IV	September 2008	May 2018	3244.4
V	January 2019	July 2020	461.02
VI	July 2020	May 2022	583.3
VII	May 2022	Ongoing	N/A

Table 3.1: The various SK periods and respective live-time. The SK-VI live-time is calculated until 1st April 2022. SK-VII started during the writing of this thesis.

503 3.1.1 The SK Detector

504 The basic structure of the Super-Kamiokande (SK) detector is a cylindrical tank
 505 with a diameter 39.3m and height 41.1m filled with ultrapure water [81]. A
 506 diagram of the significant components of the SK detector is given in Figure 3.1.

507 The SK detector is situated in the Kamioka mine in Gifu, Japan. The mine
 508 is underground with roughly 1km rock overburden (2.7km water equivalent
 509 overburden) [84]. At this depth, the rate of cosmic ray muons is significantly
 510 decreased to a value of $\sim 2\text{Hz}$. The top of the tank is covered with stainless
 511 steel which is designed as a working platform for maintenance, calibration, and
 512 location for high voltage and data acquisition electronics.



Figure 3.1: A schematic diagram of the Super-Kamiokande Detector. Taken from [85].

513 A smaller cylindrical structure (36.2m diameter, 33.8m height) is situated
 514 inside the tank, with an approximate 2m gap between this structure and the outer
 515 tank wall. The purpose of this structure is to support the photomultiplier tubes
 516 (PMTs). The volume inside and outside the support structure is referred to as the
 517 inner detector (ID) and outer detector (OD), respectively. In the SK-IV era, the
 518 ID and OD are instrumented by 11,129 50cm and 1,885 20cm PMTs respectively
 519 [81]. The ID contains a 32kton mass of water. Many analyses performed at SK
 520 use a “fiducial volume” defined by the volume of water inside the ID excluding
 521 some distance to the ID wall. This reduces the volume of the detector which is
 522 sensitive to neutrino events but reduces radioactive backgrounds and allows for

523 better reconstruction performance. The nominal fiducial volume is defined as the
524 area contained inside 2m from the ID wall for a total of 22.5kton water [86].

525 The two regions of the detector (ID and OD) are optically separated with
526 opaque black plastic hung from the support structure. The purpose of this is
527 to determine whether an event entered or exited the ID. This allows cosmic ray
528 muons and partially contained events to be tagged and separated from neutrino
529 events entirely contained within the ID. This black plastic is also used to cover
530 the area between the ID PMTs to reduce photon reflection from the ID walls.
531 Opposite to this, the OD is lined with a reflective material to allow photons to
532 reflect around inside the OD until collected by one of the PMTs. Furthermore,
533 each OD PMT is optically coupled with $50 \times 50\text{cm}$ plates of wavelength shifting
534 acrylic which increases the efficiency of light collection [84].

535 In the SK-IV data-taking period, the photocathode coverage of the detector, or
536 the fraction of the ID wall instrumented with PMTs, is $\sim 40\%$ [84]. The PMTs have
537 a quantum efficiency (the ratio of detected electrons to incident photons) of $\sim 21\%$
538 for photons with wavelengths of $360\text{nm} < \lambda < 390\text{nm}$ [87]. The proportion of
539 photoelectrons that produce a signal in the dynode of a PMT, termed the collection
540 efficiency, is $> 70\%$ [84]. The PMTs used within SK are most sensitive to photons
541 with wavelength $300\text{nm} \leq \lambda \leq 600\text{nm}$ [84]. One disadvantage of using PMTs as
542 the detection media is that the Earth's geomagnetic field can modify its response.
543 Therefore, a set of compensation coils is built around the inner surface of the
544 detector to mitigate this effect [88].

545 As mentioned, the SK detector is filled with ultrapure water, which in a perfect
546 world would contain no impurities. However, bacteria and organic compounds
547 can significantly degrade the water quality. This decreases the attenuation length,
548 which reduces the total number of photons that hit a PMT. To combat this, a
549 sophisticated water treatment system has been developed [84, 89]. UV lights,
550 mechanical filters, and membrane degasifiers are used to reduce the bacteria,
551 suspended particulates, and radioactive materials from the water. The flow of
552 water within the tank is also critical as it can remove stagnant bacterial growth

553 or build-up of dust on the surfaces within the tank. Gravity drifts impurities in
554 the water towards the bottom of the tank which, if left uncontrolled, can create
555 asymmetric water conditions between the top and bottom of the tank. Typically,
556 the water entering the tank is cooled below the ambient temperature of the tank
557 to control convection and inhibit bacteria growth. Furthermore, the rate of dark
558 noise hits within PMTs is sensitive to the PMT temperature [90] so controlling
559 the temperature gradients within the tank is beneficial for stable measurements.

560 SK-VI is the first phase of the SK experiment to use gadolinium dopants
561 within the ultrapure water [82]. As such, the SK water system had to be replaced
562 to avoid removing the gadolinium concentrate from the ultrapure water [91]. For
563 an inverse β -decay (IBD) interaction in a water target, the emitted neutron is
564 thermally captured on hydrogen. This process releases 2.2MeV γ ray which are
565 difficult to detect as the resulting Compton scattered electrons are very close to the
566 Cherenkov threshold, limiting detection capability. Thermal capture of neutrons
567 on gadolinium generates γ rays with higher energy (8MeV [69]) meaning they
568 are more easily detected and reconstructed. SK-VI has 0.01% Gd loading (0.02%
569 gadolinium sulphate by mass) which causes \approx 50% of neutrons emitted by IBD to
570 be captured on gadolinium[92, 93] . Whilst predominantly useful for low energy
571 analyses, Gd loading allows better $\nu/\bar{\nu}$ separation for atmospheric neutrino
572 event selections [94]. Efforts are currently in place to increase the gadolinium
573 concentrate to 0.03% for \approx 75% neutron capture efficiency on gadolinium [95].
574 The final stage of loading targets 0.1% concentrate targeting \approx 90% neutron
575 capture efficiency on gadolinium.

576 3.1.2 Calibration

577 The calibration of the SK detector is documented in [81] and summarised below.
578 The analysis presented within this thesis is dependent upon ‘high energy events’
579 (Charged particles with $O(> 100)$ MeV momenta). These are events that are
580 expected to generate a larger number of photons such that each PMT will
581 be hit with multiple photons. The reconstruction of these events depends

upon the charge deposited within each PMT and the timing response of each individual PMT. Therefore, the most relevant calibration techniques to this thesis are outlined.

Before installation, 420 PMTs were calibrated to have identical charge responses and then distributed throughout the tank in a cross-shape pattern (As illustrated by Figure 3.2). These are used as a standardised measure for the rest of the PMTs installed at similar geometric positions within SK to be calibrated against. To perform this calibration, a xenon lamp is located at the centre of the SK tank which flashes uniform light at 1Hz. This allows for geometrical effects, water quality variation, and timing effects to be measured in-situ throughout normal data-taking periods.



Figure 3.2: The location of “standard PMTs” (red) inside the SK detector. Taken from [81].

When specifically performing calibration of the detector (in out-of-data taking mode), the water in the tank was circulated to avoid top/bottom asymmetric water quality. Any non-uniformity within the tank significantly affects the PMT hit probability through scattering or absorption. This becomes a dominant effect for the very low-intensity light sources discussed later which are designed such that only one photon is incident upon a given PMT.

599 The “gain” of a PMT is defined as the ratio of the total charge of the signal
 600 produced compared to the charge of photoelectrons emitted by the photocathodes
 601 within the PMT. To calibrate the signal of each PMT, the “relative” and “absolute”
 602 gain values are measured. The relative gain is the variation of gain among each
 603 of the PMTs whereas the absolute gain is the average gain of all PMTs.

604 The relative gain is calibrated as follows. A laser is used to generate two
 605 measurements: a high-intensity flash that illuminates every PMT with a sufficient
 606 number of photons, and a low-intensity flash in which only a small number
 607 of PMTs collect light. The first measurement creates an average charge, $Q_{obs}(i)$
 608 on PMT i , whereas the second measurement ensures that each hit PMT only
 609 generates a single photoelectron. For the low-intensity measurement, the number
 610 of times each PMT records a charge larger than 1/4 photoelectrons, $N_{obs}(i)$, is
 611 counted. The values measured can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{obs}(i) &\propto I_H \times f(i) \times \epsilon(i) \times G(i), \\ N_{obs}(i) &\propto I_L \times f(i) \times \epsilon(i), \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

612 Where I_H and I_L is the intensity of the high and low flashes, $f(i)$ is the
 613 acceptance efficiency of the i^{th} PMT, $\epsilon(i)$ is the product of the quantum and
 614 collection efficiency of the i^{th} PMT and $G(i)$ is the gain of the i^{th} PMT. The
 615 relative gain for each PMT can determined by taking the ratio of these quantities.

616 The absolute gain calibration is performed by observing fixed energy γ -rays
 617 of $E_\gamma \sim 9\text{MeV}$ emitted isotropically from neutron capture on a NiCf source
 618 situated at the centre of the detector. This generates a photon yield of about 0.004
 619 photoelectrons/PMT/event, meaning that $> 99\%$ of PMT signals are generated
 620 from single photoelectrons. A charge distribution is generated by performing
 621 this calibration over all PMTs, and the average value of this distribution is taken
 622 to be the absolute gain value.

623 As mentioned in subsection 3.1.1, the average quantum and collection effi-
 624 ciency for the SK detector PMTs is $\sim 21\%$ and $> 70\%$ respectively. However,
 625 these values do differ between each PMT and need to be calibrated accordingly.

626 Consequently, the NiCf source is also used to calibrate the “quantum \times collection”
627 efficiency (denoted “QE”) value of each PMT. The NiCf low-intensity source is
628 used as the PMT hit probability is proportional to the QE ($N_{obs}(i) \propto \epsilon(i)$ in
629 Equation 3.1). A Monte Carlo prediction which includes photon absorption,
630 scattering, and reflection is made to estimate the number of photons incident on
631 each PMT and the ratio of the number of predicted to observed hits is calculated.
632 The difference is attributed to the QE efficiency of that PMT. This technique is
633 extended to calculate the relative QE efficiency by normalizing the average of
634 all PMTs which removes the dependence on the light intensity.

635 Due to differing cable lengths and readout electronics, the timing response
636 between a photon hitting the PMT and the signal being captured by the data
637 acquisition can be different between each PMT. Due to threshold triggers (De-
638 scribed in subsection 3.1.3), the time at which a pulse reaches a threshold is
639 dependent upon the size of the pulse. This is known as the ‘time-walk’ effect
640 and also needs to be accounted for in each PMT. To calibrate the timing response,
641 a pulse of light with width 0.2ns is emitted into the detector through a diffuser.
642 Two-dimensional distributions of time and pulse height (or charge) are made
643 for each PMT and are used to calibrate the timing response. This is performed
644 in-situ during data taking with the light source pulsing at 0.03Hz.

645 The top/bottom water quality asymmetry is measured using the NiCf calibra-
646 tion data and cross-referencing these results to the “standard PMTs”. The water
647 attenuation length is continuously measured by the rate of vertically-downgoing
648 cosmic-ray muons which enter via the top of the tank.

649 Dark noise is where a PMT registers a pulse that is consistent with a single
650 photoelectron emitted from photon detection despite the PMT being in complete
651 darkness. This is predominately caused by two processes. Firstly there is
652 intrinsic dark noise which is where photoelectrons gain enough thermal energy
653 to be emitted from the photocathode, and secondly, the radioactive decay of
654 contaminants inside the structure of the PMT. Typical dark noise rate for PMTs
655 used within SK are $O(3)\text{kHz}$ [84]. This is lower than the expected number of

656 photons generated for a ‘high energy event’ (As described in subsection 3.1.4)
657 but instability in this value can cause biases in reconstruction. Dark noise is
658 related to the gain of a PMT and is calibrated using hits inside a time window
659 recorded before an event trigger [96].

660 3.1.3 Data Acquisition and Triggering

661 As the analysis presented in this thesis only uses the SK-IV period of the SK
662 experiment so this subsection focuses on the relevant points of the data acqui-
663 sition and triggering systems to that SK period. The earlier data acquisition and
664 triggering systems are documented in [97, 98].

665 Before the SK-IV period started, the existing front-end electronics were re-
666 placed with “QTC-Based Electrons with Ethernet, QBEE” systems [99]. When the
667 QBEE observes a signal above a 1/4 photoelectron threshold, the charge-to-time
668 (QTC) converter generates a rectangular pulse. The start of the rectangular pulse
669 indicates the time at which the analog photoelectron signal was received and the
670 width of the pulse indicates the total charge integrated throughout the signal.
671 This is then digitized by time-to-digital converters and sent to the “front-end”
672 PCs. The digitized signal from every QBEE is then chronologically ordered and
673 sent to the “merger” PCs. It is the merger PCs that apply the software trigger.
674 Any triggered events are passed to the “organizer” PC. This sorts the data stream
675 of multiple merger PCs into chronologically ordered events which are then saved
676 to disk. The schematic of data flow from PMTs to disk is illustrated in Figure 3.3.

677 The software trigger (described in [101]) operates by determining the number
678 of PMT hits within a 200ns sliding window, N_{200} . This window coincides with
679 the maximum time that a Cherenkov photon would take to traverse the length
680 of the SK tank [98]. For lower energy events that generate fewer photons, this
681 technique is useful for eliminating background processes like dark noise and
682 radioactive decay which would be expected to separate in time. When the value
683 of N_{200} exceeds some threshold, a software trigger is issued. There are several
684 trigger thresholds used within the SK-IV period which are detailed in Table 3.2.




Figure 3.3: Schematic view of the data flow through the data acquisition and online system. Taken from [100].

685 If one of these thresholds is met, the PMT hits within an extended time window
 686 are also read out and saved to disk. In the special case of an event that exceeds
 687 the SHE trigger but does not exceed the OD trigger, the AFT trigger looks for
 688 delayed coincidences of 2.2MeV gamma rays emitted from neutron capture in
 689 a $535\mu\text{s}$ window after the SHE trigger. A similar but more complex “Wideband
 690 Intelligent Trigger (WIT)” has been deployed and is described in [102].

Trigger	Acronym	Condition	Extended time window (μs)
Super Low Energy	SLE	>34/31 hits	1.3
Low Energy	LE	>47 hits	40
High Energy	HE	>50 hits	40
Super High Energy	SHE	>70/58 hits	40
Outer Detector	OD	>22 hits in OD	N/A

Table 3.2: The trigger thresholds and extended time windows saved around an event which were utilised throughout the SK-IV period. The exact thresholds can change and the values listed here represent the thresholds at the start and end of the SK-IV period.

3.1.4 Cherenkov Radiation

692 Cherenkov light is emitted from any highly energetic charged particle traveling
 693 with relativistic velocity, β , greater than the local speed of light in a medium [103].

694 Cherenkov light is formed at the surface of a cone with characteristic pitch angle,

$$\cos(\theta) = \frac{1}{\beta n}. \quad (3.2)$$

695 where n is the refractive index of the medium. Consequently, the Cherenkov
 696 momentum threshold, P_{thres} , is dependent upon the mass, m , of the charged
 697 particle moving through the medium,

$$P_{thres} = \frac{m}{\sqrt{n^2 - 1}} \quad (3.3)$$

698 For water, where $n = 1.33$, the Cherenkov threshold momentum and energy
 699 for various particles are given in Table 3.3. In contrast, γ -rays are detected
 700 indirectly via the combination of photons generated by Compton scattering
 701 and pair production. The threshold for detection in the SK detector is typically
 702 higher than the threshold for photon production. This is due to the fact that the
 703 attenuation of photons in the water means that typically $\sim 75\%$ of Cherenkov
 704 photons reach the ID PMTs. Then the collection and quantum efficiencies
 705 described in subsection 3.1.1 result in the number of detected photons being
 706 lower than the number of photons which reach the PMTs.

Particle	Threshold Momentum (MeV)	Threshold Energy (MeV)
Electron	0.5828	0.7751
Muon	120.5	160.3
Pion	159.2	211.7
Proton	1070.0	1423.1

Table 3.3: The threshold momentum and energy for a particle to generate Cherenkov light in ultrapure water, as calculated in Equation 3.2 in ultrapure water which has refractive index $n = 1.33$.

707 The Frank-Tamm equation [104] describes the relationship between the num-
 708 ber of Cherenkov photons generated per unit length, dN/dx , the wavelength of
 709 the photons generated, λ , and the relativistic velocity of the charged particle,

$$\frac{d^2N}{dxd\lambda} = 2\pi\alpha \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^2\beta^2}\right) \frac{1}{\lambda^2}. \quad (3.4)$$

710 where α is the fine structure constant. For a 100MeV momentum electron,
 711 approximately 330 photons will be produced per centimeter in the $300\text{nm} \leq \lambda \leq$
 712 700nm region which the ID PMTs are most sensitive to [84].

713 3.2 The Tokai to Kamioka Experiment

714 The Tokai to Kamioka (T2K) experiment is a long-baseline neutrino oscillation
 715 experiment located in Japan. Proposed in the early 2000s [105, 106] to replace
 716 K2K [107], T2K was designed to observe electron neutrino appearance whilst
 717 precisely measuring the oscillation parameters associated with muon neutrino
 718 disappearance [108]. The experiment consists of a neutrino beam generated
 719 at the Japan Proton Accelerator Research Complex (J-PARC), a suite of near
 720 detectors situated 280m from the beam target, and the Super Kamiokande far
 721 detector positioned at a 295km baseline. The cross-section view of the T2K
 722 experiment is drawn in Figure 3.4.




Figure 3.4: The cross-section view of the Tokai to Kamioka experiment illustrating the beam generation facility at J-PARC, the near detector situated at a baseline of 280m and the Super Kamiokande far detector situated 295km from the beam target.

723 The T2K collaboration makes world-leading measurements of the $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$
 724 , Δm_{23}^2 , and δ_{CP} oscillation parameters. Improvements in the precision and
 725 accuracy of parameter estimates are still being made by including new data
 726 samples and developing the models which describe the neutrino interactions
 727 and detector responses [109]. Electron neutrino appearance was first observed
 728 at T2K in 2014 [110] with 7.3σ significance.

The near detectors provide constraints on the beam flux and cross-section model parameters used within the oscillation analysis by observing the unoscillated neutrino beam. There are a host of detectors situated in the near detector hall (As illustrated in Figure 3.5): ND280 (subsection 3.2.2), INGRID (subsection 3.2.3), NINJA [111], WAGASCI [112], and Baby-MIND [113]. The latter three are not currently used within the oscillation analysis presented within this thesis.




Figure 3.5: The near detector suite for the T2K experiment showing the ND280 and INGRID detectors. The distance between the detectors and the beam target is 280m.

Whilst this thesis presents the ND280 in terms of its purpose for the oscillation analysis, the detector can also make many cross-section measurements at neutrino energies of $O(1)$ GeV for the different targets within the detector [114, 115]. These measurements are of equal importance as they can lead the way in determining the model parameters used in the interaction models for the future high-precision era of neutrino physics.

There are two independent fitters, MaCh3 and BANFF, which perform the near detector fit. MaCh3 is the basis of this analysis and uses a bayesian Markov

743 Chain Monte Carlo fitting technique, whereas BANFF uses a frequentist gradient
744 descent technique. The output of each fitter is converted into a covariance
745 matrix to describe the error and correlations between all the flux and cross-
746 section parameters. This is then propagated to the far-detector oscillation analysis
747 group for use in the P-Theta and VALOR fitting framework. As MaCh3 can handle
748 both near and far detector samples, it does not use this covariance matrix and
749 instead opts for a simultaneous fit of the two detector measurements. This is an
750 analysis choice which removes the assumption of Gaussian posterior distributions
751 required when building the post-fit covariance matrix.


752 DB: MaCh3 vs PTheta and Valor

753 There are three particular tunes of the T2K flux and low energy cross section
754 model typically considered. Firstly, the “generated” tune which is the set of
755 dial values with which the Monte Carlo was generated. Secondly, the set of dial
756 values which are taken from external data measurements and used as inputs.
757 These are the “pre-fit” dial values. The reason these two sets of dial values are
758 different is that the external data measurements are continually updated but it
759 is very computationally intensive to regenerate a Monte Carlo prediction after
760 each update. The final tune is the “post-fit”, “post-ND fit” or “post-BANFF” dial
761 values. These are the values taken from the fit to the beam near detector data.

762 3.2.1 The Neutrino Beam

763 The neutrino beam used within the T2K experiment is described in [58, 116]
764 and summarised below. The accelerating facility at J-PARC is composed of two
765 sections; the primary and secondary beamlines. Figure 3.6 illustrates a schematic
766 of the beamline, focusing mostly on the components of the secondary beamline.
767 The primary beamline has three accelerators that progressively accelerate pro-
768 tons; a linear accelerator, a rapid-cycling synchrotron, and the main-ring (MR)
769 synchrotron. Once fully accelerated by the MR, the protons have a kinetic energy
770 of 30GeV. Eight bunches of these protons, separated by 500ns, are extracted
771 per “spill” from the MR and directed towards a graphite target (a rod of length

⁷⁷² 91.4cm and diameter 2.6cm). Spills are extracted at 0.5Hz with $\sim 3 \times 10^{14}$
⁷⁷³ protons contained per spill.



(a) Primary and secondary beamline



(b) Secondary beamline

Figure 3.6: Top panel: Bird's eye view of the most relevant part of primary and secondary beamline used within the T2K experiment. The primary beamline is the main-ring proton synchrotron, kicker magnet, and graphite target. The secondary beamline consists of the three focusing horns, decay volume, and beam dump. Figure taken from [116]. Bottom panel: The side-view of the secondary beamline including the focusing horns, beam dump and neutrino detectors. Figure taken from [117].

⁷⁷⁴ The secondary beamline consists of three main components: the target station,
⁷⁷⁵ the decay volume, and the beam dump. The target station is comprised of the
⁷⁷⁶ target, beam monitors, and three magnetic focusing horns. The proton beam
⁷⁷⁷ interacts with the graphite target to form a secondary beam of mostly pions
⁷⁷⁸ and kaons. The secondary beam travels through a 96m long decay volume,
⁷⁷⁹ generating neutrinos through the following decays [58],

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu & \pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu \\
K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu & K^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu \\
\rightarrow \pi^0 + e^+ + \nu_e & \rightarrow \pi^0 + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e \\
\rightarrow \pi^0 + \mu^+ + \nu_\mu & \rightarrow \pi^0 + \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu \\
K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^- + e^+ + \nu_e & K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e \\
\rightarrow \pi^- + \mu^+ + \nu_\mu & \rightarrow \pi^+ + \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu \\
\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_e & \mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_e
\end{array}$$

780 The electrically charged component of the secondary beam is focused towards
 781 the far detector by the three magnetic horns. These horns direct charged particles
 782 of a particular polarity towards SK whilst defocusing the oppositely charged
 783 particles. This allows a mostly neutrino or mostly antineutrino beam to be used
 784 within the experiment, denoted as “forward horn current (FHC)” or “reverse
 785 horn current (RHC)” respectively.

787 Figure 3.7 illustrates the different contributions to the FHC and RHC neutrino
 788 flux. The low energy flux is dominated by the decay of pions whereas kaon
 789 decay becomes the dominant source of neutrinos for $E_\nu > 3\text{GeV}$. The “wrong-
 790 sign” component, which is the $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ background in a ν_μ beam, and the intrinsic
 791 irreducible ν_e background, are predominantly due to muon decay for $E_\nu <$
 792 2GeV . As the antineutrino production cross-section is smaller than the neutrino
 793 cross-section, the wrong-sign component is more dominant in the RHC beam
 794 as compared to that in the FHC beam.

795 The beam dump, situated at the end of the decay volume, stops all charged
 796 particles other than highly energetic muons ($p_\mu > 5\text{GeV}$). The MuMon detector
 797 monitors the penetrating muons to determine the beam direction and inten-
 798 sity which is used to constrain some of the beam flux systematics within the
 799 analysis [117, 119].

800 The T2K experiment uses an off-axis beam to narrow the neutrino energy
 801 distribution. This was the first implementation of this technique in a long-
 802 baseline neutrino oscillation experiment after its original proposal [120]. Pion
 803 decay, $\pi \rightarrow \mu + \nu_\mu$, is a two-body decay. Consequently, the neutrino energy,




Figure 3.7: The Monte Carlo prediction of the energy spectrum for each flavour of neutrino (ν_e , $\bar{\nu}_e$, ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$) in the neutrino dominated beam FHC mode (Left) and antineutrino dominated beam RHC mode (Right) expected at SK. Taken from [118].

804 E_ν , can be determined based on the pion energy, E_π , and the angle at which
 805 the neutrino is emitted, θ ,

$$E_\nu = \frac{m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2}{2(E_\pi - p_\pi \cos(\theta))}, \quad (3.5)$$

806 where m_π and m_μ are the mass of the pion and muon respectively. For a fixed
 807 energy pion, the neutrino energy distribution is dependent upon the angle at
 808 which the neutrinos are observed from the initial pion beam direction. For the
 809 295km baseline at T2K, $E_\nu = 0.6\text{GeV}$ maximises the electron neutrino appearance
 810 probability, $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$, whilst minimising the muon disappearance probability,
 811 $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$. Figure 3.8 illustrates the neutrino energy distribution for a range of
 812 off-axis angles, as well as the oscillation probabilities most relevant to T2K.

813 3.2.2 The Near Detector at 280m

814 Whilst all the near detectors are situated in the same “pit” located at 280m from
 815 the beamline, the “ND280” detector is the off-axis detector which is situated at
 816 the same off-axis angle as the Super-Kamiokande far detector. It has two primary
 817 functions; firstly it measures the neutrino flux and secondly it counts the event
 818 rates of different types of neutrino interactions. Both of these constrain the flux



Figure 3.8: Top panel: T2K muon neutrino disappearance probability as a function of neutrino energy. Middle panel: T2K electron neutrino appearance probability as a function of neutrino energy. Bottom panel: The neutrino flux distribution for three different off-axis angles (Arbitrary units) as a function of neutrino energy.

and cross-section systematics invoked within the model for a more accurate prediction of the expected event rate at the far detector.

As illustrated in Figure 3.9, the ND280 detector consists of several sub-detectors. The most important part of the detector for this analysis is the tracker region. This is comprised of two time projection chambers (TPCs) sandwiched between three fine grain detectors (FGDs). The FGDs contain both hydrocarbon plastics and water targets for neutrino interactions and provide track reconstruction near the interaction vertex. The emitted charged particles can then propagate into the TPCs which provide particle identification and momentum reconstruction. The FGDs and TPCs are further described in subsubsection 3.2.2.1 and subsubsection 3.2.2.2 respectively. The electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL)




Figure 3.9: The components of the ND280 detector. The neutrino beam travels from left to right. Taken from [116].

encapsulates the tracker region alongside the π^0 detector (P0D). The ECAL measures the deposited energy from photons emitted from interactions within the FGD. The P0D constrains the cross-section of neutral current interactions which generate neutral pions, which is one of the largest backgrounds in the electron neutrino appearance oscillation channel. The P0D and ECAL detectors are detailed in subsubsection 3.2.2.3 and subsubsection 3.2.2.4 respectively. The entire detector is located within a large yoke magnet which produces a 0.2T magnetic field. This design of the magnet also includes a scintillating detector called the side muon range detector (SMRD) which is used to track high-angle muons as well as acting as a cosmic veto. The SMRD is described in subsubsection 3.2.2.5.

3.2.2.1 Fine Grained Detectors

The T2K tracker region is comprised of two fine grained detectors (FGD) and three Time Projection Chambers (TPC). A detailed description of the FGD design, construction, and assembly is found in [121] and summarised below. The FGDS are the primary target for neutrino interactions with a mass of 1.1 tonnes per FGD.

845 Alongside this, the FGDs are designed to be able to track short-range particles
846 which do not exit the FGD. Typically, short-range particles are low momentum
847 and are observed as tracks that deposit a large amount of energy per unit length.
848 This means the FGD needs good granularity to resolve these particles. The
849 FGDs have the best timing resolution ($\sim 3\text{ns}$) of any of the sub-detectors of the
850 ND280 detector. As such, the FGDs are used for time of flight measurements
851 to distinguish forward going positively charged particles from backward going
852 negatively charged particles. Finally, any tracks which pass through multiple
853 sub-detectors are required to be track matched to the FGD.

854 Both FGDs are made from square scintillator planes of side length 186cm and
855 width 2.02cm. Each plane consists of two layers of 192 scintillator bars in an
856 X or Y orientation. A wavelength shifting fiber is threaded through the centre
857 of each bar and is read out by a multi-pixel photon counter (MPPC). FGD1 is
858 the most upstream of the two FGDs and contains 15 planes of carbon plastic
859 scintillator which is a common target in external neutrino scattering data. As
860 the far detector is a pure water target, 7 of the 15 scintillator planes in FGD2
861 have been replaced with a hybrid water-scintillator target. Due to the complexity
862 of the nucleus, nuclear effects can not be extrapolated between different nuclei.
863 Therefore having the ability to take data on one target which is the same as
864 external data and another target which is the same as the far detector target is
865 beneficial for reliable model parameter estimates.

866 The integrated deposited energy is used for particle identification. The FGD
867 can distinguish protons from other charged particles by comparing the integrated
868 deposited energy from data to Monte Carlo prediction as seen in Figure 3.10.

869 3.2.2.2 Time Projection Chambers

870 The majority of particle identification and momentum measurements within
871 ND280 are provided by three Time Projection Chambers (TPCs) [122]. The
872 TPCs are located on either side of the FGDs. They are located inside of the




Figure 3.10: Comparison of data to Monte Carlo prediction of integrated deposited energy as a function of track length for particles that stopped in FGD1. Taken from [121].

873 magnetic field meaning the momentum of a charged particle can be determined
874 from the bending of the track.

875 Each TPC module consists of two gas-tight boxes, as shown in Figure 3.11,
876 which are made of non-magnetic material. The outer box is filled with CO₂ which
877 acts as an electrical insulator between the inner box and the ground. The inner box
878 forms the field cage which produces a uniform electric drift field of $\sim 275\text{V/cm}$
879 and is filled with an argon gas mixture. Charged particles moving through this
880 gas mixture ionize the gas and the ionised charge is drifted towards micromegas
881 detectors which measure the ionization charge. The time and position information
882 in the readout allows a three-dimensional image of the neutrino interaction.

883 The particle identification of tracks that pass through the TPCs is performed
884 using dE/dx measurements. Figure 3.12 illustrates the data to Monte Carlo
885 distributions of the energy lost by a charged particle passing through the TPC as
886 a function of the reconstructed particle momentum. The resolution is $7.8 \pm 0.2\%$
887 meaning that electrons and muons can be distinguished. This allows reliable
888 measurements of the intrinsic ν_e component of the beam.

889 3.2.2.3 π^0 Detector

890 If one of the γ -rays from a $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ decay is missed at the far detector, the
891 reconstruction will determine that event to be a charge current ν_e -like event.



Figure 3.11: Schematic design of a Time Projection Chamber detector. Taken from [122].




Figure 3.12: The distribution of energy loss as a function of reconstructed momentum for charged particles passing through the TPC, comparing data to Monte Carlo prediction. Taken from [122].

This is one of the main backgrounds hindering the electron neutrino appearance searches. The π^0 detector (P0D) measures the cross-section of the neutral current induced neutral pion production on a water target to constrain this background.

The P0D is a cube of approximately 2.5m length consisting of layers of scintillating bars, brass and lead sheets, and water bags as illustrated in Figure 3.13. Two electromagnetic calorimeters are positioned at the most upstream and most downstream position in the sub-detector and the water target is situated in between them. The scintillator layers are built from two triangular bars orientated in opposite directions to form a rectangular layer. Each triangular scintillator bar is threaded with optical fiber which is read out by MPPCs. The high-Z brass and

902 lead regions produce electron showers from the photons emitted in π^0 decay.




Figure 3.13: A schematic of the P0D side-view. Taken from [123].

903 The sub-detector can generate measurements of NC1 π^0 cross-sections on a
 904 water target by measuring the event rate both with and without the water target,
 905 with the cross-section on a water target being determined as the difference. The to-
 906 tal active mass is 16.1 tonnes when filled with water and 13.3 tonnes when empty.

907 3.2.2.4 Electromagnetic Calorimeter

908 The electromagnetic calorimeter [124] (ECal) encapsulates the P0D and tracking
 909 sub-detectors. Its primary purpose is to aid π^0 reconstruction from any interac-
 910 tion in the tracker. To do this, it measures the energy and direction of photon
 911 showers from $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ decay. It can also distinguish pion and muon tracks
 912 depending on the shape of the photon shower deposited.

913 The ECal is comprised of three sections; the P0D ECal which surrounds the
 914 P0D, the barrel ECal which encompasses the tracking region, and the downstream
 915 ECal which is situated downstream of the tracker region. The barrel and down-
 916 stream ECals are tracking calorimeters that focus on electromagnetic showers

from high-angle particles emitted from the tracking sub-detectors. Particularly in the TPC, high-angle tracks (those which travel perpendicularly to the beam-axis) can travel along a single scintillator bar resulting in very few hits. The width of the barrel and downstream ECal corresponds to ~ 11 electron radiation lengths to ensure a significant amount of the π^0 energy is contained. As the P0D has its own calorimetry which reconstructs showers, the P0D ECal determines the energy which escapes the P0D.

Each ECal is constructed of multiple layers of scintillating bars sandwiched between lead sheets. The scintillating bars are threaded with optical fiber and read out by MPPCs. Each sequential layer of the scintillator is orientated perpendicular to the previous which allows a three dimensional event reconstruction. The target mass of the P0D ECal, barrel ECal, and downstream ECal are 1.50, 4.80 and 6.62 tonnes respectively.

3.2.2.5 Side Muon Range Detector

As illustrated in Figure 3.9, the ECal, FGDs, P0D, and TPCs are enclosed within the UA1 magnet. Originally designed for the NOMAD [125] experiment and reconditioned for use in the T2K experiment [126], the UA1 magnet provides a uniform horizontal magnetic field of 0.2T with an uncertainty of 2×10^{-4} T.

Built into the UA1 magnet, the side muon range detector (SMRD)[127] monitors high-energy muons which leave the tracking region and permeate through the ECal. It additionally acts as a cosmic muon veto and trigger.

3.2.3 The Interactive Neutrino GRID

The Interactive Neutrino GRID (INGRID) detector is situated within the same “pit” as the other near detectors. It is aligned with the beam in the “on-axis” position and measures the beam direction, spread, and intensity. The detector was originally designed with 16 identical modules [116] (two modules have since been decommissioned) and a “proton” module. The design of the detector is cross-shaped with length and height 10m \times 10m as illustrated in Figure 3.14.

945 Each module is composed of iron sheets interlaced with eleven tracking
 946 scintillator planes for a total target mass of 7.1 tonnes per module. The scintillator
 947 design is an X-Y pattern of 24 bars in both orientations, where each bar contains
 948 wave-length shifting fibers which are connected to multi-pixel photon counters
 949 (MPPCs). Each module is encapsulated inside veto planes to aid the rejection
 950 of charged particles entering the module.

951 The proton module is different from the other modules in that it consists
 952 of entirely scintillator planes with no iron target. The scintillator bars are also
 953 smaller than those used in the other modules to increase the granularity of
 954 the detector and improve tracking capabilities. The module sits in the centre
 955 of the beamline and is designed to give precise measurements of quasi-elastic
 956 charged current interactions to evaluate the performance of the Monte Carlo
 957 simulation of the beamline.




Figure 3.14: Left panel: The Interactive Neutrino GRID on-axis Detector. 14 modules are arranged in a cross-shape configuration, with the centre modules being directly aligned with the on-axis beam. Right panel: The layout of a single module of the INGRID detector. Both figures are recreated from [116].

958 The INGRID detector can measure the beam direction to an uncertainty of
 959 0.4mrad and the beam centre within a resolution of 10cm [116]. The beam
 960 direction in both the vertical and horizontal directions is discussed in [128]

⁹⁶¹ and it is found to be in good agreement with the MUMON monitor described
⁹⁶² in subsection 3.2.1.

4

963

964

965

Bayesian Statistics and Markov Chain Monte Carlo Techniques

966 This thesis presents a Bayesian oscillation analysis. To extract the oscillation
967 parameters, a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method is used. This chapter
968 explains the theory of how parameter estimates can be determined using this
969 technique and condenses the material found in the literature [129–132].

970 The oscillation parameter determination presented within this thesis is built
971 upon a simultaneous fit to neutrino beam data in the near detector, beam data at
972 SK and atmospheric data at SK. In total, there are four oscillation parameters of in-
973 terest ($\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, Δm_{23}^2 , and δ_{CP}), two oscillation parameters to which
974 this study will not be sensitive ($\sin^2(\theta_{12})$, Δm_{12}^2) and many nuisance parameters
975 that control the systematic uncertainty models invoked within this study.

976 The MCMC technique generates a multi-dimensional probability distribution
977 across all of the model parameters used in the fit. To determine the parameter
978 estimate of a single parameter, this multi-dimensional object is integrated over all
979 other parameters. This process is called Marginalisation and is further described
980 in subsection 4.3.1. Monte Carlo techniques approximate the probability distribu-
981 tion of each parameter within the limit of generating infinite samples. As ever,
982 generating a large number of samples is time and resource-dependent. Therefore,

983 an MCMC technique is utilised within this analysis to reduce the required number
 984 of steps to sufficiently sample the parameter space. This technique is described
 985 in further detail in subsection 4.2.1.

986 **4.1 Bayesian Statistics**

987 Bayesian inference treats observable data, D , and model parameters, $\vec{\theta}$, on equal
 988 footing such that a probability model of both data and parameters is required.
 989 This is the joint probability distribution $P(D, \vec{\theta})$ and can be described by the
 990 prior distribution for model parameters $P(\vec{\theta})$ and the likelihood of the data given
 991 the model parameters $P(D|\vec{\theta})$,

$$P(D, \vec{\theta}) = P(D|\vec{\theta})P(\vec{\theta}). \quad (4.1)$$

992 The prior distribution, $P(\vec{\theta})$, describes all previous knowledge about the
 993 parameters within the model. For example, if the risk of developing health
 994 problems is known to increase with age, the prior distribution would describe the
 995 increase. For the purpose of this analysis, the prior distribution is typically
 996 the best-fit values taken from external data measurements with a Gaussian
 997 uncertainty. The prior distribution can also contain correlations between model
 998 parameters. In an analysis using Monte Carlo techniques, the likelihood of
 999 measuring some data assuming some set of model parameters is calculated
 1000 by comparing the Monte Carlo prediction generated at that particular set of
 1001 model parameters to the data.

1002 It is parameter estimation that is important for this analysis and as such, we
 1003 apply Bayes' theorem [133] to calculate the probability for each parameter to have
 1004 a certain value given the observed data, $P(\vec{\theta}|D)$, which is known as the posterior
 1005 distribution (often termed the posterior). This can be expressed as

$$P(\vec{\theta}|D) = \frac{P(D|\vec{\theta})P(\vec{\theta})}{\int P(D|\vec{\theta})P(\vec{\theta})d\vec{\theta}}. \quad (4.2)$$

1006 The denominator in Equation 4.2 is the integral of the joint probability dis-
 1007 tribution over all values of all parameters used within the fit. For brevity, we
 1008 say that the posterior distribution is

$$P(\vec{\theta}|D) \propto P(D|\vec{\theta})P(\vec{\theta}). \quad (4.3)$$

1009 In subsection 4.3.1, we see that for the cases used within this analysis, it is
 1010 reasonable to know the posterior to some normalisation constant.

1011 4.1.1 Application of Prior Knowledge

1012 The posterior distribution is proportional to the prior uncertainty applied on
 1013 each parameter, as illustrated by Equation 4.3. This means that it is possible
 1014 to change the prior after the posterior distribution has been determined. The
 1015 prior uncertainty of a particular parameter can be ‘divided’ out of the posterior
 1016 distribution and the resulting distribution can be reweighted using the new
 1017 prior uncertainty that is to be applied. The methodology and implementation
 1018 of changing the prior follows that described in [134].

1019 An example implementation that is useful for this analysis is the application
 1020 of the “reactor constraint”. As discussed in section 2.4, an external constraint
 1021 on $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ is determined from measurements taken from reactor experiments.
 1022 However, the sensitivities from just using the T2K and SK samples is equally
 1023 as important. Without this technique, two fits would have to be run, doubling
 1024 the required resources. Therefore, the key benefit for this analysis is the fact that
 1025 only a single ‘fit’ has to be performed and can be used to build the two posterior
 1026 distributions of the with and without reactor constraint applied.

1027 4.2 Monte Carlo Simulation

1028 Monte Carlo techniques are used to numerically solve a complex problem that
 1029 does not necessarily have an analytical solution. These techniques rely on

1030 building a large ensemble of samples from an unknown distribution and then
1031 using the ensemble to approximate the properties of the distribution.

1032 An example that uses Monte Carlo techniques is to calculate the area under-
1033 neath a curve. For example, take the problem of calculating the area under a
1034 straight line with gradient $M = 0.4$ and intercept $C = 1.0$. Analytically, one can
1035 calculate the area under the line is equal to 30 units for $0 \leq x \leq 10$. Using Monte
1036 Carlo techniques, one can calculate the area under this line by throwing many
1037 random values for the x and y components of each sample and then calculating
1038 whether that point falls below the line. The area can then be calculated by the
1039 ratio of points below the line to the total number of samples thrown multiplied by
1040 the total area in which samples were scattered. The study is shown in Figure 4.1
1041 highlights this technique and finds the area under the curve to be 29.9 compared
1042 to an analytical solution of 30.0. The deviation of the numerical to analytical
1043 solution can be attributed to the number of samples used in the study. The
1044 accuracy of the approximation in which the properties of the Monte Carlo samples
1045 replicate those of the desired distribution is dependent on the number of samples
1046 used. Replicating this study with a differing number of Monte Carlo samples
1047 used in each study (As shown in Figure 4.2) highlights how the Monte Carlo
1048 techniques are only accurate within the limit of a high number of samples.

1049 Whilst the above example has an analytical solution, these techniques are just
1050 as applicable to complex solutions. Clearly, any numerical solution is only as
1051 useful as its efficiency. As discussed, the accuracy of the Monte Carlo technique is
1052 dependent upon the number of samples generated to approximate the properties
1053 of the distribution. Furthermore, if the positions at which the samples are
1054 evaluated are not ‘cleverly’ picked, the efficiency of the Monte Carlo technique
1055 significantly drops. Given the example in Figure 4.1, if the region in which the
1056 samples are scattered significantly extends passed the region of interest, many
1057 calculations will be calculated but do not add to the ability of the Monte Carlo
1058 technique to achieve the correct result. For instance, any sample evaluated at
1059 a $y \geq 5$ could be removed without affecting the final result. This does bring in

- 1060 an aspect of the ‘chicken and egg’ problem in that to achieve efficient sampling,
1061 one needs to know the distribution beforehand.




Figure 4.1: Example of using Monte Carlo techniques to find the area under the blue line. The gradient and intercept of the line are 0.4 and 1.0 respectively. The area found to be under the curve using one thousand samples is 29.9 units.

4.2.1 Markov Chain Monte Carlo

- 1062 **4.2.1 Markov Chain Monte Carlo**
- 1063 This analysis utilises a multi-dimensional probability distribution, with some
1064 dimensions being significantly more constrained than others. This could be
1065 from prior knowledge of parameter distributions from external data or un-
1066 physical regions in which parameters can not exist. Consequently, the Monte
1067 Carlo techniques used need to be as efficient as possible. For this analysis, the
1068 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) technique is chosen. An MCMC technique
1069 is a Monte Carlo technique that uses a Markov chain to select which points at
1070 which to sample the parameter distribution. This technique performs a semi-
1071 random stochastic walk through the allowable parameter space. This builds a
1072 posterior distribution which has the property that the density of sampled points
1073 is proportional to the probability density of that parameter. This does mean that



Figure 4.2: The area under a line of gradient 0.4 and intercept 1.0 for the range $0 \leq x \leq 10$ as calculated using Monte Carlo techniques as a function of the number of samples used in each repetition. The analytical solution to the area is 30 units as given by the red line.

1074 the samples produced by this technique are not statistically independent but
1075 they will cover the space of the distribution.

1076 A Markov chain functions by selecting the position of step \vec{x}_{i+1} based on the
1077 position of \vec{x}_i . The space in which the Markov chain selects samples is dependent
1078 upon the total number of parameters utilised within the fit, where a discrete point
1079 in this space is described by the N-dimensional space \vec{x} . In a perfectly operating
1080 Markov chain, the position of the next step depends solely on the previous step
1081 and not on the further history of the chain (\vec{x}_0 , \vec{x}_1 , etc.). However, in solving
1082 the multi-dimensionality of the fit used within this analysis, each step becomes
1083 correlated with several of the steps preceding itself. This behaviour is further
1084 explained in subsection 4.2.3. Providing the MCMC chain is well optimised, it will
1085 begin to converge towards a unique stationary distribution. The period between
1086 the chain's initial starting point and the convergence to the unique stationary
1087 distribution is colloquially known as the burn-in period. This is discussed further
1088 in subsection 4.2.3. Once the chain reaches the stationary distribution, all points
1089 sampled after that point will look like samples from that distribution.

1090 Further details of the theories underpinning MCMC techniques are discussed
1091 in [130] but can be summarised by the requirement that the chain satisfies the
1092 three ‘regularity conditions’:

- 1093 • Irreducibility: From every position in the parameter space \vec{x} , there must
1094 exist a non-zero probability for every other position in the parameter space
1095 to be reached.
- 1096 • Recurrence: Once the chain arrives at the stationary distribution, every step
1097 following from that position must be samples from the same stationary
1098 distribution.
- 1099 • Aperiodicity: The chain must not repeat the same sequence of steps at any
1100 point throughout the sampling period.

1101 The output of the chain after burn-in (ie. the sampled points after the chain
1102 has reached the stationary distribution) can be used to approximate the posterior
1103 distribution and model parameters $\vec{\theta}$. To achieve the requirement that the unique
1104 stationary distribution found by the chain be the posterior distribution, one
1105 can use the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. This guides the stochastic process
1106 depending on the likelihood of the current proposed step compared to that
1107 of the previous step. Implementation and other details of this technique are
1108 discussed in subsection 4.2.2.

1109 4.2.2 Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm

1110 As a requirement for MCMCs, the Markov chain implemented in this technique
1111 must have a unique stationary distribution that is equivalent to the posterior
1112 distribution. To ensure this requirement and that the regularity conditions are
1113 met, this analysis utilises the Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm [135, 136].
1114 For the i^{th} step in the chain, the MH algorithm determines the position in the
1115 parameter space to which the chain moves to based on the current step, \vec{x}_i , and
1116 the proposed step, \vec{y}_{i+1} . The proposed step is randomly selected from some

1117 proposal function $f(\vec{x}_{i+1}|\vec{x}_i)$, which depends solely on the current step (ie. not
1118 the further history of the chain). The next step in the chain \vec{x}_{i+1} can be either the
1119 current step or the proposed step determined by whether the proposed step is
1120 accepted or rejected. To decide if the proposed step is selected, the acceptance
1121 probability, $\alpha(\vec{x}_i, \vec{y}_i)$, is calculated as

$$\alpha(\vec{x}_i, \vec{y}_{i+1}) = \min\left(1, \frac{P(\vec{y}_{i+1}|D)f(\vec{x}_i|\vec{y}_{i+1})}{P(\vec{x}_i|D)f(\vec{y}_{i+1}|\vec{x}_i)}\right). \quad (4.4)$$

1122 Where $P(\vec{y}_{i+1}|D)$ is the posterior distribution as introduced in section 4.1. To
1123 simplify this calculation, the proposal function is required to be symmetric such
1124 that $f(\vec{x}_i|\vec{y}_{i+1}) = f(\vec{y}_{i+1}|\vec{x}_i)$. In practice, a multi-variate Gaussian distribution is
1125 used to throw parameter proposals from. This reduces Equation 4.4 to

$$\alpha(\vec{x}_i, \vec{y}_{i+1}) = \min\left(1, \frac{P(\vec{y}_{i+1}|D)}{P(\vec{x}_i|D)}\right). \quad (4.5)$$

1126 After calculating this quantity, a random number, β , is generated uniformly
1127 between 0 and 1. If $\beta \leq \alpha(\vec{x}_i, \vec{y}_{i+1})$, the proposed step is accepted. Otherwise, the
1128 chain sets the next step equal to the current step and this procedure is repeated.
1129 This can be interpreted as if the posterior probability of the proposed step is
1130 greater than that of the current step, ($P(\vec{y}_{i+1}|D) \geq P(\vec{x}_i|D)$), the proposed
1131 step will always be accepted. If the opposite is true, ($P(\vec{y}_{i+1}|D) \leq P(\vec{x}_i|D)$),
1132 the proposed step will be accepted with probability $P(\vec{x}_i|D)/P(\vec{y}_{i+1}|D)$. This
1133 ensures that the Markov chain does not get trapped in any local minima in the
1134 potentially non-Gaussian posterior distribution. The outcome of this technique
1135 is that the density of steps taken in a discrete region is directly proportional to
1136 the probability density in that region.

1137 4.2.3 MCMC Optimisation

1138 As discussed in subsection 4.2.2, the proposal function invoked within the MH
1139 algorithm can take any form and the chain will still converge to the stationary
1140 distribution. At each set of proposed parameter values, a prediction of the same
1141 spectra has to be generated which requires significant computational resources.

1142 Therefore, the number of steps taken before the unique stationary distribution
1143 is found should be minimised as only steps after convergence add information
1144 to the oscillation analysis. Furthermore, the chain should entirely cover the
1145 allowable parameter space to ensure that all values have been considered. Tuning
1146 the distance that the proposal function jumps between steps on a parameter-by-
1147 parameter basis can both minimise the length of the burn-in period and ensure
1148 that the correlation between step \vec{x}_i and \vec{x}_j is sufficiently small.

1149 The effect of changing the width of the proposal function is highlighted in
1150 Figure 4.3. Three scenarios, each with the same underlying stationary distribution
1151 (A Gaussian of width 1.0 and mean 0.), are presented. The only difference between
1152 the three scenarios is the width of the proposal function, colloquially known as
1153 the ‘step size σ ’. Each scenario starts at an initial parameter value of 10.0 which
1154 would be considered an extreme variation. For the case where $\sigma = 0.1$, it is
1155 clear to see that the chain takes a long time to reach the expected region of the
1156 parameter. This indicates that this chain would have a large burn-in period and
1157 does not converge to the stationary distribution until step ~ 500 . Furthermore,
1158 whilst the chain does move towards the expected region, each step is significantly
1159 correlated with the previous. Considering the case where $\sigma = 5.0$, the chain
1160 approaches the expected parameter region almost instantly meaning that the
1161 burn-in period is not significant. However, there are clearly large regions of steps
1162 where the chain does not move. This is likely due to the chain proposing steps
1163 in the tails of the distribution which have a low probability of being accepted.
1164 Consequently, this chain would take a significant number of steps to fully span
1165 the allowable parameter region. For the final scenario, where $\sigma = 0.5$, you can
1166 see a relatively small burn-in period of approximately 100 steps. Once the chain
1167 reaches the stationary distribution, it moves throughout the expected region of
1168 parameter values many times, sufficiently sampling the full parameter region.
1169 This example is a single parameter varying across a continuous distribution and
1170 does not fully reflect the difficulties in the many-hundred multi-variate parameter

1171 distribution used within this analysis. However, it does give a conceptual idea of
1172 the importance of selecting the proposal function and associated step size.




Figure 4.3: Three MCMC chains, each with a stationary distribution equal to a Gaussian centered at 0 and width 1 (As indicated by the black dotted lines). All of the chains use a Gaussian proposal function but have different widths (or ‘step size σ ’). The top panel has $\sigma = 0.1$, middle panel has $\sigma = 0.5$ and the bottom panel has $\sigma = 5.0$.

1173 As discussed, step size tuning directly correlates to the average step accep-
1174 tance rate. If the step size is too small, many steps will be accepted but the
1175 chain moves slowly. If the opposite is true, many steps will be rejected as the
1176 chain proposes steps in the tails of the distribution. Discussion in [137] suggests
1177 that the ‘ideal’ acceptance rate of a high dimension MCMC chain should be

₁₁₇₈ approximately $\sim 25\%$. An “ideal” step size [137] of

$$\sigma = \frac{2.4}{N_p}, \quad (4.6)$$

₁₁₇₉ where N_p is the number of parameters included in the MCMC fit. However,
₁₁₈₀ the complex correlations between systematics mean that some parameters have
₁₁₈₁ to be hand tuned and many efforts have been taken to select a set of parameter-
₁₁₈₂ by-parameter step sizes to approximately reach the ideal acceptance rate.

₁₁₈₃ Figure 4.3 highlights the likelihood as calculated by the fit in DB: [Link to](#)
₁₁₈₄ AsimovA Sensitivity Section as a function of the number of steps in each chain. In
₁₁₈₅ practice, many independent MCMC chains are run simultaneously to parallelise
₁₁₈₆ the task of performing the fit. This figure overlays the distribution found in each
₁₁₈₇ chain. As seen, the likelihood decreases from its initial value and converges
₁₁₈₈ towards a stationary distribution after $\sim 1 \times 10^5$ steps.




Figure 4.4: The log-likelihood from the fit detailed in DB: [Link to AsimovA Sensitivity Section](#) as a function of the number of steps accumulated in each fit. Many independent MCMC chains were run in parallel and overlaid on this plot. The red line indicates the 1×10^5 step burn-in period after which the log-likelihood becomes stable.

₁₁₈₉ Multiple configurations of this analysis have been performed throughout this
₁₁₉₀ thesis where different samples or systematics have been used. For all of these con-
₁₁₉₁ figurations, it was found that a burnin period of 1×10^5 was sufficient in all cases.

1192 4.3 Understanding the MCMC Results

1193 The previous sections have described how to generate the posterior probability
1194 distribution using Bayesian MCMC techniques. However, this analysis focuses
1195 on oscillation parameter determination. The posterior distribution output from
1196 the chain is a high dimension object, with as many dimensions as there are
1197 parameters included in the oscillation analysis. However, this multi-dimensional
1198 object is difficult to conceptualize so parameter estimations are often presented
1199 in one or two-dimensional projections of this probability distribution. To do this,
1200 we invoke the marginalisation technique highlighted in subsection 4.3.1.

1201 4.3.1 Marginalisation

1202 The output of the MCMC chain is a highly dimensional probability distribution
1203 which is very difficult to interpret. From the standpoint of an oscillation analysis
1204 experiment, the one or two-dimensional ‘projections’ of the oscillation parameters
1205 of interest are most relevant. Despite this, the best fit values and uncertainties on
1206 the oscillation parameters of interest should correctly encapsulate the correlations
1207 to the other systematic uncertainties (colloquially called ‘nuisance’ parameters).
1208 For this joint beam and atmospheric analysis, the oscillation parameters of interest
1209 are $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, Δm_{23}^2 , and δ_{CP} . All other parameters (Including the
1210 oscillation parameter this fit is insensitive to) are deemed nuisance parameters.
1211 To generate these projections, we rely upon integrating the posterior distribution
1212 over all nuisance parameters. This is called marginalisation. A simple example
1213 of this technique is to imagine the scenario where two coins are flipped. To
1214 determine the probability that the first coin returned a ‘head’, the exact result of
1215 the second coin flip is disregarded and simply integrated over. For the parameters
1216 of interest, $\vec{\theta}_i$, we can calculate the marginalised posterior by integrating over
1217 the nuisance parameters, $\vec{\theta}_n$. In this case, Equation 4.2 becomes

$$P(\vec{\theta}_i|D) = \frac{\int P(D|\vec{\theta}_i, \vec{\theta}_n)P(\vec{\theta}_i, \vec{\theta}_n)d\vec{\theta}_n}{\int P(D|\vec{\theta})P(\vec{\theta})d\vec{\theta}} \quad (4.7)$$

1218 Where $P(\vec{\theta}_i, \vec{\theta}_n)$ encodes the prior knowledge about the uncertainty and
 1219 correlations between the parameters of interest and the nuisance parameters.
 1220 In practice, this is simply taking the one or two-dimensional projection of the
 1221 multi-dimensional probability distribution.

1222 Whilst in principle an easy solution to a complex problem, correlations
 1223 between the interesting and nuisance parameters can bias the marginalised
 1224 results. A similar effect is found when the parameters being marginalised over
 1225 have non-Gaussian probability distributions. For example, Figure 4.5 highlights
 1226 the marginalisation bias in the probability distribution found for a parameter
 1227 when requiring a correlated parameter to have a positive parameter value. Due
 1228 to the complex nature of this oscillation parameter fit presented in this thesis,
 1229 there are correlations occurring between the oscillation parameters of interest
 1230 and the other nuisance parameters included in the fit.




Figure 4.5: Left: The two dimensional probability distribution for two correlated parameters x and y . The red distribution shows the two dimensional probability distribution when $0 \leq x \leq 5$. Right: The marginalised probability distribution for the y parameter found when requiring the x to be bound between $-5 \leq x \leq 5$ and $0 \leq x \leq 5$ for the black and red distribution, respectively.

1231 4.3.2 Parameter Estimation and Credible Intervals

1232 The purpose of this analysis is to determine the best fit values for the oscillation
 1233 parameters that the beam and atmospheric samples are sensitive to: $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$
 1234 , $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, Δm_{23}^2 , and δ_{CP} . Typically, the results presented take the form of
 1235 one or two-dimension marginalised probability distributions for the appearance

1236 ($\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ and δ_{CP}) and disappearance ($\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ and Δm_{23}^2) parameters. The
1237 posterior probability density taken from the output MCMC chain is binned in
1238 these parameters. The parameter best-fit point is then taken to be the value
1239 that has the highest posterior probability. This is performed in both one and
1240 two-dimensional projections.

1241 However, the single best-fit point in a given parameter is not of much use on
1242 its own. We would also like to determine the uncertainty, or credible interval,
1243 on that best-fit point. The definition of the 1σ credible interval is that we have
1244 68% belief that the parameter is within those bounds. For a more generalised
1245 definition, the credible interval is the region, R , of the posterior distribution that
1246 contains a specific fraction of the total probability, such that

$$\int_R P(\theta|D) d\theta = \alpha \quad (4.8)$$

1247 Where θ is the parameter on which we calculate the credible interval. This
1248 technique then calculates the $\alpha \times 100\%$ credible interval.

1249 In practice, this analysis uses the highest posterior density (HPD) credible in-
1250 tervals which are calculated through the following method. First, the probability
1251 distribution is area-normalised such that it has an integrated area equal to 1.0.
1252 The bins of probability are then summed from the highest to lowest until the sum
1253 exceeds the 1σ level (0.68 in this example). This process is repeated for a range of
1254 credible intervals, notably the 1σ , 2σ and 3σ along with other levels where the
1255 critical values for each level can be found in [77]. This process can be repeated
1256 for the two-dimensional probability distributions by creating two-dimensional
1257 contours of credible intervals rather than a one-dimensional result.

1258 4.3.3 Bayesian Model Comparisons

1259 Due to the matter resonance, this analysis has some sensitivity to the mass
1260 hierarchy of neutrino states (whether Δm_{23}^2 is positive or negative) and the
1261 octant of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$. The Bayesian approach utilised within this analysis gives an
1262 intuitive method of model comparison by determining which hypothesis is most

₁₂₆₃ favourable. Taking the ratio of Equation 4.3 for the two hypotheses of normal
₁₂₆₄ hierarchy, NH , and inverted hierarchy, IH , gives

$$\frac{P(\vec{\theta}_{NH}|D)}{P(\vec{\theta}_{IH}|D)} = \frac{P(D|\vec{\theta}_{NH})}{P(D|\vec{\theta}_{IH})} \times \frac{P(\vec{\theta}_{NH})}{P(\vec{\theta}_{IH})}. \quad (4.9)$$

₁₂₆₅ The middle term defines the Bayes factor which is a data-driven interpretation
₁₂₆₆ of how strong the data prefers one hierarchy to the other. For this analysis, equal
₁₂₆₇ priors on both mass hierarchy hypotheses are chosen ($P(\vec{\theta}_{NH}) = P(\vec{\theta}_{IH}) = 0.5$).
₁₂₆₈ In practice, the MCMC chain proposes a value of $|\Delta m_{23}^2|$ and then applies a
₁₂₆₉ 50% probability that the value is sign flipped. Consequently, the Bayes factor
₁₂₇₀ can be calculated from the ratio of the probability density in either hypothesis.
₁₂₇₁ This equates to counting the number of steps taken in the normal and inverted
₁₂₇₂ hierarchies and taking the ratio. The same approach can be taken to compare the
₁₂₇₃ upper octant (UO) compared to the lower octant (LO) hypothesis of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$.

₁₂₇₄ Whilst the value of the Bayes factor should always be shown, the Jeffreys scale
₁₂₇₅ [138] (highlighted in Table 4.1) gives an indication of the strength of preference
₁₂₇₆ for one model compared to the other. Other interpretations of the strength of
₁₂₇₇ preference of a model exist, e.g. the Kass and Raferty Scale [139].

$\log_{10}(B_{AB})$	B_{AB}	Strength of Preference
< 0.0	< 1	No preference for hypothesis A (Supports hypothesis B)
0.0 – 0.5	1.0 – 3.16	Preference for hypothesis A is weak
0.5 – 1.0	3.16 – 10.0	Preference for hypothesis A is substantial
1.0 – 1.5	10.0 – 31.6	Preference for hypothesis A is strong
1.5 – 2.0	31.6 – 100.0	Preference for hypothesis A is very strong
> 2.0	> 100.0	Decisive preference for hypothesis A

Table 4.1: Jeffreys scale for strength of preference for two models A and B as a function of the calculated Bayes factor ($B_{AB} = B(A/B)$) between the two models [138]. The original scale is given in terms of $\log_{10}(B(A/B))$ but converted to linear scale for easy comparison throughout this thesis.

₁₂₇₈ 4.3.4 Comparison of MCMC Output to Expectation

₁₂₇₉ To ensure the fit is performing well, a best-fit spectrum is produced using the
₁₂₈₀ posterior probability distribution and compared with the data, allowing easy

1281 by-eye comparisons to be made. A simple method of doing this is to perform a
1282 comparison in the fitting parameters (For instance, the reconstructed neutrino
1283 energy and lepton direction for T2K far detector beam samples) of the spectra
1284 generated by the MCMC chain to ‘data’. This ‘data’ could be true data or some
1285 variation of Monte Carlo prediction. This allows easy comparison of the MCMC
1286 probability distribution to the data. To perform this, N steps from the post burn-in
1287 MCMC chain are randomly selected (Where for all plots of this style in this thesis,
1288 $N = 3000$). From these, the Monte Carlo prediction at each step is generated by
1289 reweighting the model parameters to the values specified at that step. Due to the
1290 probability density being directly correlated with the density of steps in a certain
1291 region, parameter values close to the best fit value are most likely to be selected.

1292 In practice, for each bin of the fitting parameters has a probability distribution
1293 of event rates, with one entry per sampled MCMC step. This distribution is
1294 binned where the bin with the highest probability is selected as the mean and an
1295 error on the width of this probability distribution is calculated using the approach
1296 highlighted in subsection 4.3.2. Consequently, the best fit distribution in the fit
1297 parameter is not necessarily that which would be attained by reweighting the
1298 Monte Carlo prediction to the most probable parameter values.

1299 A similar study can be performed to illustrate the freedom of the model
1300 parameter space prior to the fit. This can be done by throwing parameter values
1301 from the prior uncertainty of each parameter. This becomes troublesome for
1302 parameters with no prior uncertainty as the range is technically infinite. Where
1303 applicable solutions to remove these have been addressed.

5

1304

1305

1306

Simulation, Reconstruction, and Event Reduction

1307 As a crucial part of the oscillation analysis, an accurate prediction of the expected
1308 neutrino spectrum at the far detector is required. This includes modeling the
1309 flux generation, neutrino interactions, and detector effects. All of the simulation
1310 packages required to do this are briefly described in section 5.1. The reconstruc-
1311 tion of neutrino events inside the far detector, including the `fitQun` algorithm,
1312 is documented in section 5.2. This also includes data quality checks of the SK-
1313 V data which the author performed for the T2K oscillation analysis presented
1314 at Neutrino 2020 [76]. Finally, section 5.3 describes the steps taken in the SK
1315 detector to trigger on events of interest whilst removing the comparatively large
1316 rate of cosmic ray muon events.

1317 5.1 Simulation

1318 In order to generate a Monte Carlo prediction of the expected event rate at the far
1319 detector, all the processes in the beam and atmospheric flux, neutrino interaction,
1320 and detector need to be modeled. Each of these parts is individually modeled
1321 and each of them is detailed below.

1322 The beamline simulation consists of three distinct parts: the initial hadron
1323 interaction modeled by FLUKA [140], the target station geometry and particle
1324 tracking performed by JNUBEAM, [141, 142] and any hadronic re-interactions
1325 simulated by GCALOR [143]. The primary hadronic interactions are $O(10)\text{GeV}$,
1326 where FLUKA matches external cross-section data better than GCALOR [144].
1327 However, FLUKA is not very adaptable so a small simulation is built to model
1328 the interactions in the target and the output is then passed to JNUBEAM and
1329 GCALOR for propagation. The hadronic interactions are tuned to data from the
1330 NA61/SHINE [145–147] and HARP [148] experiments. The tuning is done by
1331 reweighting the FLUKA and GCALOR predictions to match the external data
1332 multiplicity and cross-section measurements, based on final state particle kine-
1333 matics [144]. The culmination of this simulation package generates the predicted
1334 flux for neutrino and antineutrino beam modes which are illustrated in Figure 3.7.

1335 The atmospheric neutrino flux is simulated by the HKKM model [42, 44]. The
1336 primary cosmic ray flux is tuned to AMS [149] and BESS [150] data assuming
1337 the US-standard atmosphere '76 [151] density profile and includes geomagnetic
1338 field effects. The primary cosmic rays interact to generate pions and muons.
1339 The interaction of these secondary particles to generate neutrinos is handled by
1340 DPMJET-III [152] for energies above 32GeV and JAM [44, 153] for energies below
1341 that value **DB: Question for Giles: Why different generators for above/below**
1342 **32GeV?**. These hadronic interactions are tuned to BESS and L3 data [154, 155]
1343 using the same methodology as the tuning of the beamline simulation. The
1344 energy and cosine zenith predictions of $\nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e, \nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu$ flux are given in Figure 2.3
1345 and Figure 2.5, respectively. The flux is approximately symmetrical and peaked
1346 around the horizon ($\cos(\theta_Z) = 0.0$). This is because horizontally-going pions
1347 and kaons can travel further than their vertically-going counterparts resulting
1348 in a larger probability of decaying to neutrinos. The symmetry is broken in
1349 lower-energy neutrinos due to geomagnetic effects, which modify the track of the
1350 primary cosmic rays. Updates to the HKKM model are currently ongoing [156].

Once a flux prediction has been made for all three detectors, NEUT 5.4.0 [157, 158] models the interactions of the neutrinos in the detectors. For the purposes of this analysis, quasi-elastic (QE), meson exchange (MEC), single meson production (PROD), coherent pion production (COH), and deep inelastic scattering (DIS) interactions are simulated. These interaction categories can be further broken down by whether they were propagated via a W^\pm boson in Charged Current (CC) interactions or via a Z^0 boson in Neutral Current (NC) interactions. CC interactions have a charged lepton in the final state, which can be flavour-tagged in reconstruction to determine the flavour of the neutrino. In contrast, NC interactions have a neutrino in the final state so no flavour information can be determined from the observables left in the detector after an interaction. This is the reason why neutrinos which interact through NC modes are assumed to not oscillate within this analysis. Both CC and NC interactions are modeled for all the above interaction categories, other than MEC interactions which are only modeled for CC events.

As illustrated in Figure 5.1, CCQE interactions dominate the cross-section of neutrino interactions around $E_\nu \sim 0.5\text{GeV}$. The NEUT implementation adopts the Llewellyn Smith [159] model for neutrino-nucleus interactions, where the nuclear ground state of any bound nucleons (neutrino-oxygen interactions) is approximated by a spectral-function [160] model that simulates the effects of Fermi momentum and Pauli blocking. The cross-section of QE interactions is controlled by vector and axial-vector form factors parameterised by the BBBA05 [161] model and a dipole form factor with $M_A^{QE} = 1.21\text{GeV}$ fit to external data [162], respectively. NEUT implements the Valencia [163] model to simulate MEC events, where two nucleons and two holes in the nuclear target are produced (Often called 2p2h interactions).

For neutrinos of energy $O(1)\text{GeV}$, PROD interactions become dominant. These predominantly produce charged and neutral pions although γ , kaon, and η production is also considered. To simulate these interactions, the Berger-Sehgal [164] model is implemented within NEUT. It simulates the excitation of a



Figure 5.1: The NEUT prediction of the ν_μ -H₂O cross-section overlaid on the T2K ν_μ flux. The charged current (black, solid) and neutral current (black, dashed) inclusive, charged current quasi-elastic (blue, solid), charged current 2p2h (blue, dashed), charged current single pion production (pink), and charged current multi- π and DIS (Purple) cross-sections are illustrated. Figure taken from [157].

nucleon from a neutrino interaction, production of an intermediate baryon, and the subsequent decay to a single meson or γ . Pions can also be produced through COH interactions, which occur when the incoming neutrino interacts with the entire oxygen nucleus leaving a single pion outside of the nucleus. NEUT utilises the Berger-Sehgal [165] model to simulate these COH interactions.

DIS and multi- π producing interactions become the most dominant for energies $> O(5)\text{GeV}$. PYTHIA [166] is used to simulate any interaction with invariant mass $W > 2\text{GeV}/c^2$, which produces at least one meson. For any interaction which produces at least two mesons but has $W < 2\text{GeV}/c^2$, the Bronner model is used [167]. Both of these models use parton distribution functions based on the Bodek-Yang model [168–170].




Figure 5.2: Illustration of the various processes which a pion can undergo before exiting the nucleus. Taken from [171].

1392 Any pion which is produced within the nucleus can re-interact through
 1393 final state interactions before it exits, as illustrated by the scattering, absorption,
 1394 production, and exchange interactions in Figure 5.2. These re-interactions alter
 1395 the observable particles within the detector. For instance, if the charged pion
 1396 from a CC PROD interaction is absorbed, the observables would mimic a CC QE
 1397 interaction. To simulate these effects, NEUT uses a semi-classical intranuclear
 1398 cascade model [157]. This cascade functions by stepping the pion through the
 1399 nucleus in fixed-length steps equivalent to $dx = R_N/100$, where R_N is the radius
 1400 of the nucleus. At each step, the simulation allows the pion to interact through
 1401 scattering, charged exchange, absorption, or production with an interaction-
 1402 dependent probability calculated from a fit to external data [172]. This cascade
 1403 continues until the pion is absorbed or exits the nucleus.

1404 Once the final state particle kinematics have been determined by NEUT,
 1405 they are passed into the detector simulation. The near detectors, ND280 and

1406 INGRID, are simulated using a GEANT4 package [116, 173] to simulate the detector
1407 geometry, particle tracking, and energy deposition. The response of the detectors
1408 is simulated using the elecSim package [116]. The far detector simulation is based
1409 upon the original Kamiokande experiment software which uses the GEANT3-based
1410 SKDETSIM [116, 174] package. This simulates the interactions of particles in
1411 the water as well as Cherenkov light production. The water quality and PMT
1412 calibration measurements detailed in subsection 3.1.2 are also used within this
1413 simulation to make accurate predictions of the detector response.

1414 5.2 Event Reconstruction at SK

1415 Any event which generates optical photons that occurs in SK will be observed by
1416 the PMT array, where each PMT records the time and accumulated charge. This
1417 recorded information is shown in event displays similar to those illustrated in
1418 Figure 5.3. To be useful for physics analyses, this series of PMT hit information
1419 needs to be reconstructed to determine the particle’s identity and kinematics (or
1420 track parameters): four-vertex, direction, and momenta. The reconstruction
1421 uses the fact that the charge and timing distribution of photons generated
1422 by a particular particle in an event is dependent upon its initial kinematics.
1423 Electron and muon rings are distinguished by their “fuzziness”. Muons are
1424 heavier and less affected by scattering or showering meaning they typically
1425 produce “crisp” rings. Electrons are more likely to interact via electromagnetic
1426 showering or scattering which results in larger variations of their direction from
1427 the initial direction. Consequently, electrons typically produce “fuzzier” rings
1428 compared to muons.

1429 For the purposes of this analysis, the `fiTQun` reconstruction algorithm is
1430 utilised. Its core function is to compare a prediction of the accumulated charged
1431 and timing distribution from each PMT, generated for a particular particle identity
1432 and track parameters, to that observed in the neutrino event. It determines the
1433 preferred values by minimising a likelihood function which includes information
1434 from PMTs which were hit and those that were not hit. `fiTQun` performs a

1435 simultaneous fit of particle kinematics and identity, improving both the accuracy
 1436 of the fit parameters and the rejection of neutral current π^0 events [175, 176]. The
 1437 `fitQun` algorithm is based on the key concepts of the MiniBooNE reconstruction
 1438 algorithm [177] and is described in [178] which is summarised below. The
 1439 `fitQun` algorithm improves upon the `APFit` reconstruction algorithm which has
 1440 been used for many previous SK analyses. `APFit` fits the vertex from timing
 1441 information and then fits the momentum and direction of the particle from PMT
 1442 hits within a 43 deg Cherenkov cone (which assumes an ultra-relativistic particle).
 1443 It then fits the particle identity once the track parameters have been fit.




Figure 5.3: Event displays from Super Kamiokande illustrating the “crisp” ring from a muon and the typically “fuzzy” electron ring. Each pixel represents a PMT and the color scheme denotes the accumulated charge deposited on that PMT. Figures taken from [179].

1444 The `fitQun` reconstruction algorithm proceeds by:

- 1445 • **Vertex pre-fitting:** An estimate of the vertex is made using a goodness-of-fit
 1446 metric
- 1447 • **Peak finding:** The initial time of the event is determined by clustering
 1448 events by time residuals
- 1449 • **Single-ring fits:** Given the pre-fit vertex and estimated time of interaction,
 1450 a maximum likelihood technique searches for a single particle generating
 1451 light

- 1452 • **Multi-ring fits:** Seeded from the single-ring fits, hypotheses with multiple
 1453 light-producing particles are considered using the same maximum likeli-
 1454 hood technique

1455 An event in SK can consist of a primary and decay particles. For example,
 1456 a charged current muon neutrino interaction can generate two particles that
 1457 have the potential of generating Cherenkov photons: the primary muon, and
 1458 the secondary decay-electron from the muon. To ensure the particles are recon-
 1459 structed separately, each event is divided into time clusters which are called
 1460 “subevents”. Subevents after the primary subevent are considered to be decay
 1461 electrons. To find all the subevents in an event, a vertex goodness metric is
 1462 calculated for some vertex position \vec{x} and time t ,

$$G(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_i^{\text{hit PMTs}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{T_{Res}^i(\vec{x}, t)}{\sigma} \right)^2 \right) \quad (5.1)$$

1463 where

$$T_{Res}^i(\vec{x}, t) = t^i - t - |R_{PMT}^i - \vec{x}| / c_n \quad (5.2)$$

1464 is the residual hit time. It is the difference in time between the PMT hit time,
 1465 t^i , of the i^{th} PMT and the expected time of the PMT hit if the photon was emitted
 1466 at the start of the vertex. R_{PMT}^i is the position of the i^{th} PMT, c_n is the speed of
 1467 light in water and $\sigma = 4\text{ns}$ which is comparable to the time resolution of the
 1468 PMT. When the proposed fit values of time and vertex are close to the true values,
 1469 $T_{Res}^i(\vec{x}, t)$ tends to zero resulting in subevents appearing as spikes in the goodness
 1470 metric. The proposed fit vertex and time are grid-scanned, and the values which
 1471 maximise the goodness metric are selected as the “pre-fit vertex”. Whilst this
 1472 predicts a vertex for use in the clustering algorithm, the final vertex is fit using
 1473 the higher-precision maximum likelihood method described below.

1474 Once the pre-fit vertex has been determined, the goodness metric is scanned as
 1475 a function of t to determine the number of subevents. A peak-finding algorithm
 1476 is then used on the goodness metric, requiring the goodness metric to exceed

some threshold and drop below a reduced threshold before any subsequent additional peaks are considered. The thresholds are set such that the rate of false peak finding is minimised while still attaining good data to Monte Carlo agreement. To improve performance, the pre-fit vertex for each delayed subevent is re-calculated after PMT hits from the previous subevent are masked. This improves the decay-electron tagging performance. Once all subevents have been determined, the time window around each subevent is then defined by the earliest and latest time which satisfies $-180 < T_{Res}^i < 800\text{ns}$. The subevents and associated time windows are then used as seeds for further reconstruction.

For a given subevent, the `fitQun` algorithm constructs a likelihood based on the accumulated charge q_i and time information t_i from the i^{th} PMT,

$$L(\Gamma, \vec{\theta}) = \prod_j^{\text{unhit}} P_j(\text{unhit}|\Gamma, \vec{\theta}) \prod_i^{\text{hit}} \{1 - P_i(\text{unhit}|\Gamma, \vec{\theta})\} f_q(q_i|\Gamma, \vec{\theta}) f_t(t_i|\Gamma, \vec{\theta}), \quad (5.3)$$

where $\vec{\theta}$ defines the track parameters; vertex position, direction vector and momenta, and Γ represents the particle hypothesis. $P_i(\text{unhit}|\Gamma, \vec{\theta})$ is the probability of the i^{th} tube to not register a hit given the track parameters and particle hypothesis. The charge likelihood, $f_q(q_i|\Gamma, \vec{\theta})$, and time likelihood, $f_t(t_i|\Gamma, \vec{\theta})$, represents the probability density function of observing charge q_i and time t_i on the i^{th} PMT given the specified track parameters and particle hypothesis.

The predicted charge is calculated based on contributions from both the direct light and the scattered light. The direct light contribution is determined based on the integration of the Cherenkov photon profile along the track. PMT angular acceptance, water quality, and calibration measurements discussed in subsection 3.1.2 are included to accurately predict the charge probability density at each PMT. The scattered light is calculated in a similar way, although it includes a scattering function that depends on the vertex of the particle and the position of the PMT. The charge likelihood is calculated by comparing the prediction to the observed charge in the PMT.

1503 The time likelihood is approximated to depend on the vertex \vec{x} , direction \vec{d} ,
 1504 and time t of the track as well as the particle hypothesis. The expected time
 1505 for PMT hits is calculated by assuming unscattered photons being emitted from
 1506 the midpoint of the track, S_{mid} ,

$$t_{exp}^i = t + S_{mid}/c + |R_{PMT}^i - \vec{x} - S_{mid}\vec{d}|/c_n, \quad (5.4)$$

1507 where c is the speed of light in a vacuum. The time likelihood is then expressed
 1508 in terms of the residual difference between the PMT hit time and the expected
 1509 hit time, $t_{Res}^i = t^i - t_{exp}^i$. The particle hypothesis and momentum also affect the
 1510 Cherenkov photon distribution. These parameters modify the shape of the time
 1511 likelihood density since in reality not all photons are emitted at the midpoint of
 1512 the track. As with the charge likelihood, the contributions from both the direct
 1513 and scattered light to the time likelihood density are calculated separately, which
 1514 are both calculated from particle gun studies.

1515 The track parameters and particle identity which maximise $L(\Gamma, \vec{\theta})$ are defined
 1516 as the best-fit parameters. In practice MINUIT [180] is used to minimise the value
 1517 of $-\ln L(\Gamma, \vec{\theta})$. The `fiTQun` algorithm considers an electron-like, muon-like, and
 1518 charged pion-like hypothesis for events with a single final state particle, denoted
 1519 “single-ring events”. The particle’s identity is determined by taking the ratio of
 1520 the likelihood of each of the hypotheses. For instance, electrons and muons are
 1521 distinguished by considering the value of $\ln(L(e, \vec{\theta}_e)/L(\mu, \vec{\theta}_\mu))$ in comparison
 1522 to the reconstructed momentum of the electron hypothesis, as illustrated by
 1523 Figure 5.4. The coefficients of the discriminator between electron-like and muon-
 1524 like events are determined from Monte Carlo studies [178]. Similar distributions
 1525 exist for distinguishing electron-like events from π^0 -like events, and muon-like
 1526 events from pion-like events. The cuts are defined as,

$$\text{Electron/Muon} : \ln(L_e/L_\mu) > 0.2 \times p_e^{rec} [\text{MeV}],$$

$$\text{Electron}/\pi^0 : \ln(L_e/L_{\pi^0}) < 175 - 0.875 \times m_{\gamma\gamma} [\text{MeV}], \quad (5.5)$$

$$\text{Muon/Pion} : \ln(L_\mu/L_{\pi^\pm}) < 0.15 \times p_\mu^{rec} [\text{MeV}],$$

as taken from [181], where p_e^{rec} and p_μ^{rec} are the reconstructed momentum of the single-ring electron and muon fits, respectively. $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ represents the reconstructed invariant mass of the two photons emitted from π^0 decay. Typically, the distance between a particular entry in these two-dimensional distributions and the cut-line is termed the PID parameter and is illustrated in Figure 5.5.




Figure 5.4: The difference of the electron-like and muon-like log-likelihood compared to the reconstructed single-ring fit momentum for atmospheric ν_e (left) and ν_μ (right) samples. The black line represents the cut used to discriminate electron-like and muon-like events, which coefficients obtained from Monte Carlo studies. Figures taken from [178].




Figure 5.5: The electron/muon PID separation parameter for all sub-GeV single-ring events in SK-IV. The charged current (CC) component is broken down in four flavours of neutrino (ν_μ , $\bar{\nu}_\mu$, ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$). Events with positive values of the parameter are determined to be electron-like.

1532 The `fitQun` algorithm also considers a π^0 hypothesis. To do this, it performs
1533 a fit looking for two standard electron-hypothesis tracks which point to the
1534 same four-vertex. This assumes the electron tracks are generated from photon-
1535 conversion so the electron tracks actually appear offset from the proposed π^0
1536 vertex. For these fits, the conversion length, direction, and momentum of each
1537 photon are also considered as track parameters which are then fit in the same
1538 methodology as the standard single-ring hypotheses.

1539 Whilst lower energy events are predominantly single-ring events, higher
1540 energy neutrino events can generate final states with multiple particles which
1541 generate Cherenkov photons. These “multi-ring” hypotheses are also considered
1542 in the `fitQun` algorithm. When calculating the charge likelihood density, the
1543 predicted charge associated with each ring is calculated separately and then
1544 summed to calculate the total accumulated charge on each PMT. Similarly,
1545 the time likelihood for the multi-ring hypothesis is calculated assuming each
1546 ring is independent. Each track is time-ordered based on the time of flight
1547 from the center of the track to the PMT and the direct light from any ring
1548 incident on the PMT is assumed to arrive before any scattered light. To reduce
1549 computational resource usage, the multi-ring fits only consider electron-like
1550 and charged pion-like rings as the pion fit can be used as a proxy for a muon
1551 fit due to their similar mass.

1552 Multi-ring fits proceed by proposing another ring to the previous fit and
1553 then fitting the parameters in the method described above. Typically, multi-ring
1554 fits have the largest likelihood because of the additional degrees of freedom
1555 introduced. A likelihood value is calculated for the n -ring and $(n + 1)$ -ring
1556 hypotheses, where the additional ring is only included if the likelihood value
1557 is above 9.35, based on Monte Carlo studies in [182].

1558 5.2.1 Validation of Reconstruction in SK-V

1559 As an example of how the reconstruction depends on the detector conditions, the
1560 author of this thesis assessed the quality of event reconstruction for SK-V data.

The detector systematics used in the T2K-only oscillation analysis are determined using data-to-Monte Carlo comparisons of the SK-IV data [183]. Due to tank-open maintenance occurring between SK-IV and SK-V, the dark rate of each PMT was observed to increase in SK-V due to light exposure for a significant time during the repairs. This increase can be seen in Figure 5.6. Run-10 of the T2K experiment was conducted in the SK-V period, so the consistency of SK-IV and SK-V data needs to be studied to determine whether the SK-IV-defined systematics can be applied to the run-10 data. This comparison study was performed using the stopping muon data set for both the SK-IV and SK-V periods. This data sample is used due to the high rate of interactions ($O(200)$ events per hour) as well as having similar energies to muons from CCQE ν_μ interactions from beam interactions. The rate of cosmic muons does depend on the solar activity cycle [184] but has been neglected in this comparison study. This is because the shape of the distributions is most important for the purposes of being compared to the detector systematics. The SK-IV and SK-V data samples consist of 2398.42 and 626.719 hours of data which equates to 686k and 192k events respectively.

The predicted charge calculated in the `fitQun` algorithm includes a contribution from the photoelectron emission due to dark noise. Therefore, the increase in the SK-V dark rate needs to be accounted for. In practice, the average dark rate in each SK period is calculated and used as an input in the reconstruction. This is calculated by averaging the dark rate per run for each period separately, using the calibration measurements detailed in subsection 3.1.2. The average dark rate from SK-IV and SK-V were found to be 4.57kHz and 6.30kHz, respectively. The charges associated with the muon and decay electron subevents are illustrated in Figure 5.7. The photoelectron emission from dark noise is more significant for events that have lower energy. This is because this contribution becomes more comparable to the number of photoelectrons emitted from incident photons in lower-energy events. This behaviour is observed in the data, where the charge deposited by the muon subevent is mostly unaffected by the increase in dark rate, whilst the charge associated with the decay-electron is clearly affected.




Figure 5.6: The variation of the measured dark rate as a function of date, broken down by PMT type. The SK-IV and SK-V periods span September 2008 to May 2018 and January 2019 to July 2020, respectively. The break in measurement in 2018 corresponds to the period of tank repair and refurbishment. Figure adapted from [183].

1591 The energy scale systematic is estimated from data-to-Monte Carlo differences
 1592 in the stopping muon sample in [185] and found to be 2.1%. To determine the
 1593 consistency of SK-IV and SK-V with respect to the energy scale systematic, the
 1594 muon momentum distribution is compared between the two SK periods. As
 1595 the total number of Cherenkov photons is integrated across the track length,
 1596 the reconstructed momentum divided by track length (or range) is compared
 1597 between SK-IV and SK-V as illustrated in Figure 5.8.

1598 The consistency between these distributions has been computed in two ways.
 1599 Firstly, a Gaussian is fit to the peak of each distribution separately, whose mean
 1600 is found to be $(2.272 \pm 0.003)\text{MeV/cm}$ and $(2.267 \pm 0.006)\text{MeV/cm}$ for SK-IV
 1601 and SK-V respectively. The ratio of these is equal to 1.002 ± 0.003 . The means of
 1602 the Gaussian fits are consistent with the expected stopping power of a minimum
 1603 ionising muon for a target material (water) with $Z/A \sim 0.5$ [186]. The second




Figure 5.7: Comparison of the measured raw charge deposited per event from the stopping muon data samples between SK-IV (Blue) and SK-V (Red), split by the primary muon subevent and the associated decay electron subevent.

1604 consistency check is performed by introducing a nuisance parameter, α , which
 1605 modifies the SK-V distribution. The value of α which minimises the χ^2 value
 1606 between the SK-IV and SK-V is determined by scanning across a range of values.
 1607 This is repeated by applying the nuisance parameter as both a multiplicative
 1608 factor and an additive shift. The χ^2 distributions for different values of α is
 1609 illustrated in Figure 5.9. The values which minimise the χ^2 are found to be 0.0052
 1610 and 1.0024 for the additive and multiplicative implementations, respectively. No
 1611 evidence of shifts larger than the 2.1% uncertainty on the energy scale systematic
 1612 has been found in the reconstructed momentum distribution of SK-IV and SK-V.

1613 5.3 Event Reduction at SK

1614 Atmospheric neutrino events observed in the SK detector are categorised into
 1615 three different types of samples: fully contained (FC), partially contained (PC)
 1616 and up-going muon (Up- μ), using PMT hit signatures in the inner and outer
 1617 detector (ID and OD, respectively). To identify FC neutrino events, it is re-
 1618 quired that the neutrino interacts inside the fiducial volume of the ID and that
 1619 no significant OD activity is observed. For this analysis, an event is defined




Figure 5.8: The distribution of the reconstructed momentum from the muon ring divided by the distance between the reconstructed muon and decay electron vertices as found in the stopping muon data sets of SK-IV (Black) and SK-IV (Red). Only events with one tagged decay electron are considered. A Gaussian fit is considered in the range [2.0, 2.4] MeV/cm and illustrated as the solid curve.

1620 to be in the fiducial volume provided the event vertex is at least 0.5m away
 1621 from the ID walls. PC events have the same ID requirements but can have a
 1622 larger signal present inside the OD. Typically, only high energy muons from
 1623 ν_μ interactions can penetrate the ID wall. The Up- μ sample contains events where
 1624 muons are created from neutrino interactions in the OD water or rock below the
 1625 tank. They then propagate upwards through the detector. Downward-going
 1626 muons generated from neutrino interactions above the tank are neglected is




Figure 5.9: The χ^2 difference between the SK-IV and SK-V reconstructed muon momentum divided by range when the SK-V is modified by the scaling parameter α . Both additive (Blue) and multiplicative (Black) scaling factors have been considered. In practice, the additive scaling factor actually uses the value of $(\alpha - 1.0)$ but is illustrated like this so the results can be shown on the same axis range.

¹⁶²⁷ because of the difficulty in separating their signature from the cosmic muon
¹⁶²⁸ shower background. The sample categories are visually depicted in Figure 5.10.




Figure 5.10: A depiction of the topology patterns for fully-contained (FC), partially-contained (PC) and up-going muon ($Up-\mu$) samples included in this analysis.

¹⁶²⁹ Based on the event characteristics, as defined by the `fitQun` event reconstruction software, the FC events are categorised by
¹⁶³⁰

- **Visible Energy:** equal to the sum of the reconstructed kinetic energy of particles above the Cerenkov threshold for all rings present in the event. The purpose is to separate events into sub-GeV and multi-GeV categories.
- **Number of observed Cerenkov rings.** The purpose is to separate single-ring and multi-ring events, where single-ring events predominantly consist of quasi-elastic interactions and multi-ring events are typically resonant pion production or deep inelastic scattering events.
- **Particle identification parameter of the most energetic ring:** A value determined from the maximum likelihood value based on `fitQun`'s electron, muon, or pion hypothesis. The purpose is to separate electron-like and muon-like events.
- **Number of decay electrons:** The purpose is to separate quasi-elastic events (which have one decay electron emitted from the muon decay) and resonant pion production events (which have two decay electrons emitted from the muon and pion).

The PC and Up- μ categories are broken down into “through-going” and “stopping” samples depending on whether the muon leaves the detector. This is because the PC stopping events deposit the entire energy of the interaction into the detector, resulting in better reconstruction. The energy of events that exit the detector has to be estimated, with typically worse resolution, which introduces much larger systematic uncertainties. Through-going Up- μ samples are further broken down by whether any hadronic showering was observed in the event which typically indicates DIS interactions. The expected neutrino energy for the different categories is given in Figure 5.11. FC sub-GeV and multi-GeV events peak around 0.7GeV and 3GeV respectively, with slightly different peak energies for ν_e and $n\nu_\mu$ oscillation channels. PC and Up- μ are almost entirely comprised of ν_μ events and peak around 7GeV and 100GeV, respectively.




Figure 5.11: The predicted neutrino flux of the fully contained (FC) sub-GeV and multi-GeV, partially contained (PC), and upward-going muon (Up- μ) events. The prediction is broken down by the $\nu_x \rightarrow \nu_e$ prediction (top left), $\nu_x \rightarrow \nu_\mu$ prediction (top right) and $\nu_x \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ prediction (bottom). Asimov A oscillation parameters are assumed (given in Table 2.2).

In normal data-taking operations, the SK detector observes many background events alongside the beam and atmospheric neutrino signal events of physics interest for this thesis. Cosmic ray muons and flasher events, which are the spontaneous discharge of a given PMT, contribute the largest amount of background events in the energy range relevant to this thesis. Lower energy analyses like DSNB searches are also subject to radioactive backgrounds [187]. Therefore the data recorded is reduced with the aim of removing these background events. The reduction process is detailed in [46, 86] and briefly summarised below.

1666 The first two steps in the FC reconstruction remove the majority of cosmic
1667 ray muons by requiring a significant amount of ID activity compared to that
1668 measured in the OD. Events that pass this cut are typically very high momentum
1669 muons or events that leave very little activity in the OD. Consequently, a third
1670 reduction step is then applied to select cosmic-ray muons that pass the initial
1671 reduction step. A purpose-built cosmic muon fitter is used to determine the
1672 entrance (or exit) position of the muon and a cut is applied to OD activity
1673 contained within 8m of this position. Flasher events are removed in the fourth
1674 reduction step which is based on the close proximity of PMT hits surrounding
1675 the PMT producing the flash. Events that pass all these reduction steps are
1676 reconstructed with the APFit algorithm. The fifth step of the reduction uses
1677 information from the more precise fitter to repeat the previous two steps with
1678 tighter cuts. Muons below the Cherenkov threshold can not generate optical
1679 photons in the ID but the associated decay electron can due to its lower mass.
1680 These are the types of events targeted in the fifth reduction step. The final
1681 cuts require the event vertex to be within the fiducial volume (0.5m from the
1682 wall although the nominal distance is 2.0m), visible energy $E_{vis} > 30\text{MeV}$ and
1683 fewer than 16 hits within the higher energy OD cluster. The culmination of
1684 the fully contained reduction results in 8.09 events/day in the nominal fiducial
1685 volume [83]. The uncertainty in the reconstruction is calculated by comparing
1686 Monte Carlo prediction to data. The largest discrepancy is found to be 1.3%
1687 in the fourth reduction step.

1688 The PC and Up- μ events are processed through their own reduction processes
1689 detailed in [46]. Both of these samples are reconstructed with the APFit algorithm
1690 rather than `fiTQun`. This is because the efficiency of reconstructing events that
1691 leave the detector has not been sufficiently studied for reliable systematic uncer-
1692 tainties wth `fiTQun`. The PC and Up- μ samples acquire events at approximately
1693 0.66 and 1.44 events/day.

1694 Events due to beam neutrinos undergo the same reduction steps as FC events
1695 and are then subject to further cuts [188]. The GPS system which links the timing

1696 between the beam facility and SK needs to be operating correctly and there should
1697 be no activity within the detector in the previous $100\mu\text{s}$ before the trigger. The
1698 events then need to triggered between $-2\mu\text{s}$ and $10\mu\text{s}$ of the expected spill timing.

1699 The beam neutrino samples are not split by visible energy since their energy
1700 range is smaller than the atmospheric neutrino events. Following the T2K
1701 analysis in [76], only single-ring beam neutrino events are considered. Similar to
1702 atmospheric event selection, the number of decay electrons is used as a proxy for
1703 distinguishing CCQE and CCRES events. The expected neutrino energy, broken
1704 down by number of decay electrons, is given in Figure 5.12.




Figure 5.12: The predicted flux of beam neutrinos, as a function of neutrino energy. The predictions are broken down by the number of decay electrons associated with the particular events. Asimov A oscillation parameters are assumed (given in Table 2.2).

6

1705

1706

Sample Selections and Systematics

1707 The oscillation analysis presented within this thesis is built upon a simultaneous
1708 fit to atmospheric data at SK, neutrino beam data in the near detector, and
1709 beam data measured at SK. The definitions of these samples are documented
1710 in section 6.1, section 6.2, and section 6.3, respectively. The data collected and
1711 used within this analysis is detailed in Table 6.1. The near and far detector data
1712 corresponds to T2K runs 2-9 and runs 1-10, respectively. The accumulated POT
1713 and beam power for runs 1 – 10 are illustrated in Figure 6.1.

Data Type	Total
Near Detector FHC	1.15×10^{21} POT
Near Detector RHC	8.34×10^{20} POT
Far Detector FHC	1.97×10^{21} POT
Far Detector RHC	1.63×10^{21} POT
Atmospheric SK-IV	3244.4 days

Table 6.1: The amount of data collected in each detector used within this analysis. The data collected at the near and far detector, for both neutrino beam (FHC) and antineutrino beam (RHC), is measured as the number of protons on target (POT).

1714 The difference in POT recorded at the near and far detector is due to the
1715 difference in downtime. The SK detector is very stable with almost 100% of
1716 data recorded during beam operation. Due to various technical and operational

1717 issues, the downtime of the near detector is significantly higher due to its more
1718 complex design and operating requirements.

1719 The systematic parameters invoked within the flux, detector, and interaction
1720 models used within this analysis are documented in section 6.4. The standard
1721 configuration of the joint beam and atmospheric data fit utilises far detector sys-
1722 tematics provided in the official inputs from the two experiments. Additionally,
1723 a correlated detector model which fits the parameters used in sample selections
1724 to data has been developed and documented in subsection 6.4.5.




Figure 6.1: The accumulated beam data, measured as the number of protons on target (POT). The total data (blue) is given which comprises of the neutrino beam (red) and antineutrino (purple) components. The beam power for neutrino and antineutrino beams is given as the markers using the same colour scheme. The timescale runs from Run 1 which started in January 2010 until Run 10 which ended in February 2020. The ratio of accumulated data in neutrino and antineutrino beam is 54.7% : 45.3%.

1725 6.1 Atmospheric Samples

1726 The atmospheric event selection follows the official SK-IV analysis presented
1727 in [86] and is documented below. The Monte Carlo prediction used within this
1728 analysis corresponds to 500 years worth of neutrino events, which is scaled down
1729 to match the SK-IV livetime of 3244.4 days.

1730 The fully contained (FC), partially contained (PC), and upward going muon
1731 events ($\text{up-}\mu$) which pass the reduction cuts discussed in section 5.3 are further
1732 broken down into different samples based on reconstruction information. This
1733 section details the samples used within this oscillation analysis, alongside the
1734 chosen binning.

1735 FC events are first separated by the visible energy deposited within the
1736 detector. This is calculated as the sum of the reconstructed kinetic energy
1737 above the Cherenkov threshold for all rings present in the event. Events are
1738 separated by whether they were above or below $E_{\text{vis}} = 1.33\text{GeV}$. This separates
1739 “subGeV” and “multiGeV” events. Typically, lower energy events consist of
1740 charged current quasi-elastic (CCQE) interactions which are better understood
1741 and simpler to reconstruct resulting in smaller systematic uncertainties. Events
1742 are further separated by the number of rings associated with the event due to
1743 similar reasoning. As the oscillation probability is dependent upon the flavour
1744 of neutrino, electron and muon events are separated using a similar likelihood
1745 method to that discussed in section 5.2. To reduce computational resources
1746 required for the reconstruction, only electron and pion hypotheses are considered
1747 so this separation cut depends on the ratio of the electron to pion likelihoods,
1748 $\log(L_e/L_\pi)$. Finally, the number of decay electrons is used to classify events.
1749 Charged current resonant pion production (CCRES) interactions generate a final-
1750 state pion. This can decay, mostly likely through a muon, into a decay electron.
1751 Therefore any electron-like event with one decay electron or muon-like event
1752 with two decay electrons was most likely produced by a CCRES interaction.
1753 Consequently, the number of decay electrons can be used to distinguish CCQE

¹⁷⁵⁴ and CCRES interaction modes. Ultimately, FC subGeV events are separated
¹⁷⁵⁵ into the samples listed in Table 6.2.

Sample Name	Description
SubGeV- <i>e</i> like-0dcy	Single ring <i>e</i> -like events with zero decay electrons
SubGeV- <i>e</i> like-1dcy	Single ring <i>e</i> -like events with one or more decay electrons
SubGeV- <i>μ</i> like-0dcy	Single ring <i>μ</i> -like events with zero decay electrons
SubGeV- <i>μ</i> like-1dcy	Single ring <i>μ</i> -like events with one decay electrons
SubGeV- <i>μ</i> like-2dcy	Single ring <i>μ</i> -like events with two or more decay electrons
SubGeV- <i>π</i> 0like	Two <i>e</i> -like ring events with zero decay electrons and reconstructed π^0 mass $85 \leq m_{\pi^0} < 215$ MeV

Table 6.2: The fully contained subGeV samples, defined as events with visible energy $E_{vis} < 1.33$ GeV, used within this oscillation analysis.

¹⁷⁵⁶ In addition to the cuts discussed above, multiGeV samples also have addi-
¹⁷⁵⁷ tional cuts to separate samples which target neutrino and antineutrino events.
¹⁷⁵⁸ As discussed in section 7.1, the matter resonance only occurs for neutrinos in
¹⁷⁵⁹ normal hierarchy and antineutrinos in an inverted mass hierarchy. Therefore,
¹⁷⁶⁰ having flavour-enriched samples aids in the determination of the mass hierarchy.
¹⁷⁶¹ For a CCRES interaction,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{\nu}_e + N &\rightarrow e^+ + N' + \pi^-, \\
 \nu_e + N &\rightarrow e^- + N' + \pi^+ \\
 &\quad \downarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu \\
 &\quad \downarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_\mu.
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

¹⁷⁶² The π^- emitted from a $\bar{\nu}_e$ interaction is more likely to be absorbed within the
¹⁷⁶³ oxygen nucleus than the π^+ from ν_e interactions [189]. These pions then decay,
¹⁷⁶⁴ mostly through muons, to electrons. Therefore the number of tagged decay
¹⁷⁶⁵ electrons associated with an event gives an indication of whether the interaction
¹⁷⁶⁶ was due to a neutrino or antineutrino: zero for $\bar{\nu}_e$ events, and one for ν_e events.
¹⁷⁶⁷ The ability to separate neutrino from antineutrino events is illustrated in Table 6.4,
¹⁷⁶⁸ where the MultiGeV-*e*like-nue has 78% purity of CC neutrino interactions with
¹⁷⁶⁹ only 7% antineutrino background, the rest consisting of NC backgrounds.

1770 The number of decay electrons discriminator works reasonably well for single-
 1771 ring events. However, this is not the case for multi-ring events. A multiGeV
 1772 multiring electron-like (MME) likelihood cut was introduced in [190, 191]. This
 1773 is a two-stage likelihood selection cut. Four observables are used in the first
 1774 likelihood cut to distinguish $CC\nu_e$ and $CC\bar{\nu}_e$ events from background:

- 1775 • The number of decay electrons
 1776 • The maximum distance between the vertex of the neutrino and the decay
 1777 electrons
 1778 • The energy deposited by the highest energy ring
 1779 • The particle identification of that highest energy ring

1780 Background events consist of $CC\nu_\mu$ and NC interactions. Typically, the
 1781 majority of the energy in these background events is carried by the hadronic
 1782 system. Additionally, muons tend to travel further than the pions from $CC\nu_e$
 1783 before decaying. Thus, the parameters used within the likelihood cut target these
 1784 typical background interaction kinematics.

Sample Name	Description
MultiGeV-elike-nue	Single ring e -like events with zero decay electrons
MultiGeV-elike-nuebar	Single ring e -like events with one or more decay electrons
MultiGeV-mulike	Single ring μ -like events
MultiRing-elike-nue	Two or more ring events with leading energy e -like ring and passed both MME and $\nu/\bar{\nu}$ separation cuts
MultiRing-elike-nuebar	Two or more ring events with leading energy e -like ring and passed MME and failed $\nu/\bar{\nu}$ separation cuts
MultiRing-mulike	Two or more ring events with leading energy μ -like ring and only requires $E_{vis} > 0.6\text{GeV}$ DB: Why is this not }1.33\text{GeV
MultiRing-Other1	Two or more ring events with leading energy e -like ring and failed the MME likelihood cut

Table 6.3: The fully contained multiGeV samples used within this oscillation analysis. Both the sample name and description are given.

1785 Neutrino and antineutrino events are then separated by a second likelihood
 1786 method ($\nu/\bar{\nu}$ separation) detailed in [51]. This uses the number of decay electrons,

1787 the number of reconstructed rings, and the event’s transverse momentum. The
1788 last two parameters are used because higher-energy samples tend to have more
1789 pions produced above the Cherenkov threshold which results in more rings
1790 compared to an antineutrino interaction. Furthermore, the angular distribution
1791 also tends to be more forward peaked in antineutrino interactions as compared
1792 to neutrino interactions [86]. These FC multiGeV sample definitions are de-
1793 tailed in Table 6.3.

1794 The PC and up- μ samples are split by the amount of energy deposited within
1795 the outer detector, into “stopping” and “through-going” samples. If an event
1796 leaves the detector, the energy it takes with it has to be estimated which increases
1797 the systematic uncertainty compared to events entirely contained within the
1798 inner detector. This estimation is particularly poor at high energies, thus the
1799 up- μ through-going events are not binned in reconstructed momentum. The
1800 through-going up- μ are further separated by the presence of any electromagnetic
1801 showering in the event, as the assumption of non-showering muon does not give
1802 reliable reconstruction for these types of events [46]. In total, 13 FC, 2 PC, and
1803 3 up- μ atmospheric samples are included within this analysis.

1804 The atmospheric samples are binned in direct observables: reconstructed
1805 lepton momentum and direction, as given by Table A.1. The distribution of
1806 the reconstructed lepton momentum (for samples that only have one bin in
1807 reconstructed zenith angle) and reconstructed direction for each atmospheric
1808 sample used within this analysis is illustrated in Figure 6.2. The by-mode
1809 breakdown of each of the atmospheric samples is given in Appendix A.




Figure 6.2: Comparison of the SK-IV atmospheric samples between predictions made with the CP-violating Asimov A (Black) and CP-conserving Asimov B (Red) oscillation parameter sets (given in Table 2.2). The subGeV samples CCRES and π^0 -like samples are given in their reconstructed lepton momentum. All other samples are presented in their reconstructed zenith angle projection.

Sample	$CC\nu_e$	$CC\bar{\nu}_e$	$CC(\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu)$	$CC(\nu_\tau + \bar{\nu}_\tau)$	NC
SubGeV- <i>elike</i> -0dcy	72.17	23.3	0.724	0.033	3.77
SubGeV- <i>elike</i> -1dcy	86.81	1.773	7.002	0.062	4.351
SubGeV- <i>mulike</i> -0dcy	1.003	0.380	90.07	0.036	8.511
SubGeV- <i>mulike</i> -1dcy	0.023	0.	98.46	0.029	1.484
SubGeV- <i>mulike</i> -2dcy	0.012	0.	99.25	0.030	0.711
SubGeV- <i>pi0like</i>	6.923	2.368	0.928	0.011	89.77
MultiGeV- <i>elike</i> -nue	78.18	7.041	3.439	1.886	9.451
MultiGeV- <i>elike</i> -nuebar	56.68	37.81	0.174	0.614	4.718
MultiGeV- <i>mulike</i>	0.024	0.005	99.67	0.245	0.058
MultiRing- <i>elike</i> -nue	59.32	12.39	4.906	3.385	20
MultiRing- <i>elike</i> -nuebar	52.39	31.03	1.854	1.585	13.14
MultiRing- <i>mulike</i>	0.673	0.080	97.33	0.342	1.578
MultiRingOther-1	27.98	2.366	34.93	4.946	29.78
PCStop	8.216	3.118	84.45	0.	4.214
PCThrus	0.564	0.207	98.65	0.	0.576
UpStop-mu	0.829	0.370	98.51	0.	0.289
UpThruNonShower-mu	0.206	0.073	99.62	0.	0.103
UpThruShower-mu	0.128	0.054	99.69	0.	0.132

Table 6.4: The purity of each atmospheric sample used within this analysis, broken down by charged current (CC) and neutral current (NC) interactions and which neutrino flavour interacted within the detector. Asimov A oscillation parameter sets are assumed (given in Table 2.2). Electron neutrino and antineutrino events are separated to illustrate the ability of the separation likelihood cuts used within the multiGeV and multiring sample selections.

1810 6.2 Near Detector Beam Samples

1811 The near detector sample selections are documented in detail within [192] and
1812 summarised below. Samples are selected based upon the which Fine Grained
1813 Detector (FGD) that the vertex is reconstructed in as well as the operating mode
1814 of the beam: FHC or RHC. Wrong-sign neutrino samples are considered in the
1815 RHC mode in order to add additional constraints on model parameters. Samples
1816 from the wrong-sign component of the FHC beam mode are not included as they
1817 are statistically insignificant compared to those samples already listed.

1818 For additional constraints on model parameters, wrong-sign neutrino samples
1819 are also considered when the beam is operating in RHC mode.

1820 The reconstruction algorithm uses a clustering algorithm to group hits within
1821 the TPC. It then adds information from the upstream FGD to form a track
1822 which passes through both sub-detectors. In FHC(RHC), the highest momentum
1823 negative(positive) curvature track is defined as the muon candidate. Before
1824 being assigned a sample, these candidate muon events must pass CC-inclusive
1825 cuts, as defined in [193]:

- 1826 • Event Timing: The DAQ must be operational and the event must occur
1827 within the expected beam time window consistent with the beam spill
- 1828 • TPC Requirement: The muon-candidate track path must intercept one or
1829 more TPCs
- 1830 • Fiducial volume: The event must originate from within the fiducial volume
1831 defined in [194].
- 1832 • Upstream Background: Remove events that have muon tracks that originate
1833 upstream of the FGDs by requiring no high-momentum tracks within
1834 150mm upstream of the candidate vertex. Additionally, events that occur
1835 within the downstream FGD are vetoed if a secondary track starts within
1836 the upstream FGD

- 1837 • Broken track removal: All candidates where the muon candidate is broken
1838 in two are removed

- 1839 • Muon PID: Measurements of dE/dx in a TPC are used to distinguish muon-
1840 like events, from electron-like or proton-like, using a likelihood cut

1841 In addition to these cuts, RHC neutrino events also have to undergo the
1842 following cuts to aid in the separation of neutrino and antineutrino [195]:

- 1843 • TPC Requirement: The track path must intercept TPC2

- 1844 • Positive Track: The highest momentum track must have positive recon-
1845 structed charge

- 1846 • TPC1 Veto: Remove any events originating upstream of TPC1

1847 Once all CC-inclusive events have been determined, they are further split by
1848 pion multiplicity: CC0 π , CC1 π , and CCOther. These target specific interaction
1849 modes CCQE, CCRES, and other CC background interactions, respectively. Pions
1850 in the TPCs and FGDs are selected by requiring a second track to be observed,
1851 which is separate from the muon track and is in the same beam spill window and
1852 sub-detector. If the pion originated within a FGD, it must also pass through the
1853 sequential downstream TPC (TPC2 for FGD1, TPC3 for FGD2).

1854 CC0 π , CC1 π , and CCOther samples are defined with the following cuts:

1855 **DB: Understand pion cuts at ND**

- 1856 • ν_μ CC0 π **Selection:** No electrons in TPC and no charged pions or decay
1857 electrons within the TPC or FGD

- 1858 • ν_μ CC1 π **Selection:** Exactly one charged pion in either the TPC or FGD,
1859 where the number of charged pions in the FGD is equal to the number of
1860 decay electrons

- 1861 • ν_μ CCOther **Selection:** All events which are not classified into the above
1862 two selections.

Counting the three selections for each FGD in FHC and RHC running, including the wrong-sign background in RHC, 18 near detector samples are used within this analysis. These samples are binned in reconstructed lepton momentum (illustrated in Figure 6.3) and direction with respect to the beam. The binning is chosen such that each event has at least 20 Monte Carlo events in each bin [194]. This is to ensure that the bins are coarse enough to ensure the reduction of statistical errors, whilst also being fine enough to sample the high-resolution peak regions. The exact binning is detailed in [194].




Figure 6.3: The nominal Monte Carlo predictions compared to data for the FGD1 and FGD2 samples in neutrino beam mode, broken down into the $CC\nu_\mu 0\pi$, $CC\nu_\mu 1\pi$ and $CC\nu_\mu$ Other categories. Figures taken from [192].

6.3 Far Detector Beam Samples

The beam neutrino events which occur at the SK detector, which pass the reduction cuts detailed in section 5.3, are separated based on whether the beam was operating in FHC or RHC mode. The events are then separated into three samples: electron-like ($1Re$), muon-like ($1R\mu$), and $CC1\pi^+$ -like ($1Re1de$) which are observed as electron-like events with an associated decay electron [183]. As discussed in section 6.1, positively charged pions emitted from neutrino interactions are more likely to produce decay electrons than negatively charged pions. Consequently, the $CC1\pi^+$ -like sample is only selected when the beam is operating in FHC mode. Therefore, five beam samples measured at SK are used in this analysis.

The fiducial volume definition for beam samples is slightly different from that used for the atmospheric samples. It uses both the distance to the closest wall (`dWall`) and the distance to the wall along the trajectory of the particle (`toWall`). This allows events that originate close to the wall but are facing into the tank to be included within the analysis, which would have otherwise been removed. These additional events are beneficial for a statistics-limited experiment. The exact cut values for both `dWall` and `toWall` are different for each of the three types of sample and are optimised based on T2K sensitivity to δ_{CP} [181, 196]. They are:

1Re event selection For an event to be classified as a $1Re$ -like, the event must satisfy:

- Fully-contained and have $dWall > 80\text{cm}$ and $toWall > 170\text{cm}$
- Total of one ring which is reconstructed as electron-like with reconstructed momentum $P_e > 100\text{MeV}$
- Zero decay electrons are associated with the event
- Passes π^0 rejection cut discussed in section 5.2

1897 The zero decay electron cut removes non-CCQE interactions and the π^0
 1898 rejection cut is designed to remove neutral current π^0 background events which
 1899 can be easily reconstructed as 1Re-like events.

1900 The zero decay electron cut removes non-CCQE interactions and the π^0
 1901 rejection cut is designed to remove neutral current π^0 background events which
 1902 can be easily reconstructed as 1Re-like events.

1903 **CC1 π^+ event selection** This event selection is very similar to that of the 1Re
 1904 sample. The only differences are that the `dWall` and `toWall` criteria are changed
 1905 to $> 50\text{cm}$ and $> 270\text{cm}$, respectively, and exactly one decay electron is required
 1906 from the π^+ decay.

1907 **1R μ event selection** A 1R μ -like event is determined by the following cuts:

- 1908 • Fully-contained and have `dWall` $> 50\text{cm}$ and `toWall` $> 250\text{cm}$
- 1909 • Total of one ring which is reconstructed as muon-like with reconstructed
 1910 momentum $P_\mu > 200\text{MeV}$
- 1911 • Fewer than two decay electrons are associated with the event
- 1912 • Passes π^+ rejection cut discussed in section 5.2

1913 All of these samples are binned in reconstructed neutrino energy. This is
 1914 possible under a particular interaction mode assumption, as the direction from
 1915 the source is known extremely well. For the 1Re-like and 1R μ -like samples,

$$E_\nu^{rec} = \frac{(M_N - V_{nuc})E_l - m_l^2/2 + M_N V_{nuc} - V_{nuc}^2/2 + (M_P^2 + M_N^2)/2}{M_N - V_{nuc} - E_l + P_l \cos(\theta_{beam})} \quad (6.2)$$

1916 Where M_N , M_P and m_l are the masses of the neutron, proton and outgoing
 1917 lepton, respectively. $V_{nuc} = 27\text{MeV}$ is the binding energy of the oxygen nucleus
 1918 [183], θ_{beam} is the angle between the beam and the direction of the outgoing
 1919 lepton, and E_l and P_l are the energy and momentum of that outgoing lepton.




Figure 6.4: The reconstructed neutrino energy, as defined by Equation 6.2 and Equation 6.3, for the 1R μ -like, 1Re-like and CC1 π^+ -like samples. Asimov A oscillation parameter sets are assumed (given in Table 2.2). These samples are the FHC mode samples. For ease of viewing, the 1R μ sample only shows the $0 \leq E_\nu^{rec} < 3.0\text{GeV}$ but the binning extends to 30.0GeV.

1920 The reconstructed neutrino energy of the CC1 π^+ -like events also accounts
 1921 for the delta resonance produced within the interaction,

$$E_\nu^{rec} = \frac{2M_N E_l + M_{\Delta^{++}}^2 - M_N^2 - m_l^2}{2(M_N - E_l + P_l \cos(\theta_{beam}))} \quad (6.3)$$

1922 Where $M_{\Delta^{++}}$ is the mass of the delta baryon. Binding energy effects are not
 1923 considered as a two-body process with the delta baryon is assumed. This follows
 1924 the T2K oscillation analysis presented in [76], although recent developments
 1925 of the interaction model in the latest T2K oscillation analysis do include effects
 1926 from binding energy in this calculation [197].

1927 The reconstructed neutrino energy for the FHC samples is illustrated in
 1928 Figure 6.4. As expected, the 1R μ -like and 1Re-like samples are heavily dominated

by CCQE interactions, with smaller contributions from 2p2h meson exchange and resonant pion production interactions. The CC $1\pi^+$ -like sample predominantly consists of charged current resonant pion production interactions. The 1Re-like and CC $1\pi^+$ -like samples are also binned by the angle between the neutrino beam and the reconstructed lepton momentum. This is to aid in charged current and neutral current separation, as indicated in Figure 6.5. This is because the neutral current backgrounds are predominantly due to π^0 -decays, where the opening angle of the two gammas alongside the different final state kinematics produces a slightly broader angular distribution compared to the final state particles originating from charged current ν_e interactions.




Figure 6.5: The distribution of the angle between the neutrino beam direction and the reconstructed final state lepton, for the FHC 1Re-like sample. The distribution is broken down by neutrino interaction mode into charged current (left) and neutral current (right) components. Asimov A oscillation parameter sets are assumed (given in Table 2.2). The RMS of the charged and neutral current plots are 35.17° and 40.37° , respectively.

1939 6.4 Systematic Uncertainties

1940 The systematic model parameters for this analysis are split into groups, or blocks,
 1941 depending on their purpose. They consist of flux uncertainties, neutrino-matter
 1942 interaction systematics, and detector efficiencies. There are also uncertainties on
 1943 the oscillation parameters which this analysis is not sensitive to, namely Δm_{12}^2
 1944 and $\sin^2(\theta_{12})$. These oscillation parameters uncertainties are taken from the 2020
 1945 PDG measurements [77]. As described in chapter 4, each model parameter used
 1946 within this analysis requires a prior uncertainty. This is provided via separate
 1947 covariance matrices for each block. The covariance matrices can include prior
 1948 correlations between parameters within a single block, but the separate treatment
 1949 means prior correlations can not be included for parameters in different groups.
 1950 Some parameters in these models have no reasonably motivated uncertainties
 1951 and are assigned flat priors which do not modify the likelihood penalty. In
 1952 practice, these flat prior parameters are actually assigned a Gaussian with a
 1953 very large width to ensure the covariance matrix is positive definite. They are
 1954 then checked at run time to determine if they contribute to the likelihood. The
 1955 flux, neutrino interaction, and detector modeling simulations have already been
 1956 discussed in section 5.1 and section 5.2. The uncertainties invoked within each
 1957 of these models are described below.

1958 6.4.1 Beam Flux

1959 The neutrino beam flux systematics are based upon the uncertainty in the mod-
 1960 eling of the components of the beam simulation. This includes the model of
 1961 hadron productions and reinteractions, the shape, intensity, and alignment of
 1962 the beam with respect to the target, and the uniformity of the magnetic field
 1963 produced by the horn, alongside other effects. The uncertainty, as a function
 1964 of neutrino energy, is illustrated in Figure 6.6 which includes a depiction of
 1965 the total uncertainty as well as the contribution from individual components.
 1966 The uncertainty around the peak of the energy distribution ($E_\nu \sim 0.6\text{GeV}$) is

1967 dominated by uncertainties in the beam profile and alignment. Outside of this
1968 region, uncertainties on hadron production dominate the error.




Figure 6.6: The total uncertainty evaluated on the near detector ν_μ flux prediction constrained by the replica-target data, illustrated as a function of neutrino energy. The solid(dashed) line indicates the uncertainty used within this analysis(the T2K 2018 analysis [198]). The solid histogram indicates the neutrino flux as a function of energy. Figure taken from [199].

1969 The beam flux uncertainties are described by one hundred parameters. They
1970 are split between the ND280 and SK detectors and binned by neutrino flavour:
1971 ν_μ , $\bar{\nu}_\mu$, ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$. The response is then broken down as a function of neutrino
1972 energy. The bin density in the neutrino energy is the same for the ν_μ in FHC
1973 and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ in RHC beams, and narrows for neutrino energies close to the oscillation
1974 maximum of $E_\nu = 0.6\text{GeV}$. This binning is specified in Table 6.5. All of these
1975 systematic uncertainties are applied as normalisation parameters with Gaussian
1976 priors centered at 1.0 and error specified from a covariance matrix provided
1977 by the T2K beam group [199].

Neutrino Flavour	Sign	Neutrino Energy Bin Edges (GeV)
μ	Right	0., 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 1., 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 5., 7., 30.
μ	Wrong	0., 0.7, 1., 1.5, 2.5, 30.
e	Right	0., 0.5, 0.7, 0.8, 1.5, 2.5, 4., 30.
e	Wrong	0., 2.5, 30.

Table 6.5: The neutrino energy binning for the different neutrino flavours. “Right” sign indicates neutrinos in the FHC beam and antineutrinos in the RHC beam. “Wrong” sign indicates antineutrinos in the FHC beam and neutrinos in the RHC beam. The binning of the detector response is identical for the FHC and RHC modes as well as at ND280 and SK.

1978 6.4.2 Atmospheric Flux

1979 The atmospheric neutrino flux is modeled by the HKKM model [42]. 16 systematic
 1980 uncertainties are applied to control the normalisation of each neutrino flavour,
 1981 energy, and direction. They are summarised below:

- 1982 • **Absolute Normalisation:** The overall normalisation of each neutrino flavour
 1983 is controlled by two independent systematic uncertainties, for $E_\nu < 1\text{GeV}$
 1984 and $E_\nu > 1\text{GeV}$, respectively. This is driven mostly by hadronic interaction
 1985 uncertainties for the production of pions and kaons [42]. The strength of
 1986 the response is dependent upon the neutrino energy. The uncertainty is
 1987 parameterized following Figure 11 in [42].
- 1988 • **Relative Normalisation:** Uncertainties on the ratio of $(\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu) / (\nu_e + \bar{\nu}_e)$
 1989 are controlled by the difference between the HKKM model [42], FLUKA
 1990 [45] and Bartol models [41]. Three independent parameters are applied in
 1991 the energy ranges: $E_\nu < 1\text{GeV}$, $1\text{GeV} < E_\nu < 10\text{GeV}$, and $E_\nu > 10\text{GeV}$.
- 1992 • **$\nu/\bar{\nu}$ Normalisation:** The uncertainties in the π^+/π^- (and kaon equivalent)
 1993 production uncertainties in the flux of $\nu/\bar{\nu}$. The response is applied using
 1994 the same methodology as the relative normalisation parameters.
- 1995 • **Up/Down and Vertical/Horizontal Ratio:** Similar to the above two sys-
 1996 tematics, the difference between the HKKM, FLUKA, and Bartol model

1997 predictions, as a function of $\cos(\theta_Z)$, is used to control the normalisation of
 1998 events as a function of zenith angle.

- 1999 • **K/π Ratio:** Higher energy neutrinos ($E_\nu > 10\text{GeV}$) mostly originate in
 2000 kaon decay. Measurements of the ratio of K/π production [200] are used to
 2001 control the systematic uncertainty of the expected ratio of pion and kaon
 2002 production.
- 2003 • **Solar Activity:** As the 11-year solar cycle can affect the Earth's magnetic
 2004 field, the flux of primary cosmic rays varies across the same period. The
 2005 uncertainty is calculated by taking a ± 1 year variation, equating to a 10%
 2006 uncertainty for the SK-IV period.
- 2007 • **Atmospheric Density:** The height of the interaction of the primary cosmic
 2008 rays is dependent upon the atmospheric density. The HKKM assumes the
 2009 US standard 1976 [151] profile. This systematic controls the uncertainty in
 2010 that model.

2011 The total uncertainty is dominated by the absolute and relative normalisation
 2012 parameters. The effect of which is illustrated in Figure 6.7. Generally, the
 2013 uncertainty is large at low energy, reducing to $O(10\%)$ around the peak of the
 2014 flux distribution and then increasing once the neutrino energy exceeds 10GeV.




Figure 6.7: The uncertainty evaluated on the atmospheric ν_e (left) and ν_μ (right) flux predictions. The absolute normalisation and flavour ratio uncertainties are given. The solid histogram indicates the neutrino flux as a function of energy.

2015 Updates to the HKKM and Bartol models are underway [156] to use a similar
2016 tuning technique to that used in the beam flux predictions. After those updates,
2017 it may be possible to include correlations in the hadron production uncertainty
2018 systematics for beam and atmospheric flux predictions.

2019 6.4.3 Neutrino Interaction

2020 Neutrino interactions in the detectors are modeled by NEUT. The two indepen-
2021 dent oscillation analyses, T2K-only [201] and the SK-only [51], have developed
2022 separate interaction models. To maximise sensitivity out of this simultaneous
2023 beam and atmospheric analysis, a correlated interaction model has been defined
2024 in [202]. Where applicable, correlations allow the systematic uncertainties applied
2025 to the atmospheric samples to be constrained by near detector neutrino beam
2026 measurements. This can lead to stronger sensitivity to oscillation parameters
2027 as compared to an uncorrelated model.

2028 The low-energy T2K systematic model has a more sophisticated treatment
2029 of CCQE, 2p2h, and CCRES uncertainties, where extensive comparisons of
2030 this model have been performed to external data [201]. However, the model
2031 is not designed for high-energy atmospheric events, like those illustrated in
2032 Figure 5.11. Therefore the high energy systematic model from the SK-only
2033 analysis is implemented for the relevant multiGeV, PC, and up- μ samples. The
2034 T2K CCQE model is more sophisticated so it has been implemented for all
2035 samples within this analysis, where separate low-energy and high-energy dials
2036 have been implemented. The low-energy dials are constrained by the near
2037 detector measurements and are uncorrelated to their high-energy counterparts.
2038 The author of this thesis was responsible for implementing and validating the
2039 combined cross section model as documented in [202, 203].

2040 The high energy systematic model includes parameters developed from
2041 comparisons of Nieves and Rein-Seghal models which affect resonant pion
2042 producing interactions, comparisons of the GRV98 and CKMT models which
2043 control DIS interactions, and hadron multiplicity measurements which modulate

the normalisation of multi-pion producing events. The uncertainty on the ν_τ cross-section is particularly large and is controlled by a 25% normalisation uncertainty. These uncertainties are applied via normalisation or shape parameters. The former linearly scales the weight of all affected Monte-Carlo events, whereas the latter can increase or decrease a particular event's weight depending on its neutrino energy and mode of interaction. The response of the shape parameters is defined by third-order polynomial splines which return a weight for a particular neutrino energy. To reduce computational resources for the far detector fit, the response is binned by neutrino energy and sample binning: lepton momentum and cosine zenith binning for atmospheric splined responses and reconstructed neutrino energy and direction binning for beam samples. In total, 17 normalisation and 15 shape parameters are included in the high-energy model within this analysis.

Figure 6.8 indicates the predicted neutrino energy distribution for both beam and subGeV atmospheric samples. There is clearly significant overlap in neutrino energy between the subGeV atmospheric and beam samples, allowing similar kinematics in the final state particles. Figure 6.9 illustrates the fractional contribution of the different interaction modes per sample.

Comparing beam and atmospheric samples which target CCQE interactions (S.G. e-like 0de, S.G. μ -like [0,1]de, [FHC,RHC] 1R μ -like and [FHC,RHC] 1R e-like samples), there is a very similar contribution of CCQE, CC 2p2h, and CC1 π^\pm interactions. The samples which target CC1 π^\pm interactions, (S.G. e-like 0de, S.G. μ -like 2de and FHC 1R+1d.e e-like) also consist of very similar mode interactions.

As a consequence of the similarity in energy and mode contributions, correlating the systematic model between the beam and subGeV atmospheric samples ensures that this analysis attains the largest sensitivity to oscillation parameters while still ensuring neutrino interaction systematics are correctly accounted for. Due to its more sophisticated CCQE and 2p2h model, the T2K systematic model was chosen as the basis of the correlated model.




Figure 6.8: The predicted neutrino energy distribution for subGeV atmospheric and beam samples. FHC and RHC beam samples are summed together Asimov A oscillation parameters are assumed (given in Table 2.2). Beam and atmospheric samples with similar cuts are compared against one another.

The T2K systematic model [201] is applied in a similar methodology to the SK model parameters. It consists of 19 shape parameters and 24 normalisation parameters. Four additional parameters, which model the uncertainty in the binding energy, are applied in a way to shift the momentum of the lepton emitted from a nucleus. This controls the uncertainty specified on the 27MeV binding energy assumed within Equation 6.2. The majority of these parameters are

	CC QE	CC 2p2h	CC $1\pi^\pm$	CC $M\pi$	CC Other	NC $1\pi^0$	NC $1\pi^\pm$	NC $M\pi$	NC Coh.	NC Other
FHC 1R+1d.e. e-like	0.04	0.02	0.83	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
RHC 1R e-like	0.62	0.12	0.11	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04
FHC 1R e-like	0.68	0.12	0.10	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02
RHC 1R μ -like	0.62	0.13	0.17	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
FHC 1R μ -like	0.62	0.12	0.16	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
S.G. π^0 -like	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.68	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.04
S.G. μ -like 2de	0.04	0.01	0.80	0.10	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S.G. μ -like 1de	0.72	0.11	0.12	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
S.G. μ -like 0de	0.68	0.11	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.02
S.G. e-like 1de	0.05	0.01	0.75	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01
S.G. e-like 0de	0.73	0.11	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Figure 6.9: The interaction mode contribution of each sample given as a fraction of the total event rate in that sample. Asimov A oscillation parameters are assumed (given in Table 2.2). The Charged Current (CC) modes are broken into quasi-elastic (QE), 2p2h, resonant charged pion production ($1\pi^\pm$), multi-pion production ($M\pi$), and other interaction categories. Neutral Current (NC) interaction modes are given in interaction mode categories: π^0 production, resonant charged pion production, multi-pion production, and others.

2080 assigned a Gaussian prior uncertainty. Those that have no reasonably motivated
 2081 uncertainty, or those which have not been fit to external data, are assigned a
 2082 flat prior which does not affect the penalty term.

2083 On top of the combination of the SK and T2K interaction models, several
 2084 other parameters have been specifically developed for the joint oscillation anal-
 2085 ysis. The majority of the atmospheric samples' δ_{CP} sensitivity comes from the
 2086 normalisation of subGeV electron-like events. These are modeled using a spectral
 2087 function to approximate the nuclear ground state. However, the near detector is
 2088 not able to constrain the model so an additional systematic is introduced which
 2089 models applies an alternative Continuous Random Phase Approximation (CRPA)
 2090 nuclear ground state. This dial approximates the event weights if a CRPA model

had been assumed rather than a spectral function. This dial only applies to ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ as the near detector does not constraint ν_e cross-section measurements. It is applied as a shape parameter.

Further additions to the model have been introduced due to the inclusion of the subGeV π^0 atmospheric sample. This particularly targets charged current and neutral current π^0 producing interactions to help constrain the systematic uncertainties. Therefore, an uncertainty that affects neutral current resonant π^0 production is incorporated into this analysis. Comparisons of NEUT's NC resonant pion production predictions have been made to MiniBooNE [204] data and a consistent 16% to 21% underprediction is observed [202]. Consequently, a conservative 30% normalisation parameter is invoked.

Down-going events are mostly insensitive to oscillation parameters and can act similar to the near detector within an accelerator experiment (Details will be discussed in chapter 7). This region of phase space can act as a sideband and allows the cross-section model and near detector constraint to be studied. The distribution of events in this region is calculated using the technique outlined in subsection 4.3.4. The results are illustrated in Figure 6.10. For CCQE-targeting samples, the application of the near detector constraint is well within the statistical fluctuation of the down-going data such that no significant tension is observed between the data and the Monte Carlo prediction after the near detector constraint is applied. This is not the case for samples with target CCRES interactions. The electron-like data is consistent with the constrained prediction at high reconstructed momenta but diverges at lower momentum, whereas the muon-like sample is under-predicted throughout the range of momenta. To combat this disagreement, an additional cross-section systematic dial, specifically designed to inflate the low pion momentum systematics was developed in [202]. This is a shape parameter implemented through a splined response.




Figure 6.10: Down-going atmospheric subGeV single-ring samples comparing the mean and error of the pre-fit and post-fit Monte Carlo predictions in red and blue, respectively. The magenta histogram illustrates the Monte Carlo prediction using the generated dial values. The black points illustrate the down-going data with statistical errors given. The mean and errors of the Monte Carlo predictions are calculated by the techniques documented in subsection 4.3.4. The pre-fit spectrum is calculated by throwing the cross-section and atmospheric flux dial values from the pre-fit covariance matrix. The post-fit spectrum is calculated by sampling the cross-section dial values from an ND fit MCMC chain, whilst still throwing the atmospheric flux dials from the pre-fit covariance.

2118 6.4.4 Near Detector

2119 The systematics applied due to uncertainties arising from the response of the near
 2120 detector is documented in [131]. The response is described by 574 normalisation
 2121 parameters binned in the selected sample as well as momentum and angle,

2122 P_μ and $\cos(\theta_\mu)$, of the final-state muon. These are applied via a covariance
2123 matrix with each parameter being assigned a Gaussian prior from that covariance
2124 matrix. These normalisation parameters are built from underlying systematics,
2125 e.g. pion secondary interaction systematics, which are randomly thrown and
2126 the variation in each $P_\mu \times \cos(\theta_\mu)$ bin is determined. Two thousand throws are
2127 evaluated and a covariance matrix response is created. This allows significant
2128 correlations between FGD1 and FGD2 samples, as well as adjacent $P_\mu \times \cos(\theta_\mu)$
2129 bins. Statistical uncertainties are accounted for by including fluctuations of each
2130 event's weight from a Poisson distribution.

2131 Similar to the cross-section systematics, MaCh3 and BANFF are used to
2132 constrain the uncertainty of these systematics through independent validations.
2133 Each fitter generates a post-fit covariance matrix which is compared and passed
2134 to the far-detector oscillation analysis working group. As the analysis presented
2135 within this thesis uses the MaCh3 framework, a joint oscillation analysis fit of all
2136 three sets of samples and their respective systematics is performed.

2137 6.4.5 Far Detector

2138 Two configurations of the far detector systematic model implementation have
2139 been considered. Firstly, the far detector systematic uncertainties for beam and
2140 atmospheric samples are taken from their respective analysis inputs, denoted
2141 “official inputs” analysis, with no correlations assumed between the beam and at-
2142 mospheric samples. The beam- and atmospheric-specific inputs are documented
2143 in subsubsection 6.4.5.1 and subsubsection 6.4.5.2. Secondly, an alternative
2144 detector model has been developed which correlates the response of the SK
2145 detector systematics between the beam and atmospheric samples. Here, the
2146 distribution of parameters used for applying event cuts (e.g. electron-muon
2147 PID separation) is modified within the fit. It follows a similar methodology to
2148 the beam far detector systematics implementation but performs a joint fit of
2149 the beam and atmospheric data. This alternative implementation is detailed
2150 in subsubsection 6.4.5.3.

2151 **6.4.5.1 Beam Samples**

2152 There are 45 systematics which describe the response of the far detector to
2153 beam events [183], split into 44 normalisation parameters and one energy scale
2154 systematic. The energy scale systematic is applied as a multiplicative scaling
2155 of the reconstructed neutrino energy. It is estimated from data-to-Monte Carlo
2156 differences in the stopping muon sample in [185] and found to be 2.1%. The
2157 normalisation parameters are assigned a Gaussian error centred at one with
2158 width taken from a covariance matrix. A detailed breakdown of the generation
2159 of the covariance matrix is found in [196]. To build the covariance matrix, a fit
2160 is performed on atmospheric data which has been selected using beam sample
2161 selection cuts. These cuts use the variables, L^i , where the index i is detailed in
2162 Table 6.6. Each L^i is a smear, α , and shift, β parameter such that,

$$L_j^i \rightarrow \bar{L}_j^i = \alpha_j^i L + \beta_j^i \quad (6.4)$$

2163 Where L_j^i (\bar{L}_j^i) correspond to nominal(varied) PID cut parameters given in
2164 Table 6.6. The shift and smear parameters are nuisance parameters with no prior
2165 constraints. They are binned by final-state topology, j , where the binning is given
2166 in Table 6.7. The final-state topology binning is because the detector will respond
2167 differently to events that have one or multiple rings. For example, the detector
2168 will be able to distinguish single-ring events better than two overlapping ring
2169 events, resulting in different systematic uncertainty for one-ring events compared
2170 to two-ring events. This approach is used to allow the cut parameter distributions
2171 to be modified within the fit, allowing for better data to Monte Carlo agreement.

Cut Variable	Parameter Name
0	<code>fitQun e/mu PID</code>
1	<code>fitQun e/pi0 PID</code>
2	<code>fitQun mu/pi PID</code>
3	<code>fitQun Ring-Counting Parameter</code>

Table 6.6: List of cut variables that are included within the shift/smear fit documented in [196].

Category	Description
1e	Only one electron above Cherenkov threshold in the final state
1 μ	Only one muon above Cherenkov threshold in the final state
1e+other	One electron and one or more other charged particles above Cherenkov threshold in the final state
1 μ +other	One muon and one or more other charged particles above Cherenkov threshold in the final state
1 π^0	Only one π^0 in the final state
1 π^\pm or 1p	Only one hadron (typically charged pion or proton) in the final state
Other	Any other final state

Table 6.7: Reconstructed event topology categories on which the SK detector systematics [196] are based.

2172 The mis-modeling of π^0 events is also considered. If one of the two rings
 2173 from a π^0 event is missed, this will be reconstructed as a CC ν_e -like event. This
 2174 is one of the largest systematics hindering the electron neutrino appearance
 2175 analyses. Consequently, additional systematics have been introduced to con-
 2176 strain the mis-modeling of π^0 events in SK, binned by reconstructed neutrino
 2177 energy. To evaluate this systematic uncertainty, a set of “hybrid- π^0 ” samples is
 2178 constructed. These events are built by overlaying one electron-like ring from
 2179 the SK atmospheric neutrino samples or decay electron ring from a stopping
 2180 cosmic ray muon with one simulated photon ring. Both rings are chosen so
 2181 that momenta and opening angle follow the decay kinematics of NC π^0 events
 2182 from the T2K-MC. Hybrid- π^0 Monte Carlo samples with both rings from the
 2183 SK Monte Carlo are produced to compare with the hybrid- π^0 data samples and
 2184 the difference in the fraction of events that pass the ν_e selection criteria is used
 2185 to assign the systematic errors. In order to investigate any data to Monte Carlo
 2186 differences that may originate from either the higher energy ring or lower energy
 2187 ring, two samples are built; a sample in which the electron constitutes the higher
 2188 energy ring from the π^0 decay (called the primary sample) and another one in
 2189 which it constitutes the lower energy ring (called the secondary sample). The
 2190 standard T2K ν_e fitQun event selection criteria are used to select events.

2191 Final contributions to the covariance matrix are determined by supplemen-
 2192 tary uncertainties obtained by comparing stopping muon data to Monte Carlo

prediction, as first introduced in section 5.2. The efficiency of tagging decay electrons is estimated by the stopping muon data to Monte Carlo differences by comparing the number of one decay electron events to the number of events with one or fewer decay electrons. Similarly, the rate at which fake decay electrons are reconstructed by `f iTQun` is estimated by comparing the number of two decay electron events to the number of events with one or two reconstructed decay electrons. The two sources of systematics are added in quadrature weighted by the number of events with one true decay electron yielding a 0.2% systematic uncertainty. A fiducial volume systematic of $\pm 2.5\text{cm}$ which corresponds to a 0.5% shift in the normalisation of events is also applied. Additional normalisation uncertainties based on neutrino flavour and interaction mode are also defined in [183, 205, 206].

Two additional sources of uncertainty are included: secondary and photoneuclear interactions. These are estimated by varying the underlying parameters are building a distribution of sample event rates. These contributions are then added in quadrature to the above covariance matrix.

DB: Matrix Diagonals from SK Det Matrix

6.4.5.2 Atmospheric Samples

The detector systematics for atmospheric samples, documented in [86], are split into two sub-groups: those which are related to particle identification and ring counting systematics, and those which are related to calibration, separation, and reduction uncertainties.

The particle identification systematics consist of five parameters. The ring separation systematic enforces an anti-correlated response between the single-ring and multi-ring samples. This is implemented as a fractional increase/decrease in the overall normalisation of each sample, depending on the distance to the nearest wall from an event's vertex. The coefficients of the normalisation are estimated prior to the fit and depend on the particular atmospheric sample. Two electron-muon separation systematics are included within this model which

2222 anti-correlate the response of the electron-like and muon-like samples: one for
2223 single-ring events and another for multi-ring events.

2224 The multi-ring electron-like separation likelihood, discussed in section 6.1,
2225 encodes the ability of the detector to separate neutrino from anti-neutrino events.
2226 Two normalisation parameters vary the relative normalisation of multi-ring ν_e
2227 and $\bar{\nu}_e$ samples whilst keeping a consistent overall event rate.

2228 There are 22 systematics related to calibration measurements, including effects
2229 from backgrounds, reduction, and showering effects. They are documented in
2230 [86] and are briefly summarised in Table 6.8. They are applied via normalisation
2231 parameters, with the separation systematics requiring the conservation of event
2232 rate across all samples.

2233 6.4.5.3 Correlated Detector Model

2234 A complete uncertainty model of the SK detector would be able to determine
2235 the systematic shift on the sample spectra for a variation of the underlying
2236 parameters, e.g. PMT angular acceptance. However, this is computationally
2237 intensive, requiring Monte Carlo predictions to be made for each plausible
2238 variation. Consequently, an effective parameter model has been utilised for
2239 a correlated detector model following from the T2K-only model implementation
2240 documented in subsubsection 6.4.5.1. It correlates the detector systematics
2241 between the far-detector beam and subGeV atmospheric samples due to their
2242 similar energies and interaction types. As there are no equivalent beam samples,
2243 the multiGeV, multiring, PC, and Up- μ samples will be subject to the particle
2244 identification systematics implementation as described in subsubsection 6.4.5.2
2245 rather than using this correlated detector model. The calibration systematics also
2246 described in the aforementioned chapter still apply to all atmospheric samples.

2247 The correlated detector model utilises the same smear and shift parameters
2248 documented in subsubsection 6.4.5.1, split by final state topology. Beyond this,
2249 the shift and smear parameters are split by visible energy deposited within the
2250 detector, with binning specified in Table 6.9. This is because atmospheric events

Index	Description
0	Partially contained reduction
1	Fully contained reduction
2	Separation of fully contained and partially contained events
3	Separation of stopping and through-going partially contained events in top of detector
4	Separation of stopping and through-going partially contained events in barrel of detector
5	Separation of stopping and through-going partially contained events in bottom of detector
6	Background due to cosmic rays
7	Background due to flasher events
8	Vertex systematic moving events into and out of fiducial volume
9	Upward going muon event reduction
10	Separation of stopping and through-going in upward going muon events
11	Energy systematic in upward going muon events
12	Reconstruction of the path length of upward going muon events
13	Separation of showering and non-showering upward going muon events
14	Background of stopping upward going muon events
15	Background of non-showering through-going upward going muon events
16	Background of showering through-going upward going muon events
17	Efficiency of tagging two rings from π^0 decay
18	Efficiency of decay electron tagging
19	Background from downgoing cosmic muons
20	Asymmetry of energy deposition in tank
21	Energy scale deposition

Table 6.8: Sources of systematic errors specified within the grouped into the “calibration” systematics model.

are categorised by subGeV and multiGeV events based on visible energy, so this splitting is required when correlating the systematic model for beam and atmospheric events. Alongside the technical requirement, higher energy events will be better reconstructed due to fractionally less noise within the detector. As a result of the inclusion of visible energy binning, Equation 6.4 becomes

$$L_{jk}^i \rightarrow \bar{L}_{jk}^i = \alpha_{jk}^i L + \beta_{jk}^i, \quad (6.5)$$

where k is the visible energy bin.

The implementation of this systematic model takes the events reconstructed values of the cut parameters, modifies them by the particular shift and smear

Index	Range (MeV)
0	$30 \geq E_{vis} > 300$
1	$300 \geq E_{vis} > 700$
2	$700 \geq E_{vis} > 1330$
3	$E_{vis} \geq 1330$

Table 6.9: Visible energy binning for which the correlated SK detector systematics are based

parameter for that event, and then re-applies event selection. This causes event migration, which is a new feature incorporated into the MaCh3 framework which is only achievable due to the event-by-event reweighting scheme.

Particular care has to be taken when varying the ring counting parameter. This is because the number of rings is a finite value (one-ring, two-rings, etc.) which can not be continuously varied through this shift and smear technique. Consequently a continuous ring counting parameter, RC_i , is calculated for the i^{th} event, following the definition in [182]: the preferred likelihoods from all considered one-ring (L_{1R}) and two-ring (L_{2R}) fits are determined. The difference is computed as $\Delta_{LLH} = \log(L_{1R}) - \log(L_{2R})$. The ring counting parameter is then defined as

$$RC_i = \text{sgn}(\Delta_{LLH}) \times \sqrt{|\Delta_{LLH}|}, \quad (6.6)$$

where $\text{sgn}(x) = x/|x|$. This ring counting parameter corresponds to an intermediate likelihood value used within the `fitQun` algorithm to decide the number of rings associated with a particular event. However, fake-ring merging algorithms are applied after this likelihood value is used. Consequently, this ring counting parameter does not always exactly correspond to the number of reconstructed rings. This can be seen in Figure 6.11.

As the `fitQun` algorithm does not provide a likelihood value after the fake-ring algorithms have been applied, the ring counting parameter distribution is correlated to the final number of reconstructed rings through “maps”. These are two-dimensional distributions of the ring counting parameter and the final number of reconstructed rings. An example is illustrated in Figure 6.12. In principle,




Figure 6.11: The ring counting parameter as defined in Equation 6.6 for the SubGeV-else-like-0dcy and MultiRing-else-like-nue samples.

the `fitQun` reconstruction algorithm should be re-run after the variation in the ring counting parameter. However, this is not computationally viable. Therefore the “maps” are used as a reweighting template.

The maps are split by final state topology and true neutrino flavour and all `fitQun`-reconstructed Monte Carlo events are used to fill them. The maps are row-normalised to represent the probability of X rings for a given RC_i value. Prior to the oscillation fit, an event’s nominal weight is calculated as $W^i(N_{Rings}^i, L_{jk}^i)$, where N_{Rings}^i is the reconstructed number of rings for the i^{th} event and $W^i(x, y)$ is the bin content in map associated with the i^{th} event, where x is the number of rings and y is the ring counting parameter. Then during the fit, the value of $R = W^i(N_{Rings}^i, \bar{L}_{jk}^i) / W^i(N_{Rings}^i, L_{jk}^i)$ is calculated as the event weight for the i^{th} event. This is the only cut variable that uses a reweighting technique rather than event migration.




Figure 6.12: The ring counting parameter, defined in Equation 6.6, as a function of the number of reconstructed rings as found by the `fitQun` reconstruction algorithm. Left: true ν_μ events with only one muon above the Cherenkov threshold in the final state. Right: true ν_μ events with one muon and at least one other charged particle above the Cherenkov threshold in the final state.

2294 The π^0 systematics introduced in subsection 6.4.4 are applied via a covariance
 2295 matrix. This is not possible in the alternative model as no covariance matrix
 2296 is used. Thus, the implementation of the π^0 systematics has been modified.
 2297 The inputs from the hybrid π^0 sample are included via the use of “ χ^2 maps”,
 2298 which are two-dimensional histograms in α_{jk}^i and β_{jk}^i parameters over some
 2299 range. Illustrative examples of the χ^2 maps are given in Figure 6.13. Due to
 2300 their nature, the shift and smear parameters are typically very correlated. A
 2301 map is produced for each cut parameter given in Table 6.6 and for each visible
 2302 energy bin given in Table 6.9.

2303 The maps are filled through the χ^2 comparison of the hybrid π^0 Monte Carlo
 2304 and data in the particle identification parameters documented in Table 6.6. The
 2305 Monte Carlo distribution is modified by the α_{jk}^i and β_{jk}^i scaling, whilst cross-
 2306 section and flux nuisance parameters are thrown from their prior uncertainties.
 2307 The χ^2 between the scaled Monte Carlo and data is calculated and the relevant
 2308 point in the χ^2 map is filled.

2309 The implementation within this alternative detector model is to add the bin
 2310 contents of the maps, for the relevant values of the α_{jk}^i and β_{jk}^i parameters, to
 2311 the likelihood penalty. Only 1 π^0 final state topology shift and smear parameters
 2312 use this prior uncertainty.




Figure 6.13: The χ^2 between the hybrid- π^0 Monte Carlo and data samples, as a function of smear (α) and shift (β) parameters, for events which have $1\pi^0$ final state topology. Left: Electron-muon separation PID parameter for events with $30 \leq E_{\text{vis}}(\text{MeV}) < 300$. Right: Electron- π^0 separation PID parameter for events with $30 \leq E_{\text{vis}}(\text{MeV}) < 300$.

Similarly, the implementation of the supplementary systematics documented in subsubsection 6.4.5.1 needs to be modified. A new framework [207] was built in tandem with the T2K-SK working group [183] so the additional parameters can be incorporated into the MaCh3 framework. These are applied as normalisation parameters, depending on the particular interaction mode, number of tagged decay electrons, and whether the primary particle generated Cherenkov light. They are assigned Gaussian uncertainties with widths described by a covariance matrix. Furthermore, the secondary interaction and photo-nuclear effects need to be accounted for in this detector model using a different implementation than that in subsubsection 6.4.5.1. This was done by including a shape parameter for each of the secondary interactions and the photo-nuclear systematic parameters.

There are a total of 224 α_{jk}^i and β_{jk}^i parameters, of which 32 have prior constraints from the hybrid π^0 samples.

One final complexity of this correlated detector model is that the two sets of samples, beam and subGeV atmospheric, use slightly different parameters to distinguish electron and muon-like events. The T2K samples use the value of $\log(L_e/L_\mu)$ whereas the atmospheric samples use the value of $\log(L_e/L_\pi)$, where L_X is the likelihood for hypothesis X. This is because the T2K fits use single-ring `f1TQun` fitting techniques, whereas multi-ring fits are applied to the atmospheric samples where only the electron and pion hypothesis are considered.

2333 The correlation between the two likelihood ratios is illustrated in Figure 6.14. As
 2334 discussed in section 5.2, the pion hypothesis is a very good approximation of the
 2335 muon hypothesis due to their similar mass. Consequently, using the same shift
 2336 and smear parameters correlated between the beam and subGeV atmospheric
 2337 samples is deemed a good approximation.




Figure 6.14: The distribution of $\log(L_e/L_\mu)$ compared to $\log(L_e/L_\pi)$ for subGeV events with zero (top left), one (top right) or two (bottom) decay electrons. The correlation in the distribution is calculated as 0.997, 0.999 and 0.996, respectively.

7

2338

2339

Oscillation Probability Calculation

2340 It is important to understand how and where the sensitivity to the oscillation
2341 parameters comes from for both atmospheric and beam samples. An overview
2342 of how these samples observe changes in δ_{CP} , Δm^2_{23} , and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ affect
2343 these samples is given in section 7.1. This section also explains the additional
2344 complexities involved when performing an atmospheric neutrino analysis as
2345 compared to a beam-only analysis.

2346 Without additional techniques, atmospheric sub-GeV upward-going neutrinos ($E_\nu < 1.33\text{GeV}, \cos(\theta_Z) < 0.$) can artificially inflate the sensitivity to δ_{CP}
2347 due to the quickly varying oscillation probability in this region. Therefore, a
2348 “sub-sampling” approach has been developed to reduce these biases ensuring
2349 accurate and reliable sensitivity measurements. This technique ensures that small-
2350 scale unresolvable features of the oscillation probability have been averaged over
2351 whilst the large-scale features in the oscillation probability are unaffected. The
2352 documentation and validation of this technique are found in section 7.2. The
2353 oscillation probability calculation is computationally intensive due to the large
2354 number of matrix multiplications needed. Consequently, the CUDAProb3 imple-
2355 mentation choice made within the fitting framework, as detailed in section 7.3,
2356 ensures that the analysis can be done in a timely manner.
2357

Whilst the beam neutrinos are assumed to propagate through a constant density slab of material, the density variations through the Earth result in more complex oscillation patterns for atmospheric neutrinos. Furthermore, the uncertainty in the electron density can modify the oscillation probability for the denser core layers of the Earth. The model of the Earth used within this analysis is detailed in section 7.4. This includes information about the official SK-only methodology as well as improvements that have been made to remove some of the approximations used in that analysis. Another complexity of atmospheric neutrinos oscillation studies is that the height of production in the atmosphere is not known on an event-by-event basis. An analytical averaging technique that approximates the uncertainty of the oscillation probability has been followed, with the author of this thesis being responsible for the implementation and validation.

This implementation of an external technique is illustrated in section 7.5.

7.1 Overview

DB: Should this be moved into an earlier chapter? The selections chapter references the matter resonance which has not yet been explained at that point

The analysis presented within this thesis focuses on the determination of oscillation parameters from atmospheric and beam neutrinos. Whilst subject to the same oscillation formalism, the way in which the two samples have sensitivity to the different oscillation parameters differs significantly.

Atmospheric neutrinos have a varying baseline, or “path length”, L , such that the distance each neutrino travels before interacting is dependent upon the zenith angle, θ_Z . As primary cosmic rays can interact anywhere between the Earth’s surface and $\sim 50\text{km}$ above that, the height, h , in the atmosphere at which the neutrino was generated also affects the path length,

$$L = \sqrt{(R_E + h)^2 - R_E^2 (1 - \cos^2(\theta_Z))} - R_E \cos(\theta_Z). \quad (7.1)$$

2383 Where $R_E = 6,371\text{km}$ is the Earth's radius. Consequently, the oscillation
 2384 probability is dependent upon two parameters, $\cos(\theta_Z)$ and E_ν .

2385 The oscillation probability used within this analysis is based on [21]. The
 2386 neutrino wavefunction in the vacuum Hamiltonian evolves in each layer of
 2387 constant matter density via

$$i \frac{d\psi_j(t)}{dt} = \frac{m_j^2}{2E_\nu} \psi_j(t) - \sum_k \sqrt{2} G_F N_e U_{ej} U_{ke}^\dagger \psi_k(t), \quad (7.2)$$

2388 where m_j^2 is the square of the j^{th} vacuum eigenstate mass, E_ν is the neutrino
 2389 energy, G_F is Fermi's constant, N_e is the electron number density and U is the
 2390 PMNS matrix. The transformation $N_e \rightarrow -N_e$ and $\delta_{CP} \rightarrow -\delta_{CP}$ is applied
 2391 for antineutrino propagation. Thus, a model of the Earth's density is required
 2392 for neutrino propagation. Following the official SK-only methodology [208],
 2393 this analysis uses the Preliminary Reference Earth Model (PREM) [209] which
 2394 provides piecewise cubic polynomials as a function of the Earth's radius. This
 2395 density profile is illustrated in Figure 7.1. As the propagator requires layers of
 2396 constant density, the SK methodology approximates the PREM model by using
 2397 four layers of constant density [208], detailed in Table 7.1.

Layer	Outer Radius [km]	Density [g/cm ³]	Chemical composition (Z/A)
Inner Core	1220	13	0.468 ± 0.029
Outer Core	3480	11.3	0.468 ± 0.029
Lower Mantle	5701	5.0	0.496
Transition Zone	6371	3.3	0.496

Table 7.1: Description of the four layers of the Earth invoked within the constant density approximation of the PREM model [209].

2398 The atmospheric neutrino oscillation probabilities can be presented as two di-
 2399 mensional “oscillograms” as illustrated in Figure 7.2. The distinct discontinuities,
 2400 as a function of $\cos(\theta_Z)$, are due to the discontinuous density in the PREM model.

2401 Atmospheric neutrinos have sensitivity to δ_{CP} through the overall event
 2402 rate. Figure 7.3 illustrates the difference in oscillation probability between CP-
 2403 conserving ($\delta_{CP} = 0$) and a CP-violating ($\delta_{CP} = -1.601$) value taken from




Figure 7.1: The density of the Earth given as a function of the radius, as given by the PREM model (Black), and the constant density four-layer approximation (Blue), as used in the official SK-only analysis.

2404 Asimov A oscillation parameter set (Table 2.2). The result is a complicated
 2405 oscillation pattern in the appearance probability for sub-GeV upgoing neutrinos.
 2406 The detector does not have sufficient resolution to resolve these individual
 2407 patterns so the sensitivity to δ_{CP} for atmospheric neutrinos comes via the overall
 2408 normalisation of these events.

2409 The presence of matter means that the effect δ_{CP} has on the oscillation
 2410 probability is not equal between neutrinos and antineutrinos. Furthermore,
 2411 the interaction cross-section for neutrinos is larger than antineutrinos so the
 2412 two effects have to be disentangled. These effects are further convoluted by
 2413 detector efficiencies as SK cannot distinguish neutrinos and antineutrinos well.
 2414 Furthermore, the sample selections discussed in section 6.1 have difference
 2415 efficiencies for neutrino-antineutrino selections. All of these effects lead to
 2416 a difference in the number of neutrinos detected compared to antineutrinos.
 2417 This changes how the δ_{CP} normalisation term is observed, resulting in a very
 2418 complex sensitivity to δ_{CP} .

2419 The vacuum and matter oscillation probabilities for $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ and $P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow$




Figure 7.2: An “oscillogram” that depicts the $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ oscillation probability as a function of neutrino energy and cosine of the zenith angle. The zenith angle is defined such that $\cos(\theta_Z) = 1.0$ represents neutrinos that travel from directly above the detector. The four-layer constant density PREM model approximation is used and Asimov A oscillation parameters are assumed (Table 2.2).

2420 $\bar{\nu}_e$) are presented in Figure 7.4, where the PREM model has been assumed.
 2421 The oscillation probability for both neutrinos and antineutrinos is affected in
 2422 the presence of matter. However, the resonance effects around $O(5)\text{GeV}$ only
 2423 occur for neutrinos in normal mass hierarchy and antineutrinos in inverse mass
 2424 hierarchy. The exact position and amplitude of the resonance depend on $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$
 2425 , further increasing the atmospheric neutrinos’ sensitivity to the parameter.

2426 As the T2K beam flux is centered at the first oscillation maximum ($E_\nu =$
 2427 0.6GeV), the sensitivity to δ_{CP} is predominantly observed as a change in the
 2428 event-rate of e-like samples in $\nu/\bar{\nu}$ modes. Figure 7.5 illustrates the $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$
 2429 oscillation probability for a range of δ_{CP} values. A circular modulation of the
 2430 first oscillation peak (in both magnitude and position) is observed when varying
 2431 throughout the allowable values of δ_{CP} . The CP-conserving values of $\delta_{CP} = 0, \pi$
 2432 have a lower(higher) oscillation maximum than the CP-violating values of $\delta_{CP} =$
 2433 $-\pi/2(\delta_{CP} = \pi/2)$. A sub-dominant shift in the energy of the oscillation peak is
 2434 also present, which aids in separating the two CP-conserving values of δ_{CP} .

2435 T2K’s sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ and Δm_{23}^2 is observed as a shape-based variation

$$\mathbf{P}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \delta_{CP} = -1.601) - \mathbf{P}(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e; \delta_{CP} = 0.)$$




Figure 7.3: The effect of δ_{CP} for atmospheric neutrinos given in terms of the neutrino energy and zenith angle. This oscillogram compares the $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ oscillation probability for a CP conserving ($\delta_{CP} = 0.0$) and a CP violating ($\delta_{CP} = -1.601$) value taken from the Asimov A parameter set. The other oscillation parameters assume the Asimov A oscillation parameter set given in Table 2.2.

of the muon-like samples, as illustrated in Figure 7.5. The value of Δm_{32}^2 laterally shifts the position of the oscillation dip (around $E_\nu \sim 0.6\text{GeV}$) in the $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\mu)$ oscillation probability. A variation of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is predominantly observed as a vertical shift of the oscillation dip with second-order horizontal shifts being due to matter effects. The beam neutrinos have limited sensitivity to matter effects due to the relatively shorter baseline as well as the Earth's mantle being a relatively low-density material (as compared to the Earth's core). For some values of δ_{CP} , the degeneracy in the number of e-like events allows the mass hierarchy to be broken. This leads to a δ_{CP} -dependent mass hierarchy sensitivity which can be seen in Figure 7.6.

Whilst all oscillation channels should be included for completeness, the computational resources required to run a fit are limited and any reasonable approximations which reduce the number of oscillation probability calculations




Figure 7.4: An illustration of the matter-induced effects on the oscillation probability, given as a function of neutrino energy and zenith angle. The top row of panels gives the $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ oscillation probability and the bottom row illustrates the $P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e)$ oscillation probability. The left column highlights the oscillation probability in a vacuum, whereas the middle and right column represents the oscillation probabilities when the four-layer fixed density PREM model is assumed. All oscillation probabilities assume the “Asimov A” set given in Table 2.2, but importantly, the right column sets an inverted mass hierarchy. The “matter resonance” effects at $E_\nu \sim 5\text{GeV}$ can be seen in the $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ for normal mass hierarchy and $P(\bar{\nu}_e \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e)$ for inverted hierarchy.

that need to be made should be applied. The $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$ (and antineutrino equivalent) oscillations can be ignored for beam neutrinos as the $\nu_e/\bar{\nu}_e$ fluxes are approximately two orders of magnitude smaller than the corresponding $\nu_\mu/\bar{\nu}_\mu$ flux. Furthermore, as the peak neutrino energy of the beam is well below the threshold for charged current tau production ($E_\nu = 3.5\text{GeV}$ [50], only a small proportion of the neutrinos produced in the beam have the required energy. For the few neutrinos that have sufficient energy, the oscillation probability is very




Figure 7.5: The oscillation probability for beam neutrino events given as a function of neutrino energy. All oscillation parameters assume the “Asimov A” set given in Table 2.2 unless otherwise stated. Each panel represents a change in one of the oscillation parameters whilst keeping the remaining parameters fixed.

2456 small due to the short baseline. Whilst these approximations have been made for
 2457 the beam neutrinos, the atmospheric flux of ν_e is of the same order of magnitude
 2458 as the ν_μ flux and the energy distribution of atmospheric neutrinos extends well
 2459 above the tau production threshold.




Figure 7.6: The number of electron-like events in the FHC and RHC operating mode of the beam, as a function of the oscillation probabilities. Both normal hierarchy (Solid) and inverse hierarchy (Dashed) values of Δm_{23}^2 are given.

2460 7.2 Treatment of Fast Oscillations

2461 As shown in Figure 7.7, atmospheric neutrino oscillations have a significantly
 2462 more complex structure for upgoing neutrinos with energy below 1GeV. This is
 2463 because the L/E dependence of the oscillation probability in this region induces
 2464 rapid variations for small changes in L or E . As discussed in section 7.1, this
 2465 is also the region in which atmospheric neutrinos have sensitivity to δ_{CP} . In
 2466 practice, the direction of the neutrino is inferred from the direction of the final
 2467 state particles traveling in the detector, which can be poor for low-energy neutrino
 2468 interactions. This creates a distinct difference from the beam neutrinos where
 2469 the position of the source is very precisely known.

2470 As a consequence of the unresolvable structure, an event rate consistent with
 2471 the averaged oscillation probability is observed in the subGeV upgoing region.
 2472 This creates a computational problem: A significantly large amount of Monte
 2473 Carlo statistics would be required to accurately predict the number of events
 2474 if Monte Carlo averaging was the only technique used. This section describes
 2475 the ‘sub-sampling’ approach developed for this analysis and compares it to the
 2476 methodology used within the SK-only analysis.

2477 The official SK-only analysis uses the osc3++ oscillation parameter fitter
 2478 [208]. To perform the fast oscillation averaging, it uses a ‘nearest-neighbour’
 2479 technique. For a given Monte Carlo neutrino event, the nearest twenty Monte
 2480 Carlo neighbours in reconstructed lepton momentum and zenith angle are
 2481 found and a distribution of their neutrino energies is built. The RMS, σ , of
 2482 this distribution is then used to compute an average oscillation probability for
 2483 the given neutrino Monte Carlo event.

2484 For the i^{th} event, the oscillation weight is calculated as

$$W_i = \frac{1}{5}P(E_i, \bar{L}_i) + \frac{1}{5}\sum_{\beta=-1, -0.5, 0.5, 1} P(E_i + \beta\sigma_i, L_\beta), \quad (7.3)$$

2485 where $P(E, L)$ is the oscillation probability calculation for neutrino energy
 2486 E and path length L and the two path lengths, \bar{L}_i and L_β are discussed below.




Figure 7.7: The oscillation probability $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$, given as a function of neutrino energy and zenith angle, which highlights an example of the “fast” oscillations in the sub-GeV upgoing region.

2487 All of the oscillation probability calculations are performed with a fixed zenith
2488 angle such that the same density profile is used.

2489 The uncertainty in the production height is controlled by using an “average”
2490 production height, \bar{L}_i , which represents the average path length computed using
2491 twenty production heights taken from the Honda flux model’s prediction [44].
2492 For a given event, the production heights are sampled in steps of 5% of their
2493 cumulative distribution function. L_β values are similarly calculated but instead
2494 use different combinations of four production heights,

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_{-1.0} &= \frac{1}{4}L(45, 50, 55, 60), \\
 L_{-0.5} &= \frac{1}{4}L(35, 40, 65, 70), \\
 L_{+0.5} &= \frac{1}{4}L(25, 30, 75, 68), \\
 L_{+1.0} &= \frac{1}{4}L(15, 20, 85, 89).
 \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

2495 This averaging technique works because of the inference between the zenith
2496 angle and the reconstructed direction of final state particles in the detector. For

2497 low-energy neutrinos, where the resolution of the true neutrino direction is poor,
2498 σ_i will be large, resulting in significant averaging effects. Contrary to this, the
2499 inferred direction of high-energy neutrinos will be much closer to the true value,
2500 meaning that σ_i will be smaller, culminating in small averaging effects.

2501 In practice, these calculations are performed prior to the fit as only oscillation
2502 parameters at fixed points are considered. The MCMC technique used in this
2503 thesis requires oscillation probabilities to be evaluated at arbitrary parameter
2504 values, not known *a priori*. Calculating the five oscillation probabilities per
2505 event required by the SK technique is computationally infeasible, so a differencct
2506 averaging technique is used. However, the concept of the averaging technique
2507 can be taken from it.

2508 To perform a similar averaging as the SK analysis, a sub-sampling approach
2509 using binned oscillograms has been devised. A coarsly binned oscillogram is
2510 defined in $\cos(\theta_Z)$ and E_ν . For a given set of oscillation parameters, a single
2511 oscillation probability will be assigned to each coarse bin. This value will then
2512 apply to all Monte Carlo events which fall into that bin. To assign these oscillation
2513 probabilities, the probability is calculated at $N \times N$ points on a grid within a
2514 particular bin. This ensemble of oscillation probabilities is averaged to define
2515 the coarse bin's oscillation probability, assuming a flat prior in E_ν and $\cos(\theta_Z)$.
2516 Figure 7.8 illustrates the $N = 2$ example where the assigned value to a coarse
2517 bin is the average of the four fine bins which fall in that coarse bin. Whilst the
2518 coarse bin edges do not have to be linear on either axis, the sub-division of the
2519 fine bins is linear over the range of a coarse bin.

2520 The coarse binning is defined with 67×52 bins in true neutrino energy \times
2521 cosine zenith. It is picked to be identical to that provided in [210]. In general, the
2522 binning is logarithmically spaced in neutrino energy but has some hand-picked
2523 bin edges around the matter resonance to smoothly increased the bin density.
2524 This is to avoid smearing this region which can be well sampled by the Monte
2525 Carlo. The cosine zenith binning is approximately linearly spaced across the




Figure 7.8: Illustration of the averaging procedure for $N = 2$. The oscillation probabilities calculated on the finer left binning are averaged to obtain the oscillation probabilities in the coarser right binning. These averaged oscillation probabilities with the coarser binning are then applied to each event during the fit.

allowable range but the values of layer transitions are hit precisely: -0.8376 (core-mantle) and -0.4464 (mantle/transition zone). Bins are spread further apart for downgoing events as this is a region unaffected by the fast oscillation wavelengths and reduces the total number of calculations required to perform the calculation.

The choice of N is justified based on two studies. Firstly, the variation of event rates of each sample is studied as a function of N . For a given set of oscillation parameters thrown from the PDG prior constraints (detailed in Table 2.1), the oscillation probabilities are calculated using a given value of N . Each sample is re-weighted and the event rate is stored. The value of N is scanned from 1, which corresponds to no averaging, to 19, which corresponds to the largest computationally viable subdivision binning. The event rate of each sample at large N is expected to converge to a stationary value due to the fine binning fully sampling the small-scale structure. Figure 7.9 illustrates this behaviour for the SubGeV_elike_0dcy sample for 9 different throws of the oscillation parameters.

Denoting the event rate for one sample for a given throw t at each N by λ_t^N , the average over all considered N values ($\bar{\lambda}_t = \frac{1}{24} \sum_{N=1}^{24} \lambda_t^N$) is computed. The variance in the event rate at each N is then calculated as

$$\text{Var}[\lambda^N] = \frac{1}{N_{\text{throws}}} \sum_{t=1}^{N_{\text{throws}}} (\lambda_t^N - \bar{\lambda}_t)^2 - \left[\frac{1}{N_{\text{throws}}} \sum_{t=1}^{N_{\text{throws}}} (\lambda_t^N - \bar{\lambda}_t) \right]^2. \quad (7.5)$$




Figure 7.9: Event rate of the SubGeV_elike_0dcy sample as a function of the number of sub-divisions per coarse bin. Each subplot represents the event rate of the sample at a different oscillation parameter set thrown from the PDG priors detailed in Table 2.1. The red line in each subplot represents the mean of the event rate over the different values of sub-divisions for that particular oscillation parameter throw.

2543 In practice the following procedure is undertaken. For a particular throw,
 2544 the difference between the event rate at a particular choice of N and the mean
 2545 of the distribution is calculated. This is illustrated in Figure 7.10. This value
 2546 is then calculated for all the 2000 throws, generating a distribution of $\lambda_t^N - \bar{\lambda}_t$.
 2547 This is repeated for each of the values of N considered within this study. The
 2548 distributions of this value, for $N = \{1, 5\}$, are given in Figure 7.11. As expected,
 2549 the distribution gets narrower and tends towards zero for the higher values of N .

2550 The aim of the study is to find the lowest value of N such that this variance
 2551 is below 0.001. This utilises the width of the distributions given in Figure 7.11.
 2552 This is the typical threshold used by T2K fitters to validate systematic imple-
 2553 mentation so has been set as the same criteria. The results of this study for
 2554 each atmospheric sample used within this thesis are illustrated in Figure 7.12 for
 2555 2000 throws of the oscillation parameters. As can be seen, the variance is below




Figure 7.10: Event rate of the SubGeV_elike_0dcy sample, for a particular oscillation parameter throw, as a function of the number of sub-divisions, N , per coarse bin. The difference between the mean event rate (red), $\bar{\lambda}$, and the event rate at $N = 1$, $\lambda^{N=1}$ is defined as $\lambda^N - \bar{\lambda}$ and illustrated by the blue arrow.

2556 the threshold at $N = 10$, and is driven primarily by the SubGeV_mulike_1dcy
 2557 and SubGeV_elike_0dcy samples.

2558 The second study to determine the value of N is as follows. The likelihood
 2559 for each sample is computed against an Asimov data set created with Asimov
 2560 A oscillation parameters (Table 2.2). Following Equation 7.5, the variance of
 2561 the log-likelihood over all considered N is computed. The results are shown
 2562 in Figure 7.13.

2563 A choice of $N = 10$ sub-divisions per coarse bin has a variance in both
 2564 event rate and log-likelihood residuals less than the required threshold of 0.001.
 2565 The largest value of the likelihood variance is of order 10^{-7} , corresponding to
 2566 an error on the log-likelihood of about 3×10^{-4} which is small enough to be
 2567 negligible for the oscillation analysis.

2568 Figure 7.14 illustrates the effect of the smearing using $N = 10$. The fast oscil-




Figure 7.11: The distribution of $\lambda^N - \bar{\lambda}$ for various values of N . As expected, the distribution gets narrower for larger values of N .

2569 lations in the sub-GeV upgoing region have been replaced with a normalisation
 2570 effect whilst the large matter resonance structure remains.

2571 7.3 Calculation Engine

2572 As previously discussed in section 7.2, the calculation of oscillation probabilities
 2573 is performed at run-time. Consequently, the time per calculation is crucial for fit
 2574 performance. The initial fitting framework used for this analysis was developed
 2575 with ProbGPU [211]. This is a GPU-only implementation of the prob3 engine
 2576 [212]. It is primarily designed for neutrino propagation in a beam experiment
 2577 (single layer of constant density) with the atmospheric propagation code not
 2578 being used prior to the analysis in this thesis.

2579 Another engine, CUDAProb3 [213], has been interfaced with the fitting frame-
 2580 work used in this analysis. It has been specifically optimised for atmospheric
 2581 neutrino oscillation calculation so does not contain the code to replace the




Figure 7.12: Variance of event rate for each atmospheric sample as a function of the number of sub-divisions per coarse bin. The solid red line indicates the 0.1% threshold and the dashed red line indicates the variance at a sub-division $N = 10$.




Figure 7.13: Variance of sample likelihood, when compared to ‘Asimov data’ set at Asimov A, for each atmospheric sample as a function of the number of sub-divisions per coarse bin. The solid red line indicates the 0.1% threshold and the dashed red line is a graphical indication of the variance at a sub-division $N = 10$.




Figure 7.14: The oscillation probability, $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (top row) and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (bottom row), given as a function of neutrino energy and zenith angle. The left column gives the “fine” binning used to calculate the oscillation probabilities and the right column illustrates the “coarse” binning used to reweight the Monte Carlo events. The fine binning choice is given with $N = 10$, which was determined to be below the threshold from Figure 7.12 and Figure 7.13.

beam oscillation calculation. The engine utilises object-orientated techniques as compared to the functional implementation of ProbGPU. This allows the energy and cosine zenith arrays to be kept on GPU memory, rather than having to load these arrays onto GPU memory for each calculation. Reducing the memory transfer between CPU and GPU significantly reduces the time required for calculation. This can be seen in Figure 7.15, where the GPU implementation of CUDAProb3 is approximately three times faster than the ProbGPU engine.

Another significant advantage of CUDAProb3 is that it contains a CPU multithreaded implementation which is not possible with the ProbGPU or prob3




Figure 7.15: The calculation time taken to both calculate the oscillation probabilities and fill the “coarse” oscillograms, following the technique given in section 7.2, for the CUDAProb3 and ProbGPU (Red) calculation engines. CUDAProb3 has both a GPU (Blue) and CPU (Black) implementation, where the CPU implementation is multithreaded. Therefore, 8-threads (solid) and 40-threads (dashed) configurations have been tested. Prob3, which is a CPU single-thread implementation has a mean step time of 1.142s.

2591 engines. This eliminates the requirement for GPU resources when submitting
 2592 jobs to batch systems. As illustrated in Figure 7.15, the calculation speed depends
 2593 on the number of available threads. Using 8 threads (which is typical of the
 2594 batch systems being used) is approximately twice as slow as the ProbGPU engine
 2595 implementation, but would allow the fitting framework to be run on many more
 2596 resources. This fact is utilised for any SK-only fits but GPU resources are required
 2597 for any fits which include beam samples due to the ProbGPU requirement. Based
 2598 on the benefits shown by the implementation in this section, efforts are being
 2599 placed into including linear propagation for beam neutrino propagation into
 2600 the engine [214].

2601 7.4 Matter Density Profile

2602 For an experiment observing neutrinos propagating through the Earth, a model
 2603 of the Earth’s density profile is required. The model used within this analysis is

2604 based on the Preliminary Reference Earth Model (PREM) [209], as illustrated in
 2605 Figure 7.1. Table 7.1 documents the density and radii of the layers used within
 2606 the constant density approximatton used by the SK-only analysis [208]. The
 2607 density measurements provided in the PREM model are provided in terms of
 2608 mass density, whereas neutrino oscillations are sensitive to the electron number
 2609 density. This value can be computed as the product of the chemical composition,
 2610 or the Z/A value, and the mass density of each layer. Currently, the only
 2611 way to measure the chemical composition value for layers close to the Earth's
 2612 core is through neutrino oscillations. The chemical composition of the upper
 2613 layers of the Earth's Mantle and the Transition zone is well known due to it
 2614 being predominantly pyrolite which has a chemical composition value of 0.496
 2615 [215]. The chemical composition dial for the core layers is set to a value of
 2616 0.468, as calculated in [216]. As this value is lesss well known, it is assigned a
 2617 Gaussian error with a standard deviation equivalent to the difference in chemical
 2618 composition in core and mantle layers. Figure 7.16 illustrates the effect of moving
 2619 from the $Z/A = 0.5$ method which is used in the official SK-only analysis
 2620 to these more precise values.

2621 The beam oscillation probability in this thesis uses a baseline of 295km, density
 2622 2.6g/cm^3 , and chemical composition 0.5 as is done by the official T2K-only
 2623 analysis [217].

2624 For a neutrino with given E_ν , $\cos(\theta_Z)$, the oscillation probability calculation
 2625 engine must be passed a list of the matter regions that the neutrino traversed,
 2626 with the path length and fixed density in each region. However, a neutrino
 2627 passing through the earth experiences a range of radii, and thus a range of
 2628 densities, in each region. In the SK-only analysis, the earth density model used
 2629 is piecewise-constant, thereby ignoring this effect. For this thesis, the density
 2630 values for the calculation engine are found by averaging the earth density along
 2631 the neutrino's path,

$$\langle \rho \rangle_i = \frac{1}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \rho(t) dt \quad (7.6)$$




Figure 7.16: The oscillation probability, $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (top row) and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (bottom row), given as a function of neutrino energy and zenith angle. The left column gives probabilities where the constant $Z/A = 0.5$ approximation which is used in the official SK-only analysis. The middle column gives the probabilities where $Z/A = [0.468, 0.498]$ values are used, as given in Table 7.1. The right column illustrates the difference in oscillation probability between the two different techniques.

where t_i are the intersection points between each layer and t is the path length of the trajectory across the layer. This leads to an improved approximation. For this averaging, the simplification of the PREM model developed in [218] is used. The layers of the prem model are combined into four to reduce calculation time, with a quadratic fit to each section. This fit was not performed by the author of the thesis and is documented in [210]. The coefficients of the quadratic fit to each layer are given in Table 7.2 with the final distribution illustrated in Figure 7.17. The quadratic approximation is clearly much closer to the PREM model as compared to the constant density approximation.




Figure 7.17: The density of the Earth given as a function of the radius, as given by the PREM model (Black), the constant density four-layer approximation (Blue), as used in the official SK-only analysis, and the quadratic approximation of the PREM model (Red).

Layer	Outer Radius [km]	Density [g/cm ³]
Inner Core	1220	$13.09 - 8.84x^2$
Outer Core	3480	$12.31 + 1.09x - 10.02x^2$
Lower Mantle	5701	$6.78 - 1.56x - 1.25x^2$
Transition Zone	6371	$-50.42 + 123.33x - 69.95x^2$

Table 7.2: The quadratic polynomial fits to the PREM model for four assumed layers of the PREM model. The fit to calculate the coefficients is given in [210], where $x = R / R_{\text{Earth}}$.

The effect of using the quadratic density per $\cos(\theta_Z)$ model is highlighted in Figure 7.18. The slight discontinuity in the oscillation probability around $\cos(\theta_Z) \sim -0.45$ in the fixed density model, which is due to the transition to mantle layer boundary, has been reduced. This is expected as the difference in density across this boundary is significantly smaller in the quadratic density model as compared to the constant density model. Whilst the difference in density across the other layer transitions is reduced, there is still a significant difference. This means the discontinuities in the oscillation probabilities remain but are significantly reduced. However, as the quadratic density approximation matches the PREM model well in this region, these discontinuities are due to the Earth model rather than an artifact of the oscillation calculation.




Figure 7.18: The oscillation probability, $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (top row) and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (bottom row), given as a function of neutrino energy and zenith angle. The left column gives probabilities where the four-layer constant density approximation is used. The middle column gives the probabilities where the density is integrated over the trajectory, using the quadratic PREM approximation, for each $\cos(\theta_Z)$ is used. The right column illustrates the difference in oscillation probability between the two different techniques.

2652 7.5 Production Height Averaging

2653 As discussed in section 7.1, the height at which the cosmic ray flux interacts
 2654 in the atmosphere is not known on an event-by-event basis. The production
 2655 height can vary from the Earth’s surface to $\sim 50\text{km}$ above that. The SK-only
 2656 analysis methodology (described in section 7.2) for including the uncertainty
 2657 on the production height is to include variations from the Honda model when
 2658 pre-calculating the oscillation probabilities prior to the fit. This technique is not
 2659 possible for this analysis which uses continuous oscillation parameters that can
 2660 not be known prior to the fit. Consequently, an analytical averaging technique
 2661 was developed in [210]. The author of this thesis was not responsible for the
 2662 derivation of the technique but has performed the implementation and validation
 2663 of the technique for this analysis alone.

2664 Using the 20 production heights per Monte Carlo neutrino event, provided
 2665 as 5% percentiles from the Honda flux model, a production height distribution
 2666 $p_j(h|E_\nu, \cos \theta_Z)$ is built for each neutrino flavour $j = \nu_e, \bar{\nu}_e, \nu_\mu, \bar{\nu}_\mu$. In practice, a
 2667 histogram is filled with 20 evenly spaced bins in production height h between
 2668 0 and 50km. The neutrino energy and cosine zenith binning of the histogram
 2669 is the same as that provided in section 7.2. The average production height,
 2670 $\bar{h} = \int dh \frac{1}{4} \sum_j p_j(h|E_\nu, \cos(\theta_Z))$, is calculated. The production height binning
 2671 of this histogram is then translated into $\delta t(h) = t(\bar{h}) - t(h)$, where $t(h)$ is the
 2672 distance travelled along the trajectory.

2673 For the i^{th} traversed layer, the transition amplitude, $D_i(t_{i+1}, t_i)$, is computed.
 2674 The time-ordered product of these is then used as the overall transition amplitude
 2675 via

$$A(t_{n+1}, t_0) = D_n(t_{n+1}, t_n) \dots D_1(t_2, t_1) D_0(t_1, t_0), \quad (7.7)$$

2676 where,

$$\begin{aligned} D_n(t_{n+1}, t_n) &= \exp[-iH_n(t_{n+1} - t_n)] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^3 C_k \exp[ia_k(t_{n+1} - t_n)] \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

2677 is expressed as a diagonalised time-dependent solution to the Schrodinger
 2678 equation. The 0th layer is the propagation through the atmosphere and is the
 2679 only term that depends on the production height. Using the substitution $t_0 =$
 2680 $t(\bar{h}) - \delta t(h)$, it can be shown that

$$D_0(t_1, t_0) = D_0(t_1, \bar{h})D_0(\delta t). \quad (7.9)$$

2681 Thus Equation 7.7 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} A(t_{n+1}, t_0) &= D_n(t_{n+1}, t_n) \dots D_1(t_2, t_1) D_0(t_1, \bar{h}) D(\delta t) \\ &= A(t_{n+1}, \bar{h}) \sum_{k=1}^3 C_k \exp[ia_k \delta t], \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^3 B_k \exp[ia_k \delta t]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

2682 The oscillation probability averaged over production height is then calculated
 2683 as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}(\nu_j \rightarrow \nu_i) &= \int d(\delta t) p_j(\delta t | E_\nu, \cos \theta_Z) P(\nu_j \rightarrow \nu_i) \\ &= \int d(\delta t) p_j(\delta t | E_\nu, \cos \theta_Z) A(t_{n+1}, t_0) A^*(t_{n+1}, t_0) \\ &= \sum_{km} (B_k)_{ij} (B_m)^*_{ij} \int d(\delta t) p_j(\delta t | E_\nu, \cos \theta_Z) \exp[i(a_k - a_m)\delta t] \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

2684 In practice, implementation in CUDAProb3 [213] is relatively straightforward
 2685 as the majority of these terms are already calculated in the standard oscillation
 2686 calculation. Figure 7.19 illustrates the results of the production height averaging.
 2687 As expected, the main effect is observed in the low-energy downward-going
 2688 and horizontal-going events. Upward-going events have to travel the radius
 2689 of the Earth, $R_E = 6371\text{km}$, where the production height uncertainty is a small
 2690 fraction of the total path length.




Figure 7.19: The oscillation probability, $P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (top row) and $P(\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e)$ (bottom row), given as a function of neutrino energy and zenith angle. The left column gives probabilities where a fixed production height of 25km is used. The middle column gives the probabilities where the production height is analytically averaged. The right column illustrates the difference in oscillation probability between the two different techniques.

8

2691

2692

Oscillation Analysis

2693 Using the samples and systematics defined in chapter 6, this chapter documents
2694 a simultaneous beam and atmospheric oscillation analysis from the T2K and SK
2695 experiments. The MaCh3 Bayesian MCMC framework introduced in chapter 4
2696 is used for all studies performed within this thesis.

2697 The MaCh3 framework used throughout this thesis has been validated through
2698 many tests. The code which handles the beam far detector samples was developed
2699 by the author and validated by comparison to the 2020 T2K analysis [76]. The
2700 sample event rates and likelihood evaluations of beam samples generated by
2701 the framework used within this thesis were compared to those from the T2K
2702 analysis by the author of this thesis. Variations of the sample predictions were
2703 compared at $\pm 1\sigma$ and $\pm 3\sigma$ and good agreement was found in all cases. A similar
2704 study, led by Dr. C. Wret was used to validate the near detector portion of
2705 the code [203]. The implementation of the atmospheric samples within MaCh3
2706 was completed and cross-checked by the author of this thesis against the P-
2707 Theta framework (Introduced in section 3.2). Both fitters are provided with
2708 the same inputs and can therefore cross-validate each other. These validations
2709 compared the event rate and likelihood calculation. Documentation of all the
2710 above validations can be found in [203].

2711 8.1 Monte Carlo Prediction

2712 Using the three sets of dial values (generated, pre-BANFF and post-BANFF tunes)
 2713 defined in subsection 6.4.3, the predicted event rates for each sample are defined
 2714 in Table 8.1. The oscillated (AsimovA defined in Table 2.2) and un-oscillated
 2715 event rates are calculated for each tune.

Sample	Total Predicted Events					
	Generated		Pre-fit		Post-fit	
	Osc	UnOsc	Osc	UnOsc	Osc	UnOsc
SubGeV-else-like-0dcy	7121.0	7102.6	6556.8	6540.0	7035.2	7015.7
SubGeV-else-like-1dcy	704.8	725.5	693.8	712.8	565.7	586.0
SubGeV-mulike-0dcy	1176.5	1737.2	1078.6	1588.1	1182.7	1757.1
SubGeV-mulike-1dcy	5850.7	8978.1	5351.7	8205.1	5867.0	9009.9
SubGeV-mulike-2dcy	446.9	655.2	441.6	647.7	345.9	505.6
SubGeV-pi0like	1438.8	1445.4	1454.9	1461.1	1131.1	1136.2
MultiGeV-else-like-nue	201.4	195.6	201.1	195.3	202.6	196.7
MultiGeV-else-like-nuebar	1141.5	1118.3	1060.7	1039.5	1118.5	1095.7
MultiGeV-mulike	1036.7	1435.8	963.1	1334.1	1015.2	1405.9
MultiRing-else-like-nue	1025.1	982.2	1026.8	984.3	1029.8	986.4
MultiRing-else-like-nuebar	1014.8	984.5	991.0	962.0	1008.9	978.5
MultiRing-mulike	2510.0	3474.4	2475.6	3425.8	2514.6	3480.4
MultiRingOther-1	1204.5	1279.1	1205.8	1280.3	1207.4	1281.0
PCStop	349.2	459.2	338.4	444.7	346.8	456.1
PCThrus	1692.8	2192.5	1661.5	2149.8	1689.2	2187.8
UpStop-mu	751.2	1295.0	739.7	1271.6	750.4	1293.0
UpThruNonShower-mu	2584.4	3031.6	2577.9	3019.4	2586.8	3034.0
UpThruShower-mu	473.0	488.6	473.2	488.7	473.8	489.4
FHC1Rmu	328.0	1409.2	301.1	1274.7	345.1	1568.0
RHC1Rmu	133.0	432.3	122.7	396.2	135.0	443.9
FHC1Re	84.6	19.2	77.4	18.2	93.7	19.7
RHC1Re	15.7	6.4	14.6	6.1	15.9	6.3
FHC1Re1de	10.5	3.2	10.3	3.1	8.8	2.9

Table 8.1: The Monte Carlo predicted event rate of each far detector sample used within this analysis. Three model parameter tunes are considered, as defined in subsection 6.4.3. Un-oscillated and oscillated predictions are given, where the oscillated predictions assume Asimov A oscillation parameters provided in Table 2.2. **DB: More sig figs on T2K samples**

2716 Generally, the samples which target CCQE interaction modes observe a
 2717 decrease in prediction when using the pre-fit dial values. This is in accordance
 2718 with the Monte Carlo being produced assumed $M_A^{QE} = 1.21\text{GeV}$ [162] whilst the

pre-fit dial value is set to $M_A^{QE} = 1.03\text{GeV}$ as suggested by [201]. Furthermore, the predicted event rates of samples which target CCRES interaction modes are significantly reduced when considering the post-BANFF fit. This follows the observations in subsection 6.4.3. The strength of the accelerator neutrino experiment can be seen in the remarkable difference between the oscillated and unoscillated predictions in the FHC1Rmu and RHC1Rmu samples. There is a very clear decrease in the expected event rate between the oscillated and un-oscillated predictions which is not as obvious as in the atmospheric samples. This is due to the fact that the beam energy is tuned to the maximum disappearance probability which is not the case for the naturally generated atmospheric neutrinos.

8.2 Likelihood Calculation

This analysis performs a joint oscillation parameter fit of the ND280 beam samples, the T2K far detector beam samples and the SK atmospheric samples.

Once the Monte Carlo predictions of each beam and atmospheric sample have been built (see chapter 6) a likelihood needs to be constructed. This is done by comparing the binned Monte Carlo prediction to binned data. The Monte Carlo prediction is calculated at a particular point, $\vec{\theta}$, in the model parameter space such that $N_i^{MC} = N_i^{MC}(\vec{\theta})$, where N_i represents the bin content of the i^{th} bin. The data and Monte Carlo spectra are represented by N_i^D and N_i^{MC} , respectively. The bin contents for the beam near detector, beam far detector and atmospheric samples are denoted with *ND*, *FD* and *Atm*, respectively. The binning index, i , runs over all the bins within a sample. Taking the FHC1Rmu far detector sample as an example, the binning index runs over all the reconstructed neutrino energy bins. The likelihood calculation between the data and the Monte Carlo prediction for a particular bin follows a Poisson distribution, where the data is treated as a fluctuation of the simulation.

The data can consist of either real data or an ‘Asimov’ Monte Carlo prediction, which is typically used for sensitivity studies and denoted ‘Asimov data’. The

2747 process for building Asimov data is as follows **DB: This is where asimov data**
2748 **explanation should be discussed.**

2749 Following the T2K analysis presented in [76], the likelihood contribution for
2750 the near detector samples also includes a Monte Carlo statistical uncertainty term,
2751 derived from the Barlow and Beeston statistical treatment [219, 220]. In addition
2752 to treating the data as a Poisson fluctuation of the Monte Carlo prediction, it
2753 includes a contribution to the likelihood that which treats the generated Monte
2754 Carlo prediction as a statistical fluctuation of the actual true simulation assuming
2755 an infinite amount of statistics had been created. The technical implementation
2756 of this additional likelihood term is documented in [192] and briefly summarised
2757 as follows. The term is defined as,

$$\frac{(\beta_i - 1)^2}{2\sigma_{\beta_i}^2}, \quad (8.1)$$

2758 where β_i represents a scaling parameter for the i^{th} bin that relates the bin
2759 content for the amount of Monte Carlo actually generated N_i^{MC} to the bin content
2760 if an infinite amount of Monte Carlo statistics had been generated $N_{i,true}^{MC}$, such
2761 that $N_{i,true}^{MC} = \beta_i \times N_i^{MC}$. In the case where a sufficient amount of Monte Carlo
2762 statistics had been generated, $\beta_i = 1$. An analytical solution for β_i is given in
2763 [192]. Additionally, $\sigma_{\beta_i} = \sqrt{\sum_i w_i^2} / N_i^{MC}$ where $\sqrt{\sum_i w_i^2}$ represents the sum of
2764 the square of the weights of the Monte Carlo events which fall into bin i .

2765 An additional contribution to the likelihood comes from the variation of
2766 the systematic model parameters. For those parameters with well-motivated
2767 uncertainty estimates, a covariance matrix, V , describes the prior knowledge of
2768 each parameter as well as any correlations between the parameters. Due to a
2769 technical implementation, a single covariance matrix describes each “block” of
2770 model parameters, e.g. beam flux systematics. The covariance matrix associated
2771 with the k^{th} block is denoted V^k . This substitution results in $\vec{\theta} = \sum_k^{N_b} \vec{\theta}^k$ and
2772 $V = \sum_k^{N_b} V^k$ where N_b denotes the number of blocks. A single covariance
2773 matrix is provided for: the oscillation parameters, the beam flux parameters,
2774 the atmospheric flux parameters, the neutrino interaction systematics, the near

2775 detector parameters, the beam far detector systematics, and the atmospheric
2776 far detector systematics. All of these are detailed in section 6.4. The number
2777 of parameters in the k^{th} block is defined as $n(k)$.

2778 The equation for the likelihood \mathcal{L} includes all the terms discussed above.
2779 It is defined as,

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\ln(\mathcal{L}) = & \\
 & \sum_i^{\text{NDbins}} N_i^{\text{ND},MC}(\vec{\theta}) - N_i^{\text{ND},D} + N_i^{\text{ND},D} \times \ln \left[N_i^{\text{ND},D} / N_i^{\text{ND},MC}(\vec{\theta}) \right] + \frac{(\beta_i - 1)^2}{2\sigma_{\beta_i}^2} \\
 & + \sum_i^{\text{FDbins}} N_i^{\text{FD},MC}(\vec{\theta}) - N_i^{\text{FD},D} + N_i^{\text{FD},D} \times \ln \left[N_i^{\text{FD},D} / N_i^{\text{FD},MC}(\vec{\theta}) \right] \\
 & + \sum_i^{\text{Atmbins}} N_i^{\text{Atm},MC}(\vec{\theta}) - N_i^{\text{Atm},D} + N_i^{\text{Atm},D} \times \ln \left[N_i^{\text{Atm},D} / N_i^{\text{Atm},MC}(\vec{\theta}) \right] \\
 & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k^{\text{N}_b} \sum_i^{n(k)} \sum_j^{n(k)} (\vec{\theta}^k)_i (V^k)_{ij}^{-1} (\vec{\theta}^k)_j.
 \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

2780 The negative log-likelihood value is determined at each step of the MCMC
2781 to build the posterior distribution defined in chapter 4. This value is minimised
2782 when the Monte Carlo prediction tends towards the data spectrum.

2783 8.2.1 Likelihood Scans

2784 Using the definition of the likelihood presented in section 8.2, the response of each
2785 sample to a variation of a particular parameter can be studied. Figure 8.1 presents
2786 the variation of all the samples (beam and atmospheric) at the far detector to the
2787 oscillation parameters of interest: δ_{CP} , $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, and Δm_{32}^2 . These plots
2788 are colloquially called ‘likelihood scan’ (or ‘log-likelihood scans’). The process
2789 of making these plots is as follows. **DB: Need to link to Asimov data as above**
2790 - The data bin contents in Equation 8.2 are set to the bin contents of the Monte
2791 Carlo prediction made using the Asimov A oscillation parameter values defined
2792 in Table 2.2 and the pre-fit tune (introduced in subsection 6.4.3). The Monte Carlo
2793 bin contents in Equation 8.2 are determined by reweighting the Monte Carlo

2794 prediction using a specific oscillation parameter set. The likelihood is calculated
2795 for that particular oscillation parameter set and the process is repeated for various
2796 values of the oscillation parameters of interest. This process identifies which
2797 samples drive the determination of the oscillation parameters in the joint fit.

2798 Due to the caveat of fixed systematic parameters and the correlations between
2799 oscillation parameters being ignored when creating these likelihood scans, the
2800 value of $\chi^2 = 1$ (or $-2 \times \ln(\text{Likelihood}) = 1$) does not equate to the typical 1σ
2801 sensitivity. However, it does give an indication of which samples respond the
2802 strongest to a variation in a particular oscillation parameter. The point at which
2803 the likelihood tends to zero illustrates the value of the parameter used to build
2804 the Asimov data prediction. DB: What range is considered?

2805 The sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is mostly dominated by the beam muon-like
2806 samples. The response of an individual atmospheric sample is small but non-
2807 negligible such that the summed response over all atmospheric samples becomes
2808 comparable to that of the muon-like beam samples. Consequently, the sensitivity
2809 of the joint fit to $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ would be expected to be greater than the beam-only
2810 analysis. The only sample which responds to the $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ oscillation parameter
2811 is the electron-like beam samples. Consequently, no increase in sensitivity beyond
2812 that of the T2K-only analysis would be expected from the joint fit. Regardless, the
2813 sensitivity of the beam sample is significantly weaker than the external reactor
2814 constraint so that prior knowledge will dominate any measurement that is included
2815 within this thesis. The Δm_{21}^2 and $\sin^2(\theta_{12})$ parameters are not considered as there
2816 is simply no sensitivity in any sample considered within this analysis. The
2817 response to Δm_{32}^2 is completely dominated by the beam muon-like samples. This
2818 is because the beam neutrino energy can be specifically tuned to match the
2819 maximal disappearance probability. Despite this, improvements to the $|\Delta m_{32}^2|$
2820 sensitivity may be expected due to additional mass hierarchy determination
2821 added by the atmospheric samples.

2822 Two-dimensional scans of the appearance ($\sin^2(\theta_{13})-\delta_{CP}$) and disappearance
2823 ($\sin^2(\theta_{23})-\Delta m_{32}^2$) parameters are illustrated in Figure 8.2 and Figure 8.3, respec-




Figure 8.1: The response of the likelihood, as defined in section 8.2, illustrating the response of the samples to a variation of an oscillation parameter.

tively. The caveat of fixed systematic parameters and correlations between other oscillation parameters being neglected still apply.

The appearance log-likelihood scans show the distinct difference in how the beam and atmospheric samples respond. The beam samples have an approximately constant width of the 2σ and 3σ contours, throughout all ranges of δ_{CP} . The response of the atmospheric samples to $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ is very strongly

correlated to the value of δ_{CP} being evaluated, with the strongest constraints around $\delta_{CP} \sim 1$. Consequently, this difference allows some of the degeneracy in a beam-only fit to be broken. Comparing the beam-only and joint fit likelihood scans, the 2σ continuous contour in δ_{CP} for beam samples is broken when the atmospheric samples are added. This may result in a stronger sensitivity to δ_{CP} . Similarly, the width of the 3σ contours also becomes dependent upon the value of δ_{CP} . Whilst these are encouraging results for the joint fit, these are not sensitivity measurements as the systematic parameters are fixed and the correlation between oscillation parameters is neglected. An interesting point to note is that the atmospheric samples have little sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ on their own, as evidence in Figure 8.1, but can improve sensitivity to the parameter when combined within the simultaneous fit.

DB: Discuss SK-only theta13 and marginalisation effect

The disappearance log-likelihood scans in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ - Δm_{32}^2 space (Figure 8.3) show the expected behaviour when considering the one-dimensional scans already discussed. The uncertainty on the width of $|\Delta m_{32}^2|$ is mostly driven by the beam-only sensitivities. However, the width of this contour in the inverted mass region ($\Delta m_{32}^2 < 0$) is significantly reduced due to the ability of the atmospheric samples to select the correct (normal) mass hierarchy. The width of the uncertainty in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is also reduced compared to the beam-only sensitivities, with a further decrease in the inverted hierarchy region due to the better mass hierarchy determination.




Figure 8.2: Two-dimensional log-likelihood scan of the appearance ($\sin^2(\theta_{13}) - \delta_{CP}$) parameters showing the response of the beam samples (top left), atmospheric samples (top right) and the summed response (bottom). The Asimov A oscillation parameters, defined in Table 2.2, are known to be the true point (Black Cross). The position of the smallest log-likelihood is highlighted with the triangle. Prior uncertainty terms of the oscillation parameters are neglected. The two(three) sigma contour levels are illustrated with the dashed(solid) red line.




Figure 8.3: Two-dimensional log-likelihood scan of the disappearance ($\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ - Δm_{32}^2) parameters showing the response of the beam samples (top left), atmospheric samples (top right) and the summed response (bottom). The Asimov A oscillation parameters, defined in Table 2.2, are known to be the true point (Black Cross). The position of the smallest log-likelihood is highlighted with the triangle. Prior uncertainty terms of the oscillation parameters are neglected. The two(three) sigma contour levels are illustrated with the dashed(solid) red line.

2852 The likelihood scans illustrated thus far only consider the sensitivity of this
2853 analysis for a fixed set of true oscillation parameters, namely Asimov A defined in
2854 Table 2.2. Whilst computational infeasible to run many fits at different parameter
2855 sets, it is possible to calculate the likelihood response to different Asimov data
2856 sets. Figure 8.4 and Figure 8.5 illustrate how the sensitivity changes for differing
2857 true values of δ_{CP} and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, respectively. For both of these plots, the other
2858 oscillation parameters are fixed at their Asimov A values. Consequently, the
2859 caveat of fixed systematic parameters and correlations between other oscillation
2860 parameters being neglected still applies.

2861 **DB: The next paragraph needs re-working to include the term Asimov data**
2862 To explain how these plots are made, consider Figure 8.4. This plot is built
2863 by considering multiple one-dimensional log-likelihood scans, each using the
2864 Asimov A oscillation parameter set but having a slightly differing value of δ_{CP} .
2865 Consequently, the results can be interpreted as vertical slices of the log-likelihood
2866 response made at different Asimov points. The procedure starts by building an
2867 Asimov ‘data’ prediction for a particular value of δ_{CP} taken from the x-axis. Then
2868 a likelihood value is calculated at every δ_{CP} point taken from the y-axis. This is
2869 then repeated for each point on the x-axis, such that a series of one-dimensional
2870 likelihood scans are displayed in sequential order of δ_{CP} .

2871 Figure 8.4 illustrates the sensitivity to δ_{CP} . Notably, the 1σ intervals contain
2872 regions in the off-diagonal for which the beam and atmospheric samples have
2873 broken and discontinuous contours. This indicates that there are regions of
2874 δ_{CP} which are degenerate. For example, for the x-axis value of $\delta_{CP} = 0$, the
2875 beam samples sensitivity would include two discontinuous regions excluded
2876 from the 1σ interval: $\delta_{CP} \sim 0$ and $\delta_{CP} \sim \pi$. The offset in δ_{CP} between the
2877 beam and atmospheric samples allow the joint fit to have increased sensitivity
2878 in these regions. Consequently, the difference between the beam-only and joint
2879 beam-atmospheric fit should be studied using multiple Asimov data sets.

2880 Despite the increase sensitivity at 1σ , the 2σ intervals from the joint fit are more
2881 similar to the two independent sensitivities and the off-diagonal degeneracies

2882 mostly remain. This indicates that the joint fit has the strength to aid parameter
2883 determination but can not entirely break the degeneracies in δ_{CP} at higher
2884 confidence levels.

2885 Figure 8.5 illustrates a similar analysis as above, although the value of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$
2886 is varied and δ_{CP} is fixed to the Asimov A parameter value. Due to the beam
2887 parameters and baseline being tuned to specifically target this oscillation parame-
2888 ter, the average sensitivity of the beam samples is stronger than the atmospheric
2889 samples. However, the degeneracy around maximal mixing ($\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.5$) is
2890 significantly more peaked in the beam samples compared to the atmospheric
2891 samples. This behaviour is strengthened when considering the 2σ intervals, to the
2892 point where two distinct discontinuous regions of the 2σ intervals exist around
2893 the Asimov point $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) \sim 0.41, 0.6$. Given the caveat of only considering
2894 likelihood scans, the joint analysis would mostly eliminate the discontinuous
2895 intervals in these regions. This means that the joint fit could feasible have an
2896 increased preference for the correct octant hypothesis.




Figure 8.4: A series of one-dimensional likelihood scans over δ_{CP} , where an Asimov data set is built for each value of δ_{CP} on the x-axis and the likelihood is evaluated for each value of δ_{CP} on the y-axis. The diagonal represents the minimum log-likelihood and defines the region included within the 1σ (Top) and 2σ (Bottom) confidence intervals. The beam (black) and atmospheric (red) samples are individually plotted and the joint fit (blue) is the sum of the two.




Figure 8.5: A series of one-dimensional likelihood scans over $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, where an Asimov data set is built for each value of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ on the x-axis and the likelihood is evaluated for each value of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ on the y-axis. The diagonal represents the minimum log-likelihood and defines the region included within the 1σ (Top) and 2σ (Bottom) confidence intervals. The beam (black) and atmospheric (red) samples are individually plotted and the joint fit (blue) is the sum of the two.

Alongside oscillation parameters (Figure 8.1), the sensitivity to systematic parameters can also be studied for the joint fit. As some of these parameters are correlated between the beam and atmospheric events, the response of the atmospheric samples can modify the constraint. This means the systematics can have additional constraints than what they would from a beam-only analysis. Therefore, the response from beam and atmospheric samples to various systematic parameters has been compared in Figure 8.6. The Asimov data set has been created using the AsimovA oscillation parameter and the pre-fit systematic tune. For example, the systematic parameter controlling the effective axial mass coupling in CCQE interactions, M_A^{QE} , is clearly dominated by the ND constraint. An example where the response of the atmospheric sample is approximately similar to the near detector constraint is the 2p2h_Cto0 normalisation systematic. This systematic scales the 2p2h interaction cross section on a carbon target to an oxygen target. There are also systematics which have no near detector constraint. For example, the systematic parameters which describe the normalisation of the NC1Gamma and NCOther interaction modes. The atmospheric samples are significantly more sensitive to these systematics than the beam samples due to their similar interaction contributions but relatively higher statistics (Table 8.1). As an example of how the atmospheric samples can help constrain systematic parameters used within the T2K-only analysis, these NC background events in beam electron-like samples will be considerably more constrained with the additional sensitivity of atmospheric samples. This would be expected to reduce the overall uncertainty of the beam electron-like event rates in the joint analysis compared to the beam-only studies. This could modify the sensitivity of the beam samples due to the more constrained background events.




Figure 8.6: The response of the likelihood, as defined in section 8.2, illustrating the response of the samples to the various cross-section systematic parameters.

2922 8.3 Sensitivities

2923 The sensitivities of the joint T2K and SK oscillation analysis are presented in
2924 the form of Asimov fits. This technique builds a fake ‘data’ prediction of
2925 each sample’s spectra from the Monte Carlo, reweighted to a particular set
2926 of oscillation and systematic parameters. This prediction is then used as data on
2927 which to fit against. Whilst this results in unphysical non-integer data predictions,
2928 it eliminates statistical fluctuations from the data. Therefore, the results of a
2929 fit to Asimov data should not include any biases from statistical fluctuations.
2930 Furthermore, these results should produce posterior probability distributions
2931 consistent with the parameters which were used to make the data prediction.
2932 That is to say, the fit results should return the known parameters. Any biases
2933 seen would be attributed to correlations between each oscillation parameter
2934 and correlations between oscillation and systematic parameters. Consequently,
2935 Asimov fit results present the maximum precision at which the oscillation pa-
2936 rameters could be measured to.

2937 In practice, the Asimov fits presented within this analysis are modified from
2938 the above definition. An Asimov prediction of both beam and atmospheric far
2939 detector samples is fit whilst the true data is used for near detector samples.
2940 The Asimov predictions at the far detector are built using the BANFF tuning (as
2941 discussed in section 3.2). This is equivalent to performing a far detector Asimov
2942 fit using inputs from the BANFF data fit. Consequently, this allows the results
2943 to be cross-checked to the P-Theta analysis.

2944 8.3.1 Atmospheric-Only Sensitivity Without Reactor Constraint

2945 This section presents the results of an Asimov fit using samples from the near
 2946 detector and only atmospheric samples from the far detector. The results are
 2947 marginalised over the nuisance parameters using the technique outlined in
 2948 subsection 4.3.1. Each histogram displays the posterior probability density at
 2949 each point within the parameter space. One-dimensional histograms illustrate
 2950 the 1, 2 and 3σ credible intervals, calculated using the technique discussed in
 2951 subsection 4.3.2. For these fits, a flat penalty term is used for $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ (i.e. the
 2952 reactor constraint is not applied). The Asimov data is generated assuming the
 2953 AsimovA oscillation parameter set defined in Table 2.2 and the post-BANFF
 2954 systematic parameter tune.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.7: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} , marginalised over both hierarchies, from the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

2955 Figure 8.7 illustrates the posterior probability density for δ_{CP} , marginalised
 2956 over both hierarchies. The fit does favour the Asimov position ($\delta_{CP} = -1.601$)
 2957 although the posterior probability is very flat through the range of $2 < \delta_{CP} <$

2958 π and $-\pi < \delta_{CP} < -1$. There is also a region around $\delta_{CP} \sim 0.4$ which is
2959 disfavoured at 2σ . This indicates that the SK samples can rule out some parts
2960 of the CP conserving parameter space reasonably well, near $\delta_{CP} \sim 0$, when the
2961 true value of δ_{CP} is CP violating.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.8: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 , marginalised over both hierarchies, from the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

2962 The posterior probability density in Δm_{32}^2 is given in Figure 8.8. This dis-
2963 tribution includes steps in both the normal hierarchy (NH, $\Delta m_{32}^2 > 0$) and the
2964 inverse hierarchy (IH, $\Delta m_{32}^2 < 0$). The highest posterior probability density is
2965 found within the NH, which agrees with the Asimov point. However, all of the
2966 credible intervals span both hierarchies. This is the result of marginalising over
2967 both hierarchies. If instead, only steps in the normal hierarchy were considered,
2968 the shape of the contours would change. The known oscillation parameter is
2969 $2.509 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, which is contained within the 1σ credible interval.

2970 Following the discussion in subsection 4.3.3, the Bayes factor for hierarchy
2971 preference can be calculated by determining the fraction of steps which fall into

	LO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} < 0.5$)	UO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} > 0.5$)	Sum
NH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 > 0$)	0.17	0.40	0.58
IH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 < 0$)	0.13	0.29	0.42
Sum	0.31	0.69	1.00

Table 8.2: The distribution of steps in a SK atmospheric-only fit, presented as the fraction of steps in the upper (UO) and lower (LO) octants and the normal (NH) and inverted (IH) hierarchies. The reactor constraint is not applied. The Bayes factors are calculated as $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.37$ and $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 2.24$.

the NH and the IH, as an equal prior is placed on both models. A similar analysis can be performed by calculating the fraction of steps which fall in the lower octant (LO, $\sin^2 \theta_{23} < 0.5$) or upper octant (UO, $\sin^2 \theta_{23} > 0.5$). The fraction of steps, broken down by hierarchy and octant, are given in Table 8.2. The Bayes factor for preferred hierarchy model is $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.37$. Table 4.1 states this value of the Bayes factor indicates a weak preference for the normal hierarchy model. The Bayes factor for choice of octant is $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 2.24$. This is also classified as a weak preference for the UO. Both of these show that the fit is returning the correct choice of models (NH and UO) for the known Asimov A oscillation parameters defined in Table 2.2.

The 1σ credible intervals, broken down by hierarchy, and position in parameter space of the highest posterior probability density is given in Table 8.3. These are taken from the one-dimensional projections of the oscillation parameters, marginalised over all other parameters within the fit. For the known Asimov value of $\delta_{CP} = -1.601$, the 1σ credible interval rules out a region between $\delta_{CP} = -0.86$ and $\delta_{CP} = 1.96$, when marginalising over both hierarchies. Interestingly, when considering the width of the interval when only considering steps in the NH, the intervals become narrower and the results exclude a large region of parameter space. Thus, if the hierarchy model is known before the fit, the constraint would be stronger. The 1σ credible intervals for $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ were found to be the same in all three hierarchy choices (marginalised over both, NH

Parameter	Interval	HPD
δ_{CP} , (BH)	$[-\pi, -0.86], [1.96, \pi]$	-1.57
δ_{CP} , (NH)	$[-\pi, -0.86], [1.88, \pi]$	-1.57
δ_{CP} , (IH)	$[-\pi, -0.94], [1.96, \pi]$	-1.57
Δm_{32}^2 (BH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	$[-3.00, -2.50], [2.35, 3.15]$	2.65
Δm_{32}^2 (NH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	$[2.39, 3.04]$	2.64
Δm_{32}^2 (IH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	$[-3.15, -2.45]$	-2.70
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (BH)	$[0.476, 0.59]$	0.542
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (NH)	$[0.476, 0.59]$	0.554
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (IH)	$[0.476, 0.59]$	0.542

Table 8.3: The position of the highest posterior probability density (HPD) and width of the 1σ credible interval for the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied. The values are presented by which hierarchy hypothesis is assumed: marginalised over both hierarchies (BH), normal hierarchy only (NH), and inverted hierarchy only (IH).

and IH). This illustrates that the distribution of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is symmetric across the hierarchy discontinuity.

As expected, the width of the credible intervals in Δm_{32}^2 is smaller when only the NH is considered compared to when both models are marginalised over. This follows from the fit weakly preferring the NH model over the IH model. Conversely, when the credible intervals are built using only IH steps, the credible intervals are wider than when both hierarchies are considered.

The sensitivity of the atmospheric samples to $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ is presented in Figure 8.9. The likelihood scans presented in Figure 8.1 suggest that the sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ will be small. This is seen from the fit results, where the width of the 1σ credible intervals span the region of $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) = [0.008, 0.08]$. This is an order of magnitude worse than the constraint from reactor experiments.

As previously discussed, the correlations between oscillation parameters are also important to understand how the atmospheric samples respond. Figure 8.10 illustrates the two dimensional $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) - \delta_{CP}$ projection of the full posterior probability distribution, marginalised over both hierarchies. The shape of the 1σ

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.9: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

credible interval shows that the constraining power of the fit on δ_{CP} is dependent upon the choice of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$. As expected from Figure 8.1, the atmospheric samples do not strongly constrain the value of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$. However, the choice of preferred value of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ does impact the atmospherics sensitivity to δ_{CP} . The 1 σ credible interval is consistent with the reactor constraint.

The $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) - \Delta m_{32}^2$ disappearance contours are illustrated in Figure 8.11. As expected, the distribution in the inverted hierarchy is slightly smaller than that in the normal hierarchy. This follows from the Bayes factor showing a weak preference for NH meaning that more of the steps will exist in the $\Delta m_{32}^2 > 0$ region. The Asimov points of $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.528$ and $\Delta m_{32}^2 = 2.509 \times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$ are clearly contained within the 1 σ credible interval.

Figure 8.12 highlights the two-dimensional projections for each combination of oscillation parameters to which this analysis is sensitive. The contours are built when marginalising over both hierarchies but only the NH is illustrated

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.10: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} – $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

3023 when considering Δm_{32}^2 . As expected the correlations play a significant role in
 3024 these sensitivity measurements, especially the choice of the $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ constraint.
 3025 The application of reactor constraint would be expected to alter both the width
 3026 and position of the Δm_{32}^2 credible interval and the width of the δ_{CP} and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$
 3027 constraints. The majority of the octant model preference comes from the region
 3028 of $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) \sim 0.03$. Consequently, the application of the reactor constraint would
 3029 not be expected to significantly change the octant preference. Interestingly, the
 3030 distribution of steps in the δ_{CP} - $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ plot is slightly flatter in the region of the
 3031 reactor constraint. This follows from Figure 8.2 where the likelihood scan shows
 3032 a region of low negative log-likelihood extending out towards higher values
 3033 of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ in the $\delta_{CP} = -1.601$ region. Consequently, the reactor constraint
 3034 could feasibly reduce the sensitivity of the atmospheric samples to δ_{CP} , due
 3035 to these marginalisation effects.




Figure 8.11: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\Delta m_{32}^2 - \sin^2(\theta_{23})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.




Figure 8.12: The posterior probability density distribution from the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied. The distribution is given for each two-dimensional permutation of the oscillation parameters of interest. The one-dimensional distribution of each parameter is also given.

3036 8.3.2 Atmospheric-Only Sensitivity With Reactor Constraint

3037 The results in subsection 8.3.1 discuss the atmospheric sensitivity when the reactor
 3038 constraint is not applied. The correlations illustrated in Figure 8.12 indicate that
 3039 the marginalisation effects could contribute to differing sensitivities when the
 3040 external constraint is applied. Using the technique discussed in subsection 4.1.1,
 3041 the posterior distribution can be reweighted to include the reactor constraint of
 3042 $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) = (2.18 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-2}$. The Asimov data is generated assuming the
 3043 ‘AsimovA’ oscillation parameter set defined in Table 2.2) and the post-BANFF
 3044 systematic parameter tune.




Figure 8.13: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} compared between the SK atmospheric only fit (Black) and the SK atmospheric fit with the reactor constraint (Red). The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3045 Figure 8.13 illustrates the sensitivity to δ_{CP} . The posterior distribution for
 3046 the ‘with Reactor Constraint’ fit is less peaked than the previous results. This
 3047 is due to the expected marginalisation effect observed in the likelihood scan in
 3048 Figure 8.2. The width of the 1σ credible interval is increased when the reactor
 3049 constraint is applied, indicating less sensitivity in that region of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.14: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 compared between the SK atmospheric only fit (Black) and the SK atmospheric fit with the reactor constraint (Red). The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3050 The reactor constraint increases the sensitivity of the atmospheric samples to
 3051 Δm_{32}^2 as illustrated in Figure 8.14. Due to the marginalisation effects observed in
 3052 Figure 8.12, the favoured region of Δm_{32}^2 moves closer to zero for both hierarchies.
 3053 A clear explanation of this behaviour is illustrated in Figure 8.15. The correlation
 3054 between Δm_{32}^2 and $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ is such that lower values of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ tend towards
 3055 lower values of $|\Delta m_{32}^2|$. The 1σ credible interval in Δm_{32}^2 is determined to be
 3056 $[-2.70, -2.55] \times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$ and $[2.25, 2.95] \times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$. The width of the IH credible
 3057 interval is reduced by $\sim 70\%$ when the reactor constraint is applied.

3058 The asymmetry in the number of steps within the NH to IH shows that the
 3059 reactor constraint increases the NH preference. The fraction of steps in each
 3060 hierarchy and octant model for this fit are given in Table 8.4. The preference
 3061 for the correct octant model is very slightly increased by the application of the
 3062 reactor constraint which is consistent with expectation. The reactor constraint
 3063 significantly increases the NH preference, increasing the Bayes factor from




Figure 8.15: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 – $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ compared between the SK atmospheric only fit (Black) and the SK atmospheric fit with the reactor constraint (Red). The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

	LO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} < 0.5$)	UO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} > 0.5$)	Sum
NH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 > 0$)	0.21	0.53	0.74
IH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 < 0$)	0.08	0.18	0.26
Sum	0.29	0.71	1.00

Table 8.4: The distribution of steps in a SK atmospheric with reactor constraint fit, presented as the fraction of steps in the upper (UO) and lower (LO) octants and the normal (NH) and inverted (IH) hierarchies. The Bayes factors are calculated as $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 2.86$ and $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 2.39$.

³⁰⁶⁴ $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.37$ to $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 2.86$ when the reactor constraint is applied.

³⁰⁶⁵ This is still defined as a weak preference for NH according to Jeffrey's scale (see

³⁰⁶⁶ Table 4.1), however, it is a stronger preference than without the constraint. The

³⁰⁶⁷ Bayes factor for octant determination is calculated as $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 2.39$.

3068 8.3.3 Application of Near Detector Constraints for Atmospheric 3069 Samples

3070 The choice to apply the near detector constraints to the low-energy atmospheric
3071 samples was introduced in subsection 6.4.3. The effect of this choice can be
3072 studied by comparing the sensitivities of the atmospheric only analysis when
3073 the near detector constraints are and are not applied. This section presents
3074 those effects where the Asimov data was generated assuming the ‘AsimovA’
3075 oscillation parameter set defined in Table 2.2 and the post-BANFF systematic
3076 parameter tune.

3077 The change in sensitivity on δ_{CP} is given in Figure 8.16. The reactor constraint
3078 is not applied in this comparison. The shape of the posterior is approximately
3079 the same although slightly less peaked at the Asimov point ($\delta_{CP} = -1.601$).
3080 The width of the 1σ credible intervals are approximately the same (identical
3081 to within a bin width) and the same conclusion holds for the higher credible
3082 intervals. Similar conclusions hold for the other oscillation parameters. As
3083 expected, the sensitivities are still statistics dominated and the exact choice of
3084 systematic model and constraint does not affect the physics conclusions one
3085 would make from this analysis.




Figure 8.16: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} compared between the SK atmospheric only fit where the near detector constraint is (Black) and is not (Red) applied. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3086 8.3.4 Atmospheric and Beam Sensitivity without Reactor Con- 3087 straint

3088 This section presents the sensitivities of the simultaneous beam and atmospheric
 3089 analysis without the reactor constraint. The Asimov data is built assuming the
 3090 post-BANFF cross-section tune and Asimov A oscillation parameters defined
 3091 in Table 2.2. This is a fit to all 18 near detector beam samples, 5 far detector
 3092 beam samples, and 18 atmospheric samples. The sensitivity to δ_{CP} , marginalised
 3093 over both hierarchies is given in Figure 8.17.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.17: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} , marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

3094 The credible intervals and highest posterior distribution for each oscillation
 3095 parameter is given in Table 8.5. The highest posterior probability density is
 3096 $\delta_{CP} = -1.58$ and is clearly compatible with the known Asimov A value of
 3097 $\delta_{CP} = -1.601$. The CP-conserving values of $\delta_{CP} = 0, \pi, -\pi$ are disfavoured at 1σ
 3098 credible interval. There is also a region around $\delta_{CP} = 1.4$ which is disfavoured at
 3099 more than 3σ . Whilst these conclusions can be made at this particular Asimov

3100 point, it does show that if the true value of δ_{CP} was CP-violating, this joint
 3101 analysis would be able to disfavour CP conserving values at over 1σ . The highest
 3102 posterior probability density does move further away from the Asimov point
 3103 when only steps in the NH region are considered. This is due to the correlations
 3104 between the value of δ_{CP} and the mass hierarchy.

Parameter	Interval	HPD
δ_{CP} , (BH)	$[-2.64, -0.63]$	-1.57
δ_{CP} , (NH)	$[-2.76, -0.63]$	-1.45
δ_{CP} , (IH)	$[-2.39, -0.88]$	-1.57
Δm_{32}^2 (BH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	[2.46, 2.58]	2.49
Δm_{32}^2 (NH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	[2.48, 2.56]	2.51
Δm_{32}^2 (IH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	$[-2.60, -2.52]$	-2.55
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (BH)	[0.48, 0.55]	0.509
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (NH)	[0.48, 0.55]	0.509
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (IH)	[0.48, 0.55]	0.521

Table 8.5: The position of the highest posterior probability density (HPD) and width of the 1σ credible interval for the joint beam and atmospheric fit. The reactor constraint is not applied. The values are presented by which hierarchy hypothesis is assumed: marginalised over both hierarchies (BH), normal hierarchy only (NH), and inverted hierarchy only (IH).

3105 The sensitivity to Δm_{32}^2 is illustrated in Figure 8.18, marginalised over both
 3106 hierarchies. Notably, the 1σ credible interval is entirely contained within the
 3107 normal hierarchy region, as illustrated in Table 8.5. This is illustrates reasonable
 3108 sensitivity to the mass hierarchy model. This is also reflected in the 1σ credible
 3109 intervals being approximately the same when they are made considering both
 3110 hierarchies and when considering only the NH.

3111 The fraction of steps in each of the mass hierarchy regions and octants of
 3112 $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is given in Table 8.6. The Bayes factors are determined to be $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) =$
 3113 3.67 and $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 1.74$. Jeffrey's scale (presented in Table 4.1) states that this
 3114 value of the hierarchy Bayes factor illustrates substantial evidence for normal

hierarchy. This corresponds to the known oscillation parameters input into the Asimov data and is a stronger statement than the atmospheric-only analysis can provide. The Bayes factor for octant determination represents a weak preference for the upper octant.

	LO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} < 0.5$)	UO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} > 0.5$)	Sum
NH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 > 0$)	0.29	0.50	0.79
IH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 < 0$)	0.08	0.13	0.21
Sum	0.37	0.63	1.00

Table 8.6: The distribution of steps in a joint beam and atmospheric fit, presented as the fraction of steps in the upper (UO) and lower (LO) octants and the normal (NH) and inverted (IH) hierarchies. The reactor constraint is not applied. The Bayes factors are calculated as $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 3.67$ and $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 1.74$.

The Asimov A definition is $\Delta m_{32}^2 = 2.509 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$. The normal hierarchy distribution clearly favours this region with the highest posterior probability density of $\Delta m_{32}^2 = 2.51 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$. The highest posterior probability density contained within the inverse hierarchy posterior distribution is $\Delta m_{32}^2 = -2.55 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$.

The sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is presented in Figure 8.19. There is a clear preference for the upper octant but the peak of the distribution is relatively flat. It peaks in the region of the expected Asimov value of $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.528$. The difference in the highest posterior distribution and the width of the credible interval is relatively unchanged when considering different hierarchy models. Consequently, the correlation between Δm_{32}^2 and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is such that it is approximately mirrored across the hierarchy discontinuity.

The sensitivity presented as a function of the appearance parameters ($\sin^2(\theta_{13}) - \delta_{CP}$) is given in Figure 8.20. As expected, the contours follow that given in Figure 8.2, where the 2σ credible intervals have a closed contour excluding the region around $\delta_{CP} \sim 1.2$. The width of the 3σ credible interval is also clearly dependent upon the value of δ_{CP} . Close to the Asimov point, $\delta_{CP} = -1.601$, the width of the 3σ credible interval approximately spans $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) = [0.013, 0.04]$.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.18: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 , marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

3137 This is reduced to a region of $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) = [0.023, 0.042]$ at the most disfavour value
 3138 of δ_{CP} . The 1 σ credible interval is consistent with both the Asimov point and
 3139 the reactor constraint. Application of the reactor constraint would be expected
 3140 to decrease the width of the 1 σ credible intervals of δ_{CP} due to the triangular
 3141 shape of the posterior probability.

3142 The sensitivity in terms of the ‘disappearance’ parameters marginalised over
 3143 both hierarchies is given in Figure 8.21. In this two-dimensional projection of
 3144 the posterior distribution, a small section of the 1 σ credible interval is contained
 3145 within the inverse hierarchy region. That IH region is clearly favouring the
 3146 upper octant as expected. The 1 σ credible region of the NH contour spans both
 3147 octants but favours the UO.

3148 The two-dimensional posterior distribution for each permutation of the oscil-
 3149 lation parameters of interest is given in Figure 8.22. The most notable observation
 3150 is that the $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ are anti-correlated. If the value of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ was

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.19: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

known to be closer to the Asimov point, the preferred value of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ would increase. That would move the highest posterior probability closer in line with the Asimov value. This also means that the preference for the UO would be increased if the reactor constraint was to be applied.

The correlation between $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ and Δm_{32}^2 can be seen in Figure 8.23. A much larger fraction of the posterior distribution is contained in the NH for lower values of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$. Consequently, the application of the reactor constraint would be expected to significantly increase the preference for NH.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.20: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} – $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.21: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 – $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.




Figure 8.22: The posterior probability density distribution from the joint beam and atmospheric fit. The reactor constraint is not applied. The distribution is given for each two-dimensional permutation of the oscillation parameters of interest. The one-dimensional distribution of each parameter is also given.




Figure 8.23: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\Delta m_{32}^2 - \sin^2(\theta_{13})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit. The reactor constraint is not applied.

3159 8.3.5 Atmospheric and Beam Sensitivity with Reactor Constraint

3160 This section presents the sensitivities of the joint beam and atmospheric fit when
 3161 the reactor constraint is applied to $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$. The Asimov data assumes the
 3162 AsimovA oscillation parameter set defined in Table 2.2 and the post-BANFF
 3163 systematic parameter tune.

With Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.24: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} , marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit where the reactor constraint is applied.

3164 Figure 8.24 illustrates the sensitivity to δ_{CP} , marginalised over both hierarchies.
 3165 The posterior distribution is more peaked around the Asimov parameter value
 3166 of $\delta_{CP} = -1.601$, as compared to the sensitivities without the reactor constraint
 3167 applied (subsection 8.3.4). This follows from the correlations shown in Figure 8.20,
 3168 where a lower value of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ results in tighter constraints on δ_{CP} . The
 3169 CP-conserving values of $\delta_{CP} = -\pi, 0, \pi$ are disfavoured at 2σ . Furthermore,
 3170 the 3σ credible interval excludes the region of $\delta_{CP} = [0.50, 2.39]$. Thus clearly
 3171 disfavouring the region of $\delta_{CP} = \pi/2$ at more than 3σ for this particular Asimov
 3172 parameter set. The width of the 1σ credible intervals and the position of the

³¹⁷³ highest posterior probability density is given in Table 8.7. The highest posterior
³¹⁷⁴ probability density in δ_{CP} is calculated as $\delta_{CP} = -1.57$ showing no significant
³¹⁷⁵ biases in the determination of the known oscillation parameters.

³¹⁷⁶ The effect of applying the reactor constraint for δ_{CP} in the joint beam and
³¹⁷⁷ atmospheric fit is presented in Figure 8.25. These contours are marginalised
³¹⁷⁸ over both hierarchies. Clearly, the reactor constraint improves the ability of the
³¹⁷⁹ fit to select the known oscillation parameter as the shape of the distribution is
³¹⁸⁰ much more peaked. This is also evidenced by the tightening of the 1σ and 90%
³¹⁸¹ credible intervals. Additionally, the region of $1 < \delta_{CP} < 2$ is disfavoured more
³¹⁸² strongly when the reactor constraint is applied.




Figure 8.25: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Red) and the joint beam and atmospheric fit with the reactor constraint (Black). The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

³¹⁸³ The sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, is given in
³¹⁸⁴ Figure 8.26. The highest posterior probability density is located at $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) =$
³¹⁸⁵ 0.527 which agrees with the known Asimov value of $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.528$. The

Parameter	Interval	HPD
δ_{CP} , (BH)	[-2.26, -0.75]	-1.57
δ_{CP} , (NH)	[-2.26, -0.75]	-1.57
δ_{CP} , (IH)	[-2.13, -1.00]	-1.57
Δm_{32}^2 (BH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	[2.46, 2.52]	2.49
Δm_{32}^2 (NH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	[2.48, 2.56]	2.51
Δm_{32}^2 (IH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	[-2.60, -2.52]	-2.55
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (BH)	[0.49, 0.55]	0.527
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (NH)	[0.49, 0.55]	0.527
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (IH)	[0.50, 0.56]	0.539

Table 8.7: The position of the highest posterior probability density (HPD) and width of the 1σ credible interval for the joint beam and atmospheric fit where the reactor constraint not applied. The values are presented by which hierarchy hypothesis is assumed: marginalised over both hierarchies (BH), normal hierarchy only (NH), and inverted hierarchy only (IH).

3186 distribution is clearly favouring the UO, where the application of the reactor
 3187 constraint shifts the relatively flat posterior (seen in Figure 8.19) to a much
 3188 more peaked distribution.

3189 Figure 8.27 highlights the sensitivity of the joint fit both with and without the
 3190 reactor constraint. The with reactor constraint fit selects the known Asimov point
 3191 much better ($\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.528$). Furthermore, the reactor constraint increases the
 3192 UO preference which is evidenced by the distribution moving away from the
 3193 octant boundary. This indicates that there are marginalisation effects between
 3194 the two mixing parameters. This follows from the correlation illustrated between
 3195 $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) - \sin^2(\theta_{13})$ in Figure 8.22. The posterior distribution of the fit with
 3196 reactor constraint is more peaked compared to the flatter distribution when the
 3197 reactor constraint is not applied.

3198 The fraction of steps contained within the two hierarchy and two octant
 3199 models is given in Table 8.8. The reactor constraint significantly reduces the
 3200 fraction of steps that are contained within the IH-LO from 0.08 to 0.02, whilst
 3201 significantly increasing the fraction of steps within the NH-UO region from 0.53

With Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.26: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit where the reactor constraint is applied.

3202 to 0.64. The application of the reactor constraint increases the Bayes factor from
 3203 $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 3.67$ to $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 7.29$. There is a very clear preference for the
 3204 NH, with the Jeffreys scale stating a substantial preference (see subsection 4.3.3).
 3205 The Bayes factor for UO preference is calculated as $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 2.85$. Whilst
 3206 still a weak preference, this is certainly a stronger statement than the sensitivity
 3207 when the reactor constraint is not applied.

	LO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} < 0.5$)	UO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} > 0.5$)	Sum
NH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 > 0$)	0.24	0.64	0.88
IH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 < 0$)	0.02	0.10	0.12
Sum	0.26	0.74	1.00

Table 8.8: The distribution of steps in a joint beam and atmospheric with reactor constraint fit, presented as the fraction of steps in the upper (UO) and lower (LO) octants and the normal (NH) and inverted (IH) hierarchies. The Bayes factors are calculated as $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 7.29$ and $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 2.86$.




Figure 8.27: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Red) and the joint beam and atmospheric fit with the reactor constraint (Black). The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3208 The sensitivity to Δm_{32}^2 , marginalised over both hierarchies, is presented in
 3209 Figure 8.28. As another clear indication of the NH preference, the 1σ credible
 3210 interval is entirely contained within the NH region. This follows from the
 3211 correlation of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ and Δm_{32}^2 presented in Figure 8.23. The position of the
 3212 highest posterior probability density is given as 2.49×10^{-3} eV², illustrating no
 3213 significant bias between the fit results and the known oscillation parameters.

3214 The sensitivity to the appearance parameters ($\sin^2(\theta_{13}) - \delta_{CP}$) is given in
 3215 Figure 8.29. The distribution is mostly uncorrelated between the two parameters
 3216 and is centered at the known Asimov values. The sensitivity to the disappearance
 3217 parameters ($\sin^2(\theta_{23}) - \Delta m_{32}^2$) is illustrated in Figure 8.30. As expected from
 3218 the one-dimensional distribution, the 1σ credible interval is entirely contained
 3219 within the NH region. Both the NH and IH regions favour the UO. The width of
 3220 the Δm_{32}^2 1σ credible interval does not significantly depend upon the value
 3221 or octant of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$.

With Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.28: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 , marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit where the reactor constraint is applied.

3222 Figure 8.31 illustrates the posterior distribution for each permutation of
 3223 two oscillation parameters of interest. The application of the reactor constraint
 3224 significantly reduces the correlations previously seen in Figure 8.22. There is still
 3225 a small correlation between δ_{CP} and Δm_{32}^2 . The width of the 1 σ credible interval in
 3226 Δm_{32}^2 is wider for a value of $\delta_{CP} = 0$ as compared to a value of $\delta_{CP} = \pi$. Similarly,
 3227 the width of the 1 σ credible interval in δ_{CP} is smaller for lower values of $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$.




Figure 8.29: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\delta_{CP} - \sin^2(\theta_{13})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit where the reactor constraint is applied.




Figure 8.30: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\Delta m_{32}^2 - \sin^2(\theta_{23})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, from the joint beam and atmospheric fit where the reactor constraint is applied.




Figure 8.31: The posterior probability density distribution from the joint beam and atmospheric fit where the reactor constraint is applied. The distribution is given for each two-dimensional permutation of the oscillation parameters of interest. The one-dimensional distribution of each parameter is also given.

3228 8.3.6 Comparison to Latest T2K Sensitivities without Reactor 3229 Constraint

3230 The benefits of the joint beam and atmospheric analysis can be determined by
3231 comparing the sensitivities to the beam-only analysis. This section presents
3232 those comparisons for sensitivities built at the Asimov A oscillation parameters
3233 defined in Table 2.2. The reactor constraint is not applied within the fits used
3234 for these comparisons.




Figure 8.32: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3235 The sensitivity, marginalised over both hierarchies, to δ_{CP} of both fits is
3236 presented in Figure 8.32. As expected from the log-likelihood scans (Figure 8.4),
3237 the sensitivity to δ_{CP} is not significantly increased. This is because the Asimov
3238 point ($\delta_{CP} = -1.601$) lies at the position where the T2K response dominates
3239 compared to the SK response. The width of the

The addition of the atmospheric samples does significantly impact the sensitivity to Δm_{32}^2 , as illustrated in Figure 8.33 which has been marginalised over both hierarchies. The 1σ credible interval of the joint beam and atmospheric fit is entirely contained within the NH region. This significantly increases the ability of the fit to determine the correct mass hierarchy used within the known oscillation parameters. This is further evidenced by the fact that the 90% credible intervals from the joint fit are also tighter in the IH region as compared to the beam-only analysis. The Bayes factor for mass hierarchy determination for the beam-only and joint beam and atmospheric are $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.91$ and $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 3.67$, respectively. According to Jeffrey's scale (Table 4.1), the beam-only analysis represents a weak preference for the NH hypothesis whereas the joint fit returns a substantial preference for the NH hypothesis.

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.33: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

The sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, marginalised over both hierarchies, for both the beam-only and joint beam and atmospheric analysis are presented in Figure 8.34.

The peak of the posterior distribution from the joint analysis is more aligned with the known Asimov value of $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.528$ as compared to the beam-only analysis. This indicates that the marginalisation effects from other oscillation parameters are less prevalent in the projection of this parameter. Furthermore, the width of the credible intervals are marginally smaller this change would not affect any conclusion one would make about the parameter sensitivity. The Bayes factors for the beam-only and joint beam-atmospheric fit are $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 1.56$ and $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 1.74$, respectively. Consequently, the joint beam-atmospheric fit does prefer the UO more strongly than the beam-only analysis, albeit slightly.




Figure 8.34: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

Whilst the beam-only and joint beam-atmospheric fits have similar sensitivity to δ_{CP} and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ when projected in one-dimension, the benefit of the joint analysis becomes more obvious when the sensitivities are presented in two-dimensions. The sensitivity to the ‘appearance’ parameters ($\delta_{CP} - \sin^2(\theta_{13})$) are illustrated in Figure 8.35.

3268 The width of the 99% joint fit credible interval in $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ is squeezed in the
 3269 region of $\delta_{CP} \sim 0$ compared to the beam-only analysis. This is the same behaviour
 3270 that is seen in the appearance log-likelihood scans presented in Figure 8.2. The
 3271 1σ and 2σ also exhibit slightly tighter constraints on δ_{CP} . This is most prevalent
 3272 in the region of $\delta_{CP} \sim 0$ and $\sin^2(\theta_{13}) \sim 0.03$. Whilst the atmospheric samples
 3273 do not have significant sensitivity to $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ (as shown in Figure 8.1), they
 3274 aid in breaking the degeneracy between the oscillation parameters allowing
 3275 for tighter constraints.

3276 The sensitivity to the disappearance parameters $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) - \Delta m_{32}^2$, marginalised
 3277 over both hierarchies, is presented in Figure 8.36 for both the beam-only and
 3278 joint beam-atmospheric fits. Whilst the one-dimensional sensitivity comparison
 3279 (Figure 8.34) between the two fits shows minor improvements from the joint
 3280 fit, the two-dimensional projection really shows the benefit of adding the atmo-
 3281 spheric samples to the beam samples. The area contained within the IH credible
 3282 intervals is drastically reduced. This follows from the better determination of
 3283 the mass hierarchy seen in the Bayes factors. The 1σ joint fit credible interval in
 3284 the IH region more strongly favours the UO as compared to the beam-only fit.
 3285 Even in the NH region, the width of the credible intervals in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ decrease,
 3286 albeit to a much less extent.

3287 The change in sensitivity to $\delta_{CP} - \Delta m_{32}^2$ is illustrated in Figure 8.37. The
 3288 contours presented within the IH region are much smaller in the joint fit due to
 3289 the increased sensitivity to mass hierarchy determination. This culminates in a
 3290 region around $\delta_{CP} \sim \pi/2$ which is excluded at 3σ . This is not present within
 3291 the beam-only analysis. Consistent with the previous observations, the area
 3292 contained within the IH credible intervals is significantly reduced in comparison
 3293 to the beam-only analysis.

3294 The sensitivity to Δm_{32}^2 and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$, as a function of $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$, is presented
 3295 in Figure 8.38 and Figure 8.39, respectively. These sensitivities are marginalised
 3296 over both hierarchies. As expected from the previous observations, the Δm_{32}^2
 3297 contours within IH region of the joint fit are much smaller than the beam-only

Without Reactor Constraint, Both Hierarchies




Figure 8.35: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} – $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

analysis. Notably, the joint fit IH contours exclude the region around the reactor constraint. This is not a bias from the fit as the known value for Δm_{32}^2 is in the NH region. However, this suggests that the application of the reactor constraint would further increase the preference for NH in the joint fit as compared to its effect on the beam-only analysis.

The beam-only and joint beam-atmospheric fits have a slightly different contour shape between the $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ parameters, as illustrated by Figure 8.39. The joint analysis disfavours the wrong octant hypothesis more strongly in the region of high $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$. This suggests that the application of the reactor constraint will favour the UO more strongly in the joint analysis compared to the beam-only analysis.




Figure 8.36: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 – $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.




Figure 8.37: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\Delta m_{32}^2 - \Delta_{CP}$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.




Figure 8.38: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 – $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.




Figure 8.39: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ – $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3309 8.3.7 Comparison to Latest T2K Sensitivities with Reactor Con- 3310 straint

3311 The comparison between the beam-only and joint beam-atmospheric fits are
 3312 compared in subsection 8.3.6 when the reactor constraint was not applied. This
 3313 section illustrates the comparison when the reactor constraint is applied. As
 3314 shown in Figure 8.38, the application of the reactor constraint is expected to
 3315 significantly increase the joint fit's preference for the NH hypothesis, as compared
 3316 to the beam-only analysis. Figure 8.40 illustrates the sensitivities of the two
 3317 fits to the disappearance parameters ($\sin^2(\theta_{23}) - \Delta m_{32}^2$) marginalised over both
 3318 hierarchies and with the reactor constraint applied. This plot clearly illustrates the
 3319 benefit of the joint beam and atmospheric analysis. The 1σ credible interval in the
 3320 IH region is entirely removed in the joint analysis, illustrating the improved
 3321 NH preference.




Figure 8.40: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\Delta m_{32}^2 - \sin^2(\theta_{23})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3322 The 2σ and 3σ credible intervals of the joint fit are also smaller than the beam-
3323 only analysis in both mass hierarchy regions. This shows that beyond the ability
3324 of the joint fit to prefer the NH more strongly than the beam-only analysis, the
3325 precision to which it can measure $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is also improved. The Bayes factor
3326 for NH preference is calculated as $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 7.29$ and $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 3.41$ for
3327 the joint beam-atmospheric and beam-only analysis, respectively. Whilst both
3328 present a significant preference for the NH hypothesis (Table 4.1), the joint fit's
3329 preference is much stronger. A similar conclusion can be made regarding the
3330 Bayes factors for UO preference which are $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) = 2.86$ and $B(\text{UO}/\text{LO}) =$
3331 2.67 for the joint beam-atmospheric and beam-only analysis, respectively. Both of
3332 these represent a mild preference for the UO but there is a stronger preference
3333 observed in the joint analysis.

3334 The sensitivity of the beam-only and joint beam-atmospheric analyses, to the
3335 appearance parameters ($\delta_{CP} - \sin^2(\theta_{13})$), are compared in Figure 8.41. These
3336 results are marginalised over both hierarchies and include the reactor constraint
3337 on $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$. For this particular Asimov point (AsimovA defined in Table 2.2),
3338 the beam-only analysis dominates the sensitivity. The joint fit does slightly
3339 increase the sensitivity to δ_{CP} but it does not change any conclusions one would
3340 make on the determined value.




Figure 8.41: The two-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} – $\sin^2(\theta_{13})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3341 8.3.8 Effect of Asimov Parameter Set

3342 Figure 8.4 and Figure 8.5 show that the choice of the parameter set at which
 3343 to perform the sensitivity fit at can affect the conclusion. ‘AsimovA’ oscillation
 3344 parameters are defined at a region of δ_{CP} which is dominated by the T2K
 3345 experiment. This contributes to the fact that the addition of the atmospheric
 3346 samples does not significantly increase the sensitivity to δ_{CP} , as illustrated in
 3347 subsection 8.3.6 and subsection 8.3.7. This section presents the sensitivities when
 3348 ‘AsimovB’ oscillation parameters, as defined in Table 2.2, are assumed (alongside
 3349 the post-BANFF tune) when building the Asimov data.




Figure 8.42: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in δ_{CP} compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3350 The sensitivity to δ_{CP} from an AsimovB fit for the joint beam and atmospheric
 3351 fit is presented in Figure 8.42. The results are compared to those from the beam-
 3352 only analysis in [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either of the fits. The
 3353 known Asimov value is $\delta_{CP} = 0$. The shape of the posterior distribution from the

3354 joint analysis is more peaked at $\delta_{CP} = 0$ as compared to the beam-only analysis
3355 which has approximately the same posterior probability density at $\delta_{CP} = 0$ and
3356 $\delta_{CP} = \pi$. This shows the ability of the joint analysis to better determine the correct
3357 phase of δ_{CP} if the true value was CP-conserving. The 1σ credible intervals and
3358 the position of the highest posterior probability density are given in Table 8.9.

Parameter	Interval	HPD
δ_{CP} , (BH)	$[-\pi, -2.51], [-1.51, 1.31]$	-0.06
δ_{CP} , (NH)	$[-1.13, 1.63]$	0.06
δ_{CP} , (IH)	$[-3.02, -1.88], [-1.76, 0.13]$	-0.44
Δm_{32}^2 (BH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	$[-2.60, -2.49], [2.46, 2.59]$	2.51
Δm_{32}^2 (NH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	$[2.47, 2.56]$	2.52
Δm_{32}^2 (IH) [$\times 10^{-3}\text{eV}^2$]	$[-2.61, -2.52]$	-2.57
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (BH)	$[0.43, 0.48], [0.55, 0.59]$	0.45
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (NH)	$[0.43, 0.49], [0.55, 0.58]$	0.45
$\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ (IH)	$[0.44, 0.48], [0.54, 0.59]$	0.57

Table 8.9: The position of the highest posterior probability density (HPD) and width of the 1σ credible interval for the SK atmospheric only fit. The reactor constraint is not applied. The values are presented by which hierarchy hypothesis is assumed: marginalised over both hierarchies (BH), normal hierarchy only (NH) and inverted hierarchy only (IH).

3359 Naively, if just the 1σ credible interval were considered without observing
3360 the shape of the distribution, it would appear that the joint analysis would
3361 have a worse sensitivity to δ_{CP} due to the larger interval around δ_{CP} . The
3362 1σ credible interval for the beam-only analysis is given as the range $\delta_{CP} =$
3363 $[-\pi, -1.88], [-1.13, 0.63]$ and $[2.64, \pi]$ which contains 56% of all values of δ_{CP} .
3364 The joint beam and atmospheric analysis contains 52% of all δ_{CP} values within
3365 the 1σ credible interval. Therefore, if the area within the 1σ credible interval
3366 were to be compared between the two fits, the joint analysis would be shown
3367 to have better precision.

3368 This contradiction stems from the methodology in which the credible interval
3369 is calculated. The technique used in this analysis (documented in subsection 4.3.2)

3370 fills the credible interval by selecting bins in order of magnitude until 68% of the
 3371 posterior density is contained. If instead, the credible interval was calculated
 3372 by expanding around the highest posterior probability, the benefits of the joint
 3373 fit would be more obvious. In the case where the shape of the posterior was
 3374 Gaussian, these two techniques would be equivalent.




Figure 8.43: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

3375 The sensitivity of the joint beam and atmospheric fit to $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$ is presented in
 3376 Figure 8.43. The sensitivity is compared to that of the beam-only analysis in [183].
 3377 The reactor constraint is not applied in either of the fits being compared. The
 3378 Asimov parameter value is $\sin^2(\theta_{23}) = 0.45$ and the sensitivities are marginalised
 3379 over both hierarchies. Clearly the joint beam and atmospheric fit has a much
 3380 larger probability density in this region showing a better octant determination
 3381 of the joint analysis compared to the beam-only fit. The ratio of the posterior
 3382 density at the peak of the lower octant to the peak of the upper octant from the

3383 joint fit is 1.43 compared to 1.09 from the beam-only analysis. This shows further
3384 support for the joint analysis to correctly select the lower octant which is the
3385 correct hypothesis given the known oscillation parameters.

	LO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} < 0.5$)	UO ($\sin^2 \theta_{23} > 0.5$)	Sum
NH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 > 0$)	0.35	0.24	0.59
IH ($\Delta m_{32}^2 < 0$)	0.19	0.22	0.41
Sum	0.54	0.46	1.00

Table 8.10: The distribution of steps in a joint beam and atmospheric fit, presented as the fraction of steps in the upper (UO) and lower (LO) octants and the normal (NH) and inverted (IH) hierarchies. The reactor constraint is not applied. The Bayes factors are calculated as $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.43$ and $B(\text{LO}/\text{UO}) = 1.19$.

3386 The distribution of steps, split by hierarchy and octant hypothesis, is presented
3387 in Table 8.10. The Bayes factor for hierarchy and octant determination are
3388 $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.43$ and $B(\text{LO}/\text{UO}) = 1.19$, respectively. The octant Bayes factor
3389 is now presented as LO/UO due to the known oscillation parameter is in the
3390 lower octant. These values compare to $B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.08$ and $B(\text{LO}/\text{UO}) = 0.91$
3391 from the beam-only analysis. This shows additional evidence of the joint analy-
3392 sis's preference for selecting the correct octant hypothesis. Further comparisons
3393 to the AsimovA Bayes factors presented in Table 8.6 show how the preference for
3394 the correct octant and hierarchy depend on the true value of δ_{CP} and $\sin^2(\theta_{23})$.
3395 The sensitivity of the beam-only and joint beam-atmospheric analysis to
3396 Δm_{32}^2 is given in Figure 8.44. Both of the results are marginalised over boht
3397 hierarchies and the reactor constraint is not applied in either analysis. The joint
3398 analysis has a stronger preference for the correct hierarchy (NH) which is shown
3399 by the higher Bayes factor ($B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.43$) compared to the beam-only
3400 analysis ($B(\text{NH}/\text{IH}) = 1.08$).




Figure 8.44: The one-dimensional posterior probability density distribution in Δm_{32}^2 compared between the joint beam and atmospheric only fit (Black) and the latest T2K sensitivities (Red) [183]. The reactor constraint is not applied in either fit. The distributions are marginalised over both hierarchies.

9

3401

3402

Conclusions and Outlook

Appendices

A

3404

3405

Atmospheric Sample Spectra

3406 This appendix documents the interaction mode breakdown of all the atmospheric
3407 samples used within the analysis. The generated tune of the model parameters
3408 and the Asimov A oscillation parameter set (defined in Table 2.2) are assumed.
3409 The livetime of SK-IV is taken to be 3244.4 days.

3410 A.1 Binning

3411 The lepton momentum and cosine zenith binning edges for the atmospheric
3412 samples used within this analysis are defined in Table A.1.

3413 A.2 Fully Contained Sub-GeV Samples

3414 The interaction mode breakdown of the fully contained Sub-GeV samples are
3415 shown in Figure A.1 and Figure A.2, for the samples with enriched CC0 π and
3416 CC1 π^\pm respectively.

3417 The CC0 π sample are dominated by CCQE events ($\sim 70\%$) with smaller
3418 contributions of 2p2h ($\sim 12\%$) and CC1 π ($\sim 10\%$) components. The energy peaks
3419 around 300 MeV, which is slightly below that of the T2K samples but still has
3420 significant contribution upto 1 GeV which overlaps the T2K sample energy range.

Sample	$\cos(\theta_Z)$ Bins	Momentum Bin Edges ($\log_{10}(P)$ MeV)
SubGeV-elike-0dcy	10	2.0, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0, 3.2
SubGeV-elike-1dcy	1	2.0, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0, 3.2
SubGeV-mulike-0dcy	10	2.0, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0, 3.2
SubGeV-mulike-1dcy	10	2.0, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0, 3.2
SubGeV-mulike-2dcy	1	2.0, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0, 3.2
SubGeV-pi0like	1	2.0, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.2
MultiGeV-elike-nue	10	3.0, 3.4, 3.7, 4.0, 5.0
MultiGeV-elike-nuebar	10	3.0, 3.4, 3.7, 4.0, 5.0
MultiGeV-mulike	10	3.0, 3.4, 5.0
MultiRing-elike-nue	10	3.0, 3.4, 3.7, 5.0
MultiRing-elike-nuebar	10	3.0, 3.4, 3.7, 5.0
MultiRing-mulike	10	2.0, 3.124, 3.4, 3.7, 5.0
MultiRing-Other1	10	3.0, 3.4, 3.7, 4.0, 5.0
PC-Stop	10	2.0, 3.4, 5.0
PC-Through	10	2.0, 3.124, 3.4, 3.7, 5.0
Upmu-Stop	10	3.2, 3.4, 3.7, 8.0
Upmu-Through-Showering	10	2.0, 8.0
Upmu-Through-NonShowering	10	2.0, 8.0

Table A.1: The reconstructed cosine zenith and lepton momentum binning assigned to the atmospheric samples. The “ $\cos(\theta_Z)$ Bins” column illustrates the number of bins uniformly distributed over the $-1.0 \leq \cos(\theta_Z) \leq 1.0$ region for fully and partially contained samples and $-1.0 \leq \cos(\theta_Z) \leq 0.0$ region for up- μ samples.

3421 The one-ring CC1 π samples, where the pion is tagged via its decay electron,
 3422 are dominated by CC1 π events ($\sim 75\%$) with a small contribution of CCM π
 3423 ($\sim 10\%$). The two-ring pion sample is mostly dominated by the NC1 π^0 via
 3424 resonances, and has several equally-sized contributions from CCQE, NC1 π^\pm via
 3425 resonances, and NC coherent pion production, where the π^0 likely comes from
 3426 nucleon and π^\pm final state interactions in the nucleus.




Figure A.1: Breakdown by interaction mode of the FC Sub-GeV atmospheric samples targeting CC 0π events.




Figure A.2: Breakdown by interaction mode of the FC Sub-GeV atmospheric samples targeting single pion events.

3427 A.3 Fully Contained Multi-GeV Samples

3428 The interaction mode breakdown of fully contained multi-GeV samples is high-
 3429 lighted in Figure A.3. Due to the event selection applied in SK which targets π^+
 3430 and π^- separation, the ν_e sample mainly consists of events with pions (single pion
 3431 production or multi-pion/DIS interactions). The pion separation is explained in
 3432 Section section 6.1. This reasoning also explains the significant CCQE contribution
 3433 of the $\bar{\nu}_e$ sample. The muon-like sample is dominated by CCQE interactions with
 3434 $\sim 10 - 15\%$ 2p2h and CC1 π contribution of events.




Figure A.3: Breakdown by interaction mode of the FC Multi-GeV single ring atmospheric samples.

3435 A.4 Fully Contained Multi-Ring Samples

3436 The interaction mode breakdown of fully contained multi-ring events is shown
 3437 in Figure A.4. These samples see more interaction modes contributing in general,
 3438 and there is a much larger contribution from multi-pion and DIS interaction
 3439 modes, compared to the other samples.




Figure A.4: Breakdown by interaction mode of the FC Multi-GeV multi-ring atmospheric samples.

3440 A.5 Partially Contained Samples

3441 The breakdown for partially contained samples is highlighted in Figure A.5.
 3442 As with the multi-ring samples, there is no dominating interaction mode. The
 3443 neutrino energies of events in this sample extend into the tens of GeV and become
 3444 dominated by DIS interaction modes in the high energy limit.




Figure A.5: Breakdown by interaction mode of the PC atmospheric samples.

3445 A.6 Upward-Going Muon Samples

3446 The breakdown for upward-going muons is illustrated in Figure A.6. These
 3447 samples are significantly dominated by DIS interactions with energies extending
 3448 up into the hundreds of GeV.




Figure A.6: Breakdown by interaction mode of the atmospheric upward going muon samples.

Bibliography

- [1] J Chadwick. "Intensitätsverteilung im magnetischen Spectrum der β -Strahlen von radium B + C". In: *Verhandl. Dtsc. Phys. Ges.* 16 (1914), p. 383. URL: <http://cds.cern.ch/record/262756>.
- [2] C D Ellis and W A Wooster. "The average energy of disintegration of radium E". en. In: *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A Math. Phys. Sci.* 117.776 (Dec. 1927), pp. 109–123.
- [3] W. Pauli. "Dear radioactive ladies and gentlemen". In: *Phys. Today* 31N9 (1978), p. 27.
- [4] E. Fermi. "An attempt of a theory of beta radiation. 1." In: *Z. Phys.* 88 (1934), pp. 161–177.
- [5] F. Reines and C. L. Cowan. "Detection of the Free Neutrino". In: *Phys. Rev.* 92 (3 1953), pp. 830–831. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.92.830>.
- [6] C. L. Cowan et al. "Detection of the Free Neutrino: a Confirmation". In: *Science* 124.3212 (1956), pp. 103–104. eprint: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/124/3212/103.full.pdf>. URL: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/124/3212/103>.
- [7] G. Danby et al. "Observation of High-Energy Neutrino Reactions and the Existence of Two Kinds of Neutrinos". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 9 (1 1962), pp. 36–44. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.9.36>.
- [8] K. Kodama et al. "Observation of tau neutrino interactions". In: *Physics Letters B* 504.3 (2001), pp. 218 –224. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0370269301003070>.
- [9] A. Aguilar-Arevalo et al. "Evidence for neutrino oscillations from the observation of anti-neutrino(electron) appearance in a anti-neutrino(muon) beam". In: *Phys. Rev.* D64 (2001), p. 112007. arXiv: [hep-ex/0104049](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0104049) [hep-ex].
- [10] A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo et al. "Improved Search for $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$ Oscillations in the MiniBooNE Experiment". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110 (16 2013), p. 161801. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.161801>.
- [11] Planck Collaboration et al. "Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters". In: *aap* 641 (Sept. 2020).
- [12] J. A. Bagger et al. "Precision electroweak measurements on the Z resonance". In: *Physics Reports* 427.5 (2006), pp. 257 –454. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0370157305005119>.
- [13] B. Pontecorvo. "Neutrino Experiments and the Problem of Conservation of Leptonic Charge". In: *Sov. Phys. JETP* 26 (1968). [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 53, 1717(1967)], pp. 984–988.

- 3486 [14] B. Pontecorvo. "Inverse beta processes and nonconservation of lepton charge". In:
3487 *Sov. Phys. JETP* 7 (1958). [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.34,247(1957)], pp. 172–173.
- 3488 [15] Makoto Kobayashi and Toshihide Maskawa. "CP-Violation in the
3489 Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction". In: *Progress of Theoretical Physics*
3490 49.2 (1973), pp. 652–657. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/PTP.49.652>.
- 3491 [16] Nicola Cabibbo. "Unitary Symmetry and Leptonic Decays". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 10
3492 (12 1963), pp. 531–533. URL:
3493 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.10.531>.
- 3494 [17] A Maio and. "Search for Majorana neutrinos with the SNO+ detector at
3495 SNOLAB". In: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 587 (2015), p. 012030. URL:
3496 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/587/1/012030>.
- 3497 [18] A Yu Smirnov. "The MSW effect and solar neutrinos". In: (2003).
- 3498 [19] S.P. Mikheyev and A.Y. Smirnov. "Resonance enhancement of oscillations in
3499 matter and solar neutrino spectroscopy". In: *Soviet Journal of Nuclear Physics* 42 (6
3500 1985), pp. 913–917.
- 3501 [20] L. Wolfenstein. "Neutrino oscillations in matter". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 17 (9 1978),
3502 pp. 2369–2374. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.17.2369>.
- 3503 [21] Vernon D. Barger et al. "Matter Effects on Three-Neutrino Oscillations". In: *Phys.*
3504 *Rev. D* 22 (1980), p. 2718.
- 3505 [22] Y. Ashie et al. "Evidence for an Oscillatory Signature in Atmospheric Neutrino
3506 Oscillations". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 93 (10 2004), p. 101801. URL:
3507 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.101801>.
- 3508 [23] Q. R. Ahmad et al. "Direct Evidence for Neutrino Flavor Transformation from
3509 Neutral-Current Interactions in the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory". In: *Phys.*
3510 *Rev. Lett.* 89 (1 2002), p. 011301. URL:
3511 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.011301>.
- 3512 [24] 2015 Nobel prize in Physics as listed by Nobelprize.org.
3513 https://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/2015/.
3514 Accessed: 22-06-2022.
- 3515 [25] J. A. Formaggio and G. P. Zeller. "From eV to EeV: Neutrino Cross Sections
3516 Across Energy Scales". In: *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 84 (2012), pp. 1307–1341. arXiv:
3517 1305.7513 [hep-ex].
- 3518 [26] A Bellerive. "Review of solar neutrino experiments". en. In: *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*
3519 19.08 (Mar. 2004), pp. 1167–1179.
- 3520 [27] Raymond Davis, Don S. Harmer, and Kenneth C. Hoffman. "Search for
3521 Neutrinos from the Sun". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 20 (21 1968), pp. 1205–1209. URL:
3522 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.20.1205>.
- 3523 [28] Núria Vinyoles et al. "A new generation of standard solar models". In: *Astrophys.*
3524 *J.* 835.2 (Jan. 2017), p. 202.
- 3525 [29] V Gribov and B Pontecorvo. "Neutrino astronomy and lepton charge". en. In:
3526 *Phys. Lett. B* 28.7 (Jan. 1969), pp. 493–496.

- 3527 [30] K. S. Hirata et al. "Observation of ${}^8\text{B}$ solar neutrinos in the Kamiokande-II
3528 detector". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 63 (1 1989), pp. 16–19. URL:
3529 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.16>.
- 3530 [31] W Hampel et al. "GALLEX solar neutrino observations: results for GALLEX IV".
3531 en. In: *Phys. Lett. B* 447.1-2 (Feb. 1999), pp. 127–133.
- 3532 [32] J. N. Abdurashitov et al. "Measurement of the solar neutrino capture rate with
3533 gallium metal". In: *Phys. Rev. C* 60 (5 1999), p. 055801. URL:
3534 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevC.60.055801>.
- 3535 [33] Q R Ahmad et al. "Direct evidence for neutrino flavor transformation from
3536 neutral-current interactions in the Sudbury neutrino observatory". en. In: *Phys.*
3537 *Rev. Lett.* 89.1 (June 2002).
- 3538 [34] Borexino Collaboration. "Comprehensive measurement of pp-chain solar
3539 neutrinos". en. In: *Nature* 562.7728 (Oct. 2018), pp. 505–510.
- 3540 [35] B Aharmim et al. "A search for neutrinos from the SolarhepReaction and the
3541 diffuse supernova neutrino background with the Sudbury neutrino observatory".
3542 en. In: *Astrophys. J.* 653.2 (Dec. 2006), pp. 1545–1551.
- 3543 [36] M Agostini et al. "Experimental evidence of neutrinos produced in the CNO
3544 fusion cycle in the Sun". In: (2020).
- 3545 [37] S Andringa et al. "Current status and future prospects of the SNO+ experiment".
3546 In: *Adv. High Energy Phys.* 2016 (2016), pp. 1–21.
- 3547 [38] John F Beacom et al. "Physics prospects of the Jinping neutrino experiment". In:
3548 *Chin. phys. C* 41.2 (Feb. 2017), p. 023002.
- 3549 [39] Fengpeng An et al. "Neutrino physics with JUNO". In: *J. Phys. G Nucl. Part. Phys.*
3550 43.3 (Mar. 2016), p. 030401.
- 3551 [40] T K Gaisser and M Honda. "Flux of Atmospheric Neutrinos". In: (2002).
- 3552 [41] G. D. Barr et al. "Three-dimensional calculation of atmospheric neutrinos". In:
3553 *Physical Review D* 70.2 (2004). URL:
3554 <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.70.023006>.
- 3555 [42] M. Honda et al. "Calculation of atmospheric neutrino flux using the interaction
3556 model calibrated with atmospheric muon data". In: *Physical Review D* 75.4 (2007).
3557 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.75.043006>.
- 3558 [43] M. Honda et al. "New calculation of the atmospheric neutrino flux in a
3559 three-dimensional scheme". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 70 (4 2004), p. 043008. URL:
3560 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.70.043008>.
- 3561 [44] M. Honda et al. "Improvement of low energy atmospheric neutrino flux
3562 calculation using the JAM nuclear interaction model". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 83 (12
3563 2011), p. 123001. URL:
3564 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.83.123001>.
- 3565 [45] A. Fasso et al. "FLUKA: status and prospects for hadronic applications". In:
3566 (2001).
- 3567 [46] Y. Ashie et al. "Measurement of atmospheric neutrino oscillation parameters by
3568 Super-Kamiokande I". In: *Physical Review D* 71.11 (2005). URL:
3569 <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.71.112005>.

- 3570 [47] F Reines et al. "Evidence for high-energy cosmic-ray neutrino interactions". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 15.9 (Aug. 1965), pp. 429–433.
- 3571 [48] D. Casper et al. "Measurement of atmospheric neutrino composition with the IMB-3 detector". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 66 (20 1991), pp. 2561–2564. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.66.2561>.
- 3572 [49] K S Hirata et al. "Observation of a small atmospheric ν_μ/ν_e ratio in Kamiokande". en. In: *Phys. Lett. B* 280.1-2 (Apr. 1992), pp. 146–152.
- 3573 [50] Z. Li et al. "Measurement of the tau neutrino cross section in atmospheric neutrino oscillations with Super-Kamiokande". In: *Physical Review D* 98.5 (2018). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.98.052006>.
- 3574 [51] Kamiokande Collaboration et al. "Atmospheric neutrino oscillation analysis with external constraints in Super-Kamiokande I-IV". In: (2017).
- 3575 [52] T2K Collaboration. "Constraint on the matter-antimatter symmetry-violating phase in neutrino oscillations". en. In: *Nature* 580.7803 (Apr. 2020), pp. 339–344.
- 3576 [53] M A Acero et al. "First measurement of neutrino oscillation parameters using neutrinos and antineutrinos by NOvA". en. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 123.15 (Oct. 2019), p. 151803.
- 3577 [54] M G Aartsen et al. "Measurement of atmospheric neutrino oscillations at 6–56 GeV with IceCube DeepCore". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 120.7 (Feb. 2018).
- 3578 [55] P Adamson et al. "Combined analysis of $\nu\bar{\nu}$ Disappearance and $\nu\mu \rightarrow \nu e$ Appearance in MINOS using accelerator and atmospheric neutrinos". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 112.19 (May 2014).
- 3579 [56] M. Sajjad Athar et al. "Status and perspectives of neutrino physics". In: *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* 124 (2022), p. 103947. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/Fj.pppn.2022.103947>.
- 3580 [57] G Danby et al. "Observation of high-energy neutrino reactions and the existence of two kinds of neutrinos". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 9.1 (July 1962), pp. 36–44.
- 3581 [58] K. Abe et al. "T2K neutrino flux prediction". In: *Physical Review D* 87.1 (2013). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1103%2Fphysrevd.87.012001>.
- 3582 [59] D. G. Michael et al. "Observation of Muon Neutrino Disappearance with the MINOS Detectors in the NuMI Neutrino Beam". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 97 (19 2006), p. 191801. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.191801>.
- 3583 [60] G. Danby et al. "Observation of High-Energy Neutrino Reactions and the Existence of Two Kinds of Neutrinos". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 9 (1 1962), pp. 36–44. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.9.36>.
- 3584 [61] M. A. Acero et al. "First measurement of neutrino oscillation parameters using neutrinos and antineutrinos by NOvA". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 123 (15 2019), p. 151803. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.151803>.
- 3585 [62] B Abi et al. "Long-baseline neutrino oscillation physics potential of the DUNE experiment". en. In: *Eur. Phys. J. C Part. Fields* 80.10 (Oct. 2020).
- 3586

- 3612 [63] Hyper-Kamiokande Proto-Collaboration et al. "Physics potential of a
3613 long-baseline neutrino oscillation experiment using a J-PARC neutrino beam and
3614 Hyper-Kamiokande". In: *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* 2015.5 (May 2015), pp. 53C02–0.
- 3615 [64] Carlos Blanco, Dan Hooper, and Pedro Machado. "Constraining sterile neutrino
3616 interpretations of the LSND and MiniBooNE anomalies with coherent neutrino
3617 scattering experiments". In: *Physical Review D* 101.7 (2020). URL:
3618 <https://doi.org/10.1103%2Fphysrevd.101.075051>.
- 3619 [65] MicroBooNE Collaboration et al. *Search for an Excess of Electron Neutrino*
3620 *Interactions in MicroBooNE Using Multiple Final State Topologies*. 2021. URL:
3621 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14054>.
- 3622 [66] B. Armbruster et al. "Upper limits for neutrino oscillations $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$ from muon
3623 decay at rest". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 65 (11 2002), p. 112001. URL:
3624 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.65.112001>.
- 3625 [67] Soo-Bong Kim, Thierry Lasserre, and Yifang Wang. "Reactor Neutrinos". In: *Adv.*
3626 *High Energy Phys.* 2013 (2013), pp. 1–34.
- 3627 [68] Mohammad Sajjad Athar et al. "Status and perspectives of neutrino physics". In:
3628 *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* 124 (2022), p. 103947. arXiv: 2111.07586 [hep-ph].
- 3629 [69] K Abe et al. "First gadolinium loading to Super-Kamiokande". en. In: *Nucl.*
3630 *Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A* 1027.166248 (Mar. 2022), p. 166248.
- 3631 [70] F. P. An et al. "Observation of Electron-Antineutrino Disappearance at Daya Bay".
3632 In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108 (17 2012), p. 171803. URL:
3633 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.171803>.
- 3634 [71] J. K. Ahn et al. "Observation of Reactor Electron Antineutrinos Disappearance in
3635 the RENO Experiment". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108 (19 2012), p. 191802. URL:
3636 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.191802>.
- 3637 [72] Y. Abe et al. "Indication of Reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$ Disappearance in the Double Chooz
3638 Experiment". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108 (13 2012), p. 131801. URL:
3639 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.131801>.
- 3640 [73] JUNO Collaboration et al. *TAO Conceptual Design Report: A Precision Measurement*
3641 *of the Reactor Antineutrino Spectrum with Sub-percent Energy Resolution*. 2020. arXiv:
3642 2005.08745 [physics.ins-det].
- 3643 [74] M P Decowski. "KamLAND's precision neutrino oscillation measurements". en.
3644 In: *Nucl. Phys. B*. 908 (July 2016), pp. 52–61.
- 3645 [75] A. Gando et al. "Constraints on θ_{13} from a three-flavor oscillation analysis of
3646 reactor antineutrinos at KamLAND". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 83 (5 2011), p. 052002. URL:
3647 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.83.052002>.
- 3648 [76] Patrick Dunne. *Latest Neutrino oscillation results from T2K*. 2020.
- 3649 [77] Particle Data Group et al. "Review of particle physics". en. In: *Prog. Theor. Exp.*
3650 *Phys.* 2020.8 (Aug. 2020).
- 3651 [78] R. L. Workman and Others. "Review of Particle Physics". In: *PTEP* 2022 (2022),
3652 p. 083C01.

- 3653 [79] K. Abe et al. "Precise Measurement of the Neutrino Mixing Parameter θ_{23} from
3654 Muon Neutrino Disappearance in an Off-Axis Beam". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 112 (18
3655 2014), p. 181801. URL:
3656 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.181801>.
- 3657 [80] Y Fukuda et al. "Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos". In: *Phys. Rev.
3658 Lett.* 81.8 (Aug. 1998), pp. 1562–1567.
- 3659 [81] K. Abe et al. "Calibration of the Super-Kamiokande detector". In: *Nuclear
3660 Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers,
3661 Detectors and Associated Equipment* 737 (2014), pp. 253–272. URL:
3662 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2013.11.081>.
- 3663 [82] Linyan Wan. "Atmospheric Neutrino_Super-K". In: (2022). URL:
3664 <https://zenodo.org/record/6694761>.
- 3665 [83] Miao Jiang. "Study of the neutrino mass hierarchy with the atmospheric neutrino
3666 data collected in Super-Kamiokande IV". PhD thesis. Kyoto University, 2019.
- 3667 [84] S Fukuda et al. "The super-kamiokande detector". en. In: *Nucl. Instrum. Methods
3668 Phys. Res. A* 501.2-3 (Apr. 2003), pp. 418–462.
- 3669 [85] Y Itow et al. "The JHF-Kamioka neutrino project". In: (2001).
- 3670 [86] M Jiang et al. "Atmospheric neutrino oscillation analysis with improved event
3671 reconstruction in Super-Kamiokande IV". en. In: *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* 2019.5
3672 (May 2019).
- 3673 [87] A. Suzuki et al. "Improvement of 20 in. diameter photomultiplier tubes". In:
3674 *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators,
3675 Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 329.1-2 (May 1993), pp. 299–313.
3676 URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002\(93\)90949-i](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-9002(93)90949-i).
- 3677 [88] S. Fukuda et al. "The Super-Kamiokande detector". In: *Nuclear Instruments and
3678 Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and
3679 Associated Equipment* 501.2 (2003), pp. 418–462. eprint:
3680 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016890020300425X>.
- 3681 [89] Y Nakano et al. "Measurement of the radon concentration in purified water in
3682 the Super-Kamiokande IV detector". en. In: *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A*
3683 977.164297 (Oct. 2020), p. 164297.
- 3684 [90] Hamamatsu. *Hamamatsu Photonics Photomultiplier Tubes Handbook*. URL:
3685 [https://www.hamamatsu.com/content/dam/hamamatsu-photonics/sites/
documents/99\SALES_LIBRARY/etd/PMT_handbook_v4E.pdf](https://www.hamamatsu.com/content/dam/hamamatsu-photonics/sites/
3686 documents/99\SALES_LIBRARY/etd/PMT_handbook_v4E.pdf).
- 3687 [91] K Abe et al. "First gadolinium loading to Super-Kamiokande". en. In: *Nucl.
3688 Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A* 1027.166248 (Mar. 2022), p. 166248.
- 3689 [92] John F. Beacom and Mark R. Vagins. "Antineutrino Spectroscopy with Large
3690 Water Čerenkov Detectors". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 93 (17 2004), p. 171101. URL:
3691 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.171101>.
- 3692 [93] Ll Martí et al. "Evaluation of gadolinium's action on water Cherenkov detector
3693 systems with EGADS". en. In: *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A* 959.163549
3694 (Apr. 2020), p. 163549.
- 3695 [94] Ll Martí et al. "Evaluation of gadolinium's action on water Cherenkov detector
3696 systems with EGADS". In: (2019).

- 3697 [95] Mark Vagins. *Solar/DSNB Neutrino_SK-Gd*. 2022.
- 3698 [96] John Focht. PhD thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004.
- 3699 [97] T. Tanimori et al. "Design and performance of semi-custom analog IC including
3700 two TACs and two current integrators for 'Super-Kamiokande'". In: *IEEE*
3701 *Transactions on Nuclear Science* 36.1 (1989), pp. 497–501.
- 3702 [98] J. Hosaka et al. "Solar neutrino measurements in Super-Kamiokande-I". In: *Phys.*
3703 *Rev. D* 73 (11 2006), p. 112001. URL:
3704 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.73.112001>.
- 3705 [99] H Nishino et al. "High-speed charge-to-time converter ASIC for the
3706 Super-Kamiokande detector". en. In: *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A* 610.3
3707 (Nov. 2009), pp. 710–717.
- 3708 [100] S. Yamada et al. "Commissioning of the New Electronics and Online System for
3709 the Super-Kamiokande Experiment". In: *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science* 57.2
3710 (2010), pp. 428–432.
- 3711 [101] Satoru Yamada et al. "New online system without hardware trigger for the
3712 Super-Kamiokande experiment". In: *2007 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium
3713 Conference Record*. Honolulu, HI, USA: IEEE, Oct. 2007.
- 3714 [102] Giada Carminati. "The new wide-band solar neutrino trigger for
3715 super-kamiokande". In: *Phys. Procedia* 61 (2015), pp. 666–672.
- 3716 [103] P A Čerenkov. "Visible radiation produced by electrons moving in a medium
3717 with velocities exceeding that of light". In: *Phys. Rev.* 52.4 (Aug. 1937),
3718 pp. 378–379.
- 3719 [104] I Frank and Ig Tamm. "Coherent visible radiation of fast electrons passing
3720 through matter". In: *Selected Papers*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin
3721 Heidelberg, 1991, pp. 29–35.
- 3722 [105] The T2K Collaboration. "Letter of Intent: Neutrino Oscillation Experiment at
3723 JHF". In: *KEK Proposal* (2001). eprint:
3724 <http://neutrino.kek.jp/jhfnu/loi/loi.v2.030528.pdf>.
- 3725 [106] Y Itow et al. "The JHF-Kamioka neutrino project". In: (June 2001). arXiv:
3726 [hep-ex/0106019](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0106019) [hep-ex].
- 3727 [107] The K2K Collaboration and S H Ahn. "Detection of Accelerator-Produced
3728 Neutrinos at a Distance of 250 km". In: (Feb. 2001). arXiv: [hep-ex/0103001](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0103001)
3729 [hep-ex].
- 3730 [108] The T2K Collaboration. "Tokai-to-Kamioka (T2K) Long Baseline Neutrino
3731 Oscillation Experiment Proposal". In: *KEK Proposal* (2006). eprint: {{<http://j-parc.jp/researcher/Hadron/en/pac\0606/pdf/p11-Nishikawa.pdf>}}.
- 3733 [109] Christophe Bronner. *Accelerator Neutrino I_Recent results from T2K*. 2022.
- 3734 [110] K. Abe et al. "Observation of Electron Neutrino Appearance in a Muon Neutrino
3735 Beam". In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 112 (6 2014), p. 061802. eprint:
3736 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.061802>.
- 3737 [111] T. Fukuda et al. "Proposal for precise measurement of neutrino-water
3738 cross-section in NINJA physics run". Proposal for J-PARC and KEK. 2017.

- 3739 [112] T. Ovsianikova et al. "New experiment WAGASCI to measure cross sections of
3740 neutrino interactions in water and hydrocarbon using J-PARC beam". In: *Physics*
3741 of Particles and Nuclei 48.6 (2017), pp. 1014–1017. eprint:
3742 <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1063779617060478>.
- 3743 [113] M. Antonova et al. "Baby MIND: a magnetized segmented neutrino detector for
3744 the WAGASCI experiment". In: *Journal of Instrumentation* 12.07 (2017), p. C07028.
3745 eprint: <http://stacks.iop.org/1748-0221/12/i=07/a=C07028>.
- 3746 [114] K. Abe et al. "First measurement of the charged current $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ double differential
3747 cross section on a water target without pions in the final state". In: *Phys. Rev. D*
3748 102 (1 2020), p. 012007. URL:
3749 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.012007>.
- 3750 [115] K Abe et al. "Measurements of $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_\mu$ charged-current cross-sections
3751 without detected pions or protons on water and hydrocarbon at a mean
3752 anti-neutrino energy of 0.86 GeV". In: *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental*
3753 *Physics* 2021.4 (Mar. 2021). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptab014>.
- 3754 [116] K. Abe et al. "The T2K experiment". In: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics*
3755 *Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*
3756 659.1 (2011), pp. 106 –135. eprint:
3757 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168900211011910>.
- 3758 [117] K. Matsuoka et al. "Design and performance of the muon monitor for the T2K
3759 neutrino oscillation experiment". In: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics*
3760 *Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment*
3761 624.3 (2010), pp. 591 –600. eprint:
3762 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016890021002098X>.
- 3763 [118] K Abe et al. "Improved constraints on neutrino mixing from the T2K experiment
3764 with 3.13×10^{21} protons on target". en. In: *Phys. Rev. D.* 103.11 (June 2021).
- 3765 [119] Tomislav Vladisavljevic. *Predicting the T2K neutrino flux and measuring oscillation*
3766 *parameters*. 1st ed. Springer theses. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature, Sept.
3767 2020.
- 3768 [120] D Beavis, A Carroll, and I Chiang. "Long baseline neutrino oscillation
3769 experiment at the AGS. Physics design report". In: (Apr. 1995).
- 3770 [121] P.-A. Amaudruz et al. "The T2K fine-grained detectors". In: *Nuclear Instruments*
3771 and *Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and*
3772 *Associated Equipment* 696 (Dec. 2012), pp. 1–31. URL:
3773 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.08.020>.
- 3774 [122] N. Abgrall et al. "Time projection chambers for the T2K near detectors". In:
3775 *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators,*
3776 *Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 637.1 (May 2011), pp. 25–46. URL:
3777 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2011.02.036>.
- 3778 [123] S. Assylbekov et al. "The T2K ND280 off-axis pi-zero detector". In: *Nuclear*
3779 *Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers,*
3780 *Detectors and Associated Equipment* 686 (Sept. 2012), pp. 48–63. URL:
3781 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.05.028>.

- 3782 [124] D Allan et al. "The electromagnetic calorimeter for the T2K near detector
3783 ND280". In: *Journal of Instrumentation* 8.10 (2013), P10019–P10019. URL:
3784 <https://doi.org/10.1088%2F1748-0221%2F8%2F10%2Fp10019>.
- 3785 [125] F. Vannucci. "The NOMAD Experiment at CERN". In: *Advances in High Energy
3786 Physics* 2014 (2014), pp. 1–20. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/129694>.
- 3787 [126] *UA1 magnet sets off for a second new life*. 2022. URL: <https://cerncourier.com/a/ua1-magnet-sets-off-for-a-second-new-life/>.
- 3789 [127] S. Aoki et al. "The T2K Side Muon Range Detector (SMRD)". In: *Nuclear
3790 Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers,
3791 Detectors and Associated Equipment* 698 (Jan. 2013), pp. 135–146. URL:
3792 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2012.10.001>.
- 3793 [128] K. Suzuki et al. "Measurement of the muon beam direction and muon flux for the
3794 T2K neutrino experiment". In: *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics*
3795 2015.5 (2015), pp. 53C01–0. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093%2Fptep%2Fptv054>.
- 3796 [129] S. Brooks et al. *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*. CRC Press, 2011.
- 3797 [130] W. R. Gilks, S. Richardson, and D. J. Spiegelhalter. *Markov Chain Monte Carlo in
3798 Practice*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Interdisciplinary Statistics, 1995.
- 3799 [131] Clarence Wret. "Minimising systematic uncertainties in the T2K experiment using
3800 near-detector and external data". PhD thesis. Imperial College London, 2018.
- 3801 [132] Kirsty Elizabeth Duffy. "Measurement of the Neutrino Oscillation Parameters
3802 $\sin^2 \theta_{23}$, Δm_{32}^2 , $\sin^2 \theta_{13}$, and δ_{CP} in Neutrino and Antineutrino Oscillation at T2K".
3803 PhD thesis. Oriel College, University of Oxford, 2016.
- 3804 [133] Thomas Bayes Rev. "An essay toward solving a problem in the doctrine of
3805 chances". In: *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond.* 53 (1764), pp. 370–418.
- 3806 [134] Artur Sztuc. "Standard and Non-Standard Neutrino-Antineutrino Oscillation
3807 Analyses and Event Reconstruction Studies using Markov Chain Monte Carlo
3808 Methods at T2K". PhD thesis. Imperial College London, 2021.
- 3809 [135] N. Metropolis et al. "Equation of State Calculations by Fast Computing
3810 Machines". In: *Journal of Chemical Physics* 21.6 (1970).
- 3811 [136] W. K. Hastings. "Monte Carlo Sampling Methods Using Markov Chains and
3812 Their Applications". In: *Biometrika* 57.1 (1970).
- 3813 [137] Joanna Dunkley et al. "Fast and reliable Markov chain Monte Carlo technique for
3814 cosmological parameter estimation". en. In: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* 356.3 (Jan.
3815 2005), pp. 925–936.
- 3816 [138] Harold Jeffreys. *The Theory of Probability*. Oxford Classic Texts in the Physical
3817 Sciences. 1939.
- 3818 [139] Robert E Kass and Adrian E Raftery. "Bayes factors". en. In: *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*
3819 90.430 (June 1995), pp. 773–795.
- 3820 [140] T.T. Böhlen et al. "The FLUKA Code: Developments and Challenges for High
3821 Energy and Medical Applications". In: *Nuclear Data Sheets* 120 (2014), pp. 211
3822 –214. eprint:
3823 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0090375214005018>.

- 3824 [141] René Brun et al. *GEANT: Detector Description and Simulation Tool; Oct 1994*. CERN
3825 Program Library. Long Writeup W5013. Geneva: CERN, 1993. eprint:
3826 <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1082634>.
- 3827 [142] K. Abe et al. “T2K neutrino flux prediction”. In: *Phys. Rev. D* 87 (1 2013),
3828 p. 012001. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.87.012001>.
- 3829 [143] C. Zeitnitz and T.A. Gabriel. “The GEANT-CALOR interface and benchmark
3830 calculations of ZEUS test calorimeters”. In: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in*
3831 *Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated*
3832 *Equipment* 349.1 (1994), pp. 106–111. eprint:
3833 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0168900294906130>.
- 3834 [144] A. Fiorentini et al. “Flux Prediction and Uncertainty Updates with NA61 2009
3835 Thin Target Data and Negative Focussing Mode Predictions”. In: *T2K Technical*
3836 *Note* 217 (2017).
- 3837 [145] N. Abgrall et al. “Measurements of cross sections and charged pion spectra in
3838 proton-carbon interactions at 31 GeV/ c ”. In: *Physical Review C* 84.3 (2011). URL:
3839 <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevc.84.034604>.
- 3840 [146] N. Abgrall et al. “Measurement of production properties of positively charged
3841 kaons in proton-carbon interactions at 31 GeV/ c ”. In: *Physical Review C* 85.3 (2012). URL:
3842 <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevc.85.035210>.
- 3843 [147] N. Abgrall et al. “Pion emission from the T2K replica target: Method, results and
3844 application”. In: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A:*
3845 *Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 701 (2013), pp. 99–114.
3846 eprint:
3847 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016890021201234X>.
- 3848 [148] M. Apollonio et al. “Forward production of charged pions with incident protons
3849 on nuclear targets at the CERN Proton Synchrotron”. In: *Phys. Rev. C* 80 (3 2009),
3850 p. 035208. eprint: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevC.80.035208>.
- 3851 [149] B. Blau et al. “The superconducting magnet of AMS-02”. In: *Nuclear Physics B -*
3852 *Proceedings Supplements* 113.1-3 (Dec. 2002), pp. 125–132. URL:
3853 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0920-5632\(02\)01831-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0920-5632(02)01831-5).
- 3854 [150] S. Haino et al. “Measurements of primary and atmospheric cosmic-ray spectra
3855 with the BESS-TeV spectrometer”. In: *Physics Letters B* 594.1-2 (July 2004),
3856 pp. 35–46. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2004.05.019>.
- 3857 [151] NASA. *U.S. Standard Atmosphere*, 1976. 1976.
- 3858 [152] S. Roesler, R. Engel, and J. Ranft. “The Monte Carlo Event Generator
3859 DPMJET-III”. In: *Advanced Monte Carlo for Radiation Physics, Particle Transport*
3860 *Simulation and Applications*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2001, pp. 1033–1038. URL:
3861 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18211-2_166.
- 3862 [153] Koji Niita et al. “PHITS—a particle and heavy ion transport code system”. In:
3863 *Radiation Measurements* 41.9-10 (Oct. 2006), pp. 1080–1090. URL:
3864 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radmeas.2006.07.013>.

- 3869 [154] T Sanuki et al. "Measurements of atmospheric muon spectra at mountain
3870 altitude". In: *Physics Letters B* 541.3-4 (2002), pp. 234–242. URL:
3871 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693\(02\)02265-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0370-2693(02)02265-7).
- 3872 [155] P. Achard et al. "Measurement of the atmospheric muon spectrum from 20 to
3873 3000 GeV". In: *Physics Letters B* 598.1-2 (2004), pp. 15–32. URL:
3874 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2004.08.003>.
- 3875 [156] Kazufumi Sato. *Atmospheric Neutrino_Reviews on neutrino fluxes (low E atm nu)*.
3876 2022.
- 3877 [157] Yoshinari Hayato and Luke Pickering. "The NEUT neutrino interaction
3878 simulation program library". In: *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* 230.24
3879 (Oct. 2021), pp. 4469–4481. URL:
3880 <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjs/s11734-021-00287-7>.
- 3881 [158] Yoshinari Hayato. "A Neutrino Interaction Simulation Program Library NEUT".
3882 In: *Acta Physica Polonica B* 40.9 (2009).
- 3883 [159] C.H. Llewellyn Smith. "Neutrino reactions at accelerator energies". In: *Physics
3884 Reports* 3.5 (1972), pp. 261 –379. eprint:
3885 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0370157372900105>.
- 3886 [160] Omar Benhar, Adelchi Fabrocini, and Stefano Fantoni. "The nucleon spectral
3887 function in infinite nuclear matter". In: *Nuclear Physics A* 497 (June 1989),
3888 pp. 423–430. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9474\(89\)90484-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9474(89)90484-3).
- 3889 [161] R. Bradford et al. "A New Parameterization of the Nucleon Elastic Form Factors".
3890 In: *Nuclear Physics B - Proceedings Supplements* 159 (2006). Proceedings of the 4th
3891 International Workshop on Neutrino-Nucleus Interactions in the Few-GeV
3892 Region, pp. 127 –132. eprint:
3893 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920563206005184>.
- 3894 [162] A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo et al. "First measurement of the muon neutrino charged
3895 current quasielastic double differential cross section". In: *Physical Review D* 81.9
3896 (2010). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.81.092005>.
- 3897 [163] R. Gran et al. "Neutrino-nucleus quasi-elastic and 2p2h interactions up to 10
3898 GeV". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 88 (11 2013), p. 113007. eprint:
3899 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.113007>.
- 3900 [164] Ch. Berger and L. M. Sehgal. "Lepton mass effects in single pion production by
3901 neutrinos". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 76 (11 2007), p. 113004. URL:
3902 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.76.113004>.
- 3903 [165] Ch. Berger and L. M. Sehgal. "Partially conserved axial vector current and
3904 coherent pion production by low energy neutrinos". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 79 (5 2009),
3905 p. 053003. eprint: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.79.053003>.
- 3906 [166] Torbjörn Sjöstrand. "High-energy-physics event generation with PYTHIA 5.7 and
3907 JETSET 7.4". In: *Computer Physics Communications* 82.1 (Aug. 1994), pp. 74–89.
3908 URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-4655\(94\)90132-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-4655(94)90132-5).

- 3909 [167] Christophe Bronner and Mark Hartz. "Tuning of the Charged Hadrons
3910 Multiplicities for Deep Inelastic Interactions in NEUT". In: *Proceedings of the 10th*
3911 *International Workshop on Neutrino-Nucleus Interactions in Few-GeV Region*
3912 (*NuInt15*). Journal of the Physical Society of Japan, Dec. 2016. URL:
3913 <https://doi.org/10.7566/jpsc.12.010041>.
- 3914 [168] M. Glück, E. Reya, and A. Vogt. "Dynamical parton distributions revisited". In:
3915 *The European Physical Journal C* 5.3 (1998), pp. 461–470. URL:
3916 <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs100529800978>.
- 3917 [169] Arie Bodek and Un-ki Yang. *Axial and Vector Structure Functions for Electron- and*
3918 *Neutrino- Nucleon Scattering Cross Sections at all Q^2 using Effective Leading order*
3919 *Parton Distribution Functions*. 2010. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.6592>.
- 3920 [170] Arie Bodek and Un-Ki Yang. "Update to the Bodek-Yang Unified Model for
3921 Electron- and Neutrino- Nucleon Scattering Cross Sections". In: (2010). URL:
3922 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1012.0261>.
- 3923 [171] Sowjanya Gollapinni. "Neutrino Cross section Future". In: (2016). URL:
3924 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.05299>.
- 3925 [172] E. S. Pinzon Guerra et al. "Using world π^\pm -nucleus scattering data to constrain
3926 an intranuclear cascade model". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 99 (5 2019), p. 052007. URL:
3927 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.99.052007>.
- 3928 [173] S. Agostinelli et al. "GEANT4: A Simulation toolkit". In: *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*
3929 A506 (2003), pp. 250–303.
- 3930 [174] R. Brun et al. "GEANT3". In: (Sept. 1987).
- 3931 [175] K. Abe et al. "Search for <mml:math
3932 xmlns:mml="http://www.w3.org/1998/Math/MathML"
3933 display="inline"><mml:mi>C</mml:mi><mml:mi>P</mml:mi></mml:math>
3934 Violation in Neutrino and Antineutrino Oscillations by the T2K Experiment with
3935 <mml:math xmlns:mml="http://www.w3.org/1998/Math/MathML"
3936 display="inline"><mml:mn>2.2</mml:mn><mml:mo>x</mml:mo><mml:msup><mml:mn>
3937 Protons on Target". In: *Physical Review Letters* 121.17 (Oct. 2018). URL:
3938 <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.121.171802>.
- 3939 [176] K. Abe et al. "Measurements of neutrino oscillation in appearance and
3940 disappearance channels by the T2K experiment with<mml:math
3941 xmlns:mml="http://www.w3.org/1998/Math/MathML"
3942 display="inline"><mml:mn>6.6</mml:mn><mml:mo>x</mml:mo><mml:mn>1</mml:mn
3943 on target". In: *Physical Review D* 91.7 (Apr. 2015). URL:
3944 <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.91.072010>.
- 3945 [177] R.B. Patterson et al. "The extended-track event reconstruction for MiniBooNE".
3946 In: *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators,*
3947 *Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 608.1 (2009), pp. 206–224. URL:
3948 <https://doi.org/10.1016\%2Fj.nima.2009.06.064>.
- 3949 [178] et al. S. Berkman. "fiTQun: A New Reconstruction Algorithm for Super-K". In:
3950 *T2K Technical Note* 146 (2013).
- 3951 [179] et al. A. Himmel. "Super-Kamiokande events and data quality studies for T2K
3952 Runs 5 and 6". In: *T2K Technical Note* 219 (2015).

- 3953 [180] F and James. "MINUIT: Function Minimization and Error Analysis Reference
3954 Manual". In: (1998). CERN Program Library Long Writeups. URL:
3955 <https://cds.cern.ch/record/2296388>.
- 3956 [181] Xiaoyue Li and Michael Wilking. "FiTQun Event Selection Optimization". In:
3957 *T2K Technical Note* 319 (2017).
- 3958 [182] Shimpei Tobayama. "An Analysis of the Oscillation of Atmospheric Neutrinos".
3959 PhD thesis. British Columbia U., 2016.
- 3960 [183] et al. D. Barrow. "Super-Kamiokande Data Quality, MC, and Systematics in Run
3961 10". In: *T2K Technical Note* 399 (2020).
- 3962 [184] A. Maghrabi, A. Aldosari, and M. Almutairi. "Correlation analyses between solar
3963 activity parameters and cosmic ray muons between 2002 and 2012 at high cutoff
3964 rigidity". In: *Advances in Space Research* 68.7 (Oct. 2021), pp. 2941–2952. URL:
3965 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2021.05.016>.
- 3966 [185] K. Abe et al. "Atmospheric neutrino oscillation analysis with external constraints
3967 in Super-Kamiokande I-IV". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 97 (7 2018), p. 072001. eprint:
3968 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.072001>.
- 3969 [186] J. Beringer et al. "Review of Particle Physics". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 86 (1 2012),
3970 p. 010001. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.010001>.
- 3971 [187] Yuuki Nakano and. "Radon background study in Super-Kamiokande". In: *Journal
3972 of Physics: Conference Series* 888 (2017), p. 012191. URL:
3973 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/888/1/012191>.
- 3974 [188] S. Nakayama K. Iyogi and Y. Obayashi. "T2K data acquisition and FC event
3975 selection at Super-Kamiokande". In: *T2K Technical Note* 027 (2011).
- 3976 [189] LeeKaPik. "Study of the neutrino mass hierarchy with the atmospheric neutrino
3977 data observed in Super-Kamiokande". PhD thesis. Tokyo University, 2012.
- 3978 [190] R. Wendell et al. "Atmospheric neutrino oscillation analysis with subleading
3979 effects in Super-Kamiokande I, II, and III". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 81 (9 2010), p. 092004.
3980 URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.81.092004>.
- 3981 [191] J. Hosaka et al. "Three flavor neutrino oscillation analysis of atmospheric
3982 neutrinos in Super-Kamiokande". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 74 (3 2006), p. 032002. URL:
3983 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.74.032002>.
- 3984 [192] Laura Munteanu et al. "Constraining the Flux and Cross Section Models with
3985 Data from ND280 using FGD1 and FGD2 for the 2020 Oscillation Analysis". In:
3986 *T2K Technical Note* 395 (2020).
- 3987 [193] P. Bartet et al. " ν_μ CC event selections in the ND280 tracker using Run 2+3+4
3988 data". In: *T2K Technical Note* 212 (2015).
- 3989 [194] Will Parker. "Constraining Systematic Uncertainties at T2K using Near Detector
3990 Data". PhD thesis. Royal Holloway University of London, 2020.
- 3991 [195] V. Berardi et al. " $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ event selection in the ND280 tracker using Run 5c and Run 6
3992 anti-neutrino beam data". In: *T2K Technical Note* 246 (2015).
- 3993 [196] James Misset. "TN-318: Fit to Super-K Atmospheric Neutrino Data for
3994 Optimization of the fitQun Fiducial Volume Cuts and Estimation of Detector
3995 Uncertainties". In: *T2K Technical Note* 318 (2017).

- 3996 [197] et al. J. Chakrani. "NIWG model and uncertainties for 2021 oscillation analysis".
3997 In: *T2K Technical Note 414* (2022).
- 3998 [198] Morgan Wascko. "T2K Status, Results, and Plans". *Neutrino 2018*. 2018.
- 3999 [199] et al. Tomislav Vladisavljevic. "Flux Prediction and Uncertainty with
4000 NA61/SHINE 2009 Replica-Target Data (TN354 version 3.3)". In: *T2K Technical*
4001 *Note 354* (2020).
- 4002 [200] G Ambrosini et al. "K/ π production ratios from 450 GeV/c protons on
4003 beryllium". en. In: *Phys. Lett. B* 420.1-2 (Feb. 1998), pp. 225–232.
- 4004 [201] et al. Edward Atkin. "NIWG model and uncertainties for 2019-2020 oscillation
4005 analysis". In: *T2K Technical Note 344* (2019).
- 4006 [202] et al. D. Barrow. "Flux and interaction models for the initial T2K-SK atmospheric
4007 joint fit studies". In: *T2K Technical Note 422* (2022).
- 4008 [203] et al. D. Barrow. "SK atmospheric T2K beam joint fit technical note, MaCh3
4009 details". In: *T2K Technical Note 426* (2022).
- 4010 [204] A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo et al. "Measurement of ν_μ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ induced neutral current
4011 single π^0 production cross sections on mineral oil at $E_\nu \sim \mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$ ". In: *Phys.*
4012 *Rev. D* 81 (1 2010), p. 013005. eprint:
4013 <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.81.013005>.
- 4014 [205] Patrick de Perio and James Imber. "Super-K Systematic Uncertainties for RUN1-4
4015 Joint ν_e and ν_μ Analyses". In: *T2K Technical Note 186* (2014).
- 4016 [206] Patrick de Perio and James Imber. "Update of SK ν_e systematic error for 2012a
4017 oscillation analysis". In: *T2K Technical Note 107* (2012).
- 4018 [207] Cris Vilela Daniel Barrow. *T2K-SK Detector Matrix Uncertainties - MaCh3*
4019 *Integration*. <https://git.t2k.org/t2k-sk/t2ksk-detcovmat/-/tree/feature/MaCh3Integration>. Accessed: 22-06-2022.
- 4021 [208] Roger Wendell. "Three Flavor Oscillation Analysis of Atmospheric Neutrinos in
4022 Super-Kamiokande". PhD thesis. University of North Carolina, 2008.
- 4023 [209] Adam M Dziewonski and Don L Anderson. "Preliminary reference Earth model".
4024 en. In: *Phys. Earth Planet. Inter.* 25.4 (June 1981), pp. 297–356.
- 4025 [210] et al. D. Barrow. "Oscillation probability calculation for the T2K+SK atmospheric
4026 joint fit". In: *T2K Technical Note 425* (2022).
- 4027 [211] R G Calland, A C Kaboth, and D Payne. "Accelerated event-by-event neutrino
4028 oscillation reweighting with matter effects on a GPU". In: 9.04 (Apr. 2014),
4029 P04016–P04016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/9/04/p04016>.
- 4030 [212] R. Wendell. <http://www.phy.duke.edu/~raw22/public/Prob3++/>.
- 4031 [213] Felix Kallenborn et al. "Massively parallel computation of atmospheric neutrino
4032 oscillations on CUDA-enabled accelerators". In: *Computer Physics Communications*
4033 234 (2019), pp. 235–244. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010465518302790>.
- 4035 [214] Liban Warsame. *MaCh3 Analysis Progress*. URL: <https://indico.fnal.gov/event/50217/contributions/241232/attachments/155318/202209/MaCh3ProgressforDUNELBL\underscoreMay17%20%282%29.pdf>.

- 4038 [215] Simon Bourret, João A B Coelho, and Véronique Van Elewyck and. “Neutrino
4039 oscillation tomography of the Earth with KM3NeT-ORCA”. In: *Journal of Physics:*
4040 *Conference Series* 888 (2017), p. 012114. URL:
4041 <https://doi.org/10.1088%2F1742-6596%2F888%2F1%2F012114>.
- 4042 [216] C. Rott, A. Taketa, and D. Bose. “Spectrometry of the Earth using Neutrino
4043 Oscillations”. In: *Scientific Reports* 5.1 (Oct. 2015). URL:
4044 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep15225>.
- 4045 [217] Kaoru Hagiwara, Naotoshi Okamura, and Ken ichi Senda. “The earth matter
4046 effects in neutrino oscillation experiments from Tokai to Kamioka and Korea”. In:
4047 *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2011.9 (Sept. 2011). URL:
4048 [https://doi.org/10.1007/jhep09\(2011\)082](https://doi.org/10.1007/jhep09(2011)082).
- 4049 [218] Dave Typinski. *Earth Gravity*.
4050 <http://www.typnet.net/Essays/EarthGravGraphics/EarthGrav.pdf>.
4051 Accessed: 24-06-2022.
- 4052 [219] Roger Barlow and Christine Beeston. “Fitting using finite Monte Carlo samples”.
4053 en. In: *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 77.2 (Oct. 1993), pp. 219–228.
- 4054 [220] J S Conway. *Incorporating nuisance parameters in likelihoods for multisource spectra*.
4055 2011.