

A Search for Tau Neutrino Appearance with IceCube-DeepCore

Michael. J. Larson

January 31, 2018

Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Cosmic Rays	5
1.2	Neutrinos	5
1.3	Methods of Detection	5
2	Neutrino Oscillations	6
2.1	Neutrino Experiments: Past and Present	6
2.2	Solar Neutrinos: A Hint of Multiple Flavors	6
2.3	Super-Kamiokande and Atmospheric Neutrinos	6
2.4	Oscillation Theory and the PMNS Matrix	6
3	The IceCube Detector	7
3.1	The DOM: The Basic Unit of IceCube	7
3.1.1	The Photomultiplier Tube: From Light to Signal	7
3.1.2	Digitization	7
3.1.3	Local Coincidence	7
3.2	The Geometry of the Detector	7
3.2.1	IceCube: A Detector for TeV Neutrinos	7
3.2.2	DeepCore: Extending the Reach to GeV Scales	7
4	Simulation of the IceCube-DeepCore Detector	8
4.1	Monte Carlo Generators	8
4.1.1	Background Generation	8
4.1.2	Signal Generation	11
4.2	Propagation of the Particles and Light	11
4.2.1	Modeling with GEANT4	12
4.2.2	Lepton Propagation with PROPOSAL	12
4.2.3	CLSim for Photon Propagation	12
4.2.4	Angular Acceptance and Hole Ice	13
4.3	Simulating the Detector Electronics	13
4.3.1	Event Building	15
4.4	Post-Simulation Processing	15
4.4.1	Pulse Extraction	16
4.4.2	Hit Cleaning	16
4.4.3	The DeepCoreFilter	17
5	Updates to the Noise Simulation	19
5.1	A Summary of Previous Fits	19
5.2	Limitations and Disagreement with Previous Fits	19

5.3	Low-dt Noise from Vuvuzela	20
5.4	Updating the Fitting Code	21
5.5	Results of New Noise Fits	22
6	Low-Energy Muon Simulation	25
6.1	Long-Frame CORSIKA for DeepCore	25
6.2	MuonGun for DeepCore	26
6.3	Simulation Efficiency with KDE Filtering	26
7	GRECO: An Event Selection at the Limits of DeepCore	28
7.1	Low-En Level 3 Cuts	28
7.1.1	GRECO Level 4 Cuts	28
7.1.2	GRECO Level 5 Cuts	32
7.1.3	GRECO Level 6 Cuts	36
7.1.4	GRECO Level 7: Final Level	39
7.2	The Properties of the GRECO Event Selection	40
7.2.1	Energy and Zenith Reach	40
8	A Search for Tau Neutrinos from Oscillations	41
8.1	Unitarity of the PMNS Matrix	41
8.2	Current Limits on Unitarity	41
8.3	Expectations from Monte Carlo	41
8.3.1	Choice of Binning	41
8.3.2	The MC Fit Templates	42
8.4	Parametrizing the Tau Neutrino Appearance	42
8.4.1	CC vs CC+NC	42
8.4.2	The ν_τ Normalization	43
8.4.3	Limits on the ν_τ Normalization	43
8.5	Systematics Considerations	44
8.5.1	Oscillation Parameters	44
8.5.2	Flux Uncertainties	44
8.5.3	Propagation Uncertainties	44
8.5.4	Cross-section Uncertainties	45
8.5.5	Detector Systematics	45
8.6	The Method of Maximum Likelihood	50
8.6.1	The χ^2 Fit	50
8.6.2	Finite Statistics	51
8.6.3	Expected Contour	51
8.6.4	Expected Sensitivity over Time	52
8.6.5	Systematics Pulls	52
8.6.6	Feldman-Cousins vs Wilk's Theorem	52
8.7	Fitting Data	52
8.7.1	Burn Sample Fits: Testing the Fitting Code	52
8.7.2	Blind Fits: Checking the Goodness-of-Fit	52
8.8	Results from the Analysis	52
8.8.1	Individual Years	52
8.8.2	Combining Years of Data	52
8.8.3	Systematics Pulls in the Final Result	52

8.8.4	Implications and Future Work	52
9	Phase1: An Upgrade for Oscillation Searches	52
9.1	Goals of Phase1	52
9.2	Preparing Simulation for the Upgrade	52
9.3	Potential Measurements of Phase1	52

List of Figures

7.1	The FirstHit Z position	28
7.2	Number of Hits Above Z=-200	29
7.3	QR6 and C2QR6	29
7.4	Tensor-of-Inertia Eigenvalue Ratio	30
7.5	The improvedLineFit Speed	31
7.6	The L4 BDT Score	31
7.7	Time to 75% Charge	32
7.8	Veto Identified Causal Hits	33
7.9	First Hit ρ Position	33
7.10	Quartile Distance	34
7.11	Quartile Z-Travel	34
7.12	SPE Reconstruction Zenith Angles	34
7.13	The L5 BDT Score	35
7.14	Fill-Ratio	36
7.15	The NChannel Distribution	37
7.16	CorridorCut Distribution	38
7.17	The FiniteReco Containment Cuts	39

List of Tables

8.1	The rates expected for each of the neutrino types in the Super-Kamiokande search for ν_τ appearance. Reproduced from.	44
8.2	Systematics sets used for the characterization of the signal neutrino events. While all listed sets have up to 30 years of effective livetime available, not all events are processed in each set.	46
8.3	Systematics sets used for the characterization of the atmospheric muon background.	47

A Search for Tau Neutrinos from Oscillations

8.1 Unitarity of the PMNS Matrix

8.2 Current Limits on Unitarity

8.3 Expectations from Monte Carlo

8.3.1 Choice of Binning

In order to understand the potential for IceCube's measurement of ν_τ appearance, a choice of binning must be decided upon. The analysis discussed here uses two variables to describe the oscillations: the reconstructed energy and zenith angle. These dimensions form an integral part of the standard oscillation analysis and are often used in measurements of atmospheric mixing parameters .

The choice of binning for zenith angles is selected to be similar, but somewhat finer than previous work . For this work, we use the fully sky, including upgoing events ($\cos(\phi) = -1$) corresponding to events passing through the full diameter of the Earth where we expect the strongest oscillation effects to very downgoing events ($\cos(\phi) = 1$) where events are originating in showers above the Antarctic. The energy binning is selected to match previous work from DeepCore and consists of 8 bins logarithmically spaced from 5.6 GeV to 56 GeV . In addition, recent work with DeepCore has shown that a third dimension separating the sample into cascade-like and track-like events may provide better sensitivity than using solely track-like events. Two variables are available in the GRECO sample. The first, the reconstructed length of a muon track, provides a simple separation between events with a clear muon track from those without one. This, in general, leads to reasonable separation between the ν_μ events undergoing disappearance and ν_τ events undergoing appearance. This may be seen in , where the cumulative distribution of the various simulation components are shown as a function of the reconstructed track length. The separation between the ν_μ and ν_τ charged-current samples occurs between 30-50 meters. By separating the sample into cascade-like events (eg. $L < 50$ m) and track-like events ($L \geq 50$ m), the disappearance and appearance may be partially disentangled.

The second potential separating variable is the likelihood ratio between a cascade and PegLeg's mixed cascade+track reconstructions. A higher likelihood (lower log-likelihood) in the cascade fit implies that the event is more likely intrinsically cascade-like while the reverse is true for intrinsically track-like events. The cumulative plot of the likelihood ratio is shown in . There exists a broad choice of values with similar separation properties from approximately $-4 < \Delta LLH < -2$. Once again, separating events into two samples using the likelihood ratio may improve the ability of the analysis to disentangle the disappearance and appearance effects.

Both variables clearly show some separating power and likely have similar behavior: an event with a longer reconstructed muon track should be expected to prefer the PegLeg reconstruction over a cascade reconstruction. In order to choose between the parameters, the efficacy of separating each of the simulation samples from the ν_τ charged current signal

list of atmo disappearance measurements that use zenith and energy binning

dragon, leesard 3 year papers

dragon, leesard

cumulative plot of track length

cumulative plot of deltallh

roc curves for track length

this sentence needs to be re-worded. its too verbose

8.4 Parametrizing the Tau Neutrino Appearance Chapter 8 A Search for Tau Neutrinos from Oscillations
was evaluated. The results are shown in , which give the fraction of each type rejected and the number of ν_τ events accepted into the "cascade-like" sample for various choices of the separating parameters. Values further from a diagonal indicate better separation between the ν_τ and other event types. Here we see that the track length performs uniformly better than the likelihood ratio in separating the disappearing ν_μ charged-current and appearing ν_τ charged current events. Furthermore, the reconstructed track length performs significantly better in separating the neutrino components from the atmospheric muon background. The reconstructed track length is therefore selected as the separating variable for this analysis.

8.3.2 The MC Fit Templates

A choice of 50 meters of reconstructed track length is selected for this analysis. Because the PegLeg reconstruction assumes the muon track to be minimally ionizing, the division of track-like and cascade-like has an effect on the minimum energy of each sample. In particular, no track-like events ($L \geq 50$ m) may have less than 10 GeV in total reconstructed energy. Both track- and cascade-like events may reconstruct with higher energies than 10 GeV.

mc templates!

nufit 2.2

The binned expectations used in the fit are shown in assuming the oscillation parameters given by . The lack of expected events in the track-like histogram is clearly visible. As expected, atmospheric muon background events tend to reconstruct as downgoing events, primarily visible in the track-like channel. The signal ν_τ events occur in the very upgoing cascade channel and make up, at most, approximately 10% of the events in those bins.

8.4 Parametrizing the Tau Neutrino Appearance

In order to properly measure the appearance of ν_τ events, a choice of "appearance parameter" must be selected. Here, we discuss the choice of parameter used in this analysis.

8.4.1 CC vs CC+NC

As described in 1.2, neutrinos may interact in two distinct ways to produce light in the IceCube detector. These two methods, the charged-current and neutral-current interactions, provide separate windows into neutrino interactions. Tau neutrino events may interact in either of these channels depending on the neutrino energy.

PDG

With a mass of 1776.82 ± 0.16 MeV and a lifetime of 290.3 ± 0.5 femtoseconds , τ leptons produced during neutrino oscillations in DeepCore tend to travel very short distances before decaying. The charged-current interactions of the ν_τ result in a variety of signatures due to the unique decay behavior of the τ lepton.

$$\tau^- \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu \nu_\tau & 17.41 \pm 0.04\% \\ e^- \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\tau & 17.83 \pm 0.04\% \\ \text{Hadrons} & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8.1)$$

In either the muonic or the electronic decay modes, a fraction of the energy is lost to outgoing neutrinos, resulting in a smaller observed charge than would be associated with a corresponding interaction of another neutrino type. Furthermore, the muonic decay mode may lead to a visible muon track for the ν_τ interaction. These muon tracks associated with the appearance of ν_τ would appear at lower energies than the tracks corresponding to the ν_μ disappearance, allowing both effects to be observed simultaneously.

Unlike the varied results of the charged current interactions, neutral current interactions of neutrinos are assumed to have identical coupling and behavior, regardless of flavor and, therefore, undergo no observable change due to oscillations. Because of this, studies of the standard unitary PMNS matrix tend to treat neutral current events as effectively non-oscillating. In contrast, searches for new physics and sterile neutrinos result can result in a change in the apparent number of neutral current interactions in the detector.

superk paper, opera paper sources for un-oscillating NC

For this analysis, both approaches have been adopted. A fit using charged-current events as the signal is used to provide limits on the modifications to a 3x3 mixing matrix without the introduction of neutral-current altering behavior. A second fit, including both neutral current and charged current ν_τ events, provides more insight into possible extra flavors of neutrinos.

non-sterile explanations of non-unitarity? maybe the neutrino decay paper?

8.4.2 The ν_τ Normalization

Because effectively all ν_τ events observable in DeepCore are the result of neutrino oscillations, the total number of observed ν_τ interactions is a direct measure of the appearance itself. The number of ν_τ events interacting in DeepCore is, however, affected by many of the previously-discussed systematics. In particular, the number of events is strongly related to the assumed atmospheric oscillation parameters.

In order to provide a quantitative measure of the appearance, the overall normalization of signal events is used as a final physics parameter. The normalization is a fit parameter, defined to be a total modification of the number of candidate ν_τ events after all other systematic parameters are applied.

think up a better phrasing to introduce the tau normalization

$$f'_{ijk} = \sum_{m \neq \nu_\tau} f_{ijk}^m(\theta_{23}, \Delta m^2, \dots) + N_{\nu_\tau} f_{ijk}^{\nu_\tau}(\theta_{23}, \Delta m^2, \dots) \quad (8.2)$$

In this case, we end up with two general cases for the result. In the expected case, $N_{\nu_\tau} = 1.0$, we find that the number of candidate events is consistent with our modeling of the ν_τ and unitary PMNS mixing. If the value is significantly different from 1.0, we may have hints of either mismodeled cross-sections or of novel physics. Due to the large existing uncertainties in the PMNS matrix described in 8.1, either situation is likely to yield valuable information.

Crazy shit that I will probably take out, but maybe find the neutrino decay paper again?

8.4.3 Limits on the ν_τ Normalization

This analysis is not the first to search for appearance in this way. Two other experiments, OPERA and Super-Kamiokande, have reported previous measurements parametrized in the same way.

The OPERA Limit

The Oscillation Project with Emulsion-tRacking Apparatus, better known by the acronym OPERA, is an experiment designed to search for ν_τ appearance. Unlike IceCube's use of atmospheric neutrinos, OPERA uses muon neutrinos produced in the CERN Neutrinos to Gran Sasso (CNGS) beamline. OPERA uses an bricks of photographic films in order to accurately track and reconstruct neutrino interactions in the fiducial volume. This technique allows analyzers to clearly identify not only the initial neutrino interaction vertex, but also the decay products along the path of the charged lepton produced in charged current interactions. In OPERA, the muon and tau lepton produce significantly different signals due to the short lifetime and unique decay properties of the tau lepton. The impressive ability to

Interaction Mode	Non-tau-like	tau-like	All
CC nue	3071.0	1399.2	4470.2
CC numu	4231.9	783.4	5015.3
CC nutau	49.1	136.1	185.2
NC	291.8	548.3	840.1

Table 8.1 – The rates expected for each of the neutrino types in the Super-Kamiokande search for ν_τ appearance. Reproduced from.

identify the particle dynamics is balanced by the small fiducial volume of the experiment, yielding only 5408 useful events for analysis from five years of data-taking.

In 2015, OPERA released their final result in the search for ν_τ appearance. Five candidate events, shown in , were identified in the data sample with a signal expectation of 2.64 ± 0.53 and a background expectation of 0.25 ± 0.05 . The data unambiguously rules out the no-appearance hypothesis, with a rejection at 5.1σ .

In terms of the normalization described above, OPERA reported a final value of $1.8^{+1.8}_{-1.1}$ at the 90% level. This value is consistent with the standard unitary oscillation scheme, but with large errors.

The Super-Kamiokande Limit

Super-Kamiokande, described in 2.2, also has reported results in searches for ν_τ appearance. The Super-Kamiokande collaboration developed a new event selection in the search for ν_τ events, including the implementation of a neural net to identify τ -like and non- τ -like events. The neural net itself includes information about the energy of the event and is trained against a background sample of simulated events. Events are analyzed in terms of the zenith angle and the neural net output variable.

These two categories of events are fit with an unbinned likelihood including 28 systematic effects included in the analysis.

here

The Super-Kamiokande measurement yields an expectation of 185.2 ν_τ events in 5326 days or approximately 12.7 events per year . After fitting, the final rejection of the no-appearance hypothesis is found to be 4.6σ . Like OPERA, Super-Kamiokande finds more ν_τ candidate events than expected, with a best-fit normalization of 1.47 ± 0.32 .

8.5 Systematics Considerations

8.5.1 Oscillation Parameters

8.5.2 Flux Uncertainties

Atmospheric Muon Flux

Neutrino Flux

8.5.3 Propagation Uncertainties

8.5.4 Cross-section Uncertainties

Axial Masses

DIS Cross-sections

8.5.5 Detector Systematics

While the previous systematics have been concerned with global physics parameters, the remainder are dedicated to understanding the uncertainties associated with the IceCube detector itself, such as the properties of the PMTs and the ice. These parameters, collectively referred to as the **detector systematics**, do not have known analytic forms and may affect the rate of events, the reconstruction properties of a given event, or both. The effect of these uncertainties must be evaluated using additional Monte Carlo simulations.

The GRECO event selection uses a number of simulation sets, shown in 8.2 for signal and 8.3 for background, to characterize the effects of these detector systematics. Each set contains at least one simulation parameter changed from the baseline set and are run through the full GRECO processing.

Set Number	Coincident Fraction	DOM Eff	Hole Ice	Forward Coeff	Absorption	Scattering	Livetime
Baseline	0%	100%	25	0	100%	100%	30 years
640C	100%	100%	25	0	100%	100%	30 years
641	0%	88%	25	0	100%	100%	30 years
643		94%					
644		97%					10 years
645		103%					5 years
646		106%					10 years
648		112%					
660	0%	100%	15	0	100%	100%	10 years
661			20				
662			30				
663			35				
670	0%	100%	25	2.0	100%	100%	10 years
671				-5.0			
672				-3.0			
673				1.0			
674				-1.0			
681	0%	100%	25	0.0	92.9%	92.9%	30 years
682					110%	100%	
683					100%	110%	

Table 8.2 – Systematics sets used for the characterization of the signal neutrino events. While all listed sets have up to 30 years of effective livetime available, not all events are processed in each set.

Set Number	Oversizing	DOM Eff	Hole Ice	Forward Coeff	Absorption	Scattering	Livetime	Comments
Baseline	1.0	99%	25	0	100%	100%	5 years	1 year standard + 4 years KDE Prescale
A	1.0	69.3%	30	0	100%	100%	1 year	1 year standard
B		79.2%						
C		79.2%	25				4 years	4 years KDE Prescale
D		89.1%						
E		105%					1 year	1 year KDE Prescale
F	1.0	99%	15	0	100%	100%	5 years	1 year standard + 4 years KDE Prescale
G			30					
H	1.0	99%	30	-2	100%	100%	5 years	1 year standard + 4 years KDE Prescale
I				-4				
J	3.0	99%	25	0	100%	100%	1 year	1 year KDE Prescale
K					110%			
L					80%			
M					100%	80%		
N						110%		
O						120%		
P					92.9%	92.9%		
Q					114.2%	114.2%		

Table 8.3 – Systematics sets used for the characterization of the atmospheric muon background.

The GENIE simulation sets are produced with exactly one neutrino interaction per event. In the actual detector, a fraction of triggered events will consist of a temporally coincident muon and neutrino pair which may be from the same air shower or from independent showers. In order to account for this possibility, a sample of such events are simulated assuming independent showers. In this case, every produced event contains at least one atmospheric muon in addition to exactly one neutrino interaction. By interpolating between this "100% coincident" sample and the standard "0% coincident" sets, the effect of these events may be included in the final analysis.

The GRECO event selection actively selects against atmospheric muon-like events. The lowest-order effect of this choice is that increasing the coincident event fraction leads to a correspondingly lower total event rate, as shown in ?? . In order to distinguish the effect of the coincident events from a global normalization factor, the coincident event fraction is treated in a manner such that the total rate of events remains unchanged. The effect of this systematic in the final analysis is therefore shown in instead.

coin fraction figure

In most analyses in IceCube, a coincident event fraction of approximately 10% is assumed. This is derived from a combination of the atmospheric neutrino and muon fluxes assuming independent poissonian rates. At final level, the true fraction of coincident events is unknown, but previous oscillation analyses have found no clear issues using the standard simulation sets assuming no coincident events. A generous prior is therefore assumed to be a one-sided Gaussian distribution centered at 0% with a 10% width.

DOM Efficiency

As with all PMTs, the light detection probability of the IceCube DOMs is not perfect. Indeed, the total efficiency of detecting incident photons as measured by Hamamatsu, shown in ?? , is about 30% for the R7081-02 PMT used in standard IceCube DOMs. Before and during deployment, the net quantum efficiency of some DOMs were tested . The efficiency of the DOMs was again measured in-situo in order to better account for local effects like cable shadowing and the glass-ice interface. Dedicated measurement spost-deployment have used minimum ionizing muons in data and simulation and derived a modification of the assumed efficiency, hereafter referred to as the **DOM efficiency**, of $99\% \pm 10\%$.

Hamamatsu quantum efficiency? http://www.hamamatsu.com/resources/pdf/etd/LARGE_AREA_PMT_TPMH1286E.pdf

How many were tested in a lab before deployment?

Where does the domeff prior come from?

The DOM efficiency scales the probability of observing photons incident at the face of the DOM. A higher DOM efficiency leads to more information about individual particle interactions, leading to better reconstructions. The improved reconstructions lead to higher neutrino event rates at final level as well as more well-defined oscillation features in the reconstructed space. In addition, higher DOM efficiency increases the number of hits observed along atmospheric muon tracks, yielding improved veto efficiency. The net effect of changing the DOM efficiency by 10% is shown in .

domeff

Bulk Absorption and Scattering

The ice model used in IceCube is fit in-situo using various data from the deployment and detector operation in a process similar to the one described in 5.3. The model, here referred to as the **bulk ice model**, consists of scattering and absorption coefficients fit as a function of depth within the detector as well as information about anisotropy in the scattering properties of the ice . Uncertainties for these scattering and absorption coefficients, shown in , provide a significant source of uncertainty for physics measurements

ice model

bulk ice uncertainties vs depth

Chapter 8. A Search for Tau Neutrinos from Oscillations **8.5. Systematics Considerations**
 In IceCube. To handle these effects, global scale factors are used to modify all scattering or absorption coefficients in the bulk ice model simultaneously. Using the most recent published uncertainties on our ice model, a total uncertainty of approximately 10% is assumed for these global scale factors. Three variations are typically used, corresponding to sets with 10% larger absorption coefficients, 10% larger scattering coefficients, and a 7.1% reduction to both sets of coefficients.

The scattering and absorption exhibit different behaviors at final level in the GRECO sample. In general, the absorption behaves in a similar manner to the DOM efficiency, as both parameters modify the number of observed photons at the face of the PMT. In the signal samples, the effects of absorption uncertainties is relatively small. The most notable feature is an overall rate decrease (increase) for larger (smaller) absorption coefficients. As in the DOM efficiency, the depth of the oscillation minimum is also affected by the absorption coefficients due to a change in the reconstruction resolution.

The absorption, shown in , affects the atmospheric muons much more strongly than the neutrinos. Once again, this is due to the event selection: with weaker absorption (ie, smaller coefficients), more photons from the muon track may be detected. The observation of additional photons from the muon track improves the veto efficiency, leading to a significant decrease in the number of muons at final level.

absorption

The scattering, in contrast, has very little effect on the muon distribution, as seen in . No changes in rate or in reconstruction resolution are observed in the muon distributions.

scattering

In the neutrinos, the effects of the scattering are more important. In particular, stronger scattering (larger coefficients) lead to a reconstruction bias, with more events reconstructing as downgoing. This is a known effect of the reconstruction, where we use a version of the ice model which interprets off-time hits as being due to backscattered photons in a downgoing event.

Hole Ice and Forward Scattering

While the bulk ice refers to the scattering and absorption properties of the entire interaction volume, additional care must be taken for the ice close to the face of a PMT. During deployment, contaminants, including air, were introduced into the drill holes. These contaminants have been seen to form a dense column with unique scattering properties near the center of the drill holes. This bubble column, known as the **hole ice**, has properties separate from the rest of the ice model.

The uncertainties associated with the hole ice are significant and tend to elicit more attention than bulk ice uncertainties in searches for oscillations with DeepCore. The simulation of the hole ice model used here, discussed briefly in 4.2.4, requires two free parameters which will be referred to as the **lateral** and **forward** scattering parameters here for clarity. The lateral scattering modifies the efficiency of accepting photons incident from the horizon at each DOM while the forward scattering modifies only the acceptance of the very-forward region. The models of the angular acceptance are shown in .

hole ice and
hifwd

The effects of the two hole ice parameters show very similar behavior to that of the scattering uncertainty in the bulk ice, as all three coefficients are modeling the scattering properties of different locations in the ice.

For each of the simulation sets and each particle type, histograms are produced using the reconstructed energy, zenith, and track length. These systematic histograms give information about the expected change of the final histogram as a function of the changing systematics parameters, but the information is encoded in discretized points with statistical fluctuations due to the finite simulation statistics. In order to produce continuous systematics for analysis, the discrete detector systematics must be parametrized.

For this work, a hyperplane is fit to the detector systematics sets for each particle type and for each bin in the analysis histogram.

For neutrinos, a simple linear model is assumed for each detector systematic, with one free coefficient associated with each systematic as well as one free constant term independent of the systematics. The form of the hyperplane for each neutrino type in the bin ijk is given by 8.3.

$$f'_{ijk} = \left(\sum_m^{detsys} (a_m^{ijk} (x_m - x_m^0)) + b^{ijk} \right) f_{ijk} \quad (8.3)$$

For atmospheric muons, the form is slightly modified due to the strong effects observed from both the DOM efficiency and the absorption. In these two cases, an exponential model is selected to better describe the observed effects in simulation.

$$f'_{ijk} = \left(\sum_{m \neq DE, Abs}^{detsys} (a_m^{ijk} (x_m - x_m^0)) + \sum_m^{DE, Abs} (a_m^{ijk} e^{b^{ijk} (x_m - x_m^0)}) + c^{ijk} \right) f_{ijk} \quad (8.4)$$

8.6 The Method of Maximum Likelihood

8.6.1 The χ^2 Fit

The simplest implementation of a fitting algorithm begins with an assumption of the true and observed distributions. Namely, that the observed number of events in each bin of the histogram is drawn from a distribution approximately Gaussian with a mean μ equal to the expectation from simulations and a variance σ^2 calculated from the Poisson uncertainty on the expectation.

$$P(x|\mu) = N e^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2}} \quad (8.5)$$

where N is a normalization constant and, in the case of Poissonian statistics of simple histograms, the variance is given by the event weights in the specified bin.

$$\sigma^2 = \mu = \sum w \quad (8.6)$$

From this point, taking the logarithm yields the standard χ^2 definition for the likelihood after dropping the constant terms.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(x - \mu)^2}{\mu} \quad (8.7)$$

how do i flesh this out?

muon rates vs domeff and absorption to justify exponentials

Need to include some discussion of th goodness of fit for these sets. Maybe a plot of the chi2 values for all of the sets?

chi2 values for hyperplane parametrizations

This needs work. can't even be called a derivation. its just crap.

8.6.2 Finite Statistics

The χ^2 distribution above implicitly assumes that the dominant source of uncertainty at the best-fit point comes from the statistical fluctuations of the data around the true distribution represented by the Monte Carlo simulation. While this is true in the ideal case, in practice the statistical properties of the simulation sets themselves cannot be ignored. In general, every attempt should be made to ensure the statistical fluctuations of the simulation sets are negligible compared to those of the data. This typically leads to requests for at least an order of magnitude larger simulation statistics than expected from the data itself. In the situation where this is infeasible, modifications to the likelihood space itself may be used to account for the additional uncertainties. For this analysis the statistical uncertainties of the underlying simulation sets are added to the weighted uncertainties in quadrature.

make a plot showing χ^2 value as a function of mc stats scale factor to justify the 10x rule

$$\chi_1^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(x - \sum w)^2}{(\sum w)^2 + \sum w^2} \quad (8.8)$$

Due to the large uncertainties associated with the atmospheric muon sample, further considerations are necessary. In particular, the large uncertainties associated with atmospheric muon simulation statistics may be used by the fitter in order to reduce the χ_{FS}^2 value. This situation proceeds with the minimization process as normal until a runaway effect is observed by increasing the statistical uncertainties at the expense of data/simulation agreement. In this case, the numerator becomes simply

$$\lim_{N_\mu \rightarrow \infty} (x - \sum w)^2 = (\sum w)^2 \quad (8.9)$$

The resulting limit in each bin as the event weights become large is therefore

$$\lim_{N_\mu \rightarrow \infty} \chi_1^2 = \frac{(\sum w)^2}{(\sum w)^2 + \sum w^2} \quad (8.10)$$

$$\lim_{N_\mu \rightarrow \infty} \chi_1^2 = 0 \quad (8.11)$$

While this is a particular concern for all simulation types, the dominant contribution to the $\sum w^2$ term is the atmospheric muons. In addition, the atmospheric muons have the strongest impacts from non-normalization systematic uncertainties, particularly the DOM efficiency and the absorption. Modifying either of these parameters or the normalization systematics in the fit may lead to this runaway behavior.

In order to prevent this situation, a further modification of the χ^2 is necessary. For this analysis, the total scale of the statistical uncertainty is assumed to be set by the seed values of the fit.

$$N_{w^2} = \frac{\sum w_{Seed}^2}{\sum w^2} \quad (8.12)$$

With this modification, the χ^2 is now defined to be

$$\chi_{FS}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(x - \sum w)^2}{(\sum w)^2 + N_{w^2} \sum w^2} \quad (8.13)$$

8.6.3 Expected Contour

8.6.4 Expected Sensitivity over Time

8.6.5 Systematics Pulls

8.6.6 Feldman-Cousins vs Wilk's Theorem

8.7 Fitting Data

8.7.1 Burn Sample Fits: Testing the Fitting Code

8.7.2 Blind Fits: Checking the Goodness-of-Fit

8.8 Results from the Analysis

8.8.1 Individual Years

8.8.2 Combining Years of Data

8.8.3 Systematics Pulls in the Final Result

8.8.4 Implications and Future Work

Notes

list of atmo disappearance measurements that use zenith and energy binning . . .	41
dragon, leesard 3 year papers	41
dragon, leesard	41
cumulative plot of track length	41
cumulative plot of deltallh	41
roc curves for track length	42
this sentence needs to be reworded. its too verbose	42
mc templates!	42
nufit 2.2	42
PDG	42
superk paper, opera paper sources for unoscillating NC	43
non-sterile explanations of non-unitarity? maybe the neutrino decay paper? . . .	43
think up a better phrasing to introduce the tau normalization	43
Crazy shit that I will probably take out. but maybe find the neutrino decay paper again?	43
opera tau neutrino event views	44
opera paper: https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.01417	44
superk paper on appearance https://arxiv.org/pdf/1711.09436.pdf	44
https://arxiv.org/pdf/1711.09436.pdf again	44
wtf is going on here? table 1 in the paper gives an expectation of 185.2 events, but the stuff at the top right of page 11 says the expectation is 224...?! and NIETHER of these give the 1.47 that they quote. wtf	44
figure 14 of https://arxiv.org/pdf/1711.09436.pdf	44
coin fraction figure	48
Hamamatsu quantum efficiency? http://www.hamamatsu.com/resources/pdf/etd/LARGE_AREA_PMT_TPMH1286E.pdf	48
How many were tested in a lab before deployment?	48
Where does the domeff prior come from?	48
domeff	48
ice model	48
bulk ice uncertainties vs depth	48
absorption	49
scattering	49
hole ice and hifwd	49
how do i flesh this out?	50
muongun rates vs domeff and absorption to justify exponentials	50
Need to include some discussion of th goodness of fit for these sets. Maybe a plot of the chi2 values for all of the sets?	50

Results from the Analysis	Chapter 8	A Search for Tau Neutrinos from Oscillation	50
chi2 values for hyperplane parametrizations			50
This needs work. can't even be called a derivation. its just crap.			50
make a plot showing chi2 value as a function of mc stats scale factor to justify the			
10x rule			51