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Why was MiniBooNE built?

MiniBooNE was built to prove or disprove the $\sim 1\text{eV}^2$ sterile neutrino oscillation interpretation of the LSND experiment.

Sitting inside the Booster Neutrino beam at Fermilab, it probed the same L/E as LSND.

https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6494

This is the last I will mention $1\text{eV}^2$ oscillation in the talk.
Mineral Oil Cherenkov Detector

MiniBooNE was a mineral oil Cherenkov detector.

Crucially, this technology could **not distinguish electron** induced cherenkov cones **from photon** induced cherenkov cones.

https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6494
What did MiniBooNE observe?

This is the region that the LSND oscillation was expected to have appeared for the best fit LSND parameter region.
What did MiniBooNE observe?

MiniBooNE observed a large excess in the much lower energy region (hence the name LEE).

This is the region that the LSND oscillation was expected to have appeared for the best fit LSND parameter region.
The LEE is...

- Contained below 800 MeV Visible energy. Majority below 400 MeV

Note! The drop in the first bin relative to the second is an artifact of binning. An \( E_{\text{vis}} > 140 \) MeV cut had already been applied despite the fact that binning goes from 100-200 MeV.
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The LEE is...

MiniBooNE Collaboration hep-ex/1805.12028

- Contained below 800 MeV Visible energy. Majority below 400 MeV
- Not fully isotropic, but only a slight preference to forward pointing.
- Relatively uniform in space (evenly distributed)
- If fit to two rings, opening angle between them $< 10^\circ$
- If fit to two rings, the reconstructed $\pi^0$ tends to have low momentum
A note on the new MiniBooNE dataset

As of this summer MiniBooNE published an updated analysis containing twice the statistics.

Impressively “The neutrino mode event rate of 100 events per $10^{17}$ POT has been stable to < 2% over the 15 year running period.”

However, it must be mentioned that although the statistics were doubled, no new Monte Carlo or improvements to the analysis were performed.

Everything you see in this talk will reference the combined new+old $1.284 \times 10^{20}$ POT dataset.

What is the particle content of the LEE?

$e^-$

$\gamma$
Possible Explanations: Motivated by backgrounds

**Intrinsic $\nu_e$ in the beam?** Constrained by measuring $\nu_\mu$ which come from the same $\pi$ decay as the $\mu$'s that subsequently produce the $\nu_e$.

**$\pi^0$ misidentification?** In which the second shower was missed or incorrectly reconstructed. MiniBooNE measured the largest sample of NC $\pi^0$ events ever collected and used this is constrain the exact rate of $\pi^0$'s for the CCQE analysis.

**Radiative $\Delta$ decay?** This has never been observed in the neutrino sector. MiniBooNE bound it using their NC $\pi^0$ measurements which agrees well with best theoretical calculations. The biggest channel of interest to MicroBooNE’s photon LEE analysis.
What is the particle content of the LEE?

- Overlapping $e^+ e^-$
- Highly Asymmetric $e^+ e^-$
Quantify Overlapping and Asymmetric?

Two immediate questions....

- How low-energy does the subleading electron have to be in an $e^+e^-$ pair in order for an "Asymmetric" pair to look like a single ring?
- How small an opening angle does the $e^+e^-$ pair have to have before it is "Overlapping" sufficiently to look like a single ring?

MiniBooNE has an advanced optical model to simulate exactly how particles looked in their detector [0806.4201] which complicated things.

Every event was fit under both the single ring hypothesis (electron-like) and the two-ring hypothesis ($\pi^0$-like) and used to build a likelihood based cut analysis.
MiniBooNE’s CCQE analysis cuts

“Distinguish one fuzzy ring from two fuzzy rings”

“Force a fit to two rings and see if it looks $\pi$-like”

- These require detailed knowledge of the optical modeling that MiniBooNE utilized. Exceptionally hard to approximate these with “simple” cuts... but we will try anyway.
Quantify Overlapping and Asymmetric?

Our approximations:

- How **low-energy** does the subleading electron have to be in an $e^+e^-$ pair in order for an "Asymmetric" pair to look like a single ring? $E_{\text{True}} < 30 \text{ MeV}$

- How **small an opening angle** does the $e^+e^-$ pair have to have before it is "Overlapping" sufficiently to look like a single ring? $\theta_{\text{SEP}} < 5^0$

- When forcing a two-ring fit to an event, the associated invariant mass should be sufficiently **non-$\pi^0$ like**: $m_{\gamma\gamma} < 80 \text{ MeV}$

Are these a perfect approximation of the MiniBooNE Optical modelling and likelihood analysis? No of course not, but the final answer is relatively insensitive to the specifics.
By now I hope I've convinced you that sufficiently overlapping or asymmetric $e^+e^-$ pairs could potentially mimic the MiniBooNE LEE events, but I've not introduced a model in which such a scenario could happen.
U(1)' mediated sterile neutrino decays

We assume that the SM gauge group is extended by a new factor U(1)' which kinetically mixes with SM hypercharge with a mixing parameter $\chi$.

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\nu SM} - \frac{1}{4} X_{\mu\nu} X^{\mu\nu} - \frac{\sin \chi}{2} X_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\mu^2}{2} X_\mu X^\mu$$

With $B_\mu$ and $X_\mu$ denoting the usual hypercharge $U(1)^Y$ and $U(1)'$ gauge fields, respectively.

We assume that no SM particles hold a charge under this new $U(1)'$ gauge symmetry.
Post Electroweak symmetry breaking

\[ SU(3)_C \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \quad \Rightarrow \quad SU(3)_C \otimes U(1)_{EM} \]

Post EWSM, due to the kinetic mixing we have introduced between $B$ and $X$, we now have mixed mass terms between the standard model $W^3$ and $B$ bosons and our new $X$ boson:

\[
L_{\text{Mass}} = \frac{(m_Z^{SM})^2}{2} \left( \overline{B} \ W^3 \ X \right) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{s_w^2}{c_x} + \tilde{\mu}^2 t_x^2 & -s_w c_w \frac{c_x}{c^2} & -\tilde{\mu}^2 t_x & 0 \\ -s_w c_w \frac{c_x}{c^2} & c_W^2 & 0 & \tilde{\mu}^2 \\ -\tilde{\mu}^2 t_x^2 & 0 & \tilde{\mu}^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{B} \\ W^3 \\ X \end{pmatrix}
\]

(bar'd bosons are related by a simple field shift: $\overline{X}_\mu = X_\mu + \sin \chi B_\mu$ and $\overline{B}_\mu = \cos \chi B_\mu$. )
Diagonalize the mass matrix

Post diagonalizing this mass matrix, we obtain

\[ M_0^2 = 0 \quad \text{Identically 0} \]

\[ M_1^2 = M_{Z^0}^2 \left( 1 - \sin(\theta_w) \tan(\beta) \tan(\chi) \right) \approx M_1 = M_{Z^0} + \mathcal{O}(\chi) \]

\[ M_2^2 = M_{Z'}^2 \left( 1 + \sin(\theta_w) \frac{\tan(\chi)}{\tan(\beta)} \right) \approx M_2 = \mu + \mathcal{O}(\chi) \]

How are these mass eigen-states related to our initial gauge bosons?

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
A \\
Z \\
Z'
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
c_w & s_w & c_w \chi \\
-s_w & c_w & 0 \\
s_w^2 \chi & -s_w c_w \chi & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
B \\
W^3 \\
X
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Gauge boson's
Add a single sterile neutrino

- We now introduce a new SM-gauge singlet which is charged under the new U(1)', which naturally is allowed to mix with the SM active neutrinos.

- Despite the fact no SM particles is charged under this new U(1)′ gauge symmetry, post electroweak symmetry breaking and due to the kinetic mixing of the X and B bosons, all SM particles pick up a small “effective” U(1)′ charge.

- This combination of gauge kinetic mixing and sterile-active neutrino mixing generates an interesting phenomenology at short baselines that can give rise of an LEE signature.
Interaction Lagrangian:

\[ \mathcal{L} \supset -e q f c W_x f \gamma^\mu f Z'_\mu \]

Active-Active vertices are doubly oppressed

Active-Sterile mixing

\[ U^*_{\alpha 4} g' \bar{\nu}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_4 Z'_\mu + U^*_{\alpha 4} U_{\beta 4} g' \bar{\nu}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\beta Z'_\mu \]

Gauge kinetic mixing

Interactions of \(Z'\) with charged fermions are purely vectorial

Active-Active vertices are doubly oppressed
Generating the LEE signal

A muon-neutrino from Booster Neutrino Beam..

\[ \nu_\mu \rightarrow Z' \rightarrow \nu \]

Producing a heavy sterile neutrino \textit{in-situ} inside the MiniBooNE detector

...Strikes a nucleon in the MiniBooNE Mineral Oil
Generating the LEE signal

\[ \propto |U_{\mu 4}|^2 \chi^2 \left( \frac{M_Z}{M_{Z'}} \right)^4 \]

\[ = \approx 0.01 \times \text{the NC rate in MiniBooNE} \]

Smaller \( M_{Z'} \) means:
- Larger cross-section
- Small momentum transfer \((Q^2)\) thus very forward going sterile neutrinos

Larger \( M_{Z'} \) means:
- Smaller cross-section
- Larger \( Q^2 \) and a **more isotropic distribution of sterile neutrinos**
Generating the LEE signal

If $Z'$ mass > sterile mass then the sterile neutrino can't 2-body decay to an on-shell $Z'$. Largest decay channel becomes:

$$N \rightarrow \nu_\alpha e^+ e^-$$

The mass of the sterile has a large impact on the overall visible energy spectrum. Need sufficiently small mass to account for the "Low" aspect of the low-energy excess.
Generating the LEE signal

If $Z'$ mass $> \text{sterile mass}$ then the sterile neutrino can't 2-body decay to an on-shell $Z'$. Largest decay channel becomes:

$$N \rightarrow \nu_\alpha e^+ e^-$$

The mass of the sterile has a large impact on the overall visible energy spectrum. Need sufficiently small mass to account for the "Low" aspect of the low-energy excess.
Excellent spectral agreement! Generally insensitive to mass of the Z'.

- Too large a Sterile mass ➔ too many events at high reconstructed energy.
- Too small a sterile mass ➔ most events fall into lowest bin only.
Results: Angular Spectrum

- Too small a $Z'$ mass $\square$ spectrum becomes increasingly forward and non-isotropic
- However, rate of scattering decreases as $Z'$ mass grows too.
Concrete example

For this **minimal realization** we find that we can explain the MiniBooNE LEE with neutrino mixing angles of $|U_{\mu 4}|^2 = 1.5 \times 10^{-6}$ and $|U_{\tau 4}|^2 = 7.8 \times 10^{-4}$, a kinetic mixing strength of $\chi^2 = 5 \times 10^{-6}$.

In this case, the hierarchy in mixing angles leads to a dominant visible decay of $N \rightarrow \nu_\tau e^+ e^-$ with a total decay length of $O(1\text{m})$.

If one extends the dark sector with additional sterile states one can trivially have the dominant visible decay modes being:

$$N \rightarrow \nu_5 e^+ e^-$$

Skirting the need for larger $U_{\tau 4}$ mixings
Bounds on Active-Sterile mixing, $U_{\alpha4}$

- Bounds from beam dump style experiments on $U_{\mu4}$ from PS191 and NuTeV as well as $U_{\tau4}$ from NOMAD and CHARM are exponentially weakened as the decay length of such a heavy sterile state is $O(1-10m)$ meaning the flux of heavy steriles decay away before reaching the detectors.

- Bounds on mixing from **kinematic peak searches** at the end points of meson decays (e.g. $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu\mu$) remain equally valid and provide the strongest bounds on the active-sterile mixing in the regime of interest and are satisfied by our model.
Bounds on Active-Sterile mixing, $U_{\alpha 4}$

- Bounds from beam dump style experiments on $U_{\mu 4}$ from PS191 and NuTeV as well as $U_{\tau 4}$ from NOMAD and CHARM are exponentially weakened as the decay length of such a heavy sterile state is $O(1-10m)$ meaning the flux of heavy steriles decay away before reaching the detectors.

- Bounds on mixing from **kinematic peak searches** at the end points of meson decays (e.g. $\pi \rightarrow \mu \nu_{\mu}$) remain equally valid and provide the strongest bounds on the active-sterile mixing in the regime of interest and are satisfied by our model.

Bounds on $U(1)'$ kinetic mixing, $\chi$

- Any experiment which looked for the visible decays of on-shell Z' particles must be reconsidered taking into account the invisible decays of the new boson which dominate and lead to a visible branching fraction which is **suppressed by a factor of $\chi$**. e.g BABAR, KLOE, A1/MAMI.

- Bounds due to EW precision measurements of the SM Z-boson still apply but are well below the region of interest.
U(1)' models in Future and Current LArTPCs

This class of models has incredibly rich phenomenology at LArTPCs such as MicroBooNE, SBND or the DUNE near detector:

LArTPCs have the distinct advantage that one can tell photons and electron showers apart via two methods:

- Directly look for the **conversion gap**

  ![Conversion Gap Diagram](image1.png)

  - Protons interact with the LArTPC, producing a conversion gap where the energy deposition significantly decreases.

- Use **Calorimetric measurements** to see rate of energy deposition (dE/dx). **Photons** that pair convert to e⁺e⁻ deposit \( x_2 \) as much energy.

  ![Calorimetric Measurements Diagram](image2.png)

  - Photons deposit energy differently compared to electrons, allowing for distinction in energy deposition patterns.
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U(1)’ models in Future and Current LArTPCs

\[ M_{Z'} > M_N \]

We estimate \(~150\) LEE signal-like events in MicroBooNE that be split between an overlapping \(e^+e^-\) pair and an asymmetric \(e^+e^-\) (assuming 80% reco efficiency, \(6.6\times10^{20}\) POT)

The overlapping sample would be indistinguishable from single photons.

Unlike MiniBooNE, LArTPC’s can use calorimetric measurements of the rate of energy deposition \((dE/dx)\) in the initial few cm’s of a shower to distinguish between asymmetric events.

These single shower events have to compete with the large NC \(\pi^0\) background, without a proton to “tag” the neutrino vertex either.
U(1)’ models in Future and Current LArTPCs

$$M_{Z'} > M_N$$

However, our $Z'$ is quite heavy, $O(\text{GeV})$ and so has quite the momentum exchange with the Ar nucleon. Thus alongside these lone single shower events we predict ~500 events that have hadronic activity as well as distinguishable $e^+e^-$ pairs.

Depending on the exact decay rate this $e^+e^-$ pair may not be attached to the proton, nor will it necessarily point back to the “vertex”.

Low SM background but “vertexing” has never been optimized for such topological events.

We estimate ~150 LEE signal-like events in MicroBooNE that be split between an overlapping $e^+e^-$ pair and an asymmetric $e^+e^-$ (assuming 80% reco efficiency, 6.6e20 POT)

The overlapping sample would be indistinguishable from single photons.

Unlike MiniBooNE, LArTPC’s can use calorimetric measurements of the rate of energy deposition (dE/dx) in the initial few cm's of a shower to distinguish between asymmetric events.

Unlike MiniBooNE, LArTPC’s can use calorimetric measurements of the rate of energy deposition (dE/dx) in the initial few cm's of a shower to distinguish between asymmetric events.
Summary

- We proposed a novel solution for the MiniBooNE LEE based on heavy sterile neutrino (~100 MeV) production and decay inside the detector, both of which are mediated by a new Z' (~1 GeV).

- The explanation hinges on the mis-identification of the EM shower by a combination of highly asymmetric and overlapping $e^+e^-$ pairs.

- We have given a concrete minimal realization that evades current bounds.

- This class of models have a very rich phenomenology at short baselines.

- If observed in LArTPCs measuring the fraction of overlapping to asymmetric $e^+e^-$ one can gain distinguishing power between different hierarchies of models ($M_{Z'} < M_N$ and $M_{Z'} > M_N$) as well as potentially resolve $M_N$ and $M_{Z'}$ itself.
Thank you
What fraction of heavy sterile decays are Asymmetric/Overlapping?

We have studied this via a dedicated Monte Carlo simulation of decay events, confirming that the percentage of $e^+e^-$ decays in our model which are classified as asymmetric or overlapping events is mostly insensitive to the $Z'$ mass.

- Typical values ranging from 40% (for $M_N$ of 50 MeV) to below 10% (for $M_N \geq 200$ MeV).

A natural question is thus

"What happens to the other events that have widely separable $e^+e^-$ and are obviously two-ring events?"
Three sidebands and an NC $\pi^0$ measurement...

A.A. Aguilar-Arevalo, Thesis
**In-situ $\pi^0$ measurement**

MiniBooNE Measured the $\pi^0$ *in-situ* and used this to verify their monte-carlo predictions.
Low energy $\pi^0$ Excess?

MiniBooNE Measured the $\pi^0$ \textit{in-situ} and used this to verify their monte-carlo predictions.

MiniBooNE actually saw an \textit{excess} of low-momentum $\pi^0$ -like events. (Look at the grey dashed uncorrected MC line)

Same as $\pi^0$ invariant mass plot on last slide but split up in groups of $\pi^0$ -momentum
$\pi^0$ MC Correction

MiniBooNE Measured the $\pi^0$ in-situ and used this to verify their monte-carlo predictions.

MiniBooNE actually saw an excess of low-momentum $\pi^0$-like events. [Look at the Gray dashed Uncorrected MC line]

The Monte Carlo simulation was the “Corrected” by increasing the number of expected $\pi^0$’s with low momentum.
Three sidebands..

Unfortunately these are post-correction and without detailed knowledge of optical model hard to tell exactly where our excess would fall.

A.A. Aguilar-Arevalo, *Thesis*
Alternative regime of Bertuzzo et al.: $M_{Z'} < M_N$  

Vast majority of events are (a) **coherently** produced and hence have no associated protons in the scattering (b) **extremely overlapping**.

This means the entire signal sample is indistinguishable from a lone photon shower, and without a proton to “tag” or locate the interaction vertex.

Due to increases size of Argon nucleus over Carbon, rate is even larger in MiniBooNE than MiniBooNE due to coherent production.
In the model presented here, in which $M_{Z'} > M_N$, the near-isotropic nature of the LEE is ensured by having a heavy enough $Z'$ such that the momentum transfer in the upscattering is sufficient to guarantee the result sterile neutrino is not forward going.

An alternative approach was also put forward [Enrico Bertuzzo, Sudip Jana, Pedro A. N. Machado, Renata Zukanovich Funchal] in which $M_{Z'} < M_N$ and while the scattering tends to produce forward going sterile neutrinos, the resulting decay of the sterile (which is now governed by two successive two-body decays $N \rightarrow \nu_\mu Z'$ and $Z' \rightarrow e^+ e^-$) gives the signal the necessary angular isotropy.

These two regimes are different phenomenological realizations of the same underlying generic model and highlight that if abstracted away from the LEE, these models can provide even more interesting studies.
The hadronic current in the neutrino-proton cross section is parameterized by the electromagnetic form factors of the proton, as the $Z'$ only couples to SM particles via its electric charge vectorially.

We include both coherent scattering off of Carbon and incoherent scattering off the constituent protons of the detector medium. The coherent cross section is computed using an analytical approximation of a Woods-Saxon form factor based on the symmetrized Fermi function.