Feasibility study of solar neutrinos with CYGNO

First preliminary results

Samuele Torelli





Physical motivations

- Directional DM detectors → capability of discriminating particles from different sources through directionality
- Possibility of making solar neutrinos an opportunity to study more than nuisance

- Solar neutrinos from pp cycle can be studied through elastic scattering on electrons
 - pp cycle neutrinos can be studied:
 - Low energy threshold (lower than Borexino)
 - Low background (Positive identification by sun direction correlation)





Expected rate

• Total cross section calculated with quantum field theory

Differential cross section integrated form threshold to maximum electron energy

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\nu_e}(E_{\nu}) &= \frac{G_F^2 m_e}{2\pi} \left\{ (g_V + g_A + 2)^2 \left[\frac{2E_{\nu}^2}{(m_e + 2E_{\nu})} - T'_{e,Thr} \right] + \right. \\ &\left. - (g_V - g_A)^2 \frac{E_{\nu}}{3} \left[\left(1 - \frac{2E_{\nu}}{m_e + 2E_{\nu}} \right)^3 - \left(1 - \frac{T'_{e,Thr}}{E_{\nu}} \right)^3 \right] + \right. \\ &\left. - (g_V - g_A)(g_V + g_A + 2) \frac{m_e}{2} \left[\frac{4E_{\nu}^2}{(m_e + 2E_{\nu})^2} - \frac{T'_{e,Thr}^2}{E_{\nu}^2} \right] \right] \end{aligned}$$

Threshold on e^- E set at 20 keV

- Expected rate calculated on 60:40 He/CF_4 gas mixture @ latm 25°C
- Oscillation taken into account

$$P(\nu_e \to \nu_\mu) = P_{e\mu} = \frac{1}{2}\sin^2(2\theta_{12}) \quad P(\nu_e \to \nu_e) = P_{ee} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\sin^2(2\theta_{12})$$

q [MeV]	P(q)	q $[MeV]$	P(q)	q $[MeV]$
0.00504	0.0035	0.11089	1.2477	0.21675
0.01008	0.0138	0.11593	1.3417	0.22179
0.01512	0.0307	0.12097	1.4370	0.22683
0.02016	0.0538	0.12601	1.5335	0.23187
0.02520	0.0830	0.13106	1.6310	0.23691
0.03024	0.1179	0.13610	1.7291	0.24195
0.03528	0.1582	0.14114	1.8278	0.24699
0.04032	0.2038	0.14618	1.9267	0.25203
0.04537	0.2543	0.15122	2.0258	0.25707

• pp flux tabulated taken from Bahcall

• Resulted rate:

$$R = N_e \sum \varphi(E_i) (P_{ee} \sigma_{\nu_e}(E_{\nu,i}) + P_{e\mu} \sigma_{\nu_\mu}(E_{\nu,i}))) \Delta E_{\nu,i}$$

i-th flux component

 $R = 2.9 \cdot 10^{-8} \ \frac{events}{s \cdot m^3} = 0.9 \ \frac{events}{y \cdot m^3}$

Not so bad for a 1000 m^3 detector

Expected electrons spectrum

• e^- angular distribution + energy spectrum:

I. Extraction of a random neutrino energy according to the flux











Expected electrons spectrum

- 3. Calculation of the e^- kinetic energy given E_{ν} and $\cos(\theta)$
- 4. Smearing of energy and angle according to the resolutions

 $E_{Sm} = E + gE$

g: factor extracted from a normalized gaussian with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = \sigma_F/E$

Same thing for the angle, but fixed σ_{θ}

5. Reconstruct the energy of the neutrino with E_{e^-} and $\cos \theta$ smeared

$$E_{\nu,Reco} = \frac{-m_e T_e - \sqrt{T_e^2 m_e^2 \cos(\theta)^2 + 2T_e m_e^3 \cos(\theta)^2}}{(T_e - T_e \cos(\theta)^2 - 2m_e \cos(\theta)^2)}$$

$$\frac{\sigma_E}{E} = \sqrt{4.33 + \frac{1890}{E}} \qquad \qquad \sigma_\theta = 0.3490$$

$$T'_{e}(\theta) = \frac{2E_{\nu}^{2}m_{e}\cos^{2}(\theta)}{(E_{\nu} + m_{e})^{2} - E_{\nu}^{2}\cos^{2}(\theta)}$$

$$\frac{\sigma_E}{E} = \sqrt{4.33 + \frac{1890}{E}}$$

$$t_{\theta} = 0.3490 = 20^{\circ}$$

p-1

Results

- $\cos(\theta)$ distribution for two different threshold: $20 - 100 \ keV$
- Signal free regions available for background measurements
- With higher threshold better signal but $R \sim 0.3 ev/(m^3 y)$





- Electron energy spectrum reconstrucred
- Typical falling exponential signal

Results





pp spectrum reconstructed (in agreement with the Borexino one)



Residual distribution

• Histogram std. dev. $0.16E_{\nu}$

Energy resolution

- $\sigma_{E_{\nu}}/E_{\nu}$ vs E_{ν} @ fixed e^- kinetic energy
- Same angular and Energy resolution of before
- I. Fix a neutrino Energy
- 2. Simulate the interaction (e^- Energy and $\cos(\theta)$)
- 3. In bins of electron energy build the $E_{\nu,Reco}$ distrib.
- 4. Fit each projection (Crystal ball) for any E_{ν}
- 5. Build the $\sigma_{E_{\nu}}/E_{\nu}$ vs E_{ν} for different e^- energy





Results in neutrinos E resolution



The first has more sense?

Other comparison

Comparison with Elisabetta's analytical result

The neutrino energy resolution σ_{Ev}/E_v is obtained from the derivatives of eq. (2) i.e.

$$\sigma_{\rm Ev} / E_{\rm v} = \sqrt{\{D_{\theta}^2 \sigma_{\theta}^2 + D_{\rm T}^2 (\sigma_{\rm T} / {\rm T})^2\}}$$
(11)

where the dimensionless logarithmic derivatives

$$D_{\theta} = (1/E_{v})(\partial E_{v}/\partial \theta) = (E_{v}/m_{e})\sqrt{\{1 + (2m_{e}/T) - [1 + (m_{e}/E_{v})]^{2}\}}$$
(12)
$$D_{T} = (T/E_{v})(\partial E_{v}/\partial T) = (E_{v} + m_{e})/(T + 2m_{e})$$



Remember: $FWHM = 2.355 \sigma_{Gaussian}$

Backup

Hellaz comparison

