

## Global analysis of neutrino oscillation experiments

#### **Christoph Andreas Ternes**

September 7<sup>th</sup> 2022





Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare SEZIONE DI TORINO

#### **Neutrino oscillations**



$$P_{\nu_{\alpha} \to \nu_{\beta}}(t) = \left| A_{\nu_{\alpha} \to \nu_{\beta}}(t) \right|^{2} = \sum_{k,j} U_{\alpha k}^{*} U_{\beta k} U_{\alpha j} U_{\beta j}^{*} e^{-i(E_{k} - E_{j})t}$$

#### Neutrino mixing matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13}e^{i\delta} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Three mixing angles  $\theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23}$ 1 Dirac + 2 Majorana CP-phases Three masses  $m_1, m_2, m_3$  for which two orderings are possible Oscillations are only sensitive to mass splittings



Neutrino oscillation probability in vacuum is given by

$$P_{\alpha\beta}(E,L) = \sum_{k,j} U^*_{\alpha k} U_{\beta k} U_{\alpha j} U^*_{\beta j} e^{i\frac{\Delta m^2_{kj}}{2E}L}$$

From the interplay of the mass splittings with energy and distance we see that different types of experiments are sensitive to different parameters

Parameter	Main contribution from	Other contributions from	
$\Delta m_{21}^2$	KamLAND	SOL	
$ \Delta m^2_{31} $	LBL+ATM+REAC	-	
$\theta_{12}$	SOL	KamLAND	
$\theta_{23}$	LBL+ATM	-	
$\theta_{13}$	REAC	(LBL+ATM) and (SOL+KamLAND)	
δ	LBL	$\operatorname{ATM}$	
МО	$(\mathrm{LBL}{+}\mathrm{REAC})$ and $\mathrm{ATM}$	COSMO and $0\nu\beta\beta$	

Parameter	Main contribution from	Other contributions from
$\Delta m_{21}^2$	KamLAND	SOL
$ \Delta m_{31}^2 $	LBL+ATM+REAC	-
$\theta_{12}$	SOL	KamLAND
$\theta_{23}$	LBL+ATM	_
$\theta_{13}$	REAC	(LBL+ATM) and (SOL+KamLAND)
$\delta$	LBL	$\operatorname{ATM}$
MO	(LBL+REAC) and ATM	COSMO and $0\nu\beta\beta$

Common sensitivities from different types of experiments

Combination of data sets can enhance sensitivities to oscillation parameters

=> Perform a global fit to neutrino oscillation data!











#### **Global fit** Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021 20 15 <sup>∼</sup>¥10 10 5 NO 0.024 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.016 0.020 0.028 $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ $sin^2\theta_{23}$ 20 15 <sup>7</sup>∕√ 10 5 6.5 7.0 8.0 8.5 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7 0.0 0.5 1.5 2.0 7.5 1.0 $\Delta m_{21}^2 [10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2]$ $|\Delta m^2_{31}| [10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2]$ δ/π Data as of summer 2020 See also: See also: Bari – 2107.00532, PRD 2021 NuFit - 2111.03086, Universe 2021

#### **Christoph Ternes**

#### **NOW 2022**

#### **Global fit**

Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021



#### **Global fit**

parameter	best fit $\pm 1\sigma$	$2\sigma$ range	$3\sigma$ range
$\Delta m_{21}^2 [10^{-5} \text{eV}^2]$	$7.50^{+0.22}_{-0.20}$ <b>2.7</b> %	<b>6</b> 7.12–7.93	6.94 - 8.14
$ \Delta m_{31}^2  [10^{-3} \text{eV}^2] \text{ (NO)}$	$2.55^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$ 1 20	2.49-2.60	2.47 - 2.63
$ \Delta m_{31}^2  [10^{-3} \text{eV}^2] \text{ (IO)}$	$2.45^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$	2.39-2.50	2.37 - 2.53
$\sin^2 \theta_{12} / 10^{-1}$	$3.18 \pm 0.16$ <b>5.0</b>	<mark>%</mark> 2.86−3.52	2.71 – 3.69
$\sin^2 \theta_{23} / 10^{-1} (\text{NO})$	$5.74 \pm 0.14$	5.41 - 5.99	4.34 - 6.10
$\sin^2 \theta_{23} / 10^{-1} $ (IO)	$5.78^{+0.10}_{-0.17}$ <b>2.59</b>	<b>o</b> 5.41–5.98	4.33 - 6.08
$\sin^2 \theta_{13} / 10^{-2}$ (NO)	$2.200^{+0.069}_{-0.062}$	2.069 - 2.337	2.000 - 2.405
$\sin^2 \theta_{13} / 10^{-2} $ (IO)	$2.225^{+0.064}_{-0.070}$	2.086 - 2.356	2.018 - 2.424
$\delta/\pi$ (NO)	$1.08^{+0.13}_{-0.12}$	0.84 - 1.42	0.71 – 1.99
$\delta/\pi$ (IO)	$1.58^{+0.15}_{-0.16}$	1.26 - 1.85	1.11 - 1.96

#### Data as of summer 2020

Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021

#### **Solar sector**



Better determination of mass splitting / mixing angle at KamLAND / solar expriments

A  $2\sigma$  tension in the measurement of the mass splitting

#### **Solar sector**



See talk by Y. Takeuchi

Discrepancy is reduced to  $1.1\sigma$  due to new Super-K data in 2020 Discrepancy is raised to  $1.5\sigma$  due to smaller error bars in 2022

#### **Reactor angle**



Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021

K. Luk, Neutrino 2022

See talk by Y. Hsiung

Global fit: 3.1% precision on reactor angle

3158 days Daya Bay data: 2.8% precision!

#### **Atmospheric sector**

Many experiments measure the atmospheric parameters



#### **Atmospheric octant**

LBL data on their own do not distinguish octants Adding ATM and REAC breaks degeneracies



Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021

#### **Atmospheric octant**



Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021 L. Wan, Neutrino 2022 2020 global fit prefers second octant New data from SK prefer (nearly) maximal mixing

See talk by Y. Takeuchi

#### **Atmospheric octant**



2020 global fit prefers second octant New data from SK prefer (nearly) maximal mixing Combined analysis of T2K+SK(+reactor angle) prefer second octant See talk by Y. Takeuchi



"Tension" in the measurement of the CP phase in current data



"Tension" remains when relaxing prior from reactor neutrinos

Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021



T2K and NOvA profiles disagree for NO

Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021



The measurement of delta is now worse than it was before

Valencia - Global Fit 2020, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021 Valencia - Global Fit 2018, 1708.01186, PLB 2018



The measurement of delta is improved in SK data and in the SK+T2K(+reactor angle) analysis

Global fit has  $2.5\sigma$  preference for normal neutrino mass ordering

- None of the experiments has a good sensitivity on its own
- The 2.5  $\sigma$  are due to a series of small or large tensions among different data sets
- The neutrino mass ordering is a sensible issue

The tension between T2K and NOvA in the measurement of the CP phase appears only for normal ordering



Although none of the experiments has a preference on its own, the combined analysis of all LBL data prefers IO!

At the same time there is slight preference for NO from atmospheric experiments



When combining LBL with REAC, NO is again preferred at  $1\sigma$  level, due to a better agreement in the measurement of the mass splitting among accelerators and reactor for normal ordering



When combining LBL with REAC, NO is again preferred at  $1\sigma$  level, due to a better agreement in the measurement of the mass splitting among accelerators and reactor for normal ordering



#### After combing everything we get $2.5\sigma$





 $2.5\sigma$  preference, coming from different tensions

New analysis from T2K+SK preferences NO at  $3\sigma$ ; difficult to estimate the impact of NOvA

#### Far future (DUNE, ORCA and Hyper-Kamiokande)





DUNE, ORCA and Hyper-K (and T2HK) will improve several measurements considerably

See talks by L. Stanco, C. Lastoria, Z. Xie

### Far future (JUNO)

#### JUNO collaboration, 2204.13249



JUNO will measure solar parameters with extremely good precision

See talk by M. Sisti

### (Not so) Far future (JUNO)



See also the combined sensitivity analyses in: -1911.06745 (JUNO + PINGU) -2008.11280 (JUNO + T2K-II) -2108.06293 (JUNO + ORCA)

Forero, Parke, Ternes, Zukanovich Funchal, 2107.12410, PRD 2021

# The addition of JUNO will boost the mass ordering sensitivity of the global neutrino oscillation fit to the $4\sigma$ - $5\sigma$ level

#### Conclusions

Some of the neutrino oscillation parameters are well measured

- T2K/NOvA disagreement not resolved after Neutrino 2022
- Due to this disagreement the determination of the CP phase and the neutrino mass ordering are worse than in 2018
- Open issues in the current picture are CP violation, atmospheric octant and neutrino mass ordering (apart from some anomalies)
- Next generation of experiments will address these issues

#### **Conclusions**



Valencia - Global Fit, 2006.11237, JHEP 2021

Data as of summer 2020



#### **Oscillation + Cosmology**



#### **Oscillation + Cosmology**

