Review on sensitivity to neutrino mass

Nicola Rossi and A. Cocco, N. D'Ambrosio,
M. Messina, F. Pofi and F. Virzi (*LNGS Group*)

PTOLEMY ITA Meeting
Roma, Feb 18th 2024



Part I

What we know about neutrino mass

Neutrino mass

1. $m_\beta^2 = \sum_i |U_{ei}|^2 m_i^2$ [beta decay]
2. $m_{\beta\beta} = |\sum_i U_{ei}^2 m_i|$ [double beta decay]
3. $\Sigma = \sum_i m_i$ [cosmology]

⚠ **Depending on**

- Mass ordering
- Oscillation parameters
- Cosmological model

Reference formulae

NuFIT 5.2 (2022)

without SK atmospheric data

			ing ($\Delta\chi^2 = 2.3$)	
				3σ range
$\sin^2\theta_{12}$	0.			$0.270 \to 0.341$
$\theta_{12}/^\circ$	3			$31.31 \to 35.74$
$\sin^2\theta_{23}$	$0.572^{+0.018}_{-0.023}$	$0.406 \to 0.620$	$0.578^{+0.016}_{-0.021}$	$0.412 \to 0.623$
$\theta_{23}/^\circ$	$49.1^{+1.0}$		$49.5^{+0.9}$	2.1
si				02396
θ_1				90
δ_C				60
1				03
10^{-3} eV^2	$+2.511^{}_{-0.027}$	$+2.428 \to +2.597$	$-2.498^{}_{-0.025}$	$-2.581 \to -2.408$

$$m_{\nu_e}^{\rm eff} = \sqrt{\sum_i m_i^2 |U_{ei}|^2} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{m_0^2 + \Delta m_{21}^2 (1 - c_{13}^2 c_{12}^2) + \Delta m_{32}^2 s_{13}^2} & \text{in NO} \\ \sqrt{m_0^2 + \Delta m_{21}^2 c_{13}^2 c_{12}^2 - \Delta m_{32}^2 c_{13}^2} & \text{in IO}\,, \end{cases}$$

with SK atmospheric data

	Normal Ordering (best fit)		Inverted Ordering ($\Delta\chi^2 = 6.4$)	
$\frac{\Delta m^2_{21}}{10^{-5}\ \text{eV}^2}$	$7.41^{+0.21}_{-0.20}$	$6.82 \to 8.03$	$7.41^{+0.21}_{-0.20}$	$6.82 \to 8.03$
$\frac{\Delta m^2_{3\ell}}{10^{-3}\ \text{eV}^2}$	$+2.507^{+0.026}_{-0.027}$	$+2.427 \to +2.590$	$-2.486^{+0.025}_{-0.028}$	$-2.570 \to -2.406$

$$m_{ee} = \left| \sum_i m_i U_{ei}^2 \right|$$
$$= \begin{cases} \left| m_0 c_{12}^2 c_{13}^2 + \sqrt{\Delta m_{21}^2 + m_0^2}\, s_{12}^2 c_{13}^2 e^{2i(\eta_2 - \eta_1)} + \sqrt{\Delta m_{32}^2 + \Delta m_{21}^2 + m_0^2}\, s_{13}^2 e^{-2i(\delta_{\rm CP} + \eta_1)} \right| & \text{in NO} \\ \left| m_0 s_{13}^2 + \sqrt{m_0^2 - \Delta m_{32}^2}\, s_{12}^2 c_{13}^2 e^{2i(\eta_2 + \delta_{\rm CP})} + \sqrt{m_0^2 - \Delta m_{32}^2 - \Delta m_{21}^2}\, c_{12}^2 c_{13}^2 e^{2i(\eta_1 + \delta_{\rm CP})} \right| & \text{in IO}\,. \end{cases}$$

About ordering

~~N.O.~~

I.O.

Y.E.S.

Yearningly
Expected
Spectrum

[F. Vissani, Neutrino 2018]

Beta decay ent-point

KATRIN (Tritium)

$m_\beta < 0.45$ meV (90% CL)
(Lokhov-Tkachov)

$m_\beta < 0.31$ meV (90% CL)
(Feldman-Cousins)

$Q_\beta = 18575.0 \pm 0.3$ meV

Neutrino-less double beta decay



KamLAND-Zen

$T_{1/2} > 3.8 \times 10^{26}$ y

$m_{\beta\beta} < 28\text{-}122$ meV

LEGEND-200

$T_{1/2} > 1.9 \times 10^{26}$ y

$m_{\beta\beta} < 79\text{-}180$ meV

Cosmology



Neutrinos affects the growth of the cosmic clustering → CMB, LSS

Planck+ACT+BAO+RSD
Planck+ACT_new
Planck+BAO_sample5eV_new
CMB+ACT DR6 lensing+DESI



$m_{\beta\beta}$ Bootstrap





Next generation 0νββ
(KamLAND-Zen, LEGEND-1000, CUPID)
$m_{\beta\beta}$ ~ 15 meV

$(m_0, m_{\beta\beta}) = f(\text{oscillation, Majorana, Cosmology})$

Chance for discovery:
Planck + ACT: **66%**
Planck + BAO: **41%**
Planck + BAO + ACT + RDS: **36%**
Planck + BAO + DESI: **16%**

m_β Bootstrap







Most conservative choice (CMB only)

$\langle m_\beta \rangle$ = 31 meV (NO)

$\langle m_\beta \rangle$ = 72 meV (IO)

(challenging)

Dirac vs Majoarana

Race for Majorana Neutrino

$T_{1/2} > 10^{28}$ y

LEGEND-1000

(1t of ^{76}Ge, 500 M$, >10 y)

nEXO

(5t of ^{136}Ge, 500 M$, >10 y)

CUPID

(1t of ^{100}Mo, 100 M$, >10 y)

Expected rate

- Dirac 0.4 events/g/y
- Majorana 0.8 events/g/y



Problem to face

1 g

5000 m^2

We urgently need
source compactification!!!



100 g

500000 m^2

Part II

Experimental sensitivity to neutrino mass

Reference source

$$N_{dec} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{m_S \mathcal{N}_A}{A_{(^3H)}}(1 - e^{-t/\tau})\right) \simeq 10^{16}$$

(50% Efficiency for total events) in 3 y



(x 3 years)

ρ = 0.2 mg/m²
(full loading)

→ 1 µg

716 MBq
(19.3 mCi)

Origin of sensitivity





Spectrum distortion

Region of interest

Counting analysis



$$N_{\sigma,m} = \int_{E_{th}} S_{\sigma,m}(E)dE$$

$$N_{\sigma,0} = \int_{E_{th}} S_{\sigma,0}(E)dE$$

Sensitivity 90%CL : =

$$\frac{N_{\sigma,0} - N_{\sigma,m}}{\sqrt{N_{\sigma,0} + N_{\sigma,m}}} = 1.64$$

Sensitivity from counting



Codice: PtSens®



Profile likelihood





$$\mathcal{L}_0 = -2\log\frac{\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma,0}|\mathrm{data}_0)}{\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma,m}|\mathrm{data}_0)}$$

$$\mathcal{L} = -2\log\frac{\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma,0}|\mathrm{data}_\mathrm{m})}{\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma,m}|\mathrm{data}_\mathrm{m})}$$

[Cowan et al. (2013)]

Profile likelihood with spectral fit: 1 μg



Example

m = 200 meV,

σ = 50 meV

L_1/L_0 as a function of m_{eff}





For different resolution

from 50 meV to 1 eV

Resulting sensitivity 1 μg





Counting analysis

Profile Likelihood

Effect of releasing Q_0 – Ex 2/2





Q fixed

M = 175 meV

σ = 500 meV

Q free

M = 175 meV

σ = 500 meV

Effect of releasing Q_0 – Ex 1/2





Q fixed

M = 100 meV

σ = 500 meV





Q free

M = 100 meV

σ = 500 meV

Sensitivity to (unknown) smearing



Zero-point Field (ZPF) Effect

Spectrum Deconvolution



Region-1: dominated by ZPF effect

Region-2: mass distortion region

Observed spectrum

$$S(E) = S_m(E) \otimes G_{\rm Res} \otimes G_{ZPF}$$

Strategy:

1. Deconvolution in Region-1

$$\tilde{G}_{ZPF} \simeq S(E) \otimes G_{Res}^{-1} \otimes S_0^{-1}(E)$$

2. Penalty fit in Region-2

$$S_m(E) = S(E) \otimes \tilde{G}_{ZPF}^{-1} G_{Res}^{-1}$$

Deconvolution example

Fit in Region-2



Fit in Region-1



Events in Region-1 (~ 10^{15}) are 1/10 of events needed for Region-2 fit (~ 10^{16})

Simulated:

σ_{zpF} = 500 meV

meff = 200 meV

Deconvoltuion in Region-1 (-20, -3):

σ_{Δ} = 0.49 +/- 0.06 eV (12%)

Mass with prior from fit in (-3, 2):

m_{ν} = 0.196 +/- 0.026 eV (13%)

Example 2/2



Simulated:

σ_Δ = 500 meV

m_ν = 125 meV

σ = 200 meV



Sensitivity to (known) smearing



Quantum levels



Total spectrum

Region of interest





S_m (200 meV)

S_0 (0 meV)

Random sampling

10 µg sample

Profile likelihood



Source = 1 μg

m = 200 meV

σ = 50 meV

Profile likelihood



Source = 10 μg

m = 200 meV

σ = 50 meV

Profile likelihood



Source = 20 μg

m = 200 meV

σ = 50 meV

Profile likelihood





Source = 50 μg

m = 200 meV

σ = 50 meV

Profile likelihood





Source = 100 μg

m = 200 meV

σ = 50 meV

From P. Campana (Bayesian)

- The dependence of the upper limits on m_ν from the number of collected events N has been fitted with a power law.
- In each case, the results are consistent between different choices of CL.



Conclusions

- Ptolemy could be **competitive with KATRIN** in the neutrino mass exploration with a very small target (1μg)
- (Tough) **expectations for m_β** are not really promising
- Gaussian unknown or complex know **smearing** could be reasonably handled

Thank you very much!