

15 December 2011

## Reply to ‘Corrections to the HARP–CDP Analysis of the LSND Neutrino Oscillation Backgrounds’

### Abstract

The alleged mistakes in recent papers that reanalyze the backgrounds to the ‘LSND anomaly’ do not exist. We maintain our conclusion that the significance of the ‘LSND anomaly’ is not  $3.8 \sigma$  but not larger than  $2.3 \sigma$ .

The HARP–CDP group

A. Bolshakova<sup>1</sup>, I. Boyko<sup>1</sup>, G. Chelkov<sup>1a</sup>, D. Dedovitch<sup>1</sup>, A. Elagin<sup>1b</sup>, D. Emelyanov<sup>1</sup>,  
M. Gostkin<sup>1</sup>, A. Guskov<sup>1</sup>, Z. Kroumchtein<sup>1</sup>, Yu. Nefedov<sup>1</sup>, K. Nikolaev<sup>1</sup>, A. Zhemchugov<sup>1</sup>,  
F. Dydak<sup>2</sup>, J. Wotschack<sup>2\*</sup>, A. De Min<sup>3c</sup>, V. Ammosov<sup>4†</sup>, V. Gapienko<sup>4</sup>, V. Koreshev<sup>4</sup>,  
A. Semak<sup>4</sup>, Yu. Sviridov<sup>4</sup>, E. Usenko<sup>4d</sup>, V. Zaets<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> **Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia**

<sup>2</sup> **CERN, Geneva, Switzerland**

<sup>3</sup> **Politecnico di Milano and INFN, Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy**

<sup>4</sup> **Institute of High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia**

---

<sup>a</sup> Also at the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

<sup>b</sup> Now at Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

<sup>c</sup> On leave of absence

<sup>d</sup> Now at Institute for Nuclear Research RAS, Moscow, Russia

† Deceased

\* Corresponding author; e-mail: joerg.wotschack@cern.ch

In two recent papers [1, 2], we reanalyzed the backgrounds to LSND’s signal of  $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$  oscillations [3] (the ‘LSND anomaly’), questioned LSND’s analysis procedures, and claimed that the significance of the ‘LSND anomaly’ is not  $3.8 \sigma$  but not larger than  $2.3 \sigma$ .

The concerns discussed in our papers are:

1. inadequate knowledge of  $\pi^\pm$  production by 800 MeV/ $c$  protons on various target nuclei at the time when LSND calculated their neutrino fluxes;
2. inadequate or missing consideration of pion production by higher-generation protons, pions, and—in particular—neutrons;
3. the inclusion of the first bin in the fit of the  $R_\gamma$  distribution that does not carry any information on the distinction between correlated and accidental  $\gamma$ ’s;
4. questions on the ‘efficiencies’ of correlated and accidental  $\gamma$ ’s;
5. questions on the effective rate of accidental  $\gamma$ ’s and their influence on the  $R_\gamma$  distributions of correlated and accidental  $\gamma$ ’s;
6. missing systematic errors of the ‘base distributions’ of correlated and accidental  $\gamma$ ’s; and
7. missing positrons from  $^{12}\text{N}_{\text{gs}}$  beta decays that are misidentified as correlated  $\gamma$ ’s.

Of these seven items, only items 1 and 7 are addressed in the paper ‘Corrections to the HARP–CDP Analysis of the LSND Neutrino Oscillation Backgrounds’ by G.T. Garvey *et al.* [4] that claims several mistakes in our analysis.

Before we argue in the following that these alleged mistakes do not exist, a clarification is in order. LSND insist on the notion that their neutrino flux calculations are correct within their quoted errors. We disagree with this notion. First, the knowledge of pion production cross-sections has considerably improved in the last decade (we use state-of-the-art Geant4 and FLUKA cross-sections, further improved by pertinent experimental results that are reported in Ref. [1]). Second, LSND apply the same percentage errors to neutrino flux integrals and to parts of the neutrino spectra—in particular to the small high-energy portions of the spectra, which is not realistic. Third, the LSND parametrization of pion cross-sections does not describe the results of their calibration experiment E866 [5]. All this leads to much too optimistic error assignments on neutrino fluxes by LSND, and to misconceptions on what quantities have actually been ‘measured’.

Our simulation of LSND’s setup serves the following purpose: to assess quantitatively the effect of the improvement of pion production cross-sections over those that were employed by LSND more than a decade ago. This necessitates (i) a simulation that can switch between the application of the LSND cross-sections (‘LSND emulation’) and our ‘best estimate’ cross-sections; and (ii) a demonstration that this simulation reproduces, with LSND cross-sections, approximately the published LSND result on the conventional  $\bar{\nu}_e$  background.

Our ‘LSND emulation’ reproduces with  $0.585 \times 10^{-12} (\text{pot.cm}^2)^{-1}$  remarkably well LSND’s published result on the conventional  $\bar{\nu}_e$  background of  $0.65 \times 10^{-12} (\text{pot.cm}^2)^{-1}$ . Then we add the observed increase when switching from the ‘LSND emulation’ cross-sections to our ‘best estimate’ cross-sections, to the conventional  $\bar{\nu}_e$  background that LSND published. In this procedure small differences between the real LSND setup and its simulation in our program cancel, and we obtain the conventional  $\bar{\nu}_e$  background that LSND should have obtained with our ‘best estimate’ cross-sections. The stringent result is an increase by a factor of 1.6.

The  $\bar{\nu}_e/\bar{\nu}_\mu$  ratio is not a useful quantity for the normalization of neutrino fluxes as  $\bar{\nu}_e$  originate from  $\mu^-$  from  $\pi^-$  decays while  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  originate from  $\mu^+$  from  $\pi^+$  decays. In the LSND energy domain  $\pi^+$  production is essentially unrelated with  $\pi^-$  production. Therefore, it makes

no sense to introduce an unnecessary error by transporting the uncertainty in  $\pi^+$  production into the calculation of the conventional  $\bar{\nu}_e$  background which originates from  $\pi^-$  only.

Our ‘best estimate’ of  $\nu_\mu$  and  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  rates from pion decay in flight is larger than the LSND estimate by factors of 2.5 and 3.3, respectively. The  $\nu_\mu$  and  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  rates refer to  $E_\nu > 123.7$  MeV for  $\nu_\mu$  and to  $E_\nu > 113.1$  MeV for  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  and hence to very small high-energy portions of the respective neutrino spectra. These portions are not relevant for the calculation of the conventional  $\bar{\nu}_e$  background. Rather, they are relevant for (i) calculating what we termed ‘Background II’ that concerns primarily events where a muon is misidentified as electron, and (ii) to appreciating LSND’s constraints on neutrino fluxes (which in no way contradict our claim of a conventional  $\bar{\nu}_e$  rate larger by a factor of 1.6). The factor of 3.3 for  $\bar{\nu}_\mu$  is essentially unrelated with our claim of a  $\bar{\nu}_e$  background larger by a factor of 1.6 than calculated by LSND. The proportionality between these two quantities purported by Garvey *et al.* [4] lacks justification.

We agree that ‘3 MeV’ is not a hard cutoff for muons that are not observed. Rather, it is a reasonable estimate. It is for this reason that ‘3 MeV’ is nowhere used in our calculation of ‘Background II’. We consider it safer to calculate Background II from the small portion of the neutrino spectrum between the neutrino energy threshold and 4 MeV above. The value of 4 MeV is approximate and beset with instrumental uncertainties; we bypass these uncertainties by considering not absolute numbers but relative numbers: we determine a factor by dividing ‘best estimate’ predictions by ‘LSND emulation’ predictions, and apply this factor as a correction to LSND’s estimate of Background II.

The final LSND physics paper [3] comprises a discussion of backgrounds that mimic 2.2 MeV  $\gamma$ ’s. There, even backgrounds as low as 0.1 events are discussed. There is no mention of a background from  $^{12}\text{N}_{\text{gs}}$  beta decays that is now claimed to be  $\sim 0.2$  events. As for the claim that an electron produces many more PMT hits than a photon, we note that the energy of a 2.2 MeV photon is in mineral oil within a few cm fully converted into the kinetic energy of electrons by Compton scattering and photoelectric interaction. The  $R$  distribution of betas from  $^{12}\text{N}_{\text{gs}}$  decays can neither agree with the  $R_\gamma$  distribution of correlated  $\gamma$ ’s nor with the  $R_\gamma$  distribution of uncorrelated  $\gamma$ ’s, for the pulseheight distribution of the beta’s is intrinsically different. It is straightforward to calculate the background from  $^{12}\text{N}_{\text{gs}}$  beta decays that mimic correlated  $\gamma$ ’s, and we stand by our estimate of a background of 2.3 events that was neglected by LSND.

In summary, we maintain our conclusion that the significance of the ‘LSND anomaly’ is not  $3.8\sigma$  but not larger than  $2.3\sigma$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Revisiting the ‘LSND anomaly’ I: impact of new data; A. Bolshakova *et al.*, preprint CERN-PH-EP-2011-174 (arXiv: 1110.4265), submitted for publication in Phys. Rev. D.
- [2] Revisiting the ‘LSND anomaly’ II: critique of the data analysis; A. Bolshakova *et al.*, preprint CERN-PH-EP-2011-200 (arXiv: 1112.0907), submitted for publication in Phys. Rev. D.
- [3] A. Aguilar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 112007 (2001).
- [4] Corrections to the HARP-CDP Analysis of the LSND Neutrino Oscillation Backgrounds; G.T. Garvey, W.C. Louis, G.B. Mills and D.H. White, arXiv: 1112.2181.
- [5] R.C. Allen *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **284**, 347 (1989).